

An Attempt for a Double Copy Formulation of Heterotic DFT

Rasim Yılmaz*

*Department of Physics, Faculty of Arts and Sciences
Middle East Technical University, 06800, Ankara, Türkiye*

(Dated: April 1, 2025)

It has been shown that double field theory (DFT) action can be constructed in a perturbative manner up to cubic order by using double copy of Yang-Mills. This construction can also be extended by starting with higher-derivative Yang-Mills theory to obtain higher-derivative DFT action. In this work, I try to use this classical double copy formulation for Abelian subsector of heterotic DFT, starting with a Yang-Mills theory including a charged scalar field, namely $(YM + \phi^3)$ theory. Although the methods I used cannot give an exact match, they give some promising results.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Bern-Carrasco-Johansson (BCJ) double copy [1, 2] is a remarkable correspondence between gauge theories, such as Yang-Mills theory, and gravity. Originally discovered in the study of scattering amplitudes, this duality reveals deep structural similarities between these seemingly different physical theories. The double copy states that gravitational amplitudes can be obtained by "squaring" gauge theory amplitudes, providing a powerful method for simplifying complex gravity calculations.

The origins of the double copy can be traced back to the Kawai-Lewellen-Tye (KLT) relations [3], which connect string theory amplitudes for closed and open strings. In a field theory setting, this idea was refined into the BCJ duality, which expresses gauge theory amplitudes in a form that directly manifests their connection to gravity. Besides being in the center of modern amplitude program, the implications of double copy are also extended to the classical solutions (see [4–11]).

An interesting application of double copy idea on the action level is introduced in the work [12], which shows that perturbative double field theory (DFT) action can be written as double copy of Yang-Mills theory. DFT is a framework that makes T-duality manifest by treating both the usual spacetime coordinates and their duals on an equal footing (see [13–16]). This interesting relation between double copy and DFT is also studied in the level of classical solutions [17–19], higher derivative Yang-Mills theories [20–23], and gauge algebra structures [24–27].

In another interesting work, the authors try to extend the construction of DFT action by the double copy procedure to the higher derivative Yang-Mills theories [21]. Inspired by the work [5], which states that conformal gravity amplitudes can be obtained by a double copy of pure Yang-Mills theory and dimension-six theory

(Yang-Mills including a charged scalar), the authors of [21] try to construct a conformal DFT action in a perturbative manner. Then, they introduce a double copy procedure which starts with the dimension-six theory introduced in [5].

Following the same logic as in [21], in this work, I try to construct a double copy formulation for the Abelian subsector of heterotic DFT. Heterotic DFT is an extension of usual DFT formulation of the low-energy theory of the closed bosonic string to the heterotic string [28]. There are already some works on the literature about the double copy construction of heterotic DFT [19, 29, 30], which all use the Kerr-Schild ansatz. In this work, I do not use the Kerr-Schild ansatz for heterotic DFT.

The starting point of my work is inspired by the results of [11], which states that the amplitudes for a Yang-Mills-Einstein (YME) theory coupled to a dilaton and two-form field can be obtained by the double copy of pure Yang-Mills theory and Yang-Mills+ ϕ^3 ($YM + \phi^3$) theory. Following this work, I use this $YM + \phi^3$ theory introduced in [11] as a starting point and take its double copy with a pure Yang-Mills theory. Although I cannot obtain an exact match between my final terms and the terms in Abelian subsector of heterotic DFT, I obtain some promising results, which seems worth to follow.

II. DFT AS DOUBLE COPY OF YANG-MILLS THEORY

In this section, I review the usual construction of DFT action by a double copy procedure and introduce an alternative point of view for the same procedure. The alternative point of view does not offer something new and basically is not different from the usual procedure. However, it clarifies my notation for the following chapters and offer more clear understanding of double copy when one starts with two different Yang-Mills actions.

The action for the pure Yang-Mills theory in D -

* ryilmaz@metu.edu.tr

dimensions is given by,

$$S_{\text{YM}} = -\frac{1}{4} \int d^D x \kappa_{ab} F^{\mu\nu a} F_{\mu\nu}^b, \quad (1)$$

where the field strength is defined as

$$F_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu A_\nu^a - \partial_\nu A_\mu^a + g_{\text{YM}} f^a{}_{bc} A_\mu^b A_\nu^c, \quad (2)$$

with g_{YM} is the coupling constant and $f^a{}_{bc}$ are the structure constants. Expanding up to quadratic order, integrating by parts and passing to the momentum space by

$$A_\mu^a(k) \equiv \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{D/2}} \int d^D x A_\mu^a(x) e^{ikx}, \quad (3)$$

the action (1) takes the form

$$S_{\text{YM}}^{(2)} = -\frac{1}{2} \int_k \kappa_{ab} k^2 \Pi^{\mu\nu}(k) A_\mu^a(-k) A_\nu^b(k), \quad (4)$$

where $\int_k := \int d^D k$ and the projector is defined as

$$\Pi^{\mu\nu}(k) \equiv \eta^{\mu\nu} - \frac{k^\mu k^\nu}{k^2}. \quad (5)$$

Following [12], one can introduce the double copy maps,

$$A_\mu^a(k) \rightarrow e_{\mu\bar{\mu}}(k, \bar{k}) \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_{ab} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \bar{\Pi}^{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}}(\bar{k}). \quad (6)$$

Inserting these into the (4) and introducing the dilaton field by

$$\phi = \frac{1}{k^2} k^\mu \bar{k}^\nu e_{\mu\bar{\nu}}, \quad (7)$$

the action (4) becomes

$$S_{\text{DC}}^{(2)} = -\frac{1}{4} \int_{k, \bar{k}} (k^2 e^{\mu\bar{\nu}} e_{\mu\bar{\nu}} - k^\mu k^\rho e_{\mu\bar{\nu}} e_\rho^{\bar{\nu}} - \bar{k}^\nu \bar{k}^\sigma e_{\mu\bar{\nu}} e^\mu \bar{\sigma} - k^2 \phi^2 + 2\phi k^\mu \bar{k}^\nu e_{\mu\bar{\nu}}). \quad (8)$$

