

# Gauge enhancement of super M-branes via parametrized stable homotopy theory

Vincent Braunack-Mayer\*, Hisham Sati†, Urs Schreiber‡

December 14, 2024

## Abstract

A key open problem in M-theory is the mechanism of “gauge enhancement”, which supposedly makes M-branes exhibit the nonabelian gauge degrees of freedom that are seen perturbatively in the limit of 10d string theory. In fact, since only the twisted K-theory classes represented by nonabelian Chan-Paton gauge fields on D-branes have invariant meaning, the problem is really the lift to M-theory of the twisted K-theory classification of D-brane charges.

Here we show how this problem has a solution by universal constructions in super homotopy theory, at least rationally. We recall how double dimensional reduction of super M-brane charges is described by the cyclification adjunction applied to the 4-sphere, and how M-theory degrees of freedom hidden at ADE-singularities are induced by the suspended Hopf action on the 4-sphere. Combining these, we demonstrate, at the level of rational homotopy theory, that gauge enhancement in M-theory is exhibited by lifting against the fiberwise stabilization of the unit of this cyclification adjunction on the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Two universal constructions in Homotopy theory</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1	Fiberwise stabilization . . . . .	10
2.2	The Ext/Cyc-adjunction . . . . .	18
<b>3</b>	<b>The A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere</b>	<b>25</b>
3.1	Rational homotopy type of the A-type orbispace . . . . .	28
3.2	Fiberwise stabilized Ext/Cyc-unit on the A-type orbispace . . . . .	30
<b>4</b>	<b>Gauge enhancement of M-branes</b>	<b>40</b>
4.1	The mechanism without supersymmetry . . . . .	40
4.2	The mechanism with local supersymmetry . . . . .	44

---


\*Institute of Mathematics, University of Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, CH-8057 Zürich, Switzerland

†Division of Science and Mathematics, New York University, Abu Dhabi, UAE

‡Division of Science and Mathematics, New York University, Abu Dhabi, UAE, on leave from Czech Academy of Science

# 1 Introduction

The conjecture of *M-theory* [Tow95a, Wit95a] (see [Duff99B]) says, roughly, that there exists a non-perturbative physical theory, which makes the following schematic diagram commute:




Here both *perturbative string theory* as well as *higher dimensional quantum supergravity* may, with some effort, be well-defined as *perturbative* S-matrix theories (e.g. [Pol01, Sec. 12.5][Wit12] and [Don95][BFR13]); and the conjecture is that there is a joint *non-perturbative* completion of 11-dimensional supergravity and of IIA string theory, and hence of any effective quantum field theory approximating the latter. Even though the actual nature of M-theory has remained an open problem [Mo14, Sec. 12],<sup>1</sup> there is a huge and steadily increasing network of hints supporting the M-theory conjecture. This should be regarded in light of the situation of quantum field theory as used in the standard model of particle physics, which is also just perturbative, and where the identification of any aspects of its non-perturbative completion is a pressing but wide open problem, referred to as one of the “millennium problems” [ClayMP].

In a series of articles [FSS13, FSS16a, FSS16b, HS17], we have shown that a systematic analysis of the *Green-Schwarz sigma-models* (which define the *fundamental* super  $p$ -branes, such as the fundamental membrane that gives M-theory its name) from the point of view of *super homotopy theory* provides a concrete handle on, at least, some previously elusive aspects of M-theory; see [Sch17c] for exposition of our perspective. Specifically, in the companion article [HSS18] it is shown that the existence and classification of the expected *black M-branes at real ADE-singularities* may systematically be derived and analyzed by the supergeometric version of enhancement to *equivariant homotopy theory* (e.g. [Blu17]). However, the M-theory folklore suggests ([Sen97, Sec. 2], see e.g. [IU12, Sec. 6.3.3], also [AG04]) that the phenomenon of black branes at ADE-singularities contains in it also the key to the all-important, widely expected yet still mysterious phenomenon of *gauge enhancement* in M-theory. This suggests that the super homotopy theoretic analysis may also reveal the true nature of gauge enhancement in M-theory. Here we show that this is indeed the case.

In the remainder of this introduction we review the issue of gauge enhancement clearly and in various versions, survey what is known, what is conjectured, and what has remained an open problem. Then we indicate the solution that we present in Section 4 below, based on some mathematical results which we establish in Section 2 and Section 3 below.


**Double dimensional reduction.** At the heart of the matter is the concept of *double dimensional reduction*, originally due to [DHIS87, Tow95b], whose rigorous formulation [FSS16a, Sec. 3][FSS16b, Sec. 3], we will recall and expand on, below in Section 4: Ordinary *dimensional reduction* of theories of (super-) gravity (going back to observations by Kaluza and Klein a century back, see e.g. [Duff94], [CDF91, Part V]) refers, in the case of relevance in Diagram (1), to assuming spacetime to be a pseudo-Riemannian circle fibration of dimension  $D$  over a  $(D - 1)$ -dimensional base space, and considering the limit in which the circle fiber becomes infinitesimal. This limit looks like a field theory on the base space of the circle bundle, hence in one spacetime dimension less, which however has a higher dimensional space of field species, corresponding to the Fourier modes of the original fields on the circle fiber.

<sup>1</sup>At least in mathematics it is not uncommon that a theory is conjectured to exist before its actual nature is known: Famous examples include the theory of *motives* and the theory of the *field with one element*. The former has meanwhile been found.



But secondly, one finds higher dimensional analogs of black holes in higher dimensional supergravity, with  $p + 1$ -dimensional singularities, called *black* (or “solitonic”) *p-branes* [DIPSS88]. Under dimensional reduction of the ambient supergravity theory as above, the singularity of a black  $p$ -brane may or may not extend along the circle fiber that is being shrunk away. If it does not, then the result is again a black  $p$ -brane solution, now in the lower-dimensional theory of supergravity. But if it does, then along with reduction in spacetime dimension from  $D$  to  $D - 1$ , the black  $p$ -brane singularity effectively loses one dimension and appears as a black  $(p - 1)$ -brane solution in the lower dimensional supergravity theory; whence “double dimensional reduction”.

**Chan-Paton gauge enhancement.** In its most immediate (albeit naive, see below) form, the formulation of the problem of *gauge enhancement* in M-theory proceeds from the expected double dimensional reduction (2) of the black branes of M-theory (see [HSS18] for a precise account), to those of type IIA string theory, which looks as follows [Tow95a, Tow95b, FS02a, FS02b]:



From perturbative string theory one finds that open fundamental strings ending on the D-branes behave as quanta for an abelian  $U(1)$ -gauge theory (electromagnetism) on the worldvolume of the D-brane. A widely accepted but informal<sup>2</sup> argument [Wit96, Sec. 3] indicates that if  $N$  such D-branes are *coincident* then the gauge group *enhances* from the abelian group  $(U(1))^n$  to the non-abelian group  $U(N)$ . The idea is that massless open fundamental strings stretch in  $N \times N$  possible ways between the  $N$  coincident D-branes, thus constituting gauge bosons that organize in  $N \times N$  unitary matrices, called “Chan-Paton factors”. But it is non-trivial to check that scattering of these open strings reproduces, in the suitable limit, the scattering amplitudes of gauge bosons for non-abelian gauge theory (Yang-Mills theory). First approximate numerical checks of this idea are due to [CST03], similar numerical checks as well as exact derivation under simplifying assumptions are given in [BeSc03]; a full derivation has recently been claimed in [Lee17].

This phenomenon of *gauge enhancement on D-branes* is of paramount importance for string theory, in particular as a candidate for a realistic theory of physics: the fundamental gauge fields observed in nature, as per the Standard Model of particle physics, do of course involve non-abelian gauge groups, corresponding to the weak and strong nuclear force fields. While plain dimensional KK-reduction from 11-dimensional supergravity may exhibit such, the way this happens is incompatible with realistic coupling of the fermionic matter fields [Wi81]. Instead, realistic gauge fields have to arise from gauge enhancement on coincident D-branes (see [IU12, Sec. 10]). Moreover, all discussion of modern string theoretic topics such as *AdS/CFT duality* (see [AGMOO99]) or *geometric engineering of gauge theories* (going back to

<sup>2</sup> In [Wit96, first line on p. 8] the argument was introduced as an “obvious guess”. Most subsequent references cite this as a fact, e.g. the review [Mye03, Sec. 3].


[HaWi97], see e.g. [Fa17]), such as for classification of 6d SCFTs (as in [DZHTV15]), are crucially based on the phenomenon of gauge enhancement on coincident D-branes. But, under the M-theory conjecture, double dimensional reduction should exhibit an equivalence (“duality”) between (strongly coupled) type IIA string theory and M-theory, in particular between the full non-perturbative theory of D-branes and their M-brane pre-images. Hence if M-theory exists, then the phenomenon of gauge enhancement on coincident D-branes must correspond to, and is potentially explained by, a corresponding phenomenon on M-branes. This is, therefore, the most immediate (if somewhat naive, see below) incarnation of the problem of gauge enhancement in M-theory:

**Open Problem, Version 1:**

*What is the lift to M-theory of the non-abelian Chan-Paton gauge field degrees of freedom on coincident D-branes?*

Since the string theory literature tends to blur the distinction between what is known and what is conjectured, we briefly highlight what the folklore on this problem (e.g. [IU12, Sec. 6.3.3], [AG04]) does and does not achieve:

- A celebrated result in recent years (see [BLMP13] for review) shows that a class of non-abelian gauge field theories which are plausible candidates for the non-abelian worldvolume gauge field theories to be expected on black M2-branes that sit at ADE-singularities in spacetime do exist (the “BLG-model” and, more generally, the “ABJM-model”). However, a derivation of these field theories from M-theoretic degrees of freedom is missing; the argument works just by consistency checks.
- On the other hand, a conjectural sketch of such an explicit derivation does exist for the M-brane species MK6, whose image in the low-energy approximation provided by 11-dimensional supergravity is supposed to be the *Kaluza-Klein monopole spacetime* and which becomes the black D6-brane under dimensional reduction [Tow95a], [Sen97, Sec. 1]. For an *abelian* gauge field on the D6-brane, a straightforward analysis shows that it is sourced by doubly dimensionally reduced M2-branes ending on the KK-monopole [GM03, Sec. 2], [Ma04, Sec. 5.4]. But more generally, the KK monopoles may be argued to be the fixed point loci of spacetime orbifolds locally of the form  $\mathbb{R}^{6,1} \times \mathbb{C}^2 // G_{\text{ADE}}$ , for a finite subgroup  $G_{\text{ADE}} \subset \text{SU}(2)$ . A classical theorem [DuVal34, I, p. 1-3 (453-455)] (see [Re87] for review) implies that such singularities are canonically resolved by spheres touching along the shape of an ADE-Dynkin diagram:



If one here imagines that M2-branes wrap these *vanishing 2-cycles*, then under double dimensional reduction, this situation looks like an M-theoretic lift of the strings stretching between several coincident D6-branes, as indicated in the figure above, and hence looks like an M-theoretic lift of the Chan-Paton gauge enhancement mechanism discussed above.

This argument goes back to [Sen97, Sec. 2]; for review see [IU12, Sec. 6.3.3]. While this story is appealing, it is unsatisfactory that it has to treat the membrane in 11-dimensional spacetime as a direct analogue of the fundamental string in 10-dimensional spacetime: after all, the very term “M-theory” instead of “Membrane theory” was chosen as a reminder that this direct analogy is too naive.<sup>3</sup>

In short, the traditional attempts to understand gauge enhancement on M-branes suffer from the lack of any handle on the actual nature of M-theory. But what is worse, these stories argue a point that has, meanwhile, come to be thought as being inaccurate:

<sup>3</sup> [HW06, p. 1]: “As it has been proposed that [this] theory is a supermembrane theory but there are some reasons to doubt that interpretation, we will non-committedly call it the M-theory, leaving to the future the relation of M to membranes.”


**K-Theoretic gauge enhancement.** A well-known series of arguments [MiMo97, Wi98, FrWi99, MoWi00] shows that the gauge fields carried by D-branes do not actually have well-defined existence in themselves. Instead, one must view all the  $D(2p)$ -branes taken together, and then their gauge fields serve as representatives for classes in the generalized (co)homology theory: *twisted K-theory* (see e.g. [EvSa06, Evs06]). It is only these K-theory classes that are supposed to have intrinsic meaning. In other words, nonabelian gauge fields on separate D-brane species are much like coordinate charts on spacetime: A convenient but non-invariant means to present an actual reality. In actual reality, the D-brane species  $D(2p)$ ,  $p \in \{0, 2, 4, 6, 8\}$  only have a unified joint existence, and the gauge enhancement to non-abelian gauge fields on separate D-brane species is only one presentation, out of many, for a unified *higher gauge field* carried by all of them jointly: a cocycle in twisted K-theory.

In view of this, the problem of gauge enhancement in M-theory is really the following:<sup>4</sup>

**Open Problem, Version 2:**

*What is the cohomology theory classifying M-brane charge, and how does double dimensional reduction reduce it to the classification of D-brane charge in twisted K-theory?*

Hence the refined perspective of twisted K-theory shifts the focus away from Chan-Paton-like gauge enhancement on one particular D-brane species (which has no invariant meaning in the full theory) and instead highlights the complementary problem of how the full list of D-brane species arises and unifies to twisted K-theory (co-)cycles. However, this is in stark contrast to the disparate M-theoretic origin of the D-branes in the traditional story recalled above: Only the M2-brane and M5-brane exist as *fundamental branes*, meaning that they have corresponding Green-Schwarz type sigma-models (we recall this in detail below in Section 4.2). The double dimensional reduction of these yields all the brane species in type IIA string theory, *except* the D6 and *except* the D8 (while the D0 now appears as a reflection of the circle fibration itself):



On the other hand, up to now the M-theoretic origin of the D6-brane has only been argued for using its *black brane* incarnation, where it is supposed to be given by the MK6, as recalled above. The nature of the D8-brane is still more subtle [BRGPT96]. An M-theory lift has been proposed in [Hu98], but the proposal is not among the usual list of expected black M-branes. On the other hand, the reduction of the MO9-brane, whose existence in M-theory is solid (see [HSS18]), is not the black D8-brane, but the O8-plane (e.g. [GKST01, Sec. 3]).

This highlights that the core of the open problem, from the refined K-theoretic perspective, is really in the appearance of the D6- and D8-brane:


**Open Problem, Version 3:**

*What is the lift to M-theory of the fundamental D6-branes and D8-branes in type IIA string theory, such that the unified  $Dp$ -branes are jointly classified by twisted K-theory?*

**K-Theoretic gauge enhancement in rational approximation.** Twisted K-theory is a comparatively complicated structure, and the fine detail of which of its various variants really applies to D-branes is still the subject of discussion ([DFM09]). Of course the glaring problem here is, once more, that the non-perturbative theory to really answer these questions has been missing. Therefore, it is worth highlighting

<sup>4</sup> While a *derivation of K-theory from M-theory* is suggested by the title of [DMW03], that article only checks that the behavior of the partition function of the 11d supergravity  $C$ -field is compatible with the a priori K-theory classification of D-branes. Seeking a generalized cohomology describing the M-field and M-branes has been originally advocated in [Sa05a, Sa05b, Sa06, Sa10].

that the issue of gauge enhancement is visible, and has been an open problem, already in the *rational* approximation (i.e. ignoring all torsion-group effects), where a cocycle in twisted K-theory reduces to a cocycle in *twisted de Rham cohomology*. To each of the brane species above is associated a differential form on spacetime – its *flux form* – which corresponds to the brane in analogy to how the *Faraday tensor* of electromagnetism corresponds to a charged particle (0-brane). The double dimensional reduction of these flux forms is as follows (see [MaS04, Sec 4.2]), parallel to the pattern of the double dimensional reduction of the fundamental branes.



Here the right hand sides have been recognized in [Sa13, Sec 2.5] [FSS15b] for the top part and derived in [FSS16a, FSS16b] for the bottom part, we discuss this in detail below in Section 4.1. Notice that the  $F_2$ -contribution does arise from plain double dimensional reduction, as shown, not directly from the  $(G_4, G_7)$ , but as a rational image of the first Chern-class of the circle fibration itself.

Moreover, these differential forms satisfy relations (“twisted Bianchi identities”) that identify them, via the de Rham theorem, as cocycles in the rationalization of a generalized cohomology theory:

Flux forms	Twisted Bianchi identity	Rational cocycle in
<b>M-theory</b>	$dG_4 = 0$ $dG_7 = -\frac{1}{2}G_4 \wedge G_4$	cohomotopy in degree 4
<b>Type IIA string theory</b>	$dH_3 = 0$ $dF_{2p+4} = H_3 \wedge F_{2p+2}$	twisted K-theory in even degree

In this rational approximation, the core of the open problem of gauge enhancement is still fully visible; now it reads:

#### Open Problem, Rational version 1:


*What is the origin of the RR-flux forms  $F_8$  and  $F_{10}$  from M-theory, such that these unify with the double dimensional reduction of the M-flux  $(G_4, G_7)$  to an un-truncated cocycle in rational twisted K-theory (i.e. in twisted de Rham cohomology)?*

We present a solution to this version of the problem below in Section 4.1.

Even though rationalization means to disregard, for the time being, torsion information in the problem of gauge enhancement, it has the striking advantage that these rationalized relations follow rigorously from a *first principles*-definition of M-branes (recalled below in Section 4.2), and hence serve as a starting point for a systematic analysis of the problem of gauge enhancement:

To properly take the all-important local supersymmetry into account, one has to consider the refinement of the plain flux forms to super-flux forms on super-spacetime. But the torsion constraints of supergravity [Lot90, EE12] require the bifermionic component of these to be covariantly constant on each super tangent space (see [FSS18, Sec. 1]), where they identify as those cocycles  $\mu_{p+2}$  in the supersymmetry super Lie algebra cohomology that define the Green-Schwarz-type sigma-models for the fundamental  $p$ -branes in the first place ([AETW87, AzTo89]). This identification locates the problem in the precise context of *super homotopy theory* of super-spacetimes. The beauty of this is that homotopy theory is governed by *universal constructions*, which, roughly, means that it exhibits the emergence of “god-given” structures from a minimum of input. In fact, in super homotopy theory, the super-cocycles  $\mu_{M2}$ ,  $\mu_{M5}$ , witnessing the fundamental M-branes, emerge by a universal construction (a kind of equivariant Whitehead tower) from nothing but the superpoint [FSS13, HS17], and their double dimensional reduction is

reflected by another universal construction [FSS16a, Sec. 3] [FSS16b, Sec. 3], the *Ext/Cyc-adjunction* (discussed in detail Section 2.2 below):



Fundamental brane super-cocycle	Cocycle condition	in rational cohomology theory
<b>M-theory</b>	$d\mu_{M2} = 0$ $d\mu_{M5} = -\frac{1}{2}\mu_{M2} \wedge \mu_{M2}$	cohomotopy in degree 4
<b>Type IIA string theory</b>	$d\mu_{F1} = 0$ $d\mu_{2p+2} = \mu_{F1} \wedge \mu_{2p}$	twisted K-theory in even degree

Here (rational) *cohomotopy* in degree-4 is the generalized cohomology theory that is represented by the (rationalized) 4-sphere, meaning that the joint M2/M5-brane cocycle is a morphism in the rational super homotopy category of the form ([FSS15b][FSS16a])

$$\mathbb{R}^{10,1|\mathbf{32}} \xrightarrow{\mu_{M2/M5}} S^4 \quad \in \text{Ho}(\text{SuperSpaces}_{\mathbb{R}}) .$$

That cohomotopy governs the M-brane charges this way, at least rationally, was first highlighted in [Sa13, Sec. 2.5]. A priori there are many full homotopy types that look like the 4-sphere in rational approximation. But in [HSS18] further evidence was provided to that something at least close to the actual 4-sphere is the correct coefficient for M-brane charge. Namely, the 4-sphere coefficient here is naturally identified with the 4-sphere around a black M5-brane singularity in  $D = 11$  supergravity, and this identification induces real structure on the 4-sphere, as well as finite group actions in the ADE-series, induced from corresponding BPS actions on super-spacetime. This allows to ask for enhancements of the above M2/M5-brane cocycle to *equivariant* cohomotopy

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G_{\text{ADE}} \times G_{\text{HW}} & & G_{\text{ADE}} \times G_{\text{HW}} \\ \curvearrowright & \xrightarrow{\hat{\mu}_{M2/M5}} & \curvearrowright \\ \mathbb{R}^{10,1|\mathbf{32}} & \longrightarrow & S^4 \end{array} \quad \in \text{Ho}((G_{\text{ADE}} \times G_{\text{HW}}) \text{SuperSpaces}_{\mathbb{R}}) .$$

It is shown in [HSS18] that this equivariant enhancement makes the *black branes* at ADE-singularities appear, and unifies them with the fundamental M-branes. In particular, the corresponding A-type actions on the 4-sphere factor through the circle action

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S^1 & & U(1) & & SU(2) \\ \curvearrowright & & \curvearrowright & & \curvearrowright \\ S^4 & := & S(\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{C}^2) & \subset & S(\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{C}^2) \end{array}$$

which is the suspension of the circle action on the complex Hopf fibration. The projection to the corresponding (rational) homotopy quotient is hence identified with the M-theory circle fibration in the near horizon geometry of an M5-brane:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& \boxed{\text{M2/M5-brane cocycle}} & & & \\
\boxed{\text{11d super-spacetime}} & \mathbb{R}^{10,1|32} & \xrightarrow{\mu_{\text{M2/M5}}} & S^4 & \boxed{\text{4-sphere coefficient}} \\
& \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
\boxed{\text{10d super-spacetime}} & \mathbb{R}^{9,1|16+\overline{16}} \simeq \mathbb{R}^{10,1|32} // S^1 & & S^4 // S^1 & \boxed{\text{A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere}}
\end{array} \tag{5}$$

In conclusion, the problem of gauge enhancement in M-theory reads, in the rational approximation, but otherwise proceeding from *first principles*, as follows:

**Open Problem, Rational version 2:**

*Which universal construction in rational super homotopy theory enhances the cyclification of the M2/M5-cocycle from 6-truncated to un-truncated rational twisted K-theory?*


**Gauge enhancement explained.** It is this version of the problem to which we present a solution. First we explain and analyze two relevant universal constructions in homotopy theory:

- (i) *Fiberwise stabilization* (Section 2.1) and
- (ii) *the Ext/Cyc-adjunction* (Section 2.2).

Then we consider (Section 3.1) the rational homotopy type of the *A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere*, as in (5) above, and we apply the previous two universal constructions to it (Section 3.2): Our main Theorem 3.18 shows that a direct summand of rational un-truncated twisted K-theory appears in the fiberwise stabilization of the Ext/Cyc-unit on the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere.

Since homotopy theory is immensely rich and computationally demanding (see. e.g. [Rav03, HHR09]) one computes in successive approximation, filtered *chromatic layers*. The first of these approximations is *rational homotopy theory* (e.g. [Hes06]) obtained by disregarding, for the time being, all torsion elements (nilpotent elements) in homotopy groups and cohomology groups. The model for *rational parametrized stable homotopy theory* that we use in our computations has been conjectured in [FSS16a, p. 20] and was established in [BM18]. It allows us to reveal the deeper meaning of a curious dg-algebraic observation due to [RS00] (recalled as Prop. 3.13 below), which culminates in our main Theorem 3.18 below. But since the gauge enhancement mechanism which we present is by *universal constructions* (specifically the *derived adjunctions* discussed in Section 2) the lift of the mechanism beyond the rational approximation certainly exists, it is just much harder to analyze. We come back to this below.


Finally in Section 4.2 we apply this general result to the double dimensional reduction of the fundamental M-brane cocycles and show that it implies its *gauge enhancement* by making the D6- and D8-brane cocycle appear and unify to a single super-cocycle in rational un-truncated twisted K-theory:



Notice how the ingredients of the folklore on gauge enhancement, as recalled above, do appear in this rigorous result, albeit in a somewhat subtle way: First of all, the fact that fundamental branes and



the black branes are closely related, while still crucially different, particularly when it comes to their gauge enhancement, is reflected in how super-cocycles interact with spacetime ADE-singularities in the data for a real ADE-equivariant cohomotopy class [HSS18]. Second, the claim that gauge enhancement in M-theory is connected to the appearance of ADE-singularities in spacetime is reflected here in the fact that the un-truncated rational twisted K-theory spectrum, which, as we have discussed, is the true rational coefficient for the gauge enhanced brane charges, only appears from fiberwise stabilization of the *equivariant* 4-sphere coefficient, which also induces the appearance of singular fixed point strata in spacetime, via equivariant enhancement:



Of course it remains to lift our result beyond the approximation of rational homotopy theory. We suggest that the rational solution to gauge enhancement of Thm. 3.18, Sec. 4.2 points to its own non-rational refinement. The reason is that, as amplified above, the construction of rational gauge enhancement is by *universal constructions* in homotopy theory, and by their universal nature, these do make sense also non-rationally – they are just much harder to compute. We can say this more concretely: The way that the rational version of the twisted K-theory spectrum appears below is via a rational but twisted version of *Snaith’s theorem*, see Remark 3.14 below. Snaith’s theorem says that the K-theory spectrum  $KU$  is obtained from the suspension spectrum  $\Sigma_+^\infty BS^1$  of the classifying space  $BS^1$  simply by multiplicatively inverting the Bott generator  $\beta$ :

$$\Sigma_+^\infty BS^1[\beta^{-1}] \simeq_{\text{swhe}} KU.$$

The rational version of Snaith’s theorem is not a deep theorem but an immediate fact, as is the rational version of its generalization from plain to twisted K-theory (Example 2.21 below). This underlies our identification of rational twisted K-theory in the following. Since rationalization is the coarsest non-trivial approximation to full homotopy theory (much like the first derivative to a non-linear function at some point) it loses plenty of information.

