The matrix factorizations of the D-model

The matrix factorizations of the D-model

Ilka Brunner and Matthias R Gaberdiel

Institut für Theoretische Physik, ETH-Hönggerberg, 8093 Zürich, Switzerland

E-mail: brunner@itp.phys.ethz.ch and gaberdiel@itp.phys.ethz.ch

Abstract
The fundamental matrix factorizations of the D-model superpotential are found
and identified with the boundary states of the corresponding conformal field
theory. The analysis is performed for both GSO projections. We also comment
on the relation of this analysis to the theory of surface singularities and their
orbifold description.

PACS number: 11.25.Hf

1. Introduction

Models with $N = (2, 2)$ worldsheet supersymmetry play a major role in various applications
of string theory, most notably in the context of Calabi-Yau compactifications, mirror symmetry
and the construction of four-dimensional string vacua. The simplest non-trivial theories with
superconformal symmetry are the $N = 2$ minimal models which have an ADE classification.
These models play a central role in the construction of Gepner models that describe certain
Calabi-Yau compactifications at specific points in their moduli space. In addition to their
realization as abstract conformal field theories, the $N = 2$ minimal models also have a
description as Landau Ginzburg theories. For the case of the D-model that shall mainly
concern us in this paper, the relevant superpotentials are

$$W_D = x^{\frac{n+1}{2}} - xy^2, \qquad W_{D'} = x^{\frac{n+1}{2}} - xy^2 - z^2. \tag{1.1}$$

The two different choices correspond to the two possible GSO projections that can be imposed
in conformal field theory.

In this paper, we perform a complete analysis of the B-type branes in both of these theories.
These can be studied from two points of view: on the one hand, they have a description in
terms of boundary states in rational conformal field theory. On the other hand, according to
a proposal in unpublished work of Kontsevich, B-type branes in Landau Ginzburg models
can be characterized in terms of matrix factorizations of the superpotential. This proposal
was discussed in the physics literature in [1–8]. One would thus expect that the boundary

state analysis in conformal field theory should agree with that of the D-branes in the Landau Ginzburg theory. This was for example seen to be the case for the A-type models in [2, 4].

In the following we shall compare in detail the boundary states of the D-type minimal models with the matrix factorizations of the corresponding Landau Ginzburg models. Furthermore, we shall relate the matrix factorizations of the Landau Ginzburg superpotential W to matrix factorizations that appear in the study of singularity theory. Surface singularities can formally be related to Landau Ginzburg theories by studying the locus $W = 0$ as a hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^3$. The matrix factorizations encode then the geometrical details of the blow-ups necessary to resolve the surface singularity. Interpreted on the singular variety, they also correspond to the elements of Orlov's category D_{Sg} [9]. Our analysis suggests that the Landau Ginzburg theory, despite having smaller central charge, captures some of the physical properties of the D-branes on these surface singularities that become massless at the singular point.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we review the relation between matrix factorizations and boundary states for the A-type minimal models. As explained in [4], adding a square to the Landau Ginzburg superpotential corresponds to a change in the GSO projection in conformal field theory. In section 3 we construct all B-type boundary states in the D-model for both possible GSO projections. Since the D-model is a rational conformal field theory (with respect to the $N = 2$ superconformal algebra), the boundary states we construct generate *all* superconformal boundary states. In section 4 we discuss the matrix factorizations of the corresponding Landau Ginzburg models, completing the list of factorizations provided in [4]. Once these additional factorizations are considered, we obtain complete agreement with the conformal field theory description. On the other hand, since the latter description is complete (in the above sense), we can conclude that the matrix factorizations we have found are all the fundamental matrix factorizations for these superpotentials. This is to say, any matrix factorization must be the direct sum of these fundamental factorizations. Our analysis also confirms the conjecture of [4] regarding the relation between the different GSO projections in conformal field theory and the addition of a square to the Landau Ginzburg model. Finally, in section 5, we investigate the relation between D-branes on singular surfaces, the corresponding Landau Ginzburg theories and conformal field theory. We also comment on the description of the surface singularity in terms of the singular quotient $\mathbb{C}^2/\Gamma$, where Γ is a subgroup of $SU(2)$. This allows us to use the methods of [10, 11] to describe D-branes on those orbifolds in terms of representations of Γ. We find complete agreement with the results from the matrix factorization point of view, confirming yet again that we have found all D-branes.

2. Matrix factorizations

Let us briefly review the description of D-branes in terms of matrix factorizations. This approach was proposed in unpublished form by Kontsevich, and the physical interpretation of it was given in [1–6]; for a good review of this material see for example [8].

According to Kontsevich's proposal, D-branes in Landau Ginzburg models correspond to matrix factorizations of the superpotential $W(x_i)$,

$$d_0 d_1 = d_1 d_0 = W\mathbf{1}, \tag{2.1}$$

where d_0 and d_1 are $r \times r$ matrices with polynomial entries in the x_i. To a matrix factorization of this form, one can then associate the boundary BRST operator Q of the form

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & d_1 \\ d_0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.2}$$

The spectrum of open string operators consists of polynomial matrices of the same size. It is naturally $\mathbb{Z}_2$ graded, where the bosons ϕ correspond to block-diagonal matrices, while the fermions t are off-diagonal:

$$\phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_0 & 0 \\ 0 & \phi_1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad t = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & t_1 \\ t_0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.3}$$

To obtain the physical spectrum between two such branes, one restricts to the degree 0 operators satisfying $D\phi = [Q, \phi] = 0$, and identifies operators that differ only by BRST-exact terms. To calculate this cohomology, we can follow the strategy of [4]. A BRST invariant boson has to satisfy

$$d_1\phi_1 = \phi_0 d_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad d_0\phi_0 = \phi_1 d_0, \tag{2.4}$$

where ϕ_0 and ϕ_1 are $r \times r$ matrices. This equation can be solved for ϕ_0 as

$$\phi_0 = \frac{1}{W} d_1 \phi_1 d_0, \tag{2.5}$$

provided that the matrix on the right-hand side is divisible by W. After moding out Q-exact terms, the bosonic cohomology can therefore be described using ϕ_1 only. The BRST trivial $\tilde{\phi}_1$ are derivatives of fermions, and hence take the form

$$\tilde{\phi}_1 = (Dt)_1 = t_0 d_1 + d_0 t_1. \tag{2.6}$$

For the fermions, the condition for BRST invariance is

$$t_0 d_1 + d_0 t_1 = 0 = d_1 t_0 + t_1 d_0, \tag{2.7}$$

which can be solved for t_1

$$t_1 = -\frac{1}{W} d_1 t_0 d_1, \tag{2.8}$$

resulting again in a divisibility condition. An invariant fermion $(\tilde{t}_0, \tilde{t}_1)$ is BRST trivial if $\tilde{t}_0$ can be written as

$$\tilde{t}_0 = -\phi_1 d_0 + d_0 \phi_0, \tag{2.9}$$

for a boson (ϕ_0, ϕ_1).

It is easy to see that the spectrum of two factorizations Q and $\hat{Q}$ is the same, if

$$Q = U\hat{Q}U^{-1}, \qquad U = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.10}$$

provided that U and its inverse, U^{-1}, are polynomial matrices. We therefore identify two such factorizations [12].

For a given factorization Q, we call the factorization where the roles of d_0 and d_1 are reversed the *reverse factorization* Q^r. It is clear from the above discussion that the bosonic spectrum between two factorizations Q_1 and Q_2 and the fermionic spectrum between Q_1 and Q_2^r coincide.

To make contact with conformal field theory, one has to make sure that the $U(1)$ R-symmetry that becomes the $U(1)$ current symmetry of the $N = 2$ superconformal algebra in the IR is preserved [7]. This means that one has to restrict to homogeneous superpotentials and specify a consistent assignment of R-charge in the boundary theory. By (2.1) and (2.2) this implies that Q should have charge one

$$e^{i\lambda R} Q(e^{i\lambda q_i} x_i) e^{-i\lambda R} = e^{i\lambda} Q. \tag{2.11}$$

Then one can assign R-charge to the boundary operators by [7]

$$e^{i\lambda R} \phi(e^{i\lambda q_i} x_i) e^{-i\lambda R} = e^{i\lambda q} \phi. \tag{2.12}$$

This description of D-branes should then have a direct correspondence in conformal field theory. In particular, the different factorizations (up to the aforementioned equivalence) should correspond to the different B-type boundary states in conformal field theory. The physical boson spectrum described above corresponds then to the topological open string spectrum from the point of view of conformal field theory. The reverse factorization of a given factorization corresponds to the anti-brane of the given brane; thus the physical fermion spectrum in the above description corresponds to the topological open string spectrum between a brane and an anti-brane.

