Defects in Open String Field Theory:

Organizing the OSFT Landscape







To Appear, (w/ Toshiko Kojita, Toru Masuda and Martin Schnabl)

related works

1406.3021, JHEP 1410 (2014) 029 (w/ Ted Erler)

1506.03723, JHEP 1508 (2015)149 (*w*/ *Martin Schnabl*) 1402.3546, JHEP 1405 (2014) 004 1207.4785, JHEP 1307 (2013) 033 (*w*/ *Matej Kudrna and Martin Schnabl*) 1201.5122, JHEP 1206 (2012) 084 (*w*/ *Ted Erler*) 1201.5119 , JHEP 1204 (2012) 107 (*w*/ *Ted Erler*) (solution for any D-brane system)

(non-pertrurbative marginal deformations II) (non-pertrurbative marginal deformations I) (boundary state from OSFT) (pure gauge form of OSFT solutions II) (pure gauge form of OSFT solutions I)

Theory of Fundamental Interactions, Napoli 16/09/2015

Open String Field Theory (OSFT) is a microscopic theory for D-branes, formulated as a *field theoretic* description of *open strings*



OPEN STRING FIELD THEORY

- Fix a bulk CFT (closed string background)
- Fix a reference BCFT₀ (open string background, D-brane's system)
- The string field is a state in BCFT₀

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i} t_i \,\psi^i(0)|0\rangle_{SL(2,R)}$$

- There is a non-degenerate inner product (BPZ) $\langle \psi, \phi \rangle = \langle \psi(-1)\phi(1) \rangle_{\text{BCFT}_0}^{Disk}$
- The bpz-inner product allows to write a target-space action $S[\psi] = -\frac{1}{2} \langle \psi, Q\psi \rangle_{\mathrm{BCFT}_0} \frac{1}{3} \langle \psi, \psi * \psi \rangle_{\mathrm{BCFT}_0} = S_{eff}[t_i]$
- Witten product *: associative product between states (OPE+conf. map
- Equation of motion

$$Q\Psi + \Psi * \Psi = 0$$

OSFT CONJECTURE (*once known as Sen's Conjectures*)



- Key tool for connecting the two sets is the OSFT construction of the boundary state (Kiermaier, Okawa, Zwiebach (2008), Kudrna, CM, Schnabl (2012))
- The (KMS) boundary state is constructed from gauge invariant quantities starting from a given solution

Tachvon Vacuum

• Intriguing possibility of relating BCFT consistency conditions (Cardy-Lewellen, Pradisi-Sagnotti-Stanev) with OSFT equation of motion!

SOLUTION FOR ANY BACKGROUND

Erler, CM (2014)

• A change in boundary conditions is encoded in a bcc operator (*Cardy, '86-'89*)



 OSFT: describe the dof of a target BCFT* using the dof of a reference BCFT₀

$$\phi_*(0)|0\rangle_* \to \sigma(1)\phi_*(0)\overline{\sigma}(-1)|0\rangle_0 = \sum_i t_i\phi_0^i(0)|0\rangle_0$$

Idea back from Vacuum SFT (Rastelli, Sen, Zwiebach, 2000)



 Connect two generic backgrounds by passing through the tachyon vacuum (simplest universal solution: no D-branes)



 The Sigma's can be constructed due to the trivial cohomology at the Tachyon Vacuum, using bcc's

$$Q_{\mathrm{tv}}A \equiv QA + [\Psi_{\mathrm{tv}}, A] = 1$$
 No open strings at TV
 $Q_{\mathrm{tv}}\overline{\Sigma} = Q_{\mathrm{tv}}\Sigma = 0$ \longrightarrow $\Sigma = Q_{\mathrm{tv}}(A\sigma)$
 $\overline{\Sigma} = Q_{\mathrm{tv}}(A\overline{\sigma}\sigma)$
 $\overline{\Sigma}\Sigma = Q_{\mathrm{tv}}(A\overline{\sigma}\sigma) = 1$ IF $\overline{\sigma}\sigma = 1$

Convenient universal choice

$$\sigma = e^{i\sqrt{h}X^0}\sigma_*^{(c=25)}$$

$$\overline{\sigma} = e^{-i\sqrt{h}X^0} \overline{\sigma}_*^{(c=25)}$$

Explicitly possible for time independent backgrounds! (this adds a pure gauge time-like Wilson line)

> Chan Paton's factors gets DYNAMICALLY GENERATED!