Passing to the position space, this action reads,

$$S_{\text{DC}}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{4} \int d^D x d^D \bar{x} (e^{\mu\bar{\nu}} \square e_{\mu\bar{\nu}} + \partial^\mu e_{\mu\bar{\nu}} \partial^\rho e_\rho^{\bar{\nu}} + \partial^{\bar{\nu}} e_{\mu\bar{\nu}} \bar{\partial}^{\bar{\sigma}} e^\mu \bar{\sigma} - \phi \square \phi + 2\phi \partial^\mu \bar{\partial}^\nu e_{\mu\bar{\nu}}), \quad (9)$$

which defines precisely the standard quadratic double field theory action. Similarly, one can start with the cubic part of the Yang-Mills action,

$$S_{\text{YM}}^{(3)} = -g_{\text{YM}} \int d^D x f_{abc} \partial^\mu A^{\nu a} A_\mu^b A_\nu^c, \quad (10)$$

and use double copy procedure to obtain the cubic part of the DFT action. Passing to the momentum space and writing the action more symmetrically, this cubic part (10) reads

$$S_{\text{YM}}^{(3)} = -\frac{ig_{\text{YM}}}{6(2\pi)^{D/2}} \int_{k_1, k_2, k_3} \delta(k_1 + k_2 + k_3) \times f_{abc} \Pi^{\mu\nu\rho}(k_1, k_2, k_3) A_{1\mu}^a A_{2\nu}^b A_{3\rho}^c, \quad (11)$$

where the projector is defined as

$$\Pi^{\mu\nu\rho}(k_1, k_2, k_3) \equiv \eta^{\mu\nu} k_{12}^\rho + \eta^{\nu\rho} k_{23}^\mu + \eta^{\rho\mu} k_{31}^\nu, \quad (12)$$

with $k_{ij} \equiv k_i - k_j$. This projector satisfies the same antisymmetry properties with the structure constant f_{abc} . Introducing the double copy map,

$$f_{abc} \rightarrow \frac{i}{4} \bar{\Pi}^{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\rho}}(\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2, \bar{k}_3), \quad (13)$$

inserting this to (11), passing to the position space and integrating by parts one obtains

$$S_{\text{DC}}^{(3)} = \frac{1}{8} \int d^D x d^D \bar{x} e_{\mu\bar{\mu}} [2\partial^\mu e_{\rho\bar{\rho}} \bar{\partial}^{\bar{\mu}} e^{\rho\bar{\rho}} - 2\partial^\mu e_{\nu\bar{\rho}} \bar{\partial}^{\bar{\rho}} e^{\nu\bar{\mu}} - 2\partial^\rho e^{\mu\bar{\rho}} \bar{\partial}^{\bar{\mu}} e_{\rho\bar{\rho}} + \partial^\rho e_{\rho\bar{\rho}} \bar{\partial}^{\bar{\rho}} e^{\mu\bar{\mu}} + \bar{\partial}_{\bar{\rho}} e^{\mu\bar{\rho}} \partial_\rho e^{\rho\bar{\mu}}]. \quad (14)$$

As it was shown in [12], this cubic action (14) agrees with the cubic DFT upon imposing a gauge-fixing condition and integrating out the dilaton.

One can also see this double copy procedure from an alternative point of view. The key observation is that while in the usual double copy procedure for scattering amplitudes one starts with two (same or different) Yang-Mills theories to obtain gravity amplitudes, the double copy procedure for DFT action does not start with two Yang-Mills actions explicitly and maps the color indices of one Yang-Mills action to the second set of indices in DFT. Of course, when one introduces a double copy procedure, it is understood that there are two Yang-Mills actions, even if they are not shown explicitly. However, I believe that, it is also important to fix the notation in a way that one can see two different Yang-Mills actions explicitly. Consider two Yang-Mills actions given by

$$S_{\text{YM1}} = - \int d^D x \left(\frac{1}{4} \kappa_{ab} F^{\mu\nu a} F_{\mu\nu}^b \right), \quad (15)$$

$$S_{\text{YM2}} = - \int d^D \bar{x} \left(\frac{1}{4} \bar{\kappa}_{ab} \bar{F}^{\alpha\beta a} \bar{F}_{\alpha\beta}^b \right),$$

where the field strength $F_{\mu\nu}^a$ defined in (2) and $\bar{F}_{\alpha\beta}^a$ is the field strength corresponding to gauge field \bar{A}_α^a . With these two actions, the structure of DFT action takes the form,

$$S_{\text{DFT}} \equiv S_{\text{YM1}} \otimes S_{\text{YM2}}. \quad (16)$$

Firstly, I consider the kinetic part of the DFT action, which corresponds to the double copy of quadratic parts of Yang-Mills actions. Passing to the momentum space, the quadratic parts of the Yang-Mills actions read,

$$S_{\text{YM1}}^{(2)} = -\frac{1}{2} \int_k \kappa_{ab} k^2 \Pi^{\mu\nu}(k) A_\mu^a(-k) A_\nu^b(k), \quad (17)$$

$$S_{\text{YM2}}^{(2)} = -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\bar{k}} \bar{\kappa}_{ab} \bar{k}^2 \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta}(\bar{k}) \bar{A}_\alpha^a(-\bar{k}) \bar{A}_\beta^b(\bar{k}).$$

By analogy of the usual double copy procedure for the scattering amplitudes, I replace the color factors in the

first action by the kinematic factors of the second action, which schematically can be shown as

$$\kappa_{ab} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta}(\bar{k}) \bar{A}_\alpha^a(-\bar{k}) \bar{A}_\beta^b(\bar{k}). \quad (18)$$

Since the projector $\Pi^{\mu\nu}$ is introduced in a way that it satisfies same symmetry properties with the color factor κ_{ab} , it encodes the color information and one can get rid of the color indices as it was offered in [4]. Then using the double copy prescription,

$$A_\mu(k) \bar{A}_\alpha(\bar{k}) \rightarrow e_{\mu\alpha}(k, \bar{k}), \quad (19)$$

and integrating in both coordinates, one gets

$$S_{DFT}^{(2)} \sim \int_{k, \bar{k}} k^2 \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta} \Pi^{\mu\nu}(k) e_{\mu\alpha}(-\bar{k}, \bar{k}) e_{\nu\beta}(-k, k). \quad (20)$$