In order to illustrate these concepts and set up notation for the rest of the paper, we briefly review the case of the A-type minimal models.

2.1. A-type minimal models

In [2, 4] A-type minimal models were studied from the matrix point of view. For the potential

$$W_A = x^n \tag{2.13}$$

it can be shown that a class of inequivalent matrix factorizations that generate all factorizations are described by the simple rank 1 factorizations $W = x^l x^{n-l}$, where $l = 1, \ldots, n-1$. The corresponding BRST operator is

$$Q_l = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x^l \\ x^{n-l} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.14}$$

The factorizations Q_l and Q_{n-l} are related to one another by the exchange of d_0 and d_1; they are therefore reverse factorizations of one another.

The corresponding conformal field theory is described by a single $N = 2$ minimal model with $n = k + 2$. (Our conventions are chosen as in [13].) The spectrum of this theory is (after GSO projection)

$$\mathcal{H}_A = \bigoplus_{[l,m,s]} (\mathcal{H}_{[l,m,s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[l,m,-s]}). \tag{2.15}$$

The GSO projection chosen here is the analogue of the Type 0A projection. B-type branes are characterized by the gluing conditions

$$
\begin{aligned}
(L_n - \bar{L}_{-n}) \| B \rangle\!\rangle &= 0 \\
(J_n + \bar{J}_{-n}) \| B \rangle\!\rangle &= 0 \\
\left(G_r^\pm + i\eta \bar{G}_{-r}^\pm \right) \| B \rangle\!\rangle &= 0.
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.16}
$$

The corresponding B-type boundary states were constructed some time ago (see, for example, [14]), and are explicitly given as

$$\| L, S \rangle\!\rangle = \sqrt{k+2} \sum_{l+s \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \frac{S_{L0S,l0s}}{\sqrt{S_{l0s,000}}} |[l, 0, s]\rangle\!\rangle. \tag{2.17}$$

Here $L = 0, 1, \ldots, k$ and $S = 0, 1, 2, 3$. The boundary states with S even (odd) satisfy the gluing conditions with $\eta = +1$ ($\eta = -1$); in the following we shall restrict ourselves to the case $\eta = +1$, and thus to even S.[1] We also note that

$$\| L, S \rangle\!\rangle = \| k - L, S + 2 \rangle\!\rangle \tag{2.18}$$

and thus there are only $k + 1$ different boundary states with $\eta = +1$ (and $k + 1$ different boundary states with $\eta = -1$). These boundary states therefore account for all the $N = 2$

---

[1] The D-branes corresponding to $\eta = -1$ or S odd preserve a different supercharge at the boundary. The branes that are described by the different matrix factorizations however always preserve the *same* supercharge at the boundary.

Ishibashi states. Finally we note that $\|L, S\rangle\!\rangle$ and $\|L, S + 2\rangle\!\rangle$ are anti-branes of one another (since they differ by a sign in the coupling to the RR sector states).

It is then suggestive to identify the matrix factorization corresponding to Q_l (2.14) with the boundary state with label $L = l - 1$ and $S = 0$. The equivalence (2.18) mirrors the factorization reversal map $l \mapsto n - l$ on the matrix side. Restricting without loss of generality to the range $l \leqslant n/2$ one can then easily check, both in conformal field theory and the matrix language, that there are l topological states in the open string spectrum on each of these branes (they correspond to the 'bosons' from the matrix point of view), and l topological states in the open string spectrum between brane and anti-brane (the 'fermions' in the matrix description).

From the conformal field theory perspective it is immediately clear that there is another closely related theory, where one uses a type 0B like GSO projection instead of the GSO projection discussed above. The relevant Hilbert space is

$$\mathcal{H}_{A'} = \bigoplus_{[l,m,s]} (\mathcal{H}_{[l,m,s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[l,m,s]}). \tag{2.19}$$

It was shown in [4] that from the matrix point of view this theory is described by the superpotential

$$W_{A'} = x^n - y^2. \tag{2.20}$$

Since the D-models that we shall discuss in this paper are closely related to this theory, let us briefly summarize the results of [4] on factorizations and their relation to boundary states. The superpotential $W_{A'}$ has two classes of factorizations: the first class is given by

$$d_0 = \begin{pmatrix} x^l & y \\ -y & -x^{n-l} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad d_1 = \begin{pmatrix} x^{n-l} & y \\ -y & -x^l \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.21}$$

One can easily see that the factorization corresponding to l and $n - l$ are equivalent in the sense of (2.10); in the following we shall therefore always take $l \leqslant n/2$. Since these are reverse factorizations of one another, the corresponding branes have to be their own anti-branes.

These factorizations are just a special class of the tensor product factorizations discussed in [15]. In fact, they consist of one factor coming from the potential x^n, and another one from the 'trivial' factor y^2 whose physical significance has been discussed in [1]. Accordingly, the open string spectrum inherits the tensor product structure: there are $2l$ bosons of the type

$$a_i = \begin{pmatrix} x^i & 0 \\ 0 & x^i \end{pmatrix}, \qquad a_{l+i} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x^i \\ x^{n-2l+i} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad i = 0, \ldots, l - 1, \tag{2.22}$$

where the 2×2 matrices a_j describe ϕ_1, and ϕ_0 is then determined by (2.5). Likewise, there are $2l$ fermions

$$\eta_i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x^i \\ x^i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \eta_{l+i} = \begin{pmatrix} x^i & 0 \\ 0 & x^{n-2l+i} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad i = 0, \ldots, l - 1, \tag{2.23}$$

where the 2×2 matrices η_j describe t_0, and t_1 is then determined by (2.8). In the case that n is even, the factorization $l = n/2$ is not irreducible. In fact, it is equivalent (in the sense of (2.10)) to the direct sum of the rank 1 factorization

$$d_0 = \left(x^{\frac{n}{2}} + y \right), \qquad d_1 = \left(x^{\frac{n}{2}} - y \right), \tag{2.24}$$

and its reverse. The physical open string spectrum of these rank 1 factorizations consists of $n/2$ bosons (but no fermions); correspondingly there are $n/2$ fermions (but no bosons) between the factorization (2.24) and its reverse.

In conformal field theory, the rank 2 factorizations reviewed above correspond to the boundary states [4]

$$\|L, S\rangle\rangle = (2k + 4)^{1/4} \sum_{l \text{ even}} \sum_{v=0,1} \frac{S_{Ll}}{\sqrt{S_{0l}}} \, \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\pi v S} |[l, 0, 2v]\rangle\rangle. \tag{2.25}$$

Here S is only defined modulo 2, and $\|L, S\rangle\rangle = \|k - L, S\rangle\rangle$. As before, the identification relates the factorization (2.21) to the boundary state with $L = l - 1$ and $S = 0$. (Recall that $n = k + 2$.) These boundary states do not couple to RR states and are therefore equivalent to their own anti-branes. (This is simply the statement that S is only defined modulo 2.)

If k is even, then the $L = k/2$ boundary state contains two vacua in its open string spectrum and thus can further be resolved. The explicit form of the two resolved boundary states is [14]

$$\|k/2, S\rangle\rangle_{\text{res}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\|k/2, S\rangle\rangle + \sqrt{k+2} \sum_{s=\pm 1} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\pi \mathrm{i} S s}{2}} |[k/2, (k+2)/2, s]\rangle\rangle \right), \tag{2.26}$$

where S is now defined mod 4, and $\|k/2, S\rangle\rangle_{\text{res}}$ and $\|k/2, S + 2\rangle\rangle_{\text{res}}$ are anti-branes of one another. The two branes with $S = 0$ and $S = 2$ then correspond to the matrix factorization (2.24) and its reverse, respectively.

We shall now construct the boundary states of the various GSO projections of the D-model; in section 4 we shall discuss the corresponding matrix factorizations and identify the two descriptions.