So we are now in a new phase for OSFT

Tantalizing conjecture

OSFT EOM *implies* **BCFT** *constraints* (bootstrap)

This is why EM works, essentially!

• Can we find the most generic solution to OSFT?

 All known D-branes give rise to solutions, can we reverse the argument to DISCOVER new D-branes?

Long-standing problem in CFT!

... As a first step in this challenge let's see how to generate new solutions from known ones:

Topological Defects in OSFT

Open string defect operators in OSFT

(Kojita, Masuda, CM, Schnabl, 2015)

$$\mathcal{D}: H_{\text{open}} \to H'_{\text{open}}$$

 $[\mathcal{D}, Q] = 0$

$$\mathcal{D}(\Psi_1 * \Psi_2) = (\mathcal{D}\Psi_1) * (\mathcal{D}\Psi_2)$$

• They map solutions to solutions

$$Q\Psi + \Psi * \Psi = 0 \qquad \rightarrow \qquad Q(\mathcal{D}\Psi) + (\mathcal{D}\Psi) * (\mathcal{D}\Psi) = 0$$

• Generalization of symmetries (which are group-like defects)

• An operator \mathcal{D} can be explicitly constructed starting from a *closed* topological defect line D_{cl} .



$$\begin{split} \begin{bmatrix} D_{\mathrm{cl}} & \overline{T}(\langle z^{i} \rangle)^{H_{\mathrm{imp}}} \\ [T_{++} - T_{--}, \mathcal{O}] &= 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} T_{++} - T_{--}, \mathcal{O} \end{bmatrix} = 0 \\ D_{\mathrm{cl}}^{d} &= \sum_{i, \overline{i} \in H_{\mathrm{cl}}} D_{i\overline{i}}^{d} P_{i\overline{i}} \quad \text{Petkova-Zuber (2000)} \\ & (T_{++} - T_{--}) |\mathcal{B}\rangle = 0 \,. \end{split}$$

 In (diagonal) RCFT: as many fundamental defects as irreps. The fusion rules govern their composition and the action on boundary states

$$\begin{split} [\phi_a][\phi_b] &= \sum_i N^i_{ab}[\phi_i] \qquad D^d D^c = \sum_i N^i_{cd} D^i \\ D^c ||a\rangle &= \sum_i N^i_{ca} ||i\rangle \qquad \text{Graham-Watts (2003)} \end{split}$$

• In the open string sector we must have (Diagonal Minimal models from now on!)

$$\mathcal{D}^{d} \psi_{i}^{(ab)} = \sum_{\substack{a' \in d \times a \\ b' \in d \times b}} X_{ia'b'}^{dab} \psi_{i}^{(a'b')} = \sum_{\substack{a' \in d \times a \\ b' \in d \times b}} \int_{a' \in d \times b} \int_{a'$$

• Determine X coeff. imposing the star algebra homomorphism

$$\mathcal{D}^d \left(\phi_i^{(ab)}(x) \phi_j^{(bc)}(y) \right) = \left(\mathcal{D}^d \phi_i^{(ab)}(x) \right) \left(\mathcal{D}^d \phi_j^{(bc)}(y) \right)$$
$$X_{ka'c'}^{dac} C_{ij}^{(abc)k} = \sum_{b' \in d \times b} C_{ij}^{(a'b'c')k} X_{ka'b'}^{dab} X_{kb'c'}^{dbc},$$

• In explicit case of diag. minimal models we find (pentagon identity)

$$X_{ia'b'}^{dab} = F_{di} \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ a' & b' \end{bmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{F_{1a'} \begin{bmatrix} a & d \\ a & d \end{bmatrix}} F_{1b'} \begin{bmatrix} b & d \\ b & d \end{bmatrix}}{F_{1i} \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ a & b \end{bmatrix}}$$

Generalizes Graham and Watts (2003) The composition (fusion) is trickier than in the bulk case. Naively we would expect

$$\mathcal{D}^d \mathcal{D}^c \psi = \bigoplus_e N_{dc}{}^e \mathcal{D}_e \psi \qquad (?)$$

• However explicit computation reveals a similarity transformation !

