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a conjectured nonperturbative formulation of superstring theory

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{\mathrm{b}} & =-\frac{1}{4 g^{2}} \operatorname{tr}\left(\left[A_{\mu}, A_{\nu}\right]\left[A^{\mu}, A^{\nu}\right]\right) \\
S_{\mathrm{f}} & =-\frac{1}{2 g^{2}} \operatorname{tr}\left(\Psi_{\alpha}\left(\mathcal{C} \Gamma^{\mu}\right)_{\alpha \beta}\left[A_{\mu}, \Psi_{\beta}\right]\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$N \times N$ Hermitian matrices

$$
\begin{gathered}
A_{\mu} \quad(\mu=0, \cdots, 9) \quad \text { Lorentz vector } \\
\Psi_{\alpha} \quad(\alpha=1, \cdots, 16) \quad \text { Majorana-Weyl spinor } \\
\\
\begin{array}{c}
\text { Lorentzian metric } \eta=\operatorname{diag}(-1,1, \cdots, 1) \\
\text { is used to raise and lower indices. }
\end{array}
\end{gathered}
$$

Wick rotation $\left(A_{0}=-i A_{10}, \quad \Gamma^{0}=i \Gamma_{10}\right)$
Euclidean matrix model $\mathrm{SO}(10)$ symmetry

## Crucial properties of the type IIB matrix model

 as a nonperturbative formulation of superstring theory- The connection to perturbative formulations can be seen manifestly by considering type IIB superstring theory in 10d.
worldsheet action, light-cone string field Hamiltonian, etc.
- A natural extension of the "one-matrix model", which is established as a nonperturbative formulation of non-critical strings
regarding Feynman diagrams in matrix models as string worldsheets.
- It is expected to be a nonperturbative formulation of the unique theory underlying the web of string dualities.
(Other types of superstring theory can be
 represented as perturbative vacua of the type IIB matrix model)


## Lorenzian v.s. Euclidean

The reason why no one dared to study the Lorentzian model for many years:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S_{\mathrm{b}} \propto \operatorname{tr}\left(F_{\mu \nu} F^{\mu \nu}\right)=-2 \underbrace{\left.F_{\mu \nu}=-i\left[F_{0 i}\right)^{2}+A_{\nu}\right] \operatorname{tr}\left(F_{i j}\right)^{2}}_{\begin{array}{c}
\text { opposite sign } \\
\text { ill defined as it is ! }
\end{array}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Once one Euclideanizes it by $A_{0}=-i A_{10}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S_{\mathrm{b}} \propto \operatorname{tr}\left(F_{\mu \nu}\right)^{2} \quad \text { positive definite! } \\
& \text { The flat direction }\left(\left[A_{\mu}, A_{\nu}\right] \sim 0\right) \text { is lifted } \\
& \text { due to quantum effects. } \\
& \text { (Aoki-Iso-Kawai-Kitazawa-Tada '99) }
\end{aligned}
$$

Euclidean model is well defined without any need for cutoffs.
Krauth-Nicolai-Staudacher ('98),
Austing-Wheater ('01)

Our claim : the Lorentzian type IIB matrix model describes our Universe.

- The definition of the model is not straightforward.
- Monte Carlo studies suffer from the sign problem.
- We have to use the complex Langevin method.
- (3+1)-dim. expanding behavior emerges dynamically.
- The mechanism suggests a singular space-time structure.
- We discuss the emergence of a smooth space-time.
- Emergence of the Standard Model will be discussed by Asato Tsuchiya.


## Plan of the talk

0. Introduction
1. Defining the Lorentzian type IIB matrix model
2. Complex Langevin method
3. Emergence of $(3+1)$-dim. expanding behavior
4. Emergence of a smooth space-time
5. Summary and discussions
6. Defining the Lorentzian type IIB matrix model

# Partition function of the Lorentzian type IIB matrix model 
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## partition function

$$
Z=\int d A d \Psi \underbrace{i\left(S_{\mathrm{b}}+S_{\mathrm{f}}\right)}_{\begin{array}{c}
\text { This seems to be natural from the } \\
\text { connection to the worldsheet theory. }
\end{array}}=\int d A e^{i S_{\mathrm{b}} \operatorname{Pf} \mathcal{M}(A)}
$$