3. Boundary states for the D-model

The D-model is only defined if the level k is even. As before for the case of the A-type minimal model there are two possible GSO projections one can consider. We begin by discussing the theory that is analogous to type 0B. Its spectrum depends on whether $k/2$ is even or odd, i.e. on whether k is divisible by 4 or not. In the former case, the spectrum is

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{[l,m,s], l \text{ even}} ((\mathcal{H}_{[l,m,s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[l,m,s]}) \oplus (\mathcal{H}_{[l,m,s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[k-l,m,s]})). \tag{3.1}$$

On the other hand, if $k/2$ is odd the spectrum is

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{[l,m,s], l \text{ even}} ((\mathcal{H}_{[l,m,s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[l,m,s]})) \oplus \bigoplus_{[l,m,s], l \text{ odd}} ((\mathcal{H}_{[l,m,s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[k-l,m,s]})). \tag{3.2}$$

We are interested in the B-type boundary states of this theory. In our conventions, the B-type Ishibashi states are characterized by the gluing conditions (2.16). The structure of these Ishibashi states (and thus the corresponding boundary states) depends on the two cases above, and we shall therefore discuss them in turn.

3.1. The case $k/2$ odd

For $k/2$ odd, the theory (3.2) has the Ishibashi states

$$|[l, 0, s]\rangle\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{[l,0,s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[l,0,s]}, \tag{3.3}$$

where both l and s are even, and the Ishibashi states

$$|[l, (k+2)/2, s]\rangle\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{[l, \frac{k+2}{2}, s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[k-l, \frac{k+2}{2}, s]} \tag{3.4}$$

where both l and s are odd. In total there are therefore $2(k + 1)$ Ishibashi states of the coset theory; they give rise to $(k + 1)$ Ishibashi states of the $N = 2$ theory with one spin structure $\eta = +1$, and $(k + 1)$ Ishibashi states of the $N = 2$ algebra with the other $\eta = -1$.

The corresponding boundary states are described by

$$\|L, M, S\rangle\!\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2k+4}{2}} \left(\sum_{l,s \text{ even}} \frac{S_{LMS,l0s}}{\sqrt{S_{000,l0s}}} |[l, 0, s]\rangle\!\rangle + \sum_{l,s \text{ odd}} \frac{S_{LMS,l\frac{k+2}{2}s}}{\sqrt{S_{000,l\frac{k+2}{2}s}}} |[l, (k+2)/2, s]\rangle\!\rangle \right).$$
(3.5)

Here $L + M + S$ is even, and we have the identifications

$$\|L, M, S\rangle\!\rangle = \|k - L, M + k + 2, S + 2\rangle\!\rangle = \|k - L, M, S + 2\rangle\!\rangle$$
$$= \|L, M + 4, S\rangle\!\rangle = \|L, M + 2, S + 2\rangle\!\rangle.$$
(3.6)

For fixed spin structure $\eta = +1$ (corresponding to $S = 0, 2$), we have for every value of L only two possible values of M, namely $M = 0, 2$ or $M = 1, 3$. Furthermore, because of the last identification, of the four choices $(S = 0, 2, M = 0, 2)$ or $(S = 0, 2, M = 1, 3)$ only two describe different boundary states. For $L \neq k/2$, the pair of boundary states with L and $k - L$ account therefore each for two different boundary states giving in total k different boundary states. For $L = k/2$ on the other hand, it is easy to see that the second sum in (3.5) vanishes, and thus $\|k/2, +1, 0\rangle\!\rangle = \|k/2, -1, 0\rangle\!\rangle$, thus giving only one additional boundary state. In total the above construction therefore gives $k + 1$ different boundary states of fixed spin structure, and thus accounts for all the Ishibashi states.

These boundary states satisfy the Cardy condition since their overlap equals

$$\langle\!\langle L_1, M_1, S_1 \| q^{L_0 + \bar{L}_0 - \frac{c}{12}} \| L_2, M_2, S_2 \rangle\!\rangle = \sum_{[l,m,s]} \chi_{(l,m,s)}(\tilde{q}) \delta^{(2)}(S_2 + s - S_1) \big(N_{L_2 l}{}^{L_1}$$
$$\times \delta^{(4)}(m - s + M_2 - M_1 - S_2 + S_1) + N_{L_2 k - l}{}^{L_1} \delta^{(4)}(m - s + M_2 - M_1 - S_2 + S_1 + 2) \big).$$
(3.7)

Here $N_{Ll}{}^{\hat{L}}$ denotes the level k fusion rules of $su(2)$, and $\chi_{(l,m,s)}$ is the character of the coset representation. We note that the right-hand side is invariant under the field identification, $(l, m, s) \mapsto (k - l, m + k + 2, s + 2)$, as it must be.

3.1.1. Topological spectrum. It is now straightforward to read off the topological spectrum between two such branes from this formula. If we consider only D-branes of a fixed spin structure, we may set, without loss of generality, $S = 0$. Then we can restrict the open string sum without loss of generality to the states with $s = 0$; then the topological states arise for $l = m$.

For example, for the case $L = L_1 = L_2$ (and $S_1 = S_2 = 0$), the number of topological states T is

$$M_1 = M_2 \quad \text{(bosons):} \quad |T| = \begin{cases} L + 2 & \text{if } L \text{ is even} \\ L + 1 & \text{if } L \text{ is odd,} \end{cases}$$
(3.8)

and

$$M_1 = M_2 + 2 \quad \text{(fermions):} \quad |T| = \begin{cases} L & \text{if } L \text{ is even} \\ L + 1 & \text{if } L \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$
(3.9)

Note that the boundary state corresponding to $L = k/2$ (which is an odd number) has the same number of topological fermions and bosons in its open string spectrum.

3.2. The case $k/2$ even

For $k/2$ even, the theory (3.1) has the $(k + 2)$ Ishibashi states

$$|[l, 0, s]\rangle\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{[l,0,s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[l,0,s]}, \tag{3.10}$$

where l and s are both even, and the $(k + 2)$ Ishibashi states

$$|[l, (k + 2)/2, s]\rangle\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{[l,\frac{k+2}{2},s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[k-l,\frac{k+2}{2},s]}, \tag{3.11}$$

where l is even and s is odd. In addition, there are the two Ishibashi states from the first sum in (3.1)

$$|[k/2, (k + 2)/2, s]\rangle\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{[k/2,\frac{k+2}{2},s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[k/2,\frac{k+2}{2},s]}, \qquad s = \pm 1 \tag{3.12}$$

and the two Ishibashi states from the second sum in (3.1)

$$|[k/2, 0, s]\rangle\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{[k/2,0,s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[k-k/2,0,s]}, \qquad s = 0, 2. \tag{3.13}$$

In total there are therefore $2(k + 4)$ Ishibashi states of the coset theory; they give rise to $(k + 4)$ Ishibashi states of the $N = 2$ theory with one spin structure $\eta = +1$, and $(k + 4)$ Ishibashi states of the $N = 2$ algebra with the other $\eta = -1$.
The corresponding boundary states are described by

$$\|L, M, S\rangle\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2k + 4}{2}} \sum_{l \text{ even}} \left(\sum_{s \text{ even}} \frac{S_{LMS,l0s}}{\sqrt{S_{000,l0s}}} |[l, 0, s]\rangle\rangle + \sum_{s \text{ odd}} \frac{S_{LMS,l\frac{k+2}{2}s}}{\sqrt{S_{000,l\frac{k+2}{2}s}}} |[l, (k + 2)/2, s]\rangle\rangle \right). \tag{3.14}$$

Here $L + M + S$ is even, and $L \neq k/2$. We have the identifications

$$\|L, M, S\rangle\rangle = \|k - L, M + k + 2, S + 2\rangle\rangle = \|k - L, M, S\rangle\rangle$$
$$= \|L, M + 4, S\rangle\rangle = \|L, M + 2, S + 2\rangle\rangle. \tag{3.15}$$

For fixed spin structure $\eta = +1$ (corresponding to $S = 0, 2$), we have for every value of L only two possible values of M, namely $M = 0, 2$ or $M = 1, 3$. Furthermore, because of the last identification, of the four choices $(S = 0, 2, M = 0, 2)$ or $(S = 0, 2, M = 1, 3)$, only two describe different boundary states. For $L \neq k/2$, the pair of boundary states with L and $k - L$ account therefore each for two different boundary states giving in total k different boundary states. The remaining four boundary states correspond to the 'resolved' boundary states for $L = k/2$, and will be described shortly.

