

Modern Tensor-Spinor Symbolic Algebra Algorithms and Computing Non-Closure Geometry & Holoraumy in 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ Supergravity

S. James Gates, Jr.,^{1,a} Isaiah B. Hilsenrath,^{2,a,b} and Saul Hilsenrath^{3,a,b}

^a*Department of Physics, University of Maryland,
College Park, MD 20742-4111, USA*

^b*Department of Mathematics, University of Maryland,
College Park, MD 20742-4111, USA*

ABSTRACT

A long-standing question in supergravity is whether 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity can be made off-shell, *precisely along the lines of 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ superfield supergravity*. Experience with supersymmetry theories like the 4D double-tensor multiplet indicates that such off-shell SUSY problems are intimately tied with the non-closure functions of the multiplet. Motivated by this link, we explore a formulation of the 11D supergravity multiplet especially useful for non-closure geometry computations, and we undertake a detailed derivation of the associated non-closure functions. In addition, we use this formulation to compute the on-shell holoraumy of the multiplet. We show that this holoraumy carries no so-called “electromagnetic-duality rotations,” proving that 11D supergravity provides a counterexample to the ubiquity of such rotations in holoraumy previously conjectured based on 4D calculations. These results are all achieved using a suite of new symbolic algebra algorithms, implemented in Cadabra. This includes a purely symbolic implementation of the algebra/canonicalization of spinor-indexed tensor expressions, including automatic simplification following NW-SE convention and more versatile Fierz expansion tools. We also provide algorithms solving for unknown parameters in multiplets’ supersymmetry transformation rules by leveraging superalgebra closure and action SUSY-invariance requirements, as well as an algorithm computing holoraumy, all without use of any explicit matrix representation.

PACS: 11.30.Pb, 12.60.Jv

Keywords: supergravity, supersymmetry, tensor algebra, symbolic computation

¹ gatess@umd.edu

² ihilsenr@terpmail.umd.edu

³ shilsenr@terpmail.umd.edu

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Overview	3
1.2	Review of Prior Work	8
1.3	Detailed Overview of Physical Results	13
1.4	Detailed Overview of Symbolic Algebra Methods	16
1.5	Notes on Style	22
2	Closure of the Supermultiplet	23
2.1	Computationally Enforcing Closure	23
2.2	Closure on the Graviton	25
2.3	Closure on the Three-Form	26
2.4	Closure on the Gravitino	26
2.5	Distilling Independent Constraints from Closure	32
3	SUSY-Invariance of the Action	33
3.1	Computationally Enforcing SUSY-Invariance	33
3.2	Constraints from SUSY-Invariance	34
3.3	Solving the Constraints on the 11D Supergravity Coefficients	35
3.4	Final Closure Properties, and Geometry of Fermionic Non-Closure Terms	36
4	Holoraumy of 11D Supergravity	38
4.1	Bosonic Holoraumy	38
4.2	Fermionic Holoraumy	39
4.3	Absence of an Electromagnetic-Duality Rotation	42
5	SusyPy: A Supersymmetry Multiplet Solver	43
5.1	Basic Use	43
5.2	Procedures for Traces and Dimension-Specific Substitutions	51
5.3	Algorithm for Spinor-Index Canonicalization	57
5.4	Evaluating Expressions	66
5.5	Algorithm for Four-Index Fierz Expansion	69
5.6	Algorithm for Two-Index Fierz Expansion	73

5.7	Symbolic Fourier Transform	75
5.8	Identifying Non-Gauge-Invariant Quantities	78
5.9	Multiplet Solver 1: Brute-Force Gamma-Matrix Splitting	85
5.10	Procedure for Computing Feynman Propagators	95
5.11	Multiplet Solver 2: Feynman Propagator Substitution	99
5.12	SUSY-Invariant Action Solver	108
5.13	Algorithm for Computing Holonomy	111
6	Discussion	116
A	Notation and Conventions	120
B	Ten 11D Fierz Identities	122
B.1	Five Symmetric Fierz Identities	122
B.2	Five Antisymmetric Fierz Identities	126
C	Action Normalization	130
C.1	4D Chiral Multiplet	130
C.2	4D Vector Multiplet	131
C.3	4D Tensor Multiplet	132
C.4	11D Supergravity Multiplet	133
D	Propositions on Arbitrary-Spin Fermions	135
E	Indexbracket Hexadecimals	137

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

The goal of the present work is to convey new computational results in 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity obtained via equally new algorithms for handling such computations systematically across different supermultiplets. The principal physical impetus for the work is a supergravity question which is now over 40 years old.

Question 1.1. How can we introduce a *finite* and *minimal* number of auxiliary fields into linearized 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity so as to make the supersymmetry algebra close off-shell?

This question has a remarkably rich history closely tied to the introduction of 11D supergravity itself. In particular, Cremmer, Julia, and Scherk [10] were initially interested in 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity as a means of understanding 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity via dimensional reduction, since 11D supergravity has a dramatically simpler field content consisting only of gauge fields. The first superspace formulations of 11D supergravity in [6, 9] both cited treating question 1.1 as their aims, with the particular goal of showing that the induced off-shell formulation of 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity would aid in showing the theory is ultraviolet finite. These initial studies helped elucidate the simplicity of 11D supergravity compared to its 4D counterparts and guide superspace approaches to the auxiliary-field question, e.g., the recent [19, 20], but otherwise made quite small progress toward the problem itself.

The inevitable enantiodromia of science meant that 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity's favor as a realistic model of physics proved ephemeral, as it lost to the über-popular string theory,⁴ but question 1.1 has taken a life of its own in this new context [45] as 11D supergravity has become recognized as the low-energy limit of M-theory [59]. Recently, the authors of [19] posited that the aforementioned superspace formulations of 11D supergravity are analogous to Einstein's "happiest thought" [34]. It was found that a scalar superfield in 11D superspace contains the conformal graviton at its sixteenth level. In other words, this superfield could act as the supergravity prepotential leading to a solution to the problem of formulating $\mathcal{N} = 1$, 11D supergravity such that it closes without the application of Bianchi identities (and the dynamics of the multiplet). This scalar superfield places an upper bound on the number of component fields required, viz., the maximum number of bosonic plus fermionic degrees is capped at 4,294,967,296. However, without more results on the identification of the number of these that remain in a Wess-Zumino gauge, a minimal number remains unknown. It was argued in [19], particularly from this superfield perspective, that a solution to the overall problem of closing the algebra without Bianchi identities/dynamics would mark the end of the higher-dimensional supersymmetric analogue of the race to find relativity. Needless to say, then, a solution of question 1.1 would be quite a tantalizing prospect. However, the problem has proven intractable, largely because the method used to construct off-shell 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity [5] employed an existing off-shell 4D non-abelian vector multiplet, and no analogue is known for dimension greater than six [19].

Clearly, the problem of introducing auxiliary fields to produce an off-shell multiplet is intimately tied to the non-closure functions of the on-shell multiplet. This is seen most starkly in connection with the generalization of question 1.1, concerning whether for a given on-shell supermultiplet, the addition of auxiliary fields could necessarily ever produce an off-shell supermultiplet. Known as the off-shell SUSY problem and dubbed supersymmetry's fundamental challenge by the first author in [26], this more general question has also proven refractory to classical methods.⁵ One of the quintessential instances indicating that some on-shell multiplets may have no off-shell form is the 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ double-tensor multiplet [54]. The key feature which imparts this multiplet its infamously pathological nature is its unique non-closure structure, with bosonic non-closure functions, since there is no precedent for adding auxiliary fields to eliminate bosonic equation-of-motion terms in

⁴ However, the question of whether 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity is ultraviolet finite is still very much of research interest, with remarkable results in recent years. See, for instance, [2–4].

⁵ Evidently, the off-shell problem makes it a priori unclear whether any auxiliary fields could create an off-shell 11D supergravity, but we have elected to phrase question 1.1 optimistically.

$\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry. Hence, we see that a peculiar facet of the non-closure functions effects peculiar behavior obstructing a solution to the off-shell problem.

Meditating on this relation, one must expect that the array of non-closure functions associated with a multiplet, referred to as the “non-closure geometry” of the multiplet [25], could provide a guide for *constructing* a solution to the off-shell problem. At the very least, it could tell us whether we should expect pathological behavior like in the double-tensor multiplet. Before any such effort can be accomplished, however, one must *have* the non-closure geometry at hand. It is in this respect that the non-closure geometry of the 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity multiplet is a crucial addition to the literature on question 1.1. Our hope is that computing a non-closure geometry for 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity can set vital groundwork for a constructive treatment of the off-shell 11D supergravity problem by offering a thorough record of the dynamics which must be supplanted by auxiliary fields.

In this paper, we calculate the non-closure geometry for 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity in the form studied in [25], obtaining in our view the most explicit and concrete results on the non-closure functions yet available. In order to study non-closure geometry in the manner of [25], we recast the multiplet in the following form akin to that of on-shell 4D supergravity as formulated in that paper.

Definition 1.2. The 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ *supergravity multiplet* consists of a symmetric boson field h_{ab} – the “graviton” – a fermion field Ψ_a^α – the “gravitino” – and an antisymmetric 3-tensor boson field A_{abc} – the “three-form” (or “3-form”). The action of the supercovariant derivative (i.e., the linearized set of supersymmetry transformation rules) is given as follows.

$$D_\alpha h_{ab} = u \left(\gamma_{(a} \right)_{\alpha\beta} \Psi_{b)}^\beta \quad (1.1.1a)$$

$$D_\alpha \Psi_b^\beta = v \omega_{bde} \left(\gamma^{de} \right)_\alpha{}^\beta + x \left(\gamma_b \gamma^{cdef} \right)_\alpha{}^\beta \partial_c A_{def} + y \left(\gamma^{cdef} \gamma_b \right)_\alpha{}^\beta \partial_c A_{def} \quad (1.1.1b)$$

$$D_\alpha A_{bcd} = z \left(\gamma_{[bc} \right)_{\alpha\beta} \Psi_{d]}^\beta \quad (1.1.1c)$$

One can check that these rules follow from index, symmetry, and engineering dimension considerations. Here, D_α is the supercovariant derivative which effects the supersymmetry transformation, u, v, x, y, z are a priori unknown parameters,

$$\omega_{abc} = \frac{1}{2} (c_{abc} - c_{acb} - c_{bca}) \quad (1.1.2)$$

is the spin connection, and

$$c_{abc} = \partial_a h_{bc} - \partial_b h_{ac} \quad (1.1.3)$$

is the anholonomy. The corresponding (free-field) action takes the form

$$S = \ell \int d^{11}x \left[-\frac{1}{4} c^{abc} c_{abc} + \frac{1}{2} c^{abc} c_{cab} + (c^a{}_b{}^b)^2 \right] + \frac{m}{12} \int d^{11}x \Psi_a^\alpha \left(\gamma^{abc} \right)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b \Psi_c^\beta \\ + \frac{n}{48} \int d^{11}x \left[\partial_{[a} A_{bcd]} \right] \left[\partial^{[a} A^{bcd]} \right], \quad (1.1.4)$$

where the first term (expressed quadratically using the anholonomy) corresponds to the graviton, the second to the gravitino, and the third to the three-form. Here, ℓ, m, n are again a priori unknown parameters.