A priori, what rationally looks like the twisted K-theory spectrum could be all kinds of different twisted spectra, non-rationally. However, we do not just see the rational twisted K-theory spectrum in isolation, but we see it appear by a universal construction from the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere. For our main theorem on gauge enhancement, Theorem 3.18, this universal construction is what matters (namely the adjunction units for  $\text{Ext} \dashv \text{Cyc}$  and for  $\Sigma_{S^3}^\infty \dashv \Omega_{S^3}^\infty$ ), and not just the end result. Therefore, any non-rational lift of our gauge enhancement mechanism should arise by the same universal construction, applied non-rationally, followed only by other universal constructions that are rationally invisible. This considerably constrains the possibilities. Hence what the rational triviality of Snaith’s theorem really means here is that (fiberwise) inversion of the Bott generator is a consistent candidate construction to be added to our gauge enhancement mechanism when lifting it beyond the rational approximation.

This should make it plausible that the gauge enhancement mechanism presented in Section 4.2 does generalize beyond the rational approximation to a derivation of full twisted K-theory from cohomotopy in degree 4. We may state this as the remaining part of the problem of gauge enhancement in M-theory:

**Open problem, Remaining part:** *What is the non-rational lift of the gauge enhancement mechanism, by universal constructions in super homotopy theory, from Section 4.2?*

However, this deserves to be discussed extensively elsewhere.

## 2 Two universal constructions in Homotopy theory

Here we discuss two universal constructions in homotopy theory, which, when jointly applied to the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere (discussed in Section 3 below) reveal the mechanism of gauge enhancement on M-branes (Section 4 below).


First, in Section 2.1, we recall the topic of *parametrized stable homotopy theory* and then introduce from [BM18] a dg-algebraic model for its rationalization, which enables us to compute in this theory: Theorem 2.14 establishes differential-graded modules as rational models for parametrized spectra, and Prop. 2.15 characterizes the fiberwise stabilization adjunction in terms of these.

Then, in Section 2.2, we establish how the operation of forming cyclic loop spaces participates in a homotopy-theoretic adjunction, and we characterize the adjunction unit (Theorem 2.39).


This section here may be read independently and should be of interest independent of its application to M-brane phenomena. Conversely, readers interested only in the application to M-theory and willing to trust our homotopy-theoretic proofs could well skip this section.

### 2.1 Fiberwise stabilization

In [FSS16a, p. 20] we found that the super  $L_\infty$ -algebraic F1/Dp brane cocycles organize into a diagram as shown on the right below, and we indicated that this is to be thought of as the image in supergeometric rational homotopy theory of a cocycle in twisted K-theory realized as a morphism of parametrized spectra, as shown on the left below



A cocycle in twisted K-theory according to [ABG10, NSS12].



The descended type IIA F1/Dp-brane cocycle according to [FSS16a, Theorem 4.16].

Here a *spectrum* is a kind of linearized version of a topological space. By the famous *Brown representability theory* maps into spectra represent cocycles in abelian generalized cohomology theories, such as K-theory. Moreover, a *parametrized spectrum* is a bundle of spectra over some base space, and maps into these represent cocycles in *twisted* generalized cohomology theories.

$$\text{Spectra} \hookrightarrow \text{Parametrized spectra} \xrightarrow{\text{Underlying parameter space}} \text{Spaces}$$

Parametrized over the point

Under *Koszul duality*, the conjecture of [FSS16a, p. 20] means, roughly, that there are blue/italicized entries in the following table, that unify Quillen-Sullivan's DG-model for plain homotopy theory of topological spaces (Prop. 2.8 below) with Schwede-Shipley's DG-model for stable homotopy theory of spectra (Prop. 2.13 below) to a DG-model for parametrized spectra (Theorem 2.14 below).

Homotopy theory	Stable	Parametrized stable	Plain
<b>Plain</b>	Spectra	Parametrized spectra	Spaces
<b>Rational</b>	Cochain complexes	<i>DG-modules</i>	DGC-algebras
<b>Super rational</b>	Super cochain complexes	<i>Super DG-modules</i>	Super DGC-algebras ("FDA"s)

This conjecture has been proven recently in [BM18]. Here we review the bits of the resulting *rational parametrized stable homotopy theory* that we need to state and prove our main result in Theorem 3.18 below. For that, the key result of the present section is Theorem 2.14 with Prop. 2.15 below, which characterize the DG-models of fiberwise suspension spectra and of fiberwise stabilization.

In order to fix notation and conventions, first we briefly recall some background on homotopy theory.

**Definition 2.1** (Classical homotopy theory (see e.g. [Sch17b])). We write

- (i)  $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spaces})$  for the homotopy category of topological spaces, also called the *classical homotopy category*, hence the localization of the category of topological spaces at the *weak homotopy equivalences* (the maps that induce isomorphisms on all homotopy groups, we denote these by  $\simeq_{\mathrm{whe}}$ )
- (ii)  $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spaces})_{\mathbb{Q}}$  for the corresponding *rational homotopy category*, hence the localization of the category of topological spaces at the maps that induce isomorphisms on all rationalized homotopy groups;
- (iii)  $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spaces})_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{ft}}$  for the full subcategory on homotopy types of *finite type* which are those spaces  $X$  for which  $H^1(X, \mathbb{Q})$  and  $\pi_{k \geq 2}(X) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$  are finite-dimensional  $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector spaces for all  $k \geq 2$ ;
- (iv)  $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spaces})_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{nil}}$  for the full subcategory of *nilpotent* spaces, which are those spaces  $X$  that are connected, whose fundamental group  $\pi_1(X)$  is a nilpotent group and such that its actions on the higher rational homotopy groups is nilpotent (i.e. making them nilpotent  $\pi_1(X)$ -modules).

**Definition 2.2** (Parametrized homotopy theory (e.g. [BM18, Sect. 1.1])). For  $X \in \mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spaces})$  any space (Def. 2.1), we write

- (i)  $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spaces}/_X)$  for the homotopy category of spaces over  $X$ , i.e. of spaces equipped with a map to  $X$ , we will denote such objects by  $\begin{bmatrix} Y \\ \downarrow \pi \\ X \end{bmatrix}$ ; this is the  $X$ -*parametrized classical homotopy category*;
- (ii)  $\mathrm{Ho}((\mathrm{Spaces}/_X)^{X/})$  for the homotopy category of spaces over  $X$  that are equipped with a section, we denote such objects  $\begin{bmatrix} X \\ \downarrow \sigma \\ \mathrm{id} \downarrow \pi \\ Y \\ \downarrow \pi \\ X \end{bmatrix}$ .

In the special case that  $X \simeq *$  the point we have

- (i)  $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spaces}/_*) \simeq \mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spaces})$  is equivalently the classical homotopy category (Def. 2.1);
- (ii)  $\mathrm{Ho}((\mathrm{Spaces}/_*)^{*/}) \simeq \mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spaces}^{*/})$  is the homotopy category of *pointed spaces*.

Therefore, we may think of  $(\mathrm{Spaces}/_X)^{X/}$  as the homotopy category of  $X$ -*parametrized pointed spaces*.

Recall that, given a pointed space  $Y$ , there is its based loop space  $\Omega_* Y$  and its suspension  $\Sigma_* Y$ . More generally, we can consider this in a fibered form, where the basepoint is replaced by a whole topological space  $X$ .

**Proposition 2.3** (looping and suspension). *If  $Y$  is parametrized over a space  $X$  (Def. 2.2), we can form its fiberwise loop space  $\Omega_X Y$ . This construction extends to a functor that admits a left adjoint ([Bor94, Sec. 3])  $\Sigma_X$ , called the fiberwise reduced suspension*

$$(\mathrm{Spaces}/_X)^{X/} \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\Omega_X} \\ \xrightarrow[\Sigma_X]{\tau} \end{array} (\mathrm{Spaces}/_X)^{X/} .$$

A (fiberwise) loop space  $\Omega_X Y$  carries the structure of a (fiberwise) homotopical group (“grouplike  $A_\infty$ -space”) given by concatenation of loops. By the Eckmann-Hilton argument, the (fiberwise) double loop space  $\Omega_X^2 Y := \Omega_X \Omega_X Y$  carries an additional (fiberwise) first order homotopy commutativity structure, given by twisting two based loops around each other. As the loop order  $\Omega_X^n Y$  increases with  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the resulting homotopy structure becomes ever more commutative, approaching *homotopical abelian groups*. One way to formalize that the process of increasing loop order *stabilizes* to abelian homotopy theory is to form a homotopy category for which the adjunction from Prop. 2.3 is an equivalence. This is the statement of the *stabilization adjunction* which we recall below in Prop. 2.6.

**Definition 2.4** (Stable homotopy theory (see e.g. [Sch17c])). We write

- (i)  $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spectra})$  for the *homotopy category of spectra*, also called the *stable homotopy category*;
- (ii)  $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spaces})_{\mathbb{Q}}$  for the *rational stable homotopy category*;
- (iii)  $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spectra})_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{ft}}$  for the full subcategory on those spectra  $X$  which are of *finite type*, hence all whose rationalized stable homotopy groups  $\pi_k(X) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  are finite-dimensional;
- (iv)  $\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spectra})_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{bbl}}$  for the full subcategory of on those spectra which are bounded below, hence whose rationalized stable homotopy groups all vanish below some given degree.

**Definition 2.5** (Parametrized stable homotopy theory (see e.g. [BM18, Sec. 1.2])). For  $X \in \text{Ho}(\text{Spaces})$  (Def. 2.1) we write

- (i)  $\text{Ho}(\text{Spectra}_X)$  for the *homotopy category of spectra parametrized over  $X$* ;
- (ii)  $\text{Ho}(\text{Spectra}_X)_{\mathbb{Q}}$  for the *rational homotopy category of spectra parametrized over  $X$* ;

A key point about parametrized spectra (Def. 2.5) is that they represent *twisted* generalized (abelian) cohomology theories, generalizing the fact that plain spectra represent (abelian) generalized cohomology theories (e.g. [ABGHR14]). We will be particularly interested in the (rational) twisted cohomology theory called twisted K-theory (Lemma 2.23 below).

The fundamental relation between classical and stable (parametrized) homotopy theory is expressed by the following fact:

**Proposition 2.6** (Fiberwise stabilization adjunction). *For any  $X \in \text{Ho}(\text{Spaces})$  (Def. 2.1) there are pairs of adjoint functors ([Bor94, Sec. 3])*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \Omega_{+,X}^{\infty} & & \\
 & \swarrow & & \searrow & \\
 \text{Ho}(\text{Spaces}_{/X}) & \xleftarrow{\perp} & \text{Ho}\left((\text{Spaces}_{/X})^{X/}\right) & \xleftarrow{\perp} & \text{Ho}(\text{Spectra}_X) \\
 & \searrow & & \swarrow & \\
 & & \Sigma_{+,X}^{\infty} & & 
 \end{array} \quad (6)$$

between the classical parametrized homotopy categories (Def. 2.2) and the parametrized stable homotopy category (Def. 2.5). Here  $(-)+_{+,X}$  adjoints a copy of  $X$ , while  $\Omega_X^{\infty}$  sends an  $X$ -parametrized spectrum to its fibrewise infinite loop space, and the operations  $\Sigma_X^{\infty}$  and/or  $\Sigma_{+,X}^{\infty}$  are called forming fiberwise suspension spectra.

Moreover, this stabilizes the looping/suspension adjunction from Prop. 2.3 in that there is a diagram, commuting up to natural isomorphism, as follows

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{Ho}\left((\text{Spaces}_{/X})^{X/}\right) & \xrightleftharpoons[\Sigma_X]{\Omega_X} & \text{Ho}\left((\text{Spaces}_{/X})^{X/}\right) \\
 \downarrow \Sigma_X^{\infty} \quad \uparrow \Omega_X^{\infty} & & \downarrow \Sigma_X^{\infty} \quad \uparrow \Omega_X^{\infty} \\
 \text{Ho}(\text{Spectra}_X) & \xrightleftharpoons[\Sigma_X]{\Omega_X} & \text{Ho}(\text{Spectra}_X)
 \end{array}$$

The unit morphism of the fiberwise stabilization adjunction (6) on any  $Y \in \text{Ho}(\text{Spaces}_{/X})$  we will denote by

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 Y & \xrightarrow{\text{st}_X(Y)} & \Omega_X^{\infty} \Sigma_{+,X}^{\infty}(Y) \\
 & \searrow & \swarrow \\
 & Y & 
 \end{array} \quad (7)$$

It turns out that the classical homotopy category is an extremely rich structure, and the same is still true for the stable homotopy theory. In order to get a handle on these categories, one may filter them in various ways such as to study homotopy types in controlled approximations. A key such approximation is the rational approximation. We recall this as Prop. 2.8 and Prop. 2.13 below.

**Definition 2.7** (Rational DG-algebraic homotopy theory). We write

- (i)  $\text{Ho}(\text{dgcAlg})$  for the *homotopy category of connective differential graded-commutative algebras* over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , where “connective” means that with the differential taken to be of degree  $+1$ , the dg-algebra is  $\mathbb{N}$ -graded;
- (ii)  $\text{Ho}(\text{dgcAlg})_{\text{cn}}$  for the full subcategory on the *connected* DGC-algebras, which are those  $A$  for which the unit inclusion  $\mathbb{Q} \rightarrow A$  induces an isomorphism  $\mathbb{Q} \simeq H^0(A)$ ;
- (iii)  $\text{dgcAlg}_{\text{ft}}$  for the full subcategory on those DGC-algebras  $A$  of *finite type*, which are those that are cohomologically connected (as above) and moreover quasi-isomorphic to a DG-algebra that is degreewise finitely generated;

We will write free graded commutative algebras as polynomial algebras

$$\mathbb{Q}[\alpha_{k_1}, \beta_{k_2}, \dots],$$

where the subscript on the generator will always indicate the degree. A differential on such free graded commutative algebras is fully determined by its action on the generator, and hence we denote dg-algebras obtained this way by

$$\mathbb{Q}[\alpha_{k_1}, \beta_{k_2}, \dots] / \begin{pmatrix} d\alpha_{k_1} = \dots \\ d\beta_{k_2} = \dots \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}.$$

The following is the classical statement of rational homotopy theory due to Sullivan [Su77] and Bousfield-Gugenheim [BG76] (the idea of the proof is recalled in [BM18, Theorem 2.1.10]):

**Proposition 2.8** (DG-model for rational homotopy theory (e.g. [Hes06])).

(i) *There is an adjunction*

$$\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spaces}) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}} \\ \xleftarrow[S]{\perp} \end{array} \mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{dgcAlg})^{\mathrm{op}}$$

between the classical homotopy category of topological spaces (Def. 2.1) and the opposite of the homotopy category of DGC-algebras (Def. 2.7), where  $\mathcal{O}$  denotes the derived functor of forming the DGC-algebra of polynomial differential forms of a topological spaces.

(ii) *This adjunction restricts to an equivalence of categories*

$$\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spaces})_{\mathbb{Q}, \mathrm{nil}, \mathrm{ft}} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}} \\ \xleftarrow[S]{\simeq} \end{array} \mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{dgcAlg})_{\mathrm{ft}}^{\mathrm{op}} \quad (8)$$

between the rational homotopy category of nilpotent spaces of finite type (Def. 2.1) and the homotopy category of DGC-algebras of finite type (Def. 2.7).

(iii) *The rational cohomology of a space is computed by the cochain cohomology of any one of its dgc-algebra models*

$$H^\bullet(X, \mathbb{Q}) \simeq H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}(A)).$$

(iv) *Under this equivalence, every space  $X$  on the left has a model by a minimal dgc-algebra, whose underlying graded algebra is the free graded-commutative algebra  $\mathbb{Q}[\pi_\bullet(X)^* \otimes \mathbb{Q}]$  on the rational dual homotopy groups of  $X$ :*

$$\mathcal{O}(X) \simeq \mathbb{Q}[\pi_\bullet(X)^* \otimes \mathbb{Q}] / (d(\dots) = (\dots)).$$

**Example 2.9** (Minimal DGC-algebra model for 3-sphere). A minimal DGC-algebra model for the 3-sphere, via Prop. 2.8, is given by

$$\mathcal{O}(S^3) \simeq \mathbb{Q}[h_3] / (dh_3 = 0).$$

Note that, rationally,  $S^3$  is indistinguishable from a  $K(\mathbb{Z}, 3)$ .

**Example 2.10** (Minimal DGC-algebra model for 4-sphere). A minimal DGC-algebra model for the 4-sphere, via Prop. 2.8, is given by

$$\mathcal{O}(S^4) \simeq \mathrm{Sym}(\omega_4, \omega_7) / \begin{pmatrix} d\omega_4 = 0 \\ d\omega_7 = -\frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Example 2.11** (Minimal dgc-algebra model for  $BS^1$ ). A minimal DGC-algebra model for the classifying space  $BS^1$  (16), via Prop. 2.8, is given by

$$\mathcal{O}(BS^1) \simeq \mathbb{Q}[\omega_2] / (d\omega_2 = 0).$$

**Definition 2.12** (Rational DG-modular homotopy theory). Given  $A \in \mathrm{dgcAlg}$  (Def. 2.7) we write

- (i)  $A\text{-Mod}$  for the category of (unbounded) dg-modules over  $A$ ;
- (ii)  $A\text{-Mod}_{\mathrm{ft}}$  for the subcategory of those of *finite type*, hence those whose cochain cohomology is degreewise finite-dimensional;

- (iii)  $A\text{-Mod}_{\text{bbl}}$  for the subcategory of those *bounded below*, hence those whose cochain cohomology vanishes below some degree;
- (iv)  $\text{dgcAlg}^{A/}$  for the category of rational connective DGC-algebras equipped with an algebra homomorphism from  $A$ ; we denote objects in this category by  $\begin{bmatrix} B \\ \uparrow \pi^* \\ A \end{bmatrix}$ .
- (v)  $(\text{dgcAlg}^{A/})_{/A}$  for the homotopy category of *augmented  $A$ -algebras*, with objects of form  $\begin{bmatrix} A \\ \uparrow \sigma^* \\ B \\ \uparrow \pi^* \\ A \end{bmatrix}$ .

Here  $\sigma^*$  is called the *augmentation* and its kernel  $\ker(\sigma^*) \in A\text{-Mod}$  is called the *augmentation ideal*.

The next proposition is the analogue of the Sullivan equivalence, Prop. 2.8, in the stable case:

**Proposition 2.13** (DG-model for rational stable homotopy theory). *There is an equivalence*

$$\text{Ho}(\text{Spectra})_{\mathbb{Q}, \text{ft}} \xrightleftharpoons{\simeq} \text{Ho}(\text{Ch}(\mathbb{Q}))_{\text{ft}}^{\text{op}}$$

between the homotopy category of spectra of finite type (Def. 2.1) and the opposite of the homotopy category of rational cochain complexes of finite type (Def. 2.7).

*Proof.* By [ScSh03, Thm. 5.1.6], [Shi07, Cor. 2.15] we have an equivalence

$$\text{Ho}(H\mathbb{Q}\text{-Mod}) \simeq \text{Ho}(\text{Ch}(\mathbb{Q})).$$

Under the assumption of finite type, degreewise linear dualization gives

$$\text{Ho}(\text{Ch}(\mathbb{Q}))_{\text{ft}} \simeq \text{Ho}(\text{Ch}(\mathbb{Q}))_{\text{ft}}^{\text{op}}.$$

Finally [BM18, Lemma 2.3.5] yields

$$\text{Ho}(\text{Spectra})_{\mathbb{Q}} \simeq \text{Ho}(H\mathbb{Q}\text{-Mod}).$$

Putting these three equivalences together yields the claimed equivalence. For an alternative proof of this fact which does not use dualization see [BM18, §2.7.4].  $\square$

Now we consider the unification of Prop. 2.8 with Prop. 2.13 that was conjectured in [FSS16a, p. 20] and established in [BM18]:

**Theorem 2.14** (DG-model for rational parametrized spectra). *For  $A \in \text{dgcAlg}$  a connective rational differential graded-commutative algebra (Def. 2.7), there is a pseudo-natural transformation*

$$\text{Ho}(\text{Spectra}_{\mathcal{S}(A)}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{M}_A} \text{Ho}(A\text{-Mod}^{\text{op}})$$

from the homotopy category of parametrized spectra (Def. 2.5) over the rational space  $\mathcal{S}(A)$  (Prop. 2.8) to the homotopy category of DG-modules over  $A$  (Def. 2.12) with the following properties:

1. It factors over the rational homotopy category of parametrized spectra:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Ho}(\text{Spectra}_{\mathcal{S}(A)}) & \longrightarrow & \text{Ho}(\text{Spectra}_{\mathcal{S}(A)})_{\mathbb{Q}} \\ & \searrow \mathcal{M}_A & \downarrow \\ & & \text{Ho}(A\text{-Mod})^{\text{op}}. \end{array}$$

2. If the base space  $\mathcal{S}(A)$  is simply-connected, then on parametrized spectra that are bounded below and of finite type it exhibits an equivalence of rational homotopy categories:

$$\text{Ho}(\text{Spectra}_{\mathcal{S}(A)})_{\mathbb{Q}, \text{ft}, \text{bbl}} \xrightarrow[\simeq]{\mathcal{M}_A} \text{Ho}(A\text{-Mod})_{\text{ft}, \text{bbl}}^{\text{op}}.$$

3. For  $A = \mathbb{Q}$ , this is, up to natural isomorphism, the equivalence of rational stable homotopy theory from Prop. 2.13:

$$\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spectra})_{\mathbb{Q}, \mathrm{ft}} \xrightarrow[\simeq]{\mathcal{M}_A} \mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Ch}(\mathbb{Q}))_{\mathrm{ft}}^{\mathrm{op}}.$$

*Proof.* Pseudo-naturality is [BM18, Cor. 2.7.26]. The first item is [BM18, Cor. 2.7.31]. The second item is [BM18, Thm. 2.7.42]. The third item is [BM18, Rem. 2.7.44].  $\square$

The following elaboration on Theorem 2.14 will be needed for the proof of our Theorem 3.18 below:

**Proposition 2.15** (DG-model for fiberwise suspension spectra ([BM18, Rem. 2.7.27])). *Let  $A \in \mathrm{dgcAlg}$  a connective rational differential graded-commutative algebra (Def. 2.7) and let*

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} Y \\ \downarrow \pi \\ \mathcal{S}(A) \end{array} \right] \in \mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{Spaces}_{/\mathcal{S}(A)})_{\mathbb{Q}}$$

*be a space over (Def. 2.2) the rational space  $\mathcal{S}(A)$  that it represents via Prop. 2.8. Then, after passing to DG-models via  $\mathcal{M}_A$  (Theorem 2.14), the fiberwise suspension spectrum (Prop. 2.6) is modeled by  $\mathcal{O}(Y)$  (according to Prop. 2.8), regarded as an  $A$ -module via  $\pi^*$ :*

$$\mathcal{M}_A(\Sigma_{+, \mathcal{S}(A)}^\infty(Y)) \simeq \mathcal{O}(Y). \quad (9)$$

*Proof.* By the proof of [BM18, Lemma 2.7.25] we have the following commutative diagram of left Quillen functors:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \Sigma_{+, \mathcal{S}(A)}^\infty & & \\ & \nearrow & & \searrow & \\ \mathrm{Spaces}_{/\mathcal{S}(A)} & \xrightarrow{(-)_{+, \mathcal{S}(A)}} & (\mathrm{Spaces}_{/\mathcal{S}(A)})^{\mathcal{S}(A)/} & \xrightarrow{\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}(A)}^\infty} & \mathrm{Spectra}_{\mathcal{S}(A)} \\ \downarrow \mathcal{O}_A & & \downarrow \mathcal{O}_A & & \downarrow \mathcal{M}_A \\ (\mathrm{dgcAlg}^{A/})^{\mathrm{op}} & \xrightarrow{(-) \oplus A} & ((\mathrm{dgcAlg}^{A/})_{/A})^{\mathrm{op}} & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{aug}_A} & A\text{-Mod}^{\mathrm{op}} \end{array}$$

Here the left and bottom map act by

$$\left[ \begin{array}{c} Y \\ \downarrow \pi \\ \mathcal{S}(A) \end{array} \right] \xrightarrow{\mathcal{O}_A} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{O}(Y) \\ \uparrow \pi^* \\ \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{S}(A)) \\ \uparrow \eta \\ A \end{array} \right] \mapsto \left[ \begin{array}{c} A \\ \uparrow 0 \oplus \mathrm{id} \\ \mathcal{O}(Y) \oplus A \\ \uparrow (\pi^* \circ \eta) \oplus \mathrm{id} \\ A \end{array} \right] \xrightarrow{\mathrm{aug}_A} \ker(0 \oplus \mathrm{id}) = \mathcal{O}(Y),$$

from which the assertion follows.  $\square$

Via Theorem 2.14 we may now make use of the established homotopy theory of *minimal dg-modules* [Roi94] to model parametrized spectra, rationally:

**Definition 2.16** (Minimal dg-modules (see [Roi94][RS00, Sec. 1], [BM18, Rem. 2.7.29])). Let  $A \in \mathrm{dgcAlg}$  be a dgc-algebra. Write

$$A[n] \simeq A \otimes \langle c_n \rangle \in A\text{-Mod}$$

for the dg-module over  $A$  which is free on a single generator  $c_n$  in degree  $n$ . Hence the underlying graded vector space is that of  $A$  shifted up in degree by  $n$ , the differential is that of  $A$ , and the module structure is given by left multiplication with elements in  $A$ .

(i) Given any  $N \in A\text{-Mod}$  and given a closed element  $\alpha \in N$ ,  $d\alpha = 0$ , of degree  $n + 1$ , for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we obtain a new dg-module

$$N \oplus_\alpha (A \otimes \langle c_n \rangle) \in A\text{-Mod}$$

whose underlying graded vector space is the direct sum  $N \oplus (A \otimes \langle c_n \rangle)$ , equipped with the evident  $A$ -module structure, and whose differential is induced from that of  $N$  and  $A$ , together with

$$dc_n := \alpha,$$

hence

$$d(n + a \otimes c_n) = d_N n + (d_A a) \otimes c_n + (-1)^{\deg(a)} a \cdot \alpha$$

for all  $n \in N$  and  $a \in A$ . We also say that  $N \oplus_\alpha A \otimes \langle c_n \rangle$  is obtained from  $N$  by an  $n$ -cell attachment.

