

The $A_m^{(1)}$ Q-system

Rafael I. Nepomechie¹

Physics Department, P.O. Box 248046
University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL 33124

Abstract

We propose a Q-system for the $A_m^{(1)}$ quantum integrable spin chain. We also find compact determinant expressions for all the Q-functions, both for the rational and trigonometric cases.

¹nepomechie@miami.edu

1 Introduction

Q-systems provide an efficient way of solving Bethe equations corresponding to quantum integrable models. Such Q-systems were first introduced for *rational* Bethe equations (corresponding to isotropic integrable models) in [1] (see also [2]), and have since been exploited in e.g. [3–9].¹ Generalizations to rank-1 *trigonometric* Bethe equations (corresponding to anisotropic integrable models) were recently formulated in [15, 16]. One of the principal aims of this work is to formulate trigonometric Q-systems for higher rank. We also solve the rank- m Q-systems (for both the rational and trigonometric cases) in terms of determinants of a set of $m + 1$ functions, which are generalizations of functions introduced by Pronko and Stroganov to describe integrable spin chains with $SU(2)$ [17] and $SU(3)$ [18] symmetry. (Throughout this paper, $m = 1, 2, \dots$)

We first consider the $SU(m+1)$ -invariant integrable spin chain in Section 2. After briefly reviewing its Bethe ansatz solution and Q-system [1], we show that all the Q-functions can be expressed in terms of compact determinant expressions of $m + 1$ functions F_0, \dots, F_m (2.18)-(2.21). The proof relies on a Plücker identity [19]. We then consider the $A_m^{(1)}$ integrable spin chain, which is a q-deformation of the $SU(m+1)$ -invariant model, in Section 3. We propose its Q-system (3.7)-(3.8), and again obtain determinant expressions for all the Q-functions (3.9). We close with a brief conclusion and a list of some interesting remaining open problems in Section 4.

2 The $SU(m+1)$ -invariant spin chain

We begin by briefly reviewing the closed $SU(m+1)$ -invariant integrable quantum spin chain of length N with periodic boundary conditions and with “spins” in the vector $((m+1)$ -dimensional) representation of $SU(m+1)$ at each site, see e.g. [20, 21]. The R-matrix (solution of the Yang-Baxter equation) is given by the $(m+1)^2 \times (m+1)^2$ matrix

$$\mathbb{R}(u) = u\mathbb{I} + i\mathbb{P}, \quad (2.1)$$

where \mathbb{I} is the identity matrix, and \mathbb{P} is the permutation matrix, which is given in terms of the elementary $(m+1) \times (m+1)$ matrices e_{ab} by

$$\mathbb{P} = \sum_{a,b=1}^{m+1} e_{ab} \otimes e_{ba}, \quad (e_{ab})_{ij} = \delta_{a,i} \delta_{b,j}. \quad (2.2)$$

The transfer matrix $\mathbb{T}(u)$, which is defined by

$$\mathbb{T}(u) = \text{tr}_0 \mathbb{R}_{01}(u) \mathbb{R}_{02}(u) \dots \mathbb{R}_{0N}(u), \quad (2.3)$$

¹T-systems without spectral parameter are also called Q-systems [10], and should not be confused with the subject of this paper. After this work was completed, we became aware that similar relations were investigated in [11–13]; the results of [11] were extended to the trigonometric case in [14].

satisfies the commutativity property

$$[\mathbb{T}(u), \mathbb{T}(v)] = 0. \quad (2.4)$$

The corresponding spin-chain Hamiltonian is proportional to $\frac{d}{du}(\log \mathbb{T}(u)) \Big|_{u=0}$, up to an additive constant.

The eigenvalues $T(u)$ of the transfer matrix can be expressed in terms of Bethe roots $\{u_{j,k}\}$ where $k = 1, \dots, M_j$ and $j = 1, \dots, m$, which satisfy the following set of Bethe equations

$$\left(\frac{u_{1,k} + \frac{i}{2}}{u_{1,k} - \frac{i}{2}} \right)^N = \prod_{l=1; l \neq k}^{M_1} \frac{u_{1,k} - u_{1,l} + i}{u_{1,k} - u_{1,l} - i} \prod_{l=1}^{M_2} \frac{u_{1,k} - u_{2,l} - \frac{i}{2}}{u_{1,k} - u_{2,l} + \frac{i}{2}}, \quad k = 1, \dots, M_1, \quad (2.5)$$

$$1 = \prod_{l=1; l \neq k}^{M_j} \frac{u_{j,k} - u_{j,l} + i}{u_{j,k} - u_{j,l} - i} \prod_{l=1}^{M_{j+1}} \frac{u_{j,k} - u_{j+1,l} - \frac{i}{2}}{u_{j,k} - u_{j+1,l} + \frac{i}{2}} \prod_{l=1}^{M_{j-1}} \frac{u_{j,k} - u_{j-1,l} - \frac{i}{2}}{u_{j,k} - u_{j-1,l} + \frac{i}{2}},$$

$$k = 1, \dots, M_j, \quad j = 2, \dots, m-1, \quad (2.6)$$

$$1 = \prod_{l=1; l \neq k}^{M_m} \frac{u_{m,k} - u_{m,l} + i}{u_{m,k} - u_{m,l} - i} \prod_{l=1}^{M_{m-1}} \frac{u_{m,k} - u_{m-1,l} - \frac{i}{2}}{u_{m,k} - u_{m-1,l} + \frac{i}{2}}, \quad k = 1, \dots, M_m. \quad (2.7)$$