$S=\int d^{2} \xi \sqrt{g}\left(\frac{1}{4}\left\{X^{\mu}, X^{\nu}\right\}^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{\Psi} \gamma^{\mu}\left\{X^{\mu}, \Psi\right\}\right)$
$\xi_{0} \equiv-i \xi_{2} \quad \begin{gathered}\text { (The worldsheet coordinates should } \\ \text { also be Wick-rotated.) }\end{gathered}$

## Regularizing the Lorentzian model

- Unlike the Euclidean model, the Lorentzian model is NOT well defined as it is.

$$
Z=\int d A d \Psi e^{i\left(S_{\mathrm{b}}+S_{\mathrm{f}}\right)}=\int d A \underbrace{i S_{\mathrm{b}}}_{\text {pure phase factor }} \underbrace{\operatorname{Pf} \mathcal{M}(A)}_{\text {polynomial in } A}
$$

- One possibility is to deform the path slightly into the Euclidean direction. (Yuhma Asano, private communication)

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{lcc}
A_{0}=e^{-i \frac{3}{8} \pi u} \tilde{A}_{0} & u=1 \\
A_{i}=e^{i \frac{1}{8} \pi u} \tilde{A}_{i} & \text { Euclidean }
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
u=0 \\
\text { Lorentzian }
\end{array}\right.
$$

## Path deformed theory well-defined for $0<u \leq 1$

 (Yuhma Asano, private communication)$$
\begin{aligned}
& e^{i S_{\mathrm{b}}(A)}=e^{-S(\tilde{A})}\left\{\begin{array}{l}
A_{0}=\mathrm{e}^{-i \frac{3}{8} \pi u} \tilde{A}_{0} \\
A_{i}=\mathrm{e}^{i \frac{1}{8} \pi u} \tilde{A}_{i}
\end{array}\right. \\
& S(\widetilde{A}) \sim-2 e^{i \frac{\pi}{2}(1-u)} \operatorname{tr}\left[\tilde{A}_{0}, \tilde{A}_{i}\right]^{2}-e_{\text {positive real part for } 0<u \leq 1}^{-i \frac{\pi}{2}(1-u)} \operatorname{tr}\left[\tilde{A}_{i}, \widetilde{A}_{j}\right]^{2} \\
& \operatorname{Re} S(\tilde{A}) \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Due to Cauchy's theorem,
it is expected that $\left\langle\mathcal{O}\left(\mathrm{e}^{-i \frac{3}{8} \pi u} \tilde{A}_{0}, \mathrm{e}^{i \frac{1}{8} \pi u} \tilde{A}_{i}\right)\right\rangle_{u}$
is independent of $u$.

- 

If we define the Lorentzian model by taking the $u \rightarrow+0$ limit,

$$
\left\langle\mathcal{O}\left(A_{0}, A_{i}\right)\right\rangle_{\text {Lorentzian }}=\left\langle\mathcal{O}\left(\mathrm{e}^{-i \frac{3}{8} \pi} A_{0}, \mathrm{e}^{i \frac{1}{8} \pi} A_{i}\right)\right\rangle_{\text {Euclidean }}
$$

Doesn't seem to be physical...

## IR cutoffs as an alternative regularization

- First we generalize the model with two parameters ( $s, k$ ).

$$
\left.\left.\begin{array}{l}
Z=\int d A e^{-S(A)} \operatorname{Pf} \mathcal{M}(A) \\
S(A)=N \beta e^{-i \frac{\pi}{2}(1-s)}\left\{\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr}\left[A_{0}, A_{i}\right]^{2}-\frac{1}{4} \operatorname{tr}\left[A_{i}, A_{j}\right]^{2}\right\}
\end{array}\right\} \begin{array}{ll}
\text { Pure imaginary action is hard to deal with numerically. } \\
& \text { " } s \text { " deforms the model keeping Lorentz symmetry. }
\end{array}\right] \begin{array}{ll}
A_{0}=e^{-i k \pi / 2} \overbrace{0} & (s, k)=(0,0) \text { corresponds to } \\
& \text { the Lorentzian model. }
\end{array}
$$

" $k$ " tilts the time direction in the imaginary direction.

- Introduce the IR cutoffs so that the extent in temporal and spatial directions become finite.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr}\left(\tilde{A}_{0}\right)^{2}=\kappa L^{2} \\
& \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr}\left(A_{i}\right)^{2}=L^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

In what follows, we set $L=1$
without loss of generality.

