

A_∞ perspective to Sen's formalism

Atakan Hilmi Fırat

*Center for Theoretical Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139, USA
firat@mit.edu*

Abstract

Sen's formalism is a mechanism for eliminating constraints on the dynamical fields that are imposed independently from equations of motion by employing spurious free fields. In this note a cyclic homotopy associative algebra underlying Sen's formalism is developed. The novelty lies in the construction of a symplectic form and cyclic A_∞ maps on an extended algebra that combines the dynamical and spurious fields. This algebraic presentation makes the gauge invariance of theories using Sen's formulation manifest.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Cyclic A_∞ algebra with a constraint	1
3	Cyclic A_∞ algebra without a constraint	6
3.1	Homotopy transfer to the constrained algebra	10

1 Introduction

Eliminating restrictions on fields as much as possible is almost always desirable in field theories. Recently Ashoke Sen has introduced a novel mechanism for eliminating constraints that are imposed on top of equations of motion (such as the self-duality constraints for p -form fields) motivated by string field theory (SFT) [1–4], for reviews refer to [5–10]. Sen’s formalism for lifting constraints introduces spurious fields to the theory that couple to the interacting fields at the level of the kinetic term. The relevant equations of motion remain the same while imposing the constraint separately is no longer required, but one has to pay price of having free fields that decouple from the spectrum entirely. This approach has been implemented in various theories so far; ranging from eliminating the self-duality constraint for the 5-form field strength of IIB supergravity [3,11], to the construction of the Ramond sectors in super SFTs [1,2], to eliminating the notorious level-matching condition of closed SFT [12,13].

In this brief note we construct a cyclic homotopy (associative) algebra, or A_∞ algebra, underlying Sen’s formalism and its relation to the cyclic homotopy algebra whose elements are constrained. The latter algebra is reviewed in section 2. The approach here eventually boils down to introducing a new symplectic form and explicit A_∞ maps on an unconstrained algebra that contains not just the original field Ψ , but also Sen’s spurious field $\tilde{\Psi}$, see section 3. This algebraic framework makes the gauge invariance of Sen’s formalism manifest and its connection to the homotopy algebras and Batalin-Vilkovisky formalism becomes more apparent. We also discuss generating the constrained algebra from the unconstrained one in subsection 3.1. Although we exclusively work with A_∞ algebras we expect that the generalization to the remaining species of homotopy (loop) algebras is a straightforward exercise.

Note added: As this work is finalized the author has been informed that there are some parallels between the homotopy algebra in section 2.2 of [14] and the construction sketched here.

2 Cyclic A_∞ algebra with a constraint

We begin the note by reviewing the basics of cyclic homotopy algebras and its relation to the field theory with constraints to facilitate the discussion. The form of the homotopy algebra in this section is motivated from the structures appearing in SFT, the Ramond sector of open superstrings

in particular [15, 16]. Considering the Neveu-Schwarz sector in this context amounts to a trivial work so it will be kept implicit.

So start by imagining a \mathbb{Z} -graded vector space \mathcal{H} over the super-complex numbers $\mathbb{C}^{1|1}$ for which the states $|\Psi\rangle = \Psi \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfy the constraint

$$XY|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle, \quad (2.1)$$

and the operators X, Y obey

$$XYX = X, \quad YXY = Y. \quad (2.2)$$

It immediately follows that the operator XY is a projector $(XY)^2 = XY$. The operators X, Y are fermionic (i.e. degree-even), but $X(Y)$ is assumed to increase (decrease) the grade by 1. We denote the subspace of \mathcal{H} obeying the constraint (2.1) by $\hat{\mathcal{H}} = XY\mathcal{H}$.

These definitions are abstracted from the structures appearing within open super SFT [15, 16]. The grade for this special case is the picture number (plus 1/2) and the degree refers to the Grassmannality (plus 1), while the operators X, Y are given by

$$X = -\delta(\beta_0) G_0 + \delta'(\beta_0) b_0, \quad Y = -c_0 \delta'(\gamma_0), \quad (2.3)$$

in terms of the modes of the $bc\beta\gamma$ ghost system and the zero mode of the supercurrent G_0 . The vector space \mathcal{H} can be taken to be the small Hilbert space.¹ However our considerations are not just limited to open superstrings: an analogous structure can be found within the level-matched closed bosonic SFT. In that case the grade is the (2 minus) ghost number and $X = b_0^- \delta(L_0^-)$ and $Y = c_0^-$ for instance [12, 13]. Here the mode L_0 is the zeroth Virasoro charge.

Now suppose that a cyclic A_∞ algebra on the space $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ is given. The most efficient way to present this structure is through *the tensor coalgebra* [17, 18]

$$T\hat{\mathcal{H}} \equiv \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mathcal{H}}^{\otimes n} = \mathbb{C}^{1|1} \oplus \hat{\mathcal{H}} \oplus (\hat{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \hat{\mathcal{H}}) + \dots, \quad (2.4)$$

with the natural projection maps

$$\hat{\pi}_n : T\hat{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{H}}^{\otimes n}. \quad (2.5)$$

Let us introduce some cooperations on $T\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ before proceeding. The first one is *the coproduct* $\Delta : T\hat{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow T\hat{\mathcal{H}} \boxtimes T\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ defined by

$$\Delta(\hat{\Psi}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \hat{\Psi}_n) \equiv \sum_{m=0}^n (\hat{\Psi}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \hat{\Psi}_m) \boxtimes (\hat{\Psi}_{m+1} \otimes \dots \otimes \hat{\Psi}_n), \quad (2.6)$$

for $\hat{\Psi}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{H}}$. This is a linear operation and \boxtimes arises from the splitting provided by the coproduct Δ , which is taken to be distinct from the ordinary tensor product \otimes . The coproduct Δ is *coassociative*,

¹Acting the operators X, Y to an arbitrary graded state may be ill-defined like in superstrings. However we ignore this subtlety to keep our discussion general. The actions, equations of motion, and gauge symmetries below still remain well-defined in any case.

i.e. it commutes the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} \boxtimes T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} \\
\downarrow \Delta & & \downarrow \Delta \boxtimes 1 \\
T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} \boxtimes T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} & \xrightarrow{1 \boxtimes \Delta} & T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} \boxtimes T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} \boxtimes T\widehat{\mathcal{H}}
\end{array}$$