As expected, this is exactly the same form which has been obtained in the usual double copy formulation of DFT. Of course this is not a suprising result, since basically I follow the same route in a different notation. Now, I move to the cubic part. The cubic parts of the Yang-Mills actions (15) are

$$\begin{aligned} S_{YM1}^{(3)} &= - \int d^D x g f_{abc} \partial^\mu A^{\nu a} A_\mu^b A_\nu^c, \\ S_{YM2}^{(3)} &= - \int d^D \bar{x} g \bar{f}_{abc} \bar{\partial}^\mu \bar{A}^{\nu a} \bar{A}_\mu^b \bar{A}_\nu^c. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Now, I replace the color factors of the first action by the kinematic factors of the second action. However, first one should write the second action in a more symmetric way so that its kinematic factors satisfy the same symmetry properties by analogy to the double copy of scattering amplitudes. In momentum space, the second action can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{YM2}^{(3)} &= - \frac{ig_{YM}}{6(2\pi)^{D/2}} \int_{\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2, \bar{k}_3} \delta(\bar{k}_1 + \bar{k}_2 + \bar{k}_3) \\ &\quad \times \bar{f}_{abc} \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}(\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2, \bar{k}_3) \bar{A}_{1\alpha}^a \bar{A}_{2\beta}^b \bar{A}_{3\gamma}^c, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where \bar{f}_{abc} and $\bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ satisfy the same symmetry properties. Writing the first action symmetrically, applying the double copy prescription schematically given by

$$f_{abc} \rightarrow \delta(\bar{k}_1 + \bar{k}_2 + \bar{k}_3) \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}(\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2, \bar{k}_3) \bar{A}_{1\alpha} \bar{A}_{2\beta} \bar{A}_{3\gamma}, \quad (23)$$

and integrating in double space, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} S_{DFT}^{(3)} &\sim \int dK_1 dK_2 dK_3 \delta(K_1 + K_2 + K_3) \\ &\quad \times \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}(\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2, \bar{k}_3) \Pi^{\mu\nu\rho}(k_1, k_2, k_3) e_{1\mu\alpha} e_{2\nu\beta} e_{3\rho\gamma}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

which is same with the one obtained in [12], where the notation $K \equiv (k, \bar{k})$ is used for double momenta together with $dK \equiv d^{2D}K$.

III. HETEROTIC DFT FORMULATION

In this section, I review the DFT formulation for the abelian subsector of the low-energy theory of the heterotic string following [28]. Let me start with the generalized metric formulation of usual DFT action. Introducing the generalized metric on the doubled space with coordinates $X^M = (\tilde{x}_i, x^i)$,

$$\mathcal{H}^{MN} = \begin{pmatrix} g_{ij} - b_{ik} g^{kl} b_{lj} & b_{ik} g^{kj} \\ -g^{ik} b_{kj} & g^{ij} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

one can write the DFT action as [15],

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \int_{x, \tilde{x}} e^{-2d} \left(\frac{1}{8} \mathcal{H}^{MN} \partial_M \mathcal{H}^{KL} \partial_N \mathcal{H}_{KL} + 4 \mathcal{H}^{MN} \partial_M d \partial_N d \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{H}^{MN} \partial_N \mathcal{H}^{KL} \partial_L \mathcal{H}_{MK} - 2 \partial_M d \partial_N \mathcal{H}^{MN} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

with derivatives $\partial_M = (\tilde{\partial}^i, \partial_i)$. In this action, the $O(D, D)$ invariant dilaton d defined by $e^{-2d} = \sqrt{g} e^{-2\phi}$, the indices are raised and lowered by $O(D, D)$ invariant metric,

$$\eta_{MN} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

As it was shown in [28], to construct the DFT formulation of heterotic strings, one can start with enlarging the coordinates as,

$$X^M = (\tilde{x}_i, x^i, y^\alpha), \quad (28)$$

which transforms as a fundamental $O(D, D + n)$ vector [28], and y^α correspond to the coordinates for the internal space of gauge group. Then, the $O(D, D + n)$ invariant metric takes the form

$$\eta_{MN} = \begin{pmatrix} \eta^{ij} & \eta_{jj} & \eta^i{}_\beta \\ \eta_i{}^j & \eta_{ij} & \eta_{i\beta} \\ \eta_\alpha{}^j & \eta_{\alpha j} & \eta_{\alpha\beta} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \kappa \end{pmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

where κ denote the matrix corresponding to the Cartan-Killing metric of the gauge group [28]. Next, one can introduce the extended form of the generalized metric which transforms covariantly under $O(D, D + n)$ transformations. In [28], this extended form of generalized metric is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{MN} &= \\ &\begin{pmatrix} g^{ij} & & -g^{ik} c_{kj} & -g^{ik} A_{k\beta} \\ -g^{jk} c_{ki} & g_{ij} + c_{ki} g^{kl} c_{lj} + A_i{}^\gamma A_{j\gamma} & c_{ki} g^{kl} A_{l\beta} + A_{i\beta} & \\ -g^{jk} A_{k\alpha} & c_{kj} g^{kl} A_{l\alpha} + A_{j\alpha} & \kappa_{\alpha\beta} + A_{k\alpha} g^{kl} A_{l\beta} & \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where,

$$c_{ij} = b_{ij} + \frac{1}{2} A_i^\alpha A_{j\alpha}. \quad (31)$$

Inserting these extended objects (29), (30) together with $\partial_M = (\tilde{\partial}^i, \partial_i, \partial_\alpha)$ into the action (26) and setting $\tilde{\partial}^i = \partial_\alpha = 0$, one obtains (for the abelian case),

$$S = \int dx e^{-2d} \left(\frac{1}{4} g^{ij} \partial_i g^{kl} \partial_j g_{kl} - \frac{1}{2} g^{ij} \partial_j g^{kl} \partial_l g_{ik} - 2\partial_i d \partial_j g^{ij} + 4g^{ij} \partial_i d \partial_j d - \frac{1}{12} \hat{H}^2 - \frac{1}{4} F_{ij\alpha} F^{ij\alpha} \right), \quad (32)$$

where $\hat{H}_{ijk} = 3 \left(\partial_{[i} b_{jk]} - \kappa_{\alpha\beta} A_{[i}^\alpha (\partial_j A_{k]}^\beta) \right)$. Up to boundary terms, the abelian sector of this action (32) coincides with the abelian sector of the low-energy limit of heterotic string action [28], which is

$$S = \int dx \sqrt{g} e^{-2\phi} \left(R + 4(\partial\phi)^2 - \frac{1}{12} \hat{H}^{ijk} \hat{H}_{ijk} - \frac{1}{4} F^{ij\alpha} F_{ij\alpha} \right). \quad (33)$$