In this talk, we focus on the case $k=\frac{1+s}{2}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_{0} & =e^{-i k \pi / 2} \tilde{A}_{0} \\
S & =N \beta e^{-i \frac{\pi}{2}(1-s)}\left\{\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr}\left[A_{0}, A_{i}\right]^{2}-\frac{1}{4} \operatorname{tr}\left[A_{i}, A_{j}\right]^{2}\right\} \\
& =N \beta e^{-i \frac{\pi}{2}(1-s)}\left\{\frac{1}{2} e^{-i k \pi} \operatorname{tr}\left[\tilde{A}_{0}, A_{i}\right]^{2}-\frac{1}{4} \operatorname{tr}\left[A_{i}, A_{j}\right]^{2}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

IR cutoffs

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr}\left(\tilde{A}_{0}\right)^{2}=\kappa \\
& \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr}\left(A_{i}\right)^{2}=1
\end{aligned}
$$

The first term can be made real positive by choosing

$$
e^{-i \frac{\pi}{2}(1-s)} e^{-i k \pi}=-1
$$


$k=\frac{1+s}{2}$
We focus on this case for the moment.


## 2. Complex Langevin method

## The complex Langevin method

 Parisi ('83), Klauder ('83)$$
Z=\int d x \neq(x) \quad x \in \mathbb{R}
$$

MC methods inapplicable due to sign problem !

Complexify the dynamical variables, and consider their (fictitious) time evolution :

$$
z^{(\eta)}(t)=x^{(\eta)}(t)+i y^{(\eta)}(t)
$$

defined by the complex Langevin equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d z^{(\eta)}(t)}=\sqrt[v\left(z^{(\eta)}(t)\right)]{ }+\eta(\eta(t)) & \begin{array}{ll}
\text { Gaussian noise (real) } \\
\text { probability } \propto \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{4} \int d t \eta(t)^{2}} \\
\langle\mathcal{O}\rangle \stackrel{?}{=} \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}\left\langle\mathcal{O}\left(z^{(\eta)}(t)\right)\right\rangle & v(x) \equiv \frac{1}{w(x)} \frac{\partial w(x)}{\partial x}
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

Rem 1: When $w(x)$ is real positive, it reduces to one of the usual $M C$ methods.
Rem 2: The drift term $v(x) \equiv \frac{1}{w(x)} \frac{\partial w(x)}{\partial x}$ and the observables $\mathcal{O}(x)$
should be evaluated for complexified variables by analytic continuation.

## Introducing the "time ordering"

$$
A_{0}=e^{-i k \pi / 2 \widetilde{A}^{\overbrace{0}}}
$$

Using $\operatorname{SU}(N)$ symmetry $A_{\mu} \rightarrow U A_{\mu} U^{\dagger}$, we diagonalize $\tilde{A}_{0}=\operatorname{diag}\left(\tilde{\alpha}_{1}, \cdots, \tilde{\alpha}_{N}\right)$, where $\tilde{\alpha}_{1}<\tilde{\alpha}_{2}<\cdots<\tilde{\alpha}_{N}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
Z= & \int d \tilde{A}_{0} d A_{i} e^{-S}=\int d \tilde{\alpha} d A_{i} \Delta(\tilde{\alpha}) e^{-S} \\
& \Delta(\tilde{\alpha})=\prod_{a>b}\left(\tilde{\alpha}_{a}-\tilde{\alpha}_{b}\right)^{2}: \text { van der Monde determinant }
\end{aligned}
$$

In order to respecting the time ordering
$\tilde{\alpha}_{1}<\cdots<\tilde{\alpha}_{N}$ in the CLM,
we make the following change of variables:

$$
\tilde{\alpha}_{1}=0, \quad \tilde{\alpha}_{2}=e^{\tau_{1}}, \quad \tilde{\alpha}_{3}=e^{\tau_{1}}+e^{\tau_{2}}, \quad \cdots, \quad \tilde{\alpha}_{N}=\sum_{a=1}^{N-1} e^{\tau_{a}}
$$

and complexify $\tau_{a}(a=1, \cdots, N-1)$.