Here $\mathbf{1}$ is the unit of the tensor coalgebra. Using the coproduct we can also define a *coderivation* $D : T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow T\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$, which is a linear map satisfying *the co-Leibniz rule*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} & \xrightarrow{D} & T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} \\
\downarrow \Delta & & \downarrow \Delta \\
T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} \boxtimes T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} & \xrightarrow{1 \boxtimes D + D \boxtimes 1} & T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} \boxtimes T\widehat{\mathcal{H}}
\end{array}$$

We note that the commutator of two coderivations itself is a coderivation.² Finally, define a *cohomomorphism* $F : T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow T\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$, which is a linear map that commutes the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} & \xrightarrow{F} & T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} \\
\downarrow \Delta & & \downarrow \Delta \\
T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} \boxtimes T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} & \xrightarrow{F \boxtimes F} & T\widehat{\mathcal{H}} \boxtimes T\widehat{\mathcal{H}}
\end{array}$$

If a cohomomorphism is invertible it is a *coisomorphism*. The similar definitions apply to other tensor coalgebras that appear in this note.

The A_∞ algebra on $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ is compactly encoded in an odd nilpotent coderivation in $T\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$

$$\mathbf{m}^2 = \mathbf{0}, \tag{2.7}$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ is the zero element of the tensor coalgebra. The coderivation \mathbf{m} can be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}_1 + \widehat{\delta\mathbf{m}} = \mathbf{m}_1 + \widehat{\mathbf{m}}_2 + \cdots = \mathbf{m}_1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \widehat{\mathbf{m}}_n, \tag{2.8}$$

where the coderivation \mathbf{m}_1 is associated with the free theory and the rest comes from the n -point interactions of the theory, i.e. $\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_n \widehat{\pi}_m = 0$ for $m < n$. The coderivation \mathbf{m}_1 is nilpotent by itself due to being associated with a free theory, $\mathbf{m}_1^2 = \mathbf{0}$, so

$$\mathbf{m}_1 \widehat{\delta\mathbf{m}} + \widehat{\delta\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{m}_1 + \widehat{\delta\mathbf{m}}^2 = \mathbf{0}. \tag{2.9}$$

We define the multi-linear, degree-odd maps $\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_n$ by $\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_n = \widehat{\pi}_1 \widehat{\mathbf{m}} \widehat{\pi}_n$. This collection of maps form the A_∞ algebra after suspending the degree by one. The map m_1 is the BRST operator Q_B in the context of SFT. We take m_1 to be defined on \mathcal{H} to have a notion of a free theory on this space.

²The commutators are always taken to be graded antisymmetric.

We further demand the map m_1 to satisfy [15,16]³

$$[m_1, X] = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

so that it can be restricted to $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$, i.e. m_1 maps $|\Psi\rangle \in \widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ to an element in $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$

$$\begin{aligned} m_1|\Psi\rangle &= m_1XY|\Psi\rangle = Xm_1Y|\Psi\rangle = XYXm_1Y|\Psi\rangle = XYm_1XY|\Psi\rangle = XYm_1|\Psi\rangle \\ &\implies m_1|\Psi\rangle \in \widehat{\mathcal{H}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

using (2.1) and (2.2). After defining the cohomomorphisms

$$\mathbf{X} \equiv \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} X^{\otimes n} = X + X \otimes X + \dots, \quad \mathbf{Y} \equiv \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Y^{\otimes n} = Y + Y \otimes Y + \dots, \quad (2.12)$$

the identities (2.2) and (2.10) can alternatively be expressed at the level of the tensor coalgebra $T\mathcal{H}$

$$\mathbf{X}\mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}, \quad \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{Y}, \quad [m_1, \mathbf{X}] = 0. \quad (2.13)$$

The A_∞ algebra has to endow a 2-form to provide an action for the theory. We assume that there is one in \mathcal{H}

$$\langle \omega | : \mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{1|1}, \quad (2.14)$$

which is provided by the BPZ product in the context of SFT for example. It is further assumed to have the properties

$$\langle \omega | \Psi_1 \otimes \Psi_2 = -(-1)^{\Psi_1\Psi_2} \langle \omega | \Psi_2 \otimes \Psi_1, \quad (2.15a)$$

$$\forall \Psi_1 \in \mathcal{H} \quad \langle \omega | \Psi_1 \otimes \Psi_2 = 0 \implies \Psi_2 = 0, \quad (2.15b)$$

$$\langle \omega | \widehat{\pi}_2 m_1 = \langle \omega | (m_1 \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{I} \otimes m_1) = 0, \quad (2.15c)$$

for $\Psi_i \in \mathcal{H}$, where $(-1)^{\Psi_i}$ is the degree of Ψ_i . The operators X, Y are taken to be anti-cyclic

$$\langle \omega | (X \otimes \mathbb{I} - \mathbb{I} \otimes X) = \langle \omega | (Y \otimes \mathbb{I} - \mathbb{I} \otimes Y) = 0, \quad (2.16)$$

which, again, is motivated by the constructions within SFT. Here \mathbb{I} is the identity operation on \mathcal{H} . We sometimes use the notation $\omega(\Psi_1, \Psi_2) = \langle \omega | \Psi_1 \otimes \Psi_2$ for the symplectic forms.

In the context of the constrained SFT the form $\langle \omega |$ requires insertions of Y in order to saturate the zero modes demanded by various kinds of worldsheet anomalies and obtain a nonvanishing quadratic target spacetime action. The relevant anomaly for the superstrings is the picture number anomaly while it is the ghost number anomaly for the level-matching of closed bosonic strings. This means that the following symplectic form has to be used instead

$$\langle \widehat{\omega} | : \widehat{\mathcal{H}}^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{1|1}, \quad \langle \widehat{\omega} | \equiv \langle \omega | \mathbb{I} \otimes Y = \langle \omega | Y \otimes \mathbb{I}. \quad (2.17)$$

³Take note that the operator Y doesn't commute with m_1 . In the open superstring context $Y = -c_0 \delta'(\gamma_0)$ for the Ramond sector [15,16]. This Y is different from the zero mode of the inverse picture changing operator $\mathcal{Y} = c \delta'(\gamma) = c \partial \xi e^{-2\phi}$, which commutes with the BRST operator $m_1 = Q_B$ [19,20]. The author thanks Ted Erler for explaining this subtle fact. Some discussion along these lines is also provided in [21].

