

A few recent developments in 2d (2,2) and (0,2) theories

Eric Sharpe

ABSTRACT. In this note we summarize a few of the many recent developments in two-dimensional quantum field theories. We begin with a review of the current state of quantum sheaf cohomology, a heterotic analogue of quantum cohomology. We then turn to dualities: we outline the current status of (0,2) mirror symmetry, and then outline recent work on two-dimensional gauge dualities. In particular, we describe how many two-dimensional gauge dualities in both (2,2) and (0,2) supersymmetric gauge theories can be understood simply as different presentations of the same infrared (IR) geometry. We then discuss (not necessarily supersymmetric) two-dimensional nonabelian gauge theories in which a subgroup of the gauge group acts trivially on massless matter. We describe how these theories ‘decompose’ into disjoint unions of other theories indexed by discrete theta angles, a fact which in other contexts has proven to have implications for interpretations of certain gauged linear sigma models (GLSMs) and for Gromov-Witten invariants of stacks. We conclude with a discussion of recent developments in infinitesimal moduli of heterotic compactifications.

1. Introduction

Over the last half dozen years, there has been a tremendous amount of progress in gauged linear sigma models (GLSMs) and perturbative string compactifications. A few examples include, but are not limited to:

- Nonperturbative realizations of geometry in GLSMs [30, 41, 61],
- Perturbative realizations of Pfaffians [59, 60, 63, 64],
- Non-birational GLSM phases, and physical realizations of homological projective duality [15, 16, 30, 41, 55, 61, 69, 70, 71],
- Examples of closed strings on noncommutative resolutions [3, 30, 96],
- Localization techniques, yielding new Gromov-Witten and elliptic genus computations, the role of Gamma classes, and much more (see *e.g.* [21, 22, 23, 42, 43, 65] for a few references),
- Heterotic strings: nonperturbative corrections, 2d dualities, and non-Kähler moduli [2, 6, 7, 32, 33, 38, 39, 40, 52, 53, 54, 66, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80, 81, 92, 93, 94, 101, 102].

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 14J81, Secondary 14J33, 14N35, 14M25. ES was partially supported by NSF grants PHY-1068725, PHY-1417410.

This talk will largely, though not exclusively, focus on heterotic strings. We will survey some of the results in two-dimensional (0,2) theories over the last six years or so, describing both new results as well as outlining some older results to help provide background and context.

We begin in section 2 with a brief review of the current state of the art in quantum sheaf cohomology. In section 3 we give a brief status report on (0,2) mirror symmetry. In section 4 we discuss recent progress in two-dimensional gauge dualities in theories with (2,2) and (0,2) supersymmetry. We discuss how a number of Seiberg-like dualities can be understood simply as different presentations of the same IR geometry, and use this to predict additional dualities. In section 5 we turn to a different gauge duality, one that applies to both supersymmetric and non-supersymmetric theories in two dimensions. Specifically, in two-dimensional gauge theories in which a finite subgroup of the gauge group acts trivially on the matter, the theory ‘decomposes’ into a disjoint union of theories. In nonabelian gauge theories, the various components are labelled by different discrete theta angles. Finally, in section 6 we discuss current progress in infinitesimal moduli in heterotic compactifications, specifically, recent developments in understanding moduli in both Calabi-Yau and also non-Kähler heterotic compactifications.

2. Review of quantum sheaf cohomology

Quantum sheaf cohomology is the heterotic string analogue of quantum cohomology. Whereas ordinary quantum cohomology is defined by a space, quantum sheaf cohomology is defined by a space together with a bundle. Specifically, quantum sheaf cohomology is defined by a complex manifold X together with a holomorphic vector bundle $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow X$ (often called the ‘gauge bundle’), satisfying the conditions

$$\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{E}) = \text{ch}_2(TX), \quad \det \mathcal{E}^* \cong K_X.$$

Briefly, whereas ordinary quantum cohomology is defined by intersection theory on a moduli space of curves, quantum sheaf cohomology is defined by sheaf cohomology (of sheaves induced by \mathcal{E}) over a moduli space of curves. In the special case that $\mathcal{E} = TX$, the quantum sheaf cohomology ring should match the ordinary quantum cohomology ring. See for example [38, 39, 40, 74, 77] for a few recent discussions. We shall give here a brief summary oriented more nearly towards physicists; see for example [40] for a longer summary oriented towards mathematicians.

In heterotic string compactifications, quantum sheaf cohomology encodes non-perturbative corrections to charged matter couplings. For example, for a heterotic compactification on a Calabi-Yau three-fold X with gauge bundle given by the tangent bundle (known as the standard embedding, or as the (2,2) locus, as in this case (0,2) supersymmetry is enhanced to (2,2)), the low-energy theory has an E_6 gauge symmetry and matter charged under the $\overline{27}$, counted by $H^{1,1}(X)$. The nonperturbative corrections to the $\overline{27}^3$ couplings are encoded in Gromov-Witten invariants [31] and computed by the A model topological field theory [106].

If we now deform the gauge bundle so that it is no longer the tangent bundle, then the $\overline{27}^3$ couplings will still receive nonperturbative corrections, but those corrections are no longer computed by Gromov-Witten invariants or the A model. Instead, the nonperturbative corrections are encoded in quantum sheaf cohomology. In this more general context, mathematical Gromov-Witten computational tricks

no longer seem to apply, and there is no known analogue of periods or Picard-Fuchs equations. New methods are needed, and a few new techniques have been developed, which will be outlined here.

Before working through details, let us give a simple example. Recall the ordinary quantum cohomology ring of \mathbb{P}^n is given by

$$\mathbb{C}[x]/(x^{n+1} - q).$$

When $q \rightarrow 0$, this becomes the classical cohomology ring of \mathbb{P}^n , hence the name. Now, to compare, the quantum sheaf cohomology ring of $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^n$ with bundle $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^n$ defined by

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{*} \mathcal{O}(1,0)^{n+1} \oplus \mathcal{O}(0,1)^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \rightarrow 0,$$

where

$$* = \begin{bmatrix} Ax & Bx \\ C\tilde{x} & D\tilde{x} \end{bmatrix}$$

(x, \tilde{x} vectors of homogeneous coordinates on the two \mathbb{P}^n 's, A, B, C, D a set of four $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ constant matrices encoding a deformation of the tangent bundle), is given by

$$\mathbb{C}[x, y]/(\det(Ax + By) - q_1, \det(Cx + Dy) - q_2).$$

Note that in the special case that $A = D = I$, $B = C = 0$, the bundle \mathcal{E} coincides with the tangent bundle of $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^n$, and in this case, the quantum sheaf cohomology ring above reduces to

$$\mathbb{C}[x, y]/(x^{n+1} - q_1, y^{n+1} - q_2),$$

which is precisely the ordinary quantum cohomology ring of $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^n$. This is as expected: as mentioned earlier, when $\mathcal{E} = TX$, quantum sheaf cohomology reduces to ordinary quantum cohomology.

Ordinary quantum cohomology can be understood physically as the ring of local operators, known as the OPE ring, of the A model topological field theory in two dimensions. That topological field theory is obtained by twisting a (2,2) nonlinear sigma model along a vector $U(1)$ symmetry. In a (0,2) nonlinear sigma model, if $\det \mathcal{E}^* \cong K_X$, then there is a nonanomalous $U(1)$ symmetry one can twist along, which reduces to the vector $U(1)$ symmetry on the (2,2) locus. If we twist along that nonanomalous $U(1)$, the result is a pseudo-topological field theory known as the A/2 model. Quantum sheaf cohomology is the OPE ring of the A/2 model. (There is also a pseudo-topological analogue of the B model, known as the B/2 model, but in this lecture we shall focus on the A/2 model.)

To be consistent, the ring products must close into the ring, but this is not *a priori* automatic in these quantum field theories, as in principle the products might generate local operators which are not elements of the (pseudo-)topological field theory. In the case of (2,2) supersymmetry, this closure of the OPE ring was argued in *e.g.* [72]. Closure in (0,2) theories is also possible – closure does not require (2,2) supersymmetry, but can be accomplished under weaker conditions. This was studied in detail in [2]. For example, for a (0,2) SCFT, one can use a combination of worldsheet conformal invariance and the right-moving $N = 2$ algebra to argue closure of the OPE ring on patches on the moduli space.

