

Double Field Theory as the Stringy Extension of Einstein Gravity

Jeong-Hyuck Park 朴廷熾 박정혁

Sogang University, Seoul

'THE 1ST EAST ASIA JOINT WORKSHOP ON FIELDS AND STRINGS', USTC, HEFEI, CHINA, 29TH MAY 2016

Prologue

- In Riemannian geometry, the fundamental object is the metric, $g_{\mu\nu}$.
 - Diffeomorphism: $\partial_\mu \longrightarrow \nabla_\mu = \partial_\mu + \Gamma_\mu$
 - $\nabla_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 0$, $\Gamma_{[\mu\nu]}^\lambda = 0 \longrightarrow \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \frac{1}{2}g^{\lambda\rho}(\partial_\mu g_{\nu\rho} + \partial_\nu g_{\mu\rho} - \partial_\rho g_{\mu\nu})$
 - Curvature: $[\nabla_\mu, \nabla_\nu] \longrightarrow R_{\kappa\lambda\mu\nu} \longrightarrow R$
- On the other hand, string theory puts $g_{\mu\nu}$, $B_{\mu\nu}$ and ϕ on an equal footing, as they, *i.e.* NS-NS sector fields form a ‘multiplet of T-duality’.
- This suggests the existence of a novel **unifying geometric description of them**, generalizing the above Riemannian formalism.
- Basically, Riemannian geometry is for *Particle* theory. *String* theory requires a **novel differential geometry which geometrizes the whole NS-NS sector**.

- In Riemannian geometry, the fundamental object is the metric, $g_{\mu\nu}$.
 - Diffeomorphism: $\partial_\mu \longrightarrow \nabla_\mu = \partial_\mu + \Gamma_\mu$
 - $\nabla_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 0$, $\Gamma_{[\mu\nu]}^\lambda = 0 \longrightarrow \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \frac{1}{2}g^{\lambda\rho}(\partial_\mu g_{\nu\rho} + \partial_\nu g_{\mu\rho} - \partial_\rho g_{\mu\nu})$
 - Curvature: $[\nabla_\mu, \nabla_\nu] \longrightarrow R_{\kappa\lambda\mu\nu} \longrightarrow R$
- On the other hand, string theory puts $g_{\mu\nu}$, $B_{\mu\nu}$ and ϕ on an equal footing, as they, *i.e.* NS-NS sector fields form a ‘multiplet of T-duality’.
- This suggests the existence of a novel **unifying geometric description of them**, generalizing the above Riemannian formalism.
- Basically, Riemannian geometry is for *Particle* theory. *String* theory requires a **novel differential geometry which geometrizes the whole NS-NS sector**.

- In Riemannian geometry, the fundamental object is the metric, $g_{\mu\nu}$.
 - Diffeomorphism: $\partial_\mu \longrightarrow \nabla_\mu = \partial_\mu + \Gamma_\mu$
 - $\nabla_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 0$, $\Gamma_{[\mu\nu]}^\lambda = 0 \longrightarrow \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \frac{1}{2}g^{\lambda\rho}(\partial_\mu g_{\nu\rho} + \partial_\nu g_{\mu\rho} - \partial_\rho g_{\mu\nu})$
 - Curvature: $[\nabla_\mu, \nabla_\nu] \longrightarrow R_{\kappa\lambda\mu\nu} \longrightarrow R$
- On the other hand, string theory puts $g_{\mu\nu}$, $B_{\mu\nu}$ and ϕ on an equal footing, as they, *i.e.* NS-NS sector fields form a ‘multiplet of T-duality’.
- This suggests the existence of a novel **unifying geometric description of them**, generalizing the above Riemannian formalism.
- Basically, Riemannian geometry is for *Particle* theory. *String* theory requires a **novel differential geometry which geometrizes the whole NS-NS sector**.

- In Riemannian geometry, the fundamental object is the metric, $g_{\mu\nu}$.
 - Diffeomorphism: $\partial_\mu \longrightarrow \nabla_\mu = \partial_\mu + \Gamma_\mu$
 - $\nabla_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 0$, $\Gamma_{[\mu\nu]}^\lambda = 0 \longrightarrow \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \frac{1}{2}g^{\lambda\rho}(\partial_\mu g_{\nu\rho} + \partial_\nu g_{\mu\rho} - \partial_\rho g_{\mu\nu})$
 - Curvature: $[\nabla_\mu, \nabla_\nu] \longrightarrow R_{\kappa\lambda\mu\nu} \longrightarrow R$
- On the other hand, string theory puts $g_{\mu\nu}$, $B_{\mu\nu}$ and ϕ on an equal footing, as they, *i.e.* NS-NS sector fields form a ‘multiplet of T-duality’.
- This suggests the existence of a novel **unifying geometric description of them**, generalizing the above Riemannian formalism.
- Basically, Riemannian geometry is for *Particle* theory. *String* theory requires a **novel differential geometry which geometrizes the whole NS-NS sector**.

- In Riemannian geometry, the fundamental object is the metric, $g_{\mu\nu}$.
 - Diffeomorphism: $\partial_\mu \longrightarrow \nabla_\mu = \partial_\mu + \Gamma_\mu$
 - $\nabla_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 0$, $\Gamma_{[\mu\nu]}^\lambda = 0 \longrightarrow \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \frac{1}{2}g^{\lambda\rho}(\partial_\mu g_{\nu\rho} + \partial_\nu g_{\mu\rho} - \partial_\rho g_{\mu\nu})$
 - Curvature: $[\nabla_\mu, \nabla_\nu] \longrightarrow R_{\kappa\lambda\mu\nu} \longrightarrow R$
- On the other hand, string theory puts $g_{\mu\nu}$, $B_{\mu\nu}$ and ϕ on an equal footing, as they, *i.e.* NS-NS sector fields form a ‘multiplet of T-duality’.
- This suggests the existence of a novel **unifying geometric description of them**, generalizing the above Riemannian formalism.
- Basically, Riemannian geometry is for *Particle* theory. *String* theory requires a **novel differential geometry which geometrizes the whole NS-NS sector**.

- In Riemannian geometry, the fundamental object is the metric, $g_{\mu\nu}$.
 - Diffeomorphism: $\partial_\mu \longrightarrow \nabla_\mu = \partial_\mu + \Gamma_\mu$
 - $\nabla_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 0$, $\Gamma_{[\mu\nu]}^\lambda = 0 \longrightarrow \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \frac{1}{2}g^{\lambda\rho}(\partial_\mu g_{\nu\rho} + \partial_\nu g_{\mu\rho} - \partial_\rho g_{\mu\nu})$
 - Curvature: $[\nabla_\mu, \nabla_\nu] \longrightarrow R_{\kappa\lambda\mu\nu} \longrightarrow R$
- On the other hand, string theory puts $g_{\mu\nu}$, $B_{\mu\nu}$ and ϕ on an equal footing, as they, *i.e.* NS-NS sector fields form a ‘multiplet of T-duality’.
- This suggests the existence of a novel **unifying geometric description of them**, generalizing the above Riemannian formalism.
- Basically, Riemannian geometry is for *Particle* theory. *String* theory requires a **novel differential geometry which geometrizes the whole NS-NS sector**.

- In Riemannian geometry, the fundamental object is the metric, $g_{\mu\nu}$.
 - Diffeomorphism: $\partial_\mu \longrightarrow \nabla_\mu = \partial_\mu + \Gamma_\mu$
 - $\nabla_\lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 0$, $\Gamma_{[\mu\nu]}^\lambda = 0 \longrightarrow \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \frac{1}{2}g^{\lambda\rho}(\partial_\mu g_{\nu\rho} + \partial_\nu g_{\mu\rho} - \partial_\rho g_{\mu\nu})$
 - Curvature: $[\nabla_\mu, \nabla_\nu] \longrightarrow R_{\kappa\lambda\mu\nu} \longrightarrow R$
- On the other hand, string theory puts $g_{\mu\nu}$, $B_{\mu\nu}$ and ϕ on an equal footing, as they, *i.e.* NS-NS sector fields form a ‘multiplet of T-duality’.
- This suggests the existence of a novel **unifying geometric description of them**, generalizing the above Riemannian formalism.
- Basically, Riemannian geometry is for *Particle* theory. *String* theory requires a **novel differential geometry which geometrizes the whole NS-NS sector**.

- Yet, in the conventional treatment of the NS-NS sector, the effective action describing its dynamics is ‘organized’ in terms of the Riemannian geometry, such as

$$\int d^D x \sqrt{-|g|} e^{-2\phi} \left(R + 4 |d\phi|^2 - \frac{1}{12} |dB|^2 \right),$$

where the last two terms correspond to the kinetic terms of the dilaton and the B -field.

- In this conventional description, the Riemannian metric provides the background geometry, while the dilaton and the B -field are viewed as ‘*matter*’ living on it.
- This cannot be qualified for a unifying geometric description of the NS-NS sector.

- Yet, in the conventional treatment of the NS-NS sector, the effective action describing its dynamics is ‘organized’ in terms of the Riemannian geometry, such as

$$\int d^D x \sqrt{-|g|} e^{-2\phi} \left(R + 4 |d\phi|^2 - \frac{1}{12} |dB|^2 \right),$$

where the last two terms correspond to the kinetic terms of the dilaton and the B -field.

- In this conventional description, the Riemannian metric provides the background geometry, while the dilaton and the B -field are viewed as ‘*matter*’ living on it.
- This cannot be qualified for a unifying geometric description of the NS-NS sector.

- Yet, in the conventional treatment of the NS-NS sector, the effective action describing its dynamics is ‘organized’ in terms of the Riemannian geometry, such as

$$\int d^D x \sqrt{-|g|} e^{-2\phi} \left(R + 4 |d\phi|^2 - \frac{1}{12} |dB|^2 \right),$$

where the last two terms correspond to the kinetic terms of the dilaton and the B -field.

- In this conventional description, the Riemannian metric provides the background geometry, while the dilaton and the B -field are viewed as ‘*matter*’ living on it.
- This cannot be qualified for a unifying geometric description of the NS-NS sector.

- Yet, in the conventional treatment of the NS-NS sector, the effective action describing its dynamics is ‘organized’ in terms of the Riemannian geometry, such as

$$\int d^D x \sqrt{-|g|} e^{-2\phi} \left(R + 4 |d\phi|^2 - \frac{1}{12} |dB|^2 \right),$$

where the last two terms correspond to the kinetic terms of the dilaton and the B -field.

- In this conventional description, the Riemannian metric provides the background geometry, while the dilaton and the B -field are viewed as ‘*matter*’ living on it.
- This cannot be qualified for a unifying geometric description of the NS-NS sector.

- This talk introduces a stringy geometry for the massless NS-NS sector under the name,

‘Semi-covariant Geometry’

which underlies

Double Field Theory (DFT) = Stringy Extension of Einstein’s Gravity .

Siegel; Hull, Zwiebach, Hohm

- Contrary to what it may sound like, the semi-covariant geometry is a **completely covariant** approach to DFT, as it manifests simultaneously for every term in formulas:
 - $O(D, D)$ T-duality
 - DFT-diffeomorphisms (generalized Lie derivative)
 - A pair of local Lorentz symmetries, $\text{Spin}(1, D-1)_L \times \text{Spin}(D-1, 1)_R$
 - Other gauge symmetries, *e.g.* Yang-Mills or Higher Spin
- It can also reduce to reproduce ‘Generalized Geometry’ by Hitchin; Waldram *et al.*

- This talk introduces a stringy geometry for the massless NS-NS sector under the name,

‘Semi-covariant Geometry’

which underlies

Double Field Theory (DFT) = Stringy Extension of Einstein’s Gravity .

Siegel; Hull, Zwiebach, Hohm

- Contrary to what it may sound like, the semi-covariant geometry is a **completely covariant** approach to DFT, as it manifests simultaneously for every term in formulas:
 - **$O(D, D)$ T-duality**
 - **DFT-diffeomorphisms** (generalized Lie derivative)
 - **A pair of local Lorentz symmetries**, $\text{Spin}(1, D-1)_L \times \text{Spin}(D-1, 1)_R$
 - **Other gauge symmetries**, *e.g.* Yang-Mills or Higher Spin
- It can also reduce to reproduce ‘Generalized Geometry’ by Hitchin; Waldram *et al.*

- This talk reviews a series of my works in collaborations with

Imtak Jeon, Kanghoon Lee, Yoonji Suh,

Chris Blair, Emanuel Malek, Wonyoung Cho, Jose Fernández-Melgarejo,

Soo-Jong Rey, Woohyun Rim, Yuho Sakatani,

Sung Moon Ko, Charles Melby-Thompson, Rene Meyér,

Kang-Sin Choi (Phenomenologist) and Xavier Bekaert:

- 1011.1324, 1102.0419,
1105.6294, 1109.2035, 1112.0069,
1206.3478, 1210.5078,
1302.1652, 1304.5946, 1307.8377, 1311.5109,
1402.5027,
1505.01301, 1506.05277, 1507.07545, 1508.01121,
1605.00403.