This form is graded antisymmetric

$$\langle \widehat{\omega} | \widehat{\Psi}_1 \otimes \widehat{\Psi}_2 = \langle \omega | \widehat{\Psi}_1 \otimes Y \widehat{\Psi}_2 = -(-1)^{\widehat{\Psi}_1 \widehat{\Psi}_2} \langle \omega | Y \widehat{\Psi}_2 \otimes \widehat{\Psi}_1 = -(-1)^{\widehat{\Psi}_1 \widehat{\Psi}_2} \langle \widehat{\omega} | \widehat{\Psi}_2 \otimes \widehat{\Psi}_1, \quad (2.18)$$

following from (2.14) and (2.16) for any $\widehat{\Psi}_i \in \widehat{\mathcal{H}}$. More importantly, it is non-degenerate *only* on $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$

$$\forall \widehat{\Psi}_1 \in \widehat{\mathcal{H}} \quad \langle \widehat{\omega} | \widehat{\Psi}_1 \otimes \widehat{\Psi}_2 = \langle \omega | \widehat{\Psi}_1 \otimes Y \widehat{\Psi}_2 = 0 \implies Y \widehat{\Psi}_2 = 0 \implies XY \widehat{\Psi}_2 = \widehat{\Psi}_2 = 0, \quad (2.19)$$

following from the non-degeneracy of $\langle \omega |$ (2.15b) and requiring the restriction (2.1). Lastly, the coderivation \mathbf{m}_1 can be shown to be cyclic with respect to $\langle \widehat{\omega} |$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \widehat{\omega} | \widehat{\pi}_2 \widehat{\mathbf{m}}_1 &= \langle \omega | (Y m_1 \otimes \mathbb{I} + Y \otimes m_1) = \langle \omega | (m_1 \otimes Y + Y \otimes m_1 XY) \\ &= \langle \omega | (-\mathbb{I} \otimes m_1 Y + Y \otimes X m_1 Y) = \langle \omega | (-XY \otimes m_1 Y + XY \otimes m_1 Y) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

using the fact that it acts on $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}^{\otimes 2}$, so that $\mathbb{I} \rightarrow XY$, and by the equations (2.15c) and (2.16). Not only \mathbf{m}_1 is cyclic, but all coderivations $\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_n$ have this property

$$\langle \omega | \widehat{\pi}_2 \widehat{\mathbf{m}}_n = \langle \omega | (\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_n \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{I} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{m}}_n) = 0. \quad (2.20)$$

This feature follows from the way the interactions in a particular theory is built in the presence of the constraint (2.1) on the states.

Finally, the action for the theory associated with the constrained cyclic A_∞ algebra is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{S}[\widehat{\Psi}] &= \int_0^1 dt \langle \widehat{\omega} | \left[\widehat{\pi}_1 \frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{1 - \widehat{\Psi}(t)} \otimes \widehat{\pi}_1 \mathbf{m} \frac{1}{1 - \widehat{\Psi}(t)} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\omega} \left(\widehat{\Psi}, m_1 \widehat{\Psi} \right) + \frac{1}{3} \widehat{\omega} \left(\widehat{\Psi}, \widehat{m}_2(\widehat{\Psi}, \widehat{\Psi}) \right) + \frac{1}{4} \widehat{\omega} \left(\widehat{\Psi}, \widehat{m}_3(\widehat{\Psi}, \widehat{\Psi}, \widehat{\Psi}) \right) + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

for which we define *the group-like element*

$$\frac{1}{1 - \Psi} \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Psi^{\otimes n} = 1 + \Psi + \Psi \otimes \Psi + \dots, \quad (2.22)$$

and $\widehat{\Psi}(t)$ is a smooth function on $T\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ that interpolates an element from $t = 0$ to $t = 1$ assuming $\widehat{\Psi}(t = 0) = 0$ and $\widehat{\Psi}(t = 1) = \widehat{\Psi}$ is the (degree-even, grade-zero) dynamical field. Here

$$\frac{d}{dt} \equiv \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{I}^{\otimes m} \otimes \frac{d}{dt} \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\otimes (n-m-1)} = \frac{d}{dt} + \frac{d}{dt} \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{I} \otimes \frac{d}{dt} + \dots, \quad (2.23)$$

is the degree-even coderivation associated with the derivative with respect to the parameter t . The equation of motion resulting from varying \widehat{S} is

$$0 = \widehat{\pi}_1 \mathbf{m} \frac{1}{1 - \widehat{\Psi}} = m_1 \widehat{\Psi} + \widehat{m}_2 \left(\widehat{\Psi}, \widehat{\Psi} \right) + \widehat{m}_3 \left(\widehat{\Psi}, \widehat{\Psi}, \widehat{\Psi} \right) + \dots, \quad (2.24)$$

while the infinitesimal gauge transformation is

$$\delta \widehat{\Psi} = \widehat{\pi}_1 \mathbf{m} \frac{1}{1 - \widehat{\Psi}} \otimes \widehat{\Lambda} \otimes \frac{1}{1 - \widehat{\Psi}} = m_1 \widehat{\Lambda} + \widehat{m}_2 \left(\widehat{\Lambda}, \widehat{\Psi} \right) + \widehat{m}_2 \left(\widehat{\Psi}, \widehat{\Lambda} \right) + \dots. \quad (2.25)$$

Here the field $\widehat{\Lambda} \in \widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ is a (degree-odd, grade-zero) gauge parameter.

3 Cyclic A_∞ algebra without a constraint

In this section we describe a cyclic homotopy algebra underlying the Sen's formalism. Recall that the action in Sen's formalism is given by [1]

$$S[\Psi, \tilde{\Psi}] = -\frac{1}{2}\omega(\tilde{\Psi}, \mathcal{G}m_1\tilde{\Psi}) + \omega(\tilde{\Psi}, m_1\Psi) + S_{int}[\Psi], \quad (3.1)$$

where $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}$ is the original field, now without any constraint, while (degree-even, grade-(-1)) $\tilde{\Psi} \in \mathcal{H}$ is a spurious field. The worldsheet anomaly mentioned in previous section requires $\tilde{\Psi}$ to have one less grade than Ψ . Here $S_{int}[\Psi]$ is the interaction term that only depends on the field Ψ .