We define polynomials $Q_1(u), \dots, Q_m(u)$ by

$$Q_j(u) = \prod_{k=1}^{M_j} (u - u_{j,k}), \quad j = 1, \dots, m, \quad (2.8)$$

so that their zeros are given by corresponding Bethe roots.

2.1 The $SU(m+1)$ Q-system

The QQ-relations for the $SU(m+1)$ Q-system are given by [1]

$$Q_{j,n}(u) Q_{j+1,n-1}(u) \propto Q_{j+1,n}^+(u) Q_{j,n-1}^-(u) - Q_{j+1,n}^-(u) Q_{j,n-1}^+(u),$$

$$j = 0, 1, \dots, m, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (2.9)$$

where $f^\pm(u) = f(u \pm \frac{i}{2})$, and

$$Q_{0,0}(u) = u^N,$$

$$Q_{j,0}(u) = Q_j(u), \quad j = 1, \dots, m,$$

$$Q_{m+1,0}(u) = 1, \quad (2.10)$$

where $Q_j(u)$ are defined in (2.8). The nontrivial Q-functions are in fact defined on a Young diagram with N boxes, on whose boundary the Q-functions (including $Q_{m+1,0}$) are set to 1 [1].

Let us verify that this Q-system indeed leads to the Bethe equations. Setting $n = 1$ in (2.9) and using (2.10), we obtain

$$Q_{j,1}(u) Q_{j+1}(u) \propto Q_{j+1,1}^+(u) Q_j^-(u) - Q_{j+1,1}^-(u) Q_j^+(u), \quad j = 1, \dots, m-1. \quad (2.11)$$

Shifting $j \mapsto j-1$ in (2.11) and then setting $u = u_{j,k}$, we obtain

$$0 = Q_{j,1}^+(u_{j,k}) Q_{j-1}^-(u_{j,k}) - Q_{j,1}^-(u_{j,k}) Q_{j-1}^+(u_{j,k}), \quad (2.12)$$

since $Q_j(u_{j,k}) = 0$. Shifting $u \mapsto u \pm \frac{i}{2}$ in (2.11) and then setting $u = u_{j,k}$, we obtain the pair of equations

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{j,1}^+(u_{j,k}) Q_{j+1}^+(u_{j,k}) &\propto -Q_{j+1,1}(u_{j,k}) Q_j^{++}(u_{j,k}), \\ Q_{j,1}^-(u_{j,k}) Q_{j+1}^-(u_{j,k}) &\propto Q_{j+1,1}(u_{j,k}) Q_j^{--}(u_{j,k}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Using (2.13) to eliminate $Q_{j,1}^\pm(u_{j,k})$ in (2.12), we arrive at the relations

$$\frac{Q_j^{++}(u_{j,k})}{Q_{j+1}^+(u_{j,k})} Q_{j-1}^-(u_{j,k}) = -\frac{Q_j^{--}(u_{j,k})}{Q_{j+1}^-(u_{j,k})} Q_{j-1}^+(u_{j,k}), \quad j = 2, \dots, m-1, \quad (2.14)$$

which is equivalent to the Bethe equations (2.6).

To get the first Bethe equation (2.5), we start from (2.9) with $n = 1$ and $j = 0$

$$Q_{0,1}(u) Q_1(u) \propto Q_{1,1}^+(u) Q_{0,0}^-(u) - Q_{1,1}^-(u) Q_{0,0}^+(u). \quad (2.15)$$

Evaluating this relation at $u = u_{1,k}$ gives

$$0 = Q_{1,1}^+(u_{1,k}) Q_{0,0}^-(u_{1,k}) - Q_{1,1}^-(u_{1,k}) Q_{0,0}^+(u_{1,k}). \quad (2.16)$$

Using (2.13) with $j = 1$ to eliminate $Q_{1,1}^\pm(u_{1,k})$ in (2.16), we arrive at (2.14) with $j = 1$, except with Q_0 replaced by $Q_{0,0}$, which is equivalent to the Bethe equation (2.5).