For the comparison with the results of the following sections, one can write the action (32) around Minkowski space, up to second order in h_{ij} and b_{ij} fields as

$$S = \int dx \left(\frac{1}{4} \eta^{ij} \partial_i h^{kl} \partial_j h_{kl} - \frac{1}{2} \eta^{ij} \partial_j h^{kl} \partial_l h_{ik} - 2\partial_i d \partial_j h^{ij} + 4\eta^{ij} \partial_i d \partial_j d - \frac{1}{12} \hat{H}^2 - \frac{1}{4} F_{ij\alpha} F^{ij\alpha} \right). \quad (34)$$

IV. DOUBLE COPY FORMULATION FOR HETEROTIC DFT

In [11], it has been shown that the scattering amplitudes of Yang-Mills-Einstein theory coupled the dilaton and two-form field $B^{\mu\nu}$ can be obtained from the double copy of (Yang-Mills+ ϕ^3) theory and pure Yang-Mills theory. The Lagrangian for the (Yang-Mills+ ϕ^3) is given in [11] as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{YM}+\phi^3} = & -\frac{1}{4} \kappa_{ab} F_{\mu\nu}{}^a F^{\mu\nu b} + \frac{1}{2} \kappa_{ab} \kappa_{AB} D_\mu \phi^{Aa} D^\mu \phi^{Bb} \\ & - \frac{g^2}{4} \kappa_{AC} \kappa_{BD} \kappa^{ef} f_{abe} f_{fcd} \phi^{Aa} \phi^{Bb} \phi^{Cc} \phi^{Dd} \\ & + \frac{1}{3!} \lambda g F_{ABC} f_{abc} \phi^{Aa} \phi^{Bb} \phi^{Cc}, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where the a, b, c, d indices run over the adjoint representation of the gauge group and scalar fields carry additional indices $A, B, C = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Field strength and covariant derivative are defined as [11]

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mu\nu}^a &= \partial_\mu A_\nu^a - \partial_\nu A_\mu^a + g f^a{}_{bc} A_\mu^b A_\nu^c, \\ D_\mu \phi^{Aa} &= \partial_\mu \phi^{Aa} + g f^a{}_{bc} A_\mu^b \phi^{Ac}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

The Lagrangian for the usual Yang-Mills action is,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{YM}} = -\frac{1}{4} \kappa_{ab} \bar{F}^{\mu\nu a} \bar{F}_{\mu\nu}^b. \quad (37)$$

Now, I use these two Lagrangians (35) and (37) to construct heterotic DFT action. The quadratic part of the action corresponding to the Lagrangian (35) can be written in momentum space as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{YM1}}^{(2)} = & \frac{1}{2} \int_{k_1, k_2} \delta(k_1 + k_2) \kappa_{ab} (\eta^{mn} k_{1m} k_{2n}) \\ & \times (\Pi^{\mu\nu}(k_1, k_2) A_{1\mu}{}^a A_{2\nu}{}^b - \kappa_{AB} \phi_1^{Aa} \phi_2^{Bb}), \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

with the notation for the fields as

$$A_{i\mu} \equiv A_\mu(k_i), \quad \phi_{i\mu} \equiv \phi(k_i), \quad (39)$$

and for the projector,

$$\Pi^{\mu\nu}(k_1, k_2) \equiv (\eta^{\mu\nu} - \frac{k_1^\nu k_2^\mu}{\eta^{mn} k_{1m} k_{2n}}). \quad (40)$$

Similarly for (37),

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{YM2}}^{(2)} = & \frac{1}{2} \int_{\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2} \delta(\bar{k}_1 + \bar{k}_2) \kappa_{ab} (\bar{\eta}^{pq} \bar{k}_{1p} \bar{k}_{2q}) \\ & \times (\bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta}(\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2) \bar{A}_{1\alpha}{}^a \bar{A}_{2\beta}{}^b). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Replacing the color factors of the first action (38) by the kinematic factors of the second action (41), namely using (18), and integrating in both momenta one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{DC}}^{(2)} = & \frac{1}{4} \int_{k, \bar{k}} \delta(K_1 + K_2) (\eta^{mn} k_{1m} k_{2n}) \\ & \times [\Pi^{\mu\nu}(k_1, k_2) \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta}(\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2) A_{1\mu} A_{2\nu} \bar{A}_{1\alpha} \bar{A}_{2\beta} \\ & - \kappa_{AB} \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta}(\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2) \phi_1^A \phi_2^B \bar{A}_{1\alpha} \bar{A}_{2\beta}]. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

I also need double copy maps for the remaining objects, which are schematically given as,

$$A_\mu(k_1) \bar{A}_\alpha(\bar{k}_1) \rightarrow e_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1) + h_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1) \quad (43)$$

$$\phi^A(k_1) \bar{A}_\alpha(\bar{k}_1) \rightarrow \bar{A}_\alpha{}^a(k_1, \bar{k}_1) + \bar{f}_\alpha{}^a(k_1, \bar{k}_1) \quad (44)$$

$$\kappa_{AB} \rightarrow -2\kappa_{ab} + d_{ab}, \quad (45)$$

where $h_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1)$, $\bar{f}_\alpha{}^a(k_1, \bar{k}_1)$ and d_{ab} will be determined. Note that the map given in (43) differs from (19) by an extra term $h_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1)$. The reason is that in (19) both of the A_μ and \bar{A}_α fields correspond to the gauge fields of the pure Yang-Mills theory while in (43) one of the fields corresponds to the gauge field of (YM+ ϕ^3) theory. In that sense, it can be expected that their double copy maps are different.