In the action (3.1) \mathcal{G} is a degree-even, anti-cyclic operator that raises the grade by one. It is assumed to commute with m_1 , $[m_1, \mathcal{G}] = 0$. We can choose $\mathcal{G} = X$ of previous section, however this is not strictly required as long as the interactions are accounted correctly. For example it is more convenient to choose \mathcal{G} as the zero mode of the picture changing operator $\mathcal{X} = [Q_B, \xi]$ for the Ramond sector of superstrings [1], which is different from (2.3) that appears in the constraint [16]. We consider a generic \mathcal{G} except for subsection 3.1.

After varying (3.1) we find

$$-\mathcal{G}m_1\tilde{\Psi} + m_1\Psi = 0, \quad m_1\tilde{\Psi} + J[\Psi] = 0, \quad (3.2)$$

where $J[\Psi]$ is the term results from varying $S_{int}[\Psi]$

$$\delta S_{int} = \omega(\delta\Psi, J[\Psi]). \quad (3.3)$$

Acting on the second equation with \mathcal{G} and adding to the first one in (3.1) we obtain

$$m_1\Psi + \mathcal{G}J[\Psi] = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Compare this with (2.24): there was no need to impose a constraint on the field Ψ . This is due to the presence of $\tilde{\Psi}$ —it was impossible to write a free action just using the objects $\langle\omega, \Psi, m_1$ while saturating the zero mode insertions required by the anomaly. However we pay the price of introducing a decoupled *free* field to our considerations through the first equation of motion (3.2). The combination $\mathcal{G}\tilde{\Psi} - \Psi$ can always be shifted by an unrelated field $\tilde{\Sigma} \in \mathcal{H}$ that satisfies $m_1\tilde{\Sigma} = 0$.

Now define the space

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi \\ \tilde{\Psi} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{K} \equiv \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (\mathcal{H}_n \oplus \mathcal{H}_{n-1}), \quad (3.5)$$

which makes the field Φ to have a uniform degree, i.e.

$$(-1)^\Phi = (-1)^\Psi = (-1)^{\tilde{\Psi}}. \quad (3.6)$$

The subscripts on \mathcal{H}_n refers to the grade. It is convenient to define the degree-zero, grade-zero projections $P, \tilde{P} : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$

$$P\Phi \equiv P \begin{bmatrix} \Psi \\ \tilde{\Psi} \end{bmatrix} = \Psi, \quad \tilde{P}\Phi \equiv \tilde{P} \begin{bmatrix} \Psi \\ \tilde{\Psi} \end{bmatrix} = \tilde{\Psi}. \quad (3.7)$$

The action (3.1) can be cast to the A_∞ language by introducing a new symplectic form

$$\langle \Omega | : \mathcal{K}^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{1|1}, \quad \langle \Omega | \equiv \langle \omega | \left[P \otimes \tilde{P} + \tilde{P} \otimes P - \tilde{P} \otimes \mathcal{G}\tilde{P} \right]. \quad (3.8)$$

This form indeed has the expected properties. It is clearly bilinear, as well as it is anti-symmetric and the differential M_1 on \mathcal{K} is cyclic

$$\langle \Omega | \Phi_1 \otimes \Phi_2 = -(-1)^{\Phi_1 \Phi_2} \langle \Omega | \Phi_2 \otimes \Phi_1, \quad (3.9a)$$

$$\langle \Omega | (M_1 \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{I} \otimes M_1) = 0, \quad M_1 \Phi \equiv \begin{bmatrix} m_1 & 0 \\ 0 & m_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Psi \\ \tilde{\Psi} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} m_1 \Psi \\ m_1 \tilde{\Psi} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.9b)$$

as one can easily check. The identity \mathbb{I} is the identity operator on \mathcal{K} above. It will be apparent which identity we consider from the context. This symplectic form $\langle \Omega |$ is non-degenerate as well

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \Phi_1 \in \mathcal{K} \quad \langle \Omega | \Phi_1 \otimes \Phi_2 = \langle \omega | \left[\Psi_1 \otimes \tilde{\Psi}_2 + \tilde{\Psi}_1 \otimes \Psi_2 - \tilde{\Psi}_1 \otimes \mathcal{G}\tilde{\Psi}_2 \right] = 0 \\ \implies \Psi_2 = \tilde{\Psi}_2 = 0 \implies \Phi_2 = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

given that the terms proportional to Ψ_1 and $\tilde{\Psi}_1$ can be individually set to zero.

We can rewrite the action (3.2) using $\langle \Omega |$ and Φ in the A_∞ language and find the equations of motion expected from the free theory, i.e. (3.2) when $J = 0$. However the case with interactions is far more interesting. These are described by the degree-odd, multi-linear maps $m_n : \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ for $n \geq 2$. They are taken to be cyclic with respect to the form $\langle \omega |$ on \mathcal{H}

$$\langle \omega | [m_n \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{I} \otimes m_n] = 0. \quad (3.11)$$

and satisfy a defining identity that we will come in a moment. It is useful to introduce a related set of degree-odd multi-linear maps

$$\tilde{m}_n : \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}, \quad \tilde{m}_n = \mathcal{G}m_n, \quad (3.12)$$

and uplift them to the coalgebra $T\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ as degree-odd coderivations

$$\tilde{m}_n = \pi[\mathcal{G}m_n], \quad (3.13)$$

in order to facilitate the discussion of this identity. Above π is the formal multi-linear operation

$$\pi[\cdots \otimes \mathcal{G} \otimes \cdots] = \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \cdots, \quad (3.14)$$

that is necessary to turn \tilde{m}_n into a coderivation⁴ and \mathcal{G} is the cohomomorphism constructed using \mathcal{G} like in (2.12). We have $[m_1, \mathcal{G}] = 0$ similar to (2.13). We take

$$\tilde{\delta m} = \pi[\mathcal{G}\delta m], \quad \delta m \equiv \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} m_n \equiv m_2 + m_3 + \cdots, \quad (3.15)$$

and

$$\tilde{m} \equiv m_1 + \tilde{\delta m} = m_1 + \pi[\mathcal{G}\delta m]. \quad (3.16)$$

⁴These types of formal objects that replace the operators inside the expressions to obtain the desired cooperations have been introduced recently in the context of the stubbed SFTs [22–25].