- Doubled-yet-gauged coordinates
- Worldsheet perspective
- Target spacetime perspective
- Phenomenological implications, especially to the Standard Model
- Higher Spin Double Field Theory

- Notation

Capital letters denote the $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ vector indices, *i.e.* $A, B, C, \dots = 1, 2, \dots, D+D$, which can be freely raised or lowered by the $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ invariant constant metric,

$$\mathcal{J}_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

- Notation

Capital letters denote the $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ vector indices, *i.e.* $A, B, C, \dots = 1, 2, \dots, D+D$, which can be freely raised or lowered by the $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ invariant constant metric,

$$\mathcal{J}_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

With $D \equiv 10$ for SUSY,

Index	Representation	Metric (raising/lowering indices)
A, B, \dots	$\mathbf{O}(10, 10)$ & DFT-diffeom. vector	\mathcal{J}_{AB}
p, q, \dots	$\mathbf{Spin}(1, 9)_L$ vector	$\eta_{pq} = \text{diag}(- + + \dots +)$
α, β, \dots	$\mathbf{Spin}(1, 9)_L$ spinor	$C_{+\alpha\beta}, \quad (\gamma^p)^T = C_+ \gamma^p C_+^{-1}$
\bar{p}, \bar{q}, \dots	$\mathbf{Spin}(9, 1)_R$ vector	$\bar{\eta}_{\bar{p}\bar{q}} = \text{diag}(+ - - \dots -)$
$\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}, \dots$	$\mathbf{Spin}(9, 1)_R$ spinor	$\bar{C}_{+\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta}}, \quad (\bar{\gamma}^{\bar{p}})^T = \bar{C}_+ \bar{\gamma}^{\bar{p}} \bar{C}_+^{-1}$

- Doubled-yet-gauged coordinates

The spacetime coordinates are formally doubled, being $(D+D)$ -dimensional. However, **the doubled coordinates need to be gauged**: the coordinate space is equipped with an equivalence relation,

$$x^A \sim x^A + \phi \partial^A \varphi,$$

which we call ‘**Coordinate Gauge Symmetry**’.

In the above, ϕ and φ are arbitrary functions **in** DFT.

- Doubled-yet-gauged coordinates

The spacetime coordinates are formally doubled, being $(D+D)$ -dimensional. However, **the doubled coordinates need to be gauged**: the coordinate space is equipped with an equivalence relation,

$$x^A \sim x^A + \phi \partial^A \varphi,$$

which we call '**Coordinate Gauge Symmetry**'.

In the above, ϕ and φ are arbitrary functions **in** DFT.

Each equivalence class, or gauge orbit, represents a single physical point.

Diffeomorphism symmetry means an invariance under arbitrary reparametrizations of the gauge orbits.

** The claim is that D -dimensional spacetime can be better understood in terms of the doubled-yet-gauged $(D+D)$ number of coordinates, at least for String Theory.*

- Realization of the coordinate gauge symmetry.

The equivalence relation is realized in DFT by enforcing that, arbitrary functions and their arbitrary derivatives, denoted here collectively by Φ , are invariant under the coordinate gauge symmetry shift,

$$\Phi(x + \Delta) = \Phi(x), \quad \Delta^A = \phi \partial^A \varphi.$$

- Section condition.

The invariance under the coordinate gauge symmetry can be easily shown to be equivalent to the section condition:

$$\text{Coordinate Gauge Symmetry} \iff \partial_A \partial^A \equiv 0.$$

JHP, Lee-JHP 2013

Explicitly, the section condition implies

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^A \varphi \partial_A \Phi &= 0 & (\text{strong constraint}), \\ \partial_A \partial^A \Phi &= 0 & (\text{weak constraint}). \end{aligned}$$

- Realization of the coordinate gauge symmetry.

The equivalence relation is realized in DFT by enforcing that, arbitrary functions and their arbitrary derivatives, denoted here collectively by Φ , are invariant under the coordinate gauge symmetry shift,

$$\Phi(x + \Delta) = \Phi(x), \quad \Delta^A = \phi \partial^A \varphi.$$

- Section condition.

The invariance under the coordinate gauge symmetry can be easily shown to be equivalent to the section condition:

$$\text{Coordinate Gauge Symmetry} \iff \partial_A \partial^A \equiv 0.$$

JHP, Lee-JHP 2013

Explicitly, the section condition implies

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^A \varphi \partial_A \Phi &= 0 & (\text{strong constraint}), \\ \partial_A \partial^A \Phi &= 0 & (\text{weak constraint}). \end{aligned}$$

- Diffeomorphisms.

Diffeomorphism symmetry in $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ DFT is generated by a generalized Lie derivative
Siegel, Courant, Grana

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X T_{A_1 \dots A_n} := X^B \partial_B T_{A_1 \dots A_n} + \omega_T \partial_B X^B T_{A_1 \dots A_n} + \sum_{i=1}^n (\partial_{A_i} X_B - \partial_B X_{A_i}) T_{A_1 \dots A_{i-1}{}^B A_{i+1} \dots A_n},$$

where ω_T denotes the weight.

- Diffeomorphisms.

Diffeomorphism symmetry in $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ DFT is generated by a generalized Lie derivative
Siegel, Courant, Grana

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X T_{A_1 \dots A_n} := X^B \partial_B T_{A_1 \dots A_n} + \omega_T \partial_B X^B T_{A_1 \dots A_n} + \sum_{i=1}^n (\partial_{A_i} X_B - \partial_B X_{A_i}) T_{A_1 \dots A_{i-1}{}^B{}_{A_{i+1} \dots A_n},$$

where ω_T denotes the weight.

In particular, the generalized Lie derivative of the $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ invariant metric is trivial,

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X \mathcal{I}_{AB} = 0.$$

The commutator is closed by C-bracket Hull-Zwiebach

$$[\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X, \hat{\mathcal{L}}_Y] = \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{[X, Y]_C}, \quad [X, Y]_C^A = X^B \partial_B Y^A - Y^B \partial_B X^A + \frac{1}{2} Y^B \partial^A X_B - \frac{1}{2} X^B \partial^A Y_B.$$

- Diffeomorphisms.

- Hohm-Zwibach ansatz for finite transformations:

$$F := \frac{1}{2} (L\bar{L}^{-1} + \bar{L}^{-1}L) , \quad \bar{F} := \mathcal{J}F^t\mathcal{J}^{-1} = F^{-1} ,$$

where

$$L_M^N := \partial_M x'^N , \quad \bar{L} := \mathcal{J}L^t\mathcal{J}^{-1} .$$

- Though nice and compact, F does not precisely coincide with “ $\exp(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X)$ ”.

- Yet, **up to coordinate gauge symmetry** it is possible to show

JHP 2013

$$F \equiv \exp(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X)$$

- Diffeomorphisms.

- Hohm-Zwibach ansatz for finite transformations:

$$F := \frac{1}{2} (L\bar{L}^{-1} + \bar{L}^{-1}L) , \quad \bar{F} := \mathcal{J}F^t\mathcal{J}^{-1} = F^{-1} ,$$

where

$$L_M^N := \partial_M x'^N , \quad \bar{L} := \mathcal{J}L^t\mathcal{J}^{-1} .$$

- Though nice and compact, F does not precisely coincide with “ $\exp(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X)$ ”.

- Yet, **up to coordinate gauge symmetry** it is possible to show

JHP 2013

$$F \equiv \exp(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X)$$

- Diffeomorphisms.

- Hohm-Zwibach ansatz for finite transformations:

$$F := \frac{1}{2} (L\bar{L}^{-1} + \bar{L}^{-1}L) , \quad \bar{F} := \mathcal{J}F^t\mathcal{J}^{-1} = F^{-1} ,$$

where

$$L_M^N := \partial_M x'^N , \quad \bar{L} := \mathcal{J}L^t\mathcal{J}^{-1} .$$

- Though nice and compact, F does not precisely coincide with “ $\mathbf{exp}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X)$ ”.

- Yet, **up to coordinate gauge symmetry** it is possible to show

JHP 2013

$$F \equiv \mathbf{exp}(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X)$$

- Diffeomorphisms.

- Hohm-Zwibach ansatz for finite transformations:

$$F := \frac{1}{2} (L\bar{L}^{-1} + \bar{L}^{-1}L) , \quad \bar{F} := \mathcal{J}F^t\mathcal{J}^{-1} = F^{-1} ,$$

where

$$L_M^N := \partial_M x'^N , \quad \bar{L} := \mathcal{J}L^t\mathcal{J}^{-1} .$$

- Though nice and compact, F does not precisely coincide with “ $\exp(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X)$ ”.

- Yet, **up to coordinate gauge symmetry** it is possible to show

JHP 2013

$$F \equiv \exp(\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X)$$

Worksheet perspective: string action

1304.5946/1307.8377

Doubled-yet-gauged coordinates & Gauged infinitesimal one-form

- In the doubled-yet-gauged coordinate system, the usual infinitesimal one-form, dx^M , is **not** a covariant vector of DFT: it does not transform covariantly under DFT-diffeomorphisms (obeying the way the ‘generalized Lie derivative’ would dictate).
- Hence, $dx^M dx^N \mathcal{H}_{MN}$ can **not** give a ‘proper length’ in DFT.

- Further, it is **not** coordinate gauge symmetry invariant,

$$dx^M \longrightarrow d(x^M + \phi \partial^M \varphi) \neq dx^M.$$

- These can be all cured by introducing a gauged infinitesimal one-form,

$$Dx^M := dx^M - \mathcal{A}^M.$$

The gauge potential should satisfy the same property as the coordinate gauge symmetry generator, such that

$$\mathcal{A}^M \partial_M = 0, \quad \mathcal{A}_M \mathcal{A}^M = 0,$$

or suggestively the ‘gauged’ section condition,

$$(\partial_M + \mathcal{A}_M)(\partial^M + \mathcal{A}^M) = 0.$$

Doubled-yet-gauged coordinates & Gauged infinitesimal one-form

- In the doubled-yet-gauged coordinate system, the usual infinitesimal one-form, dx^M , is **not** a covariant vector of DFT: it does not transform covariantly under DFT-diffeomorphisms (obeying the way the ‘generalized Lie derivative’ would dictate).
- Hence, $dx^M dx^N \mathcal{H}_{MN}$ can **not** give a ‘proper length’ in DFT.

- Further, it is **not** coordinate gauge symmetry invariant,

$$dx^M \longrightarrow d(x^M + \phi \partial^M \varphi) \neq dx^M.$$

- These can be all cured by introducing a gauged infinitesimal one-form,

$$Dx^M := dx^M - \mathcal{A}^M.$$

The gauge potential should satisfy the same property as the coordinate gauge symmetry generator, such that

$$\mathcal{A}^M \partial_M = 0, \quad \mathcal{A}_M \mathcal{A}^M = 0,$$

or suggestively the ‘gauged’ section condition,

$$(\partial_M + \mathcal{A}_M)(\partial^M + \mathcal{A}^M) = 0.$$

Doubled-yet-gauged coordinates & Gauged infinitesimal one-form

- In the doubled-yet-gauged coordinate system, the usual infinitesimal one-form, dx^M , is **not** a covariant vector of DFT: it does not transform covariantly under DFT-diffeomorphisms (obeying the way the ‘generalized Lie derivative’ would dictate).

- Hence, $dx^M dx^N \mathcal{H}_{MN}$ can **not** give a ‘proper length’ in DFT.

- Further, it is **not** coordinate gauge symmetry invariant,

$$dx^M \longrightarrow d(x^M + \phi \partial^M \varphi) \neq dx^M.$$

- These can be all cured by introducing a gauged infinitesimal one-form,

$$Dx^M := dx^M - \mathcal{A}^M.$$

The gauge potential should satisfy the same property as the coordinate gauge symmetry generator, such that

$$\mathcal{A}^M \partial_M = 0, \quad \mathcal{A}_M \mathcal{A}^M = 0,$$

or suggestively the ‘gauged’ section condition,

$$(\partial_M + \mathcal{A}_M)(\partial^M + \mathcal{A}^M) = 0.$$

Doubled-yet-gauged coordinates & Gauged infinitesimal one-form

- In the doubled-yet-gauged coordinate system, the usual infinitesimal one-form, dx^M , is **not** a covariant vector of DFT: it does not transform covariantly under DFT-diffeomorphisms (obeying the way the ‘generalized Lie derivative’ would dictate).
- Hence, $dx^M dx^N \mathcal{H}_{MN}$ can **not** give a ‘proper length’ in DFT.