(ii) A countable relative cell complex dg-module over  $A$  is an inclusion

$$N \hookrightarrow \widehat{N}$$

and dg-module over  $A$  that witnesses  $\widehat{N}$  as arising from  $N$  via a countable sequence of such cell attachments. If here  $N = 0$  is the zero-module, then such  $\widehat{N}$  is a *countable cell complex* dg-module. In other words, a countable cell complex dg-module over  $A$  is a choice of differential on the graded vector space  $A \otimes V$ , with  $V$  a graded rational vector space of finite type, equipped with a countable, ordered linear basis  $\{e^{(i)}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ , such that the differential of the  $(i + 1)$ th basis element is expressed in terms of the lower basis elements

$$de^{(i+1)} \in A \otimes \langle e^{(j)} \rangle_{j \leq i},$$

and such that this differential makes the evident  $A$ -module structure on  $A \otimes V$  into a dg-module structure.

(iii) Finally, this is called a *minimal dg-module* over  $A$ , if the degree of these basis elements  $e^{(i)}$  is a monotone increasing  $i$ .

**Example 2.17** (Minimal cochain complexes have vanishing differential (e.g. [Roi93, Prop. 2.2])). If  $A = \mathbb{Q}$ , so that  $A\text{-Mod} \simeq \text{Ch}(\mathbb{Q})$  is the category of rational cochain complexes, then the minimal dg-modules (Def. 2.16) are precisely the cochain complexes of finite type with vanishing differential. This is because a non-vanishing differential would have to take a generator  $e^{(i)}$  in some degree  $n$  to a linear multiple of a generator  $e^{(<i)}$  of degree  $n + 1$ , which however is ruled out by the condition that the degree of the generators be non-decreasing in the index  $i$ .

Just as for minimal dgc-algebra models (Prop. 2.8), minimal dg-modules (Def. 2.16) allow to read off stable homotopy groups of rational parametrized spectra:

**Lemma 2.18** (Rationalized spectra modeled by rational stable homotopy groups ([BM18, Rem. 2.7.32])). *Let  $E \in \text{Ho}(\text{Spectra})_{\text{ft}}$  be a spectrum of finite rational type. Then the minimal dg-module model (Def. 2.16) for its rationalization via Theorem 2.14, which by Example 2.17 is a cochain complex with vanishing differential (hence a graded rational vector space) coincides with the rational linear dual of its rationalized stable homotopy groups:*

$$(\pi_\bullet(E) \otimes \mathbb{Q})^* \simeq \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Q}}(E).$$

**Lemma 2.19** (Minimal dg-module models for fiber spectra [BM18, Rem. 2.7.35]). *Let  $X \in \text{Ho}(\text{Spaces})$  be connected and of finite rational type, and let  $E \in \text{Ho}(\text{Spectra}_X)_{\text{ft, bbl}}$  be an  $X$ -parametrized spectrum of finite rational type which is bounded below (Def. 2.5). If, moreover,*

$$A \simeq \mathcal{O}(X) \in \text{dgcAlg}$$

*is any dgc-algebra model for  $X$  under Prop. 2.8, and if*

$$A \otimes V \simeq \mathcal{M}(E) \in A\text{-Mod}$$

*is a minimal dg-module model (Def. 2.16) for  $E$  under Theorem 2.14, then for every  $x \in X$*

$$V \simeq \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Q}}(E_x) \in \text{Ch}(\mathbb{Q})$$

*is a minimal model for the fiber spectrum  $E_x \in \text{Spectra}$  according to Lemma 2.18.*



**Example 2.20** (Minimal model for suspension spectrum of  $BS^1$ ). The minimal model for the suspension spectrum (Prop. 2.6) of the classifying space  $BS^1$  is the graded vector space spanned by one generator in every non-negative even degree:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\Sigma_+^\infty BS^1) \simeq \mathbb{Q}[\beta_2] \in \text{Ch}(\mathbb{Q}).$$

*Proof.* By Prop. 2.8 a minimal dgc-algebra model for  $BS^1$  itself is the symmetric graded algebra on a single dgc-algebra generator in degree 2:

$$\mathbb{Q}[\beta_2] \simeq \mathcal{O}(BS^1) \in \text{dgcAlg}.$$

This implies the claim with Prop. 2.15. □

**Example 2.21** (Rational Snaith theorem). Let  $KU \in \text{Ho}(\text{Spectra})$  be the spectrum (Def. 2.4) representing complex K-theory, and write  $ku \in \text{Spectra}$  for its connective cover. Minimal dg-module models (Def. 2.16) for theses are, by Lemma 2.18, given by

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Q}}(ku) \simeq \mathbb{Q}[\beta_2] \in \text{Ch}(\mathbb{Q})$$

and

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Q}}(KU) \simeq \mathbb{Q}[\beta_2, \beta_2^{-1}] \in \text{Ch}(\mathbb{Q}).$$

Comparison with Example 2.20 shows that rationally the connective complex K-theory spectrum is equivalent to the suspension spectrum of the classifying space  $BS^1$ :

$$\Sigma_+^\infty BS^1 \simeq_{\mathbb{Q}} ku$$

and that the non-connective version is obtained by multiplicatively inverting the element  $\beta_2$

$$\Sigma_+^\infty BS^1[\beta_2^{-1}] \simeq_{\mathbb{Q}} KU.$$

**Remark 2.22** (‘Non-rational’ Snaith theorem). The last statement in Example 2.21 is still true non-rationally: this is the content of *Snaith’s theorem* [Sna81]. After rationalization, Snaith’s theorem reduces to a triviality, however keeping in mind that this is a “rational shadow” will help identify the non-rational situation approximated by our main Theorem 3.18 below. We conjecture that Theorem 3.18 remains true non-rationally by a generalization of Snaith’s theorem to twisted K-theory obtained by *fiberwise* inversion of the Bott generator. This will be discussed elsewhere.

**Lemma 2.23** (Minimal dg-model for twisted connective K-theory). *We denote the parametrized spectrum (Def. 2.5) which represents general twisted connective K-theory (as in [ABG10]) by*

$$\begin{array}{c} ku//GL_1(ku) \\ \downarrow \\ BGL_1(ku) \end{array}$$

and its restriction to the twist by ordinary cohomology in degree-3 by <sup>5</sup>

$$\begin{array}{ccc} ku//BS^1 & \longrightarrow & ku//GL_1(ku) \\ \downarrow & (pb) & \downarrow \\ K(\mathbb{Z}, 3) & \longrightarrow & BGL_1(ku) \end{array}$$

The minimal dgc-algebra model for the base space is, by Example 2.9, given by the graded symmetric algebra freely generated by a single generator in degree  $h_3$ , with vanishing differential:

$$\mathcal{O}(K(\mathbb{Z}, 3)) \simeq \mathbb{Q}[h_3].$$

---

<sup>5</sup>Throughout, the symbols “(pb)” denote a (homotopy-)pullback square.

A corresponding minimal dg-module model (Def. 2.16) for the rationalization of the parametrized spectrum, according to Theorem 2.8, is

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Q}[h_3]}(\mathrm{ku} // BS^1) \simeq \mathbb{Q}[h_3] \otimes \langle \omega_{2k} \mid k \in \mathbb{N} \rangle / \left( \begin{array}{l} d\omega_0 = 0 \\ d\omega_{2k+2} = h_3 \wedge \omega_{2k} \end{array} \right). \quad (10)$$

The module structure over  $\mathbb{Q}[h_3]$  is given by its canonical action on this tensor factor.

We will be interested in the image under  $\Omega_{B^3\mathbb{Q}}^\infty$  (Prop. 2.6) of suspensions of twisted connective K-theory. By the above, these are modeled by

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\Omega_{B^3\mathbb{Q}}^{\infty-2n}(\mathrm{ku} // BS^1)\right) \simeq \mathbb{Q}[h_3, \omega_{2k+2n} \mid k \in \mathbb{N}] / \left( \begin{array}{l} d\omega_{2n} = 0 \\ d\omega_{2k+2n+2} = h_3 \wedge \omega_{2k+2n} \end{array} \right). \quad (11)$$

*Proof.* The underlying  $\mathbb{Q}[h_3]$ -module structure is implied by Lemma 2.19 with Example 2.21. With this it only remains to determine the differential. By [AtSe05, Prop. 3.9] the degree-3 twist on complex K-theory is non-trivial in every degree. But by the degrees of the generators in (10), the given differential is degreewise and up to isomorphism the only possible non-trivial differential.  $\square$

A form of this statement also appears as [BuNi14, Example 12.5], [GS17, Sec. 3.1].

This concludes our discussion of rational parametrized stable homotopy theory.

## 2.2 The Ext/Cyc-adjunction

Our mathematical formalization both of *double dimensional reduction* as well as of *gauge enhancement* (below in Section 4) involves, at its core, a fundamental phenomenon, which we call the *Ext/Cyc-adjunction*. While we give a concrete account in a moment, we wish to amplify that the phenomenon is an extremely general one, based on core principles in homotopy theory: Namely for  $\mathbf{H}$  any good homotopy theory (namely, an  $\infty$ -topos [Lur06]) and for  $G$  a strong homotopy group in  $\mathbf{H}$  (namely, a grouplike  $A_\infty$ -monoid), with delooping object  $\mathbf{B}G$ , there is a duality (namely, an  $\infty$ -adjunction)

$$\mathbf{H} \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\mathrm{Ext}_G} \\ \perp \\ \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Cyc}_G} \end{array} \mathbf{H}/\mathbf{B}G$$

between

- (i) the operation  $\mathrm{Ext}_G$  of forming  $G$ -extensions and
- (ii) the operation which is the generalization to arbitrary  $G$  of what in the case  $G = S^1$  the circle group is the operation of forming the *cyclic loop space*, i.e., the result of first forming the space of maps out of  $G$  and then taking the homotopy-quotient of that by the  $G$ -action that rigidly reparametrizes these maps.

In terms of abstract homotopy theory, this duality/adjunction turns out to be the right base change along the essentially unique point inclusion map  $* \rightarrow \mathbf{B}G$ . For the reader familiar with abstract homotopy theory this fully defines the adjunction, and the only point to note here is that the right adjoint is indeed obtained by forming cyclic loop spaces (and generally their  $G$ -analogs).

One immediate implication, of central importance for our application, is that for any object  $X$  in the homotopy theory which is equipped with a  $G$ -principal bundle

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathrm{Ext}_G(X) \\ \downarrow \\ X, \end{array}$$

there is a canonical map (namely, the adjunction unit) of the form

$$X \longrightarrow \mathrm{Cyc}_G \mathrm{Ext}_G(X)$$

which may be described as the operation that takes any point in  $X$  to the loop (generally: map out of  $G$ ) in  $\mathrm{Ext}_G(X)$  that winds identically around the extension-fiber over that point. This is well-defined only

up to a choice of base point in the fiber, but precisely this ambiguity is quotiented out in the definition of  $\text{Cyc}_G$ .

We now describe this in detail for the basic case that  $\mathbf{H} = L_{\text{whe}}(\text{Spaces})$  is the classical “ordinary” homotopy theory, the one that is presented by (compactly generated) topological spaces, regarded up to weak homotopy equivalence (Def. 2.1). We consider now an ordinary adjunction (Theorem 2.39 below) in topological spaces, which serves as an explicit presentation of the abstract base change adjunction above.

First we recall some preliminaries, to set up notation and conventions:

**Definition 2.24** (Group action on topological space). For  $X$  a topological space and  $G$  a topological group, a right *action* of  $G$  on  $X$  is a continuous function

$$\begin{aligned} X \times G &\longrightarrow X \\ (x, g) &\longrightarrow x \cdot g \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$x \cdot e = e \quad \text{and} \quad (x \cdot g_1) \cdot g_2 = x \cdot (g_1 \cdot g_2).$$

One also summarizes this by saying that  $X$  is a  $G$ -space, and we will denote this situation by writing  $\overset{G}{\curvearrowright} X$ .

**Definition 2.25** (Quotients by group actions). For  $\overset{G}{\curvearrowright} X$  a  $G$ -space (Def. 2.24), we write

$$X/G := X/(x \sim x \cdot g)$$

for the ordinary quotient space, which comes with its quotient projection

$$\begin{array}{c} X \\ \downarrow \pi_G \\ X/G \end{array} \tag{12}$$

Given two spaces  $X, Y$  with right  $G$ -action, we write

$$X \times_G Y := (X \times Y)/G := (X \times Y)/((x, y) \sim (x \cdot g, y \cdot g)) \tag{13}$$

for the quotient by the diagonal action.

**Definition 2.26** (Comparison map for free actions). A  $G$ -action on some  $X$  (Def. 2.24) is called *free* if for every pair of points  $(x_1, x_2) \in X \times X$  there is *at most one*  $g \in G$  such that  $x_2 = x_1 \cdot g$ . Hence if the action is free, then with respect to the quotient projection  $\pi_G$  (12) it is free and fiberwise transitive in that there is a comparison map, which we suggestively denote by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \times X & \longrightarrow & G \\ \downarrow \pi_G & & \\ (x_1, x_2) & \longmapsto & (x_1^{-1} \cdot x_2) \end{array} \tag{14}$$

such that the equation  $x_1 \cdot (x_1^{-1} \cdot x_2) = x_2$  holds.

**Definition 2.27** ( $G$ -Extension functor). For  $G$  a compact topological group there exists a topological space  $EG$  which

1. carries a *free*  $G$ -action (Def. 2.26);
2. is contractible:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \overset{G}{\curvearrowright} EG & \xrightarrow{\simeq_{\text{whe}}} & * \end{array} \tag{15}$$

Its quotient space (Def. 2.25)

$$BG := (EG)/G \tag{16}$$

is called the *classifying space* of  $G$ . Equipped with the quotient projection (12)

$$\begin{array}{c} EG \\ \downarrow \pi_G \\ BG \end{array} \tag{17}$$

this is called the *universal  $G$ -principal bundle*. The  $G$ -bundle  $EG \rightarrow BG$  is determined by this specification uniquely up to homotopy equivalence.

Given any topological space  $X$  equipped with a map  $X \xrightarrow{\phi} BG$ , then we may pull back the universal bundle (17) and obtain a space  $X \times_{BG} EG$  with free  $G$ -action, whose quotient space is  $X$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \times_{BG} EG & \longrightarrow & EG \\ \pi_G \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi_G \\ X & \xrightarrow{\phi} & BG. \end{array} \quad (18)$$

This is the  $G$ -principal bundle classified by  $\phi$ . For our purposes it will be useful to think of this as the *extension* that is classified by the *cocycle*  $\phi$ . Therefore we write  $\text{Ext}_G$  for the functor that constructs these fiber products

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Spaces}_{/BG} & \xrightarrow{\text{Ext}_G} & \text{Spaces} \\ (Y \rightarrow BG) & \longmapsto & Y \times_{BG} EG. \end{array} \quad (19)$$

**Definition 2.28** (Homotopy quotient). Given a  $G$ -action on  $X$  (Def. 2.24), we write  $X // G$  for the *homotopy* quotient space. Up to weak homotopy equivalence, this is given by the *Borel construction*, namely by the diagonal  $G$ -quotient (13) of the product of  $X$  with the space  $EG$  from Def. 2.27. Here we take that as the definition of the homotopy quotient:

$$X // G := X \times_G EG. \quad (20)$$

**Example 2.29** (Homotopy quotient of trivial  $G$ -actions). The homotopy quotient (Def. 2.28) of the

(unique)  $G$ -action  $\begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ * \end{array}$  on the point space  $*$  is the classifying space (16)

$$* // G := (* \times EG) / G = (EG) / G = BG.$$

More generally, for  $\begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ X \end{array} = X \times \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ * \end{array}$  any space equipped with trivial  $G$ -action, the homotopy quotient is the product space with the classifying space:

$$X // G \simeq X \times BG.$$

**Remark 2.30** (Maps related to the homotopy quotient). The homotopy quotient (Def. 2.28) comes equipped with the following maps of interest:

(i) The ordinary quotient projection (12) canonically factors through the homotopy quotient as

$$\pi_G : X \longrightarrow X // G \longrightarrow X / G.$$

To see this, choose any point  $p \in EG$  (since  $EG$  is contractible (15), this choice is homotopically unique). Then the factorization in question is given by the maps on the left of the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{x \mapsto (x,p)} & X \times EG \\ \downarrow x \mapsto [x,p] & & \downarrow \\ X // G & \xlongequal{\quad} & X \times_G EG \\ \downarrow \pi_G & & \downarrow \\ X / G & \xlongequal{\quad} & X \times_G * \end{array} \quad (21)$$

Here on the right we first of the quotient projection of the diagonal action (13) and then the image under taking diagonal quotient (13) with  $X$  of the terminal map  $EG \rightarrow *$  (15). If the  $G$ -action on  $X$  is free, the comparison map  $X // G \rightarrow X / G$  is a weak homotopy equivalence.

(ii) There is a canonical map to the classifying space (16)

$$X//G \longrightarrow BG \quad (22)$$

which is the image of the terminal map  $X \rightarrow *$  under taking diagonal quotient (13) with  $EG$ :

$$X//G = X \times_G EG \longrightarrow * \times_G EG = (EG)/G = BG. \quad (23)$$

**Proposition 2.31** (Extension of homotopy quotient equivalent to original space). *Let  $X$  be a topological  $G$ -space (Def. 2.24). Then  $X$  is weakly homotopy equivalent to the  $G$ -extension (Def. 2.27) of its homotopy quotient (Def. 2.28) which is classified by the canonical map (22) from Remark 2.30:*

$$\text{Ext}_G(X//G) \xrightarrow[\simeq_{\text{whe}}]{\kappa} X. \quad (24)$$

*Proof.* By Def. 2.27 and Def. 2.28, the extension in question is the pullback in

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Ext}_G(X//G) & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & EG \\ \downarrow & \text{(pb)} & \downarrow \\ X \times_G EG & \longrightarrow & * \times_G EG = EG/G. \end{array}$$

This pullback

$$\text{Ext}_G(X//G) = (X \times_G EG) \times_{BG} EG \quad (25)$$

is *isomorphic* to the space  $X \times EG$ :

$$\begin{aligned} (X \times_G EG) \times_{BG} EG &\xrightarrow{\simeq} X \times EG \\ ([x, e_1], e_2) &\longmapsto ([x, e_2 \cdot (e_2^{-1} \cdot e_1)], e_2) \longrightarrow (x \cdot (e_1^{-1} \cdot e_2), e_2), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where we used (fiberwise over  $BG$ ) the comparison map (14) and then the relation in the diagonal quotient (13). Hence

$$\kappa : \text{Ext}_G(X//G) \simeq X \times EG \xrightarrow{\simeq_{\text{whe}}} X$$

by (15). □

**Remark 2.32** ( $\text{Ext}_G(X//G)$  is free resolution of  $X$ ). Even if the action on  $X$  is not free (Def. 2.26), the induced one on  $X//G \times_{BG} EG \simeq_{\text{whe}} X$  in (25) is free. In fact the isomorphism (26) is manifestly  $G$ -equivariant, for the diagonal  $G$ -action on  $X \times EG$ . For instance if  $X = *$  is the point, then  $X//G \times_{BG} EG = BG \times_{BG} EG = EG$ , which, by definition, is weakly homotopy equivalent to the point and has free  $G$ -action (15). Hence Prop. 2.31 says that  $\text{Ext}_G(X//G)$  is a *resolution* of  $X$  by a free  $G$ -action.

**Definition 2.33** (Mapping space out of  $G$ ). For  $Y$  a topological space, write  $\text{Maps}(G, Y)$  for the space of maps. We regard this as equipped with the  $G$ -action (Def. 2.24) given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Maps}(G, Y) \times G &\longrightarrow \text{Maps}(G, Y) \\ (f, g) &\longmapsto (f \cdot g) : h \mapsto f(h \cdot g^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

This  $G$ -action is the *conjugation action* on maps, where we regard  $Y$  as equipped with the trivial  $G$ -action.

**Definition 2.34** ( $G$ -Cyclification functor). For  $G$  a topological group and  $Y$  a topological space, we may form the homotopy quotient (Def. 2.28) of the canonical  $G$ -action on the mapping space from  $G$  to  $Y$  Def. 2.33, which, by (22) is canonically a space over  $BG$ :

$$\text{Maps}(G, Y)//G \in \text{Spaces}_{/BG}.$$

(i) This construction extends to a functor, which we denote by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Spaces} &\xrightarrow{\text{Cyc}_G} \text{Spaces}_{/BG} \\ Y &\longmapsto \text{Maps}(G, Y) \times_G EG. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) For the special case that  $G = S^1$  is the circle group, we omit the subscript and write

$$\text{Cyc}(X) := \mathcal{L}_{S^1}(X) := \text{Maps}(S^1, X) // S^1. \quad (27)$$

This is the homotopy quotient of the *free loop space* of  $X$  by the rigid rotation action on loops. (The cohomology of  $\text{Cyc}(X)$  is the *cyclic cohomology* of  $X$ , whence the terminology and notation.)

Below we will mainly be concerned with the rational approximation to such cyclic loop spaces:

**Example 2.35** (Minimal dgc-algebra model for cyclic loop spaces ([VB85])). Let  $X$  be a simply connected topological space of finite rational homotopy type, and let  $(\mathbb{Q}[\{\omega_i\}], d_X)$  be a minimal Sullivan dgc-algebra model for its rational homotopy type. Then

(i) a minimal dgc-algebra model for the free loop space  $\mathcal{L}(X) := \text{Maps}(S^1, X)$  is given by adjoining a second copy  $\{s\omega_i\}$  of generators, each in one degree *lower* than the original generator (“looped generators”), with differential given by

$$d_{\mathcal{L}(X)}\omega_i := d_X\omega_i, \quad d_{\mathcal{L}(X)}s\omega_i := -s(d_X\omega_i),$$

where on the right  $s$  is uniquely extended from a linear map on generators to a graded algebra derivation of degree  $-1$ .

(ii) a minimal dgc-algebra model for the cyclic loop space  $\text{Cyc}(X)$  (Def. 2.34) is given by adjoining one more generator  $\omega_2$  in degree 2, and taking the differential to be given by

$$d_{\text{Cyc}(X)}\omega_2 = 0, \quad d_{\text{Cyc}(X)}w = d_{\mathcal{L}(X)}w + \omega_2 \wedge sw,$$

where on the right  $w \in \{\omega_i, s\omega_i\}$ .

We will be interested in the specification of the general formula of Example 2.35 to the minimal rational model of the 4-sphere from Example 2.10;

**Example 2.36** (Minimal DGC-algebra model for the cyclification of the 4-sphere (see [FSS16a, Example 3.3])). A minimal DGC-algebra model (Prop. 2.8) for the cyclification (Def. 2.34) of the 4-sphere is given by

$$\mathcal{O}(\text{Cyc}(S^4)) \simeq_{\text{qi}} \mathbb{Q}[h_3, h_7, \omega_2, \omega_4, \omega_6] / \left( \begin{array}{l} dh_3 = 0 \\ dh_7 = -\frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4 + \omega_6 \wedge \omega_2 \\ d\omega_2 = 0 \\ d\omega_4 = h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \\ d\omega_6 = h_3 \wedge \omega_4 \end{array} \right).$$

This exhibits the structure of a dgc-algebra over  $\mathbb{Q}[h_3]/(dh_3 = 0)$ , exhibiting a rational model for a map

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Cyc}(S^4) \\ \downarrow \\ S^3 \end{array} \quad (28)$$

**Example 2.37** (Cyclification of 4-sphere receives 6-truncation of twisted connective K-theory, rationally). Example 2.36 reveals that, rationally, the cyclification of the 4-sphere, is, apart from the extra generator  $h_7$ , a truncation of doubly suspended twisted connective K-theory (Lemma 2.23). Explicitly, this is witnessed by the following morphism over  $B^3\mathbb{Q} \simeq_{\text{whe}, \mathbb{Q}} S^3$  from (11):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega_{B^3\mathbb{Q}}^{\infty-2}(\text{ku} // BS^1) & \xrightarrow{\tau_6} & \text{Cyc}(S^4) \\ h_3 & \longleftarrow & h_3 \\ \omega_2 & \longleftarrow & \omega_2 \\ \omega_4 & \longleftarrow & \omega_4 \\ \omega_6 & \longleftarrow & \omega_6 \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & h_7 \end{array}$$

**Proposition 2.38** (Minimal DG-module for fiberwise stabilization of cyclification of 4-sphere).

(i) A minimal DG-module (Def. 2.16) modeling the fiberwise stabilization (Prop. 2.6) of the cyclic loop space of the 4-sphere (Example 2.36) over  $S^3$  (via (28)) is

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{Q}[S^3]}(\Sigma_{S^3}^\infty \text{Cyc}(S^4)) \simeq_{\text{qi}} \frac{\mathbb{Q}[h_3, \omega_2, \omega_4, \omega_6]}{(\omega_6 \wedge \omega_2 - \frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4)} / \begin{pmatrix} dh_3 = 0 \\ d\omega_2 = 0 \\ d\omega_4 = h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \\ d\omega_6 = h_3 \wedge \omega_4 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{Q}[h_3]\text{-Mod}.$$

Here the module structure is the evident one induced by multiplication in  $\mathbb{Q}[h_3]$ .