The local operators in the A model, the additive part of the OPE ring, are BRST-closed states of the form

$$b_{i_1 \dots i_p \bar{i}_1 \dots \bar{i}_q} \chi^{\bar{i}_1} \dots \chi^{\bar{i}_q} \chi^{i_1} \dots \chi^{i_p},$$

which are identified with closed differential forms representing $H^{p,q}(X)$. The analogous operators in the A/2 model are right-BRST-closed states of the form

$$b_{\bar{\tau}_1 \dots \bar{\tau}_q a_1 \dots a_p} \psi_+^{\bar{\tau}_1} \dots \psi_+^{\bar{\tau}_q} \lambda_-^{a_1} \dots \lambda_-^{a_p},$$

which are identified with closed bundle-valued differential forms representing elements of $H^q(X, \wedge^p \mathcal{E}^*)$. On the (2,2) locus, where $\mathcal{E} = TX$, the A/2 model reduces to the A model, which in operators follows from the statement

$$H^q(X, \wedge^p T^*X) = H^{p,q}(X).$$

At a purely schematic level, we can understand correlation functions as follows. Classically, in the A model, correlation functions are of the form

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_1 \dots \mathcal{O}_n \rangle = \int_X \omega_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_n = \int_X (\text{top-form}),$$

where $\omega_i \in H^{p_i, q_i}(X)$. In the A/2 model, classical contributions to correlation functions are of the form

$$\langle \mathcal{O}_1 \dots \mathcal{O}_n \rangle = \int_X \omega_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_n,$$

where $\omega_i \in H^{q_i}(X, \wedge^{p_i} \mathcal{E}^*)$. Now,

$$\omega_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_n \in H^{\text{top}}(X, \wedge^{\text{top}} \mathcal{E}^*) = H^{\text{top}}(X, K_X),$$

using the anomaly constraint $\det \mathcal{E}^* \cong K_X$. Thus, again we have a top-form, and so the correlation function yields a number.

In passing, note that the number one gets above depends upon a particular choice of an isomorphism $\det \mathcal{E}^* \cong K_X$. To uniquely define the A/2 theory, one must pick a particular isomorphism, which is a reflection of properties of the corresponding physical heterotic worldsheet theory. Moreover, as one moves on the moduli space of bundles or complex or Kähler structures, that isomorphism may change, so these correlation functions should be understood as sections of bundles over such moduli spaces. Technically, this is closely related to the realization of the Bagger-Witten line bundle in four-dimensional $N = 1$ supergravity [107] on the worldsheet [36, 88], as the action of the global $U(1)$ in the worldsheet $N = 2$ algebra on the spectral flow operator. (The original Bagger-Witten paper [107] assumed that the SCFT moduli space was a smooth manifold; see for example [37, 58] for modern generalizations to the case of moduli stacks.)

Correlation functions as outlined above define functions on spaces of sheaf cohomology groups. Now, we are interested in the relations amongst products of those sheaf cohomology groups, and those relations emerge as kernels of the (correlation) functions.

Let us consider a concrete example, namely the classical sheaf cohomology of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ with bundle \mathcal{E} given by a deformation of the tangent bundle, defined as

$$(2.1) \quad 0 \longrightarrow W^* \otimes \mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{*} \mathcal{O}(1, 0)^2 \oplus \mathcal{O}(0, 1)^2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $W \cong \mathbb{C}^2$,

$$* = \begin{bmatrix} Ax & Bx \\ C\tilde{x} & D\tilde{x} \end{bmatrix},$$

x, \tilde{x} vectors of homogeneous coordinates on the two \mathbb{P}^1 's, and A, B, C, D four 2×2 constant matrices encoding the tangent bundle deformation.

We will focus on operators counted by

$$H^1(\mathcal{E}^*) = H^0(W \otimes \mathcal{O}) = W.$$

An n -point correlation function is then a map

$$\mathrm{Sym}^n H^1(\mathcal{E}^*) (= \mathrm{Sym}^n W) \longrightarrow H^n(\wedge^n \mathcal{E}^*).$$

The kernel of this map defines the classical sheaf cohomology ring relations, which we shall compute.

Since \mathcal{E} is rank two, we will consider products of two elements of $H^1(\mathcal{E}^*) = W$, *i.e.* a map

$$H^0(\mathrm{Sym}^2 W \otimes \mathcal{O}) \longrightarrow H^2(\wedge^2 \mathcal{E}^*).$$

This map is implicitly encoded in the resolution

$$(2.2) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \wedge^2 \mathcal{E}^* \longrightarrow \wedge^2 Z \longrightarrow Z \otimes W \longrightarrow \mathrm{Sym}^2 W \otimes \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow 0,$$

determined by the definition (2.1), where

$$Z \equiv \mathcal{O}(-1, 0)^2 \oplus \mathcal{O}(0, -1)^2.$$

We break the resolution (2.2) into a pair of short exact sequences:

$$(2.3) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \wedge^2 \mathcal{E}^* \longrightarrow \wedge^2 Z \longrightarrow S_1 \longrightarrow 0,$$

$$(2.4) \quad 0 \longrightarrow S_1 \longrightarrow Z \otimes W \longrightarrow \mathrm{Sym}^2 W \otimes \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow 0,$$

(which define S_1).

The second sequence (2.4) induces

$$H^0(Z \otimes W) \longrightarrow H^0(\mathrm{Sym}^2 W \otimes \mathcal{O}) \xrightarrow{\delta} H^1(S_1) \longrightarrow H^1(Z \otimes W).$$

Since Z is a sum of $\mathcal{O}(-1, 0)$'s and $\mathcal{O}(0, -1)$'s,

$$H^0(Z \otimes W) = 0 = H^1(Z \otimes W),$$

hence the coboundary map

$$\delta : H^0(\mathrm{Sym}^2 W \otimes \mathcal{O}) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^1(S_1)$$

is an isomorphism.

The first sequence (2.3) induces

$$H^1(\wedge^2 Z) \longrightarrow H^1(S_1) \xrightarrow{\delta} H^2(\wedge^2 \mathcal{E}^*) \longrightarrow H^2(\wedge^2 Z).$$

The last term vanishes, but $H^1(\wedge^2 Z) \cong \mathbb{C}^2$, hence the coboundary map

$$\delta : H^1(S_1) \longrightarrow H^2(\wedge^2 \mathcal{E}^*)$$

has a two-dimensional kernel.

The composition of these two coboundary maps is our designed two-point correlation function

$$H^0(\mathrm{Sym}^2 W \otimes \mathcal{O}) \xrightarrow{\delta, \sim} H^1(S_1) \xrightarrow{\delta} H^2(\wedge^2 \mathcal{E}^*).$$

The right δ has a two-dimensional kernel, which one can show is generated by

$$\det(A\psi + B\tilde{\psi}), \quad \det(C\psi + D\tilde{\psi}),$$

where A, B, C, D are four matrices defining the deformation \mathcal{E} , and $\psi, \tilde{\psi}$ correspond to elements of a basis for W .

Putting this together, we get that the classical sheaf cohomology ring is

$$\mathbb{C}[\psi, \tilde{\psi}] / \left(\det(A\psi + B\tilde{\psi}), \det(C\psi + D\tilde{\psi}) \right).$$

So far we have discussed classical physics. Instanton sectors have the same general form, except that X is replaced by a moduli space M of curves, and \mathcal{E} is replaced by an induced sheaf¹ \mathcal{F} over the moduli space M . Broadly speaking, the moduli space M must be compactified, and \mathcal{F} extended over the compactification divisor. The anomaly conditions

$$\text{ch}_2(\mathcal{E}) = \text{ch}_2(TX), \quad \det \mathcal{E}^* \cong K_X$$

imply that

$$\det \mathcal{F}^* \cong K_M,$$

which is needed for the correlation functions to yield numbers.

Within any one instanton sector, in general terms one can follow the same method just outlined. In the case of the example just outlined, it can be shown that in a sector of instanton degree (a, b) , the ‘classical’ ring in that sector is of the form

$$\text{Sym}^\bullet W / (Q^{a+1}, \tilde{Q}^{b+1}),$$

where

$$Q = \det(A\psi + B\tilde{\psi}), \quad \tilde{Q} = \det(C\psi + D\tilde{\psi}).$$

Now, OPE’s can relate correlation functions in different instanton degrees, and so should map ideals to ideals. To be compatible with the ideals above,

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_{a,b} = q^{a'-a} \tilde{q}^{b'-b} \langle \mathcal{O} Q^{a'-a} \tilde{Q}^{b'-b} \rangle_{a',b'}$$

for some constants q, \tilde{q} . As a result of the relations above, we can read off the OPE’s

$$Q = q, \quad \tilde{Q} = \tilde{q},$$

which are the quantum sheaf cohomology relations.