We will achieve several accomplishments with respect to this formulation of 11D supergravity. First, we use constraints from Fierz expansions of the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to each field, as well as from supersymmetry invariance (SUSY-invariance) of the action, to derive exact values for all of the coefficients $u, v, x, y, z, \ell, m, n$ in the supersymmetry rules and the action, completing this formulation of the multiplet along the lines of [25]. Second, we use the values of these coefficients to obtain formulas for the terms of the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to each field in terms of the usual translation as well as gauge transformations and equation-of-motion terms. These equation-of-motion terms form our non-closure geometry. Third, as an extra upshot of deriving this form for the 11D supergravity multiplet, we answer another question on holoraumy.

Holoraumy was introduced in [24] as an analogue of holonomy, in the sense that holoraumy is related to the commutator of supercovariant derivatives in a manner similar to the way that holonomy is related to the commutator of covariant derivatives. This will behave differently on the bosonic fields than on the fermionic fields, giving bosonic holoraumy and fermionic holoraumy. The principal achievement of [24] was establishing holoraumy as an empirically holography-related tensor, since for a variety of off-shell 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ multiplets, it was shown that the holoraumy associated with the 1D, $\mathcal{N} = 4$ adinkras obtained by dimensional reduction carried manifestations of 3D spatial rotations and extended R -symmetry. More recently, it was discovered in [25] that when extended to the on-shell variants of the multiplets, the holoraumy featured a natural rotational symmetry similar to the Maxwellian symmetry between the electric and magnetic fields, which even reduced to the relativistic form of this symmetry in the case of the $\mathcal{N} = 1$, 4D vector (i.e., gauge) multiplet. These so-called electromagnetic-duality rotations elicit the fanciful idea that the on-shell holoraumy carries all information about canonical symmetries between the fields of a multiplet. However, it was recently shown that the rotations are not present in the holoraumy for $\mathcal{N} = 1$, 10D super Maxwell theory [18]. Hence, a natural question to ask is the following.

Question 1.3. Does the holoraumy for linearized 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity carry electromagnetic-duality rotations?

In this paper, using our form (1.1.1) for 11D supergravity with the parameters solved, we derive explicit forms for the bosonic and fermionic holoraumy for 11D supergravity. Furthermore, we answer question 1.3 in the negative, i.e., 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity does not carry electromagnetic-duality rotations in its holoraumy analogous to the symmetries found in 4D multiplets in [25].

Effectively, then, the goal of this work is to extend the computations of [25] to 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity. The especially compelling feature of the results which this paper intends to promulgate are the brand new symbolic algebra techniques we develop for solving computations in the vein of [25] automatically. By now, a particular ubiquitous workflow has become conventional after it was related repeatedly in the supersymmetry genomics project [8, 16, 17, 38]. Specifically, one can arduously grind through myriad Fierz expansion computations, heavy in tensor-spinor arithmetic, to verify closure of a superalgebra or solve for parameters like u, v, x, y, z in (1.1.1) which render it closed, and then isolate the supercurrent to verify SUSY-invariance of the action or solve for parameters like ℓ, m, n in (1.1.4) which render it SUSY-invariant. Once this is accomplished, i.e., we have a verified supersymmetric theory in the formalism of the genomics project, then properties like

adinkras and off-shell holoraumy can be computed. However, when attempting to apply the same hand-computation methods to 11D supergravity, one quickly finds the effort abortive as the tensor arithmetic rapidly grows unwieldy, e.g., with Fierz expansions of unprecedented size and complexity. Our solution, as depicted in the following pages, has been to develop software which solves these problems by computer, leveraging algorithms which reduce the number of independent Fierz expansions that must be computed and eliminate the need to explicitly calculate a supercurrent, among other efficiency boosts.

It is a particularly auspicious time to create such a suite of tools, as tensor arithmetic software has become increasingly sophisticated. For Clifford algebra arithmetic, particularly notable pieces of software are (in roughly chronological order) GAMMA [28], Cadabra [47], Redberry [52], GammaMaP [36], and FieldsX [14], the combination of which have successfully relegated multiplication of gamma matrices and arithmetic of spinor bilinears to the computer. At the same time, computations of genomics-related features like adinkras and off-shell holoraumy, which are completed after a supermultiplet has been calculated, have been automated in Adinkra.m [38]. However, to our knowledge, no software currently exists bridging the gap between these two computational advancements, namely, solving for a supermultiplet itself. That is, there exists no computational tool which can take a set of transformation rules like (1.1.1) and an action like (1.1.4) which are obtained from physical considerations but have unknown parameters, and leverage tensor symbolic algebra to solve for the unknown parameters and give an explicit multiplet which can then undergo further analysis of adinkras and holoraumy. We dub this computation of the unknown coefficients in the supersymmetry transformation rules and action “solving the multiplet.”

We have elected to build our software on top of Cadabra, since Cadabra enables interacting with a Clifford algebra without attention to underlying differential-geometric considerations, and because our own algorithms are founded on similar tensor canonicalization principles. One of our principal contributions here has been the development of a robust procedure for automatically canonicalizing tensor-spinor expressions, augmenting existing algorithms which effectively only treat canonicalization of pure Lorentz-tensor arithmetic. This point merits a bit of clarification: by tensor-spinor canonicalization, we do not mean the mere sorting of spinor indices on a tensor via the exploitation of the tensor’s symmetries, which functions the same whether the indices are vectorial or spinorial. Rather, we refer to the correct manipulation of NW-SE convention, the spinor metric, and previously untreated dimension-specific dualities of spinor-indexed expressions to bring a complicated multi-factor expression with tensor-spinors expressed using spinor-indices (rather than spinor bilinears), as is ubiquitous in the genomics papers and subsequent work, to a standard (i.e., canonical) simplified form, a distinct task and one very much necessary to develop symbolic algebra implementations of genomics-type computations. Our algorithms are expressly flexible, with the ultimate software enabling the user to define a symbolic algebra workspace adapted to the dimension of interest (11D or any other, with automatically implemented changes to dimension-specific identities and traces) and even to the particular choice of Clifford algebra representation (where appropriate). Importantly, matrix representations of tensors are not used at all in our system. With the help of symbolic algebra systems like Cadabra, we can treat all tensor-spinor arithmetic completely symbolically.

Building on this improved tensor-spinor arithmetic, we have developed the following tools. First,

we have created algorithms which systematically calculate Fierz expansions, even when the expressions involve multiple terms or two of the spinor indices are unknown. Both of these are advantages not available in any previous Fierz-identity calculator, and they become necessary in order for a computer without the cunning of sentience to handle an arbitrary inputted multiplet automatically. Second, we have written algorithms which employ different procedures, from gamma-matrix splitting to Feynman propagator substitutions, to solve a wide class of multiplets, both off-shell and on-shell. To prove their accuracy and validity beyond doubt, we have demonstrated their application broadly on numerous cases in the literature (in 4D), showing that they rapidly solve all of the multiplets in [25]. Third, we show that the same techniques used for the multiplet-solvers can be tweaked to automatically produce on-shell holonomy results for an inputted multiplet. Our solution of the multiplet (1.1.1), the non-closure geometry computations on which this paper is centered, and the holonomy computations leading to a solution of question 1.3 are all derived via application of these new tools.

The plan of the rest of the paper is as follows. In the remainder of this introduction, we review the specifics of our tensor-spinor formalism, superalgebra closure and the off-shell SUSY problem, the electromagnetic-duality rotations in holonomy, and the physics behind our action (1.1.4). Then, we give a detailed overview of the results of our paper. The second chapter is devoted to the derivation of the constraints on the six parameters u, v, x, y, z in (1.1.1) that arise in order that each field satisfies the SUSY algebra up to terms involving equations of motion. We first provide the simplest computational generation of these constraints before detailing a more explicit derivation which aids in later establishing the non-closure functions. The third chapter is devoted to the derivation of constraints on the parameters u, v, x, y, z as well as the three parameters ℓ, m, n that arise from the SUSY-invariance condition on the action. Once again, we first provide the simplest computational generation of these constraints before detailing a more explicit derivation. We then solve the array of constraints to get our final form for the 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity multiplet, the associated action, and finally the desired non-closure geometry. The fourth chapter is devoted to the derivation of the on-shell bosonic and fermionic holonomy for 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity. In this chapter, we explain in detail the absence of any electromagnetic-duality rotation in 11D supergravity, answering question 1.3 in the negative. Finally, the fifth chapter is devoted to an exposition of the algorithms employed in the earlier sections, accompanied by examples of the procedures reproducing results from the supersymmetry/supergravity literature, both to indicate certain boundaries of the scope of the algorithms but also to demonstrate their wide applicability and prove to the reader their consistent validity.

1.2 Review of Prior Work

1.2.1 Review of the Tensor-Spinor Formalism

We briefly review here the notion of gamma matrices as spinor-indexed expressions to fix the formalism on which our symbolic algebra is founded. We employ a seldom-mentioned approach to gamma matrices, namely, that the basic gamma matrices $(\gamma_a)_\alpha^\beta$ can be regarded as mixed third-order tensors in a space where one group – the Lorentz-group – is realised on the Lorentz index a and a second group – the spin group – is realized on the spinor indices α and β . Here, a “down” index is covariant and an “up” index is contravariant (in the traditional language of tensor analysis),

so a is covariant with respect to the Lorentz-group, α is covariant with respect to the spin group, and β is contravariant with respect to the spin group. Similarly, all products of gamma matrices can be regarded as mixed (1,1)-tensors with respect to the spin group, but higher-order with respect to the Lorentz-group. Crucially, all calculations can be made using only tensorial manipulations without reference to the actual numerical entries of all of these mixed-order tensors, until traces must be evaluated. This is the fundamental degree of abstractness which makes this approach so computationally useful in the genomics project and which makes it ripe for symbolic arithmetic, bypassing the slog of explicit values, matrix representations, or associated differential geometry.