(ii) Moreover, a quasi-isomorphism from this minimal dg-module to the dg-module underlying the minimal dgc-algebra from Example 2.36 exists

$$\frac{\mathbb{Q}[h_3, \omega_2, \omega_4, \omega_6]}{(\omega_6 \wedge \omega_2 - \frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4)} / \begin{pmatrix} dh_3 = 0 \\ d\omega_2 = 0 \\ d\omega_4 = h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \\ d\omega_6 = h_3 \wedge \omega_4 \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\simeq_{\text{qi}}} \mathbb{Q}[h_3, h_7, \omega_2, \omega_4, \omega_6] / \begin{pmatrix} dh_3 = 0 \\ dh_7 = -\frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4 + \omega_2 \wedge \omega_6 \\ d\omega_2 = 0 \\ d\omega_4 = h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \\ d\omega_6 = h_3 \wedge \omega_4 \end{pmatrix}$$

given by any choice of linear splitting of the underlying quotient map of graded algebras, for instance by the map that sends equivalence classes on the left to their unique representatives that are at most linear in  $\omega_4$ .

*Proof.* By Prop. 2.15 and Lemma 2.19 the underlying graded  $\mathbb{Q}[h_3]$ -module is the free  $\mathbb{Q}[h_3]$ -module on the cohomology of the homotopy cofiber of

$$\mathbb{Q}[h_3] \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q}[h_3, h_7, \omega_2, \omega_4, \omega_6] / \begin{pmatrix} dh_3 = 0 \\ dh_7 = -\frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4 + \omega_2 \wedge \omega_6 \\ d\omega_2 = 0 \\ d\omega_4 = h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \\ d\omega_6 = h_3 \wedge \omega_4 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the minimal dgc-algebra on the right is from Example 2.36. This cofiber cohomology is evidently the vector space

$$\frac{\mathbb{Q}[\omega_2, \omega_4, \omega_6]}{(\omega_6 \wedge \omega_2 - \frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4)}.$$

and hence the graded vector space underlying the minimal DG-module is

$$\mathbb{Q}[h_3] \otimes \frac{\mathbb{Q}[\omega_2, \omega_4, \omega_6]}{(\omega_6 \wedge \omega_2 - \frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4)} = \frac{\mathbb{Q}[h_3, \omega_2, \omega_4, \omega_6]}{(\omega_6 \wedge \omega_2 - \frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4)}.$$

The differential on this must be such that the fiberwise stabilization map (the unit map of the adjunction  $\Sigma_{S^3}^\infty \dashv \Omega_{S^3}^\infty$ ) is a dg-algebra homomorphism. This fixes it as claimed.  $\square$

Finally we may state the key fact relating the functors  $\text{Ext}$  and  $\text{Cyc}$ :

**Theorem 2.39** (The  $\text{Ext}/\text{Cyc}$ -adjunction in topological spaces).

(i) The two functors from Def. 2.27 and Def. 2.34 are adjoint to each other ([Bor94, Sec. 3]), with  $\text{Ext}_G$  the left adjoint and  $\text{Cyc}_G$  the right adjoint:

$$\text{Spaces} \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\text{Ext}_G} \\ \perp \\ \xrightarrow{\text{Cyc}_G} \end{array} \text{Spaces}_{/BG}.$$

(ii) The unit of this adjunction

$$X \xrightarrow{\eta_X} \text{Cyc}_X(\text{Ext}_G(X))$$

sends  $x \in X$  to the equivalence class of the loop which winds identically around the fiber of  $\text{Ext}_G(X)$  over  $x$  (18)

$$\eta_X : x \longmapsto [G \xrightarrow{\simeq} \text{Ext}_G(X)|_x].$$

(iii) The counit of this adjunction

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Ext}_G(\text{Cyc}_G(X)) & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_X} & X \\ & \searrow \kappa \quad \nearrow \text{ev}_e & \\ & \text{Maps}(G, X) & \end{array}$$

is the composite of a weak homotopy equivalence to  $\text{Maps}(G, X)$  followed by evaluation at the neutral element.

*Proof.* (i) Given  $(X \xrightarrow{c} BG) \in \text{Spaces}_{BG}$  and  $Y \in \text{Spaces}$ , we need to produce a natural bijection

$$\text{Hom}\left(X \times_{BG} EG, Y\right) \xrightleftharpoons[\simeq]{} \text{Hom}_{/BG}(X, \text{Maps}(G, Y) \times_G EG).$$

In one direction, given

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \text{Maps}(G, Y) \times_G EG \\ & \searrow c \quad \nearrow & \\ & BG & \\ x \mapsto & \xrightarrow{\quad} & [f_x, p_x] \end{array}$$

this defines a map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \times_{BG} EG & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\phi}} & Y \\ (x, p) \mapsto & \xrightarrow{\quad} & f_x(p^{-1} \cdot p_x). \end{array}$$

Conversely, given a map of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \times_{BG} EG & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & Y \\ (x, p) \mapsto & \xrightarrow{\quad} & y_{x,p} \end{array}$$

define a map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\varphi}} & \text{Maps}(G, Y) \times_G EG \\ & \searrow \quad \nearrow & \\ & BG & \\ x \mapsto & \xrightarrow{\quad} & [y_{x, p_x \cdot (-)^{-1}}, p_x], \end{array}$$

where  $p_x \in EG$  is such that  $(x, p_x) \in X \times_{BG} EG$ . It is straightforward to check that these constructions are inverse to each other:

$$\left(x \xrightarrow{\phi} [f_x, p_x]\right) \mapsto \left((x, p) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\phi}} f_x(p^{-1} \cdot p_x)\right) \mapsto \left(x \xrightarrow{\tilde{\phi}} [f_x((-) \cdot \widetilde{p_x^{-1}} \cdot p_x), \widetilde{p_x}] = [f_x, p_x]\right)$$

$$\text{and} \quad \left((x, p) \xrightarrow{\varphi} y_{x,p}\right) \mapsto \left(x \xrightarrow{\tilde{\varphi}} [y_{x, p_x \cdot (-)^{-1}}, p_x]\right) \mapsto \left((x, p) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\varphi}} y_{x, p_x \cdot (p_x^{-1} \cdot p)} = y_{x,p}\right).$$

This establishes the adjunction.

(ii) It follows that the adjoint of the identity on  $\text{Ext}_G(X)$  is

$$x \mapsto [(x, p_x \cdot (-)^{-1}), p_x],$$

which is the unit map as claimed.

(iii) It also follows that the adjoint of the identity on  $\text{Cyc}_G(Y)$  is

$$([f, p_1], p_2) \mapsto f(p_2^{-1} \cdot p_1).$$

This decomposes as claimed:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Maps}(G, Y) \times_G EG \times_{BG} EG & \xrightarrow{\epsilon} & Y \\ & \searrow \simeq \quad \nearrow \text{ev}_e & \\ & \text{Maps}(G, Y) & \\ ([f, p_1], p_2) \mapsto & \xrightarrow{\quad} & f \cdot (p_1^{-1} \cdot p_2) = f((-) \cdot (p_2^{-1} \cdot p_1)) \mapsto f((p_2^{-1} \cdot p_1)), \end{array}$$

where the weak homotopy equivalence on the left is (26) of Prop. 2.31.  $\square$



This concludes our general discussion of the cyclification construction. We now turn to applying it to the special case of interest here.

### 3 The A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere

We consider here a particular circle action on the 4-sphere, as well as its induced homotopy quotient (Def. 3.1 below), which we call the *A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere* (see Remark 3.2 below). We give informal string theoretic motivation for this space in Remark 3.4 below, and then we substantiate this by formal analysis: After some preliminaries on the rational homotopy type of the A-type orbispace in Section 3.1, our main result in Theorem 3.18 below states that, rationally, there is a copy of twisted K-theory in the fiberwise stabilization of the A-type orbispace, fibered over the 3-sphere. This witnesses the phenomenon of gauge enhancement of M-branes, discussed in Section 4.

**Definition 3.1** (The A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere). The identification


$$S^4 \simeq S(\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{C}^2) \xrightarrow{\text{SU}(2)_L} S^4 \quad (29)$$

induces an action of  $\text{SU}(2)$  on the 4-sphere, where on the right we have the defining linear representation of  $\text{SU}(2)$  on  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . Along the canonical inclusion  $S^1 \simeq U(1) \hookrightarrow \text{SU}(2)$  this restricts to a circle action on the 4-sphere. The corresponding homotopy quotient (Borel construction (20))

$$S^4 // S^1 \simeq S^4 \times_{S^1} ES^1 \quad (30)$$

we call the *A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere*.

The following picture gives a schematic impression of this situation:



**Remark 3.2** (Terminology). The terminology in Def. 3.1 is motivated as follows: The finite subgroups of  $\text{SU}(2)$  have a famous ADE-classification. Here the finite subgroups in the A-series are cyclic groups which, up to conjugation, are all subgroups of the circle group via

$$\mathbb{Z}_{n+1} \subset S^1 \simeq U(1) \subset \text{SU}(2).$$

In this sense the circle action in Def. 3.1 is a limiting case for  $n \rightarrow \infty$  of the A-type finite group actions. Now the homotopy quotient of the smooth  $S^4$  by such a finite group action is an *orbifold*, hence an *A-type orbifold* for one of the cyclic groups (see [HSS18] for an extensive discussion). More generally, homotopy quotients by possibly non-finite topological groups may be called *orbispaces* ([HeGe07]), whence “A-type orbispace” in Def. 3.1.

**Proposition 3.3** (Quotient and fixed points of A-type action on 4-sphere). *Consider the circle action on the 4-sphere from Def. 3.1. Then:*

(i) *The ordinary topological quotient of the circle action is the 3-sphere:*

$$S^4 / S^1 \simeq S^3.$$

Hence, via the Borel construction (30), there is a canonical continuous function (21) from the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere to the 3-sphere

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S^4 // S^1 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & S^3 \\ \parallel & & \parallel \\ S^4 \times_{S^1} ES^1 & \xrightarrow[\text{id} \times p]{\quad} & S^4 \times_{S^1} * \end{array} \quad (31)$$

(ii) The fixed point space of the circle action is the 0-sphere, included as two antipodal points

$$S^0 = (S^4)^{S^1} \hookrightarrow S^4.$$

In summary, we have the following system of spaces over  $S^3$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \underbrace{\text{Fixed}} & & \underbrace{\text{4-sphere}} & & \underbrace{\text{Homotopy}} & & \underbrace{\text{Naive}} \\ \underbrace{\text{points}} & & & & \underbrace{\text{quotient}} & & \underbrace{\text{quotient}} \\ S^0 = (S^4)^{S^1} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & S^4 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & S^4 // S^1 & \xrightarrow{\quad} & S^4 / S^1 \\ & \searrow & \searrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ & & & & S^3 & & \end{array} \quad (32)$$

Below in Section 4 we will be regarding the (rationalization of) the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere from Def. 3.1 as the *coefficient* of a generalized cohomology theory. But, as explained in [HSS18, Sec. 2.2], the 4-sphere here ultimately originates as a copy of the 4-sphere factor in a black M5-brane spacetime  $\sim \text{AdS}_7 \times S^4$ . In this guise the spaces appearing in (32) readily explain those that have been discussed in the string theory literature:

**Remark 3.4** (The A-type quotient of the 4-sphere from black 5-brane geometry). The near horizon geometry of a black M2-brane and of a black M5-brane solution of 11-dimensional supergravity are given by  $\text{AdS}_4 \times S^7$  and  $\text{AdS}_7 \times S^4$ , respectively ([Gue92]). Since the 4-sphere is the simplest homotopy type with non-torsion homotopy groups of the form  $\pi_4 \simeq \pi_7 \simeq \mathbb{Z}$ , we may naturally identify the  $S^4$  spacetime factor here as the coefficient for a cohomology theory (called *cohomotopy*) that measures M-brane charge, at least rationally [Sa13, FSS15b, FSS16a], in the spirit of Dirac charge quantization (see [Fre00, Sec. 2]):

$$\begin{array}{l} \begin{array}{c} \text{one unit of} \\ \text{M2-brane charge} \\ \text{[ AdS}_4 \times S^7 \xrightarrow{p_2} S^7 \xrightarrow{H_{\mathbb{H}}} S^4 ]} \\ \text{black M2-brane} \quad \text{sphere around} \\ \text{spacetime} \quad \text{M2-brane} \\ \quad \quad \text{singularity} \end{array} \quad \in H(Y, S^4) \\ \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{one unit of} \\ \text{M5-brane charge} \\ \text{[ AdS}_7 \times S^4 \xrightarrow{p_2} S^4 \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{S^4}} S^4 ]} \\ \text{black M5-brane} \quad \text{sphere around} \\ \text{spacetime} \quad \text{M5-brane} \\ \quad \quad \text{singularity} \end{array} \quad \in H(Y, S^4) \end{array} \quad (33)$$

cohomotopy classes  
of  $Y$  in degree 4

But, more generally, the black M5-brane may sit inside an MK6, which is located at the singular locus of a global orbifold

$$\text{AdS}_7 \times S^4 // G_{\text{ADE}}$$

(see [HSS18, Example 2.7] for a precise statement and for pointers to the literature), where  $G_{\text{ADE}} \subset \text{SU}(2)$  is a finite subgroup, acting via the identification

$$\begin{array}{c} G_{\text{ADE}} \\ \curvearrowright \\ S^4 \end{array} \simeq S(\mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{C}^2).$$


Hence for the 4-sphere *coefficient* of cohomotopy theory to also measure the unit charge of such M5-branes at singularities, in generalization of (33), it must be equipped with that same group action. The resulting equivariant cohomology theory for M-branes is the subject of [HSS18]. Here we focus on the A-type finite subgroups, namely the *cyclic* subgroups

$$\mathbb{Z}_{n+2} \subset S^1 = U(1) \subset \text{SU}(2),$$

which act, up to conjugation, through the A-type circle action on the 4-sphere from Def. 3.1. Hence, just as for the analogous case of M2-branes as in [ABJM08, p.3], that circle action may be interpreted as that of the M-theory circle fibration. Under this interpretation, passage to the finite A-type orbifold quotient

$$\text{AdS}_7 \times S^4 // \mathbb{Z}_{n+2}$$

corresponds to shrinking the M-theory circle fiber, and hence the coupling constant of non-perturbative type IIA string theory, by the factor  $n + 2$ . The limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , in which the cyclic groups  $\mathbb{Z}_{n+2}$  tend to exhaust the circle group  $S^1$ , thus corresponds to the limit of perturbative type IIA string theory. But this means that in this limit the corresponding spacetime is now a product with the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere, from Def. 3.1:



Here the vertical maps are from (21) (and we use that  $S^1 // \mathbb{Z}_{n+1} \simeq S^1$ ).

Therefore, applying the same logic as before, we may expect that the A-type orbispace  $S^4 // S^1$  itself serves as the coefficient for the version of cohomotopy cohomology theory that measures M-brane charge, when M-branes are dually identified with their incarnation as D-branes in type IIA string theory. That this is indeed the case, up to some subtle fine print related to fiberwise stabilization, is our result on gauge enhancement, discussed in Section 4.

While the role of the A-type homotopy quotient  $S^4 // S^1$  in this picture has not been realized in the literature before, in its approximation by the plain quotient 3-sphere  $S^4 / S^1 \simeq S^3$ , this reduction from (low-energy) M-theory to (low energy) type IIA string theory has been considered. For completeness, we briefly survey some of the related literature:

The dimensional reduction of 11-dimensional supergravity on the 4-sphere factor yields a maximal  $\text{SO}(5) = \text{Isom}(S^4)$ -gauged supergravity in seven dimensions [PNT84]. The consistency of the reduction is established in [NVvN00] and a systematic classification is given in [FS04]. On the other hand, the reduction of type IIA supergravity on  $S^3$  leads to an  $\text{SO}(4) = \text{Isom}(S^3)$ -gauged supergravity in seven dimensions. In order to compare the two gauge supergravity theories, one needs a means of breaking the corresponding gauge symmetries. The general comparison between the two reductions is done in [CLPST00], where again the singular scaling limit of  $S^4$  opening up to  $S^3 \times \mathbb{R}$  is used, based on earlier constructions [HW88][CLLP00]. The consistency of the reduction is studied and established in [CLP00].

Reductions with less symmetries are also possible, gauging only a left-acting  $\text{SU}(2)$  subgroup of  $\text{Spin}(4) \cong \text{SU}(2)_L \times \text{SU}(2)_R$  [CS00]. This has been derived in [NV00] as arising from a singular limit of the  $S^4$  reduction of  $d = 11$  supergravity. In [HSS18, Sec. 2.2] it is explained how the distinction between these actions relates to the 4-sphere detecting both black M5-branes as well as black M2-branes at singularities.

**Remark 3.5** (Other circle actions on the 4-sphere). Circle actions on spheres form one of the most important problems in transformation groups. For  $G$  a compact connected topological group acting nontrivially on the 4-sphere, if all orbits are of dimension  $\leq 1$  it follows that  $G$  has to be the circle group, but the action may not be equivalent to a differentiable action [MZ54]. Codimension-3 circle actions are studied in [MY60], where it was shown that the 4-sphere is essentially unique in leading to an isolated

singular orbit. Furthermore, there are in fact infinitely many nonlinear circle actions on  $S^4$ , which together with the linear ones exhaust all possible actions [Pa78]. Since  $S^4$  is compact, it follows that the fixed point set  $F$  will have the same Euler characteristic as  $S^4$  (by applying [FOT08, Theorem 7.33]), which is 2. Furthermore, the sum of dimensions of cohomology for the fixed point set is always at most as large as the corresponding sum for the space  $S^4$  (by applying [FOT08, Theorem 7.37]). As the latter has only two cohomology groups, then  $\dim H^*(F; \mathbb{Q}) \leq 2$ . The two together give  $\dim H^{\text{ev}}(F; \mathbb{Q}) = 2$  and  $\dim H^{\text{odd}}(F; \mathbb{Q}) = 0$ , leading to two possibilities: Either  $F$  has the real homotopy type of the union of two points (i.e., a 0-sphere) or  $F$  is a compact connected manifold that has the rational homology of a sphere, hence the rational homotopy type of an even-dimensional sphere; by dimension the only second possibility is, therefore, the 2-sphere. The latter is described in [FOT08, Example 7.39] but here we are interested solely in the first case.

### 3.1 Rational homotopy type of the A-type orbispace

Here we discuss the rational homotopy type of the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere (Def. 3.1) and of the action of the Ext/Cyc-adjunction unit (Theorem 2.39) on it. After some Lemmas, the main result is stated as Prop. 3.12 below.

**Lemma 3.6** (Homotopy groups and cohomology groups of  $S^4//S^1$ ). *For every  $S^1$ -action on the 4-sphere, the resulting homotopy quotient  $S^4//S^1$  (20) has the following properties:*

(i) *Its rationalized homotopy groups are*

$$\pi_{\bullet}^{\mathbb{Q}}(S^4//S^1) \simeq \langle \tilde{\omega}_0 \rangle \oplus \langle \omega_2 \rangle \oplus \langle \omega_4 \rangle \oplus \langle h_7 \rangle. \quad (34)$$

(ii) *Its rational cohomology groups are*

$$H^{\bullet}(S^4//S^1, \mathbb{Q}) \simeq \langle \tilde{\omega}_0 \rangle \oplus \langle \omega_2 \rangle \oplus \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \omega_2^{\wedge k+2}, \omega_4 \wedge \omega_2^{\wedge k} \rangle. \quad (35)$$

*Proof.* The first statement follows with the long exact sequence of rational homotopy groups induced by the homotopy fiber sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S^1 & \longrightarrow & S^4 \\ & & \downarrow \\ & & S^4//S^1. \end{array}$$

The second statement follows with the corresponding multiplicative Serre spectral sequence.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.7** (dgc-algebra model for general  $S^4//S^1$ ). *For every  $S^1$ -action on the 4-sphere, the minimal dgc-algebra (via Prop. 2.8) of the resulting homotopy quotient (Def. 2.28) is of the form*

$$\mathcal{O}(S^4//S^1) \simeq \mathbb{Q}[\omega_2, \omega_4, h_7] / \left( \begin{array}{l} d\omega_2 = 0 \\ d\omega_4 = 0 \\ dh_7 = \frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4 \\ + c_1 \omega_2 \wedge \omega_2 \wedge \omega_2 \wedge \omega_2 + c_2 \omega_2 \wedge \omega_2 \wedge \omega_4 \end{array} \right) \in \text{dgcAlg} \quad (36)$$

for some coefficients  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* By Prop. 2.8, minimal dgc-algebra models for nilpotent finite type spaces such as  $S^4//S^1$  exist, and have the following properties:

1. they are generated as graded algebras from the linear generators for the rational homotopy groups;
2. they carry a differential whose cochain cohomology reproduces the rational cohomology;

Hence by the first item in Lemma 3.6 the underlying graded algebra of the minimal dgc-algebra model for any  $S^4//S^1$  is  $\mathbb{Q}[\omega_2, \omega_4, h_7]$  (where the algebra unit is identified with  $1 = \tilde{\omega}_0$ , as in (35)), and by the second item in Lemma 3.6 and for degree reasons, the differential on these generators has to be as stated.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.8** (Rational Ext/Cyc-adjunction unit on  $S^4//S^1$ ). *For any  $S^1$ -action on  $S^4$ , the unit  $\eta_{S^4//S^1}$  of the Ext/Cyc-adjunction (Theorem 2.39) on the homotopy quotient  $S^4//S^1$  (Def. 2.28), composed with the equivalence (23) from Prop. 2.31 pulls back the generators of the minimal dgc-algebra model for the cyclification of the 4-sphere (Example 2.36) to those of the minimal model for  $S^4//S^1$ , from Lemma 3.7, as follows:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
S^4//S^1 & \xrightarrow{\eta_{S^4//S^1}} & \text{CycExt}(S^4//S^1) \xrightarrow[\simeq_{\text{whe}}]{\text{Cyc}(\kappa)} \text{Cyc}(S^4) \\
\omega_2 & \longleftarrow & \omega_2 \\
\omega_4 & \longleftarrow & \omega_4 \\
c_1 \omega_2 \wedge \omega_2 \wedge \omega_2 + c_2 \omega_2 \wedge \omega_4 & \longleftarrow & \omega_6 \\
0 & \longleftarrow & h_3 \\
h_7 & \longleftarrow & h_7
\end{array} \tag{37}$$

where  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  are the two constants from (36).

*Proof.* That  $h_3$  vanishes under this pullback follows simply by degree-reasons: By (36) there is no non-vanishing element of degree 3 in the minimal model for  $S^4//S^1$ .

That  $\omega_2$  is pulled back to itself follows from the fact that this is the generator of the dgc-algebra model for the base space  $BS^1$  (Example 2.11) and that the adjunction unit is a morphism over  $BS^1$  (Prop. 2.6).

To see that  $\omega_4$  and  $\omega_7$  are pulled back as shown, use that the zig-zag identity ([Bor94, Thm. 3.1.5 (2)]) of the Ext/Cyc-adjunction (Theorem 2.39) says that we have a commuting diagram of the following form:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
S^4 & \simeq_{\text{whe}} & \text{Ext}(S^4//S^1) & \xrightarrow{\text{Ext}(\eta_{S^4//S^1})} & \text{ExtCycExt}(S^4//S^1) & \simeq_{\text{whe}} & \text{Maps}(S^1, S^4) \\
& & \searrow \text{id} & & \downarrow \epsilon_{\text{Ext}(S^4//S^1)} & & \downarrow \text{ev}_0 \\
& & & & \text{Ext}(S^4//S^1) & \simeq_{\text{whe}} & S^4
\end{array}$$

where all the weak homotopy equivalences shown are via Prop. 2.31. By the dgc-algebra model of the free loop space (Example 2.35), this means that  $\eta$  pulls back the non-shifted (non-looped) dgc-model generators of the homotopy fibers to themselves. These generators are  $\omega_4$  and  $\omega_7$ .

With this the statement for  $\omega_6$  follows, because this is the only choice that implies respect for the differential on  $h_7$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
-\frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4 & & -\frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4 \\
+ \omega_2 \wedge (c_1 \omega_2 \wedge \omega_2 + c_2 \omega_4) & \longleftarrow & + \omega_2 \wedge \omega_6 \\
\uparrow d & & \uparrow d \\
h_7 & \longleftarrow & h_7
\end{array} \quad \square$$

**Example 3.9** (dgc-algebra model for homotopy quotient of trivial action). For  $S^4 = S^4 \times *$  the trivial circle action on the 4-sphere, the homotopy quotient is  $S^4//S^1 = S^4 \times BS^1$  (Example 2.29). The minimal dgc-algebra model of this product space via Prop. 2.8 is that of Lemma 3.7 for  $c_1 = 0, c_2 = 0$ :

$$\mathcal{O}(S^4 \times BS^1) \simeq \mathbb{Q}[\omega_2, \omega_4, h_7] / \left( \begin{array}{l} d\omega_2 = 0 \\ d\omega_4 = 0 \\ dh_7 = \frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4 \end{array} \right) \in \text{dgcAlg}.$$

**Lemma 3.10** (A-type circle action on 4-sphere is rationally trivial). *For every element  $g \in S^1$  in the circle group, its A-type action (Def. 3.1) on the 4-sphere is rationally trivial, in that it is given by the identity morphism on the minimal dgc-algebra model (Example 2.10):*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
S^4 & \xrightarrow{g} & S^4 \\
\omega_4 & \longleftarrow & \omega_4 \\
\omega_7 & \longleftarrow & \omega_7
\end{array}$$

Hence the rationalization of the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere  $S^4//S^1$  (Def. 3.1) is in fact equivalent to that of the trivial action from Example 3.9.