More generally [38, 39, 76], for any toric variety, and any deformation \mathcal{E} of its tangent bundle defined in the form

$$0 \longrightarrow W^* \otimes \mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{*} \underbrace{\oplus_i \mathcal{O}(\tilde{q}_i)}_{Z^*} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow 0,$$

the chiral ring is

$$\prod_{\alpha} (\det M_{(\alpha)})^{Q_{\alpha}^a} = q_a,$$

where the $M_{(\alpha)}$ ’s are matrices of chiral operators constructed from the map $*$.

So far we have outlined mathematical computations of quantum sheaf cohomology, but there also exist methods based on gauged linear sigma models (GLSMs):

- Ordinary quantum cohomology is computed from (2,2) GLSMs in [83],
- Quantum sheaf cohomology is computed from (0,2) GLSMs in [75, 76].

Briefly, for the (0,2) case, one computes quantum corrections to the effective action of the form

$$L_{\text{eff}} = \int d\theta^+ \sum_a \Upsilon_a \log \left(\prod_{\alpha} (\det M_{(\alpha)})^{Q_{\alpha}^a} / q_a \right),$$

¹ If there are vector zero modes (‘excess’ intersection in the (2,2) case), then this story is more complicated – for example, there is a second induced sheaf, and one must utilize four-fermi terms in the action. For simplicity, for the purposes of this outline, we shall focus on the simpler case of no vector zero modes.

from which one derives the conditions for vacua

$$\prod_{\alpha} (\det M_{(\alpha)})^{Q_{\alpha}^a} = q_a.$$

These are the quantum sheaf cohomology relations, and those derived in [38, 39] match these.

The current state of the art in quantum sheaf cohomology are computations on toric varieties. Our goal is to eventually perform these computations on compact Calabi-Yau manifolds, and as an intermediate step, we are currently studying Grassmannians.

Briefly, we need better computational methods. Conventional Gromov-Witten tricks seem to revolve around the idea that the A model is independent of complex structure, which is not necessarily true for the A/2 model. That said, it has been argued [76] that the A/2 model is independent of some moduli. Despite attempts to check [47], however, this is still not perfectly well-understood.

3. (0,2) mirror symmetry

Let us begin our discussion of dualities with a review of progress on a conjectured generalization of mirror symmetry, known as (0,2) mirror symmetry.

Now, ordinary mirror symmetry, in its most basic form, is a relation between Calabi-Yau manifolds, ultimately because a (2,2) supersymmetric nonlinear sigma model is defined by a manifold. Nonlinear sigma models with (0,2) supersymmetry are defined by a space X together with a holomorphic vector bundle $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow X$ satisfying certain consistency conditions discussed earlier, so (0,2) mirror symmetry, in its most basic form, is a statement about complex manifolds together with holomorphic vector bundles.

In this language, a prototypical² (0,2) mirror is defined by a space Y with holomorphic vector bundle $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow Y$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim X &= \dim Y, \\ \text{rank } \mathcal{E} &= \text{rank } \mathcal{F}, \\ \text{A/2}(X, \mathcal{E}) &= \text{B/2}(Y, \mathcal{F}), \\ H^p(X, \wedge^q \mathcal{E}^*) &= H^p(Y, \wedge^q \mathcal{F}), \\ (\text{moduli}) &= (\text{moduli}). \end{aligned}$$

In the special case that $\mathcal{E} = TX$, (0,2) mirror symmetry should reduce to ordinary mirror symmetry.

Some of the first significant evidence for (0,2) mirror symmetry was numerical: the authors of [24] wrote a computer program to scan a large number of examples and compute pertinent sheaf cohomology groups. The resulting data set was mostly invariant under the exchange of sheaf cohomology groups outlined above, giving a satisfying albeit limited test of the existence of (0,2) mirrors.

In [25], the Greene-Plesser orbifold construction [50] was extended to (0,2) models. This construction (and its (0,2) generalization) creates mirrors to Fermat-type Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces and complete intersections, as resolutions of certain

² Described here is the most basic incarnation of (0,2) mirror symmetry. For example, ordinary mirrors are sometimes given by Landau-Ginzburg models instead of spaces, and there are analogous statements in the (0,2) case. For simplicity, we focus on prototypical incarnations in which both sides of the mirror relation are defined by spaces (and bundles).

orbifolds of the original hypersurface or complete intersection. Because the construction can be understood as utilizing symmetries of what are called ‘Gepner models’ (see *e.g.* [48]), the fact that the SCFT’s match is automatic, and so one can build what are necessarily examples of (0,2) mirrors. Unfortunately, this construction does not generate families of mirrors, only isolated examples.

In another more recent development, the Hori-Vafa-Morrison-Plesser-style GLSM duality picture of mirror symmetry [62, 84] was repeated for (0,2) theories in [1]. Unfortunately, unlike the case of ordinary mirror symmetry, understanding duality in (0,2) GLSMs requires additional input beyond the machinery of [62, 84].

More recently, a promising approach was discussed in [80], generalizing Batyrev’s mirror construction [18, 19] to (0,2) models defined by certain special (‘reflexively plain’) hypersurfaces in toric varieties, with bundles given by deformations of the tangent bundles. The authors of [80] are able to make a proposal for a precise mapping of parameters in these cases, *i.e.* to relate families of (0,2) models, which they check by matching singularity structures in moduli spaces.

This represents significant progress, but there is still much to do before (0,2) mirror symmetry is nearly as well understood as ordinary mirror symmetry. Beyond the [80] construction, we would still like a more general mirror construction that applies to a broader class of varieties, and bundles beyond just deformations of the tangent bundle. Fully developing (0,2) mirror symmetry will also require further developments in quantum sheaf cohomology.

4. Two-dimensional gauge dualities

Next, we shall give an overview of recent progress in two-dimensional gauge theoretic dualities, in which different-looking gauge theories renormalization-group (RG) flow to the same infrared (IR) fixed point, *i.e.* become isomorphic at low energies and long distances.

Such dualities are of long-standing interest in the physics community, and there has been significant recent interest (see *e.g.* [21, 44, 45, 59, 63, 67, 68]). In two dimensions, we will see that such dualities can at least sometimes be understood as different presentations of the same geometry. This not only helps explain why these dualities work, but also implies a procedure to generate further examples (at least for Calabi-Yau and Fano geometries).

A prototypical example of a two-dimensional gauge duality, closely analogous to the central example of four-dimensional Seiberg duality [90], was described in [21] and relates a pair of theories with (2,2) supersymmetry:

$U(k)$ gauge group	$U(n-k)$ gauge group
n chirals in fundamental, $n > k$	n chirals Φ in fundamental
A chirals in antifundamental, $A < n$	A chirals P in antifundamental
	nA neutral chirals M
	superpotential $W = M\Phi P$

The theory on the left RG flows to a nonlinear sigma model on

$$\text{Tot}(S^{\oplus A} \rightarrow G(k, n)) = (\mathbb{C}^{kn} \times \mathbb{C}^{kA}) // GL(k),$$

where S is the universal subbundle on the Grassmannian $G(k, n)$. The RG flow for the theory on the right is a bit more subtle, but can be analyzed by realizing that the superpotential is realizing a map in the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow S \xrightarrow{\Phi} \mathcal{O}^n \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 0,$$

which implies that the theory on the right RG flows to a nonlinear sigma model on

$$\text{Tot}((Q^*)^{\oplus A} \rightarrow G(n-k, n)) = \text{Tot}(S^{\oplus A} \rightarrow G(k, n)),$$

the same geometry as for the theory on the left. Since the two theories RG flow to nonlinear sigma models on the same geometry, the RG flows of the two theories eventually coincide, and so the two gauge theories are Seiberg dual. In particular, this particular version of Seiberg duality has a purely geometric understanding.

We can apply the ideas above to make predictions for further two-dimensional dualities, at least for Fano and Calabi-Yau geometries. (For other cases, GLSM phases can be decorated with discrete Coulomb vacua [78, 79], which complicate the analysis.)