- Further, it is **not** coordinate gauge symmetry invariant,

$$dx^M \longrightarrow d(x^M + \phi \partial^M \varphi) \neq dx^M.$$

- **These can be all cured by introducing a gauged infinitesimal one-form,**

$$Dx^M := dx^M - \mathcal{A}^M.$$

The gauge potential should satisfy the same property as the coordinate gauge symmetry generator, such that

$$\mathcal{A}^M \partial_M = 0, \quad \mathcal{A}_M \mathcal{A}^M = 0,$$

or suggestively the ‘gauged’ section condition,

$$(\partial_M + \mathcal{A}_M)(\partial^M + \mathcal{A}^M) = 0.$$

Doubled-yet-gauged coordinates & Gauged infinitesimal one-form

- Under coordinate gauge symmetry, we have the invariance of Dx^M ,

$$\begin{aligned} x^M &\longrightarrow x'^M = x^M + \phi \partial^M \varphi, \\ \mathcal{A}^M &\longrightarrow \mathcal{A}'^M = \mathcal{A}^M + d(\phi \partial^M \varphi) & : \quad \mathcal{A}'^M \partial'_M = 0, \\ Dx^M &\longrightarrow D'x'^M = Dx^M = dx^M - \mathcal{A}^M. \end{aligned}$$

- Similarly, under (finite) DFT diffeomorphisms *à la* Hohm-Zwiebach

$$\begin{aligned} L_M{}^N &:= \partial_M x'^N, & \bar{L} &:= \mathcal{J} L^t \mathcal{J}^{-1}, \\ F &:= \frac{1}{2} (L \bar{L}^{-1} + \bar{L}^{-1} L), & \bar{F} &:= \mathcal{J} F^t \mathcal{J}^{-1} = F^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

we have the covariance,

$$\begin{aligned} x^M &\longrightarrow x'^M(x), \\ \mathcal{H}_{MN}(x) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{H}'_{MN}(x') = \bar{F}_M{}^K \bar{F}_N{}^L \mathcal{H}_{KL}(x), \\ \mathcal{A}^M &\longrightarrow \mathcal{A}'^M = \mathcal{A}^N F_N{}^M + dx^N (L - F)_N{}^M & : \quad \mathcal{A}'^M \partial'_M = 0, \\ Dx^M &\longrightarrow D'x'^M = Dx^N F_N{}^M. \end{aligned}$$

Doubled-yet-gauged coordinates & Gauged infinitesimal one-form

- Under coordinate gauge symmetry, we have the invariance of Dx^M ,

$$\begin{aligned} x^M &\longrightarrow x'^M = x^M + \phi \partial^M \varphi, \\ \mathcal{A}^M &\longrightarrow \mathcal{A}'^M = \mathcal{A}^M + d(\phi \partial^M \varphi) \quad : \quad \mathcal{A}'^M \partial'_M = 0, \\ Dx^M &\longrightarrow D'x'^M = Dx^M = dx^M - \mathcal{A}^M. \end{aligned}$$

- Similarly, under (finite) DFT diffeomorphisms *à la* Hohm-Zwiebach

$$\begin{aligned} L_M^N &:= \partial_M x'^N, & \bar{L} &:= \mathcal{J} L^t \mathcal{J}^{-1}, \\ F &:= \frac{1}{2} (L \bar{L}^{-1} + \bar{L}^{-1} L), & \bar{F} &:= \mathcal{J} F^t \mathcal{J}^{-1} = F^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

we have the covariance,

$$\begin{aligned} x^M &\longrightarrow x'^M(x), \\ \mathcal{H}_{MN}(x) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{H}'_{MN}(x') = \bar{F}_M^K \bar{F}_N^L \mathcal{H}_{KL}(x), \\ \mathcal{A}^M &\longrightarrow \mathcal{A}'^M = \mathcal{A}^N F_N^M + dX^N (L - F)_N^M \quad : \quad \mathcal{A}'^M \partial'_M = 0, \\ Dx^M &\longrightarrow D'x'^M = Dx^N F_N^M. \end{aligned}$$

Fixing the coordinate gauge symmetry

- In DFT (unlike EFT), the solution of the section condition, *i.e.* the section is unique up to the duality rotations,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^M} = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_\mu}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\nu} \right) \equiv \left(0, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\nu} \right) \quad : \text{Conventional choice of the section}$$

- Then, the ‘coordinate gauge symmetry’ reads

$$\left(\tilde{x}_\mu, x^\nu \right) \sim \left(\tilde{x}_\mu + \phi \partial_\mu \varphi, x^\nu \right).$$

- The coordinate gauge potential and the gauged infinitesimal one-form become

$$\mathcal{A}^M = A_\lambda \partial^M x^\lambda = \left(A_\mu, 0 \right), \quad D x^M = \left(d\tilde{x}_\mu - A_\mu, dx^\nu \right).$$

Fixing the coordinate gauge symmetry

- In DFT (unlike EFT), the solution of the section condition, *i.e.* the section is unique up to the duality rotations,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x^M} = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_\mu}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\nu} \right) \equiv \left(0, \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\nu} \right) \quad : \text{Conventional choice of the section}$$

- Then, the ‘coordinate gauge symmetry’ reads

$$\left(\tilde{x}_\mu, x^\nu \right) \sim \left(\tilde{x}_\mu + \phi \partial_\mu \varphi, x^\nu \right).$$

- The coordinate gauge potential and the gauged infinitesimal one-form become

$$\mathcal{A}^M = A_\lambda \partial^M x^\lambda = \left(A_\mu, 0 \right), \quad D x^M = \left(d\tilde{x}_\mu - A_\mu, dx^\nu \right).$$

Side remark: Newton mechanics with doubled-yet-gauged coordinates

- The doubled-yet-gauged coordinates can be applied to any physical system, not exclusively to DFT.
- Newton mechanics can be formulated on the doubled-yet-gauged space, $x^M = (\tilde{x}_m, x^n)$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Newton}} = \frac{1}{2} m D_t x^M D_t x^N \delta_{MN} - V(x),$$

where $M, N = 1, 2, \dots, 6$ and the potential, $V(x)$, satisfies the section condition.

- With the conventional choice of the section, we get

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Newton}} = \frac{1}{2} m \dot{x}^m \dot{x}^n \delta_{mn} - V(x) + \frac{1}{2} m \left(\dot{\tilde{x}}_m - A_m \right) \left(\dot{\tilde{x}}_n - A_n \right) \delta^{mn}.$$

Hence, after integrating out A_m , we recover the conventional formulation.

Side remark: Newton mechanics with doubled-yet-gauged coordinates

- The doubled-yet-gauged coordinates can be applied to any physical system, not exclusively to DFT.
- Newton mechanics can be formulated on the doubled-yet-gauged space, $x^M = (\tilde{x}_m, x^n)$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Newton}} = \frac{1}{2} m D_t x^M D_t x^N \delta_{MN} - V(x),$$

where $M, N = 1, 2, \dots, 6$ and the potential, $V(x)$, satisfies the section condition.

- With the conventional choice of the section, we get

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Newton}} = \frac{1}{2} m \dot{x}^m \dot{x}^n \delta_{mn} - V(x) + \frac{1}{2} m \left(\dot{\tilde{x}}_m - A_m \right) \left(\dot{\tilde{x}}_n - A_n \right) \delta^{mn}.$$

Hence, after integrating out A_m , we recover the conventional formulation.

String probes the doubled-yet-gauged spacetime

- **DFT string action** is with $D_i X^M = \partial_i X^M - \mathcal{A}_i^M$, JHP-Lee 2013, c.f. Hull 2006

$$\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \int d^2\sigma \mathcal{L}_{\text{string}}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{\text{string}} = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{-h} h^{ij} D_i X^M D_j X^N \mathcal{H}_{MN}(X) - \epsilon^{ij} D_i X^M \mathcal{A}_{jM},$$

- The action is **fully symmetric** for an arbitrary curved generalized metric, $\mathcal{H}_{MN}(X)$, essentially due to the auxiliary coordinate gauge potential, \mathcal{A}_i^M , under
 - worldsheet diffeomorphisms plus Weyl symmetry
 - $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ T-duality
 - target spacetime DFT-diffeomorphisms
 - the coordinate gauge symmetry: $X^M \sim X^M + \phi \partial^M \varphi$

String probes the doubled-yet-gauged spacetime

- **DFT string action** is with $D_i X^M = \partial_i X^M - \mathcal{A}_i^M$, JHP-Lee 2013, c.f. Hull 2006

$$\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \int d^2\sigma \mathcal{L}_{\text{string}}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{\text{string}} = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{-h} h^{ij} D_i X^M D_j X^N \mathcal{H}_{MN}(X) - \epsilon^{ij} D_i X^M \mathcal{A}_{jM},$$

- The action is **fully symmetric** for an arbitrary curved generalized metric, $\mathcal{H}_{MN}(X)$, essentially due to the auxiliary coordinate gauge potential, \mathcal{A}_i^M , under
 - worldsheet diffeomorphisms plus Weyl symmetry
 - $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ T-duality
 - target spacetime DFT-diffeomorphisms
 - the coordinate gauge symmetry: $X^M \sim X^M + \phi \partial^M \varphi$

String probes the doubled-yet-gauged spacetime

- **DFT string action** is with $D_i X^M = \partial_i X^M - \mathcal{A}_i^M$, JHP-Lee 2013, *c.f.* Hull 2006

$$\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \int d^2\sigma \mathcal{L}_{\text{string}}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{\text{string}} = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{-h} h^{ij} D_i X^M D_j X^N \mathcal{H}_{MN}(X) - \epsilon^{ij} D_i X^M \mathcal{A}_{jM},$$

- The generalized metric is defined to be a symmetric $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ element:

$$\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{H}_{BA}, \quad \mathcal{H}_A{}^C \mathcal{H}_B{}^D \mathcal{I}_{CD} = \mathcal{I}_{AB}.$$

- There are **two types** of generalized metric : **Riemannian vs. non-Riemannian**.

String probes the doubled-yet-gauged spacetime

- **DFT string action** is with $D_i X^M = \partial_i X^M - \mathcal{A}_i^M$, JHP-Lee 2013, *c.f.* Hull 2006

$$\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \int d^2\sigma \mathcal{L}_{\text{string}}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{\text{string}} = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{-h} h^{ij} D_i X^M D_j X^N \mathcal{H}_{MN}(X) - \epsilon^{ij} D_i X^M \mathcal{A}_{jM},$$

- The generalized metric is defined to be a symmetric $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ element:

$$\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{H}_{BA}, \quad \mathcal{H}_A^{C} \mathcal{H}_B^{D} \mathcal{J}_{CD} = \mathcal{J}_{AB}.$$

- There are **two types** of generalized metric : **Riemannian vs. non-Riemannian**.

String probes the doubled-yet-gauged spacetime

- **DFT string action** is with $D_i X^M = \partial_i X^M - \mathcal{A}_i^M$, JHP-Lee 2013, *c.f.* Hull 2006

$$\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \int d^2\sigma \mathcal{L}_{\text{string}}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{\text{string}} = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{-h} h^{ij} D_i X^M D_j X^N \mathcal{H}_{MN}(X) - \epsilon^{ij} D_i X^M \mathcal{A}_{jM},$$

- The generalized metric is defined to be a symmetric $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ element:

$$\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{H}_{BA}, \quad \mathcal{H}_A{}^C \mathcal{H}_B{}^D \mathcal{J}_{CD} = \mathcal{J}_{AB}.$$

- There are **two types** of generalized metric : **Riemannian vs. non-Riemannian**.

DFT backgrounds : Riemannian vs. non-Riemannian

- W.r.t. the conventional choice of the section, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_\mu} \equiv 0$, ‘**Riemannian**’ **generalized metric** assumes the well-known form,

$$\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} g^{-1} & -g^{-1}B \\ Bg^{-1} & g - Bg^{-1}B \end{pmatrix}.$$

Up to field redefinition (e.g. β -gravity **Andriot-Betz**) this is the most general form of a symmetric $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ element, **if the upper left $D \times D$ block is ‘non-degenerate’**.

- The DFT sigma model then reduces to the standard string action,

$$\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \mathcal{L}_{\text{string}} \equiv \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'} \left[-\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{-h} h^{ij} \partial_i X^\mu \partial_j X^\nu g_{\mu\nu}(X) + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{ij} \partial_i X^\mu \partial_j X^\nu B_{\mu\nu}(X) + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{ij} \partial_i \tilde{X}_\mu \partial_j X^\mu \right],$$

with the bonus of the topological term introduced by Giveon-Roczek; Hull.

- The EOM of \mathcal{A}_I^M implies **self-duality** on the full doubled spacetime,

$$\mathcal{H}^M{}_N D^j X^N + \frac{1}{\sqrt{-h}} \epsilon^{ij} D_j X^M = 0.$$

DFT backgrounds : Riemannian vs. non-Riemannian

- W.r.t. the conventional choice of the section, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_\mu} \equiv 0$, ‘**Riemannian**’ **generalized metric** assumes the well-known form,

$$\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} g^{-1} & -g^{-1}B \\ Bg^{-1} & g - Bg^{-1}B \end{pmatrix}.$$

Up to field redefinition (e.g. β -gravity **Andriot-Betz**) this is the most general form of a symmetric $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ element, **if the upper left $D \times D$ block is ‘non-degenerate’**.

- The DFT sigma model then reduces to the standard string action,**

$$\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \mathcal{L}_{\text{string}} \equiv \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'} \left[-\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{-h} h^{ij} \partial_i X^\mu \partial_j X^\nu g_{\mu\nu}(X) + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{ij} \partial_i X^\mu \partial_j X^\nu B_{\mu\nu}(X) + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{ij} \partial_i \tilde{X}_\mu \partial_j X^\mu \right],$$

with the bonus of the topological term introduced by **Giveon-Roce**; **Hull**.