*Proof.* Every element  $g \in \mathrm{SU}(2)$  in (29) preserves the norm on  $\mathbb{C}^2 \simeq \mathbb{H}$ , hence acts through

$$\mathrm{SU}(2) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{SO}(4) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{SO}(5)$$

on  $S^4 \simeq S(\mathbb{R}^5)$  and hence as an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism on the 4-sphere. As such, pullback along  $g$  preserves the standard volume form on  $S^4$ . But under the equivalence of Theorem 2.8 this maps to the element  $\omega_4$  in the minimal dgc-algebra model of  $S^4$ , and hence

$$g^*(\omega_4) = \omega_4.$$

But the only way that this respects the differential in Example 2.10 is that also

$$g^*(\omega_7) = \omega_7.$$

□

**Remark 3.11.** (i) In interpreting Prop. 3.12 it may be worthwhile to recall that rationalization of spaces in homotopy theory is a categorified analog of forming derivatives of functions in calculus. That the rationalization of the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere is found in Lemma 3.10 to coincide with that of the trivial action is analogous to finding that the derivative of some non-trivial function of the real numbers vanishes at the origin.

(ii) For the purpose of the present article, namely for the solution of the open problems stated on p. 6 and p. 1, this happens to be just the relevant bit of information (see Section 4). But in the companion article [HSS18] we go further and consider a partial non-rational lift of this analysis, by regarding the A-type action in *equivariant rational homotopy theory*. This means to consider the group that acts beyond the rational approximation.

In summary:

**Proposition 3.12** (Minimal dgc-algebra model for A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere). *The minimal dgc-algebra model, via Prop. 2.8, of the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere (Def. 3.1) is*

$$\mathcal{O}(S^4//S^1) \simeq \mathbb{Q}[\omega_2, \omega_4, h_7] / \left( \begin{array}{l} d\omega_2 = 0 \\ d\omega_4 = 0 \\ dh_7 = -\frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4 \end{array} \right) \in \mathrm{dgcAlg}.$$

Moreover, the unit of the  $\mathrm{Ext} \dashv \mathrm{Cyc}$ -adjunction (Theorem 2.39) on the A-type orbispace, composed with the equivalence (23) from Prop. 2.31, pulls back the generators of the dgc-algebra model for  $\mathrm{Cyc}(S^4)$  (Example 2.36) as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S^4//S^1 & \xrightarrow{\eta_{S^4//S^1}} & \mathrm{CycExt}(S^4//S^1) \xrightarrow[\simeq_{\mathrm{whe}}]{\mathrm{Cyc}(\kappa)} \mathrm{Cyc}(S^4) \\ \omega_2 & \longleftarrow & \longleftarrow \omega_2 \\ \omega_4 & \longleftarrow & \longleftarrow \omega_4 \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & \longleftarrow \omega_6 \\ 0 & \longleftarrow & \longleftarrow h_3 \\ h_7 & \longleftarrow & \longleftarrow h_7 \end{array} \quad (38)$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.10, the minimal dgc-algebra model for the homotopy quotient of the A-type action coincides with that of the trivial action, given by Example 3.9, hence is given by the general formula (36) for the case  $c_1 = 0$  and  $c_2 = 0$ . This yields the action of the adjunction unit by Lemma 3.8. □

This concludes our discussion of the rational homotopy type of the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere. Next we discuss the rational homotopy type of its fiberwise stabilization over the 3-sphere.

### 3.2 Fiberwise stabilized $\mathrm{Ext}/\mathrm{Cyc}$ -unit on the A-type orbispace

Above in Prop. 3.12 we have described the rationalization of the unit  $\eta_{S^4//S^1}$  of the  $\mathrm{Ext}/\mathrm{Cyc}$ -adjunction (Theorem 2.39) on the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere (Def. 3.1). Here we regard this map as lying over the classifying space  $B^3\mathbb{Z} \simeq_{\mathbb{Q}} B^3\mathbb{Q} \simeq_{\mathbb{Q}} S^3$  and discuss its *fiberwise stabilization* (Prop. 2.6) in the sense of rational parametrized stable homotopy theory (Theorem 2.14).

The main result we establish here is Theorem 3.18 below, stating that there are two summands of twisted connective K-theory in the fiberwise stabilization of the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere, and that lifts of cocycles through the fiberwise stabilized adjunction unit involve lifts from 6-truncated to untruncated twisted K-theory (Example 2.37) and exist as soon as the latter exists. It is this lifting which we interpret, in Section 4 below, as the rational image of the mechanism of gauge enhancement for M-branes.

The statement of the following Prop. 3.13 appears in [RS00, p. 2]. We spell out the statement and its proof in some detail, since we will need to refer to these details for the proof of our main Theorem 3.18 via Prop. 3.17 below. Notice that, in order to highlight the pattern of interest in Theorem 3.18, we are renaming generators as compared to [RS00] as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c|ccccccc} \text{[RS00]:} & a & 1 & c_{2n} & c_{2n+1} & e & \gamma_{2n} & \gamma_{2n+1} \\ \text{here:} & h_3 & \tilde{\omega}_0 & \omega_{2n+2}^L & \omega_{2n+4}^R & \omega_2 & \tilde{\omega}_{2n} & \omega_{2n} \end{array}$$

**Proposition 3.13** (Minimal dg-module for fiberwise stabilization of A-type Orbispace (cf. [RS00, p. 2])). *The following are minimal DG-modules (Def. 2.16), over the minimal dgc-algebra for the 3-sphere from Example 2.9 for the three maps (32) corresponding to the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere (Def. 3.1):*

Fibration	Vector space underlying minimal DG-model	Differential of minimal DG-model
$(S^4)^{S^1}$ $\downarrow$ $S^3$	$\mathbb{Q}[h_3] \otimes \langle \omega_{2p}^L, \omega_{2p}^R \mid p \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$	$d : \begin{cases} \omega_0^L \mapsto 0 \\ \omega_{2p+2}^L \mapsto h_3 \otimes \omega_{2p}^L & (\text{ku} // BS^1) \\ \omega_0^R \mapsto 0 \\ \omega_{2p+2}^R \mapsto h_3 \otimes \omega_{2p}^R & (\text{ku} // BS^1) \end{cases}$
$S^4$ $\downarrow$ $S^3$	$\mathbb{Q}[h_3] \otimes \langle \tilde{\omega}_{2p}, \omega_{2p+4} \mid p \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$	$d : \begin{cases} \tilde{\omega}_0 \mapsto 0 \\ \tilde{\omega}_{2p+2} \mapsto h_3 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_{2p} & (\text{ku} // BS^1) \\ \omega_4 \mapsto 0 \\ \omega_{2p+6} \mapsto h_3 \otimes \omega_{2p+4} & (\Sigma^4 \text{ku} // BS^1) \end{cases}$
$S^4 // S^1$ $\downarrow$ $S^3$	$\mathbb{Q}[h_3, \omega_2] \otimes \langle \tilde{\omega}_{2p}, \omega_{2p+4} \mid p \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$	$d : \begin{cases} \tilde{\omega}_0 \mapsto 0 \\ \tilde{\omega}_{2p+2} \mapsto h_3 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_{2p} & (\text{ku} // BS^1) \\ \omega_2 \mapsto 0 \\ \omega_4 \mapsto h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_0 & (\Sigma^2 \text{ku} // BS^1) \\ \omega_{2p+6} \mapsto h_3 \otimes \omega_{2p+4} \end{cases}$

Beware of the special placement of the element  $\omega_2$  in the last line, as a generator of (the graded vector space underlying) a whole graded-commutative algebra. On the far right of the table we are highlighting that there are two sequences of differentials in each case, differing only in the degrees in which they start, which each are of the same form as those for the minimal dg-model (10) of the correspondingly shifted twisted K-theory spectrum from Lemma 2.23. Observe that the second such sequence in the last line really starts with the element  $\omega_2 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_0$ .

*Proof.* In each case we use that:

1. by the very definition 2.9, the minimal dg-modules in questions are in particular free modules over  $\mathbb{Q}[h_3]$ ;
2. via (9) in Prop. 2.15, the cochain cohomology of the minimal dg-module must coincide with the rational cohomology of the total space of the given fibration.

We will find in each case that there is a unique solution to the combination of these two constraints, by induction over the degree of the generators: We begin by adjoining generators  $\omega_k$  to capture the cohomology of the total space. But by the free module structure this also makes term  $h_3 \otimes \omega_k$  appear, which however must not appear in cohomology. Hence in the next step we adjoin generators with differential such as to removed these tensor products from cohomology. To these new generators the same reasoning applies, and so ever on.

We now say this explicitly in each of the three cases:

(i) We start with the case  $S^0 \rightarrow S^3$ . Write the 0-sphere as the disjoint union of a ‘left’ and a ‘right’ point

$$S^0 = *^L \sqcup *^R.$$

Then, on cohomology, the map  $S^0 \xrightarrow{\pi} S^3$  acts as

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H^\bullet(S^0, \mathbb{R}) & = \langle [\omega_0^L], [\omega_0^R] \rangle & & [\omega_0^L] + [\omega_1^R] & 0 \\ \uparrow \pi^* & & & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ H^\bullet(S^3, \mathbb{R}) & = \langle [1], [h_3] \rangle & & [1] & [h_3] \end{array}$$

Hence if the dg-model for  $S^0$  is to be of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \langle 1, h_3 \rangle & \otimes \langle \omega_0^L, \omega_0^R, \dots \rangle & & 1 \otimes (\omega_0^L + \omega_0^R) & h_3 \otimes (\omega_0^L + \omega_0^R) \\ \uparrow \pi^* & & & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ \underbrace{\langle 1, h_3 \rangle}_{\text{Sym}(h_3)} & & & 1 & h_3 \end{array}$$

with

$$d1 = 0, \quad dh_3 = 0, \quad d\omega_0^{L/R} = 0,$$

then the statement follows by induction: In the first step, we find that there must be generators  $\omega_2^{L/R}$  in order to remove the elements  $h_3 \otimes \omega_0^{L/R}$  from cohomology, via the differential

$$d\omega_2^{L/R} = h_3 \otimes \omega_0^{L/R}.$$

But this means that  $h_3 \otimes \omega_2^{L/R}$  will be closed, since by the dg-module property we must have

$$\begin{aligned} d(h_3 \otimes \omega_2^{L/R}) &= \underbrace{(dh_3)}_{=0} \otimes \omega_2^{L/R} - h_3 \otimes d\omega_2^{L/R} \\ &= -\underbrace{h_3 \wedge h_3}_{=0} \otimes \omega_0^{L/R}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence to remove these elements from cohomology, next there need to be elements  $\omega_4^{L/R}$  with differential

$$d\omega_4^{L/R} = h_3 \otimes \omega_2^{L/R}.$$

And so forth.

(ii) We now consider the case  $S^4 \xrightarrow{\pi} S^3$ . On cohomology this map acts as

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H^\bullet(S^4, \mathbb{R}) & = \langle [\tilde{\omega}_0], [\omega_4] \rangle & & [\tilde{\omega}_0] & 0 \\ \uparrow \pi^* & & & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ H^\bullet(S^3, \mathbb{R}) & = \langle [1], [h_3] \rangle & & [1] & [h_3] \end{array}$$

Hence if the dg-model is to look like

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \langle 1, h_3 \rangle & \otimes \langle \tilde{\omega}_0, \omega_4, \dots \rangle & & 1 \otimes \omega_0 & h_3 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_0 \\ \uparrow \pi^* & & & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ \underbrace{\langle 1, h_3 \rangle}_{\text{Sym}(h_3)} & & & 1 & h_3 \end{array}$$

with

$$d1 = 0, \quad d\tilde{\omega}_0 = 0, \quad d\omega_4 = 0,$$



then the statement follows by induction: First there need to be elements  $\tilde{\omega}_2$  and  $\omega_6$  to remove  $h_3 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_0$  and  $h_3 \otimes \omega_4$  from cohomology, respectively, via

$$d\tilde{\omega}_2 = h_3 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_0, \quad d\omega_6 = h_3 \otimes \omega_4.$$

But this implies that

$$d(h_3 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_2) = 0, \quad d(h_3 \otimes \omega_6) = 0$$

and hence to remove these elements from cohomology there must be  $\tilde{\omega}_4$  and  $\omega_8$ . And so forth.

(iii) Now consider the main case of interest, the fibration  $S^4//S^1$ . From Prop. 3.6 we know the cohomology of the total space, and hence the map on cohomology is now of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^\bullet(S^4//S^1, \mathbb{R}) & = \langle [\tilde{\omega}_0], [\omega_2], [\omega_4], [\omega_2 \wedge \omega_2], \dots \rangle & \begin{array}{c} [\tilde{\omega}_0] \\ \uparrow \\ [1] \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \uparrow \\ [h_3] \end{array} \\ \uparrow \pi^* & & \\ H^\bullet(S^3, \mathbb{R}) & = \langle [1], [h_3] \rangle & \end{array}$$

First consider the presence of  $\tilde{\omega}_0$  and of  $\omega_2$ . By the argument directly analogous as that in item (ii) above, these induce the sequences of generators  $\tilde{\omega}_{2p}$  and  $\omega_{2p+2}$  as claimed. Hence for the claim to hold, it must be that this already implies the existence of a further degree four class  $\omega_4$ , so that *no* further generators have to be added. Indeed, the element

$$\hat{\omega}_4 := 1 \otimes \omega_4 - \omega_2 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_2 \quad (39)$$

is closed:

$$d\hat{\omega}_4 = \underbrace{d\omega_4}_{h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_0} - \underbrace{d\omega_2}_{0} \otimes \tilde{\omega}_2 - \omega_2 \wedge \underbrace{d\tilde{\omega}_2}_{h_3 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_0} = 0. \quad (40)$$

Moreover, the only potential primitives are multiples of  $h_3$  (by degree reasons), which however are closed, so that  $\omega_4$  is not exact and hence indeed represents a non-trivial cohomology class in degree four.  $\square$

We pause to provide some intuition for the result of Prop. 3.13:

**Remark 3.14** (Interpretation of fiberwise stabilization of A-type orbispace). Due to the rational equivalence

$$S^3 \simeq_{\text{whe}, \mathbb{Q}} B^2 S^1,$$

the homotopy fiber of the point inclusion into the 3-sphere is, rationally, the classifying space  $BS^1$  (16):

$$\text{hofib} \left( \begin{array}{c} * \\ \downarrow \\ S^3 \end{array} \right) \simeq_{\text{whe}, \mathbb{Q}} BS^1.$$

Accordingly, the homotopy fiber of the first fibration in Prop. 3.13, is, rationally, the disjoint union of two copies of  $BS^1$ :

$$\text{hofib} \left( \begin{array}{c} (S^4)^{S^1} \\ \downarrow \\ S^3 \end{array} \right) \simeq_{\text{whe}, \mathbb{Q}} BS^1 \sqcup BS^1.$$

But the operation of forming fiberwise suspension spectra (Prop. 2.6) really refers to these homotopy fibers. This makes it manifest that the fiberwise suspension spectrum of  $(S^4)^{S^1}$  over  $S^3$  is a parametrized spectrum whose fiber spectrum over any point of the connected base space is the direct sum

$$\Sigma_+^\infty BS^1 \oplus \Sigma_+^\infty BS^1 \simeq_{\text{swhe}, \mathbb{Q}} \text{ku} \oplus \text{ku}$$

of two copies of the suspension spectrum of  $BS^1$ , which is rationally equivalent to the direct sum of two copies of the connective K-theory spectrum, by Example 2.21. This means that  $\Sigma_{+S^3}^\infty (S^4)^{S^1}$  is rationally equivalent to the direct sum of two copies of some twisted version of connective K-theory. As in the discussion of Lemma 2.23, rationally there is (degreewise) only one possible non-trivial twist, and hence



from Diagram (32) in terms of the dg-models from Def. 3.13 is

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \left( \begin{array}{l} d\omega_0^{L/R} = 0 \\ d\omega_{2p+2}^{L/R} = \omega_{2p}^{L/R} \end{array} \right) & \xleftarrow{\left( \begin{array}{l} \omega_{2p} \mapsto (\omega_{2p}^L + \omega_{2p}^R) \\ \tilde{\omega}_{2p+4} \mapsto 0 \end{array} \right)} & \left( \begin{array}{l} d\omega_0 = 0, d\omega_{2p+2} = h_3 \otimes \omega_{2p} \\ d\tilde{\omega}_4 = 0, d\omega_{2p+6} = h_3 \otimes \omega_{2p+4} \end{array} \right) \\
 & \nwarrow \left( \begin{array}{l} 1 \mapsto 1 \otimes (\omega_0^L + \omega_0^R) \\ h_3 \mapsto h_3 \otimes (\omega_0^L + \omega_0^R) \end{array} \right) \quad \nearrow \left( \begin{array}{l} 1 \mapsto 1 \otimes \omega_0 \\ h_3 \mapsto h_3 \otimes \omega_0 \end{array} \right) & \\
 & \left( \begin{array}{l} d1 = 0 \\ dh_3 = 0 \end{array} \right) &
 \end{array}$$

*Proof.* We know that the various cohomology generators are mapped as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 1 \otimes ([\omega_0^L] + [\omega_0^R]) & \xleftarrow{\quad} & 1 \otimes [\omega_0] \\
 & \nwarrow \quad \nearrow & \\
 & [1] &
 \end{array}$$

This implies the statement along the lines of the proof of Prop. 3.13.  $\square$

So far this shows how there are copies of rational twisted K-theory in the rational fiberwise stabilization of the A-type orbispace. The next proposition analyzes how the adjunction unit compares these to the rational 6-truncated twisted K-theory inside the rational cyclification of the 4-sphere:

**Proposition 3.17** (Fiberwise stabilization of Ext/Cyc-unit for A-type orbispace via minimal models). *The fiberwise stabilization of the Ext/Cyc-unit on the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere*

$$\Sigma_{S^3}^\infty(S^4 // S^1) \xrightarrow{\Sigma_{S^3}^\infty(\eta)} \Sigma_{S^3}^\infty \text{Cyc}(S^4)$$

is represented on the corresponding minimal DG-modules from Prop. 2.38 and Prop. 3.13 by a dg-module homomorphism over  $\mathbb{Q}[h_3]$ , shown as a dotted map in (43), with the following properties:

(i) It sends the generators  $\omega_2$ ,  $\omega_4$  and  $\omega_6$  from Prop. 2.38 to the generators of the same name in Prop. 3.13:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \omega_2 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_0 & \xleftarrow{\Sigma_{S^3}^\infty(\eta)^*} & \omega_2 \\
 1 \otimes \omega_4 & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \omega_4 \\
 1 \otimes \omega_6 & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \omega_6
 \end{array} \tag{42}$$

(ii) The elements

$$1 \otimes \omega_{2p+8}, \quad p \in \mathbb{N}$$

are not in its image.

(iii) It is a (minimal) relative dg-module inclusion (Def. 2.16).

*Proof.* A general representative for  $\Sigma_{S^3}^\infty(\eta)$  on the respective minimal DG-models is a dotted morphism that makes the following diagram commute up to homotopy, but we claim that a representative with the

stated properties exists that even makes this diagram strictly commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\Sigma_{S^3}^\infty(S^4 // S^1) & \xrightarrow{\Sigma_{S^3}^\infty(\eta_{S^4 // S^1})} & \Sigma_{S^3}^\infty \text{CycExt}(S^4 // S^1) & \xrightarrow[\simeq_{\text{whe}}]{\Sigma_{S^3}^\infty \text{Cyc}(\kappa)} & \Sigma_{S^3}^\infty \text{Cyc}(S^4) \\
\\
\mathbb{Q}[\omega_2, \omega_4, h_7] / \left( \begin{array}{l} d\omega_2 = 0 \\ d\omega_4 = 0 \\ dh_7 = -\frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4 \end{array} \right) & \xleftarrow[\omega_2 \mapsto \omega_2, \omega_4 \mapsto \omega_4, \omega_6 \mapsto 0]{\begin{array}{l} h_3 \mapsto 0 \\ h_7 \mapsto h_7 \end{array}} & \mathbb{Q}[h_3, h_7, \omega_2, \omega_4, \omega_6] / \left( \begin{array}{l} dh_3 = 0 \\ dh_7 = -\frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4 + \omega_2 \wedge \omega_6 \\ d\omega_2 = 0 \\ d\omega_4 = h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \\ d\omega_6 = h_3 \wedge \omega_4 \end{array} \right) & & \\
\uparrow \simeq_{\text{qi}} \begin{array}{l} h_3 \mapsto 0 \\ \tilde{\omega}_0 \mapsto 1 \\ \tilde{\omega}_{2p+2} \mapsto 0 \\ \omega_2 \mapsto \omega_2 \\ \omega_4 \mapsto \omega_4 \\ \omega_{2p+6} \mapsto 0 \end{array} & & \uparrow \simeq_{\text{qi}} \begin{array}{l} h_3 \mapsto h_3 \\ \omega_2 \mapsto \omega_2 \\ \omega_4 \mapsto \omega_4 \\ \omega_6 \mapsto \omega_6 \end{array} & & \\
\mathbb{Q}[h_3, \omega_2] \otimes \langle \tilde{\omega}_{2p}, \omega_{2p+4} \rangle / \left( \begin{array}{l} dh_3 = 0 \\ d\tilde{\omega}_0 = 0 \\ d\tilde{\omega}_{2p+2} = h_3 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_{2p} \\ d\omega_2 = 0 \\ d\omega_4 = h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_0 \\ d\omega_{2p+6} = h_3 \otimes \omega_{2p+4} \end{array} \right) & \xleftarrow[\omega_6 \mapsto 1 \otimes \omega_6]{\begin{array}{l} h_3 \mapsto h_3 \\ \omega_2 \mapsto \omega_2 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_0 \\ \omega_4 \mapsto 1 \otimes \omega_4 \\ \vdots \end{array}} & \frac{\mathbb{Q}[h_3, \omega_2, \omega_4, \omega_6]}{(\omega_2 \wedge \omega_6 - \frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4)} / \left( \begin{array}{l} dh_3 = 0 \\ d\omega_2 = 0 \\ d\omega_4 = h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \\ d\omega_6 = h_3 \wedge \omega_4 \end{array} \right) & & \\
\end{array} \tag{43}$$

Here the top horizontal morphism is, via Prop. 3.12, given by (38) from Prop. 3.8, while in the bottom row we have the corresponding minimal models: the left vertical morphism is (41) from Lemma 3.15 and the right vertical morphism is from Prop. 2.38.

First we show that if such a dotted morphism exists, then it satisfies **(i)**: To start with, the dotted morphism necessarily sends  $h_3 \mapsto h_3$ , since it is a homomorphism of free  $\mathbb{Q}[h_3]$ -modules. Next, in order for the underlying linear maps to commute, the dotted morphism needs to send

$$\omega_2 \mapsto \omega_2 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_0 + \cdots,$$

where the ellipsis indicate a term of degree 2 which vanishes under the left vertical map. This must be a multiple by some  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  of  $1 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_2$ . But then the respect for the differential

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
ch_3 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_0 & \xleftarrow{\quad} & 0 \\
d \uparrow & & \uparrow d \\
\omega_2 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_0 + c 1 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_2 & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \omega_2
\end{array}$$

enforces  $c = 0$ .

The analogous argument applies to  $\omega_4$ : In order for the underlying linear maps to commute, it needs to be sent to

$$\omega_4 \mapsto 1 \otimes \omega_4 + \cdots$$

where the ellipsis indicates a term of degree 4 that vanishes under the left vertical map. This means that it must be of the form  $c_1 \omega_2 \wedge \tilde{\omega}_2 + c_2 1 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_4$  for some  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ . But then the respect for the differentials

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_0 + c_1 \omega_2 \wedge h_3 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_0 + c_2 h_3 \wedge \tilde{\omega}_2 & \xleftarrow{\quad} & h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \\
d \uparrow & & \uparrow d \\
1 \otimes \omega_4 + c_1 \omega_2 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_2 + c_2 1 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_4 & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \omega_4
\end{array}$$

implies that  $c_1 = 0$  and  $c_2 = 0$ .

Finally, for the underlying linear maps to commute on  $\omega_6$ , it must be that

$$\omega_6 \mapsto 0 + \cdots$$

where the ellipsis is a term of degree 6 that vanishes under the left vertical map. Hence

$$\omega_6 \mapsto c_1 1 \otimes \omega_6 + c_2 1 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_6 + c_3 \omega_2 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_4 + c_4 \omega_2 \wedge \omega_2 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_2$$

for some  $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 \in \mathbb{R}$ . Now the respect for the differentials

$$\begin{array}{ccc} c_1 h_3 \otimes \omega_4 + c_2 h_3 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_6 + c_3 \omega_2 \wedge h_3 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_2 + c_4 \omega_2 \wedge \omega_2 \wedge h_3 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_0 & \longleftarrow & h_3 \wedge \omega_4 \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ c_1 1 \otimes \omega_6 + c_2 1 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_6 + c_3 \omega_2 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_4 + c_4 \omega_2 \wedge \omega_2 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_2 & \longleftarrow & \omega_6 \end{array}$$

implies  $c_1 = 1$  and  $c_2 = c_3 = c_4 = 0$ .

This proves (i), provided that the dotted morphism indeed exists.

We now prove that a dotted morphism does exist. We claim that we may take it to be a  $\mathbb{Q}[h_3, \omega_2]$ -module homomorphism, hence we declare that it sends wedge products of some element with powers of  $h_3$  and  $\omega_2$  to the corresponding wedge products with the image of that element. Together with the property (i) just proven, this means that the dotted morphism is now defined on all terms that are at most linear in  $\omega_4, \omega_6$ . Hence the task is to extend it to a dg-module morphism also defined on elements which are at least quadratic in  $\omega_4, \omega_6$ .