Our next example will be constructed utilizing the fact that the Grassmannian $G(2, 4)$ is a quadric hypersurface in \mathbb{P}^5 . The corresponding duality relates the theories

	$U(1)$ gauge theory
$U(2)$ gauge theory	6 chirals $z_{ij} = -z_{ji}$, $i, j = 1 \cdots 4$, charge +1
4 chirals ϕ_i in fundamental	one chiral P , charge -2
	$W = P(z_{12}z_{34} - z_{13}z_{24} + z_{14}z_{23})$

The theory on the left RG flows to a nonlinear sigma model on $G(2, 4)$. The theory on the right RG flows to a nonlinear sigma model on the corresponding quadric hypersurface. Since the geometries match, we see that the RG flows converge, and so the theories are Seiberg dual. As a consistency check, the chirals on the right and left are related by

$$z_{ij} = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta} \phi_i^\alpha \phi_j^\beta.$$

Both theories admit a global $GL(4)$ action, which acts as

$$\phi_i^\alpha \mapsto V_i^j \phi_j^\alpha, \quad z_{ij} \mapsto V_i^k V_j^\ell z_{k\ell}.$$

Chiral rings, anomalies, and Higgs moduli spaces match automatically.

This particular example is interesting because it relates abelian and nonabelian gauge theories, which in four dimensions would be difficult at best. In two dimensions, since gauge fields have no dynamics, abelian and nonabelian gauge theories are more closely related than in four dimensions.

In two dimensions, this understanding of Seiberg dualities in terms of matching geometries is not only entertaining but serves a more concrete purpose. In four dimensions, renormalizability heavily constrains possible superpotentials, which means as a practical matter that theories tend to have a number of global symmetries which can be used as guides to help confirm possible Seiberg duals. In two dimensions, by contrast, renormalizability does not constrain superpotentials at all, and generic superpotentials will break all symmetries. Thus, identifying gauge duals as different presentations of the same geometry allows us to construct duals when standard tricks from four dimensions do not apply.

We can build on the previous example to construct a simple set of (2,2) supersymmetric examples in which global symmetries are broken. Specifically, consider the two theories

$U(2)$ gauge theory 4 chirals ϕ_i in fundamental chirals p_a , charge $-d_a$ under $\det U(2)$ $W = \sum_a p_a f_a(\epsilon_{\alpha\beta} \phi_i^\alpha \phi_j^\beta)$	$U(1)$ gauge theory 6 chirals $z_{ij} = -z_{ji}$ of charge +1 one chiral P of charge -2 chirals P_a of charge $-d_a$ $W = P(z_{12}z_{34} - z_{13}z_{24} + z_{14}z_{23})$ $+ \sum_a P_a f_a(z_{ij})$
--	--

The two theories above RG flow to nonlinear sigma models on the complete intersection

$$G(2,4)[d_1, d_2, \dots] = \mathbb{P}^5[2, d_1, d_2, \dots]$$

and so, as above, are Seiberg dual.

An even more complex-appearing (2,2) gauge duality can be described as follows:

$U(2)$ gauge theory n chirals in fundamental	$U(n-2) \times U(1)$ gauge theory n chirals X in fundamental of $U(n-2)$ n chirals P in antifundamental of $U(n-2)$ (n choose 2) chirals $z_{ij} = -z_{ji}$, charge +1 under $U(1)$ $W = \text{tr } PAX$
---	---

Each of these two theories RG flows to a nonlinear sigma model on $G(2, n)$, using the fact that $G(2, n)$ can be described as the rank 2 locus of an $n \times n$ matrix A over $\mathbb{P}^{\frac{n!}{(n-2)!2!} - 1}$, where A is defined by

$$A(z_{ij}) = \begin{bmatrix} z_{11} = 0 & z_{12} & z_{13} & \dots \\ z_{21} = -z_{12} & z_{22} = 0 & z_{23} & \dots \\ z_{31} = -z_{13} & z_{32} = -z_{23} & z_{33} = 0 & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \end{bmatrix},$$

using the perturbative description of Pfaffians in [59, 64]. Since the RG flows converge, the two gauge theories above are necessarily Seiberg dual.

The same techniques can be extended to two-dimensional theories with (0,2) supersymmetry. Consider for example the two theories

$U(2)$ gauge theory 4 chirals in fundamental 1 Fermi in $(-4, -4)$ 8 Fermis in $(1, 1)$ 1 chiral in $(-2, -2)$ 2 chirals in $(-3, -3)$ plus suitable superpotential	$U(1)$ gauge theory 6 chirals, charge +1 2 Fermis, charge $-2, -4$ 8 Fermis, charge +1 1 chiral, charge -2 2 chirals, charge -3 plus suitable superpotential
---	--

(Matter supermultiplets in (0,2) supersymmetry come in two types labelled ‘chiral’ and ‘Fermi’. In the left column, $U(2)$ representations are indicated with a non-increasing pair of integers as in [63].) These theories will RG flow to the (0,2) nonlinear sigma model on the Calabi-Yau

$$G(2,4)[4] = \mathbb{P}^5[2, 4],$$

with holomorphic vector bundle \mathcal{E} given as

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \oplus^8 \mathcal{O}(1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(2) \oplus^2 \mathcal{O}(3) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since the RG flows converge, these two theories are Seiberg dual. As a consistency test, it can be shown that the elliptic genera of these two theories match [63], applying recent GLSM-based computational methods described in [22, 23, 43].

A different example is provided by ‘trinality’ [44, 45]. Here, triples of (0,2) GLSMs are believed to flow to the same IR fixed point. Each GLSM has two different geometric phases; however, unlike previous cases, not all of the geometric phases describe the same geometry. Schematically, we can understand the relationship between the phases as follows [63]:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 S^A \oplus (Q^*)^{2k+A-n} \rightarrow G(k, n) & \text{-----} & (S^*)^A \oplus (Q^*)^n \rightarrow G(k, 2k + A - n) \\
 \cong \updownarrow & & \\
 (Q^*)^A \oplus S^{2k+A-n} \rightarrow G(n - k, n) & \text{-----} & (Q^*)^n \oplus (S^*)^{2k+A-n} \rightarrow G(n - k, A) \\
 & & \uparrow \cong \\
 S^n \oplus (Q^*)^A \rightarrow G(A - n + k, 2k + A - n) & \text{-----} & (S^*)^n \oplus (Q^*)^{2k+A-n} \rightarrow G(A - n + k, A) \\
 \cong \updownarrow & & \\
 (Q^*)^n \oplus (S^*)^A \rightarrow G(k, 2k + A - n) & \text{-----} & (Q^*)^{2k+A-n} \oplus S^A \rightarrow G(k, n).
 \end{array}$$

Each phase also has a bundle summand, either $(\det S)^{\oplus 2}$ or $(\det S^*)^{\oplus 2}$, which we have omitted for brevity. Horizontal dashed lines indicate phase transitions to different geometries; vertical arrows indicate equivalent geometries. The fourth line is physically equivalent to the first: the bottom right corner is equivalent to the upper left, and the bottom left, to the upper right. In writing the diagram above, we have used the fact that in (0,2) theories, dualizing the gauge bundle is an equivalence of the theories:

$$\text{QFT}(X, \mathcal{E} \rightarrow X) \cong \text{QFT}(X, \mathcal{E}^* \rightarrow X).$$

(See for example [93] for a discussion of corner cases of this duality.) A test of triality recently appeared in [54].

How do these gauge dualities relate to (0,2) mirrors as discussed in the previous section? As we have seen, gauge dualities often relate different presentations of the same geometry, whereas (0,2) mirrors exchange different geometries. The existence of (0,2) mirrors seems to imply that there ought to exist more ‘exotic’ gauge dualities, that present different geometries.

So far in this section we have used mathematics to make predictions for physics. In the next section we shall turn that around, and use physics to make predictions for mathematics.

5. Decomposition in two-dimensional nonabelian gauge theories

In a two-dimensional orbifold or gauge theory, if a finite subgroup of the gauge group acts trivially on all massless matter, the theory decomposes as a disjoint union [57].

For example, a trivially-acting \mathbb{Z}_2 orbifold of a nonlinear sigma model on a space X is equivalent to a nonlinear sigma model on two copies of X :

$$\text{CFT}([X/\mathbb{Z}_2]) = \text{CFT}(X \amalg X).$$

In the \mathbb{Z}_2 orbifold, since the \mathbb{Z}_2 acts trivially on X , there is a dimension zero twist field. Linear combinations of that twist field and the identity operator form projection operators onto the two copies of X .