These boundary states satisfy the Cardy condition since their overlap equals

$$\langle\langle L_1, M_1, S_1 \| q^{L_0 + \bar{L}_0 - \frac{c}{12}} \| L_2, M_2, S_2 \rangle\rangle = \sum_{[l,m,s]} \chi_{(l,m,s)}(\tilde{q}) \delta^{(2)}(S_2 + s - S_1)$$
$$\times \left(N_{L_2 l}{}^{L_1} + N_{L_2 k - l}{}^{L_1} \right) \delta^{(4)}(m - s + M_2 - M_1 - S_2 + S_1). \tag{3.16}$$

We observe again that the right-hand side is invariant under the field identification, $(l, m, s) \mapsto (k - l, m + k + 2, s + 2)$, as it must be.

It is easy to see that the topological open string spectrum of these branes is described by the same formulae as (3.8) and (3.9) above.

3.2.1. The resolved branes.

The remaining boundary states are of the form

$$\|k/2, M, S, \pm\rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \|k/2, M, S\rangle\rangle_{(3.14)} \pm \frac{\sqrt{2k + 4}}{4}$$
$$\times \left(\sum_{s \text{ odd}} e^{i\pi M/2} e^{-i\pi s S/2} |[k/2, (k + 2)/2, s]\rangle\rangle + \sum_{s \text{ even}} e^{-i\pi s S/2} |[k/2, 0, s]\rangle\rangle \right). \tag{3.17}$$

Here $M + S$ is even, and we have the same identifications as in the second line of (3.15). Thus these boundary states account for four more boundary states (of a fixed spin structure).

One easily checks that the overlaps of these boundary states with the previously constructed boundary states is simply

$$\langle\langle L_1, M_1, S_1 \| q^{L_0+\bar{L}_0-\frac{c}{12}} \| k/2, M_2, S_2, \pm\rangle\rangle = \sum_{[l,m,s]} \chi_{(l,m,s)}(\tilde{q})$$

$$\times \delta^{(2)}(S_2 + s - S_1) N_{k/2l}{}^{L_1} \delta^{(4)}(m - s + M_2 - M_1 - S_2 + S_1). \tag{3.18}$$

On the other hand, the overlaps involving two resolved branes is

$$\langle\langle k/2, M_1, S_1, \pm \| q^{L_0+\bar{L}_0-\frac{c}{12}} \| k/2, M_2, S_2, \pm\rangle\rangle = \sum_{[l,m,s]\, l=4n} \chi_{(l,m,s)}(\tilde{q})$$

$$\times \delta^{(2)}(S_2 + s - S_1)\delta^{(4)}(m - s + M_2 - M_1 - S_2 + S_1), \tag{3.19}$$

and

$$\langle\langle k/2, M_1, S_1, \pm \| q^{L_0+\bar{L}_0-\frac{c}{12}} \| k/2, M_2, S_2, \mp\rangle\rangle = \sum_{[l,m,s]\, l=4n+2} \chi_{(l,m,s)}(\tilde{q})\delta^{(2)}$$

$$\times (S_2 + s - S_1)\delta^{(4)}(m - s + M_2 - M_1 - S_2 + S_1). \tag{3.20}$$

It is now straightforward to determine the topological open string spectrum of these branes. As before, we may set, without loss of generality (if we restrict ourselves to a specific spin structure) $S_1 = S_2 = 0$. Then the number of topological states on the +brane is

$$M_1 = M_2 \quad \text{(bosons):} \qquad |T| = \frac{k}{4} + 1, \tag{3.21}$$

$$M_1 = M_2 + 2 \quad \text{(fermions):} \quad |T| = 0. \tag{3.22}$$

Obviously the result for the $-$brane is identical. On the other hand, the topological spectrum between the +brane and the $-$brane is

$$M_1 = M_2: \qquad |T| = 0, \tag{3.23}$$

$$M_1 = M_2 + 2: \quad |T| = \frac{k}{4}. \tag{3.24}$$

3.3. The other GSO projection

As we mentioned before, we can also consider the 0A-like GSO projection. Then the spectrum of the D-model is for $k/2$ even

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{[l,m,s],\, l\,\text{even}} ((\mathcal{H}_{[l,m,s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[l,m,-s]}) \oplus (\mathcal{H}_{[l,m,s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[k-l,m,-s]})). \tag{3.25}$$

On the other hand, if $k/2$ is odd, the spectrum is

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{[l,m,s],\, l\,\text{even}} ((\mathcal{H}_{[l,m,s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[l,m,-s]})) \oplus \bigoplus_{[l,m,s],\, l\,\text{odd}} ((\mathcal{H}_{[l,m,s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[k-l,m,-s]})). \tag{3.26}$$

In both cases we have the $k + 2$ Ishibashi states

$$|[l, 0, s]\rangle\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{[l,0,s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[l,0,-s]}, \tag{3.27}$$

where l and s are both even, as well as the two Ishibashi states

$$|[k/2, 0, s]\rangle\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{[k/2,0,s]} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{[k/2,0,-s]}, \qquad k/2 + s = \text{even}. \tag{3.28}$$

We therefore expect to have $k/2 + 2$ boundary states of each spin structure. Some of these boundary states are given by

$$\|L, S\rangle\rangle = \sqrt{2k + 4} \sum_{l,s \text{ even}} \frac{S_{L0S,l0s}}{\sqrt{S_{000,l0s}}} |[l, 0, s]\rangle\rangle, \qquad (3.29)$$

where $L = 0, 1, \ldots, k$ with $L \neq k/2$ and S is defined modulo 4. We observe that

$$\|L, S\rangle\rangle = \|k - L, S\rangle\rangle = \|L, S + 2\rangle\rangle. \qquad (3.30)$$

For fixed spin structure (say S even) there are thus $k/2$ such boundary states. Their overlap equals

$$\langle\langle L_1, S_1 \| q^{L_0 + \bar{L}_0 - \frac{c}{12}} \| L_2, S_2\rangle\rangle = \sum_{[l,m,s]} \chi_{(l,m,s)}(\tilde{q}) \delta^{(2)}(S_2 + s - S_1)\left(N_{L_2 l}{}^{L_1} + N_{L_2 k - l}{}^{L_1}\right).$$

Thus the open string spectrum on the brane $\|L, S\rangle\rangle$ has $2(L + 1)$ topological states; the same is true for the open string between the $\|L, S\rangle\rangle$ brane and its anti-brane.

The remaining two boundary states are then

$$\|k/2, S, \pm\rangle\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\|k/2, S\rangle\rangle_{(3.29)} \pm \sqrt{\frac{k + 2}{4}} \sum_s e^{-i\pi Ss/2} |[k/2, 0, s]\rangle\rangle, \qquad (3.31)$$

where the sum over s runs over 0, 2 if $k/2$ is even, and over ± 1 if $k/2$ is odd. For $k/2$ odd, these two branes are anti-branes of one another, i.e. $\|k/2, S, +\rangle\rangle = \|k/2, S + 2, -\rangle\rangle$, and their overlaps equal

$$\langle\langle k/2, S_1, \pm \| q^{L_0 + \bar{L}_0 - \frac{c}{12}} \| k/2, S_2, \pm\rangle\rangle$$
$$= \sum_{[l,m,s],l \text{ even}} \chi_{(l,m,s)}(\tilde{q}) \delta^{(2)}(S_2 + s - S_1) \delta^{(4)}(l + S_2 + s - S_1).$$

There are then $(k + 2)/4$ topological states in the open string spectrum of each of these branes, and $(k + 2)/4$ topological states in the open string spectrum between the brane and the anti-brane.

For $k/2$ even, on the other hand, each of the two branes $\|k/2, S, \pm\rangle\rangle = \|k/2, S + 2, \pm\rangle\rangle$ is its own anti-brane. In this case their overlaps equal

$$\langle\langle k/2, S_1, \pm \| q^{L_0 + \bar{L}_0 - \frac{c}{12}} \| k/2, S_2, \pm\rangle\rangle = \sum_{[l,m,s]} \chi_{(l,m,s)}(\tilde{q}) \delta^{(2)}(S_2 + s - S_1) \delta^{(4)}(l),$$

$$\langle\langle k/2, S_1, \pm \| q^{L_0 + \bar{L}_0 - \frac{c}{12}} \| k/2, S_2, \mp\rangle\rangle = \sum_{[l,m,s]} \chi_{(l,m,s)}(\tilde{q}) \delta^{(2)}(S_2 + s - S_1) \delta^{(4)}(l + 2).$$

In this case there are $k/4 + 1$ topological states in the open string spectrum of either of these two branes, and $k/4$ topological states in the open string between the two different branes.