But by the relation  $\frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4 = \omega_2 \wedge \omega_6$ , which holds in the minimal dg-module in the bottom right of (43), we may consider those unique representatives which are at most linear in  $\omega_4$ . Hence what remains to be shown is that we may find consistent images for all elements on the right of the form

$$(\omega_6)^n, \quad (\omega_6)^{n-1} \wedge \omega_4 \quad \text{for all } n \geq 2.$$

We claim that there are unique coefficients  $a_n, b_n \in \mathbb{N} \subset \mathbb{Q}$  such that the following choice works, in that it respects the differentials (while it is clear that this makes the underlying linear maps commute):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} b_n \omega_2 \otimes \omega_{6n-4} & \longleftarrow & (\omega_6)^{n-1} \wedge \omega_4 \\ a_n \omega_2 \otimes \omega_{6n-2} & \longleftarrow & (\omega_6)^n \end{array} \quad \text{for } n \geq 2. \quad (44)$$

We prove the respect of the differentials for (44) by induction. To start the induction, we need to check the case  $n = 2$ : The respect for the differentials on  $\omega_6 \wedge \omega_4$  means that the following square has to commute

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 3h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \otimes \omega_6 & \longleftarrow & 3h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \wedge \omega_6 \\ \uparrow d & & \uparrow d \\ b_2 \omega_2 \otimes \omega_8 & \longleftarrow & \omega_6 \wedge \omega_4, \end{array} \quad (45)$$

where the top left entry shows the image of top right element. To see this, notice that:

- (a) In computing the differential on the right of (45), we are using the relation  $\frac{1}{2}\omega_4 \wedge \omega_4 = \omega_2 \wedge \omega_6$  in the minimal dg-module model from Prop. 2.38, in order to uniquely represent all differentials by representatives that are at most linear in  $\omega_4$ .
- (b) Beware that the definition (44) applies only to terms at least quadratic in  $\omega_6, \omega_4$ . For the image of the top right element in (45) we instead use (42) and the assumed respect for the  $\mathbb{Q}[h_3, \omega_2]$ -module structure.

But the differential of the bottom left element in (45) is  $b_2 \omega_2 \wedge h_3 \otimes \omega_6$ , and hence the square (45) commutes precisely if  $b_2 = 3$ . In an analogous manner, we see that the respect for the differential on  $\omega_6 \wedge \omega_6$  means that the following square has to commute

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 2b_2 h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \otimes \omega_8 & \longleftarrow & 2h_3 \wedge \omega_6 \wedge \omega_4 \\ \uparrow d & & \uparrow d \\ a_2 \omega_2 \otimes \omega_{10} & \longleftarrow & \omega_6 \wedge \omega_6, \end{array}$$

where again the top left element shown is the image of the top right element, now obtained via (44). We see that the differential on the left has this same image precisely if

$$a_2 = 2b_2 = 6.$$

This shows that there are unique values for  $a_2$  and  $b_2$  in (44), as claimed, and hence that the start of the inductive proof is verified.

Now for the induction step, assume that the statement holds for  $(n-1)$ , with  $n \geq 3$ . Then we need to consider the analogous commutativity of the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} n!b_n h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \otimes \omega_{6n-4} & \xleftarrow{\quad} & n!(\omega_6)^{n-1} \wedge \omega_4 \\ \uparrow d & & \uparrow d \\ a_n \omega_2 \otimes \omega_{6n-2} & \xleftarrow{\quad} & (\omega_6)^n \end{array}$$

and of the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} a_{n-1} (2 \cdot (n-1)! + 1) h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \otimes \omega_{6(n-1)} & \xleftarrow{\quad} & (2 \cdot (n-1)! + 1) h_3 \wedge \omega_2 \wedge (\omega_6)^{n-1} \\ \uparrow d & & \uparrow d \\ b_n \omega_2 \otimes \omega_{6n-4} & \xleftarrow{\quad} & (\omega_6)^{n-1} \wedge \omega_4 \end{array}$$

By the same logic as before, we see that the first one commutes precisely if

$$a_n = n!b_n$$

and with that the second one commutes precisely if

$$\begin{aligned} b_n &= a_{n-1} (2 \cdot (n-1)! + 1) \\ &= b_{n-1} (n-1)! (2 \cdot (n-1)! + 1) . \end{aligned}$$

This means that  $a_n$  and  $b_n$  exist uniquely once  $a_{n-1}$  and  $b_{n-1}$  have been found. Hence, by induction, we have a unique solution given by (44), and hence a dotted morphism as claimed does exist. This completes the proof of item (i).

It is now immediate, by the construction (44), that the elements  $1 \otimes \omega_{2p+8}$  are not in the image of the dotted morphism just constructed (only those of the form  $(\omega_2)^n \otimes \omega_{2p+8}$  and  $h_3 \wedge (\omega_2)^n \otimes \omega_{2p+8}$  for  $n \geq 1$  are). This is the statement of item (ii) to be proven.

Finally, the construction of the dashed morphism via (i) and (44) is a map between minimal dg-modules, hence between (minimal) cell complexes in dg-modules (Def. 2.16), which is manifestly an injective cell map (i.e. it injectively maps generators to generators). This means that it is a relative cell complex inclusion, in fact a relative minimal dg-module inclusion, according to Def. 2.16. This is the statement of the last item (iii) to be proven.  $\square$

To summarize, we now state and prove the main technical result here, Theorem 3.18 below. In the statement, the topological group in Section 2.2 is taken to be the circle group  $G := S^1 = U(1)$ . Accordingly, we omit the group subscript in the Ext/Cyc-adjunction (Theorem 2.39) and write

$$\text{Cyc}(X) := \mathcal{L}_{S^1}(X) := \text{Maps}(S^1, X) \times_{S^1} ES^1 .$$

Also recall the weak homotopy equivalence from Prop. 2.31

$$S^4 \xrightarrow[\simeq_{\text{whe}}]{\kappa^{-1}} \text{Ext}(S^4 // S^1) .$$

**Theorem 3.18** (Enhancement to twisted K-theory by lifting against fiberwise stabilization of A-type orbispace of 4-sphere). *Regard the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere (Def. 3.1) as fibered over the 3-sphere, hence, rationally, over the classifying space  $B^3\mathbb{Q}$ , via the canonical map (32) from Prop. 3.3,*

$$\begin{array}{c} S^4 // S^1 \\ \downarrow \\ S^3 \\ \downarrow \simeq_{\mathbb{Q}} \\ B^3\mathbb{Q} \end{array} \tag{46}$$

Then:

(i) Rationally, the fiberwise stabilization (Prop. 2.6) of (46) contains as a direct summand a copy of the 2-fold suspension of twisted connective K-theory (Lemma 2.23)

$$(\Sigma^2 \mathrm{ku} // BS^1)_{\mathbb{Q}} \xrightarrow{\iota} \Sigma_{S^3}^{\infty} (S^4 // S^1) .$$

(ii) A lift through the fiberwise stabilization of the Ext/Cyc-unit  $\eta_{S^4 // S^1}$  on (46) implies an enhancement from rational 6-truncated to rational untruncated twisted K-theory, and exists as soon as such an enhancement exists. In more detail: A dotted lift  $\widehat{\mathrm{st}_{S^3} \circ \phi}$  of the composite  $\mathrm{st}_{S^3} \circ \phi$  with the stabilization unit (7) through the fiberwise stabilized unit  $\eta_{S^4 // S^1}$  of the rationalized Ext/Cyc-adjunction (Theorem 2.39)

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\Omega_{B^3 \mathbb{Q}}^{\infty-2} (\mathrm{ku} // BS^1)_{\mathbb{Q}} \xrightarrow{\iota} \Omega_{S^3}^{\infty} \Sigma_{S^3}^{\infty} (S^4 // S^1)_{\mathbb{Q}} \\
\downarrow \tau_6 \qquad \qquad \qquad \downarrow \Omega_{S^3}^{\infty} \Sigma_{S^3}^{\infty} (\eta_{S^4 // S^1}) \\
X_{\mathbb{Q}} \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathrm{Cyc}(S^4)_{\mathbb{Q}} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{st}_{S^3}} \Omega_{S^3}^{\infty} \Sigma_{S^3}^{\infty} \mathrm{Cyc}(S^4)_{\mathbb{Q}} \xrightarrow{(\kappa^{-1})} \Omega_{S^3}^{\infty} \Sigma_{S^3}^{\infty} \mathrm{CycExt}(S^4 // S^1)_{\mathbb{Q}} \\
\downarrow \mu_3 \qquad \qquad \qquad \downarrow \\
B^3 \mathbb{Q}
\end{array}
\end{array}$$

$\widehat{\mathrm{st}_{S^3} \circ \phi}$  (dotted arrow from  $X_{\mathbb{Q}}$  to  $\Omega_{S^3}^{\infty} \Sigma_{S^3}^{\infty} (S^4 // S^1)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ )  
 $\widehat{\phi}$  (dotted arrow from  $X_{\mathbb{Q}}$  to  $\Omega_{B^3 \mathbb{Q}}^{\infty-2} (\mathrm{ku} // BS^1)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ )

implies and requires a lift  $\widehat{\phi}$  of  $\phi$  through the morphism  $\tau_6$  from Example 2.37, and exists as soon as the latter exists.

*Proof.* We may represent the situation using the minimal dg-modules for the objects on the right, from Prop. 2.38 and Prop. 2.38. That there is a direct summand of rationalized shifted twisted K-theory is the statement of Prop. 3.13.

On these minimal dg-modules, the vertical map on the right is represented by the dashed morphism in (43).

That a strict lifting (i.e. not up to homotopy) implies a strict lifting through  $\tau_6$ , as claimed, is equivalently the statement of item (i) in Prop. 3.17. That there is no further obstruction in strictly lifting is equivalently the statement of item (ii) in Prop. 3.17, together with the previous fact that  $\iota$  includes a direct summand: Together this implies that every lift through  $\tau_6$  may be extended by zero to the complementary direct summand. Hence it remains only to see that such strict lifts are equivalent to lifts up to homotopy. But this follows by item (iii) in Prop. 3.17.

This last equivalence is a standard argument in homotopy theory. For completeness, we briefly recall it: Lifts up to homotopy

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
Y \xrightarrow{\quad \hat{f} \quad} Y_1 & & N \xleftarrow{\quad \hat{f}^* \quad} N_1 \\
\mathrm{id} \downarrow \swarrow & \text{or dually} & \uparrow \swarrow p^* \\
Y \xrightarrow{\quad f \quad} Y_2 & & A \xleftarrow{\quad f^* \quad} N_2
\end{array}$$

are equivalently morphisms in the  $\infty$ -category of  $\infty$ -presheaves on  $\Delta[1]$ , with values in the given ambient homotopy theory (see [Lur06, Sec. 5.1]). But if the latter is presented by a cofibrantly generated model category, then the former is presented by the corresponding projective model structure, see [Lur06, Sec. A.2.8]. By basic statements in model category theory (e.g. [Lur06, Sec. A.2.2]), this implies that homotopy-commutative diagrams as above are equivalent to strictly commuting diagrams, as soon as, when regarded as morphisms of presheaves on  $\Delta[1]$ , their domain is projectively cofibrant and their domain is projectively fibrant. This is precisely the case here: First of all, the relevant model structure on dg-modules is cofibrantly generated, and moreover all its objects are fibrant ([BM18, Sec 2.7.2]). This

means that  $\begin{bmatrix} N \\ \mathrm{id} \uparrow \\ N \end{bmatrix}$  is projectively fibrant for all dg-modules  $N$ , while  $\begin{bmatrix} N_1 \\ p^* \uparrow \\ N_2 \end{bmatrix}$  is projectively cofibrant precisely

if  $N_2$  is cofibrant and  $f^*$  is a cofibration (so that then also  $N_1$  is cofibrant), hence in particular if  $N_2$  is a minimal dg-module and  $f^*$  is a relative minimal dg-module inclusion, according to Def. 2.16. That this is the case here is the statement of item (iii) in Prop. 3.17.  $\square$

This concludes our discussion of lifts through the fiberwise stabilization of the  $\text{Ext} \dashv \text{Cyc}$ -unit on the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere. In the next Section 4 we apply this general fact to the discussion of gauge enhancement of the double dimensional reduction of cocycles for fundamental M-branes.

## 4 Gauge enhancement of M-branes

Here we explain how Theorem 3.18 provides a mechanism for the gauge enhancement of fundamental M-branes, in the sense discussed in Section 3.18.

First in Section 4.1, we give the discussion without local supersymmetry taken into account and present a solution to *Open Problem, Rational version 1* (p. 6). Here the construction happens completely in classical rational homotopy theory, and it explains the core of the gauge enhancement mechanism via Theorem 3.18, for double dimensional reduction of flux forms as in [MaS04]. This serves to focus on the enhancement from truncated to un-truncated twisted de Rham cohomology, but it falls short of exhibiting the existence and uniqueness of cocycles and their lifts, which is brought about only by supersymmetry.

Then, in Section 4.2, we pass to (rational) super homotopy theory and explain the full mechanism of gauge enhancement on M-branes from first principles. To be self-contained, we first recall how super spacetimes and super  $p$ -branes propagating on them are incarnated as super-cocycles in super-homotopy theory. Then we explain how exactly the expected gauge enhancement of fundamental M-branes, under double dimensional reduction to type IIA D-branes, comes about (at least rationally).

### 4.1 The mechanism without supersymmetry

Here we first discuss what is visible of the mechanism of gauge enhancement in plain rational homotopy theory, disregarding, for the moment, its interaction with (local) supersymmetry. The latter is a necessary ingredient for the very existence and classification of  $p$ -branes and their charges, and will be discussed below. But if we are content, for the moment, with assuming that a collection of flux-like forms is given on some spacetime, disregarding their origin in string/M-theory, then we may already discuss the mechanism of gauge enhancement on these, in terms of lifts according to Theorem 3.18.

The input datum is a smooth manifold  $Y$  (thought of as 11-dimensional spacetime), equipped with the (homotopy class) of a continuous function to the 4-sphere

$$Y \xrightarrow{(G_4, G_7)} S^4 . \quad (47)$$

In the approximation of rational homotopy theory (Def. 2.1) this datum is equivalently encoded by a pair consisting of a differential 4-form  $G_4$  and a differential 7-form  $G_7$  on  $Y$ , satisfying the relations shown on the right of the following:

$$(G_4, G_7) = \begin{cases} dG_4 = 0 \\ dG_7 = -\frac{1}{2}G_4 \wedge G_4 , \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

where on the left we have the de Rham differential operator on the smooth manifold  $Y$ . This follows from applying the equivalence Prop. 2.8 and using the minimal dgc-algebra model for the 4-sphere, from Example 2.10. The relations (48) have the form of the “topological sector” of the equations of motion in 11-dimensional supergravity for the *C-field strength*  $G_4$  and its dual flux  $G_7$ , which is thereby identified with a cocycle in rational cohomotopy of degree 4 [Sa13, Sec. 2.5].

Here the contribution of the dual flux  $G_7$  may be disentangled from that of the C-field strength  $G_4$  by considering the homotopy pullback along the quaternionic Hopf fibration  $S^7 \xrightarrow{H_{\mathbb{H}}} S^4$ . This is an  $\text{SU}(2)$ -principal bundle over  $S^4$ , hence classified by a map  $S^4 \xrightarrow{\phi_{\mathbb{H}}} \text{BSU}(2)$  to the classifying space, as in (18). The above cohomotopy cocycle decomposes along the quaternionic Hopf fibration as follows:



$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\hat{Y} & \xrightarrow{G_7} & S^7 \\
\downarrow & \text{(homotopy pullback)} & \downarrow H_{\mathbb{H}} \\
Y & \xrightarrow{(G_4, G_7)} & S^4 \\
\searrow G_4 & & \downarrow \phi_{\mathbb{H}} \\
& & BSU(2) \\
& \swarrow c_2 & \\
& B^4\mathbb{Q} &
\end{array}
\tag{49}$$

We are interested in the *double dimensional reduction* of this data, along a choice of circle action on  $Y$ , as in (2). This means that we assume now that  $Y$  sits in a homotopy fiber sequence with the classifying space  $BS^1$  as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
Y \simeq_{\text{whe}} \text{Ext}(X) & & (50) \\
\pi_{S^1} \downarrow & & \\
X := Y // S^1 & \searrow & \\
& & BS^1,
\end{array}$$

hence that  $Y$  is an  $S^1$ -extension of  $X$ , according to Prop. 2.31. This implies that our cohomotopy cocycles, as in the bottom part of (49), are now exhibited equivalently as a map out of a space in the image of the Ext-functor (19):

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Ext}(X) & \xrightarrow{(G_4, G_7)} & S^4 \\
\searrow G_4 & & \swarrow c_2(\phi_{\mathbb{H}}) \\
& B^4\mathbb{Q} &
\end{array}$$

But Theorem 2.39 asserts that the functor  $\text{Ext}$  is the left adjoint in a pair of adjoint functors, the right adjoint being the operation of constructing cyclic loop spaces (27).

By virtue of being adjoint, maps *out of* the image of the left adjoint functor  $\text{Ext}$  are equivalent to maps *into* the image of the right adjoint functor  $\text{Cyc}$ . Moreover, this equivalence is exhibited by first applying the right adjoint functor  $\text{Cyc}(-)$ , and then precomposing with the adjunction unit map  $X \xrightarrow{\eta_X} \text{CycExt}(X)$  (e.g. [Bor94, Sec. 3]). In summary, this means that Theorem 2.39 implies that the cohomotopy cocycle on  $Y$  with rational components  $(G_4, G_7)$  is naturally identified with a  $\text{Cyc}(S^4)$ -valued cocycle on  $X$ , whose rationalization we will denote by  $(\widetilde{G_4, G_7})$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & \text{double dimensional reduction} & & \\
& & \text{of } (G_4, G_7) & & \\
X & \searrow & (\widetilde{G_4, G_7}) & \searrow & \\
\eta \downarrow & & & & \\
\text{CycExt}(X) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \text{Cyc}(G_4, G_7) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \text{Cyc}(S^4) \\
& \searrow & & \swarrow & \\
& & \text{Cyc}(B^4\mathbb{Q}) & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \\
& & B^3\mathbb{Q} & &
\end{array}
\tag{51}$$

Using once more the equivalence Prop. 2.8, as well as minimal dgc-algebra model for  $\text{Cyc}(S^4)$  from Example 2.36, shows that this  $\text{Ext}/\text{Cyc}$ -adjunct of our cohomotopy cocycle is rationally determined by a collection of differential forms on  $X$ , which satisfy the following relations

$$\widetilde{(G_4, G_7)} = \begin{cases} dH_3 = 0 & dH_7 = F_2 \wedge F_6 - \frac{1}{2}F_4 \wedge F_4 \\ dF_2 = 0 \\ dF_4 = H_3 \wedge F_2 \\ dF_6 = H_3 \wedge F_4. \end{cases} \quad (52)$$

In fact, these differential forms arise from the input datum  $(G_4, G_7)$  precisely by the *double dimensional reduction* of (3), as obtained, via the Gysin exact sequence, in [MaS04, Sec 4.2]. If the original differential forms  $G_4$  and  $G_7$  are interpreted as the M-brane flux forms of 11-dimensional supergravity, corresponding to the M2-brane and the M5-brane, then the forms in (52) are precisely those flux forms of 10-dimensional type IIA supergravity, together with their Bianchi identities, which are supposed to arise via double dimensional reduction from the M-branes: the NS1-brane flux  $H_3$ , the RR-flux forms  $F_{(2p+2 \leq 6)}$  for the  $D(2p \leq 4)$ -branes, as well as for the NS5-brane flux  $H_7$ .<sup>6</sup>

So far this is the plain mechanism of double dimensional reduction, formalized via the Ext/Cyc-adjunction in rational homotopy theory, according to [FSS13, Sec. 3] [FSS16b, Sec. 3]. The question of *gauge enhancement* now is how the collection of flux forms in (52) may naturally complete itself to contain also  $F_8$  and  $F_{10}$  (on a 10-dimensional spacetime). Since, by Remark 3.4, operations on spacetime  $Y$  should be accompanied by corresponding operations on the 4-sphere coefficient, in (47), we consider, in parallel to (50), also a circle action on the 4-sphere, namely the A-type circle action from Def. 3.1:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Ext}(S^4//S^1) \simeq_{\text{whe}} S^4 \\ \downarrow \\ S^4//S^1 \\ \swarrow \\ BS^1 \end{array} \quad (53)$$

This makes the situation of (51) take the following completely symmetric form:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & & S^4//S^1 & & \\ \eta_X \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_{S^4//S^1} & & \\ \text{CycExt}(X) & \xrightarrow{\quad \text{Cyc}(G_4, G_7) \quad} & \text{Cyc}(\text{Ext}(S^4//S^1)) & & \\ & \searrow & \swarrow & & \\ & \text{Cyc}(B^4\mathbb{Q}) & & & \\ & \downarrow & & & \\ & B^3\mathbb{Q} & & & \end{array} \quad (54)$$

Since the diagonal composite here is still the ordinary double dimensionally reduced flux  $\widetilde{(G_4, G_7)}$  from (51), this makes manifest that we are compelled to ask for an enhancement of double dimensional reduction which treats spacetime and the flux coefficients on equal footing, in the vein of Remark 3.4.

The most immediate form of such an *enhanced double dimensional reduction* would be to ask for a lift of the plain doubly dimensionally reduced flux  $(G_4, G_7)$  through the right vertical map in (54):

<sup>6</sup> Here we will be interested in the left column in (52). In fact the item on the right in (52), which is Bianchi identity  $dH_7 = F_2 \wedge F_6 - \frac{1}{2}F_4 \wedge F_4$  for the type IIA NS5-brane-flux, will disappear after stabilization in (58). That contribution, however, is interesting in its own right, as its right hand is similar to, while different from, a Massey product of RR-flux forms with the NS 3-form flux. This relation between RR-fluxes and Massey products is explored, homotopy-theoretically, in [GS15, Sec. 4.3].

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& \text{enhanced} \\
& \text{double dimensional reduction} \\
& \text{of } (G_4, G_7) \text{ ??} \\
X & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & S^4//S^1 \\
\eta_X \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_{S^4//S^1} \\
\text{CycExt}(X) & \xrightarrow{\text{Cyc}(G_4, G_7)} & \text{Cyc}(\text{Ext}(S^4//S^1)) \\
& \searrow H_3 & \swarrow \\
& B^3\mathbb{Q} & 
\end{array} \tag{55}$$

However, such a direct lift is strongly obstructed: Proposition 3.12 implies, via (38), that for such a lift to exist, the double dimensionally reduced cocycle data in (52) needs to satisfy the strong extra conditions that  $F_6 = 0$  and  $H_3 \wedge F_2 = 0$  (hence that  $dF_4 = 0$ ). Once we pass to the complete discussion that takes local supersymmetry into account, in Section 4.2 below, we will see that these conditions are in fact too strong: They are not satisfied, and hence the direct lift in (55) just does not exist.

This is the right time to highlight, that not only string theory, but also homotopy theory has a concept of *perturbative expansion*:

**Remark 4.1** (Homotopy theoretic perturbation theory – Goodwillie calculus). Full homotopy theory is immensely rich and computationally demanding (see for example [Rav03, HHR09]). But there is a tower of increasingly accurate approximations to it, that is strikingly analogous to Taylor series expansion in differential calculus: This is called the *Goodwillie-Taylor tower* (see e.g. [Kuhn04, Lur09]). Now the first order approximation in this *Goodwillie-Taylor perturbation theory* is provided by nothing but the *stabilization* adjunction between spaces and spectra, discussed in Section 2.1.

In view of this, as we encounter strong obstructions to a construction in full homotopy theory, as in (55), we are entitled to ask whether the construction exists “perturbatively”, hence stage-wise in Goodwillie-Taylor approximation. To first order in Goodwillie perturbation theory, this means to ask for the enhanced double dimensional reduction of (55) after *fiberwise stabilization* (Prop. 2.6) after applying the composition of stable looping  $\Omega_{S^3}^\infty$  and stable suspension  $\Sigma_{S^3}^\infty$ , both parametrized over the 3-sphere. Hence this amounts to asking for a lift in the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& \text{perturbatively enhanced} \\
& \text{double dimensional reduction} \\
& \text{of } (G_4, G_7) \text{ ??} \\
X & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & \Omega_{S^3}^\infty \Sigma_{S^3}^\infty (S^4//S^1) \\
\eta_X \downarrow & & \downarrow \Omega_{S^3}^\infty \Sigma_{S^3}^\infty (\eta_{S^4//S^1}) \\
\text{CycExt}(X) & \xrightarrow{\text{Cyc}(G_4, G_7)} & \text{Cyc}(S^4) & \xrightarrow{\text{st}} & \Omega_{S^3}^\infty \Sigma_{S^3}^\infty \text{Cyc}(S^4) \\
& \searrow H_3 & \downarrow & \swarrow & \\
& B^3\mathbb{Q} & & & 
\end{array} \tag{56}$$

But this is precisely the question to which Theorem 3.18 is the answer: This theorem says that the obstruction to perturbatively enhanced double dimensional reduction in (56) is the lift denoted  $(\widehat{G_4}, \widehat{G_7})$  in the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
X & \xrightarrow[\text{perturbatively enhanced}]{\text{double dimensional reduction}} & \Omega_{B^3\mathbb{Q}}^{\infty-2}(\mathrm{ku}/BS^1) & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \Omega_{S^3}^{\infty}\Sigma_{S^3}^{\infty}S^4//S^1 \\
\eta_X \downarrow & \xrightarrow[\widetilde{(G_4, G_7)}]{(\widehat{G_4, G_7})} & \downarrow \tau_6 & & \downarrow \Omega_{S^3}^{\infty}\Sigma_{S^3}^{\infty}(\eta_{S^4//S^1}) \\
\mathrm{CycExt}(X) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Cyc}(G_4, G_7)} & \mathrm{Cyc}(S^4) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{st}} & \Omega_{S^3}^{\infty}\Sigma_{S^3}^{\infty}\mathrm{Cyc}(S^4) \\
& \searrow H_3 & \downarrow & \swarrow & \\
& & B^3\mathbb{Q} & & 
\end{array} \tag{57}$$

Finally, by Example 2.37, such a lift is precisely the extension of the cocycle data for the plain double dimensional reduction in (52) to an untruncated cocycle in rational twisted K-theory (twisted de Rham cohomology):

$$(\widehat{G_4, G_7}) = \begin{cases} dH_3 = 0 \\ \\ dF_2 = 0 \\ dF_4 = H_3 \wedge F_2 \\ dF_6 = H_3 \wedge F_4 \\ dF_8 = H_3 \wedge F_6 \\ dF_{10} = H_3 \wedge F_8 \\ \vdots \end{cases} \quad (58)$$

This is the required gauge enhancement, according to the discussion in Section 1.