For another example, consider a D_4 orbifold of a nonlinear sigma model on a space X , where the center $\mathbb{Z}_2 \subset D_4$ acts trivially on X . This orbifold is equivalent to the disjoint union of a pair of $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ orbifolds, one with and one without discrete torsion:

$$\text{CFT}([X/D_4]) = \text{CFT}\left([X/\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2] \coprod [X/\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2]_{\text{d.t.}}\right),$$

where $D_4/\mathbb{Z}_2 = \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$.

These are examples in physics of what is meant by ‘decomposition.’

Decomposition is also a statement about mathematics. Briefly, over the last several years, the following dictionary has been built:

2d Physics	Math
D-brane	Derived category [91]
Gauge theory	Stack [86, 87, 85]
Gauge theory with trivially-acting subgroup	Gerbe [57, 86, 87, 85]
Universality class of renormalization group flow	Categorical equivalence

In particular, decomposition is a statement about the physics of strings propagating on gerbes, detailed in the ‘decomposition conjecture’ **[57]**, which for banded gerbes can be summarized as:

$$\text{CFT}(G\text{-gerbe on } X) = \text{CFT}\left(\coprod_{\hat{G}}(X, B)\right),$$

where \hat{G} is the set of irreducible representations of G , and the B field on each component is determined by the image of the characteristic class of the gerbe:

$$H^2(X, Z(G)) \xrightarrow{Z(G) \mapsto U(1)} H^2(X, U(1)).$$

The decomposition conjecture has been checked in a wide variety of ways, including, for example:

- multiloop orbifold partition functions: partition functions decompose in the desired form,
- quantum cohomology ring relations as derived from GLSMs match the implicit prediction above,
- D-branes, K theory, sheaves on gerbes: the physical decomposition of D-branes matches the mathematical decomposition of K theory and sheaves on gerbes.

Decomposition also has a number of applications, including

- Predictions for Gromov-Witten invariants of gerbes, as checked in *e.g.* **[8, 9, 10, 11, 49, 103, 104, 105]**,
- Understanding certain GLSM phases **[30, 56, 59, 95]**, via giving a physical realization of Kuznetsov’s homological projective duality **[71]**,

and these works serve implicitly as further checks on the decomposition conjecture above.

To understand the decomposition conjecture in orbifolds, one can compare (multi)loop partition functions, state spaces, and D-branes, and they all imply the same result. In gauge theories, there are further subtleties. For example, let us compare the following two theories:

- Ordinary $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$ model: a $U(1)$ gauge theory with $n + 1$ chiral superfields, each of charge $+1$,
- Gerby $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^n$ model: a $U(1)$ gauge theory with $n + 1$ chiral superfields, each of charge k , $k > 1$.

In order for these two theories to be distinct, the physics of the second must be different from the first – but how can multiplying the charges by a factor change anything? Naively, this is just a convention, and physics should not depend upon conventions.

Perturbatively, multiplying all the charges by a factor does not modify the physics; however, nonperturbatively³, there can be a difference between these two theories. On a compact worldsheet, to make manifest the distinction, one must specify which bundles the fields couple to, to unambiguously specify the theory. If the chiral fields are sections of a line bundle L in the first theory, then in the second they are sections of a different bundle, $L^{\otimes k}$, and hence have different zero modes, different anomalies, and hence different nonperturbative physics.

On a noncompact worldsheet, one can instead appeal to the periodicity of the θ angle in the two-dimensional gauge theory. The θ angle acts as an electric field, so by building a sufficiently large capacitor, one can excite states of arbitrary mass. In particular, we can distinguish the second theory from the first by adding a pair of massive minimally charged fields, which a sufficiently large capacitor can excite. In this fashion, essentially through different periodicities of the θ angle, one can distinguish the two theories.

Now, decomposition has been extensively checked for orbifolds and abelian gauge theories, but tests in nonabelian gauge theories in two dimensions have only appeared more recently [97]. Since two-dimensional gauge theories do not have propagating degrees of freedom, an analogous phenomena ought to take place in nonabelian gauge theories with center-invariant matter. Specifically, it was proposed in [97] that for G semisimple, a G -gauge theory with center-invariant matter should decompose into a sum of theories with variable discrete theta angles. For example, an $SU(2)$ gauge theory with only adjoints or other center invariant matter should decompose into a pair of $SO(3)$ gauge theories with the same matter but different discrete theta angles, schematically:

$$(5.1) \quad SU(2) = SO(3)_+ + SO(3)_-$$

Before working through this in detail, let us first remind the reader of how discrete theta angles are defined, as they are relatively new [4, 46]. Consider a two-dimensional gauge theory, with gauge group $G = \tilde{G}/K$, \tilde{G} compact, semisimple, and simply-connected, K a finite subgroup of the center of \tilde{G} . This theory has a degree-two K -valued characteristic class which we will denote w . (For example, in an $SO(3)$ gauge theory, this is the second Stiefel-Whitney class.) For any character

³ We would like to thank A. Adams, J. Distler, and R. Plesser for explaining the distinction, on both compact and noncompact worldsheets, at an Aspen workshop in 2004.

λ of K , we can add the topological term $\lambda(w)$ to the action. This is the discrete theta angle term, and we see in this fashion that the possible values of the discrete theta angle are classified by characters of K .

For example, let us consider an $SO(3)$ gauge theory. Now,

$$SO(3) = SU(2)/\mathbb{Z}_2,$$

hence as \mathbb{Z}_2 has two characters, we see that an $SO(3)$ gauge theory in two dimensions has two discrete theta angles.

Let us check the decomposition conjecture for nonabelian gauge theories in the case of pure $SU(2)$ gauge theory in two dimensions. The partition function for pure (nonsupersymmetric) two-dimensional gauge theories can be found in *e.g.* [51, 82, 89], from which we derive

$$\begin{aligned} Z(SU(2)) &= \sum_R (\dim R)^{2-2g} \exp(-AC_2(R)), \\ Z(SO(3)_+) &= \sum_R (\dim R)^{2-2g} \exp(-AC_2(R)). \end{aligned}$$

In the expressions above, g is the genus of the two-dimensional surface, A is its area, R a representation, and $C_2(R)$ a Casimir of the representation R . The $SU(2)$ partition function sums over all representations R of $SU(2)$, and the $SO(3)_+$ partition function sums over all representations R of $SO(3)$. (For $SO(3)_+$, the discrete theta angle vanishes, so $SO(3)_+$ is the ordinary $SO(3)$ gauge theory.) The partition function of $SO(3)_-$ was described in [100], and has the form

$$Z(SO(3)_-) = \sum_R (\dim R)^{2-2g} \exp(-AC_2(R)),$$

where the sum is now over representations of $SU(2)$ that are not representations of $SO(3)$. Combining these three expressions, it should be clear that

$$Z(SU(2)) = Z(SO(3)_+) + Z(SO(3)_-).$$

More generally, for G gauge theories with G semisimple, K a finite subgroup of the center of G , and matter invariant under K , we can express decomposition schematically as

$$G = \sum_{\lambda \in \hat{K}} (G/K)_\lambda.$$

This can be checked for pure gauge theories using partition functions as above, and can also similarly be checked for correlation functions of Wilson lines in pure gauge theories. In addition, it can also be checked in supersymmetric theories using expressions for partition functions given in [21, 42]. The arguments in this case revolve around details of cocharacter lattices, which for brevity we omit here; see [97] for details.

6. Heterotic moduli

It was known historically that for large-radius heterotic nonlinear sigma models on the (2,2) locus, there were three classes of infinitesimal moduli⁴:

- Kähler moduli, counted by $H^1(X, T^*X)$,

⁴ Physically, the moduli are indistinguishable from one another; the distinction we list is purely mathematical in origin.

- Complex moduli, counted by $H^1(X, TX)$,
- Bundle moduli, counted by $H^1(X, \text{End } \mathcal{E})$,

for a compactification on a space X with gauge bundle $\mathcal{E} = TX$ (the (2,2) locus).

When the gauge bundle \mathcal{E} is different from the tangent bundle TX , the correct counting is more complicated. It was shown in the physics literature in *e.g.* [5] that the correct counting is given by

- Kähler moduli, counted by $H^1(X, T^*X)$,
- Compatible complex and bundle moduli, counted by $H^1(Q)$ where Q is defined by the Atiyah sequence

$$(6.1) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \text{End } \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow Q \longrightarrow TX \longrightarrow 0.$$

The extension class is determined by the curvature of the bundle. Specifically, it is an element of

$$\text{Ext}^1(TX, \text{End } \mathcal{E}) = H^1(T^*X \otimes \text{End } \mathcal{E})$$

given by the curvature.