$$\mathcal{D}^{d}\mathcal{D}^{c}\psi = U_{dc}\left(\bigoplus_{e} N_{dc}{}^{e}\mathcal{D}_{e}\psi\right)U_{dc}^{-1}$$
$$(U_{dc})^{T} = (U_{dc})^{-1}$$

$$(U_{dc})^{\{aa'a''\}[e;a,a'']} = \sqrt{\frac{F_{1a''}\begin{bmatrix}d&a'\\d&a'\end{bmatrix}F_{1a'}\begin{bmatrix}c&a\\c&a\end{bmatrix}}{F_{1a''}\begin{bmatrix}e&a\\e&a\end{bmatrix}F_{1e}\begin{bmatrix}d&c\\d&c\end{bmatrix}}}F_{a'e}\begin{bmatrix}d&c\\a''&a\end{bmatrix}}$$

These objects stay invariant under Moore-Seiberg F-matrix "gauge" symmetry (rescaling of CVO's)

• The need for **U** is transparent using defect-network manipulations



Important to keep track of *defect junctions* (from which the square roots of F originates), example:

$$\underbrace{\left[\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} & & \\ a \end{array} \right]_{a'} & a \end{array} \right]_{a'} & & \\ a \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ b \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} F_{1b'} \begin{bmatrix} d \\ d \end{array} \right]_{a'} & & \\ a \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ a \end{array} \right]_{b' \in b} \\ \hline & \\ b \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ b \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ b \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ a \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} & \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ \hline & \\ c \end{array} \\ \\ c \end{array} \right]_{b' \in d \times b} \\ c \end{array} \\ c \end{array} \\ c \end{array} \\ c \end{array} \\$$

OSFT observables and defects

• Change in the (off-shell) action

$$S_{\text{OSFT}}(\mathcal{D}^{d}\Psi) = \frac{g_{d}}{g_{1}}S_{\text{OSFT}}(\Psi) \quad g_{a} \equiv \langle\langle a || 0 \rangle_{SL(2,C)} = \langle 1 \rangle_{\text{disk}}^{\text{BCFT}_{a}}$$

Change in the gauge-invariant coupling to closed strings (Ellwood invariant)

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{V}[\mathcal{D}^{d}\Psi] = \mathrm{Tr}_{D^{d}_{\mathrm{cl}}V}[\Psi]$$



OSFT boundary state and defects

• Given a solution $\Psi_{X \to Y}$, we can compute its boundary state

$$|B(\Psi_{X \to Y})\rangle_{OSFT} = ||Y\rangle\rangle_{BCFT}$$
 Kiermaier, Okawa, Zwiebach (2008)
Kudrna, CM, Schnabl (2012)

• Previous slide computation has the important consequence that

 $|B(\mathcal{D}^d \Psi_{X \to Y})\rangle_{\text{OSFT}} = D^d_{\text{cl}} ||Y\rangle\rangle_{\text{BCFT}}$ Kojita, Masuda, CM, Schnabl (2015)

$$\mathcal{D}\Psi_{X\to Y} = \Psi_{DX\to DY}$$

Example: Ising Model OSFT

• 3 Virasoro labels, 3 fundamental boundary condtns, 3 topological defects

$$\epsilon \times \epsilon = 1$$

$$\epsilon \times \sigma = \sigma$$

$$\sigma \times \sigma = 1 + \epsilon$$

• Solutions are organized by the defects action (*group* and *duality* defects)



 All solutions and their BCFT observables explicitly generated starting from a single solution (for example)

$$\Psi_{\sigma \to 1} = \Psi_{\rm tv}^{\sigma\sigma} - \Sigma^{\sigma 1} \,\Psi_{\rm tv}^{11} \,\bar{\Sigma}^{\sigma 1}$$

CONCLUSIONS

- OSFT is (among other things) a dynamical field theory for BCFT.
- All known (time ind.) BCFT's remarkably give exact analytic solutions of OSFT. The string field is indeed "big enough"!
- Topological defects give rise to new operators in the open string algebra which map solutions to solutions.
- First explicit example of solution generating operators in OSFT: they must play an important role in the classification of OSFT solutions.

★ Away from diagonal/minimal/rational

★ Open **Super**string Field Theory Vs Boundary **S**CFT??

Thank you.