To get the final Bethe equation (2.7), we start from (2.9) with $n = 1$ and $j = m$ ²

$$Q_{m,1}(u) \propto Q_{m+1,1}^+(u) Q_m^-(u) - Q_{m+1,1}^-(u) Q_m^+(u). \quad (2.17)$$

Shifting $u \mapsto u \pm \frac{i}{2}$ in (2.17) and then setting $u = u_{m,k}$, we obtain (2.13) with $j = m$, except with Q_{m+1} replaced by 1. Using these relations to eliminate $Q_{m,1}^\pm(u_{m,k})$ in (2.12) with $j = m$, we arrive at (2.14) with $j = m$, except with Q_{m+1} replaced by 1, which is indeed equivalent to the Bethe equation (2.7).

2.2 Determinant representation for all the Q-functions

We now show that the Q-system (2.9)-(2.10) can be solved in terms of a set of $m+1$ functions $F_0(u), \dots, F_m(u)$, whose interpretation will be discussed later. Explicitly, all the Q-functions can be expressed in terms of determinants as follows³

$$Q_{m,n} = F_0^{(n)}, \quad (2.18)$$

²Eq. (2.17) holds if $M_m > 1$; however, $Q_{m,1} = 1$ if $M_m = 1$, which is consistent with (2.18).

³Similar formulas were found for bosonic spin chains in [11], and for supersymmetric spin chains in [22,23].

$$Q_{m-1,n} = \begin{vmatrix} F_0^{(n)+} & F_0^{(n)-} \\ F_1^{(n)+} & F_1^{(n)-} \end{vmatrix}_{2 \times 2}, \quad (2.19)$$

$$\vdots$$

$$Q_{j,n} = \begin{vmatrix} F_0^{(n)[m-j]} & F_0^{(n)[m-j-2]} & \dots & F_0^{(n)[j-m]} \\ F_1^{(n)[m-j]} & F_1^{(n)[m-j-2]} & \dots & F_1^{(n)[j-m]} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ F_{m-j}^{(n)[m-j]} & F_{m-j}^{(n)[m-j-2]} & \dots & F_{m-j}^{(n)[j-m]} \end{vmatrix}_{(m+1-j) \times (m+1-j)}, \quad (2.20)$$

$$\vdots$$

$$Q_{0,n} = \begin{vmatrix} F_0^{(n)[m]} & F_0^{(n)[m-2]} & \dots & F_0^{(n)[-m]} \\ F_1^{(n)[m]} & F_1^{(n)[m-2]} & \dots & F_1^{(n)[-m]} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ F_m^{(n)[m]} & F_m^{(n)[m-2]} & \dots & F_m^{(n)[-m]} \end{vmatrix}_{(m+1) \times (m+1)}, \quad (2.21)$$

where $n = 0, 1, \dots$. Throughout Section 2, we use the notation $f^{(n)}(u)$ to denote the n^{th} discrete derivative of any function $f(u)$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(n)}(u) &= f^{(n-1)+}(u) - f^{(n-1)-}(u) \\ &= f^{(n-1)}(u + \tfrac{i}{2}) - f^{(n-1)}(u - \tfrac{i}{2}), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

with $f^{(0)}(u) = f(u)$. Moreover, we use the notation $f^{[k]}(u)$ to denote a k -fold shift by $\frac{i}{2}$, i.e.

$$f^{[k]}(u) = f(u + k \tfrac{i}{2}). \quad (2.23)$$

Hence, $f^{[1]} = f^+$ and $f^{[-1]} = f^-$, etc. Note that (2.10) and (2.18) imply that

$$Q_m = Q_{m,0} = F_0. \quad (2.24)$$

An important consequence of the result (2.18)-(2.21) is that the functions $F_0(u), \dots, F_m(u)$ are polynomials in u if and only if all the Q -functions are polynomials in u .

In order to show that the expressions (2.18)-(2.21) indeed satisfy the QQ-relations (2.9), we make use of Plücker identities [19], which we first briefly review. Let X denote a *rectangular* matrix with r rows and c columns, with $c > r$,

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} X_{1,1} & X_{1,2} & \dots & X_{1,c} \\ X_{2,1} & X_{2,2} & \dots & X_{2,c} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ X_{r,1} & X_{r,2} & \dots & X_{r,c} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.25)$$

Furthermore, let the symbol (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_r) denote the determinant of the square matrix formed by the r columns i_1, i_2, \dots, i_r of X

$$(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_r) = \begin{vmatrix} X_{1,i_1} & X_{1,i_2} & \cdots & X_{1,i_r} \\ X_{2,i_1} & X_{2,i_2} & \cdots & X_{2,i_r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ X_{r,i_1} & X_{r,i_2} & \cdots & X_{r,i_r} \end{vmatrix}, \quad (2.26)$$

which is antisymmetric in all indices. The particular Plücker identity that we need is [19]

$$(i_1, i_2, k_3, \dots, k_r) (j_1, j_2, k_3, \dots, k_r) = (j_1, i_2, k_3, \dots, k_r) (i_1, j_2, k_3, \dots, k_r) \\ + (j_2, i_2, k_3, \dots, k_r) (j_1, i_1, k_3, \dots, k_r), \quad (2.27)$$

where all indices take values in $\{1, 2, \dots, c\}$.