4. The matrix factorization description

We now want to describe the matrix factorizations that correspond to the above boundary states. As for the case of the A-type minimal model, the two different GSO projections correspond to two different superpotentials. We shall now discuss them in turn.

4.1. The first D-model

The theory whose boundary states we discussed in sections 3.1 and 3.2 corresponds to the superpotential

$$W_D = x^{n+1} - xy^2, \tag{4.1}$$

where $n = k/2$. Its matrix factorizations have partially been studied in [4], but, as we shall see, the list of factorizations given there is incomplete. If we include another class of factorizations, we obtain perfect agreement with the conformal field theory results described above. Given that these boundary states generate all boundary states of the superconformal field theory, we can turn the argument around and conclude that we have identified all fundamental factorizations for this potential, i.e. that any factorization is equivalent to a direct sum of these fundamental factorizations.

4.1.1. Rank 1 factorizations. We start with a discussion of the rank 1 factorizations, all of which have been discussed in [4]. The most obvious factorization is

$$\mathcal{R}_0: \quad d_0 = x^n - y^2, \qquad d_1 = x, \tag{4.2}$$

as well as its reverse. The bosonic spectrum of either factorization consists of two states, whereas the fermionic spectrum is empty. The only boundary states with two bosons and no fermions in their open string spectrum are the $L = 0$ and $L = k$ boundary states of (3.5) and (3.14), respectively. They must therefore correspond to the above factorization (and its reverse).

Generically this is the only rank 1 factorization, but if n is even, there are in addition the two resolved rank 1 factorizations, given by

$$\mathcal{R}_+: \quad d_0 = (x^{n/2} + y), \qquad d_1 = x(x^{n/2} - y),$$
$$\mathcal{R}_-: \quad d_0 = x(x^{n/2} + y), \qquad d_1 = (x^{n/2} - y),$$

as well as their reverses. Either of these factorizations has a purely bosonic spectrum consisting of $n/2+1$ states, and there are $n/2$ fermionic operators propagating between $\mathcal{R}_+$ and $\mathcal{R}_-$. Given that $n/2 = k/4$, this matches precisely with the spectrum of the resolved branes described in section 3.2.1 that also only exist provided that $k/2$ is even.

4.1.2. Rank 2 factorizations. Next we turn to the rank 2 factorizations. In [4] the factorizations of the form

$$d_0 = \begin{pmatrix} x^l & \alpha \\ -\beta & -x^{n+1-l} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad d_1 = \begin{pmatrix} x^{n+1-l} & \alpha \\ -\beta & -x^l \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \alpha\beta = xy^2 \tag{4.3}$$

were considered. Exchanging l with $n + 1 - l$ amounts to exchanging d_0 and d_1, and hence to considering the reverse factorization. The same holds for the exchange of α and β. The only two inequivalent choices for α, β are therefore $\beta = x$ or $\beta = y$. As was shown in [4] the choice $\beta = x$ leads to a class of factorizations that is equivalent to the direct sum of the factorization (4.2) and its reverse. This leaves us with the factorizations

$$\mathcal{S}_l: \quad d_0 = \begin{pmatrix} x^l & xy \\ -y & -x^{n+1-l} \end{pmatrix} \qquad d_1 = \begin{pmatrix} x^{n+1-l} & xy \\ -y & -x^l \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.4}$$

where $l = 1, \ldots, n$. One easily finds that the factorization $\mathcal{S}_l$ has $2l$ bosons and $2l$ fermions. Comparing with the conformal field theory analysis, one would then like to identify the factorization $\mathcal{S}_l$ with the boundary state (3.5) or (3.14) with $L = 2l - 1$. Note that $l \mapsto n + 1 - l$, which maps the factorization to the reverse factorization, then corresponds to

$L = 2l - 1 \mapsto k - L$, which maps the brane to the anti-brane. (If $k/2$ is even, the anti-brane of $\|L, M, 0\rangle\!\rangle$ is $\|k - L, M, 2\rangle\!\rangle$, while for $k/2$ odd it is $\|k - L, M, 0\rangle\!\rangle$.)

As is clear from the conformal field theory analysis, the above factorizations do not yet account for all branes since there are also the boundary states (3.5) or (3.14) with L even. The corresponding class of factorizations can directly be obtained from the factorizations (2.21) of the A-type minimal model with potential $W_{A'} = x^n - y^2$: since $W_D = x(x^n - y^2) = x W_{A'}$, one obtains a factorization for the D-model by multiplying the matrix d_1 of any A-model factorization by x. This leads to the following factorizations:

$$\mathcal{T}_l: \quad d_0^D = \begin{pmatrix} x^l & y \\ -y & -x^{n-l} \end{pmatrix} = d_0^{A'}, \qquad d_1^D = \begin{pmatrix} x^{n-l+1} & xy \\ -xy & -x^{l+1} \end{pmatrix} = x d_1^{A'}. \tag{4.5}$$

Here $l = 0, \ldots, n$, and the factorization $\mathcal{T}_l$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{T}_{n-l}$, but neither is equivalent to $\mathcal{T}_l^r$. We now propose that the factorization $\mathcal{T}_l$ corresponds to the boundary state (3.5) or (3.14) with $L = 2l$. To confirm this proposal, we have to determine the spectrum of these factorizations.

The calculation of the fermionic part of the spectrum proceeds exactly as in the case of the A-model. For this, consider a fermion described by its two components (t_0, t_1). BRST invariance means that

$$t_0 d_1^D = -d_0^D t_1, \tag{4.6}$$

which can be solved by

$$t_1 = -\frac{1}{W_D} d_1^D t_0 d_1^D. \tag{4.7}$$

This requires, of course, that the entries of the matrix appearing on the right-hand side are all divisible by W_D. In terms of the A-model data, this equation can be rewritten as

$$t_1 = -x \frac{x}{W_D} d_1^{A'} t_0 d_1^{A'} = -x \frac{1}{W_{A'}} d_1^{A'} t_0 d_1^{A'}, \tag{4.8}$$

where W_D/x is the A-model potential $W_{A'}$. Without the additional factor of x on the right-hand side, this condition is simply the A-model result, implying a divisibility condition for the entries of the matrix $d_1^{A'} t_0 d_1^{A'}$. Since x does not divide $W_{A'}$ the divisibility conditions of the A- and D-model are therefore equivalent.

Any solution for t_0 is BRST trivial if

$$t_0 = -\phi_1 d_0^D + d_0 \phi_0^D. \tag{4.9}$$

Since $d_0^D = d_0^{A'}$ it is obvious that the fermionic part of the spectrum for the A- and D-model is the same for this class of factorizations. Thus there are $2l$ fermions for the factorization $\mathcal{T}_l$.