In particular, as \mathcal{E} is required to be a *holomorphic* bundle, the complex and bundle moduli are not independent of one another, and in fact a given bundle may not be compatible with all complex structure moduli, a result that was well-known in mathematics but whose relevance the physics community only recently digested.

At the time, however, this still left unresolved the question of understanding moduli of heterotic non-Kähler compactifications [99]. In a non-Kähler compactification, there is no version of Yau's theorem relating metric moduli to complex and Kähler moduli, so in principle, in close-to-large-radius⁵ non-Kähler compactifications, the moduli need not have any meaningful connection to Calabi-Yau moduli. (That said, it should also be noted that even in a Calabi-Yau (0,2) compactification, although the space admits a Kähler metric, away from the large-radius limit the metric solving the supergravity equations is necessarily non-Kähler, because the Green-Schwarz condition forces H to be nonzero.)

A partial solution to this problem was discovered in [81]. There, it was argued from a worldsheet analysis that for non-Kähler compactifications in a purely formal $\alpha' \rightarrow 0$ limit, the infinitesimal moduli are counted by $H^1(S)$, where

$$0 \longrightarrow T^*X \longrightarrow S \longrightarrow Q \longrightarrow 0,$$

where Q is the extension determined by the Atiyah sequence (6.1). The extension above is determined by an element of

$$\text{Ext}^1(TX, T^*X)$$

determined by the H flux, which is assumed to obey $dH = 0$.

As non-Kähler compactifications do not exist in the $\alpha' \rightarrow 0$ limit, the solution above was necessarily incomplete. It was improved upon in [6, 33], which gave an overcounting of heterotic moduli valid through first order in α' . On manifolds satisfying the $\partial\bar{\partial}$ -lemma, the moduli are overcounted by $H^1(S')$, where

$$0 \longrightarrow T^*X \longrightarrow S' \longrightarrow Q' \longrightarrow 0$$

⁵ Non-Kähler heterotic compactifications do not have a large-radius limit. The best one can do is to hope for solutions “close” to large-radius, where geometry is still valid. In this section, we implicitly assume the non-Kähler compactifications being considered are all in that regime, close enough to large radius that geometry is a valid description.

(defined by H satisfying the Green-Schwarz condition), for Q' given by

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{End } \mathcal{E} \oplus \text{End } TX \longrightarrow Q' \longrightarrow TX \longrightarrow 0,$$

with the extension defined by the curvatures of the gauge bundle and TX .

The overcounting above is the current state-of-the-art; currently work is in progress to find the correct counting and to extend to higher orders in α' .

So far we have outlined infinitesimal moduli, corresponding to marginal operators on the worldsheet. These can be obstructed by *e.g.* nonperturbative effects, and there is an interesting story behind this. Initially, in the mid-80s, it was observed in [34, 35] that a single worldsheet instanton can generate a superpotential term obstructing deformations off the (2,2) locus, but in the early 90s it was observed that for moduli realizable in GLSMs, the sum of the contributions from different contributing rational curves all cancel out, and so the moduli are unobstructed. This led to a revitalization of interest in (0,2) models, and paved the way for work on F theory, for example. The original GLSM arguments have found alternate presentations⁶ in *e.g.* [17, 20]. Current work on the subject, such as [12, 13, 14, 26, 27, 28, 29], has focused on understanding non-GLSM moduli, for which nonperturbative corrections to obstructions often do not cancel out.

7. Conclusions

In this note we have given an overview of recent developments in two-dimensional theories, focusing primarily though not exclusively on (0,2) theories. We began in section 2 with a brief review of the current state of the art in quantum sheaf cohomology. In section 3 we gave a brief status report on (0,2) mirror symmetry. In section 4 we discussed recent progress in two-dimensional gauge dualities in theories with (2,2) and (0,2) supersymmetry. We showed how a number of Seiberg-like dualities can be understood simply as different presentations of the same IR geometry, and use this to predict additional dualities. In section 5 we described a different gauge duality, one that applies to both supersymmetric and nonsupersymmetric theories in two dimensions. Specifically, in two-dimensional gauge theories in which a finite subgroup of the gauge group acts trivially on the matter, the theory ‘decomposes’ into a disjoint union of theories. In nonabelian gauge theories, the various components are labelled by different discrete theta angles. Finally, in section 6 we discussed current progress in infinitesimal moduli in heterotic compactifications, specifically, recent developments in understanding moduli in both Calabi-Yau and also non-Kähler heterotic compactifications.

References

1. Allan Adams, Anirban Basu, and Savdeep Sethi, (0,2) *duality*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **7** (2003), no. 5, 865–950. MR 2045304 (2005b:81167)

⁶ In our experience, sometimes these papers are mis-quoted as claiming that the spacetime superpotential vanishes in heterotic compactifications. The correct statement is that nonperturbative corrections to gauge singlet moduli interactions arising from moduli realizable in GLSMs cancel out. However, gauge non-singlet interactions can and will receive nonperturbative corrections, and can even be nonzero classically. For example, on the (2,2) locus, in a heterotic compactification on a Calabi-Yau 3-fold, the $\overline{27}^3$ couplings are nonzero: in addition to the classical contribution described in [98], they also receive nonperturbative corrections corresponding to the Gromov-Witten invariants of the Calabi-Yau [31, 106].

2. Allan Adams, Jacques Distler, and Morten Ernebjerg, *Topological heterotic rings*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **10** (2006), no. 5, 657–682. MR 2281544 (2008b:81263)
3. Nicolas M. Addington, Edward P. Segal, and Eric Sharpe, *D-brane probes, branched double covers, and noncommutative resolutions*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **18** (2014), 1369–1436.
4. Ofer Aharony, Nathan Seiberg, and Yuji Tachikawa, *Reading between the lines of four-dimensional gauge theories*, J. High Energy Phys. (2013), no. 8, 115, front matter+41. MR 3106323
5. Lara B. Anderson, James Gray, Andre Lukas, and Burt Ovrut, *Stabilizing the complex structure in heterotic Calabi-Yau vacua*, J. High Energy Phys. (2011), no. 2, 088, 16. MR 2820787 (2012f:81209)
6. Lara B. Anderson, James Gray, and Eric Sharpe, *Algebroids, Heterotic Moduli Spaces and the Strominger System*, JHEP **1407** (2014), 037.
7. Lara B. Anderson, Bei Jia, Ryan Manion, Burt Ovrut, and Eric Sharpe, *General aspects of heterotic string compactifications on stacks and gerbes*, (2013).
8. Elena Andreini, Yunfeng Jiang, and Hsian-Hua Tseng, *On Gromov-Witten theory of root gerbes*, (2008).
9. ———, *Gromov-Witten theory of product stacks*, (2009).
10. ———, *Gromov-Witten theory of root gerbes I: structure of genus 0 moduli spaces*, (2009).
11. ———, *Gromov-Witten theory of banded gerbes over schemes*, (2011).
12. Paul S. Aspinwall and Benjamin Gaines, *Rational Curves and (0,2)-Deformations*, (2014).
13. Paul S. Aspinwall, Ilarion V. Melnikov, and M. Ronen Plesser, *(0,2) elephants*, J. High Energy Phys. (2012), no. 1, 060, 50. MR 2949305
14. Paul S. Aspinwall and M. Ronen Plesser, *Elusive worldsheet instantons in heterotic string compactifications*, String-Math 2011, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 85, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2012, pp. 33–51. MR 2985325
15. Matthew Ballard, Dragos Deliu, David Favero, M. Umut Isik, and Ludmil Katzarkov, *Homological Projective Duality via Variation of Geometric Invariant Theory Quotients*, (2013).
16. Matthew Ballard, David Favero, and Ludmil Katzarkov, *Variation of geometric invariant theory quotients and derived categories*, (2012).
17. Anirban Basu and Savdeep Sethi, *World-sheet stability of (0,2) linear sigma models*, Phys. Rev. D (3) **68** (2003), no. 2, 025003, 8. MR 2033807
18. Victor V. Batyrev, *Dual polyhedra and mirror symmetry for Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces in toric varieties*, J. Algebraic Geom. **3** (1994), no. 3, 493–535. MR 1269718 (95c:14046)
19. Victor V. Batyrev and Lev A. Borisov, *Dual cones and mirror symmetry for generalized Calabi-Yau manifolds*, Mirror symmetry, II, AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math., vol. 1, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997, pp. 71–86. MR 1416334 (98b:14033)
20. Chris Beasley and Edward Witten, *Residues and world-sheet instantons*, J. High Energy Phys. (2003), no. 10, 065, 39 pp. (electronic). MR 2030598 (2005f:81223)
21. Francesco Benini and Stefano Cremonesi, *Partition functions of $N = (2, 2)$ gauge theories on S^2 and vortices*, (2012).
22. Francesco Benini, Richard Eager, Kentaro Hori, and Yuji Tachikawa, *Elliptic genera of 2d $N=2$ gauge theories*, (2013).
23. ———, *Elliptic genera of two-dimensional $N = 2$ gauge theories with rank-one gauge groups*, Lett. Math. Phys. **104** (2014), no. 4, 465–493. MR 3177993
24. Ralph Blumenhagen, Rolf Schimmrigk, and Andreas Wißkirchen, *(0,2) mirror symmetry*, Nuclear Phys. B **486** (1997), no. 3, 598–628. MR 1436158 (98a:81156)
25. Ralph Blumenhagen and Savdeep Sethi, *On orbifolds of (0,2) models*, Nuclear Phys. B **491** (1997), no. 1-2, 263–278. MR 1449061 (98f:81294)
26. Volker Braun, Maximilian Kreuzer, Burt A. Ovrut, and Emanuel Scheidegger, *Worldsheet instantons, torsion curves and non-perturbative superpotentials*, Phys. Lett. B **649** (2007), no. 4, 334–341. MR 2308810 (2008b:81211)
27. ———, *Worldsheet instantons and torsion curves*, Advances in string theory, AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math., vol. 44, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008, pp. 231–240. MR 2494190 (2010e:14008)
28. Volker Braun, Burt A. Ovrut, Maximilian Kreuzer, and Emanuel Scheidegger, *Worldsheet instantons and torsion curves. A. Direct computation*, J. High Energy Phys. (2007), no. 10, 022, 58. MR 2357956 (2009i:14080)