1.2.2 Review of Superalgebra Closure

Since a principal goal of this work is the computation of the non-closure functions for the multiplet (1.1.1), we review here the definition of superalgebra closure to fix the lexicon which we will use throughout much of the paper and which will be programmatically incarnated in §5. "Closure of the algebra" refers to a particular relation between different transformations which act on a given multiplet's fields. These transformations include supersymmetry transformations, translations, gauge transformations, and equation-of-motion terms. The condition of closure is that the anticommutator of supersymmetry transformations be a specific translation up to specified other transformations, viz.,⁶

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} = c \cdot i (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a + \text{other terms}, \quad (1.2.1)$$

where the "other terms" generally vary with the field to which the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives⁷ is applied. If the field to which the supercovariant-derivative anticommutator is applied is a gauge field, these "other terms" will generally include gauge terms, which can be identified by the presence of a free index on the partial derivative in the term. The presence of non-gauge additional terms depends on whether the multiplet is on- or off-shell. As summarized in [26], if the multiplet is off-shell, then the extra terms must only include gauge transformations, but if the multiplet is on-shell, then the extra terms may also include terms arising from the equations of motion of the field.⁸ For example, in the 4D chiral multiplet (i.e., the original Wess-Zumino theory of [57] in modern multiplet garb), it can be verified that off-shell, the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the spinor fermion gives ((3) of [16])

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} \Psi_\gamma = 2i (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \Psi_\gamma, \quad (1.2.2)$$

while on-shell, the same computation gives ((5) of [16] and (3.6), (3.8) of [25])

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} \Psi_\gamma = 2i (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \Psi_\gamma - i (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a \gamma^b)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_b \Psi_\eta, \quad (1.2.3)$$

⁶ The coefficient of the translation varies with convention and dimension. In 4D multiplets, it is typical to choose $c = 2$, while in 11D, we take $c = 1$.

⁷ We occasionally refer to the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to a field as the "closure."

⁸ It is perhaps more sound to frame this in the opposite way, namely, that if non-closure terms exist in the anticommutator of supersymmetry transformations, then the requirement that they identically vanish imposes equations of motion on the field, rendering the theory on-shell. These equation-of-motion terms are occasionally referred to as "central charges," as in [25], reflecting in spirit the additional possible transformations proven (originally in 4D) permissible in [31]. However, often in the literature, the term "central charge" is reserved for non-closure terms involving fields other than the field on which the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives is being calculated. Hence, to eliminate any ambiguity, we simply refer to these non-closure terms as "equation-of-motion terms."

where the second term is an equation-of-motion term. It is crucial to recognize that this ostensible discrepancy between on- and off-shell closure conditions does not reflect that the off-shell condition is more stringent, i.e., that off-shell multiplets are required to have coefficients which make equation-of-motion terms vanish even if they do not vanish identically via equations of motion. Rather, the presence of auxiliary fields does away with equation-of-motion terms automatically, a fact which enables the solvers of §5 to handle both on- and off-shell multiplets with the same procedure. The off-shell SUSY problem, which is the focus of [26], is the problem of whether on-shell multiplets can always be made off-shell, i.e., of whether equation-of-motion terms in the closure may be eliminated by adjoining a finite number of auxiliary fields, and remains open.

The characterization provided above of equation-of-motion terms as terms arising from equations of motion is somewhat nebulous and merits further explanation. In the case of fermions, equations of motion are first-order, the same order as terms in the closure. Hence, on fermions, equation-of-motion terms are precisely terms which vanish under the equations of motion. Indeed, in the chiral multiplet example, the equation-of-motion term in the on-shell fermionic closure vanishes under the Dirac equation, viz.,

$$(\gamma^b)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_b \Psi_\eta = 0. \quad (1.2.4)$$

We dub such non-closure terms which vanish under the equations of motion “off-shell equation-of-motion terms.”⁹ In contrast, in the case of bosons, equations of motion are second-order, higher-order than the terms in the closure. Hence, any non-closure terms in the boson cannot vanish under the equations of motion, and are called “on-shell equation-of-motion terms.”¹⁰ The only example in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry is the pathological 4D double tensor multiplet, which has on-shell equation-of-motion terms in the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to either rank-2 antisymmetric tensor boson ((16) of [16]). These can still be interpreted as equation-of-motion terms, since the terms to which they give rise in the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the field strength of the bosons are second-order and vanish under the equations of motion (§3 of [54]). We will see that the non-closure functions for 11D supergravity are all off-shell equation-of-motion terms.

1.2.3 Review of Electromagnetic-Duality Rotations in Holoraumy

Since another goal of the present paper is to answer question 1.3, we review here the precise definition and motivation for holoraumy and the various different forms in which electromagnetic-duality rotations appeared phenomenologically in 4D multiplets. The holoraumy tensors are inspired by the properties of ordinary covariant derivatives ∇_a , and in particular, the fact

$$[\nabla_a, \nabla_b] = T_{ab}{}^c \nabla_c + \hat{R}_{ab}, \quad (1.2.5)$$

where $T_{ab}{}^c$ is the torsion and \hat{R}_{ab} is the curvature. When applied to a tangent vector, the curvature gives the holonomy. Analogously, the holoraumy is defined as the commutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to a field. More specifically, for a field A_E , where E is the set of indices carried

⁹ In [25], such terms are referred to as “off-shell central charges.”

¹⁰ The terminology refers to the fact that off-shell equation-of-motion terms can generally be eliminated by adjoining standard auxiliary fields, while it is unclear whether on-shell equation-of-motion terms can be eliminated in such a manner, giving rise to the off-shell SUSY problem.

by A , the holoraumy $\mathcal{H}_{F\alpha\beta}$ is defined in [24] by

$$[D_\alpha, D_\beta]A_E = -2i\mathcal{H}^{aG}_{E\alpha\beta}\partial_a A_G, \quad (1.2.6)$$

where $F = \{a\} \cup G \cup E$. Formally, there are two holoraumy tensors for a multiplet, a bosonic holoraumy tensor and a fermionic holoraumy tensor, each defined per the equation above but for the column vector of bosons or fermions, respectively. Due to the difficulty in handling this definition when different fields are represented by tensors of different rank, holoraumy is often taken simply to be collectively the commutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the various fields, as in for example [18]. This is the convention we use here. It turns out that the holoraumy tensors play a role in SUSY holography: in [24], it is shown that the holoraumy of the 1D, $\mathcal{N} = 4$ multiplet which arises by dimensional reduction of a 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ multiplet carries information of the latter, particularly the 3D spatial symmetries and R-symmetry.

In [25], it was discovered that the presence of a rotation reminiscent of the classical electromagnetic rotation-invariance of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \vec{E}' \\ \vec{B}' \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\theta) & -\sin(\theta) \\ \sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \vec{E} \\ \vec{B} \end{bmatrix} \quad (1.2.7)$$

was present (with $\theta = \pi/2$) ubiquitously in on-shell 4D multiplets, specifically the $\mathcal{N} = 1$, 4D chiral, vector, axial-vector, matter-gravitino, supergravity, and tensor/axial-tensor multiplets. The most relevant example for us is the on-shell 4D tensor/axial-tensor multiplet.¹¹

$$D_\alpha \varphi = \chi_\alpha \quad (1.2.8a)$$

$$D_\alpha B_{ab} = -\frac{1}{2}(\gamma_{ab})_\alpha{}^\beta \chi_\beta \quad (1.2.8b)$$

$$D_\alpha \chi_\beta = i(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \varphi - (\gamma_* \gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \epsilon_a{}^{bcd} \partial_b B_{cd}. \quad (1.2.8c)$$

It was shown in [25] that

$$[D_\alpha, D_\beta]\varphi = -2(\gamma_* \gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \epsilon_a{}^{bcd} \partial_b B_{cd} \quad (1.2.9a)$$

$$[D_\alpha, D_\beta]B_{ab} = \epsilon_{abcd}(\gamma_* \gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} \partial^d \varphi + (\gamma_* \gamma_{[a})_{\alpha\beta} \epsilon_{b]cde} \partial^c B^{de} \quad (1.2.9b)$$

$$[D_\alpha, D_\beta]\chi_\gamma = 2i(\gamma_* \gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_*)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_a \chi_\eta - \mathcal{Z}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^{(TS)}, \quad (1.2.9c)$$

where

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^{(TS)} = 2i \left\{ -C_{\alpha\beta} \delta_\gamma{}^\eta + (\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_*)_\gamma{}^\eta \right\} (\gamma^a)_\eta{}^\rho \partial_a \chi_\rho \quad (1.2.10)$$

is an off-shell equation-of-motion term which vanishes under the Dirac equation (1.2.4).