Note that the output grades of m_n are one lower than those of \widetilde{m}_n by the presence of \mathcal{G} (3.12).

The aforementioned identity satisfied by the multi-linear maps m_n is then encoded by

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_1[\mathbf{m}_1 \delta \mathbf{m} + \delta \mathbf{m} \widetilde{\mathbf{m}}] &= \pi_1[\mathbf{m}_1 \delta \mathbf{m} + \delta \mathbf{m} \mathbf{m}_1 + \delta \mathbf{m} \widetilde{\delta \mathbf{m}}] \\ &= \pi_1[\mathbf{m}_1 \delta \mathbf{m} + \delta \mathbf{m} \mathbf{m}_1 + \delta \mathbf{m} \pi[\mathcal{G} \delta \mathbf{m}]] = 0.\end{aligned}\quad (3.17)$$

The gauge invariance in Sen's formalism is a consequence of this relation [16]. Here π_n is the projection on $T\mathcal{H}$, that is $\pi_n T\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$. We highlight that constructing m_n with the properties (3.11) and (3.17) may not be straightforward a priori and require an input from the theory under consideration [12, 16]. We assume this can be done for our purposes.

An important corollary to (3.17) shows that the coderivation $\widetilde{\mathbf{m}}$ (3.16) itself is nilpotent

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \mathcal{G} \pi_1[\mathbf{m}_1 \delta \mathbf{m} + \delta \mathbf{m} \mathbf{m}_1 + \delta \mathbf{m} \widetilde{\delta \mathbf{m}}] \\ &= \pi_1[\mathbf{m}_1 \widetilde{\delta \mathbf{m}} + \widetilde{\delta \mathbf{m}} \mathbf{m}_1 + \widetilde{\delta \mathbf{m}} \widetilde{\delta \mathbf{m}}] = \pi_1[\widetilde{\mathbf{m}}, \widetilde{\mathbf{m}}] \implies \widetilde{\mathbf{m}}^2 = \mathbf{0},\end{aligned}\quad (3.18)$$

where we used $[m_1, \mathcal{G}] = 0$, $\mathbf{m}_1^2 = \mathbf{0}$, and (3.16). Importantly, however, the coderivation $\widetilde{\mathbf{m}}$ isn't cyclic. The construction below is going to bypass this issue as we shall see.

At this point it is beneficial to make a remark on the relation between $\widetilde{\mathbf{m}}$ and \mathbf{m} of the constrained theory (2.8) in previous section. They are supposed to be the same upon choosing $\mathcal{G} = X$, which occurs when the maps m_n and \widehat{m}_n are related by

$$\widehat{m}_n = X m_n, \quad n \geq 2. \quad (3.19)$$

The image of $X m_n$ always belongs to $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$ due to the identity $XYX = X$ so the maps \widehat{m}_n remain well-defined on $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}$. The nilpotency (3.18) is automatic in this case by (2.7). The constructions along these lines for the maps satisfying this type of relations for the open superstrings can be found in [16] and for the closed bosonic strings without level-matching can be found in [12].

Now we are ready to define the degree-odd multi-linear maps $M_n : \mathcal{K}^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ for $n \geq 2$

$$M_n(\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_n) \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{G} m_n(P\Phi_1, \dots, P\Phi_n) \\ m_n(P\Phi_1, \dots, P\Phi_n) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{m}_n(P\Phi_1, \dots, P\Phi_n) \\ m_n(P\Phi_1, \dots, P\Phi_n) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.20)$$

Note that they have the correct grades at each row. These can be further expressed on the coalgebra $T\mathcal{K}$ as degree-odd coderivations

$$M_n = \mathbf{\Pi}[\iota \mathcal{G} m_n P + \widetilde{\iota} m_n P] = \mathbf{\Pi}[\iota \widetilde{m}_n P + \widetilde{\iota} m_n P], \quad (3.21)$$

where $\iota, \widetilde{\iota} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ are the canonical inclusion maps to the first and second factors of the space \mathcal{K} (3.5) respectively

$$\iota \Psi \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \Psi \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \widetilde{\iota} \Psi \equiv \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \Psi \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.22)$$

for $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\iota, \widetilde{\iota}$ are their associated cohomomorphisms defined similar to (2.12). Clearly

$$P \iota = \widetilde{P} \widetilde{\iota} = 1, \quad P \widetilde{\iota} = \widetilde{P} \iota = 0 \implies P \iota = \widetilde{P} \widetilde{\iota} = 1, \quad P \widetilde{\iota} = \widetilde{P} \iota = 0. \quad (3.23)$$

The operation $\mathbf{\Pi}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{\Pi}[\cdots \otimes \iota \mathcal{G}P \otimes \cdots] = \mathbf{\Pi}[\cdots \otimes \iota P \otimes \cdots] = \mathbf{\Pi}[\cdots \otimes \tilde{\iota}P \otimes \cdots] = \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \cdots, \quad (3.24)$$

which makes M_n coderivation. We collect the coderivations

$$M = M_1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} M_n = M_1 + M_2 + \cdots = M_1 + \delta M, \quad (3.25)$$

to write interactions compactly as

$$\delta M = \mathbf{\Pi}[\iota \mathcal{G} \delta m P + \tilde{\iota} \delta m P] = \mathbf{\Pi}[\iota \widetilde{\delta m} P + \tilde{\iota} \delta m P], \quad (3.26)$$

where M_1 is constructed using M_1 similar to (2.23). It is clearly odd and nilpotent.