Now, the explicit forms of (43), (44), and (45) should be decided. One can do that by inserting these maps into (41) and comparing the result by (34) in the case that there is no dependence on dual coordinates. Inspired by the definition (31), one can try an ansatz for the $h_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1)$ as,

$$h_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} A_\mu(k_1) A_\alpha(\bar{k}_1). \quad (46)$$

After trying the calculation using this ansatz, I concluded that one should choose the ansatz as,

$$h_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1) \equiv \frac{1}{2} (A_\mu(\bar{k}_1)A_\alpha(k_1) - A_\mu(k_1)A_\alpha(\bar{k}_1)), \quad (47)$$

to get the desired results. Inserting (43), (44),(45) into the action (42), one gets,

$$S_{DC}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{4} \int_{k, \bar{k}} \delta(K_1 + K_2) (\mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2), \quad (48)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1 &\equiv (\eta^{mn} k_{1m} k_{2n}) \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta} \Pi^{\mu\nu} (e_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1) + h_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1)) \\ &\quad \times (e_{\nu\beta}(k_2, \bar{k}_2) + h_{\nu\beta}(k_2, \bar{k}_2)), \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_2 &\equiv (2\kappa_{ab} - d_{ab}) (\eta^{mn} k_{1m} k_{2n}) \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta} \\ &\quad \times [\bar{A}_\alpha^a(k_1, \bar{k}_1) + \bar{f}_\alpha^a(k_1, \bar{k}_1)] [\bar{A}_\beta^b(k_2, \bar{k}_2) + \bar{f}_\beta^b(k_2, \bar{k}_2)], \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

and $h_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1)$ is defined in (47). The first Lagrangian term (49) can be divided into 4 parts, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{11} &\equiv (\eta^{mn} k_{1m} k_{2n}) \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta} \Pi^{\mu\nu} e_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1) e_{\nu\beta}(k_2, \bar{k}_2), \\ \mathcal{L}_{12} &\equiv (\eta^{mn} k_{1m} k_{2n}) \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta} \Pi^{\mu\nu} e_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1) h_{\nu\beta}(k_2, \bar{k}_2), \\ \mathcal{L}_{13} &\equiv (\eta^{mn} k_{1m} k_{2n}) \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta} \Pi^{\mu\nu} h_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1) e_{\nu\beta}(k_2, \bar{k}_2), \\ \mathcal{L}_{14} &\equiv (\eta^{mn} k_{1m} k_{2n}) \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta} \Pi^{\mu\nu} h_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1) h_{\nu\beta}(k_2, \bar{k}_2). \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

The first piece, \mathcal{L}_{11} , defines the quadratic part of the usual DFT action around Minkowski space. Passing to the position space, and turning off the dependence on dual coordinates, it matches with the corresponding terms in the action (34). Note that in this notation, the barred momentum operators correspond to the derivatives for the left moving coordinates, namely,

$$\bar{k}^\alpha \rightarrow \bar{D}^\alpha \equiv \partial^\alpha + \tilde{\partial}^\alpha, \quad (52)$$

where $\tilde{\partial}^\alpha$ operator corresponds to the derivative with respect to dual coordinates. Similarly, the momentum operators without tilde correspond to the right moving coordinates, namely,

$$k^\alpha \rightarrow D^\alpha \equiv \partial^\alpha - \tilde{\partial}^\alpha. \quad (53)$$

In that sense, turning off the dependence on dual coordinates means that $\bar{k}^\alpha = k^\alpha$, or in position space $D^\alpha = \bar{D}^\alpha = \partial^\alpha$.

Now continue with the last piece, \mathcal{L}_{14} , which can explicitly be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{14} &= \frac{1}{4} (\eta^{mn} k_{1m} k_{2n}) \Pi^{\mu\nu} (k_1, k_2) \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta} (\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2) \\ &\quad \times (A_\mu(\bar{k}_1)A_\alpha(k_1) - A_\mu(k_1)A_\alpha(\bar{k}_1)) \\ &\quad \times (A_\nu(\bar{k}_2)A_\beta(k_2) - A_\nu(k_2)A_\beta(\bar{k}_2)). \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Before expanding (54), let me separate its last piece, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{14} &= \frac{1}{4} \frac{k_1^\nu k_2^\mu \bar{k}_1^\beta \bar{k}_2^\alpha}{\bar{\eta}^{pq} k_{1p} k_{2q}} (A_\nu(\bar{k}_2)A_\beta(k_2) - A_\nu(k_2)A_\beta(\bar{k}_2)) \\ &\quad \times (A_\mu(\bar{k}_1)A_\alpha(k_1) - A_\mu(k_1)A_\alpha(\bar{k}_1)). \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Passing to the position space, (55) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{14} &= +\frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{\square} \bar{\partial}^\beta \bar{\partial}^\alpha A_\mu(\bar{x}) \right) (\partial^\mu \partial^\nu A_\alpha(x)) \\ &\quad \times \left(A_\nu(\bar{x})A_\beta(x) - A_\nu(x)A_\beta(\bar{x}) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{\square} \bar{\partial}^\beta \bar{\partial}^\alpha A_\alpha(\bar{x}) \right) (\partial^\mu \partial^\nu A_\mu(x)) \\ &\quad \times \left(A_\nu(x)A_\beta(\bar{x}) - A_\nu(\bar{x})A_\beta(x) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

which gives zero after turning off the dependence on dual coordinates. Expanding the remaining terms in (54), passing to the position space and turning off the dependence on dual coordinates, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}'_{14} &= -\frac{1}{2} (\partial_\beta A_\mu) A_\alpha \left((\partial^\beta A^\mu) A^\alpha - (\partial^\beta A^\alpha) A^\mu \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\partial^\alpha A^\beta) A^\mu - (\partial^\alpha A^\mu) A^\beta + (\partial^\mu A^\alpha) A^\beta - (\partial^\mu A^\beta) A^\alpha \right). \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

The second piece \mathcal{L}_{12} can be explicitly written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{12} &= \frac{1}{2} (\eta^{mn} k_{1m} k_{2n}) \Pi^{\mu\nu} (k_1, k_2) \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta} (\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2) \\ &\quad \times e_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1) (A_\nu(\bar{k}_2)A_\beta(k_2) - A_\nu(k_2)A_\beta(\bar{k}_2)), \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

where I again separate the last part of it, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{12} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{k_1^\nu k_2^\mu \bar{k}_1^\beta \bar{k}_2^\alpha}{\bar{\eta}^{pq} k_{1p} k_{2q}} e_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1) \\ &\quad \times (A_\nu(\bar{k}_2)A_\beta(k_2) - A_\nu(k_2)A_\beta(\bar{k}_2)), \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