The observed rotation occurred in four fashions. The first form of the rotation was the consistent appearance of $i(\gamma_* \gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta}$ in each term of the holoraumy besides gauge and equation-of-motion terms, as seen in (1.2.9). This was interpreted as an angle- $\pi/2$ rotation of gamma matrices exchanging

¹¹ Here, γ_* is the highest-rank element in the Clifford algebra, denoted γ^5 in [25].

the $(\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta}$ in the closure (1.2.1) with $i(\gamma_*\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta}$ in the holoraumy. That is, the transition of the (α, β) -gamma matrix from closure to holoraumy was seen as the transformation

$$\begin{bmatrix} (\gamma^b)' \\ (i\gamma_*\gamma^b)' \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\frac{\pi}{2}) & -\sin(\frac{\pi}{2}) \\ \sin(\frac{\pi}{2}) & \cos(\frac{\pi}{2}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \gamma^b \\ i\gamma_*\gamma^b \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1.2.11)$$

The second incarnation of the rotation was as a transformation between bosons in multiplets. For example, if one dualizes the tensor field in (1.2.9b), then the first term becomes

$$[D_\alpha, D_\beta]\epsilon^{abef}B_{ab} = -2\delta_c^{[e}\delta_d^{f]}(\gamma_*\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta}\partial^d\varphi = -2(\gamma_*\gamma^{[e})_{\alpha\beta}\partial^{d]}\varphi, \quad (1.2.12)$$

a form paralleling (1.2.9a), which involves the dualized gradient of the tensor field. Ignoring the second term in (1.2.9b), this was interpreted as the transformation

$$\begin{bmatrix} (\partial_a\varphi)' \\ \epsilon_{abcd}(\partial^b B^{cd})' \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\frac{\pi}{2}) & -\sin(\frac{\pi}{2}) \\ \sin(\frac{\pi}{2}) & \cos(\frac{\pi}{2}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \partial_a\varphi \\ \epsilon_{abcd}\partial^b B^{cd} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1.2.13)$$

Notice the importance here of the fact that the gradient of the tensor field can be dualized to give a tensor of the same rank as the gradient of the scalar field, putting the two on the same footing and making it possible to consider a transformation of this type. The third form of the rotation was a relativistic fashion for vector fields in multiplets with only one boson, where it was observed that the holoraumy of the vector field was proportional to the signature factor $i(\gamma_*\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta}$ multiplied by the dual of the field strength; this was viewed as a rotation between the ordinary and dual field strengths. The fourth and final incarnation was the consistent appearance of the factor $(\gamma_*)_\gamma^\eta$ in each fermionic holoraumy term besides the gauge and equation-of-motion terms, as seen in (1.2.9c). This was interpreted as a transformation

$$\begin{bmatrix} (\chi_\alpha)' \\ [(\gamma_*)_\gamma^\eta\chi_\beta]' \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\frac{\pi}{2}) & -\sin(\frac{\pi}{2}) \\ \sin(\frac{\pi}{2}) & \cos(\frac{\pi}{2}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \chi_\alpha \\ (\gamma_*)_\gamma^\eta\chi_\beta \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1.2.14)$$

In [18], it was discovered that the electromagnetic-duality rotation was absent in the $\mathcal{N} = 1$, 10D super Maxwell multiplet. Since the multiplet had a single vector-field boson, the third form of the rotation was the one for which to look. It turned out that the holoraumy was not proportional to a sigma-matrix¹² multiple of the dual field strength, but rather a sigma-matrix multiple of the field itself. Hence, the ubiquity of the electromagnetic-duality rotation broke down in 10D. In this paper, we show that the $\mathcal{N} = 1$, 11D supergravity multiplet provides another counterexample to the ubiquity of these rotations conjectured in [25].

1.2.4 Review of Superfield Approaches, and the 11D Supergravity Action

Notice that up to a total derivative, the first term (the graviton term) in our action (1.1.4) for $\mathcal{N} = 1$, 11D supergravity is equal to the fully contracted Riemann curvature scalar. This seems

¹²In 10D, the sigma matrices generally offer a more useful representation of the Clifford algebra than the gamma matrices. See the discussion, for example, in [27], as well as in §6.

unnatural, but it follows straightforwardly from superfield considerations surrounding 11D supergravity and question 1.1. We briefly review these superfield considerations here before explaining the source of this action term. In 2020, there was a series of papers [20–23] that identified candidates for the supergravity prepotential superfields for the cases of 10D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$, 10D, $\mathcal{N} = 2A$, 10D, $\mathcal{N} = 2B$, and 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ superspaces. In the last three cases, it was found that the scalar superfields in each of the superspaces contain the conformal graviton representation at the sixteenth level of the traditional θ -expansion of the superfields. If one wishes to include the degrees of freedom associated with the Lorentz-rotations, the simplest way to accomplish this is to introduce a spinorial superfield, \mathcal{U}^α in 11D superspace, which can include all of the graviton at its seventeenth level. This observation yields two immediate directions which are being pursued for the study of the 11D theory.

1. The most natural candidate gauge group associated with \mathcal{U}^α takes the form

$$\delta_G \mathcal{U}^\alpha = (\gamma_{ab})^{\alpha\beta} D_\beta \Lambda^{ab} + (\gamma_{abcde})^{\alpha\beta} D_\beta \Lambda^{abcde} + \dots, \quad (1.2.15)$$

in terms of gauge parameter superfields Λ^{ab} and Λ^{abcde} , while the terms in the ellipsis have yet to be determined.

2. Under this assumption, the semi-prepotential superfield Ψ introduced in [19] can be expressed in the form

$$\Psi = [D^{(16)}] [D_\alpha \mathcal{U}^\alpha], \quad (1.2.16)$$

as the quantity on the RHS of (1.2.16) is invariant under the variation described by (1.2.15).

The papers [20–23] also inform us that the superfield that contains the component conformal graviton at its lowest level in terms of the θ -expansion can be expressed in the form

$$h_{ab} = [D^{(16)}_{ab}] [D_\alpha \mathcal{U}^\alpha], \quad (1.2.17)$$

for some operator $[D^{(16)}_{ab}]$ whose explicit form is currently unknown.

Now, let us return to consideration of the action. The experience and insight from the work of [53] points to a little-known and often overlooked fact. Specifically, the 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ analogue of the 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity superfield \mathcal{U}^α is not a spinor, but a bosonic vector superfield \mathcal{U}^a , and when one calculates the determinant of the supervielbein, the graviton portion of the action is exactly the three-term integrand seen in the first term of (1.1.4). The reason for this is that \mathcal{U}^a does not contain a field that corresponds to the spin-connection. Incidentally, later study of the 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 2$ case showed the same fact [1, 30], and it seems reasonable to conjecture that all minimal and irreducible higher-dimensional superfield supergravity (SFSG) theories follow this observation with regards to their SFSG prepotential, as the latter must be embedded in the former.

1.3 Detailed Overview of Physical Results

1.3.1 The Solved 11D Supergravity Multiplet

In §2, §3, and Appendix C.4, we derive the following system of nonlinear equations for the parameters $u, v, x, y, z, \ell, m, n$ in definition 1.2.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left. \begin{aligned} uv &= -\frac{i}{8} \\ xz &= \frac{i}{96} \\ yz &= -\frac{i}{288} \end{aligned} \right\} \text{from closure of the superalgebra (§2)} \\
& \left. \begin{aligned} \ell u &= \frac{1}{12}mv \\ mx &= 36nz \\ my &= -12nz \end{aligned} \right\} \text{from SUSY-invariance of the action (§3)} \\
& \left. \begin{aligned} \ell &= \frac{1}{4} \\ n &= -\frac{1}{36} \end{aligned} \right\} \text{from normalization of the action (Appendix C.4)} \\
& \left. \begin{aligned} z &= \frac{1}{2} \end{aligned} \right\} \text{from a convenient (but arbitrary) scaling.}
\end{aligned}$$

Directly solving this system shows that the ultimate rules for the supercovariant derivative in our formalism are

$$D_\alpha h_{ab} = (\gamma_{(a})_{\alpha\beta} \Psi_{b)}^\beta \quad (1.3.1a)$$

$$D_\alpha \Psi_b^\beta = -\frac{i}{8} \omega_{bde} (\gamma^{de})_\alpha{}^\beta + \frac{i}{48} (\gamma_b \gamma^{cdef})_\alpha{}^\beta \partial_c A_{def} - \frac{i}{144} (\gamma^{cdef} \gamma_b)_\alpha{}^\beta \partial_c A_{def} \quad (1.3.1b)$$

$$D_\alpha A_{bcd} = \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_{[bc})_{\alpha\beta} \Psi_{d]}^\beta \quad (1.3.1c)$$

and the ultimate action is

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= \frac{1}{4} \int d^{11}x \left[-\frac{1}{4} c^{abc} c_{abc} + \frac{1}{2} c^{abc} c_{cab} + (c^a{}_b{}^b)^2 \right] + 2i \int d^{11}x \Psi_a^\alpha (\gamma^{abc})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b \Psi_c^\beta \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{1728} \int d^{11}x [\partial_{[a} A_{bcd}] [\partial^{[a} A^{bcd}]] .
\end{aligned} \quad (1.3.2)$$

1.3.2 Non-Closure Geometry of 11D Supergravity

Using closure computations from §2, in §3.4, we show that the solved parameters above yield the following form for the closure, i.e., for the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to each field in the $\mathcal{N} = 1$, 11D supergravity multiplet.

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} h_{ab} = i (\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c h_{ab} - \partial_{(a} \xi_{b)}_{\alpha\beta} \quad (1.3.3a)$$

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} A_{abc} = i (\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d A_{abc} - \partial_{[a} \zeta_{bc]}_{\alpha\beta} \quad (1.3.3b)$$

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} \Psi_a^\gamma = i (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b \Psi_a^\gamma - \partial_a \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma - Z_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma \quad (1.3.3c)$$

The gauge transformations are

$$\xi_{b\alpha\beta} = \frac{i}{2} (\gamma^{[1})_{\alpha\beta} h_{1]b} \quad (1.3.4a)$$

$$\zeta_{bc\alpha\beta} = \frac{i}{2} (\gamma^{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} A_{[1]bc} + \frac{i}{2} (\gamma^{[1]b})_{\alpha\beta} h_{c[1]} \quad (1.3.4b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}{}^\gamma &= \frac{27i}{32} (\gamma^{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} \Psi_{[1]}{}^\gamma - \frac{i}{8} (\gamma_{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} \left(\gamma^{[1][\bar{1}]} \right)_\eta{}^\gamma \Psi_{[\bar{1}]}{}^\eta \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{8} \left(\gamma^{[1][\bar{1}]} \right)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[1]})_\eta{}^\gamma \Psi_{[\bar{1}]}{}^\eta - \frac{3i}{64} (\gamma_{[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[2][1]})_\eta{}^\gamma \Psi_{[1]}{}^\eta \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{768} (\gamma^{[4][1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[4]})_\eta{}^\gamma \Psi_{[1]}{}^\eta. \end{aligned} \quad (1.3.4c)$$