- The EOM of \mathcal{A}_I^M implies **self-duality** on the full doubled spacetime,

$$\mathcal{H}^M{}_N D^j X^N + \frac{1}{\sqrt{-h}} \epsilon^{ij} D_j X^M = 0.$$

DFT backgrounds : Riemannian vs. non-Riemannian

- W.r.t. the conventional choice of the section, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_\mu} \equiv 0$, ‘**Riemannian**’ **generalized metric** assumes the well-known form,

$$\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} g^{-1} & -g^{-1}B \\ Bg^{-1} & g - Bg^{-1}B \end{pmatrix}.$$

Up to field redefinition (e.g. β -gravity **Andriot-Betz**) this is the most general form of a symmetric $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ element, **if the upper left $D \times D$ block is ‘non-degenerate’**.

- The DFT sigma model then reduces to the standard string action,**

$$\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \mathcal{L}_{\text{string}} \equiv \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'} \left[-\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{-h} h^{ij} \partial_i X^\mu \partial_j X^\nu g_{\mu\nu}(X) + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{ij} \partial_i X^\mu \partial_j X^\nu B_{\mu\nu}(X) + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{ij} \partial_i \tilde{X}_\mu \partial_j X^\mu \right],$$

with the bonus of the topological term introduced by **Giveon-Rocek; Hull**.

- The EOM of \mathcal{A}_i^M implies **self-duality** on the full doubled spacetime,

$$\mathcal{H}^M{}_N D^i X^N + \frac{1}{\sqrt{-h}} \epsilon^{ij} D_j X^M = 0.$$

- On the other hand, w.r.t. $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{x}_\mu} \equiv 0$ again, the **‘non-Riemannian’ DFT background** is characterized by the ‘degenerate’ upper left $D \times D$ block, such that it does not admit any Riemannian interpretation, **even locally**.
- It turns out that **upon such a non-Riemannian DFT background, the DFT sigma model reduces to a ‘chiral’ action for the ‘untilded’ coordinates, X^μ .**
- An ‘extreme’ example is the case where $\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{J}_{AB}$. The DFT sigma model becomes

$$\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \mathcal{L}_{\text{string}} \equiv \frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \epsilon^{ij} \partial_i \tilde{X}_\mu \partial_j X^\mu, \quad \partial_i X^\mu + \frac{1}{\sqrt{-h}} \epsilon_i^j \partial_j X^\mu = 0.$$

- On the other hand, w.r.t. $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{X}_\mu} \equiv 0$ again, the **‘non-Riemannian’ DFT background** is characterized by the ‘degenerate’ upper left $D \times D$ block, such that it does not admit any Riemannian interpretation, **even locally**.
- It turns out that **upon such a non-Riemannian DFT background, the DFT sigma model reduces to a ‘chiral’ action for the ‘untilded’ coordinates, X^μ .**
- An ‘extreme’ example is the case where $\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{J}_{AB}$. The DFT sigma model becomes

$$\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \mathcal{L}_{\text{string}} \equiv \frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \epsilon^{ij} \partial_i \tilde{X}_\mu \partial_j X^\mu, \quad \partial_i X^\mu + \frac{1}{\sqrt{-h}} \epsilon^j_i \partial_j X^\mu = 0.$$

Non-Riemannian DFT background for non-relativistic string theory

- Less simple example of a **non-Riemannian DFT background**, which is supersymmetric, can be obtained by performing a doubly T-dual rotation, $(t, x^1) \Leftrightarrow (\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}_1)$, of the known F1 background (**Dabholkar-Gibbons-Harvey-Ruiz 1990**): With $D = 10 = 2 + 8$,

$$\mathcal{H}_{MN} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \epsilon^\alpha{}_\beta & 0 \\ 0 & \delta^{ij} & 0 & 0 \\ -\epsilon_\alpha{}^\beta & 0 & f\eta_{\alpha\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \delta_{ij} \end{pmatrix}, \quad f = 1 + \frac{Q}{r^6}, \quad r^2 = \sum_{i=2}^9 (x^i)^2.$$

- Upon this non-Riemannian background with $Q \equiv 0$, the DFT sigma model reduces precisely to **the non-relativistic string theory action** by Gomis-Ooguri 2000.

Further, the non-relativistic sigma model **spectrum matches with the ‘perturbation’** of DFT. This is one clear example which shows that DFT is not a mere reformulation but a nontrivial extension of SUGRA. Ko-Melby-Thompson-Meyer-JHP 2015

Non-Riemannian DFT background for non-relativistic string theory

- Less simple example of a **non-Riemannian DFT background**, which is supersymmetric, can be obtained by performing a doubly T-dual rotation, $(t, x^1) \Leftrightarrow (\tilde{t}, \tilde{x}_1)$, of the known F1 background (Dabholkar-Gibbons-Harvey-Ruiz 1990): With $D = 10 = 2 + 8$,

$$\mathcal{H}_{MN} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \epsilon^\alpha{}_\beta & 0 \\ 0 & \delta^{ij} & 0 & 0 \\ -\epsilon_\alpha{}^\beta & 0 & f\eta_{\alpha\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \delta_{ij} \end{pmatrix}, \quad f = 1 + \frac{Q}{r^6}, \quad r^2 = \sum_{i=2}^9 (x^i)^2.$$

- Upon this non-Riemannian background with $Q \equiv 0$, the DFT sigma model reduces precisely to **the non-relativistic string theory action** by Gomis-Ooguri 2000.

Further, the non-relativistic sigma model **spectrum matches with the ‘perturbation’** of DFT. This is one clear example which shows that DFT is not a mere reformulation but a nontrivial extension of SUGRA. Ko-Melby-Thompson-Meyer-JHP 2015

- The Euler-Lagrange equation for $X^M(\sigma)$ gives the **Stringy Geodesic Motion**:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{-h}} \partial_i (\sqrt{-h} D^i X^M \mathcal{H}_{ML}) - \Gamma_{LMN} (PD_i X)^M (\bar{P} D^i X)^N = 0$$

where we set

$$\begin{aligned} (PD_i X)^M &= P^M_N D_i X^N, & P_{MN} &= \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{J}_{MN} + \mathcal{H}_{MN}), \\ (\bar{P} D_i X)^M &= \bar{P}^M_N D_i X^N, & \bar{P}_{MN} &= \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{J}_{MN} - \mathcal{H}_{MN}), \end{aligned}$$

and Γ_{LMN} corresponds to the DFT extension of the Christoffel connection.

For the exposition, we turn to the target spacetime perspective henceforth.

Target spacetime perspective: (S)DFT

1011.1324/1105.6294/1210.5078/1505.01301/1506.05277

- Dilaton and a pair of two-index projectors.

The **geometric objects** in DFT consist of a **dilaton, d** , and a pair of symmetric **projection operators**,

$$P_{AB} = P_{BA}, \quad \bar{P}_{AB} = \bar{P}_{BA}, \quad P_A{}^B P_B{}^C = P_A{}^C, \quad \bar{P}_A{}^B \bar{P}_B{}^C = \bar{P}_A{}^C.$$

Further, the projectors are orthogonal and complementary,

$$P_A{}^B \bar{P}_B{}^C = 0, \quad P_{AB} + \bar{P}_{AB} = \mathcal{I}_{AB}.$$

- Dilaton and a pair of two-index projectors.

The **geometric objects** in DFT consist of a **dilaton, d** , and a pair of symmetric **projection operators**,

$$P_{AB} = P_{BA}, \quad \bar{P}_{AB} = \bar{P}_{BA}, \quad P_A{}^B P_B{}^C = P_A{}^C, \quad \bar{P}_A{}^B \bar{P}_B{}^C = \bar{P}_A{}^C.$$

Further, the projectors are orthogonal and complementary,

$$P_A{}^B \bar{P}_B{}^C = 0, \quad P_{AB} + \bar{P}_{AB} = \mathcal{J}_{AB}.$$

Remark: The difference of the two projectors, $P_{AB} - \bar{P}_{AB} = \mathcal{H}_{AB}$, corresponds to the “generalized metric”. Yet, in supersymmetric double field theories, it appears that the projectors are more fundamental than the “generalized metric”, as there are a pair of vielbeins which are “square-roots” of the projectors .

- Integral measure.

- While the projectors are weightless, the dilaton gives rise to the $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ invariant integral measure with weight one, after exponentiation,

$$e^{-2d}.$$

- Naturally **the cosmological constant term in DFT** is given by

$$e^{-2d} \Lambda_{\text{DFT}}$$

which deviates from the conventional one in Riemannian GR, and hence reformulates the **cosmological constant problem** in a novel manner.

Jeon-Lee-JHP 2011

c.f. Meissner-Veneziano 1991

- Remark: Scherk-Schwarz-type dimensional reductions from $D = 10$ half-maximal SDFT can produce $\Lambda_{\text{DFT}} > 0$ (as well as $\Lambda_{\text{DFT}} < 0$),

Cho-Fernández-Melgarejo-Jeon-JHP 2015

once the section condition is 'relaxed' for the twisting ansatz.

Geissbuhler, Grana-Marques, Berman-Lee

- Integral measure.

- While the projectors are weightless, the dilaton gives rise to the $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ invariant integral measure with weight one, after exponentiation,

$$e^{-2d}.$$

- Naturally **the cosmological constant term in DFT** is given by

$$e^{-2d}\Lambda_{\text{DFT}}$$

which deviates from the conventional one in Riemannian GR, and hence reformulates the **cosmological constant problem** in a novel manner.

Jeon-Lee-JHP 2011

c.f. Meissner-Veneziano 1991

- *Remark: Scherk-Schwarz-type dimensional reductions from $D = 10$ half-maximal SDFT can produce $\Lambda_{\text{DFT}} > 0$ (as well as $\Lambda_{\text{DFT}} < 0$),*

Cho-Fernández-Melgarejo-Jeon-JHP 2015

once the section condition is 'relaxed' for the twisting ansatz.

Geissbuhler, Grana-Marques, Berman-Lee

- Integral measure.

- While the projectors are weightless, the dilaton gives rise to the $\mathbf{O}(D, D)$ invariant integral measure with weight one, after exponentiation,

$$e^{-2d}.$$

- Naturally **the cosmological constant term in DFT** is given by

$$e^{-2d} \Lambda_{\text{DFT}}$$

which deviates from the conventional one in Riemannian GR, and hence reformulates the **cosmological constant problem** in a novel manner.

Jeon-Lee-JHP 2011

c.f. Meissner-Veneziano 1991

- *Remark: Scherk-Schwarz-type dimensional reductions from $D = 10$ half-maximal SDFT can produce $\Lambda_{\text{DFT}} > 0$ (as well as $\Lambda_{\text{DFT}} < 0$),*

Cho-Fernández-Melgarejo-Jeon-JHP 2015

once the section condition is ‘relaxed’ for the twisting ansatz.

Geissbuhler, Grana-Marques, Berman-Lee

- Semi-covariant derivative and semi-covariant four-index curvature.

We define a semi-covariant derivative,

$$\nabla_C T_{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n} := \partial_C T_{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n} - \omega_T \Gamma^B_{BC} T_{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n} + \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{CA_i}^B T_{A_1 \cdots A_{i-1} B A_{i+1} \cdots A_n},$$

and

- Semi-covariant derivative and semi-covariant four-index curvature.

We define a semi-covariant derivative,

$$\nabla_C T_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_n} := \partial_C T_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_n} - \omega_T \Gamma^B_{BC} T_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_n} + \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{CA_i}^B T_{A_1 \dots A_{i-1} B A_{i+1} \dots A_n},$$

and a semi-covariant four-index curvature,

$$S_{ABCD} := \frac{1}{2} \left(R_{ABCD} + R_{CDAB} - \Gamma^E_{AB} \Gamma_{ECD} \right).$$

Here R_{ABCD} denotes the ordinary “field strength” of a connection,

$$R_{CDAB} = \partial_A \Gamma_{BCD} - \partial_B \Gamma_{ACD} + \Gamma_{AC}^E \Gamma_{BED} - \Gamma_{BC}^E \Gamma_{AED} \quad \Leftarrow \quad d\Gamma + \Gamma \wedge \Gamma.$$

- Semi-covariant derivative and semi-covariant four-index curvature.

We define a semi-covariant derivative,

$$\nabla_C T_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_n} := \partial_C T_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_n} - \omega_T \Gamma^B_{BC} T_{A_1 A_2 \dots A_n} + \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_{CA_i}^B T_{A_1 \dots A_{i-1} B A_{i+1} \dots A_n},$$

and a semi-covariant four-index curvature,

$$S_{ABCD} := \frac{1}{2} \left(R_{ABCD} + R_{CDAB} - \Gamma^E_{AB} \Gamma_{ECD} \right).$$

Here R_{ABCD} denotes the ordinary “field strength” of a connection,

$$R_{CDAB} = \partial_A \Gamma_{BCD} - \partial_B \Gamma_{ACD} + \Gamma_{AC}^E \Gamma_{BED} - \Gamma_{BC}^E \Gamma_{AED} \quad \Leftarrow \quad d\Gamma + \Gamma \wedge \Gamma.$$

As will be explained below, one can determine the (torsionless) connection uniquely:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{CAB} = & \quad 2 (P \partial_C P \bar{P})_{[AB]} + 2 (\bar{P}_{[A}^D \bar{P}_{B]}^E - P_{[A}^D P_{B]}^E) \partial_D P_{EC} \\ & - \frac{4}{D-1} (\bar{P}_{C[A} \bar{P}_{B]}^D + P_{C[A} P_{B]}^D) (\partial_D d + (P \partial^E P \bar{P})_{[ED]}), \end{aligned}$$

which corresponds to **the DFT generalization of the Christoffel connection, 1105.6294**.