For the problem at hand, we choose X to be a rectangular matrix with $r = m + 1 - j$ and $c = m + 3 - j$ (where $j = 0, 1, \dots, m$) given by

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & \cdots & m+1-j & m+2-j & m+3-j \\ F_0^{(n)[m-j]} & F_0^{(n)[m-j-2]} & \cdots & F_0^{(n)[j-m]} & F_0^{(n-1)[m-j-1]} & 0 \\ F_1^{(n)[m-j]} & F_1^{(n)[m-j-2]} & \cdots & F_1^{(n)[j-m]} & F_1^{(n-1)[m-j-1]} & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ F_{m-j-1}^{(n)[m-j]} & F_{m-j-1}^{(n)[m-j-2]} & \cdots & F_{m-j-1}^{(n)[j-m]} & F_{m-j-1}^{(n-1)[m-j-1]} & 0 \\ F_{m-j}^{(n)[m-j]} & F_{m-j}^{(n)[m-j-2]} & \cdots & F_{m-j}^{(n)[j-m]} & F_{m-j}^{(n-1)[m-j-1]} & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.28)$$

Moreover, we choose the indices in (2.27) as follows

$$i_1 = 1, \quad i_2 = m+1-j, \quad j_1 = m+2-j, \quad j_2 = m+3-j, \quad (2.29)$$

and

$$k_l = l-1 \quad \text{for} \quad l = 3, 4, \dots, m+1-j. \quad (2.30)$$

With the choices (2.29)-(2.30), the Plücker identity (2.27) reads

$$(1, 2, \dots, m-j, m+1-j) (2, \dots, m-j, m+2-j, m+3-j) \\ \propto (2, \dots, m-j, m+1-j, m+2-j) (1, 2, \dots, m-j, m+3-j) \\ - (2, \dots, m-j, m+1-j, m+3-j) (1, 2, \dots, m-j, m+2-j), \quad (2.31)$$

where we have made use of the antisymmetry properties of the symbols. Using the following identifications

$$(1, 2, \dots, m-j, m+1-j) = Q_{j,n}, \quad (2.32)$$

$$(2, \dots, m-j, m+2-j, m+3-j) = Q_{j+1,n-1}, \quad (2.33)$$

$$(2, \dots, m-j, m+1-j, m+2-j) = Q_{j,n-1}^-, \quad (2.34)$$

$$(1, 2, \dots, m-j, m+3-j) = Q_{j+1,n}^+, \quad (2.35)$$

$$(2, \dots, m-j, m+1-j, m+3-j) = Q_{j+1,n}^-, \quad (2.36)$$

$$(1, 2, \dots, m-j, m+2-j) = Q_{j,n-1}^+, \quad (2.37)$$

we immediately obtain from the identity (2.31) the QQ-relations (2.9). The first (2.32), fourth (2.35) and fifth (2.36) relations follow directly from (2.20) and the expression (2.28) for X ; while the second (2.33), third (2.34) and sixth (2.37) relations, which involve Q-functions with $n-1$ instead of n , require also (2.22).

The determinant expressions (2.18)-(2.21) for the Q-functions and their proof constitute some of the main results of this paper. We remark that the result (2.20) with $n=0$ is similar to Eq. (9.21) in [10].

In order to understand how to interpret the functions $F_0(u), \dots, F_m(u)$, it is helpful to begin by analyzing the simplest cases $m=1, 2$.

$m=1$ For the $SU(2)$ case ($m=1$), the results (2.18)-(2.21) reduce to

$$Q_{1,n} = F_0^{(n)}, \quad Q_{0,n} = \begin{vmatrix} F_0^{(n)+} & F_0^{(n)-} \\ F_1^{(n)+} & F_1^{(n)-} \end{vmatrix} = F_0^{(n)+} F_1^{(n)-} - F_0^{(n)-} F_1^{(n)+}. \quad (2.38)$$

In view of (2.24), we can identify $F_0(u)$ as the “fundamental” Q-function $F_0(u) = Q_1(u) \equiv Q(u)$. Moreover, we can identify $F_1(u)$ as the “dual” Q-function, which is denoted by $P(u)$ in [17] and [15], see also [16]. Indeed, with these identifications, (2.38) coincides with Eq. (2.23) in [15]. Note that (2.38) with $n=0$ implies that

$$Q_{0,0} = F_0^+ F_1^- - F_0^- F_1^+, \quad (2.39)$$

which we recognize as the important discrete Wronskian relation in [17].