Finally, and most importantly, the only non-closure function is fermionic and consists of the equation-of-motion terms

$$Z_{a\alpha\beta}{}^\gamma = Z_{a\alpha\beta}^{(1)\gamma\zeta} R_\zeta + Z_a^{(2)b}{}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma\zeta} E_{b\zeta}, \quad (1.3.5)$$

where

$$R_\alpha = (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\eta} \partial_b \Psi_c{}^\eta \quad (1.3.6a)$$

$$E_{c\alpha} = (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\eta} \partial_{[b} \Psi_{c]}{}^\eta. \quad (1.3.6b)$$

are forms of the Rarita-Schwinger equation and¹³

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{a\alpha\beta}^{(1)\gamma\zeta} &= \frac{41i}{192} (\gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta} C^{\gamma\zeta} - \frac{5i}{192} (\gamma^{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[1]a})^{\gamma\zeta} \\ &\quad - \frac{29i}{192} (\gamma_{a[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[1]})^{\gamma\zeta} + \frac{7i}{384} (\gamma^{[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[2]a})^{\gamma\zeta} \\ &\quad - \frac{7i}{4608} (\gamma_{a[4]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[4]})^{\gamma\zeta} \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{552960} \epsilon_{a[5][5]} (\gamma^{[5]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[5]})^{\gamma\zeta} \end{aligned} \quad (1.3.7a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z_a^{(2)b}{}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma\zeta} &= \frac{5i}{48} (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a)^{\gamma\zeta} - \frac{3i}{8} (\gamma^{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[1]})^{\gamma\zeta} \delta_a{}^b \\ &\quad - \frac{19i}{48} (\gamma_a{}^b)_{\alpha\beta} C^{\gamma\zeta} + \frac{i}{24} (\gamma^{[1]b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[1]})^{\gamma\zeta} \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{32} (\gamma^{[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[2]})^{\gamma\zeta} \delta_a{}^b + \frac{i}{144} (\gamma_a{}^{b[3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[3]})^{\gamma\zeta} \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{1152} (\gamma^{[4]b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[4]})^{\gamma\zeta}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.3.7b)$$

1.3.3 Holoraumy of 11D Supergravity

Finally, in §4, we compute the holoraumy (the commutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to each field) of $\mathcal{N} = 1$, 11D supergravity, finding the bosonic holoraumy to be

$$\begin{aligned} [D_\alpha, D_\beta] h_{ab} &= -\frac{i}{4} (\gamma^{[1][2]}{}_{(a|})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{[1]} A_{|b)[2]} + \frac{i}{18} \eta_{ab} (\gamma^{[1][3]})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{[1]} A_{[3]} \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{2} \left(\gamma^{[1][\bar{1}]}{}_{(a|})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{[1]} h_{|b)[\bar{1}]} - \partial_{(a} \xi'_{b)\alpha\beta} \right. \end{aligned} \quad (1.3.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} [D_\alpha, D_\beta] A_{abc} &= \frac{i}{4} \left(\gamma^{[1][\bar{1}]}{}_{[ab]} \right)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{[1]} h_{|c][\bar{1}]} + \frac{i}{4} \left(\gamma^{[1][\bar{1}]}{}_{[a|})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{[1]} A_{|bc][\bar{1}]} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{i}{288} \epsilon_{abc}{}^{[4][1][3]} (\gamma_{[4]})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{[1]} A_{[3]} - \partial_{[a} \xi'_{bc]\alpha\beta} \right. \end{aligned} \quad (1.3.9)$$

¹³Here, $C_{\alpha\beta}$ is the spinor metric, i.e., the charge-conjugation matrix expressed with spinor indices. Note that $C_\alpha{}^\beta = \delta_\alpha{}^\beta$.

and the fermionic holoraumy to be

$$\begin{aligned}
[D_\alpha, D_\beta] \Psi_a^\gamma &= \frac{i}{2} \left(\gamma_a^{[1][\bar{1}]} \right)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{[1]} \Psi_{[\bar{1}]}^\gamma + \frac{i}{3} \left(\gamma_a^{[1][\bar{1}][\bar{1}]} \right)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[1]})_\eta{}^\gamma \partial_{[\bar{1}]} \Psi_{[\bar{1}]}^\eta \\
&+ \frac{i}{8} (\gamma^{[2][1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[2]})_\eta{}^\gamma \partial_{[1]} \Psi_a^\eta + \frac{i}{12} \left(\gamma^{[2][1][\bar{1}]} \right)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[2]})_\eta{}^\gamma \partial_{[1]} \Psi_{[\bar{1}]}^\eta \\
&+ \frac{i}{24} (\gamma^{[3][1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[3]})_\eta{}^\gamma \partial_{[1]} \Psi_a^\eta - \partial_a \epsilon'_{\alpha\beta}{}^\gamma - \mathcal{Z}_{a\alpha\beta}{}^\gamma.
\end{aligned} \tag{1.3.10}$$

The gauge transformations are

$$\xi'_{b\alpha\beta} = \frac{i}{12} (\gamma_b^{[3]})_{\alpha\beta} A_{[3]} \tag{1.3.11}$$

$$\zeta'_{bc\alpha\beta} = \frac{i}{4} (\gamma^{[2]}_b)_{\alpha\beta} A_{c[2]} \tag{1.3.12}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon'_{\alpha\beta}{}^\gamma &= -\frac{5i}{32} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[1]})_\eta{}^\gamma \Psi_{[1]}^\eta + \frac{5i}{64} (\gamma^{[2][1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[2]})_\eta{}^\gamma \Psi_{[1]}^\eta \\
&- \frac{i}{96} (\gamma_{[3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[3][1]})_\eta{}^\gamma \Psi_{[1]}^\eta + \frac{i}{32} (\gamma^{[3][1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[3]})_\eta{}^\gamma \Psi_{[1]}^\eta \\
&- \frac{i}{768} (\gamma_{[4]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[4][1]})_\eta{}^\gamma \Psi_{[1]}^\eta.
\end{aligned} \tag{1.3.13}$$

Finally, the off-shell equation-of-motion terms are

$$\mathcal{Z}_{a\alpha\beta}{}^\gamma = \mathcal{Z}_{a\alpha\beta}^{(1)\gamma\zeta} R_\zeta + \mathcal{Z}_a^{(2)b}{}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma\zeta} E_{b\zeta}, \tag{1.3.14}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Z}_{a\alpha\beta}^{(1)\gamma\zeta} &= \frac{3i}{64} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a)^{\gamma\zeta} - \frac{3i}{128} (\gamma_{a[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[2]})^{\gamma\zeta} \\
&- \frac{i}{384} (\gamma^{[3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[3]a})^{\gamma\zeta} + \frac{5i}{1152} (\gamma_{a[3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[3]})^{\gamma\zeta} \\
&- \frac{7i}{4608} (\gamma^{[4]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[4]a})^{\gamma\zeta}
\end{aligned} \tag{1.3.15}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Z}_a^{(2)b}{}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma\zeta} &= \frac{i}{4} C_{\alpha\beta} C^{\gamma\zeta} \delta_a{}^b + \frac{i}{6} (\gamma_a{}^{b[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[1]})^{\gamma\zeta} \\
&+ \frac{i}{96} (\gamma^{[2]b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[2]})^{\gamma\zeta} + \frac{5i}{96} (\gamma_a{}^{b[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[2]})^{\gamma\zeta} \\
&- \frac{i}{72} (\gamma^{[3]b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[3]})^{\gamma\zeta} - \frac{i}{192} (\gamma^{[4]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[4]})^{\gamma\zeta} \delta_a{}^b \\
&+ \frac{i}{96} (\gamma^{[3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[3]})^{\gamma\zeta} \delta_a{}^b.
\end{aligned} \tag{1.3.16}$$

Examination of the structure of this holoraumy in §4.3 reveals no analogue to the electromagnetic-duality rotations of [25], answering question 1.3 in the negative.

1.4 Detailed Overview of Symbolic Algebra Methods

1.4.1 Algebra of Spinor-Indexed Expressions

In order to build a system capable of solving a multiplet, in the sense of finding the complex coefficients of supersymmetry transformation rules and an associated action, one must start with

procedures capable of systematically simplifying spinor-indexed expressions and resolving decomposition tasks in a Clifford algebra representation. One certainly expects, then, that the system should be able to determine that in 11D, $C_{\eta\rho}(\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta}C^{\gamma\beta}(\gamma_{cd})^\alpha{}_\gamma(\gamma^{cd})^\rho{}_\sigma$ can be simplified to $64(\gamma^{ab})_{\eta\sigma}$. This represents a significant extension of Cadabra's tensor arithmetic. In particular, Cadabra includes multiplication for gamma matrices without spinor indices, as well as an ability to distinguish a set of indices nominally as "spinorial" and manually impart, to a given tensor, symmetries with respect to this set. However, Cadabra lacks true arithmetic features, like the spinor metric¹⁴ and NW-SE convention, for tensors equipped with spinor indices. While Cadabra carries arithmetic for spinor bilinears, it is more natural to consider spinor-indexed expressions in the context of genomics-related computations [16], and this formalism has become standard in the works spawning from the supersymmetry genomics project. The first main achievement of the present work with respect to symbolic algebra is the construction of a set of algorithms, which we have implemented in Cadabra, handling this formalism.

Let us break down one view of what the capability of simplifying $C_{\eta\rho}(\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta}C^{\gamma\beta}(\gamma_{cd})^\alpha{}_\gamma(\gamma^{cd})^\rho{}_\sigma$ demands.

1. The system must be able to sort tensor-spinor factors so that factors sharing dummy indices are adjacent, giving $(\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{cd})^\alpha{}_\gamma C^{\gamma\beta}C_{\eta\rho}(\gamma^{cd})^\rho{}_\sigma$.
2. The system must be able to recognize dimension-specific symmetries of gamma matrices and the spinor metric, and employ them to manipulate indices of adjacent factors into NW-SE convention, giving $(\gamma^{ab})^{\beta\alpha}(\gamma_{cd})_\alpha{}^\gamma C_{\gamma\beta}C_\eta{}^\rho(\gamma^{cd})_{\rho\sigma}$.
3. The system must be able to recognize the spinor metric $C_{\alpha\beta}$ and contract it correctly with tensor-spinors, giving $(\gamma^{ab})^{\beta\alpha}(\gamma_{cd})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{cd})_{\eta\sigma}$.
4. The system must be able to recognize $(\gamma^{ab})^{\beta\alpha}(\gamma_{cd})_{\alpha\beta} = -(\gamma^{ab}\gamma_{cd})_\beta{}^\beta$ as an implicit trace and evaluate the factor as $32\delta_{[c}{}^a\delta_{d]}{}^b$, giving $32\delta_{[c}{}^a\delta_{d]}{}^b(\gamma^{cd})_{\eta\sigma}$.