which is also equal to zero after the dual coordinates are turned off. Expanding the remaining terms in (58), passing to the position space and turning off the dependence on dual coordinates, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}'_{12} &= \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\beta e_{\mu\alpha}) \left((\partial^\beta A^\mu) A^\alpha - (\partial^\beta A^\alpha) A^\mu - (\partial^\alpha A^\beta) A^\mu \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\partial^\alpha A^\mu) A^\beta + (\partial^\mu A^\alpha) A^\beta - (\partial^\mu A^\beta) A^\alpha \right). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Similar considerations for the third piece, \mathcal{L}_{13} , leads to the same terms as (60). Adding them, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}'_{123} &= \mathcal{L}_{12} + \mathcal{L}_{13} = (\partial_\beta e_{\mu\alpha}) \left((\partial^\beta A^\mu) A^\alpha - (\partial^\beta A^\alpha) A^\mu \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (\partial^\alpha A^\beta) A^\mu + (\partial^\alpha A^\mu) A^\beta + (\partial^\mu A^\alpha) A^\beta - (\partial^\mu A^\beta) A^\alpha \right), \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

while the corresponding terms, which couples two-form field $b_{\mu\nu}$ and gauge field A_μ , in (34) have the form

$$\mathcal{A} = (\partial_\beta e_{\mu\alpha}) \left((\partial^\beta A^\mu) A^\alpha - (\partial^\beta A^\alpha) A^\mu + (\partial^\alpha A^\beta) A^\mu - (\partial^\alpha A^\mu) A^\beta + (\partial^\mu A^\alpha) A^\beta - (\partial^\mu A^\beta) A^\alpha \right). \quad (62)$$

Comparing (61) and (62), one can see that they differ in their third and fourth terms by a minus sign. In the end, one can see that combining \mathcal{L}_{11} , \mathcal{L}'_{14} and \mathcal{L}'_{123} and inserting in (48), creates almost all the terms in (34), except the mismatch of signs in two terms. Moreover, the last term which corresponds to the kinetic term of A_μ^a gauge field is not obtained yet.

Now, I calculate the terms which come from \mathcal{L}_2 given in (50). The first term of (50) is

$$\mathcal{L}_{21} = 2\kappa_{ab}(\eta^{mn}k_{1m}k_{2n})\bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta}(\bar{A}_\alpha^a(k_1, \bar{k}_1)\bar{A}_\beta^a(k_2, \bar{k}_2)). \quad (63)$$

Inserting (63) into (48), passing to the position space and turning off the dependence on dual coordinates, one can obtain the last term of (34). There are two more objects, d_{ab} and \bar{f}_α^a , which have to be determined. One can hope to define these objects in a way that their contributions may cancel the terms which are mismatched in signs in (61). Such a contribution would make the double copy formalism I introduced more consistent. However, I could not find such a choice for d_{ab} and \bar{f}_α^a .

To recapitulate, I started with two theories with corresponding Lagrangians (35), (37), and introduced the double copy maps,

$$\begin{aligned} A_\mu(k_1)\bar{A}_\alpha(\bar{k}_1) &\rightarrow e_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1) + h_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1) \\ \phi^A(k_1)\bar{A}_\alpha(\bar{k}_1) &\rightarrow \bar{A}_\alpha^a(k_1, \bar{k}_1), \\ \kappa_{AB} &\rightarrow -2\kappa_{ab}, \\ \kappa_{ab} &\rightarrow \frac{1}{2}\bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta}(\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2)\bar{A}_\alpha^a(\bar{k}_1)\bar{A}_\beta^b(\bar{k}_2) \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

where $h_{\mu\alpha}(k_1, \bar{k}_1)$ is defined in (47), to obtain the Abelian subsector of heterotic formulation of DFT. Although, I found some promising results and managed to obtain many terms of the action (34), there are two terms in my final result which have the opposite signs from the corresponding terms in (34).

Now, I try an alternative way for the double construction of Abelian subsector of heterotic DFT. In my first attempt, I started with Abelian subsectors of Yang-Mills theory and $YM + \phi^3$ theory, by choosing the structure constants as zero, namely I used,

$$f_{abc} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad F_{ABC} = 0. \quad (65)$$

However, one can also introduce a double copy procedure where the Abelian gauge fields A_μ in (34) are expected

to come only from the ϕ^{Aa} fields. In that sense, an alternative procedure may be constructed by choosing the structure constants $F_{ABC} = 0$, but the f_{abc} as nonzero. So, let me start with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{YM+\phi^3} &= -\frac{1}{4}\kappa_{ab}F_{\mu\nu}^a F^{\mu\nu b} + \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{ab}\kappa_{AB}D_\mu\phi^{Aa}D^\mu\phi^{Bb} \\ &\quad - \frac{g^2}{4}\kappa_{AC}\kappa_{BD}\kappa^{ef}f_{abe}f_{fcd}\phi^{Aa}\phi^{Bb}\phi^{Cc}\phi^{Dd}, \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

as the Lagrangian of my first theory, and (37) as the Lagrangian of my second theory. One can expand the Lagrangian (66) explicitly and separate it into five parts as,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\phi 1} &= -\frac{1}{4}\kappa_{ab}F_{\mu\nu}^a F^{\mu\nu b}, \\ \mathcal{L}_{\phi 2} &= +\frac{1}{2}\kappa_{ab}\kappa_{AB}\eta^{\mu\nu}(\partial_\mu\phi^{Aa})(\partial_\nu\phi^{Bb}), \\ \mathcal{L}_{\phi 3} &= +g\kappa_{AB}\eta^{\mu\nu}f_{abc}(\partial_\mu\phi^{Aa})(A_\nu^b\phi^{Bc}), \\ \mathcal{L}_{\phi 4} &= +\frac{1}{2}g^2\kappa^{ab}\kappa_{AB}\eta^{\mu\nu}(f_{acd}A_\mu^c\phi^{Ad})(f_{bef}A_\nu^e\phi^{Bf}), \\ \mathcal{L}_{\phi 5} &= -\frac{g^2}{4}\kappa_{AC}\kappa_{BD}\kappa^{ef}f_{abe}f_{fcd}\phi^{Aa}\phi^{Bb}\phi^{Cc}\phi^{Dd}. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

Passing to the momentum space, and introducing double copy maps (6), (13), $\mathcal{L}_{\phi 1}$ leads to usual DFT action up to cubic order [12]. Now, consider the second piece, $\mathcal{L}_{\phi 2}$. Passing to the momentum space, it reads

$$S_{\phi 2} = +\frac{1}{2}\int_k \kappa_{ab}\kappa_{AB}k^2\phi^{Aa}(-k)\phi^{Bb}(k). \quad (68)$$

Introducing the double copy map for κ_{ab} from (6) together with,

$$\phi^{Aa}(-k) \rightarrow A_\alpha^a(-k, -\bar{k}) \quad \text{and} \quad K_{AB} \rightarrow -\kappa_{ab}, \quad (69)$$

one obtains

$$S'_{\phi 2} = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{k, \bar{k}} \kappa_{ab}\bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta}k^2A_\alpha^a(-k, -\bar{k})A_\beta^b(k, \bar{k}), \quad (70)$$

which takes the form

$$S'_{\phi 2} = -\frac{1}{4}\int d^D x \kappa_{ab}F^{\mu\nu a}F_{\mu\nu}^b, \quad (71)$$

in the position space. So, the last term of (34) is obtained.