A crucial **defining property of the semi-covariant four-index curvature** is that, under arbitrary transformation of the connection, it transforms as total derivative,

$$\delta S_{ABCD} = \nabla_{[A} \delta \Gamma_{B]CD} + \nabla_{[C} \delta \Gamma_{D]AB}.$$

A crucial **defining property of the semi-covariant four-index curvature** is that, under arbitrary transformation of the connection, it transforms as total derivative,

$$\delta S_{ABCD} = \nabla_{[A} \delta \Gamma_{B]CD} + \nabla_{[C} \delta \Gamma_{D]AB}.$$

Further, the semi-covariant four-index curvature satisfies precisely the same symmetric properties as the ordinary Riemann curvature,

$$S_{ABCD} = S_{[AB][CD]} = S_{CDAB}, \quad S_{[ABC]D} = 0,$$

as well as additional identities involving the projectors,

$$P_I^A P_J^B \bar{P}_K^C \bar{P}_L^D S_{ABCD} = 0, \quad P_I^A \bar{P}_J^B P_K^C \bar{P}_L^D S_{ABCD} = 0.$$

Notably, it turns out that the naive scalar contraction vanishes identically,

$$S^{AB}{}_{AB} = 0.$$

- The uniqueness of the DFT Christoffel connection.

The connection is the unique solution to the following four constraints:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_A P_{BC} &= 0, & \nabla_A \bar{P}_{BC} &= 0, \\
\nabla_A d &= -\frac{1}{2} e^{2d} \nabla_A (e^{-2d}) = \partial_A d + \frac{1}{2} \Gamma^B_{BA} = 0, \\
\Gamma_{ABC} + \Gamma_{BCA} + \Gamma_{CAB} &= 0, \\
\mathcal{P}_{ABC}{}^{DEF} \Gamma_{DEF} &= 0, & \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{ABC}{}^{DEF} \Gamma_{DEF} &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

- The uniqueness of the DFT Christoffel connection.

The connection is the unique solution to the following four constraints:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_A P_{BC} &= 0, & \nabla_A \bar{P}_{BC} &= 0, \\
\nabla_A d &= -\frac{1}{2} e^{2d} \nabla_A (e^{-2d}) = \partial_A d + \frac{1}{2} \Gamma^B_{BA} = 0, \\
\Gamma_{ABC} + \Gamma_{BCA} + \Gamma_{CAB} &= 0, \\
\mathcal{P}_{ABC}{}^{DEF} \Gamma_{DEF} &= 0, & \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{ABC}{}^{DEF} \Gamma_{DEF} &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

- The first two relations are the compatibility conditions with all the geometric objects in DFT , or the massless NS-NS sector, and further imply $\nabla_A \mathcal{J}_{BC} = 0$.

- The uniqueness of the DFT Christoffel connection.

The connection is the unique solution to the following four constraints:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_A P_{BC} &= 0, & \nabla_A \bar{P}_{BC} &= 0, \\
\nabla_A d &= -\frac{1}{2} e^{2d} \nabla_A (e^{-2d}) = \partial_A d + \frac{1}{2} \Gamma^B_{BA} = 0, \\
\Gamma_{ABC} + \Gamma_{BCA} + \Gamma_{CAB} &= 0, \\
\mathcal{P}_{ABC}{}^{DEF} \Gamma_{DEF} &= 0, & \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{ABC}{}^{DEF} \Gamma_{DEF} &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

- The next cyclic property makes the semi-covariant derivative compatible with the generalized Lie derivative, as well as with the C-bracket,

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X(\partial) = \hat{\mathcal{L}}_X(\nabla), \quad [X, Y]_C(\partial) = [X, Y]_C(\nabla).$$

The relaxation of the cyclic condition leads to a torsionful connection which can be used to ensure the [1.5 formalism](#) in the full order supersymmetric completions of DFT. [1112.0069 \(Half-maximal SUSY\)](#) / [1210.5078 \(Maximal SUSY\)](#)

- The uniqueness of the DFT Christoffel connection.

The connection is the unique solution to the following four constraints:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_A P_{BC} &= 0, & \nabla_A \bar{P}_{BC} &= 0, \\
\nabla_A d &= -\frac{1}{2} e^{2d} \nabla_A (e^{-2d}) = \partial_A d + \frac{1}{2} \Gamma^B_{BA} = 0, \\
\Gamma_{ABC} + \Gamma_{BCA} + \Gamma_{CAB} &= 0, \\
\mathcal{P}_{ABC}{}^{DEF} \Gamma_{DEF} &= 0, & \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{ABC}{}^{DEF} \Gamma_{DEF} &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

- The last formulae are ‘projection conditions’ which ensure the uniqueness.
- Explicitly the **six-index projection operators** are

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{CAB}{}^{DEF} &:= P_C{}^D P_{[A}{}^{[E} P_{B]}{}^{F]} + \frac{2}{D-1} P_{C[A} P_{B]}{}^{[E} P^{F]D}, & \mathcal{P}_{ABC}{}^{DEF} \mathcal{P}_{DEF}{}^{GHI} &= \mathcal{P}_{ABC}{}^{GHI}, \\
\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{CAB}{}^{DEF} &:= \bar{P}_C{}^D \bar{P}_{[A}{}^{[E} \bar{P}_{B]}{}^{F]} + \frac{2}{D-1} \bar{P}_{C[A} \bar{P}_{B]}{}^{[E} \bar{P}^{F]D}, & \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{ABC}{}^{DEF} \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{DEF}{}^{GHI} &= \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{ABC}{}^{GHI}.
\end{aligned}$$

They are symmetric and traceless,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{ABCDEF} &= \mathcal{P}_{DEFABC}, & \mathcal{P}_{ABCDEF} &= \mathcal{P}_{A[BC]D[EF]}, & P^{AB} \mathcal{P}_{ABCDEF} &= 0, \\
\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{ABCDEF} &= \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{DEFABC}, & \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{ABCDEF} &= \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{A[BC]D[EF]}, & \bar{P}^{AB} \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{ABCDEF} &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Remark: Failure of the Equivalence Principle

Unlike the usual Christoffel symbol in Riemannian geometry, the DFT-diffeomorphisms cannot transform our connection to vanish point-wise:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{CAB} &= 2(P\partial_C P\bar{P})_{[AB]} + 2(\bar{P}_{[A}{}^D\bar{P}_{B]}{}^E - P_{[A}{}^D P_{B]}{}^E)\partial_D P_{EC} \\ &\quad - \frac{4}{D-1}(\bar{P}_{C[A}\bar{P}_{B]}{}^D + P_{C[A}P_{B]}{}^D)(\partial_D d + (P\partial^E P\bar{P})_{[ED]}) \\ &\neq 0.\end{aligned}$$

That is to say, there is no ‘normal’ coordinate in DFT.

This can be viewed as the failure of the equivalence principle applied to an extended object, *i.e.* string.

- Crucially, **the projection operator dictates the anomalous terms** in the diffeomorphic transformations of the semi-covariant derivative and the four-index curvature,

$$(\delta_X - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_X) \nabla_C T_{A_1 \dots A_n} = \sum_{i=1}^n 2(\mathcal{P} + \bar{\mathcal{P}})_{CA_i}{}^{BDEF} \partial_D \partial_E X_F T_{A_1 \dots A_{i-1} B A_{i+1} \dots A_n},$$

$$(\delta_X - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_X) S_{ABCD} = 2\nabla_{[A} \left((\mathcal{P} + \bar{\mathcal{P}})_{B][CD]}{}^{EFG} \partial_E \partial_F X_G \right) + 2\nabla_{[C} \left((\mathcal{P} + \bar{\mathcal{P}})_{D][AB]}{}^{EFG} \partial_E \partial_F X_G \right).$$

- Complete covariantizations.

Both the semi-covariant derivative and the semi-covariant four-index curvature can be fully covariantized, through appropriate contractions with the projectors:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_C{}^D \bar{P}_{A_1}{}^{B_1} \dots \bar{P}_{A_n}{}^{B_n} \nabla_D T_{B_1 \dots B_n}, & \quad \bar{P}_C{}^D P_{A_1}{}^{B_1} \dots P_{A_n}{}^{B_n} \nabla_D T_{B_1 \dots B_n}, \\
P^{AB} \bar{P}_{C_1}{}^{D_1} \dots \bar{P}_{C_n}{}^{D_n} \nabla_A T_{BD_1 \dots D_n}, & \quad \bar{P}^{AB} P_{C_1}{}^{D_1} \dots P_{C_n}{}^{D_n} \nabla_A T_{BD_1 \dots D_n} \quad (\text{divergences}), \\
P^{AB} \bar{P}_{C_1}{}^{D_1} \dots \bar{P}_{C_n}{}^{D_n} \nabla_A \nabla_B T_{D_1 \dots D_n}, & \quad \bar{P}^{AB} P_{C_1}{}^{D_1} \dots P_{C_n}{}^{D_n} \nabla_A \nabla_B T_{D_1 \dots D_n} \quad (\text{Laplacians}),
\end{aligned}$$

and

- Complete covariantizations.

Both the semi-covariant derivative and the semi-covariant four-index curvature can be fully covariantized, through appropriate contractions with the projectors:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_C{}^D \bar{P}_{A_1}{}^{B_1} \dots \bar{P}_{A_n}{}^{B_n} \nabla_D T_{B_1 \dots B_n}, & \quad \bar{P}_C{}^D P_{A_1}{}^{B_1} \dots P_{A_n}{}^{B_n} \nabla_D T_{B_1 \dots B_n}, \\
P^{AB} \bar{P}_{C_1}{}^{D_1} \dots \bar{P}_{C_n}{}^{D_n} \nabla_A T_{B D_1 \dots D_n}, & \quad \bar{P}^{AB} P_{C_1}{}^{D_1} \dots P_{C_n}{}^{D_n} \nabla_A T_{B D_1 \dots D_n} \quad (\text{divergences}), \\
P^{AB} \bar{P}_{C_1}{}^{D_1} \dots \bar{P}_{C_n}{}^{D_n} \nabla_A \nabla_B T_{D_1 \dots D_n}, & \quad \bar{P}^{AB} P_{C_1}{}^{D_1} \dots P_{C_n}{}^{D_n} \nabla_A \nabla_B T_{D_1 \dots D_n} \quad (\text{Laplacians}),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
P_A{}^C \bar{P}_B{}^D S_{CED}{}^E & \quad (\text{Ricci-like curvature}), \\
(P^{AC} P^{BD} - \bar{P}^{AC} \bar{P}^{BD}) S_{ABCD} & \quad (\text{scalar curvature}).
\end{aligned}$$

- Complete covariantizations.

Both the semi-covariant derivative and the semi-covariant four-index curvature can be fully covariantized, through appropriate contractions with the projectors:

$$\begin{aligned}
P_C{}^D \bar{P}_{A_1}{}^{B_1} \dots \bar{P}_{A_n}{}^{B_n} \nabla_D T_{B_1 \dots B_n}, & \quad \bar{P}_C{}^D P_{A_1}{}^{B_1} \dots P_{A_n}{}^{B_n} \nabla_D T_{B_1 \dots B_n}, \\
P^{AB} \bar{P}_{C_1}{}^{D_1} \dots \bar{P}_{C_n}{}^{D_n} \nabla_A T_{BD_1 \dots D_n}, & \quad \bar{P}^{AB} P_{C_1}{}^{D_1} \dots P_{C_n}{}^{D_n} \nabla_A T_{BD_1 \dots D_n} \quad (\text{divergences}), \\
P^{AB} \bar{P}_{C_1}{}^{D_1} \dots \bar{P}_{C_n}{}^{D_n} \nabla_A \nabla_B T_{D_1 \dots D_n}, & \quad \bar{P}^{AB} P_{C_1}{}^{D_1} \dots P_{C_n}{}^{D_n} \nabla_A \nabla_B T_{D_1 \dots D_n} \quad (\text{Laplacians}),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
P_A{}^C \bar{P}_B{}^D S_{CED}{}^E & \quad (\text{Ricci-like curvature}), \\
(P^{AC} P^{BD} - \bar{P}^{AC} \bar{P}^{BD}) S_{ABCD} & \quad (\text{scalar curvature}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the curvatures, we also have the ‘conserved’ Einstein-like curvature:

$$\nabla_A G^{AB} = 0, \quad G^{AB} := 2(P^{AC} \bar{P}^{BD} - \bar{P}^{AC} P^{BD}) S_{CED}{}^E - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{J}^{AB} (P^{CD} P^{EF} - \bar{P}^{CD} \bar{P}^{EF}) S_{CEDF}.$$

- Further completely covariant examples follow from the above generic prescription:

- **Completely covariant Yang-Mills field strength** is given by two opposite projections,

$$P_A{}^M \bar{P}_B{}^N \mathcal{F}_{MN},$$

where \mathcal{F}_{MN} is the semi-covariant field strength of a YM potential, \mathcal{V}_M ,

$$\mathcal{F}_{MN} := \nabla_M \mathcal{V}_N - \nabla_N \mathcal{V}_M - i[\mathcal{V}_M, \mathcal{V}_N].$$

Unlike the Riemannian case, the Γ connections are not canceled out.