## Complex Langevin equation

The constraints are replaced by some appropriate potential.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr}\left(\tilde{A}_{0}\right)^{2}=\kappa \\
& \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr}\left(A_{i}\right)^{2}=1
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
S_{\text {pot }}=\frac{1}{p} \gamma_{\mathrm{s}}\left(\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr}\left(A_{i}\right)^{2}-1\right)^{p}+\frac{1}{p} \gamma_{\mathrm{t}}\left(\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr}\left(\tilde{A}_{0}\right)^{2}-\kappa\right)^{p} \\
\text { We use } p=4
\end{gathered}
$$

The effective action reads:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{\mathrm{eff}}= & N \beta e^{-i \frac{\pi}{2}(1-s)}\left\{\frac{1}{2} e^{-i k \pi} \operatorname{tr}\left[\tilde{A}_{0}, A_{i}\right]^{2}-\frac{1}{4} \operatorname{tr}\left[A_{i}, A_{j}\right]^{2}\right\} \\
& +\frac{1}{p} \gamma_{\mathrm{S}}\left(\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr}\left(A_{i}\right)^{2}-1\right)^{p}+\frac{1}{p} \gamma_{\mathrm{t}}\left(\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr}\left(\tilde{A}_{0}\right)^{2}-\kappa\right)^{p} \\
& -\log \Delta(\tilde{\alpha})-\sum_{a=1}^{N-1} \tau_{a}
\end{aligned}
$$

Treat $\tau_{a}$ as complex variables, and $A_{i}$ as general complex matrices, and solve the complex Langevin equation:

$$
\left\{\begin{aligned}
\frac{d \tau_{a}}{d t} & =-\frac{\partial S_{\mathrm{eff}}}{\partial \tau_{a}}+\eta_{a} \\
\frac{d\left(A_{i}\right)_{a b}}{d t} & =-\frac{\partial S_{\mathrm{eff}}}{\partial\left(A_{i}\right)_{b a}}+\left(\eta_{i}\right)_{a b}
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

## 3. Emergence of (3+1)-dimensional expanding behavior

## Results at $(s, k)=(-1,0)$ in the 6D bosonic model



$$
A_{0}=\tilde{A}_{0} \quad \mathrm{k}=0 ; \text { no tilt in the time direction (real time). }
$$

$$
S=N \beta\left\{-\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr}\left[A_{0}, A_{i}\right]^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \operatorname{tr}\left[A_{i}, A_{j}\right]^{2}\right\}
$$

favors $A_{j}$ close to diagonal
favors maximal non-commutativity between $A_{j}$

## How to extract time-evolution



Emergence of (3+1)-dim. expanding behavior

$$
N=128, \quad \kappa=0.13, \quad \beta=2, \quad(s, k)=(-1,0), \quad n=16
$$

$$
\text { eigenvalues of } T_{i j}(t)=\frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}\left\{X_{i}(t) X_{j}(t)\right\}
$$



$$
X_{i}(t)=\frac{1}{2}\left(\bar{A}_{i}(t)+\bar{A}_{i}^{\dagger}(t)\right)
$$



SSB : SO(5) $\rightarrow$ SO(3) occurs at some point in time.

## The mechanism of the SSB



$$
\text { maximize } \mathrm{NC}=-\operatorname{tr}\left[\bar{A}_{i}(t), \bar{A}_{j}(t)\right]^{2}
$$

$$
\text { for } \operatorname{tr}\left(\bar{A}_{i}(t)\right)^{2}=\text { const. }
$$



$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{A}_{i}(t) & \propto \sigma_{i} \quad \text { for } i=1,2,3 \\
\bar{A}_{i}(t) & =0 \quad \text { for } i \geq 4 \\
& \text { up to SO(5) rotation }
\end{aligned}
$$

Kim-J.N.-Tsuchiya, PRL 108 (2012) 011601

## Confirmation of the mechanism

$$
N=128, \quad \kappa=0.13, \quad \beta=2, \quad(s, k)=(-1,0), \quad n=16
$$



Only 2 eigenvalues of $Q$ become large.
4. Emergence of a smooth space-time

## Exploring the phase diagram near $s=0$



Can we obtain (3+1)-dim. expanding behavior with a smooth space-time structure ?