Cadabra can then contract out the Kronecker deltas to yield $64(\gamma^{ab})_{\eta\sigma}$. On top of these requirements, the system must be able to reduce a gamma matrix with more than $\lfloor D/2 \rfloor$ indices into one with at most $\lfloor D/2 \rfloor$ indices, e.g., if gamma matrices with number of indices close to $\lfloor D/2 \rfloor$ are multiplied, and the system must be able to recognize the highest-rank element γ_* in the Clifford algebra for even dimensions.

In the early sections of §5, we develop algorithms accomplishing all of these tasks to create a full-fledged module for arithmetic with spinor-indexed expressions. We detail a procedure that calculates, for any dimension D , the dimension-specific sequence $\{t_r\} \in \{-1, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ [13] which determines the symmetries of gamma matrices, γ_* , and the spinor metric via

$$(\gamma_{a_1 \dots a_r})_{\alpha\beta} = -t_r(\gamma_{a_1 \dots a_r})_{\beta\alpha} \quad (1.4.1a)$$

$$(\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} = -t_{2m}(\gamma_*)_{\beta\alpha} \quad (1.4.1b)$$

$$(\gamma_{a_1 \dots a_r} \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} = -t_0 t_r t_{2m} (-1)^r (\gamma_{a_1 \dots a_r} \gamma_*)_{\beta\alpha} \quad (1.4.1c)$$

¹⁴In particular, Cadabra carries no means for creating an antisymmetric metric.

$$C_{\alpha\beta} = -t_0 C_{\beta\alpha}, \quad (1.4.1d)$$

where $C_{\alpha\beta}$ is a new metric object we introduce into Cadabra. Additional subprocedures that we present recognize implicit traces and leverage Cadabra's pure-Lorentz-tensor arithmetic to evaluate them, and reduce high-indexed gamma matrices via

$$\gamma^{a_1 \dots a_r} = \begin{cases} \pm \frac{i^{m+1}}{(D-r)!} \epsilon^{a_1 \dots a_D} \gamma_{a_D \dots a_{r+1}}, & \text{if } D \text{ is odd and the} \\ & \text{representation is } \pm; \\ (-1)^r \frac{i^{m+1}}{(D-r)!} \epsilon^{a_1 \dots a_D} \gamma_{a_D \dots a_{r+1}} \gamma_*, & \text{if } D \text{ is even.} \end{cases} \quad (1.4.2)$$

Using the above symmetries, we develop a sorting procedure that loops through the factors in a tensor-spinor expression, building a cache of ordered chains, each of which consists of factors for which dummy spinor index pairs and symmetries generated by the $\{t_r\}$ permit symbolic multiplication in accordance with the NW-SE convention;¹⁵ these chains themselves are sorted by lexicographic order of the lexicographically lowest-order index among their first and last spinor indices, giving the expression a canonical form. We develop an additional auxiliary procedure which implements the symbolic spinor-index manipulation necessary to bring the expression into NW-SE convention, taking into account signs from the necessary symmetries and from swapping parities of a dummy-index pair, completing all spinor metric contractions (i.e., actually making the tensor $C_{\alpha\beta}$ a veritable metric), and combining spinor-index brackets (e.g., $(\gamma_a)_\alpha{}^\beta (\gamma_b)_\beta{}^\gamma \mapsto (\gamma_a \gamma_b)_\alpha{}^\gamma$). This ensemble of algorithms is executed by an evaluation procedure which reduces all tensor-spinor expressions into a canonical simplified form, vastly extending Cadabra's pure-Lorentz-tensor arithmetic while maintaining Cadabra's virtue of eschewing any explicit matrix representation. We view this index manipulation as an extension of ordinary canonicalization, and refer to it henceforth as spinor-index canonicalization.

With this spinor-index canonicalization in our armamentarium, we develop algorithms for fundamental decomposition tasks in a Clifford algebra, particularly Fierz identities in the spinor-index formalism. This is essential for handling expressions like the following

$$\begin{aligned} \{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} \Psi_a{}^\gamma &= 2uv(\gamma_{[1})_{\eta(\alpha} (\gamma^{[1c]}_{\beta)}{}^\gamma \partial_c \Psi_a{}^\eta \\ &\quad - 2uv(\gamma_a)_{\eta(\alpha} (\gamma^{bc]}_{\beta)}{}^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_c{}^\eta \\ &\quad + 6z(x+y)(\gamma^{[2]}_{\eta(\alpha} (\gamma^{bc]}_{[2a} \beta)^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_c{}^\eta \\ &\quad + 6z(x-y)(\gamma_{[2])_{\eta(\alpha} (\gamma^{[2c]}_{\beta)}{}^\gamma \partial_{[a} \Psi_{c]}{}^\eta \\ &\quad - 12z(x-y)(\gamma_{[1a})_{\eta(\alpha} (\gamma^{[1bc]}_{\beta)}{}^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_c{}^\eta, \end{aligned} \quad (1.4.3)$$

which we will see needs to be expressed in terms of tensor-spinors of the form $(\cdot)_{\alpha\beta}$ in order to obtain constraints from superalgebra closure. The standard route for handling a Fierz expansion of this magnitude is to individually Fierz-expand the products of spinor-indexed gamma matrices into linear combinations of quadratics in the Clifford algebra basis elements with coefficients in \mathbb{C} (or more

¹⁵ Strictly speaking, NW-SE convention is only necessary if the spinor metric is antisymmetric, i.e., in dimensions with $t_0 = 1$, but there is no error and relatively little computational overhead in forcing NW-SE convention anyway, and the spinor metric is antisymmetric in most dimensions of interest for supersymmetry.

accurately, the complex space spanned by the pure Lorentz tensors), necessitating a multi-term four-index Fierz transformation. We develop an algorithm of complete generality for computing any multi-term four-index Fierz expansion in the formalism of spinor-indexed expressions, broadly extending Cadabra’s own, generally single-term, spinor bilinear Fierz transformation function. We apply this algorithm to produce some quite massive Fierz identities in Appendix B. For the specific purpose of automatically solving a multiplet, we also create a modified algorithm which implements a two-index Fierz expansion, decomposing in one go expressions like the above into linear combinations of simple Clifford algebra basis elements (not quadratics), with coefficients that are arbitrary elements in the Clifford algebra (i.e., tensor-spinors), a dramatically more computationally efficient approach than individually four-index Fierz-expanding the gamma matrix product in each term and combining the terms at the end.

1.4.2 Solving Multiplets using Brute-Force Gamma-Matrix Splitting

In order to treat the problem of solving the 11D supergravity multiplet, or any multiplet, we develop in §5 a new algorithm which isolates all possible nonlinear constraints on the coefficients of supersymmetry transformation rules that can be gleaned by requiring that the algebra close. In principle, this corresponds to the conventional hand-computation approach of computing the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to each field, Fierz-expanding to move the spinor indices of the supercovariant derivatives onto the same gamma matrices, and comparing with (1.2.1), setting the coefficient of the translation equal to $c \cdot i$ and the coefficients of non-gauge and non-equation-of-motion terms equal to 0. The hurdle, both in hand-computation and certainly in a software implementation, is the isolation of on-shell-multiplets’ equation-of-motion terms, which must be ignored when drawing constraints; these terms are also of separate interest for us as part of obtaining the non-closure geometry.¹⁶ The particular novelty of our algorithm is an approach to isolating these terms, and to eliminating these terms in the distillation of nonlinear constraints.

We assume in our algorithm that all equation-of-motion terms are fermionic and that the fermions are symmetric in their Lorentz indices.¹⁷ In this case, we use the fact, derived from [42], that if a fermion has spin $s + 1/2$, then equation-of-motion (sets of) terms are Clifford-algebra multiples of

$$(\gamma^b)_\eta{}^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_{a_1 \dots a_s}{}^\eta - \sum_{i=1}^s (\gamma^b)_\eta{}^\gamma \partial_{a_i} \Psi_{b U_i}{}^\eta, \quad (1.4.4)$$

where $U_i = \{a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_s\}$. Ignoring equation-of-motion terms amounts to introducing an identity setting the above equal to zero. This is difficult for two reasons. First, the problem is somewhat analogous to a multi-term canonicalization problem, a class of problems which is notoriously difficult, effectively requiring (notwithstanding helpful structure) a search through permutations of terms. (See the review in [37].) Second, the above expression will rarely appear in isolation, instead arising contracted with another tensor, or worse still, multiplied by gamma matrices to give a virtually unrecognizable expression.

¹⁶ The gauge terms are identified easily by querying the index on the partial derivative and checking whether it is an element of the set of free Lorentz indices in the expression, so there is hardly a similar issue for these terms.

¹⁷ We are therefore somewhat lucky that 11D supergravity turned out indeed to have only fermionic equation-of-motion terms. Since the gravitino has only a single vector index, symmetry holds vacuously.

We demonstrate that certain properties of the Lorentz-index structure of a term make it a candidate multiple of a single term in the above equation of motion, and this multiple can be factored out *in most cases* by guided gamma-matrix decomposition (i.e., splitting). We show that multiples of the equation of motion are uniquely identified by such Lorentz-index structure of their terms combined with gauge-invariance, enabling a filtration method. In particular, given decomposed terms which have isolated multipliers beside single terms from the equation of motion, we can replace the fermion in the terms with a gauge transformation, and by definition, all of the gauge-invariant true equation-of-motion terms will vanish. A challenge arises because, as we prove, there exist cases in which no substitution can revert the resulting expression back to one in terms of the fermion, but a system of linear equations with Clifford-algebra coefficients enables this reversion. We show that this linear system can be transformed into an augmented matrix with rational entries except for Clifford algebra elements in the last column, a matrix problem that can be solved. The manipulations are easier in momentum-space, so we have also furnished symbolic Fourier and inverse-Fourier transform subprocedures. The final reverted expression has no equation-of-motion terms, so we can apply the naïve off-shell procedure to this expression, yielding the desired constraints. In addition to the constraints, the algorithm outputs the closure structure just before the deletion of equation-of-motion terms, enabling scrutiny for the purpose of discerning the non-closure functions.

This algorithm always either outputs a correct and consistent system of nonlinear equations or an inconsistent system of nonlinear equations. That is, the algorithm never fails in the sense of producing an incorrect set of constraints which can be erroneously solved. The cases in which the procedure outputs inconsistent equations occur because it is not always possible to isolate equation-of-motion terms by decomposition, leading to spurious equations on top of, but not replacing, the correct equations. We show that the algorithm outputs correct constraints for the off-shell $\mathcal{N} = 1$, 4D vector multiplet and the on-shell $\mathcal{N} = 1$, 4D chiral and vector multiplets; this algorithm is used to solve the 11D supergravity multiplet and to aid in computing its non-closure functions.