Jeon-Lee-JHP 2011, Choi-JHP 2015

- **Completely covariant Killing equations** of DFT:

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X \mathcal{H}_{MN} = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad (P\nabla)_M (\bar{P}X)_N - (\bar{P}\nabla)_N (PX)_M = 0,$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X d = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \nabla_M X^M = 0.$$

JHP-Rey-Rim-Sakatani 2015

- Further completely covariant examples follow from the above generic prescription:

- **Completely covariant Yang-Mills field strength** is given by two opposite projections,

$$P_A{}^M \bar{P}_B{}^N \mathcal{F}_{MN},$$

where \mathcal{F}_{MN} is the semi-covariant field strength of a YM potential, \mathcal{V}_M ,

$$\mathcal{F}_{MN} := \nabla_M \mathcal{V}_N - \nabla_N \mathcal{V}_M - i[\mathcal{V}_M, \mathcal{V}_N].$$

Unlike the Riemannian case, the Γ connections are not canceled out.

Jeon-Lee-JHP 2011, Choi-JHP 2015

- **Completely covariant Killing equations** of DFT:

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X \mathcal{H}_{MN} = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad (P\nabla)_M (\bar{P}X)_N - (\bar{P}\nabla)_N (PX)_M = 0,$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_X d = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \nabla_M X^M = 0.$$

JHP-Rey-Rim-Sakatani 2015

- *Apology of semi-covariance:*

In the ‘Theory of Everything’, one cannot take derivatives arbitrarily.

Taking derivative needs to be disciplined.

- **Now having the semi-covariant differential tool kits at our disposal, we can do various things:**
 - Couple to Yang-Mills, fermions and R-R sector 1011.1324/1109.2035/1206.3478
 - Double Field Theorize the Standard Model 1506.05277
 - Double Field Theorize the Vasiliev's Higher Spin theory 1605.00403
 - Supersymmetrizations Half-maximal SFT 1112.0069
Maximal SFT 1210.5078
Gauged SFT 1505.01301
(section condition relaxed)
 - Wald type gravitational Noether currents and global charges 1507.07545
 - Perturbations of $\delta\mathcal{H}_{AB}$, δd 1508.01121
 - Non-Riemannian backgrounds, *e.g.* $\mathcal{H}_{MN} = \mathcal{J}_{MN}$ 1307.8377/1508.01121
 - Extensions to U-duality, 'U-gravity' 1302.1652/1402.5027

Supersymmetric Extension

Utilizing the semi-covariant derivatives introduced above,

after incorporating fermions and R-R sector,

it is possible to construct, to the ‘full order’ in fermions,

Type II, or $\mathcal{N} = 2$, $D = 10$ Maximally Supersymmetric Double Field Theory

of which the Lagrangian reads

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Max}} = e^{-2d} & \left[\frac{1}{8} (P^{AB} P^{CD} - \bar{P}^{AB} \bar{P}^{CD}) S_{ACBD} + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F} \bar{\mathcal{F}}) - i \bar{\rho} \mathcal{F} \rho' + i \bar{\psi} \bar{p} \gamma_q \mathcal{F} \bar{\gamma}^{\bar{p}} \psi'^q \right. \\ & \left. + i \frac{1}{2} \bar{\rho} \gamma^p \mathcal{D}_p \rho - i \bar{\psi} \bar{\rho} \mathcal{D}_{\bar{p}} \rho - i \frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi} \bar{\rho} \gamma^q \mathcal{D}_q \psi_{\bar{p}} - i \frac{1}{2} \bar{\rho}' \bar{\gamma}^{\bar{p}} \mathcal{D}_{\bar{p}} \rho' + i \bar{\psi}'^p \mathcal{D}_p \rho' + i \frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi}'^p \bar{\gamma}^{\bar{q}} \mathcal{D}_{\bar{q}} \psi'_{\bar{p}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Jeon-Lee-Suh-JHP 1210.5078

c.f. other approaches: Coimbra, Strickland-Constanble, Waldram; Kwak, Hohm, Zwiebach

Symmetries of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $D = 10$ SDFT

- $O(10, 10)$ T-duality
- Gauge symmetries
 1. DFT-diffeomorphism (generalized Lie derivative)
 2. A pair of local Lorentz symmetries, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R$
 3. local $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY with 32 supercharges.
- All the bosonic symmetries are realized manifestly and simultaneously for each term.
- For this, it is crucial to have the right field variables:

$$d, \quad V_{Ap}, \quad \bar{V}_{A\bar{p}}, \quad C^\alpha{}_{\bar{\alpha}}, \quad \rho^\alpha, \quad \rho'^{\bar{\alpha}}, \quad \psi_p^\alpha, \quad \psi_p'^{\bar{\alpha}}$$

which are $O(10, 10)$ covariant **genuine DFT-field-variables**, and *a priori* they are NOT Riemannian, such as metric, B-field, R-R p -forms.

Symmetries of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $D = 10$ SDFT

- $O(10, 10)$ T-duality
- Gauge symmetries
 1. DFT-diffeomorphism (generalized Lie derivative)
 2. A pair of local Lorentz symmetries, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R$
 3. local $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY with 32 supercharges.
- All the bosonic symmetries are realized manifestly and simultaneously for each term.
- For this, it is crucial to have the right field variables:

$$d, \quad V_{Ap}, \quad \bar{V}_{A\bar{p}}, \quad C^\alpha{}_{\bar{\alpha}}, \quad \rho^\alpha, \quad \rho'^{\bar{\alpha}}, \quad \psi_p^\alpha, \quad \psi_p'^{\bar{\alpha}}$$

which are $O(10, 10)$ covariant **genuine DFT-field-variables**, and *a priori* they are NOT Riemannian, such as metric, B-field, R-R p -forms.

Symmetries of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $D = 10$ SDFT

- $O(10, 10)$ T-duality
- Gauge symmetries
 1. DFT-diffeomorphism (generalized Lie derivative)
 2. A pair of local Lorentz symmetries, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R$
 3. local $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY with 32 supercharges.
- All the bosonic symmetries are realized manifestly and simultaneously for each term.
- For this, it is crucial to have the right field variables:

$$d, \quad V_{Ap}, \quad \bar{V}_{A\bar{p}}, \quad C^\alpha{}_{\bar{\alpha}}, \quad \rho^\alpha, \quad \rho'^{\bar{\alpha}}, \quad \psi_p^\alpha, \quad \psi_p'^{\bar{\alpha}}$$

which are $O(10, 10)$ covariant **genuine DFT-field-variables**, and *a priori* they are NOT Riemannian, such as metric, B -field, R-R p -forms.

Symmetries of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $D = 10$ SDFT

- **$O(10, 10)$ T-duality**
- **Gauge symmetries**
 1. **DFT-diffeomorphism (generalized Lie derivative) $\Rightarrow \Gamma_A$**
 2. **A pair of local Lorentz symmetries, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R \Rightarrow \Phi_A, \bar{\Phi}_A$**
 3. **local $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY with 32 supercharges.**
- **Assigning a connection to each (bosonic) gauge symmetry, we introduce 'master' semi-covariant derivative,**

$$\mathcal{D}_A := \partial_A + \Gamma_A + \Phi_A + \bar{\Phi}_A = \nabla_A + \Phi_A + \bar{\Phi}_A.$$

- **The spin connections are then determined in terms of the DFT-Christoffel connection by requiring the compatibility with the DFT-vielbeins,**

$$\mathcal{D}_A V_{Bp} = \nabla_A V_{Bp} + \Phi_{Ap}{}^q V_{Bq} = 0, \quad \mathcal{D}_A \bar{V}_{B\bar{p}} = \nabla_A \bar{V}_{B\bar{p}} + \bar{\Phi}_{A\bar{p}}{}^{\bar{q}} \bar{V}_{B\bar{q}} = 0.$$

Symmetries of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $D = 10$ SDFT

- $O(10, 10)$ T-duality
- Gauge symmetries
 1. DFT-diffeomorphism (generalized Lie derivative) $\Rightarrow \Gamma_A$
 2. A pair of local Lorentz symmetries, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R \Rightarrow \Phi_A, \bar{\Phi}_A$
 3. local $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY with 32 supercharges.
- Assigning a connection to each (bosonic) gauge symmetry, we introduce ‘master’ semi-covariant derivative,

$$\mathcal{D}_A := \partial_A + \Gamma_A + \Phi_A + \bar{\Phi}_A = \nabla_A + \Phi_A + \bar{\Phi}_A.$$

- The spin connections are then determined in terms of the DFT-Christoffel connection by requiring the compatibility with the DFT-vielbeins,

$$\mathcal{D}_A V_{Bp} = \nabla_A V_{Bp} + \Phi_{Ap}{}^q V_{Bq} = 0, \quad \mathcal{D}_A \bar{V}_{B\bar{p}} = \nabla_A \bar{V}_{B\bar{p}} + \bar{\Phi}_{A\bar{p}}{}^{\bar{q}} \bar{V}_{B\bar{q}} = 0.$$

Symmetries of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $D = 10$ SDFT

- $O(10, 10)$ T-duality
- Gauge symmetries
 1. DFT-diffeomorphism (generalized Lie derivative) $\Rightarrow \Gamma_A$
 2. A pair of local Lorentz symmetries, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R \Rightarrow \Phi_A, \bar{\Phi}_A$
 3. local $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY with 32 supercharges.
- Assigning a connection to each (bosonic) gauge symmetry, we introduce ‘master’ semi-covariant derivative,

$$\mathcal{D}_A := \partial_A + \Gamma_A + \Phi_A + \bar{\Phi}_A = \nabla_A + \Phi_A + \bar{\Phi}_A.$$

- The spin connections are then determined in terms of the DFT-Christoffel connection by requiring the compatibility with the DFT-vielbeins,

$$\mathcal{D}_A V_{Bp} = \nabla_A V_{Bp} + \Phi_{Ap}{}^q V_{Bq} = 0, \quad \mathcal{D}_A \bar{V}_{B\bar{p}} = \nabla_A \bar{V}_{B\bar{p}} + \bar{\Phi}_{A\bar{p}}{}^{\bar{q}} \bar{V}_{B\bar{q}} = 0.$$

Unification of IIA and IIB

- $O(10, 10)$ T-duality
- Gauge symmetries
 1. DFT-diffeomorphism (generalized Lie derivative)
 2. A *pair* of local Lorentz symmetries, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R$
 3. local $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY with 32 supercharges.
- The theory is chiral with respect to both Local Lorentz groups: $\rho^\alpha, \psi_\rho^\alpha$ vs. $\rho'^{\bar{\alpha}}, \psi_{\rho'}^{\bar{\alpha}}$
- Consequently, there is no distinction of IIA and IIB \implies Unification of IIA and IIB
- While the theory is unique, it contains type IIA and IIB SUGRA backgrounds as different kind of solutions.

Unification of IIA and IIB

- $O(10, 10)$ T-duality
- Gauge symmetries
 1. DFT-diffeomorphism (generalized Lie derivative)
 2. A pair of local Lorentz symmetries, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R$
 3. local $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY with 32 supercharges.
- The theory is chiral with respect to both Local Lorentz groups: $\rho^\alpha, \psi_\rho^\alpha$ vs. $\rho'^{\bar{\alpha}}, \psi_\rho'^{\bar{\alpha}}$
- Consequently, there is no distinction of IIA and IIB \implies Unification of IIA and IIB
- While the theory is unique, it contains type IIA and IIB SUGRA backgrounds as different kind of solutions.

Unification of IIA and IIB

- $O(10, 10)$ T-duality
- Gauge symmetries
 1. DFT-diffeomorphism (generalized Lie derivative)
 2. A pair of local Lorentz symmetries, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R$
 3. local $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY with 32 supercharges.
- The theory is chiral with respect to both Local Lorentz groups: $\rho^\alpha, \psi_\rho^\alpha$ vs. $\rho'^{\bar{\alpha}}, \psi_\rho'^{\bar{\alpha}}$
- Consequently, there is no distinction of IIA and IIB \implies Unification of IIA and IIB
- While the theory is unique, it contains type IIA and IIB SUGRA backgrounds as different kind of solutions.