Let us now turn to the bosonic spectrum. The condition for an operator (ϕ_0, ϕ_1) to be BRST invariant is

$$d_1^D \phi_1 = \phi_0 d_1^D, \tag{4.10}$$

which is the same condition as in the A-model. Solving for ϕ_0, one obtains the divisibility condition

$$\phi_0^D = \frac{1}{W_D} d_1^D \phi_1 d_0^D = \frac{1}{W_{A'}} d_1^{A'} \phi_0 d_0^{A'}, \tag{4.11}$$

which is explicitly (since $\mathcal{T}_l \equiv \mathcal{T}_{n-l}$ we may assume that $l \leqslant n/2$)

$$y(\phi_1^{11} - \phi_1^{22}) + x^l \phi_1^{21} - x^{n-l} \phi_1^{12} = 0 \qquad \mod W_{A'}, \tag{4.12}$$

where ϕ_1^{ij} denote the matrix elements of the 2×2 matrix ϕ_1. The possible solutions for ϕ_1 are further restricted by the requirement that the operator is BRST non-trivial. BRST trivial

operators can be written in the form (see (2.6))

$$\phi_1^{11} = t_0^{11} x^{n-l+1} - t_0^{12} xy + x^l t_1^{11} + y t_1^{21} \tag{4.13}$$

$$\phi_1^{12} = t_0^{11} xy - t_0^{12} x^{l+1} + x^l t_1^{12} + y t_1^{22} \tag{4.14}$$

$$\phi_1^{21} = t_0^{21} x^{n-l+1} - t_0^{22} xy - y t_1^{11} - x^{n-l} t_1^{21} \tag{4.15}$$

$$\phi_1^{22} = t_0^{21} xy - t_0^{22} x^{l+1} - y t_1^{12} - x^{n-l} t_1^{22}. \tag{4.16}$$

One can now use the freedom in t_1 to restrict the powers of x appearing in the representatives of the BRST cohomology classes to lie in the range $0, \ldots, l - 1$ (for ϕ_1^{11} and ϕ_1^{12})) and $0, \ldots, n - l - 1$ (for ϕ_1^{21} and ϕ_1^{22})). On the other hand, this then uses up the freedom described by t_1, and in particular, the y-dependence of the solution cannot be eliminated any longer. Indeed, in addition to the obvious x-dependent solutions (that are as for the A-model, see (2.22))

$$a_i = \begin{pmatrix} x^i & 0 \\ 0 & x^i \end{pmatrix}, \qquad a_{l+i} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x^i \\ x^{n-2l+i} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad i = 0, \ldots, l - 1, \quad (4.17)$$

there are now the following two non-trivial solutions (for ϕ_1)

$$b_1 = \begin{pmatrix} y & 0 \\ 0 & y \end{pmatrix} \qquad \text{and} \qquad b_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y \\ yx^{n-2l} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.18}$$

This means, in particular, that there are two more bosons than fermions for each factorization $\mathcal{T}_l$. This is then in perfect agreement with the conformal field theory spectra (3.8) and (3.9) for the branes with $L = 2l$.

In summary, we therefore propose the identifications:

Boundary state	Matrix factorization	
$\|0, M, S\rangle\rangle$	$\mathcal{R}_0, \mathcal{R}_0^r$	
$\|2l - 1, M, S\rangle\rangle$	$\mathcal{S}_l, \mathcal{S}_l^r$	$l = 1, \ldots, [(n + 1)/2]$
$\|2l, M, S\rangle\rangle$	$\mathcal{T}_l, \mathcal{T}_l^r$	$l = 0, \ldots, [n/2]$
$\|k/2, M, S, \pm\rangle\rangle$	$\mathcal{R}_\pm, \mathcal{R}_\pm^r$	n even

As a consistency check we note that we have now identified the boundary state with $L = 0$ with two factorizations, namely with $\mathcal{R}_0$ and with $\mathcal{T}_0$. Thus we need to have that these two factorizations are actually equivalent (in the sense of (2.10)), and this is indeed easily checked. Furthermore, for $k/2 = n$ even, the boundary state $\|k/2, M, S\rangle\rangle$ is not fundamental, but can be resolved as explained in section 3.2.1. We have identified these resolved branes with the factorizations $\mathcal{R}_\pm$; thus we expect that for n even the factorization $\mathcal{T}_{n/2}$ is equivalent to the direct sum of $\mathcal{R}_+$ and $\mathcal{R}_-$, and this is also straightforwardly confirmed.

Another consistency check concerns the various flows of D-brane configurations. By switching on suitable tachyons, one can show that there are flows from the point of view of the matrix factorization (such flows were first discussed, for the case of the A-model, in [16])

$$\mathcal{R}_0 \oplus \mathcal{R}_0^r \to \mathcal{S}_1 \qquad \mathcal{S}_l \oplus \mathcal{R}_0 \to \mathcal{T}_l \qquad \mathcal{T}_l \oplus \mathcal{R}_0^r \to \mathcal{S}_{l+1}.$$

These flows are easily seen to be compatible with the RR-charges of the corresponding boundary states. They are also in agreement with what one expects based on the analysis of [17]. Finally, we note that the $L = 0$-brane (together with the two resolved branes if n is even) generates all D-brane charges since all D-branes (except for the resolved branes) can be obtained from it by the above flows. The corresponding matrix factorizations of these three D-branes all have rank 1. This is similar to the situation for the tensor product of two A-models where the permutation branes (whose factorizations also have rank 1) generate all the charges [13].

4.2. The other D-model

Finally we consider the superpotential

$$W_{D'} = x^{n+1} - xy^2 - z^2 \qquad (4.19)$$

that should correspond, following the logic of [4], to the D-model with the other GSO projection that was discussed in section 3.3. The easiest class of factorizations of this model is of tensor product type: for any factorization of W_D one obtains a factorization of $W_{D'}$, where one factorizes z^2 as $z^2 = zz$. Since the spectrum on a brane with superpotential $W = z^2$ consists of the identity $\phi_0 = \phi_1 = 1$ and a fermion $t_0 = -t_1 = 1$, it is very simple to calculate the spectrum of these factorizations. The number of bosons is simply given by the sum of the number of bosons and fermions of the corresponding factorization of the D-model W_D. The same holds for the number of fermions. In particular, the number of bosons always equals the number of fermions for any factorization of this type.

We now propose that we can identify the boundary states (3.29) with these tensor product factorizations. As is explained in section 3.3, each of these branes has $2(L + 1)$ topological states in its open string spectrum (irrespective of whether L is even or odd), and the same is true for the open string between the brane and its anti-brane. This then matches precisely with the above spectrum of the corresponding tensor product factorizations, given our previous identifications of the boundary states with the matrix factorizations for the W_D model: in particular, the sum of the number of bosons and fermions in (3.8) and (3.9) is precisely equal to $2(L + 1)$ for all L.

The analysis works similarly for the two resolved branes $\|k/2, S, \pm\rangle\rangle$ for $k/2$ even. This leaves us with identifying the resolved brane $\|k/2, S, \pm\rangle\rangle$ for $n = k/2$ odd, which does not come from such a tensor factorization. For n odd there are however additional factorizations of the form

$$d_0 = \begin{pmatrix} x^{\frac{n+1}{2}} - z & \alpha \\ -\beta & -\left(x^{\frac{n+1}{2}} + z\right) \end{pmatrix}, \qquad d_1 = \begin{pmatrix} x^{\frac{n+1}{2}} + z & \alpha \\ -\beta & -\left(x^{\frac{n+1}{2}} - z\right) \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \alpha\beta = xy^2.$$
$$(4.20)$$

Exchanging α and β maps the factorization to its reverse, and thus effectively the only inequivalent choices are $\beta = x$ and $\beta = y$. As before for the case of the D-model, one may expect that $\beta = x$ is in some sense trivial, and indeed one can show that this factorization is equivalent to the tensor product factorization corresponding to the D-model factorization $\mathcal{R}_0$,

$$d_0 = \begin{pmatrix} x^n - y^2 & z \\ -z & -x \end{pmatrix}, \qquad d_1 = \begin{pmatrix} x & z \\ -z & -(x^n - y^2) \end{pmatrix}. \qquad (4.21)$$

On the other hand, the topological spectrum of the factorization (4.20) with $\beta = y$ has $(n+1)/2$ bosonic and fermionic states, which thus agrees with the result of section 3.3.

We have therefore also managed to identify the boundary states of this D-model with the factorizations of the superpotential $W_{D'}$. Since we know that the boundary states we have described generate all possible boundary states, the same must be true for the above factorizations.

5. Matrix factorizations and singularity theory

Matrix factorizations are also a well-known tool in the theory of singularities in mathematics. In the case of complex dimension two, the simple singularities are known to have an ADE

classification. The relevant singularities are described by hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^3$ characterized by the equations[2]

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_{n-1}: & \quad W = x^n - yz = 0 \\
D_{n+2}: & \quad W = x^{n+1} - xy^2 - z^2 = 0 \\
E_6: & \quad W = x^4 + y^3 + z^2 = 0 \\
E_7: & \quad W = yx^3 + y^3 + z^2 = 0 \\
E_8: & \quad W = x^5 + y^3 + z^2 = 0.
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.1}
$$

The resolution of the singularities is obtained by blow-ups, where each node of the associated ADE Dynkin diagram corresponds to an exceptional divisor. For the case of these simple surface singularities, the explicit description of the blow-up can be encoded in a matrix factorization of the polynomial W defining the hypersurface [18–20].