Let us demonstrate two facts now: the odd coderivation M (3.25) is nilpotent and it is cyclic with respect to the symplectic form $\langle \Omega |$ (3.8). Begin with showing the former. First of all

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 \delta M + \delta M M_1 &= M_1 \mathbf{\Pi}[\iota \widetilde{\delta m} P + \tilde{\iota} \delta m P] + \mathbf{\Pi}[\iota \widetilde{\delta m} P + \tilde{\iota} \delta m P] M_1 \\ &= \mathbf{\Pi}[\iota (m_1 \widetilde{\delta m} + \widetilde{\delta m} m_1) P + \tilde{\iota} (m_1 \delta m + \delta m m_1) P], \end{aligned} \quad (3.27a)$$

where M_1 is moved inside the operation $\mathbf{\Pi}$ and commuted with the projections and inclusions, which resulted m_1 inside $\mathbf{\Pi}$ as shown above, see (3.7), (3.9), and (3.22). We also evaluate

$$\delta M^2 = \mathbf{\Pi}[\iota \widetilde{\delta m} P + \tilde{\iota} \delta m P] \mathbf{\Pi}[\iota \widetilde{\delta m} P + \tilde{\iota} \delta m P] = \mathbf{\Pi}[\iota \widetilde{\delta m}^2 P + \tilde{\iota} \delta m \widetilde{\delta m} P], \quad (3.27b)$$

where we used (3.23). The ‘‘cross terms’’ in both expressions are canceled by the anti-commutation. Combining (3.27) and using the relations (3.17)-(3.18) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Pi}_1[M_1 \delta M + \delta M M_1 + \delta M^2] = 0 &\implies \mathbf{\Pi}_1[M, M] = 0 \\ &\implies M^2 = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

In the second step we have included $M_1^2 = \mathbf{0}$ and in the last step we have used M is a coderivation from the construction. Here $\mathbf{\Pi}_n$ is the projection on $T\mathcal{K}$, that is $\mathbf{\Pi}_n T\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}^{\otimes n}$. Indeed, M is an odd *nilpotent* coderivation on the tensor coalgebra $T\mathcal{K}$.

Next we check the cyclicity of M_n with respect to the symplectic form $\langle \Omega |$. This is easier to accomplish with the form given in (3.20). So focus on

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Omega | (M_n \otimes \mathbb{I}) (\Phi_1, \cdots, \Phi_{n+1}) &= \langle \Omega | M_n(\Phi_1, \cdots, \Phi_n) \otimes \Phi_{n+1} = \langle \Omega | \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{G}m_n(P\Phi_1, \cdots, P\Phi_n) \\ m_n(P\Phi_1, \cdots, P\Phi_n) \end{bmatrix} \otimes \Phi_{n+1} \\ &= \langle \omega | \left[\mathcal{G}m_n(\Psi_1, \cdots, \Psi_n) \otimes \tilde{\Psi}_{n+1} + m_n(\Psi_1, \cdots, \Psi_n) \otimes (\Psi_{n+1} - \mathcal{G}\tilde{\Psi}_{n+1}) \right] \\ &= \langle \omega | m_n(\Psi_1, \cdots, \Psi_n) \otimes \Psi_{n+1} = \langle \omega | (m_n \otimes \mathbb{I}) (\Psi_1, \cdots, \Psi_{n+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.29a)$$

where we have used (3.8) and the fact that \mathcal{G} is anti-cyclic. Analogous arguments establish

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Omega | (\mathbb{I} \otimes M_n) (\Phi_1, \cdots, \Phi_{n+1}) &= (-1)^{\Phi_1} \langle \Omega | \Phi_1 \otimes M_n(\Phi_2 \cdots, \Phi_{n+1}) \\ &= (-1)^{\Psi_1} \langle \omega | \Psi_1 \otimes m_n(\Psi_2 \cdots, \Psi_{n+1}) \\ &= \langle \omega | (\mathbb{I} \otimes m_n) (\Psi_1, \cdots, \Psi_{n+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.29b)$$

Combining (3.29) together shows \mathbf{M}_n is indeed cyclic with respect to the symplectic form $\langle \Omega |$

$$\langle \Omega | (M_n \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{I} \otimes M_n) = \langle \Omega | \Pi_2 \mathbf{M}_n = 0 \quad \implies \quad \langle \Omega | \Pi_2 \mathbf{M} = 0. \quad (3.30)$$

from (3.9) and (3.11).

As promised a cyclic A_∞ algebra is obtained for Sen's formalism, see (3.8) and (3.26). The associated action is

$$\begin{aligned} S[\Phi] &= \int_0^1 dt \langle \Omega | \left[\Pi_1 \frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{1 - \Phi(t)} \otimes \Pi_1 \mathbf{M} \frac{1}{1 - \Phi(t)} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \Omega(\Phi, M_1 \Phi) + \frac{1}{3} \Omega(\Phi, M_2(\Phi, \Phi)) + \dots \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \omega(\tilde{\Psi}, \mathcal{G}m_1 \tilde{\Psi}) + \omega(\tilde{\Psi}, m_1 \Psi) + \frac{1}{3} \omega(\Psi, m_2(\Psi, \Psi)) + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

which is the same as (3.1). The dynamical field Φ is degree-even and taken to belong $\mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_{-1}$. It is also interesting to report the equation of motion

$$0 = \Pi_1 \mathbf{M} \frac{1}{1 - \Phi} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} M_n(\Phi^{\otimes n}) = \begin{bmatrix} m_1 \Psi + \mathcal{G}m_2(\Psi, \Psi) + \mathcal{G}m_3(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi) + \dots \\ m_1 \tilde{\Psi} + m_2(\Psi, \Psi) + m_3(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi) + \dots \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.32)$$

which is precisely what we would have obtained upon choosing

$$J[\Psi] = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} m_n(\Psi^{\otimes n}) = m_2(\Psi, \Psi) + m_3(\Psi, \Psi, \Psi) + \dots, \quad (3.33)$$

in (3.2) and (3.4). The gauge transformations can be given like in (2.25) as well

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \Phi &= \Pi_1 \mathbf{M} \frac{1}{1 - \Phi} \otimes \Omega \otimes \frac{1}{1 - \Phi} \\ &= M_1 \Omega + M_2(\Omega, \Phi) + M_2(\Phi, \Omega) + \dots = \begin{bmatrix} m_1 \Lambda + \mathcal{G}m_2(\Lambda, \Psi) + \mathcal{G}m_2(\Psi, \Lambda) + \dots \\ m_1 \tilde{\Lambda} + m_2(\Lambda, \Psi) + m_2(\Psi, \Lambda) + \dots \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

where the field Ω is a degree-even gauge parameter given by

$$\Omega = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda \\ \tilde{\Lambda} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_{-1}. \quad (3.35)$$

This is indeed the expected gauge transformation for the action (3.1). Note that it contains the extra gauge symmetry with the parameter $\tilde{\Lambda}$.