Unification of IIA and IIB

- $O(10, 10)$ T-duality
- Gauge symmetries
 1. DFT-diffeomorphism (generalized Lie derivative)
 2. A pair of local Lorentz symmetries, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R$
 3. local $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY with 32 supercharges.
- The theory is chiral with respect to both Local Lorentz groups: $\rho^\alpha, \psi_\rho^\alpha$ vs. $\rho'^{\bar{\alpha}}, \psi_\rho'^{\bar{\alpha}}$
- Consequently, there is no distinction of IIA and IIB \implies **Unification of IIA and IIB**
- While the theory is unique, it contains type IIA and IIB SUGRA backgrounds as different kind of solutions.

- Euler-Lagrange equations includes the DFT generalization of the Einstein equation:

$$S_{p\bar{q}} = -\text{Tr}(\gamma_p \mathcal{F} \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{q}} \bar{\mathcal{F}}) + \text{fermions} ,$$

where the RR field strength is defined by an $O(D, D)$ covariant nilpotent operator,

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}_+ \mathcal{C} := \gamma^A \mathcal{D}_A \mathcal{C} + \gamma^{(11)} \mathcal{D}_A \mathcal{C} \bar{\gamma}^A , \quad \mathcal{D}_+^2 = 0 , \quad \bar{\mathcal{F}} = \bar{\mathcal{C}}_+^{-1} \mathcal{F}^T \mathcal{C}_+ .$$

which covariantizes the H -twisted cohomology, as \mathcal{D}_+ reduces to $d_H = d + H \wedge$, upon the diagonal gauge fixing, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R \rightarrow \text{Spin}(1, 9)_D$.

- Maximal 32 SUSY : covariant Killing Spinor Equations (red color)

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\varepsilon d &= -i \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\varepsilon} \rho + \bar{\varepsilon}' \rho') , \quad \delta_\varepsilon V_{Ap} = i \bar{V}_A^{\bar{q}} (\bar{\varepsilon}' \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{q}} \psi'_p - \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma_p \psi_{\bar{q}}) , \quad \delta_\varepsilon \bar{V}_{\bar{A}\bar{p}} = i V_A^q (\bar{\varepsilon} \gamma_q \psi_{\bar{p}} - \bar{\varepsilon}' \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{p}} \psi'_q) , \\ \delta_\varepsilon \mathcal{C} &= i \frac{1}{2} (\gamma^p \varepsilon \bar{\psi}'_p - \varepsilon \bar{\rho}' - \psi_{\bar{p}} \bar{\varepsilon}' \bar{\gamma}^{\bar{p}} + \rho \bar{\varepsilon}') + \mathcal{C} \delta_\varepsilon d - \frac{1}{2} (\bar{V}_A^{\bar{q}} \delta_\varepsilon V_{Ap}) \gamma^{(d+1)} \gamma^p \mathcal{C} \bar{\gamma}^{\bar{q}} , \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\varepsilon \rho &= -\gamma^p \mathcal{D}_p \varepsilon , & \delta_\varepsilon \rho' &= -\bar{\gamma}^{\bar{p}} \mathcal{D}_{\bar{p}} \varepsilon' , \\ \delta_\varepsilon \psi_{\bar{p}} &= \mathcal{D}_{\bar{p}} \varepsilon + \mathcal{F} \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{p}} \varepsilon' , & \delta_\varepsilon \psi'_p &= \mathcal{D}_p \varepsilon' + \bar{\mathcal{F}} \gamma_p \varepsilon . \end{aligned}$$

* The higher order fermionic terms are suppressed for simplicity above. Nevertheless, the 'full' order supersymmetrization has been completed in 1210.5078.

- Euler-Lagrange equations includes the DFT generalization of the Einstein equation:

$$S_{p\bar{q}} = -\text{Tr}(\gamma_p \mathcal{F} \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{q}} \bar{\mathcal{F}}) + \text{fermions} ,$$

where the RR field strength is defined by an $O(D, D)$ covariant nilpotent operator,

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}_+ \mathcal{C} := \gamma^A \mathcal{D}_A \mathcal{C} + \gamma^{(11)} \mathcal{D}_A \mathcal{C} \bar{\gamma}^A , \quad \mathcal{D}_+^2 = 0 , \quad \bar{\mathcal{F}} = \bar{\mathcal{C}}_+^{-1} \mathcal{F}^T \mathcal{C}_+ .$$

which covariantizes the H -twisted cohomology, as \mathcal{D}_+ reduces to $d_H = d + H \wedge$, upon the diagonal gauge fixing, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R \rightarrow \text{Spin}(1, 9)_D$.

- Maximal 32 SUSY : **covariant Killing Spinor Equations (red color)**

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\varepsilon d &= -i \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\varepsilon} \rho + \bar{\varepsilon}' \rho') , \quad \delta_\varepsilon V_{Ap} = i \bar{V}_A^{\bar{q}} (\bar{\varepsilon}' \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{q}} \psi'_p - \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma_p \psi_{\bar{q}}) , \quad \delta_\varepsilon \bar{V}_{\bar{A}\bar{p}} = i V_A^q (\bar{\varepsilon} \gamma_q \psi_{\bar{p}} - \bar{\varepsilon}' \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{p}} \psi'_q) , \\ \delta_\varepsilon \mathcal{C} &= i \frac{1}{2} (\gamma^p \varepsilon \bar{\psi}'_p - \varepsilon \bar{\rho}' - \psi_{\bar{p}} \bar{\varepsilon}' \bar{\gamma}^{\bar{p}} + \rho \bar{\varepsilon}') + \mathcal{C} \delta_\varepsilon d - \frac{1}{2} (\bar{V}_A^{\bar{q}} \delta_\varepsilon V_{Ap}) \gamma^{(d+1)} \gamma^p \mathcal{C} \bar{\gamma}^{\bar{q}} , \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\varepsilon \rho &= -\gamma^p \mathcal{D}_p \varepsilon , & \delta_\varepsilon \rho' &= -\bar{\gamma}^{\bar{p}} \mathcal{D}_{\bar{p}} \varepsilon' , \\ \delta_\varepsilon \psi_{\bar{p}} &= \mathcal{D}_{\bar{p}} \varepsilon + \mathcal{F} \bar{\gamma}_{\bar{p}} \varepsilon' , & \delta_\varepsilon \psi'_p &= \mathcal{D}_p \varepsilon' + \bar{\mathcal{F}} \gamma_p \varepsilon . \end{aligned}$$

* The higher order fermionic terms are suppressed for simplicity above. Nevertheless, the 'full' order supersymmetrization has been completed in **1210.5078**.

Phenomenological Implication

Standard Model as a Double Field Theory

with Kangsin Choi 1506.05277 PRL

Standard Model as a Double Field Theory : Prediction

- In principle, fermions live on a locally inertial frame, and spin is a gauge symmetry.
- Physically, this local Lorentz symmetry means the arbitrariness in choosing the locally inertial frame at each spacetime point.
- SDFT manifests twofold local Lorentz symmetries: $\mathbf{Spin}(1, D-1)_L \times \mathbf{Spin}(D-1, 1)_R$, and as a consequence it unifies type IIA and IIB supergravities.
- Left and right string modes live on two different locally inertial frames. Duff 1986
- **SDFT predicts the fermions in Standard Model are twofold: $\mathbf{Spin}(1, 3)_L \times \mathbf{Spin}(3, 1)_R$.** (Even after Scherk-Schwarz compactification, the spin group remains still twofold.)
- Employing the semi-covariant geometry, we can couple the Standard Model to stringy backgrounds in a completely covariant manner: **It is possible to Double Field Theorize the Standard Model, without introducing any extra physical degree.**
- Doing so, one has to decide the spin group for each fermion (*c.f.* Yukawa coupling).
- No experimental evidence of proton decay seems to suggest that **the quarks and the leptons may belong to the different spin classes.**

Standard Model as a Double Field Theory : Prediction

- In principle, fermions live on a locally inertial frame, and spin is a gauge symmetry.
- Physically, this local Lorentz symmetry means the arbitrariness in choosing the locally inertial frame at each spacetime point.
- SDFT manifests twofold local Lorentz symmetries: $\mathbf{Spin}(1, D-1)_L \times \mathbf{Spin}(D-1, 1)_R$, and as a consequence it unifies type IIA and IIB supergravities.
- Left and right string modes live on two different locally inertial frames. Duff 1986
- **SDFT predicts the fermions in Standard Model are twofold: $\mathbf{Spin}(1, 3)_L \times \mathbf{Spin}(3, 1)_R$.**
(Even after Scherk-Schwarz compactification, the spin group remains still twofold.)
- Employing the semi-covariant geometry, we can couple the Standard Model to stringy backgrounds in a completely covariant manner: **It is possible to Double Field Theorize the Standard Model, without introducing any extra physical degree.**
- Doing so, one has to decide the spin group for each fermion (*c.f.* Yukawa coupling).
- No experimental evidence of proton decay seems to suggest that **the quarks and the leptons may belong to the different spin classes.**

Standard Model as a Double Field Theory : Prediction

- In principle, fermions live on a locally inertial frame, and spin is a gauge symmetry.
- Physically, this local Lorentz symmetry means the arbitrariness in choosing the locally inertial frame at each spacetime point.
- SDFT manifests twofold local Lorentz symmetries: $\mathbf{Spin}(1, D-1)_L \times \mathbf{Spin}(D-1, 1)_R$, and as a consequence it unifies type IIA and IIB supergravities.
- Left and right string modes live on two different locally inertial frames. Duff 1986
- **SDFT predicts the fermions in Standard Model are twofold: $\mathbf{Spin}(1, 3)_L \times \mathbf{Spin}(3, 1)_R$.** (Even after Scherk-Schwarz compactification, the spin group remains still twofold.)
- Employing the semi-covariant geometry, we can couple the Standard Model to stringy backgrounds in a completely covariant manner: **It is possible to Double Field Theorize the Standard Model, without introducing any extra physical degree.**
- Doing so, one has to decide the spin group for each fermion (*c.f.* Yukawa coupling).
- No experimental evidence of proton decay seems to suggest that **the quarks and the leptons may belong to the different spin classes.**

Standard Model as a Double Field Theory : Prediction

- In principle, fermions live on a locally inertial frame, and spin is a gauge symmetry.
- Physically, this local Lorentz symmetry means the arbitrariness in choosing the locally inertial frame at each spacetime point.
- SDFT manifests twofold local Lorentz symmetries: $\mathbf{Spin}(1, D-1)_L \times \mathbf{Spin}(D-1, 1)_R$, and as a consequence it unifies type IIA and IIB supergravities.
- Left and right string modes live on two different locally inertial frames. Duff 1986
- **SDFT predicts the fermions in Standard Model are twofold: $\mathbf{Spin}(1, 3)_L \times \mathbf{Spin}(3, 1)_R$.**
(Even after Scherk-Schwarz compactification, the spin group remains still twofold.)
- Employing the semi-covariant geometry, we can couple the Standard Model to stringy backgrounds in a completely covariant manner: **It is possible to Double Field Theorize the Standard Model, without introducing any extra physical degree.**
- Doing so, one has to decide the spin group for each fermion (*c.f.* Yukawa coupling).
- No experimental evidence of proton decay seems to suggest that **the quarks and the leptons may belong to the different spin classes.**

Standard Model as a Double Field Theory : Prediction

- In principle, fermions live on a locally inertial frame, and spin is a gauge symmetry.
- Physically, this local Lorentz symmetry means the arbitrariness in choosing the locally inertial frame at each spacetime point.
- SDFT manifests twofold local Lorentz symmetries: $\mathbf{Spin}(1, D-1)_L \times \mathbf{Spin}(D-1, 1)_R$, and as a consequence it unifies type IIA and IIB supergravities.
- Left and right string modes live on two different locally inertial frames. Duff 1986
- **SDFT predicts the fermions in Standard Model are twofold: $\mathbf{Spin}(1, 3)_L \times \mathbf{Spin}(3, 1)_R$.**
(Even after Scherk-Schwarz compactification, the spin group remains still twofold.)
- Employing the semi-covariant geometry, we can couple the Standard Model to stringy backgrounds in a completely covariant manner: **It is possible to Double Field Theorize the Standard Model, without introducing any extra physical degree.**
- Doing so, one has to decide the spin group for each fermion (*c.f.* Yukawa coupling).
- No experimental evidence of proton decay seems to suggest that **the quarks and the leptons may belong to the different spin classes.**

Standard Model as a Double Field Theory : Prediction

- In principle, fermions live on a locally inertial frame, and spin is a gauge symmetry.
- Physically, this local Lorentz symmetry means the arbitrariness in choosing the locally inertial frame at each spacetime point.
- SDFT manifests twofold local Lorentz symmetries: $\mathbf{Spin}(1, D-1)_L \times \mathbf{Spin}(D-1, 1)_R$, and as a consequence it unifies type IIA and IIB supergravities.
- Left and right string modes live on two different locally inertial frames. Duff 1986
- **SDFT predicts the fermions in Standard Model are twofold: $\mathbf{Spin}(1, 3)_L \times \mathbf{Spin}(3, 1)_R$.**
(Even after Scherk-Schwarz compactification, the spin group remains still twofold.)
- Employing the semi-covariant geometry, we can couple the Standard Model to stringy backgrounds in a completely covariant manner: **It is possible to Double Field Theorize the Standard Model, without introducing any extra physical degree.**
- Doing so, one has to decide the spin group for each fermion (*c.f.* Yukawa coupling).
- No experimental evidence of proton decay seems to suggest that **the quarks and the leptons may belong to the different spin classes.**