It was proved in [24, 25] that polynomiality of Q and P (i.e., F_0 and F_1) is equivalent to the admissibility of the Bethe roots. It follows from (2.38) that polynomiality of the Q-system is equivalent to the admissibility of the Bethe roots, as already noted in [1].⁴

$m=2$ For the $SU(3)$ case ($m=2$), the results (2.18)-(2.21) reduce to

$$Q_{2,n} = F_0^{(n)}, \quad (2.40)$$

$$Q_{1,n} = \begin{vmatrix} F_0^{(n)+} & F_0^{(n)-} \\ F_1^{(n)+} & F_1^{(n)-} \end{vmatrix}, \quad (2.41)$$

⁴We remind the reader that some solutions of the Bethe equations, most notably the so-called unphysical singular solutions, do not lead to eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the transfer matrix, see e.g. [15] and references therein. Here we call *admissible* those solutions of the Bethe equations that *do* give rise to genuine eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the transfer matrix.

$$Q_{0,n} = \begin{vmatrix} F_0^{(n)++} & F_0^{(n)} & F_0^{(n)--} \\ F_1^{(n)++} & F_1^{(n)} & F_1^{(n)--} \\ F_2^{(n)++} & F_2^{(n)} & F_2^{(n)--} \end{vmatrix}. \quad (2.42)$$

The functions F_0, F_1, F_2 correspond to the functions P, Q, R in [18]. In particular, (2.42) with $n = 0$ can be recognized as Eq. (4) in [18].

General m We now see that the functions $F_0(u), \dots, F_m(u)$ are generalizations of the functions introduced by Pronko and Stroganov to describe integrable spin chains with $SU(2)$ [17] and $SU(3)$ [18] symmetry. These functions satisfy a generalized discrete Wronskian relation given by (2.21) with $n = 0$. We conjecture, generalizing the $m = 1$ result of [24, 25], that polynomiality of $F_0(u), \dots, F_m(u)$ (and hence, by (2.18)-(2.21), polynomiality of all the Q-functions) is equivalent to the admissibility of the Bethe roots $\{u_{j,k}\}$.

3 The $A_m^{(1)}$ spin chain

We turn now to the closed $A_m^{(1)}$ spin chain with periodic boundary conditions, which is a q-deformation of the $SU(m+1)$ -invariant model considered in Section 2. The R-matrix is now given by (see e.g. [26], with $x = e^{2u}$ and $k = e^{-\eta}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}(u) = \frac{1}{2} e^{\eta-u} & \left\{ (e^{2u} - e^{-2\eta}) \sum_{a=1}^{m+1} e_{aa} \otimes e_{aa} + e^{-\eta} (e^{2u} - 1) \sum_{a \neq b} e_{aa} \otimes e_{bb} \right. \\ & \left. - (e^{-2\eta} - 1) \left(\sum_{a < b} + e^{2u} \sum_{a > b} \right) e_{ab} \otimes e_{ba} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where η is the anisotropy parameter. The transfer matrix $\mathbb{T}(u)$ is again given by (2.3)

$$\mathbb{T}(u) = \text{tr}_0 \mathbb{R}_{01}(u) \mathbb{R}_{02}(u) \dots \mathbb{R}_{0N}(u). \quad (3.2)$$

The Bethe equations are now given by

$$\left(\frac{\sinh(u_{1,k} + \frac{\eta}{2})}{\sinh(u_{1,k} - \frac{\eta}{2})} \right)^N = \prod_{l=1; l \neq k}^{M_1} \frac{\sinh(u_{1,k} - u_{1,l} + \eta)}{\sinh(u_{1,k} - u_{1,l} - \eta)} \prod_{l=1}^{M_2} \frac{\sinh(u_{1,k} - u_{2,l} - \frac{\eta}{2})}{\sinh(u_{1,k} - u_{2,l} + \frac{\eta}{2})}, \quad k = 1, \dots, M_1, \quad (3.3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} 1 = & \prod_{l=1; l \neq k}^{M_j} \frac{\sinh(u_{j,k} - u_{j,l} + \eta)}{\sinh(u_{j,k} - u_{j,l} - \eta)} \prod_{l=1}^{M_{j+1}} \frac{\sinh(u_{j,k} - u_{j+1,l} - \frac{\eta}{2})}{\sinh(u_{j,k} - u_{j+1,l} + \frac{\eta}{2})} \\ & \times \prod_{l=1}^{M_{j-1}} \frac{\sinh(u_{j,k} - u_{j-1,l} - \frac{\eta}{2})}{\sinh(u_{j,k} - u_{j-1,l} + \frac{\eta}{2})}, \quad k = 1, \dots, M_j, \quad j = 2, \dots, m-1, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

$$1 = \prod_{l=1; l \neq k}^{M_m} \frac{\sinh(u_{m,k} - u_{m,l} + \eta)}{\sinh(u_{m,k} - u_{m,l} - \eta)} \prod_{l=1}^{M_{m-1}} \frac{\sinh(u_{m,k} - u_{m-1,l} - \frac{\eta}{2})}{\sinh(u_{m,k} - u_{m-1,l} + \frac{\eta}{2})}, \quad k = 1, \dots, M_m, \quad (3.5)$$

and we now define functions $Q_1(u), \dots, Q_m(u)$ by

$$Q_j(u) = \prod_{k=1}^{M_j} \sinh(u - u_{j,k}), \quad j = 1, \dots, m, \quad (3.6)$$

which are polynomials in $t \equiv e^u$ and t^{-1} .