1.4.3 Solving Multiplets using Feynman Propagator Substitution

In order to broaden the set of multiplets that can be solved algorithmically by our module, we develop a second multiplet-solving algorithm identifying equation-of-motion terms in a much different fashion. In particular, we employ the fact that Feynman propagators are Green's functions for equations of motion. For convenience of use for the forthcoming procedure, we first construct symbolic algebra methods to generate Feynman propagators. We construct a symbolic algebra procedure computing projection operator identities, and then a second procedure using the first to compute both fermionic and bosonic¹⁸ Feynman propagators based on the recursive computation technique in [33, 42]. In addition, we provide a function which outputs the Rarita-Schwinger Feynman propagator for any dimension.

The second multiplet-solver algorithm identifies equation-of-motion terms by converting the fermionic closure to momentum space via the earlier-mentioned symbolic Fourier transform and then substituting the product of the momentum-space propagator and a coupling current for

¹⁸ We do not need bosonic Feynman propagators, but they are involved in the computation of fermionic Feynman propagators.

each fermionic field. The Feynman propagator involves the momentum-space inverse $\hat{\square}^{-1}$ of the d'Alembert operator, and equation-of-motion terms can be identified directly by the cancellation of this operator. Since the Feynman propagator is a multi-term expression, as with the isolation of gauge-invariant terms in the first method, there is difficulty in reverting the substitution, so we simply avoid this. We show that the post-substitution translation can be identified by a unique hook of the form

$$\hat{\square}^{-1}(\gamma^{a'})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{b'})_{\gamma}{}^{\beta'} k_{a'} k_{b'} \mathcal{F}(J_{\beta'}), \quad (1.4.5)$$

where α, β are the indices of the supercovariant derivatives, γ is the spinor index on the fermion, k_a is a momentum parameter, and $F(J_\alpha)$ is the Fourier-transformed coupling current. The principal remaining difficulty which we surmount is the necessity of Schouten identities due to the many dummy Lorentz indices introduced in the substitution of the Feynman propagator. We demonstrate that it empirically suffices to consider permutations of elements in a running cache of terms of the form

$$\hat{\square}^{-1}(\gamma^E)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^F)_{\gamma}{}^{\beta'} k_{a'_1} \cdots k_{a'_n} \mathcal{F}(J_{\beta'}), \quad (1.4.6)$$

where E, F are sets of Lorentz indices, $|F| = D$ (the dimension), and $\{a'_1, \dots, a'_n\} \not\subset F$.

The resulting algorithm empirically succeeds quite uniformly in producing correct systems of nonlinear constraints on the coefficients of the supersymmetry transformation rules in a multiplet. We demonstrate this via the examples of the on-shell $\mathcal{N} = 1$, 4D axial-vector, matter-gravitino, and most importantly, supergravity multiplets. Together with the examples treated by the prior multiplet solver (which the reader can test are solved successfully by the second multiplet solver as well), this shows that all of the computations in [25] are correctly generated by our symbolic algebra. In addition, this solver confirms the constraints on 11D supergravity produced by the other solver. In principle, a Schouten identity not treated by the method mentioned above could make the sum of an equation-of-motion term and a non-gauge/non-equation-of-motion term appear to simply be a sum of non-gauge/non-equation-of-motion terms, resulting in spurious constraints which override correct constraints and give an incorrect but consistent result, in contrast with the prior multiplet solver. However, this issue has not appeared in any tested case, and it seems a priori unlikely that spurious equations would be consistent with a rather long remaining system of nonlinear constraints. The tradeoff is that this alternative solver is able to solve a much broader range of multiplets than the prior one, which was limited by the possibility of suitable gamma-matrix splittings.

1.4.4 Forcing SUSY-Invariance of an Action, and Computing Holoraumy

We mention two more important algorithms we develop in this work. The first is a procedure which distills constraints on the coefficients of the supersymmetry transformation rules and parameters in the action by requiring the action to be SUSY-invariant. Conventionally, this requires wrestling with the expression for the application $D_\alpha \mathcal{L}$ of the supercovariant derivative to the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} until one obtains an expression of the form $d\mathcal{J}/dt + \text{other terms}$, with constraints obtained by setting the “other terms” equal to zero; \mathcal{J} becomes the supercurrent. Instead, we use the standard boundary conditions that the Lagrangian and fields vanish at infinity to use integration by parts, moving all derivatives in the integrand of $D_\alpha S$, where S is the action, onto the bosons and

setting the coefficients in the ultimate expression to zero. The result is a more systematic algorithm which can be executed in a symbolic algebra engine.

The second algorithm is a procedure to compute on-shell holoraumy. In [25], the form of on-shell holoraumy which turns out to be useful for the purpose of tackling questions on electromagnetic-duality rotations like question 1.3 is one consisting of gauge terms, equation-of-motion terms, and remaining terms. The remaining terms are those of particular interest, so we again wish to separate out gauge and equation-of-motion terms. We therefore develop a procedure for computing this form of holoraumy by adopting the approach of the first multiplet solver to treat the commutator of supercovariant derivatives rather than the anticommutator, *mutatis mutandis*. We show that the procedure correctly reproduces the results of [25] when applied to the on-shell $\mathcal{N} = 1$, 4D chiral and supergravity multiplets.

1.5 Notes on Style

Our derivations in the next several chapters will involve the steady aid of the software in §5; see that chapter for explanations of the functions we employ. That chapter presents the construction of a complete symbolic algebra system for handling the solution of multiplets quite broadly, and demonstrates the tools applied to a variety of 4D and 11D problems in the literature, building the groundwork for the new 11D results of the chapters below. The goal of this paper is to provide what is to our knowledge the first non-closure-function and holoraumy results of this kind in an 11D supermultiplet, a setting which has previously been refractory to treatment by hand or even by less developed computational methods. The next few chapters detail not only the results of the solvers, but also an extended depiction of the explicit derivation of these results as aided by the ancillary symbolic algebra tools. This explicitness merits a brief apologia: we offer three reasons in our defense.

First, desired results and results of independent interest emerge from the intermediate steps. Most importantly, the desired results include not only the values of the coefficients in (1.1.1), which can be readily computed from the output of the computational multiplet solvers of §5.9 and §5.11 (and the SUSY-invariant action solver of §5.12), but they also include the complete geometry of non-closure terms, which demands attention to the intermediate steps within the algorithms of those solvers. In particular, not only the constraints on the coefficients in (1.1.1) obtained in §2 are useful, but also the closure expressions which give rise to those constraints, as they yield the non-closure geometry furnished at the end of §3. Similarly, the intricate 11D Fierz identities which come into play in this intermediate work should be of independent interest for supersymmetry calculations, given Fierz identities' ubiquity. These are tabulated in Appendix B.

Second, since we believe that the presented symbolic algebra will become essential for extending these calculations further in 11D supergravity and to other multiplets, we wish to impart a complete picture of the workflow of producing results with the algorithm. For this reason, for example, we typically provide more-or-less raw (but L^AT_EX-ed) output of the code and afterward give the simplified output, in an effort to convey clearly the steps like recognition of (anti)symmetrized indices which users should complete to get a yet more tractable tabulation of results. At the same time, we produce intermediate steps demonstrating the full prowess of the symbolic algebra system in the 11D setting: by the end of the following chapters, the reader will be convinced not

only of the dimension-wise versatility of the multiplet solvers which return some specific output, but also of underlying procedures, including both Fierz-expansion functions, SUSY expansion, and more fundamentally, the reduction of spinor-indexed expressions to a simplified standard form by “Evaluate” (§5.4).

Third, and most importantly, it is desirable to prod the symbolic algebra system to produce the principal results, leading up to the isolation of constraints, which would have been generated had one solved the multiplet by hand, for this enables the ready verification of our results. We have deliberately fleshed out steps which we feel serve as especially useful hooks in hand-verification, without which the reader would be as bemused in attempting to verify our results as the authors were upon embarking on this project. Indeed, the reader should feel obliged to scrutinize these intermediate results to his or her satisfaction rather than blindly trust the answers. Any reader who wishes to compute some representative samples of the results below can make use of the gamma matrix multiplication table in Appendix B of [20], as well as identities for commuting higher-index gamma matrices in the appendix to [15].

Hopefully, this brings the reader to some agreement with, or at least toleration for, our frequent re-derivation of results via several distinct routes, with the intention of gleaning more information about the structure of the multiplet, and especially with the aim of enabling the reader to eliminate for him- or herself any doubt as to the computationally-obtained conclusions. Our view is captured in the following credo by the great mathematician Norbert Wiener.

“ Naturally, none but the extremely indolent will content himself with taking the proof of these fundamental theorems on faith.”

- N. Wiener [58]

2 Closure of the Supermultiplet

2.1 Computationally Enforcing Closure

As a first step toward solving the multiplet (1.1.1) and its non-closure functions, we consider here its closure. Since we are considering the *on-shell* 11D supergravity multiplet, the condition of closure is that on-shell (i.e., upon enforcing the equations of motion),¹⁹

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} = i(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \quad (2.1.1)$$

up to gauge transformations, i.e., terms involving a gradient with a free index. This condition will introduce constraints on the scalar coefficients in (1.1.1), as it will require those coefficients to be chosen in such a manner that the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives is of precisely the above form when applied to each field. We begin by rewriting the first term on the left-hand side of (1.1.1b) in terms of the graviton by leveraging (1.1.2), (1.1.3), and the Lorentz antisymmetry of

¹⁹In 11D, our convention is to take $c = 1$ in (1.2.1).

the gamma matrix.

$$\begin{aligned}
v \, \omega_{bde} (\gamma^{de})_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} &= \frac{v}{2} (c_{bde} - c_{bed} - c_{deb}) (\gamma^{de})_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} \\
&= \frac{v}{2} (2c_{bde} - c_{deb}) (\gamma^{de})_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} \\
&= \frac{v}{2} (2\partial_b h_{de} - 2\partial_d h_{be} - \partial_d h_{eb} + \partial_e h_{db}) (\gamma^{de})_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} \\
&= \frac{v}{2} (0 - 3\partial_d h_{be} + \partial_e h_{db}) (\gamma^{de})_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} \\
&= 2v \, \partial_e h_{bd} (\gamma^{de})_{\alpha}{}^{\beta}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1.2}$$