**Remark 4.2.** In conclusion, a **solution to Open Problem, Rational version 1** (p. 6) is given as follows: While plain double dimensional reduction of the M-theory flux  $(G_4, G_7)$  (48) is given by the Ext/Cyc-adjunct  $(\widetilde{G_4}, \widetilde{G_7})$  (51) along the M-theoretic spacetime extension (50) of the corresponding cocycle (47), its perturbative gauge enhancement, making the RR-flux forms  $F_8$  and  $F_{10}$  appear, is exhibited by lifting the latter through the fiberwise stabilization of the Ext/Cyc-adjunction unit on the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere (56), which reflects the analogous M-theoretic extension, now of the charge coefficients (53).

Before refining this discussion of gauge enhancement to take local supersymmetry into account, in Section 4.2 below, we briefly highlight a curious aspect of our gauge enhancement theorem.

**Remark 4.3** (Copies of twisted K-theory). By Prop. 3.13 there are *several* direct summands of rationalized twisted K-theory inside the rational fiberwise stabilization of the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere. Theorem 3.18 assigns a special role to one of them, a copy of rationalized  $\Sigma^2 \mathrm{ku} // BS^1$ , because the lift to this copy is what obstructs the general lift. As we have just seen, this 2-fold suspended copy of rational twisted  $\mathrm{ku}$  corresponds to the fact that the RR-flux forms on type IIA string theory ordinarily start with the D0-flux form  $F_2$  in degree 2. But there is, in particular, also a rational copy of unshifted  $\mathrm{ku} // BS^1$  in Prop. 3.13. A cocycle with image in that rational copy hence corresponds to a cocycle in twisted de Rham cohomology whose lowest component is a 0-form instead of a 2-form. The subtle issue of considering this possibility in the context of the K-theory classification of RR-flux has been discussed in [MoS03][MaS04][BV05].

## 4.2 The mechanism with local supersymmetry

Here we present our solution to the problem of gauge enhancement for super M-branes, in its formulation as *Open problem, Rational version 2*) from p. 1. This proceeds just as the solution to the version *Open Problem, Rational version 1*), which is explained in the previous Section 4.1, only that now we consider this solution in the proper context for super  $p$ -branes, namely locally supersymmetric supergeometry. Hence before looking at the solution, we first briefly review some background on local supersymmetry

and fundamental super  $p$ -branes (see [Sch16] for detailed introduction with emphasis on the aspects of relevance here):

While there is no known mechanism in string theory that would enforce or even prefer *global* supersymmetry,<sup>7</sup> what is predicted by perturbative string theory (see e.g. [Pol01, p. 28-29]), and what is at the heart of its non-perturbative description as in [HSS18], is *local* supersymmetry, namely *supergravity*.

An elegant way to understand this is via *Cartan geometry* (e.g. [CaSl09, Chapter 1]), which is a powerful unified generalization of Riemannian geometry. In Cartan geometry, one fixes a local model space  $V$  and a subgroup  $G \subset \text{Aut}(V)$  of its automorphism group, and then studies spaces that look *locally*, namely on the infinitesimal neighborhood of every point, like  $V$  equipped with this *reduction of the structure group* to  $G$ :

Local model for Cartan geometry	$\begin{array}{c} G \\ \curvearrowright \\ V \end{array}$
------------------------------------	---

The physics literature knows this as the method of *local gauging via Cartan moving frames* (following [Cartan1923]), while mathematically this is the study of *torsion-free  $G$ -structures* [Gui65]. If one chooses the local model to be Minkowski spacetime

Local model for off-shell gravity	$\begin{array}{c} \text{SO}(d,1) \\ \curvearrowright \\ \mathbb{R}^{d,1} \end{array}$	(59)
--------------------------------------	---	------

then the resulting Cartan geometries are precisely the pseudo-Riemannian manifolds that model field configurations of gravity in ordinary Einstein theory (general relativity). Not all of these are physically admissible, though (they may be “off-shell”), one needs to impose the *Einstein equations of motion of gravity* to pick out those Cartan geometries which represent physically admissible field configurations of gravity (the “on-shell” field configurations). In this Cartan geometric formulation of geometry and gravity, the passage to super-gravity is immediate: If instead one chooses the local model to be *super* Minkowski spacetime

Local model for off-shell supergravity	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Spin}(d,1) \\ \curvearrowright \\ \mathbb{R}^{d,1 \mathbf{N}} \end{array}$	(60)
---	--	------

then the resulting Cartan geometries are the super-spacetimes of supergravity. This is made explicit in [Lot90, EE12], and it is implicit in the physics literature on supergravity, following [CDF91].

$\begin{array}{c} G \\ \curvearrowright \end{array}$

In the spirit of Kleinian geometry [Klein1872], the group  $G$  that acts on a local model space  $V$  is the reflection of extra structure on  $V$ , namely of whatever structure it is that is preserved by this group. For plain Minkowski spacetime (59) with its Lorentz group action, this extra structure is of course the Minkowski metric of Einstein special relativity. For the super-Minkowski spacetime (60) with its Lorentzian spin-group action, this structure is the translational *supersymmetry* super Lie algebra structure on  $\mathbb{R}^{d,1|\mathbf{N}}$ , whose only non-trivial component is the odd-odd superbracket which pairs two spinors to a vector:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{N} \otimes \mathbf{N} & \xrightarrow{\overline{(-)}\Gamma(-)} & \mathbb{R}^{d,1} \\ \psi_1, \psi_2 & \longmapsto & (\overline{\psi}_1 \Gamma^a \psi_2) \end{array} .$$

The Chevalley-Eilenberg algebra of this super Minkowski super Lie algebra is a super dgc-algebra

$$\text{CE}(\mathbb{R}^{d,1|\mathbf{N}}) := \left( \mathbb{R} \left[ \underbrace{(e^a)_{a=0}^d}_{\text{deg}=(1,\text{even})}, \underbrace{(\psi^\alpha)_{\alpha=1}^{\mathbf{N}}}_{(1,\text{odd})} \right] / \left( \begin{array}{l} de^a = \overline{\psi} \Gamma^a \psi \\ d\psi^\alpha = 0 \end{array} \right) \right) \in \text{dgcSuperAlg} . \quad (61)$$

<sup>7</sup> Models of particle physics obtained from dimensionally reducing M-theory on singular fiber manifolds of  $G_2$ -holonomy (see [Kan17]) are among the globally supersymmetric extensions of the standard model of particle physics that are still consistent with experimental constraints, so far [BGK18]. When or if these models are also ruled out, then dimensional reductions of M-theory on singular fiber manifolds of  $G_2$ -holonomy may be ruled out as a realistic models of particle physics. But reduction along fibers which are  $G_2$ -manifolds is not dictated by the theory, nor expected to be generic among all possibilities (on the contrary), but were motivated only by the expectation of global supersymmetry in the first place. What is dictated by the theory is *local* supersymmetry.

like those used in rational homotopy theory in Def. 2.7, but equipped with additional  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -grading. In view of the equivalence of Prop. 8 we may think of these super dgc-algebras of finite type as the formal duals of rational *superspaces* (see [HSS18, Sec. 3.2] for details):

$$\mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{SuperSpaces}_{\mathbb{R}, \mathrm{cn}, \mathrm{ft}, \mathrm{nil}}) := \mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{dgcSuperAlg}_{\mathrm{cn}, \mathrm{ft}}^{\mathrm{op}}). \quad (62)$$

All of ordinary (now: “bosonic”) rational homotopy theory, as in Section 2, embeds into rational super homotopy theory by regarding ordinary dgc-algebras as being additionally  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded, with all elements having  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -degree equal to zero.

For instance, a morphism of the form

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathrm{Spin}(d,1) \\ \curvearrowright \\ \mathbb{R}^{d,1|\mathbf{N}} \end{array} \xrightarrow{\mu_p} B^{p+1}S^1$$

in rational super homotopy theory is equivalently a  $\mathrm{Spin}(d,1)$ -invariant super Lie algebra cocycle in degree  $p+1$  on the given super Minkowski super Lie algebra. By  $\mathrm{Spin}(d,1)$ -invariance, such a cocycle has to be a product of elements of the form

$$\mu_p := (\bar{\psi}\Gamma_{a_1 \dots a_p} \psi) \wedge e^{a_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e^{a_p} \in \mathrm{CE}(\mathbb{R}^{d,1|\mathbf{N}}).$$

Remarkably, when the local model space is taken, specifically, to be the  $D=11, \mathcal{N}=1$  super Minkowski spacetime

Local model for <i>on-shell</i> $D=11, \mathcal{N}=1$ supergravity	$\mathrm{Spin}(10,1)$ $\curvearrowright$ $\mathbb{R}^{10,1 \mathbf{32}}$
---	--

then the condition of (super-)torsion freeness is already *equivalent* to the equations of motion of supergravity [CL94, Ho97, FOS17]: (super-)torsion-free  $D=11, \mathcal{N}=1$  super Cartan geometries are necessarily *on-shell* configurations of supergravity. Hence super-Cartan geometry alone, without any further Einstein equations imposed by hand, already knows everything about 11-dimensional supergravity. In fact, more is true: These equations of motion, and hence the (super-)torsion constraint, imply that the fermionic contribution to the super flux forms  $(G_4, G_7)$  from (48) is covariantly constant on each super tangent space  $\mathbb{R}^{10,1|\mathbf{32}}$ , and constrained there to be of the form

$$(G_4, G_7)_{\mathrm{fermionic}} = \mu_{M2/M5} := \left( \begin{array}{l} \frac{i}{2} (\bar{\Psi}\Gamma_{a_1 a_2} \Psi) \wedge E^{a_1} \wedge E^{a_2}, \\ \frac{1}{5!} (\bar{\Psi}\Gamma_{a_1 \dots a_5} \Psi) \wedge E^{a_1} \wedge \dots \wedge E^{a_5} \end{array} \right). \quad (63)$$

Here  $(E^a, \Psi^\alpha)$  is the *super-vielbein* field on super spacetime, hence the supergeometric analog of the vielbein field which defines a torsion-free Cartan geometry (see [Lot90]). Due to torsion-freeness, this reproduces on each infinitesimal neighborhood the super left-invariant 1-form generators  $(e^a, \psi^\alpha)$  of  $\mathrm{CE}(\mathbb{R}^{10,1|\mathbf{32}})$  from (61).

For the constraint (63) to be consistent with the equations of motion (48), it must be true that these super-forms satisfy the relations shown on the right here:

$$\mu_{M2/M5} = \begin{cases} d\mu_{M2} = 0 \\ d\mu_{M5} = -\frac{1}{2}\mu_{M2} \wedge \mu_{M2} \end{cases} \quad (64)$$

on each super tangent space  $\mathbb{R}^{10,1|\mathbf{32}}$ . This is indeed the case, due to exceptional *Fierz identities* of Spin-representation theory [D’AF82]. Moreover, this is precisely the super tangent space-wise condition which witnesses that the fundamental super M2-brane ([BST87, (15)]) and the fundamental super M5-brane ([LT96, (5)], [BLNPST97, (6)]) propagate in the given super-spacetime. See [HSS18, Sec. 2.1] for background on the concept of fundamental super  $p$ -branes.

Comparison of the M2/M5-brane Fierz identity (64) with the minimal dgc-algebra model for the 4-sphere, from Example 2.10, shows that we may concisely summarize this state of affairs using the language of (rational) super homotopy theory (62) as follows [FSS15b]: *11-dimensional super-Minkowski spacetime carries an exceptional super-cocycle in rational cohomotopy of degree four [FSS16a, FSS15b] and*

super-spacetimes of 11-dimensional supergravity together with the fundamental M2/M5-branes propagating inside them are the higher Cartan geometries [Sch15, Wel17] locally modeled on this local geometric data:

Local model for fundamental M2/M5-branes in $D = 11, \mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Spin}(10,1) \\ \curvearrowright \\ \mathbb{R}^{10,1 \mathbf{32}} \xrightarrow{\mu_{M2/M5}} S^4 \end{array}$
--	---

(65)

Analogous statements hold for all the fundamental branes in string theory [FSS13]. In particular, super spacetimes of  $D = 10, \mathcal{N} = (1, 1)$  supergravity (i.e. type IIA supergravity) are Cartan geometries locally modeled on the type IIA super Minkowski spacetime:

local model for $D = 10, \mathcal{N} = (1, 1)$ supergravity	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Spin}(9,1) \\ \curvearrowright \\ \mathbb{R}^{9,1 \mathbf{16}+\overline{\mathbf{16}}} \end{array}$
--	--

and the presence of the fundamental F1- and Dp-branes on these is reflected by the constraint that the corresponding super flux forms have fermionic components which are super tangent space-wise constrained to be given by the following expressions (all of which are non-vanishing) [CGNSW97, (3.9)]:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu_{F1}^{\text{IIA}} &= i (\overline{\Psi} \Gamma_a \Psi) \wedge E^a \\
 \mu_{D0} &= (\overline{\Psi} \Gamma_{10} \Psi) \\
 \mu_{D2} &= \frac{i}{2} (\overline{\Psi} \Gamma_{a_1 a_2} \Psi) \wedge E^{a_1} \wedge E^{a_2} \\
 \mu_{D4} &= \frac{i}{2} (\overline{\Psi} \Gamma_{a_1 \dots a_4} \Psi) \wedge E^{a_1} \wedge \dots \wedge E^{a_4} \\
 \mu_{D6} &= \frac{i}{6!} (\overline{\Psi} \Gamma_{a_1 \dots a_6} \Psi) \wedge E^{a_1} \wedge \dots \wedge E^{a_6} \\
 \mu_{D8} &= \frac{i}{8!} (\overline{\Psi} \Gamma_{a_1 \dots a_8} \Psi) \wedge E^{a_1} \wedge \dots \wedge E^{a_8} \\
 \mu_{D10} &= \frac{i}{10!} (\overline{\Psi} \Gamma_{a_1 \dots a_{10}} \Psi) \wedge E^{a_1} \wedge \dots \wedge E^{a_{10}}.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{66}$$

Using Fierz identities for Spin(9, 1)-representations, one finds that these expressions satisfy the following relations (where all right hand sides are non-vanishing) ([CGNSW97, appendix A], [CAIB00, (6.8), (6.9)], see [FSS16a, Thm. 4.16], [FSS16b, Prop. 4.8]):

$$(\mu_{F1/Dp}) = \begin{cases} d\mu_{F1} = 0, \\ d\mu_{D(2p+4)} = \mu_{F1} \wedge \mu_{D(p+2)}. \end{cases}
 \tag{67}$$

This is the supersymmetric version of the twisted Bianchi identity for the RR-flux forms in (58).

In direct analogy with (65), now using Lemma 2.23, we may concisely summarize this in the language of rational super homotopy theory as follows: *10-dimensional type IIA super-Minkowski spacetime carries an exceptional cocycle in rational twisted connective K-theory and super-spacetimes of 10-dimensional type IIA supergravity together with the fundamental D1/Dp-branes propagating inside them are the higher Cartan geometries locally modeled on this local geometric data:*

Local model for fundamental F1/Dp-branes in $D = 10, \mathcal{N} = (1, 1)$ supergravity	$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Spin}(9,1) & & \\ \curvearrowright & & \\ \mathbb{R}^{9,1 \mathbf{16}+\overline{\mathbf{16}}} & \xrightarrow{\mu_{F1/Dp}} & \text{ku} // BS^1 \\ & \searrow \mu_{F1} & \swarrow \\ & B^3 \mathbb{Q} & \end{array}$
---	--

(68)

One may proceed in this way and find cocycle incarnations reflecting large parts of the string/M-theory folklore, see [HSS18, Sec 2] for a more comprehensive account. The upshot is that all information about brane species and their behavior in string/M-theory is encoded in cohomological data of super homotopy on local model super spacetimes (while actual dynamics will be provided by the higher super Cartan geometric globalization of this local data).

This way, we may reduce the problem of gauge enhancement for M-branes to the question how an enhancement of double dimensional reduction turns the local model (65) for  $D = 11, \mathcal{N} = 1$  superspace-time with M2/M5-branes in it into the local model (68) for  $D = 10, \mathcal{N} = (1, 1)$  super spacetime with fundamental superstrings and *all* D-brane species inside. We now explain this point.

The input datum (47) is now specifically the fundamental M2/M5-brane super cocycle (65):

$$\mathbb{R}^{10,1|32} \xrightarrow{\mu_{M2/M5}} S^4 \quad (69)$$

The supersymmetric version of the spacetime circle extension (50) is extension of type IIA super-Minkowski spacetime to  $D = 11$  super Minkowski spacetime which is classified by the D0-brane cocycle [FSS13, Prop. 4.5] (“D0-brane condensation” [FSS13, Rem. 4.6]):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{R}^{10,1|32} & \simeq & \text{Ext}(\mathbb{R}^{9,1|16+\overline{16}}) \\ \downarrow & & \\ \mathbb{R}^{9,1|16+\overline{16}} & & \\ & \searrow \mu_{D0} & \\ & & BS^1 \end{array} \quad (70)$$

This way, the fundamental M2/M5-brane cocycle (69) is equivalently of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Ext}(\mathbb{R}^{10,1|32}) & \xrightarrow{\mu_{M2/M5}} & S^4 \\ & \searrow \mu_{M2} & \swarrow \\ & B^4\mathbb{Q} & \end{array}$$

Hence its plain double dimensional reduction as in (51) is the Ext/Cyc-adjunct  $(\widetilde{\mu_{M2/M5}})$  in the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \text{double dimensional reduction} & & \\ & & \text{of } \mu_{M2/M5} & & \\ & \mathbb{R}^{9,1|16+\overline{16}} & & & \\ & \downarrow \eta & & & \\ \text{CycExt}(\mathbb{R}^{9,1|16+\overline{16}}) & & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\mu_{M2/M5}}} & & \text{Cyc}(S^4) \\ & \searrow & \xrightarrow{\text{Cyc}(\mu_{M2/M5})} & \swarrow & \\ & & \text{Cyc}(B^4\mathbb{Q}) & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \\ & & B^3\mathbb{Q} & & \end{array} \quad (71)$$

The component data of this double dimensional reduction (52) was computed in [FSS16a, Prop. 3.8] [FSS16b, Thm. 3.8, Exp. 4.5]; it is the truncation of (66), (67), containing the fundamental F1-brane cocycle  $\mu_{F1}$  (the type IIA superstring), the fundamental NS5-brane cocycle  $\mu_{NS5}$ , as well as the fundamental  $D(p \leq 4)$ -cocycles  $\mu_{D2p}$ , subject to their Bianchi identities (as in [CGNSW97, (3.7), (3.12)]):

$$\widetilde{\mu_{M2/M5}} = \begin{cases} d\mu_{F1} = 0 & d\mu_{NS5} = \mu_{D0} \wedge \mu_{D4} - \frac{1}{2}\mu_{D2} \wedge \mu_{D2} \\ d\mu_{D0} = 0 \\ d\mu_{D2} = \mu_{F1} \wedge \mu_{D0} \\ d\mu_{D4} = \mu_{F1} \wedge \mu_{D2} \end{cases} \quad (72)$$

To enhance this ordinary double dimensional reduction, we could ask as in (55) for a lift in the following diagram:



$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& \text{enhanced} \\
& \text{double dimensional reduction} \\
& \text{of } \mu_{M2/M5} \text{ ??} \\
& \text{---} \\
X & \xrightarrow{\quad} & S^4//S^1 \\
\downarrow \eta_{\mathbb{R}^{9,1}|16+\overline{16}} & & \downarrow \eta_{S^4//S^1} \\
\text{CycExt}(\mathbb{R}^{9,1}|16+\overline{16}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Cyc}(\mu_{M2/M5})} & \text{Cyc}(\text{Ext}(S^4//S^1)) \\
& \searrow \mu_{F1} \quad \swarrow & \\
& B^3\mathbb{Q} &
\end{array} \tag{73}$$

But a dashed lift in (73) does not exist: Proposition 3.12 implies, via (38), that for such a lift to exist, the double dimensionally reduced cocycle data in (72) needs to satisfy the extra conditions

1.  $\mu_{D4} = 0$ .
2.  $\mu_{F1} \wedge \mu_{D0} = 0$

Both of these conditions fail: The first by (66) the second by (67).

But, applying homotopy theoretic perturbation theory (Remark 4.1), we instead ask for a Goodwillie-perturbative lift as in (56), hence a lift in the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& \text{perturbatively enhanced} \\
& \text{double dimensional reduction} \\
& \text{of } \mu_{M2/M5} \text{ ??} \\
& \text{---} \\
\mathbb{R}^{9,1}|16+\overline{16} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \Omega_{S^3}^\infty \Sigma_{S^3}^\infty (S^4//S^1) \\
\downarrow \eta_{\mathbb{R}^{9,1}|16+\overline{16}} & & \downarrow \Omega_{S^3}^\infty \Sigma_{S^3}^\infty (\eta_{S^4//S^1}) \\
\text{CycExt}(\mathbb{R}^{9,1}|16+\overline{16}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Cyc}(\mu_{M2/M5})} \text{Cyc}(S^4) \xrightarrow{\text{st}} \Omega_{S^3}^\infty \Sigma_{S^3}^\infty \text{Cyc}(S^4) \\
& \searrow \mu_{F1} \quad \downarrow \quad \swarrow & \\
& B^3\mathbb{Q} &
\end{array} \tag{74}$$

As in (75), Theorem 3.18 says that the lift in (74) exists precisely if the lift  $\widehat{\mu_{M2/M5}}$  in the following diagram exists:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& \text{perturbatively enhanced} \\
& \text{double dimensional reduction} \\
& \text{of } \mu_{M2/M5} \text{ !} \\
& \text{---} \\
\mathbb{R}^{9,1}|16+\overline{16} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\mu_{M2/M5}}} \Omega_{B^3\mathbb{Q}}^{\infty-2} (\text{ku}//BS^1) \xrightarrow{\iota} \Omega_{S^3}^\infty \Sigma_{S^3}^\infty (S^4//S^1) \\
\downarrow \eta_{\mathbb{R}^{9,1}|16+\overline{16}} & \searrow \widetilde{\mu_{M2/M5}} \quad \downarrow \tau_6 & & \downarrow \Omega_{S^3}^\infty \Sigma_{S^3}^\infty (\eta_{S^4//S^1}) \\
\text{CycExt}(\mathbb{R}^{9,1}|16+\overline{16}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Cyc}(\mu_{M2/M5})} \text{Cyc}(S^4) \xrightarrow{\text{st}} \Omega_{S^3}^\infty \Sigma_{S^3}^\infty \text{Cyc}(S^4) \\
& \searrow \mu_{F1} \quad \downarrow & & \\
& B^3\mathbb{Q} & &
\end{array} \tag{75}$$

By Example 2.37 and as in (58), such a lift is equivalently the extension of the truncated data in (72) as follows:<sup>8</sup>

$$\widehat{\mu_{M2/M5}} = \begin{cases} d\mu_{F1} = 0 \\ d\mu_{D0} = 0 \\ d\mu_{D2} = \mu_{F1} \wedge \mu_{D0} \\ d\mu_{D4} = \mu_{F1} \wedge \mu_{D2} \\ d\mu_{D6} = \mu_{F1} \wedge \mu_{D4} \\ d\mu_{D8} = \mu_{F1} \wedge \mu_{D6} \\ d\mu_{D10} = \mu_{F1} \wedge \mu_{D8} \end{cases} \quad (76)$$

By (66) and (67) this exists, and is precisely the required enhancement of the double dimensional reduction of the fundamental M2/M5-brane cocycle by the missing D( $p \geq 6$ )-brane cocycles to the full F1/Dp-brane cocycle of type IIA string theory, with coefficients in rational twisted K-theory.

This is the required gauge enhancement, according to the discussion in Section 1.

**Remark 4.4.** In conclusion, a **solution to Open Problem, Rational version 2** (p. 8) is given as follows: While plain double dimensional reduction of the fundamental M2/M5-brane cocycle  $\mu_{M2/M5}$  (64) with coefficients in the rational 4-sphere is given by the Ext/Cyc-adjunct  $\widehat{\mu_{M2/M5}}$  (71) along the M-theoretic super spacetime extension (70), its perturbative gauge enhancement, making the D( $p \geq 6$ )-brane cocycles appear, is exhibited by lifting the latter through the fiberwise stabilization of the Ext/Cyc-adjunction unit on the A-type orbispace of the 4-sphere (56), which reflects the analogous M-theoretic extension, now of the charge coefficients (53).

**Acknowledgements.** We are grateful to Augustí Roig and Martintxo Saralegi-Aranguren for discussion of [RS00]. We also thank David Corfield, Ted Erler, Domenico Fiorenza, David Roberts for useful comments.