3.1 The $A_m^{(1)}$ Q-system

We propose that the $A_m^{(1)}$ spin chain has the same QQ-relations as the isotropic case (2.9), namely

$$Q_{j,n}(u) Q_{j+1,n-1}(u) \propto Q_{j+1,n}^+(u) Q_{j,n-1}^-(u) - Q_{j+1,n}^-(u) Q_{j,n-1}^+(u), \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, m, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (3.7)$$

but where now $f^\pm(u) = f(u \pm \frac{\eta}{2})$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{0,0}(u) &= \sinh^N(u), \\ Q_{j,0}(u) &= Q_j(u), \quad j = 1, \dots, m, \\ Q_{m+1,0}(u) &= 1, \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where the functions $Q_j(u)$ are defined in (3.6).

We can easily verify that this Q-system indeed leads to the $A_m^{(1)}$ Bethe equations. Indeed, starting from (3.7)-(3.8) and repeating the steps in Section 2.1, we arrive at the Bethe equations (3.3)-(3.5).

As in the isotropic case, the $A_m^{(1)}$ Q-system can be solved in terms of functions $F_0(u), \dots, F_m(u)$ by

$$Q_{j,n} = \begin{vmatrix} F_0^{(n)[m-j]} & F_0^{(n)[m-j-2]} & \dots & F_0^{(n)[j-m]} \\ F_1^{(n)[m-j]} & F_1^{(n)[m-j-2]} & \dots & F_1^{(n)[j-m]} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ F_{m-j}^{(n)[m-j]} & F_{m-j}^{(n)[m-j-2]} & \dots & F_{m-j}^{(n)[j-m]} \end{vmatrix}_{(m+1-j) \times (m+1-j)}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, m, \quad (3.9)$$

and $n = 0, 1, \dots$, except now

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(n)}(u) &= f^{(n-1)+}(u) - f^{(n-1)-}(u) \\ &= f^{(n-1)}(u + \frac{\eta}{2}) - f^{(n-1)}(u - \frac{\eta}{2}), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

and

$$f^{[k]}(u) = f(u + k\frac{\eta}{2}). \quad (3.11)$$

Indeed, the same proof from Section 2.2 carries over to the anisotropic case.

The $A_m^{(1)}$ Q-system (3.7)-(3.8) and its determinant representation (3.9) constitute the other main results of this paper.

We conjecture that polynomiality of F_0 in $t \equiv e^u$ and t^{-1} , together with quasi-polynomiality (polynomial plus $\log t$ times a polynomial) of F_1, \dots, F_m , is equivalent to the admissibility of the Bethe roots; and is also equivalent to polynomiality of all the Q-functions. Evidence supporting this conjecture for the simplest cases $m = 1, 2$ is provided below.

$m = 1$ The $A_1^{(1)}$ case ($m = 1$) corresponds to the spin-1/2 XXZ spin chain, whose Q-system was recently formulated in [15]. As in the isotropic case, we identify $F_0(u)$ as the “fundamental” Q-function $Q(u)$, and $F_1(u)$ as the “dual” Q-function $P(u)$. The relations (3.9) with $m = 1$ coincide with Eq. (3.13) in [15].

It was argued in [15] that polynomiality of Q , together with quasi-polynomiality of P , is equivalent to the admissibility of the Bethe roots. It follows from (3.9) with $m = 1$ that polynomiality of the Q-system is equivalent to the admissibility of the Bethe roots.

$m = 2$ For the $A_2^{(1)}$ case ($m = 2$), we have verified numerically for small values of N that the polynomial (in $t \equiv e^u$ and t^{-1}) solutions of the Q-system (3.7)-(3.8) give the complete spectrum of the transfer matrix $\mathbb{T}(u)$ (3.2). Indeed, we have used this Q-system to numerically obtain the admissible Bethe roots for some generic value of η , as in the $A_1^{(1)}$ case [15]; and we have verified that the corresponding eigenvalues $T(u)$ of the transfer matrix computed using

$$T(u) = Q_{0,0}^{++}(u) \frac{Q_1^-(u)}{Q_1^+(u)} + Q_{0,0}(u) \frac{Q_1^{[3]}(u)}{Q_1^+(u)} \frac{Q_2(u)}{Q_2^{++}(u)} + Q_{0,0}(u) \frac{Q_2^{[4]}(u)}{Q_2^{++}(u)} \quad (3.12)$$

match with the results obtained by direct diagonalization of $\mathbb{T}(u)$.