3.1 Homotopy transfer to the constrained algebra

As an application we generate the constrained algebra from the unconstrained counterpart in this subsection. In order to do that we need to take $\mathcal{G} = X$ and *impose* the constraints

$$\tilde{\Psi} - Y\Psi = \tilde{\Sigma}, \quad X\tilde{\Psi} - \Psi = X\tilde{\Sigma}, \quad m_1 \tilde{\Sigma} = 0, \quad (3.36)$$

between the factors of \mathcal{K} (3.5). They immediately require

$$XY|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle, \quad (3.37)$$

for the fields in the first row of Φ . This is the avatar of the original restriction (2.1) in \mathcal{K} . Observe that all dependence on the m_1 -closed fields $\tilde{\Sigma}$ is irrelevant for this constraint.

The restrictions (3.36) should be imposed on top of the action in the vein similar to self-dual constraints on the p -form fields. We highlight that the right-hand sides of them contain an arbitrary m_1 -closed (or *free*) fields in general. Directly setting $\tilde{\Psi} - Y\Psi$ or $\Psi - X\tilde{\Psi}$ to zero would lead to an inconsistency due to their combination can contain m_1 -closed, but *not* necessarily m_1 -exact, fields. These modes can't be simply set to zero. Furthermore (3.36) can't be thought as a gauge-fixing condition as explained in [18]. These are genuine constraints.

An insightful reader may already realize the field $\tilde{\Sigma}$ here is associated with the Sen's decoupled free field. This is indeed the case. In order to see this precisely identify the elements $\Phi \in \mathcal{K}$ constrained by (3.36) through

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi \\ Y\Psi \end{bmatrix} \simeq \begin{bmatrix} \Psi \\ Y\Psi \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \tilde{\Sigma} \end{bmatrix} = \Phi + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \tilde{\Sigma} \end{bmatrix}, \quad m_1\tilde{\Sigma} = 0. \quad (3.38)$$

This identification instructs to treat the fields Φ that differ by $\tilde{\Sigma}$ like above in the same way and the free field $\tilde{\Sigma}$ would decouple from our constructions for all intents and purposes as a result. This is the behavior expected from the Sen's free field.⁵ We denote the quotient defined by (3.38) $\hat{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{K}/\simeq$.

Now it is possible to construct the (degree-even, grade-zero) bijection F between $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$

$$F : \hat{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{K}}, \quad F\hat{\Psi} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ Y \end{bmatrix} \hat{\Psi} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Psi} \\ Y\hat{\Psi} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.39)$$

whose inverse F^{-1} is well-defined thanks to the quotient (3.38). We can lift the bijection F to the level of the tensor coalgebra as coisomorphism \mathbf{F} via (2.12) upon changing $X \rightarrow F$. Then the coderivation \mathbf{M} of $T\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ can be transferred to $T\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ by

$$\hat{\mathbf{m}} = \mathbf{F}^{-1}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{F}, \quad (3.40)$$

where we denoted the transferred odd coderivation by $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$. Note that \mathbf{M} (and $\langle\Omega|\$) trivially descends from $T\mathcal{K}$ to the quotient $T\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ thanks to the presence of the projector P in the definition (3.20). The nilpotency is preserved after the transfer

$$\hat{\mathbf{m}}^2 = \mathbf{F}^{-1}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{F}\mathbf{F}^{-1}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}^{-1}\mathbf{M}^2\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (3.41)$$

This procedure can be understood in the context of homotopy transfer [18]. However since F is an isomorphism, rather than a mere homomorphism, its entire machinery wasn't necessary.

It shouldn't be too surprising to learn

$$\hat{\mathbf{m}} = \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}_1 + \hat{\mathbf{m}}_2 + \hat{\mathbf{m}}_3 + \cdots, \quad (3.42)$$

after observing (3.20) and (3.39). Moreover the coderivation $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ is cyclic with respect to the symplectic form

$$\langle\hat{\Omega}|\ : \hat{\mathcal{H}}^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{1|1}, \quad \langle\hat{\Omega}|\hat{\pi}_2 = \langle\Omega|\Pi_2\mathbf{F}. \quad (3.43)$$

⁵This identification shouldn't be understood as the elimination of these modes from the spectrum. It is simply a mathematical statement of their decoupling from the rest of the interacting part, at least perturbatively.

This is trivial to establish

$$\langle \widehat{\Omega} | \widehat{\pi}_2 \widehat{\mathbf{m}} = \langle \Omega | \Pi_2 \mathbf{F} \widehat{\mathbf{m}} = \langle \Omega | \Pi_2 \mathbf{M} \mathbf{F} = 0, \quad (3.44)$$

using (3.30) (3.40) (3.39) and descending the projections Π_n to $T\widehat{\mathcal{K}}$. In fact $\langle \widehat{\Omega} | \widehat{\pi}_2$ evaluates to

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \widehat{\Omega} | \widehat{\pi}_2 &= \langle \Omega | \Pi_2 \mathbf{F} = \langle \omega | \left[P \otimes \tilde{P} + \tilde{P} \otimes P - \tilde{P} \otimes X \tilde{P} \right] \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ Y \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ Y \end{bmatrix} \widehat{\pi}_2 \\ &= \langle \omega | (\mathbb{I} \otimes Y + Y \otimes \mathbb{I} - Y \otimes XY) \widehat{\pi}_2 = \langle \omega | (Y \otimes \mathbb{I}) \widehat{\pi}_2 = \langle \widehat{\omega} | \widehat{\pi}_2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

after using (2.16), (3.8). This shows the form $\langle \widehat{\Omega} |$ is nothing other than the symplectic form of the constrained algebra (2.17) and we have indeed generated the constrained cyclic A_∞ algebra from the unconstrained one.