Continuing with the third piece, $\mathcal{L}_{\phi 3}$, one can write in the momentum space

$$S_{\phi 3} = \frac{-ig}{(2\pi)^{D/2}}\int_k \kappa_{AB}f_{abc}\delta(k_1+k_2+k_3)k_1^\mu\phi_1^{Aa}A_{2\mu}^b\phi_3^{Bc}. \quad (72)$$

Inserting the double copy maps (6),(13),(69); the action (72) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\phi 3} &= \frac{-g}{4(2\pi)^{D/2}}\int dK_1dK_2dK_3\kappa_{ab}\delta(K_1+K_2+K_3) \\ &\quad \times \bar{\Pi}^{\alpha\beta\sigma}(k_1^\mu A_\alpha^a(k_1, \bar{k}_1)e_{\mu\beta}(k_2, \bar{k}_2)A_\sigma^b(k_3, \bar{k}_3)), \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

Expanding (73), one obtains some terms of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\phi 3} = & + \frac{1}{8} (\bar{\partial}_\sigma e_{\mu\beta}) ((\partial^\mu A^\sigma) A^\beta - (\partial^\mu A^\beta) A^\sigma) \\ & + \frac{1}{8} (\partial^\mu A_\sigma) e_{\mu\beta} (\bar{\partial}^\beta A^\sigma - \bar{\partial}^\sigma A^\beta) \\ & + \frac{1}{8} e_{\mu\beta} A_\sigma (\bar{\partial}^\sigma \partial^\mu A^\beta - \bar{\partial}^\beta \partial^\mu A^\sigma), \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

where I also let $g \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$ following [12] and ignore the color indices since I work on Abelian subsector. Comparing this with (62), one observes that the first two terms (74) matches with the last two terms of (62), but they have the opposite signs. The other terms of (62) do not show up in (74), but there are some extra terms. One can also try to use integration by parts and choose a gauge but the problem is not solved. Calculating $\mathcal{L}_{\phi 4}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\phi 5}$ terms from (67) and adding their results also cannot help the situation in here, because they bring structurally different terms. So, using this procedure, I could not obtain the terms (62) in the action (34).

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this work, a double copy procedure for the Abelian subsector of DFT action is offered. Inspired by the results of [11], the starting point is taken as the $(YM + \phi^3)$ theory introduced in [11]. In that work [11], the authors show that the scattering amplitudes for the YME theory coupled to the dilaton and two-form field can be obtained as a double copy of pure Yang-Mills theory and $(YM + \phi^3)$. Since the usual DFT action is reduced to the supergravity action when the dependence on dual coordinates are turned off, it is consistent to use this double copy idea for the heterotic DFT.

For the double copy formulation of Abelian subsector of DFT, two approaches are introduced in this work. Firstly, I used a double copy formulation by choosing the structure constants of both theories (YM and $YM + \phi^3$) as zero, namely $f_{abc} = 0$ and $F_{ABC} = 0$. In this method, I also used a structurally different double copy procedure, by mapping the product of two gauge fields to the new DFT field, instead of mapping the color indices of one gauge field to the second indices of DFT field. The inspiration of this choice comes from the way double copy introduced in [4]. One can think that this way of thinking about double copy is not different from the way introduced in [12], but I believe that its implications should be carefully considered. Using this method and introducing the maps (64), I managed to obtain most of the terms in the action (34), but two terms come with different signs. This implies that this method should be improved for an exact match.

In the second method, I choose the structure constants of the usual gauge fields, f_{abc} , nonzero while choosing

$F_{ABC} = 0$. The motivation of this choice is based on the idea that the color indices a, b, c, \dots are mapped to the dual indices of DFT fields, so their presence does not make the final theory non-Abelian. On the other hand, in this method A, B, C, \dots indices are mapped to the a, b, c, \dots color indices, so choosing $F_{ABC} = 0$ makes the final double copy theory Abelian. Using this formalism, together with the double copy maps (6), (13), (69); some of the terms in the action (34) are obtained but most of them do not appear. The first problem is observed for the double copy of the action (72). In here, I inserted the maps for the K_{AB} , f_{abc} , ϕ^{Aa} and A_μ^b , which were chosen consistently with the works on the literature and the previous results in this work. After inserting this, one expects to obtain the terms in (62), but most of them do not appear. Calculating the other contributions from (67) also cannot help, because they give structurally different terms. So, what can be the origin of this problem? The first observation can be done by looking at how the double copy map for f_{abc} is inserted in (72). In (72), I directly insert the double copy map for f_{abc} into the action. On the other hand, in the cubic order calculation of [12], the authors insert the double copy map for f_{abc} after they write the action in a more symmetric way in the momenta k_1 , k_2 and k_3 . By doing this, they guarantee that the kinematic factors satisfy the same algebra as the structure constants f_{abc} . However, one can see that the situation is more complicated for the action (72), because the interaction is on the form $\phi A \phi$, not AAA and it cannot be written in a symmetric way in the three momenta k_1 , k_2 and k_3 . This can be one of the reasons for the mismatch I obtained.

Another important point, which deserves a discussion, is the last two terms in (67), namely $\mathcal{L}_{\phi 4}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\phi 5}$. While $\mathcal{L}_{\phi 4}$ gives structurally $(\partial e)A(\partial e)A$ terms, $\mathcal{L}_{\phi 5}$ is expected to give $(\partial A)(\partial A)AA$ terms. The problem about this terms is presence of inverse Cartan-Killing metric, namely κ^{ab} . The double copy map for κ_{ab} is given in (6) and one can see that it is not invertible. In that sense it is not obvious how to define a double copy map for the inverse Cartan-Killing metric, κ^{ab} .