We report in Table 1, for given values of chain length N , the numbers of Bethe roots of each type (M_1, M_2) , the corresponding number of admissible solutions (n_{M_1, M_2}) of the Bethe equations (3.3)-(3.5) obtained by solving the Q-system (3.7)-(3.8), and the degeneracies (d_{M_1, M_2}) of the corresponding transfer-matrix eigenvalues $T(u)$ (3.12) obtained by direct diagonalization of $\mathbb{T}(u)$. (We refrain from displaying the Bethe roots themselves, which would require much bigger tables.) The completeness is demonstrated by the fact (easily confirmed from the data in Table 1) that all 3^N transfer-matrix eigenvalues are accounted for, i.e.

$$\sum_{M_1, M_2} n_{M_1, M_2} d_{M_1, M_2} = 3^N. \quad (3.13)$$

N	M_1	M_2	n_{M_1, M_2}	d_{M_1, M_2}
2	0	0	1	3
	1	0	2	3
3	0	0	1	3
	1	0	3	6
	2	1	6	1
4	0	0	1	3
	1	0	4	6
	2	0	6	3
	2	1	12	3
5	0	0	1	3
	1	0	5	6
	2	0	10	6
	2	1	20	3
	3	1	30	3

Table 1: Chain length (N), numbers of Bethe roots (M_1, M_2), number of admissible solutions of the Bethe equations (n_{M_1, M_2}) and degeneracies (d_{M_1, M_2}) for the $A_2^{(1)}$ spin chain

4 Conclusions

We have proposed a Q-system for the $A_m^{(1)}$ spin chain (3.7)-(3.8), which provides an efficient way of obtaining solutions of the trigonometric Bethe equations (3.3)-(3.5). We have also found compact determinant expressions for all the Q-functions, both for the rational (2.18)-(2.21) and trigonometric (3.9) cases. In so doing, we have established links between Q-systems and the works by Kuniba et al. [10] and by Pronko and Stroganov [17, 18].

Several interesting related problems remain to be addressed. The fact that all the Q-functions can be expressed in terms of the $m + 1$ F-functions F_0, \dots, F_m suggests that the F-functions are of fundamental importance for the $SU(m + 1)$ and $A_m^{(1)}$ models, and merit further investigation. In particular, it would be desirable to have proofs that polynomiality in u (or quasi-polynomiality in t and t^{-1} for the trigonometric case) of the F-functions is equivalent to the admissibility of the Bethe roots. For $SU(m|n)$ graded (supersymmetric) spin chains [27], Q-systems were also formulated in [1, 2]; it should be possible to formulate similar determinant expressions for these Q-systems and for the corresponding q-deformed models, and to relate them to results of Tsuboi [22, 23]. We restricted here to periodic boundary conditions; it should be possible to generalize the $A_m^{(1)}$ Q-system (and the corresponding determinant representation) to open diagonal boundary conditions [28–31], thereby generalizing the corresponding rank-1 results [15, 16] to higher rank. Only A-type Q-systems are so far known; it would be very interesting to construct such Q-systems for other algebras.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Z. Bajnok, E. Granet, J. Jacobsen, Y. Jiang and Y. Zhang for their collaboration on related earlier projects [9, 15], from which this work arose. I also thank A. Gainutdinov for valuable discussions.

References

- [1] C. Marboe and D. Volin, “Fast analytic solver of rational Bethe equations,” *J. Phys.* **A50** no. 20, (2017) 204002, [arXiv:1608.06504 \[math-ph\]](#).
- [2] V. Kazakov, A. S. Sorin, and A. Zabrodin, “Supersymmetric Bethe ansatz and Baxter equations from discrete Hirota dynamics,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B790** (2008) 345–413, [arXiv:hep-th/0703147 \[HEP-TH\]](#).
- [3] C. Marboe and D. Volin, “The full spectrum of AdS5/CFT4 I: Representation theory and one-loop Q-system,” *J. Phys.* **A51** no. 16, (2018) 165401, [arXiv:1701.03704 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [4] B. Basso, F. Coronado, S. Komatsu, H. T. Lam, P. Vieira, and D.-l. Zhong, “Asymptotic Four Point Functions,” *JHEP* **07** (2019) 082, [arXiv:1701.04462 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [5] R. Suzuki, “Refined Counting of Necklaces in One-loop $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM,” *JHEP* **06** (2017) 055, [arXiv:1703.05798 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [6] P. Ryan and D. Volin, “Separated variables and wave functions for rational $\mathfrak{gl}(N)$ spin chains in the companion twist frame,” *J. Math. Phys.* **60** no. 3, (2019) 032701, [arXiv:1810.10996 \[math-ph\]](#).
- [7] F. Coronado, “Perturbative four-point functions in planar $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM from hexagonalization,” *JHEP* **01** (2019) 056, [arXiv:1811.00467 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [8] J. L. Jacobsen, Y. Jiang, and Y. Zhang, “Torus partition function of the six-vertex model from algebraic geometry,” *JHEP* **03** (2019) 152, [arXiv:1812.00447 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [9] Z. Bajnok, J. L. Jacobsen, Y. Jiang, R. I. Nepomechie, and Y. Zhang, “Cylinder partition function of the 6-vertex model from algebraic geometry,” *JHEP* **06** (2020) 169, [arXiv:2002.09019 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [10] A. Kuniba, T. Nakanishi, and J. Suzuki, “T-systems and Y-systems in integrable systems,” *J. Phys.* **A44** (2011) 103001, [arXiv:1010.1344 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [11] E. Mukhin and A. Varchenko, “Solutions to the XXX type Bethe ansatz equations and flag varieties,” *Central Eur. J. Math.* **1** (2002) 238–271, [arXiv:math/0211321 \[math.QA\]](#).