## References

- [AG04] B. S. Acharya, S. Gukov, *M theory and Singularities of Exceptional Holonomy Manifolds*, Phys. Rept. **392** (2004), 121-189, [arXiv:hep-th/0409191].
- [AETW87] A. Achúcarro, J. Evans, P. Townsend, D. Wiltshire, *Super p-Branes*, Phys. Lett. **B 198** (1987), 441-446, [spire:22286](#).
- [AGMOO99] O. Aharony, S. S. Gubser, J. Maldacena, H. Ooguri, Y. Oz, *Large N Field Theories, String Theory and Gravity*, Phys. Rept. **323** (2000), 183-386, [arXiv:hep-th/9905111].
- [ABJM08] O. Aharony, O. Bergman, D. Jafferis, J. Maldacena, *N = 6 superconformal Chern-Simons-matter theories, M2-branes and their gravity duals*, J. High Energy Phys. **0810** (2008), 091, [arXiv:0806.1218].
- [ABG10] M. Ando, A. Blumberg and D. Gepner, *Twists of K-theory and TMF*, in *Superstrings, geometry, topology, and C\*-algebras*, 27-63, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. 81, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI 2010 [arXiv:1002.3004].
- [ABGHR14] M. Ando, A. J. Blumberg, D. Gepner, M. J. Hopkins, C. Rezk, *An  $\infty$ -categorical approach to R-line bundles, R-module Thom spectra, and twisted R-homology*, Journal of Topology Volume 7, Issue 3 2014 [arXiv:1403.4325]

<sup>8</sup> A point often neglected in related discussion is that, with local supersymmetry taken account, the system of relations in (75) is indeed non-trivial up to the degrees shown. The purely bosonic part of the D8-flux super form  $F_{10}$ , being of bosonic degree 10, is necessarily closed, on a 10-dimensional spacetime manifold. But its fermionic component  $\propto (\bar{\Psi}\Gamma_{a_1\dots a_8}\Psi) \wedge E^{a_1} \wedge \dots \wedge E^{a_8}$  is only of bosonic degree 8, and hence its differential need not vanish, as a super form, and in fact it does not vanish here (see [CAIB00, (6.9)]). For the same reason, the super form relations (75) do involve a non-trivial component denoted  $\mu_{D10}$ , as shown, which superficially would correspond to a D10-brane, were it not for the fact that there is no bosonic aspect of a 10-brane in a 10-dimensional spacetime, just some supergeometric shadow of it. One way to see the contribution  $\mu_{D10}$  arise is to consider the corresponding super cocycles  $\mu_{D1}, \mu_{D3}, \mu_{D5}, \mu_{D7}, \mu_{D9}$  for type IIB string theory ([Sak00, Sec. 2]), and then apply super-geometric T-duality, see [FSS16b, Proof of Theorem 5.3]. By different means, the existence of charge structure for would-be D10-branes has also been noticed in [CaSm09, p. 30]

- [AtSe05] M. Atiyah, G. Segal, *Twisted K-theory and cohomology*, In *Inspired By SS Chern: A Memorial Volume in Honor of A Great Mathematician*, 2006 [[arXiv:math/0510674](#)]
- [D'AF82] R. D'Auria and P. Fré, *Geometric supergravity in  $D = 11$  and its hidden supergroup*, Nucl. Phys. **B 201** (1982), 101–140, [[ncatlab.org/nlab/files/GeometricSupergravity.pdf](#)].
- [AzTo89] J. de Azcárraga and P. Townsend, *Superspace geometry and the classification of supersymmetric extended objects*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62** (1989), 2579–2582, [[spire:284635](#)].
- [BLNPST97] I. Bandos, K. Lechner, A. Nurmagambetov, P. Pasti, D. Sorokin, and M. Tonin, *Covariant action for the super-five-brane of M-theory*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997) 4332–4334, [[arXiv:hep-th/9701149](#)].
- [BeSc03] N. Berkovits, M. Schnabl, *Yang-Mills Action from Open Superstring Field Theory*, JHEP **0309** (2003), 022, [[arXiv:hep-th/0307019](#)].
- [BFR13] R. Brunetti, K. Fredenhagen, K. Rejzner, *Quantum gravity from the point of view of locally covariant quantum field theory*, Commun. Math. Phys. **345** (2016), 741–779, [[arXiv:1306.1058](#)].
- [CDF91] L. Castellani, R. D'Auria, and P. Fré, *Supergravity and Superstrings – A geometric perspective*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1991.
- [BLMP13] J. Bagger, N. Lambert, S. Mukhi, C. Papageorgakis, *Multiple Membranes in M-theory*, Phys. Rep. **527** (2013), 1–100, [[arXiv:1203.3546](#)]
- [BV05] A. Bergman and U. Varadarajan, *Loop Groups, Kaluza-Klein Reduction and M-Theory*, J. High Energy Phys. **0506** (2005), 043, [[arXiv:hep-th/0406218](#)]
- [BRGPT96] E. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo, M. Green, G. Papadopoulos, P. Townsend, *Duality of Type II 7-branes and 8-branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B470** (1996), 113–135, [[arXiv:hep-th/9601150](#)].
- [BST87] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin, and P. K. Townsend, *Supermembranes and eleven-dimensional supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B189** (1987), 75–78, [[spire:248230](#)].
- [Blu17] A. Blumberg *Equivariant homotopy theory*, lecture notes 2017, [github.com/adebray/equivariant\\_homotopy\\_theory](#)
- [Bor94] F. Borceux, *Basic Category Theory*, Vol. 1 of *Handbook of Categorical Algebra*, Cambridge University Press (1995)
- [BG76] A. Bousfield and V. Gugenheim, *On PL deRham theory and rational homotopy type*, Memoirs of the AMS, vol. 179, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1976.
- [BM18] V. Braunack-Mayer, *Rational parametrised stable homotopy theory*, PhD thesis, Zurich University, 2018, [[ncatlab.org/schreiber/show/thesis+Braunack-Mayer](#)]
- [BuNi14] U. Bunke, T. Nikolaus, *Twisted differential cohomology*, [[arXiv:1406.3231](#)]
- [BGK18] M. Buschmann, E. Gonzalez, G. L. Kane, *Revisiting Gluinos at LHC* [[arXiv:1803.04394](#)].
- [CL94] A. Candiello and K. Lechner, *Duality in supergravity theories*, Nucl. Phys. **B412** (1994) 479–501, [[arXiv:hep-th/9309143](#)].
- [Cartan1923] É. Cartan, *Sur les variétés à connexion affine et la théorie de la relativité généralisée (première partie)* Ann. scient. de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure, Sér. 3, 40 (1923), p. 325–412 [[http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASENS\\_1923\\_3\\_40\\_\\_325\\_0](#)]
- [CGNSW97] M. Cederwall, A. von Gussich, B.E.W. Nilsson, P. Sundell, and A. Westerberg, *The Dirichlet Super-p-Branes in Ten-Dimensional Type IIA and IIB Supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B490** (1997), 179–201, [[hep-th/9611159](#)].
- [CaSm09] A. K. Callister, D. J. Smith, *Topological charges in  $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$  covariant massive 11-dimensional and Type IIB SUGRA*, Phys. Rev. D **80**:125035, 2009 [[arXiv:0907.3614](#)]
- [CaSl09] A. Čap, J. Slovák, *Parabolic Geometries I: Background and General Theory*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, Volume 154, American Mathematical Society, 2009
- [CS00] A. H. Chamseddine and W. A. Sabra,  *$D = 7$   $SU(2)$  gauged supergravity from  $D = 10$  supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B 476** (2000), 415–419, [[arXiv:hep-th/9911180](#)].
- [CAIB00] C. Chryssomalakos, J. de Azcárraga, J. Izquierdo, and C. Pérez Bueno, *The geometry of branes and extended superspaces*, Nucl. Phys. **B 567** (2000), 293–330, [[arXiv:hep-th/9904137](#)].
- [ClayMP] Clay Mathematics Institute, *Millennium Problems – YangMills and Mass Gap* [www.claymath.org/millennium-problems/yang-mills-and-mass-gap](#)

- [CST03] E. Coletti, I. Sigalov, W. Taylor, *Abelian and nonabelian vector field effective actions from string field theory*, JHEP **0309** (2003), 050, [arXiv:hep-th/0306041].
- [CLLP00] M. Cvetič, J. T. Liu, H. Lü, and C. N. Pope, *Domain-wall supergravities from sphere reduction*, Nucl. Phys. **B 560** (1999), 230-256, [arXiv:hep-th/0005137].
- [CLP00] M. Cvetič, H. Lü, C. N. Pope, *Consistent Kaluza-Klein sphere reductions*, Phys. Rev. **D 62** (2000) 064028, [arXiv:hep-th/0003286].
- [CLPST00] M. Cvetič, H. Lü, C. N. Pope, A. Sadrzadeh, T. A. Tran,  *$S^3$  and  $S^4$  reductions of type IIA supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B 590** (2000), 233-251, [arXiv:hep-th/0005137].
- [DZHTV15] M. Del Zotto, J. Heckman, A. Tomasiello, C. Vafa, *6d Conformal Matter*, J. High Energ. Phys. **2015** (2015), 54, [arXiv:1407.6359].
- [DMW03] D. Diaconescu, G. Moore, E. Witten,  *$E_8$ -gauge theory and a derivation of K-theory from M-theory* Adv. Theor. Math. Phys **6** (2003), 1031, [arXiv:hep-th/0005090].
- [Don95] J. F. Donoghue, *Introduction to the Effective Field Theory Description of Gravity*, [arXiv:gr-qc/9512024].
- [Duff94] M. Duff, *Kaluza-Klein Theory in Perspective*, Proc. of the Symposium: *The Oskar Klein Centenary*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1994, [arXiv:hep-th/9410046].
- [DIPSS88] M. Duff, T. Inami, C. Pope, E. Sezgin, K. Stelle, *Semiclassical Quantization of the Supermembrane*, Nucl. Phys. **B297** (1988), 515-538, [spire:247064].
- [DFM09] J. Distler, D. Freed, G. Moore, *Orientifold Précis* in: H. Sati, U. Schreiber (eds.), *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Field and Perturbative String Theory*, Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, AMS (2011) [arXiv:0906.0795], ncatlab.org/nlab/files/FreedESI2012.pdf
- [Duff99B] M. Duff (ed.) *The World in Eleven Dimensions: Supergravity, Supermembranes and M-theory*, IoP, Bristol, 1999.
- [DHIS87] M. Duff, P. Howe, T. Inami, K. Stelle, *Superstrings in  $D = 10$  from Supermembranes in  $D = 11$* , Phys. Lett. **B191** (1987), 70-74, reprinted in [?] [spire:245249]
- [EE12] M. Egeileh and F. El Chami, *Some remarks on the geometry of superspace supergravity*, J. Geom. Phys. **62** (2012), 53-60.
- [Evs06] J. Evslin, *What Does(n't) K-theory Classify?*, Second Modave Summer School in Mathematical Physics [arXiv:hep-th/0610328].
- [EvSa06] J. Evslin, H. Sati, *Can D-Branes Wrap Nonrepresentable Cycles?*, JHEP **0610** (2006), 050, [arXiv:hep-th/0607045].
- [Fa17] M. Fazzi, *Higher-dimensional field theories from type II supergravity*, [arXiv:1712.04447].
- [FOT08] Y. Félix, J. Oprea, and D. Tanré, *Algebraic models in geometry*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008.
- [FOS17] J. Figueroa-O'Farrill, A. Santi, *Spencer cohomology and eleven-dimensional supergravity*, Comm. Math. Phys. **349** (2017), 627-660, [arXiv:1511.08737] [hep-th].
- [FS02a] J. Figueroa-O'Farrill and J. Simón, *Supersymmetric Kaluza-Klein reductions of M2 and M5-branes*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **6** (2003), 703-793, [arXiv:hep-th/0208107]
- [FS02b] J. Figueroa-O'Farrill and J. Simón, *Supersymmetric Kaluza-Klein reductions of M-waves and MKK-monopoles*, Class. Quant. Grav. **19** (2002), 6147-6174, [hep-th/0208108]
- [FS04] J. Figueroa-O'Farrill and J. Simón, *Supersymmetric Kaluza-Klein reductions of AdS backgrounds*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **8** (2004), 217-317, [arXiv:hep-th/0401206].
- [FSS13] D. Fiorenza, H. Sati, and U. Schreiber, *Super Lie  $n$ -algebra extensions, higher WZW models, and super  $p$ -branes with tensor multiplet fields*, Intern. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys. **12** (2015) 1550018, [arXiv:1308.5264].
- [FSS15b] D. Fiorenza, H. Sati, and U. Schreiber, *The WZW term of the M5-brane and differential cohomotopy*, J. Math. Phys. **56** (2015), 102301 [arXiv:1506.07557].
- [FSS16a] D. Fiorenza, H. Sati, U. Schreiber, *Rational sphere valued supercocycles in M-theory and type IIA string theory*, J. Geom. Phys. **114** (2017) 91-108 [arXiv:1606.03206].
- [FSS16b] D. Fiorenza, H. Sati, U. Schreiber, *T-Duality from super Lie  $n$ -algebra cocycles for super  $p$ -branes*, [arXiv:1611.06536].

- [FSS17] D. Fiorenza, H. Sati, U. Schreiber, *T-duality in rational homotopy theory via  $L_\infty$ -algebras*, [arXiv:1712.00758] [math-ph].
- [FSS18] D. Fiorenza, H. Sati, U. Schreiber, *Higher T-duality of M-branes*, [arXiv:1803.05634].
- [Fre00] D. Freed, *Dirac charge quantization and generalized differential cohomology*, Surveys in Differential Geometry, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2000, pp. 129-194, [arXiv:hep-th/0011220].
- [FrWi99] D. Freed, E. Witten, *Anomalies in String Theory with D-Branes*, Asian J. Math. **3** (1999), 819-852, [arXiv:hep-th/9907189].
- [GM03] C. Gómez and J. J. Manjarín, *A note on the dyonic D6-brane*, 6th International Workshop on Conformal Field Theory and Integrable Models, Landau Institute, Sept. 2002, [arXiv:hep-th/0302096].
- [GKST01] E. Gorbatov, V.S. Kaplunovsky, J. Sonnenschein, S. Theisen, S. Yankielowicz, *On Heterotic Orbifolds, M Theory and Type I' Brane Engineering*, JHEP **0205** (2002), 015, [arXiv:hep-th/0108135].
- [GS15] D. Grady and H. Sati, *Massey products in differential cohomology via stacks*, J. Homotopy Relat. Struct. **13** (2017), 169-223, [arXiv:1510.06366] [math.AT].
- [GS17] D. Grady, H. Sati, *Twisted differential generalized cohomology theories and their Atiyah-Hirzebruch spectral sequence*, [arXiv:1711.06650]
- [Gue92] R. Gueven, *Black p-brane solutions of  $D = 11$  supergravity theory*, Phys. Lett. **B276** (1992), 49-55, (reprinted in [Duff99B]) [spire:338203].
- [Gui65] V. Guillemin, *The integrability problem for G-structures*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **116** (1965), 544-560, [jstor:1994134].
- [HaWi97] A. Hanany, E. Witten, *Type IIB Superstrings, BPS Monopoles, And Three-Dimensional Gauge Dynamics*, Nucl. Phys. **B492** (1997), 152-190, [arXiv:hep-th/9611230].
- [HSS18] J. Huerta, H. Sati, U. Schreiber, *Real ADE-equivariant (co)homotopy of super M-branes*, [arXiv:1805.05987].
- [HeGe07] A. Henriques, D. Gepner, *Homotopy Theory of Orbispaces*, [arXiv:math/0701916].
- [Hes06] K. Hess, *Rational homotopy theory: a brief introduction*, Interactions between homotopy theory and algebra, 175-202. Contemp. Math 436 [arXiv:math.AT/0604626].
- [HHR09] M. A. Hill, M. J. Hopkins, D. C. Ravenel, *On the non-existence of elements of Kervaire invariant one*, Ann. Math. **184** (2016), 1-262, [arXiv:0908.3724].
- [HW06] P. Hořava, E. Witten, *Heterotic and Type I string dynamics from eleven dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. B460 (1996) 506 [arXiv:hep-th/9510209]
- [Ho97] P. Howe, *Weyl superspace*, Phys. Lett. **B 415** (1997), 149-155, [arXiv:hep-th/9707184].
- [HS17] J. Huerta and U. Schreiber, *M-Theory from the superpoint*, Lett. Math. Phys. 2018, [arXiv:1702.01774] [hep-th].
- [Hu98] C. M. Hull, *Massive string theories from M-theory and F-theory*, J. High Energy Phys. **11** (1998) 027, [arXiv:hep-th/9811021].
- [HW88] C. M. Hull and N. P. Warner, *Non-compact gaugings from higher dimensions*, Classical Quantum Grav. **5** (1988), 1517-1530.
- [IU12] L. Ibáñez, A. Uranga, *String Theory and Particle Physics: An Introduction to String Phenomenology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- [Klein1872] F. Klein, *Vergleichende Betrachtungen über neuere geometrische Forschungen* (1872) translation by M. W. Haskell, *A comparative review of recent researches in geometry*, Bull. New York Math. Soc. 2, (1892-1893), 215-249.
- [Kuhn04] N. J. Kuhn, *Goodwillie towers and chromatic homotopy: an overview* Geom. Topol. Monogr. **10** (2007), 245-279, [arXiv:math/0410342].
- [LT96] K. Lechner and M. Tonin, *Worldvolume and target space anomalies in the  $D = 10$  super-fivebrane sigma-model*, Nucl. Phys. **B475** (1996), 545-561, [hep-th/9603094].
- [Lot90] J. Lott, *The geometry of supergravity torsion constraints*, Comm. Math. Phys. **133** (1990), 563-615; see [arXiv:math/0108125].

- [Kan17] G. Kane, *String theory and the real world*, Morgan & Claypool, 2017, [doi:0.1088/978-1-6817-4489-6]
- [Lee17] T. Lee, *Covariant open bosonic string field theory on multiple D-branes in the proper-time gauge*, J. Korean Phys. Soc. **71** (2017), 886-903, [arXiv:1609.01473].
- [Lur06] J. Lurie, *Higher Topos Theory* Princeton University Press 2009 [arXiv:math/0608040]
- [Lur09] J. Lurie, *The Goodwillie calculus*, section 5 in  $\infty, 2$ -Categories and the Goodwillie calculus [arXiv:0905.0462]  
also:  
*The calculus of functors*, chapter VI in *Higher Algebra*, [http://www.math.harvard.edu/~lurie/papers/HA.pdf]
- [Ma04] J. J. Manjarín, *Topics on D-brane charges with B-fields*, Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys. **1** (2004), 545-602, [arXiv:hep-th/0405074].
- [MaS04] V. Mathai, H. Sati, *Some relations between twisted K-theory and  $E_8$  gauge theory*, J. High Energy Phys. **03** (2004), 016, [arXiv:hep-th/0312033].
- [Mye03] R. C. Myers, *Nonabelian Phenomena on D-branes*, Class. Quant. Grav. **20** (2003), S347-S372, [arXiv:hep-th/0303072].
- [MiMo97] R. Minasian, G. Moore, *K-theory and Ramond-Ramond charge*, JHEP **9711** (1997), 002, [arXiv:hep-th/9710230].
- [MY60] D. Montgomery and C. T. Yang, *Groups on  $S^n$  with principal orbits of dimension  $n-3$* , I Illinois J. Math. **4** (1960), 507-517.
- [MZ54] D. Montgomery and L. Zippin, *Examples of transformation groups*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **5** (1954), 460-465.
- [Mo14] G. Moore, *Physical Mathematics and the Future*, talk at Strings 2014  
http://www.physics.rutgers.edu/~gmoore/PhysicalMathematicsAndFuture.pdf
- [MoS03] G. Moore and N. Saulina, *T-duality, and the K-theoretic partition function of type IIA superstring theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B670** (2003) 27-89 [arXiv:hep-th/0206092].
- [MoWi00] G. Moore, E. Witten, *Self-duality, Ramond-Ramond Fields, and K-theory*, JHEP **0005** (2000), 032, [hep-th/9912279].
- [NV00] H. Nastase and D. Vaman, *On the nonlinear KK reductions on spheres of supergravity theories*, Nucl. Phys. **B 583** (2000), 211-236, [arXiv:hep-th/0002028].
- [NVvN00] H. Nastase, D. Vaman, and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Consistency of the  $AdS_7 \times S^4$  reduction and the origin of self-duality in odd dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B 581** (2000) 179-239, [arXiv:hep-th/9911238].
- [NSS12] T. Nikolaus, U. Schreiber, and D. Stevenson, *Principal  $\infty$ -bundles – general theory*, J. Homotopy Related Structr. **10** (2015), 749–801, [arXiv:1207.0248].
- [Pa78] P. S. Pao, *Nonlinear circle actions on the 4-sphere and twisting spun knots*, Topology **17** (1978), no. 3, 291-296.
- [PNT84] K. Pilch, P. van Nieuwenhuizen, and P.K. Townsend, *Compactification of  $D = 11$  supergravity on  $S^4$  (or  $11 = 7 + 4$ , too)*, Nucl. Phys. **B 242** (1984), 377-392.
- [Pol01] J. Polchinski, *String theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [Rav03] D. Ravenel, *Complex cobordism and stable homotopy groups of spheres*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003, [web.math.rochester.edu/people/faculty/doug/mu.html]
- [Re87] M. Reid, *Young person's guide to canonical singularities*, in S. Bloch (ed.), *Algebraic geometry – Bowdoin 1985, Part 1*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. 46 Part 1, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1987, pp. 345-414.
- [Roi93] A. Roig, *Minimal resolutions and other minimal models*, Publicacions Matemàtiques **37** (1993), 285-303.
- [Roi94] A. Roig, *Formalizability of dg modules and morphisms of cdg algebras*, Illinois J. Math. **38** (1994), 434-451, [euclid:1255986724].
- [RS00] A. Roig and M. Saralegi-Aranguren, *Minimal models for non-free circle actions*, Illinois J. Math. **44** (2000), no. 4, 784-820, [arXiv:math/0004141].

- [Sak00] M. Sakaguchi, *IIB-branes and new spacetime superalgebras*, J. High Energy Phys. **0004** (2000), 019, [arXiv:hep-th/9909143].
- [Sa05a] H. Sati, *M-theory and Characteristic Classes*, JHEP **0508** (2005) 020, [arXiv:hep-th/0501245].
- [Sa05b] H. Sati, *Flux Quantization and the M-Theoretic Characters*, Nucl. Phys. **B727** (2005) 461-470, [arXiv:hep-th/0507106].
- [Sa06] H. Sati, *Duality symmetry and the form fields of M-theory*, JHEP **0606** (2006) 062, [arXiv:hep-th/0509046].
- [Sa10] H. Sati, *Geometric and topological structures related to M-branes*, Superstrings, geometry, topology, and  $C^*$ -algebras, 181-236, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 81, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010, [arXiv:1001.5020] [math.DG].
- [Sa13] H. Sati, *Framed M-branes, corners, and topological invariants*, J. Math. Phys., [arXiv:1310.1060] [hep-th].
- [SS18] H. Sati and U. Schreiber, *Higher T-duality of M-branes via local supersymmetry*, Phys. Lett. B, 2018, [arXiv:1805.00233] [hep-th].
- [Sch15] U. Schreiber, *Higher Cartan Geometry*, lecture notes, Prague 2015  
ncatlab.org/schreiber/show/Higher+Cartan+Geometry
- [Sch16] U. Schreiber, *From the Superpoint to T-Folds*, lecture notes, Prague 2016,  
[ncatlab.org/schreiber/show/From+the+Superpoint+to+T-Folds]
- [Sch17b] U. Schreiber, *Introduction to Homotopy Theory*, lecture notes, Bonn 2017,  
ncatlab.org/nlab/show/Introduction+to+Homotopy+Theory
- [Sch17c] U. Schreiber, *Introduction to Stable Homotopy Theory*, lecture notes, Bonn 2017,  
ncatlab.org/nlab/show/Introduction+to+Stable+homotopy+theory+--+1
- [Sc17] U. Schreiber, *Super p-Brane Theory emerging from Super Homotopy Theory*, talk at String Math 17, Hamburg, 2017, [ncatlab.org/schreiber/show/StringMath2017]
- [ScSh03] S. Schwede and B. Shipley, *Stable model categories are categories of modules*, Topology **42** (2003), 103-153.
- [Shi07] B. Shipley, *HZ-algebra spectra are differential graded algebras*, Amer. J. Math. **129** (2007), 351-379, [arXiv:math/0209215].
- [Sen97] A. Sen, *A Note on Enhanced Gauge Symmetries in M- and String Theory*, J. High Energy Phys. **9709** (1997), 001, [arXiv:hep-th/9707123]
- [Sna81] V. Snaith, *Localized stable homotopy of some classifying spaces*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 89 (1981), no. 2, 325-330 [doi:10.1017/S0305004100058205]
- [Su77] D. Sullivan, *Infinitesimal computations in topology*, Publ. Math. de I.H.É.S. **47** (1977), 269-331.
- [Tow95a] P. Townsend, *The eleven-dimensional supermembrane revisited*, Phys. Lett. **B350** (1995), 184-187, [arXiv:hep-th/9501068].
- [Tow95b] P. Townsend, *D-branes from M-branes*, Phys. Lett. **B373** (1996) 68-75 [arXiv:hep-th/9512062]
- [DuVal34] P. du Val, *On isolated singularities of surfaces which do not affect the conditions of adjunction*, I, II and III, Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. 30 1934, 453-459, 460-465, 483-491.
- [VB85] M. Vigué-Poirrier and D. Burghelea, *A model for cyclic homology and algebraic K-theory of 1-connected topological spaces*, J. Differential Geom. **22** (1985), 243-253, [projecteuclid.org/euclid.jdg/1214439821].
- [Well17] F. Wellen, *Formalizing Cartan Geometry in Modal Homotopy Type Theory*, PhD Thesis, KIT 2017, [ncatlab.org/schreiber/show/thesis+Wellen]
- [Wi81] E. Witten, *Search for a realistic Kaluza-Klein theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B 186** (1981), 412-428.
- [Wit95a] E. Witten, *String Theory Dynamics In Various Dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B443** (1995), 85-126, [arXiv:hep-th/9503124].
- [Wit96] E. Witten, *Bound States of Strings and p-Branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B460** (1996), 335-350, [arXiv:hep-th/9510135].
- [Wi98] E. Witten, *D-Branes And K-Theory*, J. High Energy Phys. **9812** (1998), 019, [arXiv:hep-th/9810188].
- [Wit12] E. Witten, *Superstring Perturbation Theory Revisited*, [arXiv:1209.5461].