D-branes on such singular geometries have recently been discussed in [9]. There it was proposed to define a category D_{Sg} that is supposed to capture the topological sector of B-type branes on singular spaces. On smooth manifolds, any coherent sheaf has a finite resolution of locally free sheaves of finite type. On singular spaces this is no longer the case and Orlov defined D_{Sg} to be the quotient of the bounded derived category of coherent sheaves modulo those sheaves that have such a finite resolution. It is shown in [9] that this category is equivalent to the category of matrix factorizations; in particular, any object in D_{Sg} corresponds to a matrix factorization, and the open string spectrum that is described in D_{Sg} in terms of morphisms of modules describing the branes, corresponds exactly to the BRST invariant spectrum of the Landau Ginzburg theory. More precisely, consider a Landau Ginzburg potential $W : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$ with an isolated critical point at the origin. (In our case the relevant LG potentials are $W_{ADE} : \mathbb{C}^3 \to \mathbb{C}$, and thus describe precisely the singular hupersurfaces of (5.1).) Denoting the fibre of W over 0 by S_0, [9] allows us to establish a relation between $D_{Sg}(S_0)$ and the Landau Ginzburg category. For this, we associate with any factorization $W = d_0 d_1$

$$
\left(P_1 \underset{d_0}{\overset{d_1}{\rightleftarrows}} P_0 \right)
$$

the short exact sequence

$$
0 \longrightarrow P_1 \xrightarrow{d_1} P_0 \longrightarrow \operatorname{Coker} d_1 \longrightarrow 0.
\tag{5.2}
$$

The geometrical object associated with the factorization is then the sheaf $\operatorname{Coker} d_1$, which, since it is annihilated by W, is a sheaf on S_0. For further details on this functor and mathematical proofs, we refer to [9].

5.1. Singular geometry versus Landau Ginzburg model

As we have just seen, the very same matrix factorizations that describe B-type D-branes in the Landau Ginzburg theory with superpotential W also characterize the B-type D-branes of the singular hypersurface $W = 0$ and its possible resolutions. Despite their formal similarities, these two descriptions are however rather different: string theory on the singular geometry is, in sigma-model language, a singular limit of a theory with $c = 6$ that has no well-behaved conformal field theory description. On the other hand, the Landau Ginzburg model flows to a perfectly well-defined conformal field theory, namely the $N = 2$ minimal model with $c = 3k/(k+2)$.

---

[2] By a change of variables one can also rewrite the first equation as $W = x^n - y^2 - z^2 = 0$.

From the closed string point of view the relation between singular geometries and $N = 2$ conformal field theories has been studied before in [21–24]. In particular, characteristic properties of the Landau Ginzburg model, such as the central charge and the chiral ring, have been compared with concepts appearing in singularity theory (singularity index, local ring of W). The agreement of the matrix factorizations thus provides a natural extension of this correspondence to the open string sector. Since the matrix factorizations determine (the topological part of the) open string spectrum, this may even suggest that the B-type D-branes of the Landau Ginzburg model (or of the $N = 2$ minimal model) provide a worldsheet description of the D-branes that become massless in the singular geometry.

5.2. Singular geometry versus the orbifold description

String theory compactified on a singular surface does not have a well-defined perturbation theory since at the singular point non-perturbative (D-brane) states become massless. However, it is possible to give a well-defined conformal field theory description for a closely related background where a nonzero B-field has been switched on for all singular cycles. (This B-field prevents the D-branes from becoming massless in the singular limit, and therefore avoids the breakdown of string perturbation theory [25, 26].) The relevant conformal field theory is the orbifold theory $\mathbb{C}^2/\Gamma$, where Γ is a finite subgroup of $SU(2)$. Orbifold theories are well behaved, and it is known how to describe their D-branes. In particular, following [10], the different D-branes are in essence characterized by the representation of the orbifold group Γ that acts on the corresponding Chan-Paton indices. The charges are then generated by the branes that are associated with the non-trivial irreducible representations of Γ. If we associate with each such representation a node of a (Dynkin) diagram, and connect nodes if the open string between the corresponding D-branes has a (massless) hypermultiplet in its spectrum, we recover precisely again the corresponding ADE Dynkin diagrams. Furthermore, the dimension of the irreducible representation of Γ equals the Kac-label of the corresponding node. This suggests, in particular, that the orbifold description captures at least some of the structure of the geometry described by $W = 0$.

Since the fundamental D-branes of the orbifold theory also give rise to the same ADE Dynkin diagram, they should be in natural one-to-one correspondence with the matrix factorizations of the LG potential[3]. In fact this relation can be understood fairly directly. As described in [27] following the ideas of [19, 20], for each irreducible representation of Γ one can find a module of the Γ-invariant part of $\mathbb{C}[X, Y]$. Unless the representation of Γ is trivial, these modules are not free, and the relations among the generators of the module can be described by a matrix. This is then precisely the matrix that appears as one factor of the matrix factorization. For the two cases of interest in this paper, this can be done explicitly as follows.

5.2.1. A-type singularity.
In the case of A-type singularities, the generator of the orbifold group acts on $\mathbb{C}^2$ as

$$gX = \xi X, \qquad gY = \xi^{-1}Y, \qquad \xi = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}. \tag{5.3}$$

The singular surface can be described by the polynomial subring in the two variables X, Y that is invariant under the orbifold action. This invariant subring is generated by $x = XY$, $y = Y^n$ and $z = X^n$. These polynomials are however not independent, but satisfy the equation $x^n - yz = 0$, which is just the singular hypersurface equation of the A-type singularity.

---

[3] However, the open string spectra should not (and do not) agree: because of the resolution certain massless open string states of the Landau Ginzburg theory become massive in the orbifold theory.

The orbifold group Γ is in this case $\mathbb{Z}_n$, which has $n - 1$ irreducible non-trivial representations. All of these representations are one-dimensional: for $l = 1, \ldots, n - 1$ the corresponding representation associates with the generating element $g \in \Gamma$ the phase $e^{\frac{2\pi i l}{n}}$.

These $n - 1$ representations are then in one-to-one correspondence to the matrix factorizations of the Landau Ginzburg potential (2.13), or equivalently, the boundary states of the minimal model (2.15), whose label take values $L = l - 1 = 0, \ldots, k = n - 2$.[4] As explained in [27] we can associate with each representation of Γ a module for the invariant part of the polynomial ring in two variables. For example, for the representation labelled by l the corresponding module is generated by X^l and Y^{n-l}. This is not a free module since we have the relations between the generators $s_1 = Y^{n-l}$, $s_2 = X^l$:

$$x^l s_1 - y s_2 = 0, \qquad -z s_1 + x^{n-l} s_2 = 0. \tag{5.4}$$

The matrix of relations

$$d_1 = \begin{pmatrix} x^l & -y \\ -z & x^{n-l} \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.5}$$

is then one of the matrices appearing in the matrix factorization. Conversely, we can apply the functor of Orlov and recover the module (and thus the representation of Γ) from the factorization.

5.2.2. D-type singularity.
The D-type minimal model corresponds to the case where the orbifold is a binary dihedral group. Its two generators act on $\mathbb{C}^2$ as

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} \beta & 0 \\ 0 & \beta^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad h = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \text{where} \quad \beta = e^{\frac{\pi i}{n}} \tag{5.6}$$

and satisfy the relations

$$g^{2n} = \mathbf{1}, \qquad h^2 = g^n, \qquad h g h^{-1} = g^{-1}. \tag{5.7}$$

The ring of invariant polynomials under the group is generated by

$$x = (XY)^2, \qquad y = \frac{1}{2}(X^{2n} + Y^{2n}), \qquad z = \frac{i}{2}(XY)(X^{2n} - Y^{2n}), \tag{5.8}$$

which satisfy the D-type hypersurface equation $x^{n+1} - xy^2 - z^2 = 0$. Generically, the irreducible representations of this group are two dimensional, with

$$\rho^{(l)}(g) = \begin{pmatrix} \beta^l & 0 \\ 0 & \beta^{-l} \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.9}$$

and

$$\rho^{(l)}(h) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (l \text{ odd}), \qquad \rho^{(l)}(h) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (l \text{ even}). \tag{5.10}$$

Here $l = 0, 1, \ldots, 2n - 1$, and the representations $\rho^{(l)}$ and $\rho^{(2n-l)}$ are equivalent. Furthermore, the representations $\rho^{(0)}$ and $\rho^{(n)}$ are not irreducible but can be further decomposed into one-dimensional representations: $\rho^{(0)}$ contains the trivial representation and the one where $g \to 1, h \to -1$. Likewise, $\rho^{(n)}$ can be decomposed into the two one dimensional irreducible representations $g \to -1$ and $h \to \pm 1$ (l even) or $h \to \pm i$ (l odd).