Higher Spin Double Field Theory

with Xavier Bekaert 1605.00403

- The proposed $O(4, 4)$ covariant HS-DFT action consists of two parts:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{HS-DFT}} = \int_{\Sigma_4} \mathcal{L}_{\text{HS-DFT}}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{\text{HS-DFT}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{DFT}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{HS}},$$

- the ‘pure’ DFT Lagrangian,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DFT}} = e^{-2d} \left[(P^{AB} P^{CD} - \bar{P}^{AB} \bar{P}^{CD}) S_{ACBD} - 2\Lambda_{\text{DFT}} \right],$$

- the ‘matter’ HS Lagrangian, with the Wick normal ordered star product,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{HS}} = g_{\text{HS}}^{-2} e^{-2d} \text{Tr} \left[P^{AC} \bar{P}^{BD} \mathcal{F}_{AB} \star \mathcal{F}_{CD} + \bar{\Psi} \star \gamma^{(5)} \gamma^A \mathcal{D}_A \Psi \right].$$

- The full set of the Euler-Lagrange equations are automatically fulfilled, provided the following ‘stronger’ equations hold:

- EOMs of the pure DFT,

$$(P^{AB} P^{CD} - \bar{P}^{AB} \bar{P}^{CD}) S_{ACBD} - 2\Lambda_{\text{DFT}} = 0, \quad P_A{}^C \bar{P}_B{}^D S_{CD} = 0,$$

- BPS-like conditions, as a DFT generalization of the Vasiliev HS equations,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P}_A{}^B \mathcal{D}_B \Psi &= 0, & \gamma^A \mathcal{D}_A \Psi &= 0, \\ P_A{}^C \bar{P}_B{}^D \mathcal{F}_{CD} &= 0, & [\Psi^\alpha, \Psi^\beta]_\star (\mathbf{C} \gamma^{(5)} \gamma^\rho)_{\alpha\beta} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

- The proposed $O(4, 4)$ covariant HS-DFT action consists of two parts:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{HS-DFT}} = \int_{\Sigma_4} \mathcal{L}_{\text{HS-DFT}}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{\text{HS-DFT}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{DFT}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{HS}},$$

- the ‘pure’ DFT Lagrangian,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DFT}} = e^{-2d} \left[(P^{AB} P^{CD} - \bar{P}^{AB} \bar{P}^{CD}) S_{ACBD} - 2\Lambda_{\text{DFT}} \right],$$

- the ‘matter’ HS Lagrangian, with the Wick normal ordered star product,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{HS}} = g_{\text{HS}}^{-2} e^{-2d} \text{Tr} \left[P^{AC} \bar{P}^{BD} \mathcal{F}_{AB} \star \mathcal{F}_{CD} + \bar{\Psi} \star \gamma^{(5)} \gamma^A \mathcal{D}_A \Psi \right].$$

- The full set of the Euler-Lagrange equations are automatically fulfilled, provided the following ‘stronger’ equations hold:

- EOMs of the pure DFT,

$$(P^{AB} P^{CD} - \bar{P}^{AB} \bar{P}^{CD}) S_{ACBD} - 2\Lambda_{\text{DFT}} = 0, \quad P_A{}^C \bar{P}_B{}^D S_{CD} = 0,$$

- BPS-like conditions, as a DFT generalization of the Vasiliev HS equations,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P}_A{}^B \mathcal{D}_B \Psi &= 0, & \gamma^A \mathcal{D}_A \Psi &= 0, \\ P_A{}^C \bar{P}_B{}^D \mathcal{F}_{CD} &= 0, & [\Psi^\alpha, \Psi^\beta]_\star (\mathbf{C} \gamma^{(5)} \gamma^p)_{\alpha\beta} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Concluding Remarks

- Equipped with the DFT generalization of the Christoffel connection,

$$\Gamma_{CAB} = 2(P\partial_C P\bar{P})_{[AB]} + 2(\bar{P}_{[A}{}^D \bar{P}_{B]}{}^E - P_{[A}{}^D P_{B]}{}^E) \partial_D P_{EC} - \frac{4}{D-1} (\bar{P}_{C[A} \bar{P}_{B]}{}^D + P_{C[A} P_{B]}{}^D) (\partial_D d + (P\partial^E P\bar{P})_{[ED]})$$

we can Double Field Theorize various conventional theories, including SUGRAs, the Standard Model and Higher Spin theory.

- The ‘relaxation’ of the section condition is also under control in semi-covariant geometry : the gauged SDFT follows immediately from the simple replacement,

$$(d, V_{Ap}, \bar{V}_{A\bar{p}}) \longrightarrow (\dot{d} + \lambda, U_A{}^{\dot{A}} \dot{V}_{\dot{A}p}, U_A{}^{\dot{A}} \dot{\bar{V}}_{\dot{A}\bar{p}})$$

where $\lambda, U_A{}^{\dot{A}}$ denote the section condition breaking Scherk-Schwarz twist. 1505.01301

- The twofold spin structure, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R$, naturally unifies IIA and IIB.
- Moreover, the fact that the spin is twofold can be an experimentally verifiable prediction of SDFT, or String Theory.

Concluding Remarks

- Equipped with the DFT generalization of the Christoffel connection,

$$\Gamma_{CAB} = 2(P\partial_C P\bar{P})_{[AB]} + 2(\bar{P}_{[A}{}^D \bar{P}_{B]}{}^E - P_{[A}{}^D P_{B]}{}^E) \partial_D P_{EC} - \frac{4}{D-1} (\bar{P}_{C[A} \bar{P}_{B]}{}^D + P_{C[A} P_{B]}{}^D) (\partial_D d + (P\partial^E P\bar{P})_{[ED]})$$

we can Double Field Theorize various conventional theories, including SUGRAs, the Standard Model and Higher Spin theory.

- The ‘relaxation’ of the section condition is also under control in semi-covariant geometry : the gauged SDFT follows immediately from the simple replacement,

$$(d, V_{Ap}, \bar{V}_{A\bar{p}}) \longrightarrow (\dot{d} + \lambda, U_A{}^{\dot{A}} \dot{V}_{\dot{A}p}, U_A{}^{\dot{A}} \dot{\bar{V}}_{\dot{A}\bar{p}})$$

where $\lambda, U_A{}^{\dot{A}}$ denote the section condition breaking Scherk-Schwarz twist. **1505.01301**

- The twofold spin structure, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R$, naturally unifies IIA and IIB.
- Moreover, the fact that the spin is twofold can be an experimentally verifiable prediction of SDFT, or String Theory.

Concluding Remarks

- Equipped with the DFT generalization of the Christoffel connection,

$$\Gamma_{CAB} = 2(P\partial_C P\bar{P})_{[AB]} + 2(\bar{P}_{[A}{}^D \bar{P}_{B]}{}^E - P_{[A}{}^D P_{B]}{}^E) \partial_D P_{EC} - \frac{4}{D-1} (\bar{P}_{C[A} \bar{P}_{B]}{}^D + P_{C[A} P_{B]}{}^D) (\partial_D d + (P\partial^E P\bar{P})_{[ED]})$$

we can Double Field Theorize various conventional theories, including SUGRAs, the Standard Model and Higher Spin theory.

- The ‘relaxation’ of the section condition is also under control in semi-covariant geometry : the gauged SDFT follows immediately from the simple replacement,

$$(d, V_{Ap}, \bar{V}_{A\bar{p}}) \longrightarrow (\dot{d} + \lambda, U_A{}^{\dot{A}} \dot{V}_{\dot{A}p}, U_A{}^{\dot{A}} \dot{\bar{V}}_{\dot{A}\bar{p}})$$

where $\lambda, U_A{}^{\dot{A}}$ denote the section condition breaking Scherk-Schwarz twist. **1505.01301**

- The twofold spin structure, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R$, naturally unifies IIA and IIB.**
- Moreover, the fact that the spin is twofold can be an experimentally verifiable prediction of SDFT, or String Theory.

Concluding Remarks

- Equipped with the DFT generalization of the Christoffel connection,

$$\Gamma_{CAB} = 2(P\partial_C P\bar{P})_{[AB]} + 2(\bar{P}_{[A}{}^D \bar{P}_{B]}{}^E - P_{[A}{}^D P_{B]}{}^E) \partial_D P_{EC} - \frac{4}{D-1} (\bar{P}_{C[A} \bar{P}_{B]}{}^D + P_{C[A} P_{B]}{}^D) (\partial_D d + (P\partial^E P\bar{P})_{[ED]})$$

we can Double Field Theorize various conventional theories, including SUGRAs, the Standard Model and Higher Spin theory.

- The ‘relaxation’ of the section condition is also under control in semi-covariant geometry : the gauged SDFT follows immediately from the simple replacement,

$$(d, V_{Ap}, \bar{V}_{A\bar{p}}) \longrightarrow (\dot{d} + \lambda, U_A{}^{\dot{A}} \dot{V}_{\dot{A}p}, U_A{}^{\dot{A}} \dot{\bar{V}}_{\dot{A}\bar{p}})$$

where $\lambda, U_A{}^{\dot{A}}$ denote the section condition breaking Scherk-Schwarz twist. 1505.01301

- The twofold spin structure, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R$, naturally unifies IIA and IIB.**
- Moreover, the fact that the spin is twofold can be an experimentally verifiable prediction of SDFT, or String Theory.**

Concluding Remarks

- Equipped with the DFT generalization of the Christoffel connection,

$$\Gamma_{CAB} = 2(P\partial_C P\bar{P})_{[AB]} + 2(\bar{P}_{[A}{}^D \bar{P}_{B]}{}^E - P_{[A}{}^D P_{B]}{}^E) \partial_D P_{EC} - \frac{4}{D-1} (\bar{P}_{C[A} \bar{P}_{B]}{}^D + P_{C[A} P_{B]}{}^D) (\partial_D d + (P\partial^E P\bar{P})_{[ED]})$$

we can now Double Field Theorize various conventional theories, including SUGRAs, the Standard Model and Higher Spin theory.

- The ‘relaxation’ of the section condition is also under control in semi-covariant geometry : the gauged SDFT follows from the simple replacement,

$$(d, V_{Ap}, \bar{V}_{A\bar{p}}) \longrightarrow (\dot{d} + \lambda, U_A{}^{\dot{A}} \dot{V}_{\dot{A}p}, U_A{}^{\dot{A}} \dot{\bar{V}}_{\dot{A}\bar{p}})$$

where $\lambda, U_A{}^{\dot{A}}$ denote the section condition breaking Scherk-Schwarz twist. 1505.01301

- The twofold spin structure, $\text{Spin}(1, 9)_L \times \text{Spin}(9, 1)_R$, naturally unifies IIA and IIB.**
- Moreover, the fact that the spin is twofold can be an experimentally verifiable prediction of SDFT, or String Theory.**

謝 謝

Talk based on collaborations with Imtak Jeon (8 papers), Kanghoon Lee (8 papers), Yoonji Suh (3 papers), Chris Blair, Emanuel Malek, Wonyoung Cho, Jose Fernández-Melgarejo, Soo-Jong Rey, Woohyun Rim, Yuho Sakatani, Sung Moon Ko, Charles Melby-Thompson, Rene Meyér, Kang-Sin Choi (Phenomenologist) and Xavier Bekaert.

- *Differential geometry with a projection: Application to double field theory* 1011.1324 JHEP
- **Stringy differential geometry, beyond Riemann** 1105.6294 PRD
- *Incorporation of fermions into double field theory* 1109.2035 JHEP
- *Ramond-Ramond Cohomology and $O(D,D)$ T-duality* 1206.3478 JHEP
- *Supersymmetric Double Field Theory: Stringy Reformulation of Supergravity* 1112.0069 PRD
- **Stringy Unification of IIA and IIB Supergravities under $\mathcal{N}=2$ $D=10$ Supersymmetric Double Field Theory** 1210.5078 PLB
- **Supersymmetric gauged Double Field Theory: Systematic derivation by virtue of 'Twist'** 1505.01301 JHEP
- *Comments on double field theory and diffeomorphisms* 1304.5946 JHEP
- **Covariant action for a string in doubled yet gauged spacetime** 1307.8377 NPB
- *Double field formulation of Yang-Mills theory* 1102.0419 PLB
- **Standard Model as a Double Field Theory** 1506.05277 PRL
- *$O(D,D)$ Covariant Noether Currents and Global Charges in Double Field Theory* 1507.07545 JHEP
- *Dynamics of Perturbations in Double Field Theory & Non-Relativistic String Theory* 1508.01121 JHEP
- **Higher Spin Double Field Theory: A Proposal** 1605.00403
- *U-geometry: $SL(5) \Rightarrow$ U-gravity: $SL(N)$* 1302.1652 JHEP / **1402.5027 JHEP**
- *M-theory and Type IIB from a Duality Manifest Action* 1311.5109 JHEP

THE END