## $s=-1$ V.S. $s \sim 0$

eigenvalues of $T_{i j}(t)=\frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}\left\{X_{i}(t) X_{j}(t)\right\}$ eigenvalues of $Q=\sum_{i=1}^{5}\left\{X_{i}(t)\right\}^{2}$


$(s, k)=(-1,0), \quad n=16$



$$
N=128, \quad \kappa=0.0037, \quad \beta=32, \quad(s, k)=(0.0076,0.5038), \quad n=16
$$

## Hermiticity of the spatial matrices

$N=128, \quad \kappa=0.0037, \quad \beta=32, \quad(s, k)=(0.0076,0.5038), \quad n=16$

$0 \leq h(t) \leq 1$
Hermitian

Spatial matrices become close to Hermitian near the peak of $\operatorname{Re} R^{2}(t)$.

Classical solution seems to be dominating in this region.

## Approaching from $s=1$


$s=1$ corresponds to the Euclidean model with the constraints: $\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr}\left(\tilde{A}_{0}\right)^{2}=\kappa, \quad \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr}\left(A_{i}\right)^{2}=1$

## Eulidean model with the constraints yields $(1+1)$ d expanding behavior

 eigenvalues of $T_{i j}(t)=\frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}\left\{X_{i}(t) X_{j}(t)\right\} \quad$ eigenvalues of $Q=\sum_{i=1}^{5}\left\{X_{i}(t)\right\}^{2}$


$$
N=128, \quad \kappa=0.01, \quad \beta=32, \quad(s, k)=(1,1), \quad n=16
$$

## Decreasing $s$ from $s=1$

eigenvalues of $T_{i j}(t)=\frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}\left\{X_{i}(t) X_{j}(t)\right\}$ eigenvalues of $Q=\sum_{i=1}^{5}\left\{X_{i}(t)\right\}^{2}$



$$
N=128, \quad \kappa=0.06, \quad \beta=32, \quad(s, k)=(0.195,0.5975), \quad n=16
$$

Gradual transition to $(3+1) \mathrm{d}$ expanding behavior with Pauli matrices.

## $N=128$ v.s. $N=192$

eigenvalues of $T_{i j}(t)=\frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}\left\{X_{i}(t) X_{j}(t)\right\} \quad$ eigenvalues of $Q=\sum_{i=1}^{5}\left\{X_{i}(t)\right\}^{2}$



$$
N=128, \quad \kappa=0.0037, \quad \beta=32, \quad(s, k)=(0.0076,0.5038), \quad n=16
$$



## 5. Summary and Discussions

## Summary

The Lorentzian version of the type IIB matrix model with certain generalization

$$
\begin{aligned}
S(A) & =N \beta e^{-i \frac{\pi}{2}(1-s)}\left\{\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr}\left[A_{0}, A_{i}\right]^{2}-\frac{1}{4} \operatorname{tr}\left[A_{i}, A_{j}\right]^{2}\right\} \\
A_{0} & =e^{-i k \pi / 2} \tilde{A}_{0} \\
\text { IR cutoffs }: & \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr}\left(\tilde{A}_{0}\right)^{2}=\kappa, \quad \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr}\left(A_{i}\right)^{2}=1
\end{aligned}
$$



## Discussions

Our previous work

> Kim-J.N.-Tsuchiya,
> PRL 108 (2012) 011601

## $k$



- Transition from the Pauli matrices to a smooth space-time occurs at slightly positive $s$ for $N=128,192$.

Does the transition point approach $s=0$ at larger $N$ ?

- Complex Langevin simulation becomes unreliable due to growing nonhermiticity when we decrease $k$ from $k=(1+s) / 2$ too much.

Can we approach the target $(s, k)=(0,0)$ at larger $N$ ?
Does the $(3+1)$ d expanding smooth space-time survive there ?

## Discussions (cont’d)

- Hermiticity of spatial matrices emerges as the space expands.

This suggests that a classical solution is dominating there. If so, solving the classical eq. of motion is a sensible way to explore the late time behavior of this model.
c.f.) Asato Tsuchiya's talk

- Effects of the fermionic matrices ?

Not straightforward due to the "singular-drift problem" in the CLM caused by the near-zero eigenvalues the Dirac operator, but maybe possible.

- Generalizing the IR cutoffs to

$$
\frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr}\left\{\left(\tilde{A}_{0}\right)^{2}\right\}^{p}=\kappa^{p}, \quad \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{tr}\left\{\left(A_{i}\right)^{2}\right\}^{p}=1
$$

Previous studies suggest that we obtain universal results for $p \sim 1.5$, but the model becomes pathological for larger $p$.