To sum up, I tried to offer a double copy map for the Abelian subsector of heterotic DFT starting with a pure Yang-Mills theory and $YM + \phi^3$ theory, inspired by the results of [11], [21]. Although there are some promising results, some problems were encountered and I could not obtain an exact match. Understanding the origins of these problems can help us better understand the classical double copy procedure in DFT, especially when we start with two different Yang-Mills theories.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Özgür Sarıoğlu for the helpful discussions, and continuous support he gave throughout the development of this article.

-
- [1] Z. Bern, J. J. M. Carrasco, and H. Johansson, New Relations for Gauge-Theory Amplitudes, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 085011 (2008), arXiv:0805.3993 [hep-ph].
- [2] Z. Bern, J. J. M. Carrasco, and H. Johansson, Perturbative Quantum Gravity as a Double Copy of Gauge Theory, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 061602 (2010), arXiv:1004.0476 [hep-th].
- [3] H. Kawai, D. C. Lewellen, and S. H. H. Tye, A Relation Between Tree Amplitudes of Closed and Open Strings, *Nucl. Phys. B* **269**, 1 (1986).
- [4] Z. Bern, T. Dennen, Y.-t. Huang, and M. Kiermaier, Gravity as the Square of Gauge Theory, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 065003 (2010), arXiv:1004.0693 [hep-th].
- [5] H. Johansson and J. Nohle, Conformal Gravity from Gauge Theory, (2017), arXiv:1707.02965 [hep-th].
- [6] H. Johansson, G. Mogull, and F. Teng, Unraveling conformal gravity amplitudes, *JHEP* **09**, 080, arXiv:1806.05124 [hep-th].
- [7] A. Luna, R. Monteiro, D. O’Connell, and C. D. White, The classical double copy for Taub–NUT spacetime, *Phys. Lett. B* **750**, 272 (2015), arXiv:1507.01869 [hep-th].
- [8] M. Carrillo-González, R. Penco, and M. Trodden, The classical double copy in maximally symmetric spacetimes, *JHEP* **04**, 028, arXiv:1711.01296 [hep-th].
- [9] N. Bahjat-Abbas, A. Luna, and C. D. White, The Kerr-Schild double copy in curved spacetime, *JHEP* **12**, 004, arXiv:1710.01953 [hep-th].
- [10] T. Adamo, J. J. M. Carrasco, M. Carrillo-González, M. Chiodaroli, H. Elvang, H. Johansson, D. O’Connell, R. Roiban, and O. Schlotterer, Snowmass White Paper: the Double Copy and its Applications, in *Snowmass 2021* (2022) arXiv:2204.06547 [hep-th].
- [11] M. Chiodaroli, M. Gunaydin, H. Johansson, and R. Roiban, Explicit Formulae for Yang-Mills-Einstein Amplitudes from the Double Copy, *JHEP* **07**, 002, arXiv:1703.00421 [hep-th].
- [12] F. Diaz-Jaramillo, O. Hohm, and J. Plefka, Double field theory as the double copy of Yang-Mills theory, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 045012 (2022), arXiv:2109.01153 [hep-th].
- [13] C. Hull and B. Zwiebach, Double Field Theory, *JHEP* **09**, 099, arXiv:0904.4664 [hep-th].
- [14] O. Hohm, C. Hull, and B. Zwiebach, Background independent action for double field theory, *JHEP* **07**, 016, arXiv:1003.5027 [hep-th].
- [15] O. Hohm, C. Hull, and B. Zwiebach, Generalized metric formulation of double field theory, *JHEP* **08**, 008, arXiv:1006.4823 [hep-th].
- [16] G. Aldazabal, D. Marques, and C. Nunez, Double Field Theory: A Pedagogical Review, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30**, 163001 (2013), arXiv:1305.1907 [hep-th].
- [17] K. Lee, Kerr-Schild Double Field Theory and Classical Double Copy, *JHEP* **10**, 027, arXiv:1807.08443 [hep-th].
- [18] W. Cho and K. Lee, Heterotic Kerr-Schild Double Field Theory and Classical Double Copy, *JHEP* **07**, 030, arXiv:1904.11650 [hep-th].
- [19] E. Lescano and S. Roychowdhury, Heterotic Kerr-Schild Double Field Theory and its double Yang-Mills formulation, *JHEP* **04**, 090, arXiv:2201.09364 [hep-th].
- [20] E. Lescano, G. Menezes, and J. A. Rodríguez, Aspects of conformal gravity and double field theory from a double copy map, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 126017 (2023), arXiv:2307.14538 [hep-th].
- [21] E. Lescano and J. A. Rodríguez, Constructing Conformal Double Field Theory through a Double Copy Map, (2024), arXiv:2408.11892 [hep-th].
- [22] E. Lescano and J. A. Rodríguez, Quadratic Curvature Corrections in Double Field Theory via Double Copy, (2024), arXiv:2409.05628 [hep-th].
- [23] R. Yılmaz, On the extension of double copy procedure to higher derivative double field theory, (2024), arXiv:2408.16524 [hep-th].
- [24] R. Bonezzi, F. Diaz-Jaramillo, and O. Hohm, The gauge structure of double field theory follows from Yang-Mills theory, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 026004 (2022), arXiv:2203.07397 [hep-th].
- [25] R. Bonezzi, C. Chiaffrino, F. Diaz-Jaramillo, and O. Hohm, Gauge invariant double copy of Yang-Mills theory: The quartic theory, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 126015 (2023), arXiv:2212.04513 [hep-th].
- [26] R. Bonezzi, C. Chiaffrino, F. Diaz-Jaramillo, and O. Hohm, Weakly constrained double field theory: the quartic theory (2023), arXiv:2306.00609 [hep-th].
- [27] R. Bonezzi, C. Chiaffrino, F. Diaz-Jaramillo, and O. Hohm, Weakly constrained double field theory as the double copy of Yang-Mills theory, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 066020 (2024), arXiv:2309.03289 [hep-th].
- [28] O. Hohm and S. K. Kwak, Double Field Theory Formulation of Heterotic Strings, *JHEP* **06**, 096, arXiv:1103.2136 [hep-th].
- [29] E. Lescano and J. A. Rodríguez, Higher-derivative heterotic Double Field Theory and classical double copy, *JHEP* **07**, 072, arXiv:2101.03376 [hep-th].
- [30] W. Cho and K. Lee, Heterotic Kerr-Schild Double Field Theory and Classical Double Copy, *JHEP* **07**, 030, arXiv:1904.11650 [hep-th].