- [12] E. Mukhin and A. Varchenko, “Quasi-polynomials and the Bethe Ansatz,” *Geom. Topol. Monogr.* **13** (2008) 385–420, [arXiv:math/0604048](#) [math.QA].
- [13] E. Mukhin, V. Tarasov, and A. Varchenko, “Spaces of quasi-exponentials and representations of the Yangian $Y(gl_N)$,” *Transform. Groups* **19** (2014) 861–885, [arXiv:1303.1578](#) [math.AG].
- [14] J. R. Li and V. Tarasov, “XXZ-type Bethe ansatz equations and quasi-polynomials,” in *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.*, vol. 411, p. 012020. 2013. [arXiv:1210.2315](#) [math.QA].
- [15] Z. Bajnok, E. Granet, J. L. Jacobsen, and R. I. Nepomechie, “On Generalized Q -systems,” *JHEP* **03** (2020) 177, [arXiv:1910.07805](#) [hep-th].
- [16] R. I. Nepomechie, “ Q -systems with boundary parameters,” *J. Phys.* **A53** (2020) 294001, [arXiv:1912.12702](#) [hep-th].
- [17] G. P. Pronko and Yu. G. Stroganov, “Bethe equations ‘on the wrong side of equator’,” *J. Phys.* **A32** (1999) 2333–2340, [arXiv:hep-th/9808153](#) [hep-th].
- [18] G. P. Pronko and Yu. G. Stroganov, “The Complex of solutions of the nested Bethe ansatz. The $A(2)$ spin chain,” *J. Phys.* **A33** (2000) 8267, [arXiv:hep-th/9902085](#) [hep-th].
- [19] I. Krichever, O. Lipan, P. Wiegmann, and A. Zabrodin, “Quantum integrable systems and elliptic solutions of classical discrete nonlinear equations,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **188** (1997) 267–304, [arXiv:hep-th/9604080](#) [hep-th].
- [20] P. P. Kulish and N. Yu. Reshetikhin, “Generalized Heisenberg ferromagnet and the Gross-Neveu model,” *Sov. Phys. JETP* **53** (1981) 108–114. [*Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.*80,214(1981)].
- [21] H. J. de Vega, “Yang-Baxter algebras, integrable theories and quantum groups,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A04** (1989) 2371–2463.
- [22] Z. Tsuboi, “Solutions of the T-system and Baxter equations for supersymmetric spin chains,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B826** (2010) 399–455, [arXiv:0906.2039](#) [math-ph].
- [23] Z. Tsuboi, “Wronskian solutions of the T, Q and Y-systems related to infinite dimensional unitarizable modules of the general linear superalgebra $gl(M-N)$,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B870** (2013) 92–137, [arXiv:1109.5524](#) [hep-th].
- [24] E. Mukhin, V. Tarasov, and A. Varchenko, “Bethe algebra of homogeneous XXX Heisenberg model has simple spectrum,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **288** (2009) 1–42, [arXiv:0706.0688](#) [math].
- [25] V. Tarasov, “Completeness of the Bethe ansatz for the periodic isotropic Heisenberg model,” *Rev. Math. Phys.* **30** (2018) 1840018.
- [26] M. Jimbo, “Quantum R Matrix for the Generalized Toda System,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **102** (1986) 537–547.

- [27] P. P. Kulish, “Integrable graded magnets,” *J. Sov. Math.* **35** (1986) 2648–2662. [Zap. Nauchn. Semin.145,140(1985)].
- [28] E. K. Sklyanin, “Boundary Conditions for Integrable Quantum Systems,” *J. Phys.* **A21** (1988) 2375.
- [29] H. J. de Vega and A. Gonzalez Ruiz, “Boundary K matrices for the six vertex and the $n(2n-1)$ $A(n-1)$ vertex models,” *J. Phys.* **A26** (1993) L519–L524, [arXiv:hep-th/9211114](#) [hep-th].
- [30] H. J. de Vega and A. Gonzalez-Ruiz, “Exact Bethe Ansatz solution for $A(n-1)$ chains with nonSU-q(n) invariant open boundary conditions,” *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A9** (1994) 2207, [arXiv:hep-th/9404141](#) [hep-th].
- [31] A. Doikou and R. I. Nepomechie, “Duality and quantum algebra symmetry of the $A_{N-1}^{(1)}$ open spin chain with diagonal boundary fields,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B530** (1998) 641–664, [arXiv:hep-th/9807065](#) [hep-th].