The action after the homotopy transfer is given by (2.21) with the additional (and expected) constraint (3.37) on the dynamical field $\widehat{\Psi}$. In order to see this concretely note that we have

$$\mathbf{F} \frac{1}{1 - \widehat{\Psi}(t)} = \frac{1}{1 - F(\widehat{\Psi}(t))}, \quad (3.46)$$

for a smooth interpolation between $0 \leq t \leq 1$ with $\widehat{\Psi}(0) = 0$ and $\widehat{\Psi}(1) = \widehat{\Psi} \in \widehat{\mathcal{H}}$. Then imposing the constraints in (3.36) on the form of the field $\Phi = \Phi(t)$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned} S[\Phi = F(\widehat{\Psi})] &= \int_0^1 dt \langle \Omega | \left[\Pi_1 \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{F} \frac{1}{1 - \widehat{\Psi}(t)} \otimes \Pi_1 \mathbf{M} \mathbf{F} \frac{1}{1 - \widehat{\Psi}(t)} \right] \\ &= \int_0^1 dt \langle \Omega | \left[\Pi_1 \mathbf{F} \frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{1 - \widehat{\Psi}(t)} \otimes \Pi_1 \mathbf{F} \widehat{\mathbf{m}} \frac{1}{1 - \widehat{\Psi}(t)} \right] \\ &= \int_0^1 dt \langle \widehat{\Omega} | \left[\widehat{\pi}_1 \frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{1 - \widehat{\Psi}(t)} \otimes \widehat{\pi}_1 \mathbf{m} \frac{1}{1 - \widehat{\Psi}(t)} \right] = \widehat{S}[\widehat{\Psi}], \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$

using various relations from above. This is the constrained action (2.21) and the field $\widehat{\Psi}$ satisfies the constraint (3.37) by construction. On top of this we also have a decoupled set of free modes and they become invisible from the perspective of the constrained theory.

It may be interesting to investigate different types of homotopy transfers, especially its possible relation to the Feynman graph interpretation of the Ramond sector interactions [26], within the context of the unconstrained algebra but we conclude our discussion here.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Manki Kim, Raji Mamade, Nicolás Valdés-Meller, and Barton Zwiebach for the assorted discussions on related topics and Harold Erbin for discussions and his comments on the early draft. We also would like to thank Ted Erler for his insightful comments and bringing the author's attention to [14]. This material is based upon work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics of U.S. Department of Energy under grant Contract Number DE-SC0012567.

References

- [1] A. Sen, “Gauge Invariant 1PI Effective Superstring Field Theory: Inclusion of the Ramond Sector,” *JHEP* **08** (2015) 025, 1501.00988.
- [2] A. Sen, “BV Master Action for Heterotic and Type II String Field Theories,” *JHEP* **02** (2016) 087, 1508.05387.
- [3] A. Sen, “Covariant Action for Type IIB Supergravity,” *JHEP* **07** (2016) 017, 1511.08220.
- [4] A. Sen, “Self-dual forms: Action, Hamiltonian and Compactification,” *J. Phys. A* **53** (2020), no. 8, 084002, 1903.12196.
- [5] A. Sen and B. Zwiebach, “String Field Theory: A Review,” *to appear*.
- [6] B. Zwiebach, “Closed string field theory: Quantum action and the B-V master equation,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **390** (1993) 33–152, hep-th/9206084.
- [7] C. de Lacroix, H. Erbin, S. P. Kashyap, A. Sen, and M. Verma, “Closed Superstring Field Theory and its Applications,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **32** (2017), no. 28n29, 1730021, 1703.06410.
- [8] T. Erler, “Four Lectures on Closed String Field Theory,” *Phys. Rept.* **851** (2020) 1–36, 1905.06785.
- [9] H. Erbin, *String Field Theory: A Modern Introduction*, vol. 980 of *Lecture Notes in Physics*. 3, 2021.
- [10] C. Maccaferri, “String Field Theory,” 8, 2023. 2308.00875.
- [11] S. Chakrabarti, D. Gupta, and A. Manna, “On-shell action for type IIB supergravity and superstrings on $AdS_5 \times S^5$,” *Phys. Lett. B* **835** (2022) 137578, 2211.02345.
- [12] Y. Okawa and R. Sakaguchi, “Closed string field theory without the level-matching condition,” 2209.06173.
- [13] H. Erbin and M. Médevielle, “Closed string theory without level-matching at the free level,” *JHEP* **03** (2023) 091, 2209.05585.
- [14] T. Erler, S. Konopka, and I. Sachs, “One Loop Tadpole in Heterotic String Field Theory,” *JHEP* **11** (2017) 056, 1704.01210.
- [15] H. Kunitomo and Y. Okawa, “Complete action for open superstring field theory,” *PTEP* **2016** (2016), no. 2, 023B01, 1508.00366.
- [16] T. Erler, Y. Okawa, and T. Takezaki, “Complete Action for Open Superstring Field Theory with Cyclic A_∞ Structure,” *JHEP* **08** (2016) 012, 1602.02582.
- [17] J. Vošmera, *Selected topics in string field theory and physics of D-branes*. PhD thesis, Charles U., Prague (main), 2020.

- [18] H. Erbin, C. Maccaferri, M. Schnabl, and J. Vošmera, “Classical algebraic structures in string theory effective actions,” *JHEP* **11** (2020) 123, 2006.16270.
- [19] E. Witten, “Interacting Field Theory of Open Superstrings,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **276** (1986) 291–324.
- [20] A. Sen, “Normalization of type IIB D-instanton amplitudes,” *JHEP* **12** (2021) 146, 2104.11109.
- [21] S. Alexandrov, A. H. Fırat, M. Kim, A. Sen, and B. Stefański, “D-instanton induced superpotential,” *JHEP* **07** (2022) 090, 2204.02981.
- [22] M. Schnabl and G. Stetinger, “Open string field theory with stubs,” *JHEP* **07** (2023) 032, 2301.13182.
- [23] M. Schnabl and G. Stetinger, “More on stubs in open string field theory,” 2402.00308.
- [24] H. Erbin and A. H. Fırat, “Open string stub as an auxiliary string field,” 2308.08587.
- [25] C. Maccaferri, R. Poletti, A. Ruffino, and B. Valsesia, “Adding stubs to quantum string field theories,” 2403.10471.
- [26] T. Erler, “Superstring Field Theory and the Wess-Zumino-Witten Action,” *JHEP* **10** (2017) 057, 1706.02629.