29. ———, *Worldsheet instantons and torsion curves. B. Mirror symmetry*, J. High Energy Phys. (2007), no. 10, 023, 53. MR 2357955 (2009i:14079)
30. Andrei Căldăraru, Jacques Distler, Simeon Hellerman, Tony Pantev, and Eric Sharpe, *Non-birational twisted derived equivalences in abelian GLSMs*, Comm. Math. Phys. **294** (2010), no. 3, 605–645. MR 2585982 (2011f:81182)
31. Philip Candelas, Xenia C. de la Ossa, Paul S. Green, and Linda Parkes, *A pair of Calabi-Yau manifolds as an exactly soluble superconformal theory*, Nuclear Phys. B **359** (1991), no. 1, 21–74. MR 1115626 (93b:32029)
32. Jin Chen, Xiaoyi Cui, Mikhail Shifman, and Arkady Vainshtein, *$N=(0,2)$ deformation of $(2, 2)$ sigma models: Geometric structure, holomorphic anomaly, and exact β functions*, Phys.Rev. **D90** (2014), no. 4, 045014.
33. Xenia de la Ossa and Eirik E. Svanes, *Holomorphic Bundles and the Moduli Space of $N=1$ Supersymmetric Heterotic Compactifications*, JHEP **1410** (2014), 123.
34. M. Dine, N. Seiberg, X.-G. Wen, and E. Witten, *Nonperturbative effects on the string world sheet*, Nuclear Phys. B **278** (1986), no. 4, 769–789. MR 862903 (88c:81081)
35. ———, *Nonperturbative effects on the string world sheet. II*, Nuclear Phys. B **289** (1987), no. 2, 319–363. MR 895317 (88k:81195)
36. Jacques Distler, *Notes on $N=2$ sigma models*, (1992).
37. Jacques Distler and Eric Sharpe, *Quantization of Fayet-Iliopoulos Parameters in Supergravity*, Phys.Rev. **D83** (2011), 085010.
38. Ron Donagi, Josh Guffin, Sheldon Katz, and Eric Sharpe, *Physical aspects of quantum sheaf cohomology for deformations of tangent bundles of toric varieties*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **17** (2013), no. 6, 1255–1301. MR 3262522
39. ———, *A mathematical theory of quantum sheaf cohomology*, Asian J. Math. **18** (2014), no. 3, 387–417. MR 3257832
40. Ron Donagi, Joshua Guffin, Sheldon Katz, and Eric Sharpe, *$(0, 2)$ quantum cohomology*, String-Math 2011, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 85, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2012, pp. 83–103. MR 2985327
41. Ron Donagi and Eric Sharpe, *GLSMs for partial flag manifolds*, J. Geom. Phys. **58** (2008), no. 12, 1662–1692. MR 2468445 (2009m:81223)
42. Nima Doroud, Jaume Gomis, Bruno Le Floch, and Sungjay Lee, *Exact results in $D = 2$ supersymmetric gauge theories*, J. High Energy Phys. (2013), no. 5, 093, front matter+69. MR 3080568
43. Abhijit Gadde and Sergei Gukov, *2d index and surface operators*, J. High Energy Phys. (2014), no. 3, 080, front matter+40. MR 3190966
44. Abhijit Gadde, Sergei Gukov, and Pavel Putrov, *$(0, 2)$ trialities*, JHEP **1403** (2014), 076.
45. ———, *Exact Solutions of 2d Supersymmetric Gauge Theories*, (2014).
46. Davide Gaiotto, Gregory W. Moore, and Andrew Neitzke, *Framed BPS states*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **17** (2013), no. 2, 241–397. MR 3250763
47. Richard S. Garavuso and Eric Sharpe, *Analogues of Mathai-Quillen forms in sheaf cohomology and applications to topological field theory*, (2013).
48. Doron Gepner, *Exactly solvable string compactifications on manifolds of $SU(N)$ holonomy*, Phys. Lett. B **199** (1987), no. 3, 380–388. MR 929596 (89h:83035)
49. Amin Gholampour and Hsian-Hua Tseng, *On Donaldson-Thomas invariants of threefold stacks and gerbes*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **141** (2013), no. 1, 191–203. MR 2988722
50. B. R. Greene and M. R. Plesser, *Duality in Calabi-Yau moduli space*, Nuclear Phys. B **338** (1990), no. 1, 15–37. MR 1059831 (91h:32018)
51. David J. Gross and Washington Taylor, IV, *Two-dimensional QCD is a string theory*, Nuclear Phys. B **400** (1993), no. 1-3, 181–208. MR 1227260 (94h:81140)
52. Josh Guffin, *Quantum sheaf cohomology, a précis*, Mat. Contemp. **41** (2012), 17–26. MR 3087571
53. Josh Guffin and Sheldon Katz, *Deformed quantum cohomology and $(0, 2)$ mirror symmetry*, J. High Energy Phys. (2010), no. 8, 109, 27. MR 2756043 (2012b:81223)
54. J. Guo, B. Jia, and E. Sharpe, *Chiral operators in two-dimensional $(0,2)$ theories and a test of triality*, (2015).
55. Daniel Halpern-Leistner and Ian Shipman, *Autoequivalences of derived categories via geometric invariant theory*, (2013).