These representations are exactly in one-to-one correspondence with the boundary states of section 3.3, or equivalently the matrix factorizations of section 4.2. More explicitly,

---

[4] The superpotential $W = x^n - yz$ (that is equivalent by a change of variables to $W = x^n - y^2 - z^2$) differs from $W_A = x^n$ by changing the GSO projection twice. One would therefore expect that these two superpotentials are equivalent. From the point of view of singularity theory this equivalence is known as Knörrer periodicity [28].

the representation $\rho^{(l)}$ precisely corresponds to the boundary state with $L = l$. Since $n = k/2$, the reducible representation $\rho^{(n)}$ corresponds then to the non-fundamental brane with $L = k/2$ which can be resolved into two boundary states (that correspond in turn to the two one-dimensional representations with $g \mapsto -1$). Also the identification $\rho^{(l)} \simeq \rho^{(2n-l)}$ mirrors the equivalence of boundary states (3.30). As in the A-case, one can also relate these representations to certain modules of the invariant algebra $\mathbb{C}[X, Y]^\Gamma$, and obtain the corresponding matrix factorizations in this manner (see [27]). It is maybe remarkable that the blow-ups that correspond to the one-dimensional representations of Γ are quite different to those that are associated with the two-dimensional representations.

For completeness we should also mention yet another class of models with $c = 6$ describing the motion of strings on ALE spaces. In this approach (which is due to [29]), the minimal models are tensored with another theory that contributes the missing central charge to get $c = 6$. To be more precise, [29] consider the tensor product of two coset theories $SL(2, \mathbb{R})/U(1) \times SU(2)/U(1)$, and orbifold by an appropriate discrete group to impose the charge integrality condition. In terms of Landau Ginzburg potentials, these models can be written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_{n-1}: \quad & W = -\mu t^{-n} + x^n - yz = 0 \\
D_{n/2+1}: \quad & W = -\mu t^{-n} + x^{n/2} - xy^2 - z^2 = 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}
$$

which are again subject to an integer charge projection. As argued in [29], the value of the B-field in these models is 0, but now $\mu \neq 0$, and we are therefore discussing the resolved geometry. The D-branes of this model have been investigated in [30, 31]. If one wants to consider B-type D-branes in these models, one can effectively reduce the discussion to A-type D-branes in the minimal model part. The reason is that the orbifold procedure (followed by the mirror map) maps A-type to B-type branes, and, as noted in [30, 31], the contribution of the non-compact coset can be captured by universal factors. Since this description effectively involves the A-type D-branes of the minimal model, the relation to matrix factorizations and branes in the singular geometry is however less evident.

Acknowledgments

References

[1] Kapustin A and Li Y 2003 D-branes in Landau-Ginzburg models and algebraic geometry *J. High Energy Phys.* JHEP12(2003)005 (*Preprint* hep-th/0210296)
[2] Brunner I, Herbst M, Lerche W and Scheuner B 2003 Landau-Ginzburg realization of open string TFT (*Preprint* hep-th/0305133)
[3] Kapustin A and Li Y 2004 Topological correlators in Landau-Ginzburg models with boundaries *ATMP* **7** 727 (*Preprint* hep-th/0305136)
[4] Kapustin A and Li Y 2004 D-branes in topological minimal models: the Landau-Ginzburg approach *J. High Energy Phys.* JHEP07(2004)045 (*Preprint* hep-th/0306001)
[5] Lazaroiu C I 2003 On the boundary coupling of topological Landau-Ginzburg models (*Preprint* hep-th/0312286)
[6] Herbst M and Lazaroiu C I 2004 Localization and traces in open-closed topological Landau-Ginzburg models (*Preprint* hep-th/0404184)
[7] Hori K and Walcher J 2005 F-term equations near gepner points *J. High Energy Phys.* JHEP01(2005)008 (*Preprint* hep-th/0404196)

[8]   Hori K and Walcher J 2004 D-branes from matrix factorisations *C. R. Phys.* **5** 1061 (*Preprint* hep-th/0409204)
[9]   Orlov D 2003 Triangulated categories of singularities and D-branes in Landau-Ginzburg models (*Preprint* math.AG/0302304)
[10] Douglas M R and Moore G W 1996 D-branes, Quivers, and ALE Instantons (*Preprint* hep-th/ 9603167)
[11] Johnson C V and Myers R C 1997 Aspects of type IIB theory on ALE spaces *Phys. Rev.* D **55** 6382 (*Preprint* hep-th/9610140)
[12] Herbst M, Lazaroiu C I and Lerche W 2004 Superpotentials, A(infinity) relations and WDVV equations for open topological strings (*Preprint* hep-th/0402110)
[13] Brunner I and Gaberdiel M R 2005 Matrix factorisations and permutation branes *J. High Energy Phys.* 0507 012 *Preprint* hep-th/0503207
[14] Maldacena J, Moore G and Seiberg N 2001 Geometrical interpretation of D-branes in gauged WZW models *J. High Energy Phys.* JHEP07(2001)046 (*Preprint* hep-th/0105038)
[15] Ashok S K, Dell'Aquila E and Diaconescu D E 2004 Fractional branes in Landau-Ginzburg orbifolds (*Preprint* hep-th/0401135)
[16] Herbst M, Lazaroiu C I and Lerche W 2004 D-brane effective action and tachyon condensation in topological minimal models (*Preprint* hep-th/0405138)
[17] Fredenhagen S 2003 Organizing boundary RG flows *Nucl. Phys.* B **660** 436 (*Preprint* hep-th/0301229)
[18] Eisenbud D 1980 Homological algebra on a complete intersection with application to group representations *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **260** 35
[19] Yoshino Y 1990 *Cohen-Macaulay Modules over Cohen-Macaulay Rings (LMS Lecture Notes* vol 146*)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
[20] Gonzalez-Springberg G and Verdier J-L 1981 Points doubles et répresentations de groupes *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I. Math.* **293** 111
[21] Vafa C and Warner N P 1989 Catastrophes and the classification of conformal theories *Phys. Lett.* B **218** 51
[22] Warner N P 1991 *Lectures on N = 2 Superconformal Theories and Singularity Theory: 'Superstrings '89', Proc. Trieste Spring School (3–14 Apr. 1989)* ed M B Green *et al* (Singapore: World Scientific)
[23] Lerche W, Vafa C and Warner N P 1989 Chiral rings in $n = 2$ superconformal theories *Nucl. Phys.* B **324** 427
[24] Martinec E J 1990 Criticality, catastrophes and compactifications *Physics and Mathematics of Strings* Memorial volume for V G Knizhnik ed L Brink *et al* (Singapore: World Scientific)
[25] Aspinwall P S 1995 Enhanced gauge symmetries and k3 surfaces *Phys. Lett.* B **357** 329 (*Preprint* hep-th/ 9507012)
[26] Aspinwall P S 1996 K3 surfaces and string duality (*Preprint* hep-th/9611137)
[27] Curto C 2005 Matrix model superpotentials and Calabi-Yau spaces: an ADE classification (*Preprint* math.AG/ 0505111)
[28] Knörrer H 1987 Cohen-Macaulay modules on hypersurface singularities: I *Invent. Math.* **88** 153
[29] Ooguri H and Vafa C 1996 Two-dimensional black hole and singularities of CY manifolds *Nucl. Phys.* B **463** 55 (*Preprint* hep-th/9511164)
[30] Lerche W 2000 On a boundary CFT description of nonperturbative $N = 2$ Yang–Mills theory (*Preprint* hep-th/0006100)
[31] Lerche W, Lütken C A and Schweigert C 2002 D-branes on ALE spaces and the ADE classification of conformal field theories *Nucl. Phys.* B **622** 269 (*Preprint* hep-th/0006247)