56. James Halverson, Vijay Kumar, and David R. Morrison, *New methods for characterizing phases of 2D supersymmetric gauge theories*, J. High Energy Phys. (2013), no. 9, 143, front matter+31. MR 3107702
57. Simeon Hellerman, André Henriques, Tony Pantev, Eric Sharpe, and Matt Ando, *Cluster decomposition, T-duality, and gerby CFTs*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **11** (2007), no. 5, 751–818. MR 2365496 (2008m:81168)
58. Simeon Hellerman and Eric Sharpe, *Sums over topological sectors and quantization of Fayet-Iliopoulos parameters*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **15** (2011), no. 4, 1141–1199. MR 2929685
59. Kentaro Hori, *Duality in two-dimensional (2, 2) supersymmetric non-Abelian gauge theories*, J. High Energy Phys. (2013), no. 10, 2013:121, front matter+74. MR 3118316
60. Kentaro Hori and Johanna Knapp, *Linear sigma models with strongly coupled phases - one parameter models*, JHEP **1311** (2013), 070.
61. Kentaro Hori and David Tong, *Aspects of non-abelian gauge dynamics in two-dimensional $N = (2, 2)$ theories*, J. High Energy Phys. (2007), no. 5, 079, 41 pp. (electronic). MR 2318130 (2009d:81351)
62. Kentaro Hori and Cumrun Vafa, *Mirror symmetry*, (2000).
63. Bei Jia, Eric Sharpe, and R. Wu, *Notes on nonabelian (0,2) theories and dualities*, JHEP **1408** (2014), 017.
64. Hans Jockers, Vijay Kumar, Joshua M. Lapan, David R. Morrison, and Mauricio Romo, *Nonabelian 2D gauge theories for determinantal Calabi-Yau varieties*, J. High Energy Phys. (2012), no. 11, 166, front matter + 46. MR 3036443
65. ———, *Two-sphere partition functions and Gromov-Witten invariants*, Comm. Math. Phys. **325** (2014), no. 3, 1139–1170. MR 3152749
66. Sheldon Katz and Eric Sharpe, *Notes on certain (0, 2) correlation functions*, Comm. Math. Phys. **262** (2006), no. 3, 611–644. MR 2202305 (2006m:81232)
67. David Kutasov and Jennifer Lin, *(0,2) ADE Models From Four Dimensions*, (2014).
68. ———, *(0,2) Dynamics From Four Dimensions*, Phys.Rev. **D89** (2014), 085025.
69. Alexander Kuznetsov, *Homological projective duality for grassmannians of lines*.
70. ———, *Homological projective duality*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. (2007), no. 105, 157–220. MR 2354207 (2008k:14043)
71. ———, *Derived categories of quadric fibrations and intersections of quadrics*, Adv. Math. **218** (2008), no. 5, 1340–1369. MR 2419925 (2009g:14019)
72. Wolfgang Lerche, Cumrun Vafa, and Nicholas P. Warner, *Chiral rings in $N = 2$ superconformal theories*, Nuclear Phys. B **324** (1989), no. 2, 427–474. MR 1025424 (91d:81132)
73. Hai Lin, Baosen Wu, and Shing-Tung Yau, *Heterotic String Compactification and New Vector Bundles*, (2014).
74. Jock McOrist, *The revival of (0, 2) sigma models*, Internat. J. Modern Phys. A **26** (2011), no. 1, 1–41. MR 2763382 (2012e:81160)
75. Jock McOrist and Ilarion V. Melnikov, *Half-twisted correlators from the Coulomb branch*, J. High Energy Phys. (2008), no. 4, 071, 19. MR 2425232 (2009h:81272)
76. ———, *Summing the instantons in half-twisted linear sigma models*, J. High Energy Phys. (2009), no. 2, 026, 61. MR 2486403 (2011b:81228)
77. Ilarion Melnikov, Savdeep Sethi, and Eric Sharpe, *Recent developments in (0, 2) mirror symmetry*, SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl. **8** (2012), Paper 068, 28. MR 2988026
78. Ilarion V. Melnikov and M. Ronen Plesser, *The Coulomb branch in gauged linear sigma models*, J. High Energy Phys. (2005), no. 6, 013, 33. MR 2158560 (2007a:81135)
79. ———, *A-model correlators from the Coulomb branch*, J. High Energy Phys. (2006), no. 2, 044, 21. MR 2219460 (2007d:81209)
80. ———, *A (0, 2) mirror map*, J. High Energy Phys. (2011), no. 2, 001, 15. MR 2820839
81. Ilarion V. Melnikov and Eric Sharpe, *On marginal deformations of (0, 2) non-linear sigma models*, Phys. Lett. B **705** (2011), no. 5, 529–534. MR 2860523
82. Alexander A. Migdal, *Recursion Equations in Gauge Theories*, Sov.Phys.JETP **42** (1975), 413.
83. David R. Morrison and M. Ronen Plesser, *Summing the instantons: quantum cohomology and mirror symmetry in toric varieties*, Nuclear Phys. B **440** (1995), no. 1-2, 279–354. MR 1336089 (96f:32036)

84. ———, *Towards mirror symmetry as duality for two-dimensional abelian gauge theories*, Strings '95 (Los Angeles, CA, 1995), World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1996, pp. 374–387. MR 1660724 (99m:81224)
85. Tony Pantev and Eric Sharpe, *Notes on gauging noneffective group actions*, (2005).
86. ———, *GLSMs for gerbes (and other toric stacks)*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **10** (2006), no. 1, 77–121. MR 2222223 (2007a:81121)
87. ———, *String compactifications on Calabi-Yau stacks*, Nuclear Phys. B **733** (2006), no. 3, 233–296. MR 2192505 (2006h:81243)
88. Vipul Periwal and Andrew Strominger, *Kähler geometry of the space of $N = 2$ superconformal field theories*, Phys. Lett. B **235** (1990), no. 3-4, 261–267. MR 1037713 (91g:32028)
89. B. Ye. Rusakov, *Loop averages and partition functions in $U(N)$ gauge theory on two-dimensional manifolds*, Modern Phys. Lett. A **5** (1990), no. 9, 693–703. MR 1051372 (91m:81152)
90. N. Seiberg, *Electric-magnetic duality in supersymmetric non-abelian gauge theories*, Nuclear Phys. B **435** (1995), no. 1-2, 129–146. MR 1314365 (96b:81117)
91. Eric Sharpe, *D-branes, derived categories, and Grothendieck groups*, Nuclear Phys. B **561** (1999), no. 3, 433–450. MR 1726156 (2001k:14024)
92. ———, *Notes on correlation functions in $(0, 2)$ theories*, Snowbird lectures on string geometry, Contemp. Math., vol. 401, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006, pp. 93–104. MR 2222532 (2007e:81100)
93. ———, *Notes on certain other $(0, 2)$ correlation functions*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **13** (2009), no. 1, 33–70. MR 2471852 (2010a:81217)
94. ———, *An introduction to quantum sheaf cohomology*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **61** (2011), no. 7, 2985–3005. MR 3112514
95. ———, *A few Ricci-flat stacks as phases of exotic GLSM's*, Phys.Lett. **B726** (2013), 390–395.
96. ———, *Predictions for Gromov-Witten invariants of noncommutative resolutions*, J. Geom. Phys. **74** (2013), 256–265. MR 3118585
97. ———, *Decomposition in diverse dimensions*, Phys.Rev. **D90** (2014), 025030.
98. Andrew Strominger, *Yukawa Couplings in Superstring Compactification*, Phys.Rev.Lett. **55** (1985), 2547.
99. ———, *Superstrings with torsion*, Nuclear Phys. B **274** (1986), no. 2, 253–284. MR 851702 (87m:81177)
100. Yuji Tachikawa, *On the 6d origin of discrete additional data of 4d gauge theories*, JHEP **1405** (2014), 020.
101. Meng-Chwan Tan, *Two-dimensional twisted sigma models and the theory of chiral differential operators*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **10** (2006), no. 6, 759–851. MR 2302273 (2009h:81267)
102. ———, *Two-dimensional twisted sigma models, the mirror chiral de Rham complex, and twisted generalised mirror symmetry*, J. High Energy Phys. (2007), no. 7, 013, 80 pp. (electronic). MR 2326774 (2009g:81184)
103. Xiang Tang and Hsian-Hua Tseng, *Duality theorems for étale gerbes on orbifolds*, Adv. Math. **250** (2014), 496–569. MR 3122175
104. Hsian-Hua Tseng, *On degree-0 elliptic orbifold Gromov-Witten invariants*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2011), no. 11, 2444–2468. MR 2806585 (2012h:14143)
105. ———, *Notes on orbifold Gromov-Witten theory*, Fifth International Congress of Chinese Mathematicians. Part 1, 2, AMS/IP Stud. Adv. Math., 51, pt. 1, vol. 2, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2012, pp. 327–340. MR 2908078
106. Edward Witten, *Mirror manifolds and topological field theory*, Essays on mirror manifolds, Int. Press, Hong Kong, 1992, pp. 120–158. MR 1191422 (94c:81194)
107. Edward Witten and Jonathan Bagger, *Quantization of Newton's constant in certain supergravity theories*, Phys. Lett. B **115** (1982), no. 3, 202–206. MR 669354 (83m:81107)

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS, VIRGINIA TECH
 Current address: Department of Physics, Virginia Tech
 E-mail address: ersharpe@vt.edu