The multiplet from (1.1.1) can be entered in code as shown below.²⁰

```

>>> susy = r'D_{\alpha}(h_{a b}) -> u ((\Gamma_{\alpha})_{\alpha \beta} (\Psi_b)^{\beta} +
→ (\Gamma_b)_{\alpha \beta} (\Psi_a)^{\beta}), D_{\alpha}((\Psi_b)^{\beta}) -> 2 v
→ \partial_e(h_{b d}) (\Gamma^{d e})_{\alpha \beta} + x (\Gamma_b \Gamma^{c d e}
→ f)_{\alpha \beta} \partial_c(A_{d e f}) + y (\Gamma^{c d e} f)
→ (\Gamma_b)_{\alpha \beta} \partial_c(A_{d e f}), D_{\alpha}(A_{b c d}) -> 2 z
→ (\Gamma_{b c})_{\alpha \beta} (\Psi_d)^{\beta} - 2 z (\Gamma_{b d})_{\alpha \beta}
→ (\Psi_c)^{\beta} + 2 z (\Gamma_{c d})_{\alpha \beta} (\Psi_b)^{\beta}, c_{a b c} ->
→ \partial_a(h_{b c}) - \partial_b(h_{a c})'

```

As our first bit of analysis, we apply the multiplet solvers of §5.9 and §5.11 to find independent constraints on the values of the coefficients u, v, x, y, z of the supersymmetry transformation rules. Note that the gauge transformation of the gravitino is of the form

$$\delta_G \Psi_a{}^{\gamma} = \partial_a \zeta^{\gamma} \tag{2.1.3}$$

for a gauge parameter ζ^{γ} , and the chosen basis for the Clifford algebra is that in (A.0.4). The code below applies the algorithm “SUSYSolve” from §5.9.

```

>>> bosons = [Ex('h_{a b}'), Ex('A_{a b c}')]
>>> fermions = [Ex(r'(\Psi_a)^{\gamma}')]
>>> gauge_trans = [Ex(r'\partial_a((\zeta)^{\gamma}'))]
>>> basis = [Ex(r'C_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{\alpha})_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{\alpha}
→ b)_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{\alpha b c})_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{\alpha b c
→ d})_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{\alpha b c d e})_{\alpha \beta}')]
>>> consts = ['u', 'v', 'x', 'y', 'z']
>>> indices = [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\beta}']
>>> susy_solve(bosons, fermions, gauge_trans, susy, basis, consts, indices)

```

The result is the following set of constraints.

$$uv = -\frac{i}{8} \tag{2.1.4a}$$

$$xz = \frac{i}{96} \tag{2.1.4b}$$

²⁰ We include at the end of the SUSY rules “susy” a substitution rule which records (1.1.3). The utility of this will be apparent when the SUSY rules are used to take the supercovariant derivative of the action in §3, since the graviton part of (1.1.4) is expressed in terms of the anholonomy.

$$yz = -\frac{i}{288}. \quad (2.1.4c)$$

The code below uses the second multiplet solver, namely, “SUSYSolvePropagator” of §5.11, to tackle the same problem. The Feynman propagator of the gravitino is the spin-3/2 propagator of (5.10.15) with $D = 11$, i.e., (5.10.16). However, we do not input this propagator explicitly, instead making use of our function `rarita_schwinger_prop()` from §5.10. The bosons, fermions, basis, unknowns, and spinor indices are the same as above and are suppressed for brevity.

```
>>> fermion_propagators = [rarita_schwinger_prop()]
>>> sol = susy_solve_propagator(bosons, fermions, fermion_propagators, susy, basis, consts,
↪ indices)
```

The result is again (2.1.4).

In the next three sections, we begin deriving the non-closure geometry of the multiplet by computing the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the graviton, three-form, and gravitino. Of course, these computations are precisely the principal intermediate results which give rise to the constraints above via comparison with (2.1.1). This means that the constraints obtained purely computationally above can serve to verify the following supercovariant derivative computations. Indeed, in §2.5, it is verified that the explicit closure calculations yield the constraints (2.1.4), serving as the desired check on the validity of both sets of results.

2.2 Closure on the Graviton

We first consider the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the graviton h_{ab} . We can use our “SUSYExpand” (§5.9) and “Evaluate” (§5.4) algorithms to find this expression and Cadabra’s `factor_in()` to combine like terms with different coefficients, as in the code below.

```
>>> ex = Ex(r'D_{\alpha}(D_{\beta}(h_{a b})) + D_{\beta}(D_{\alpha}(h_{a b}))')
>>> susy_expand(ex, susy)
>>> evaluate(ex)
>>> factor_in(ex, Ex('u, v, x, y, z', False))
```

The result is

$$\{D_{\alpha}, D_{\beta}\}h_{ab} = -8uv (\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c h_{ab} + 4uv (\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b h_{ac} + 4uv (\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a h_{bc}.$$

Factoring out u and recognizing symmetrized indices yields

$$\{D_{\alpha}, D_{\beta}\}h_{ab} = -8uv (\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c h_{ab} + 4uv (\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{(a} h_{b)c}. \quad (2.2.1)$$

The term in black is of the desired form (2.1.1) for closure of the multiplet, and its coefficient must equal i . The term in blue is a gauge transformation (regardless of the value of its coefficient) because the partial derivative is with respect to either one of the two free Lorentz indices in the expression. Since closure of the multiplet is desired up to gauge transformations, the term in blue can be ignored. The resulting constraint is

$$-8uv = i. \quad (2.2.2)$$

2.3 Closure on the Three-Form

Now, we consider the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the three-form A_{abc} . Running the code

```
>>> ex = Ex(r'D_{\alpha}(D_{\beta}(A_{a b c})) + D_{\beta}(D_{\alpha}(A_{a b c})))
>>> susy_expand(ex, susy)
>>> evaluate(ex)
>>> factor_in(ex, Ex('u, v, x, y, z', False))
```

gives

$$\begin{aligned} \{D_{\alpha}, D_{\beta}\}A_{abc} = & (72xz - 72yz) (\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d A_{abc} + (-72xz + 72yz) (\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c A_{abd} \\ & + (72xz - 72yz) (\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b A_{acd} + (-72xz + 72yz) (\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a A_{bcd} \\ & - 8vz (\gamma_a^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c h_{bd} + 8vz (\gamma_a^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b h_{cd} + 8vz (\gamma_b^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c h_{ad} \\ & - 8vz (\gamma_b^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a h_{cd} - 8vz (\gamma_c^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b h_{ad} + 8vz (\gamma_c^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a h_{bd} \\ & + (12xz + 36yz) (\gamma_{ab}^{def})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d A_{cef} + (-4xz - 12yz) (\gamma_{ab}^{def})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c A_{def} \\ & + (-12xz - 36yz) (\gamma_{ac}^{def})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d A_{bef} + (4xz + 12yz) (\gamma_{ac}^{def})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b A_{def} \\ & + (12xz + 36yz) (\gamma_{bc}^{def})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d A_{aef} + (-4xz - 12yz) (\gamma_{bc}^{def})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a A_{def}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3.1)$$

Factoring out z , recognizing antisymmetrized indices, and rearranging yields

$$\begin{aligned} \{D_{\alpha}, D_{\beta}\}A_{abc} = & 72z(x - y) (\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d A_{abc} \\ & + 6z(x + 3y) (\gamma_{[ab]}^{def})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d A_{|c]ef} \\ & - 36z(x - y) (\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{[a} A_{bc]d} \\ & - 2z(x + 3y) (\gamma_{[ab]}^{def})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{c]} A_{def} \\ & + 8vz (\gamma_a^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b h_{c]d}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3.2)$$

The term in black is of the desired form (2.1.1), and its coefficient must equal i . The term in red is an undesired term whose coefficient must be set to zero. Finally, the terms in blue are gauge transformations (regardless of coefficient) because they involve gradients with free indices, so these terms can be ignored. The resulting constraints are as follows.

$$72z(x - y) = i \quad (2.3.3a)$$

$$6z(x + 3y) = 0. \quad (2.3.3b)$$

2.4 Closure on the Gravitino

Our last and most difficult closure calculation will be the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the gravitino Ψ_a^γ . Running the code

```
>>> ex = Ex(r'D_{\alpha}(D_{\beta}((\Psi_{a})^{\gamma})) +
↪ D_{\beta}(D_{\alpha}((\Psi_{a})^{\gamma})))
>>> susy_expand(ex, susy)
>>> evaluate(ex)
>>> factor_in(ex, Ex('u, v, x, y, z', False))
```

gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} \Psi_a^\gamma = & -2uv(\gamma_a)_{\alpha\eta} \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta (\gamma^{bc})_\beta^\gamma - 2uv(\gamma^{bc})_\alpha^\gamma (\gamma_a)_{\beta\eta} \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta \\
& + 2uv(\gamma^b)_{\alpha\eta} \partial_c \Psi_a^\eta (\gamma_b^c)_\beta^\gamma + 2uv(\gamma_b^c)_\alpha^\gamma (\gamma^b)_{\beta\eta} \partial_c \Psi_a^\eta \\
& + (12xz - 12yz)(\gamma_a^b)_{\alpha\eta} \partial_c \Psi_d^\eta (\gamma_b^{cd})_\beta^\gamma + (12xz - 12yz)(\gamma_b^{cd})_\alpha^\gamma (\gamma_a^b)_{\beta\eta} \partial_c \Psi_d^\eta \\
& + (6xz - 6yz)(\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\eta} \partial_a \Psi_d^\eta (\gamma_{bc}^d)_\beta^\gamma + (-6xz + 6yz)(\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\eta} \partial_d \Psi_a^\eta (\gamma_{bc}^d)_\beta^\gamma \\
& + (6xz + 6yz)(\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\eta} \partial_d \Psi_e^\eta (\gamma_{abc}^{de})_\beta^\gamma + (6xz - 6yz)(\gamma_{bc}^d)_\alpha^\gamma (\gamma^{bc})_{\beta\eta} \partial_a \Psi_d^\eta \\
& + (-6xz + 6yz)(\gamma_{bc}^d)_\alpha^\gamma (\gamma^{bc})_{\beta\eta} \partial_d \Psi_a^\eta + (6xz + 6yz)(\gamma_{abc}^{de})_\alpha^\gamma (\gamma^{bc})_{\beta\eta} \partial_d \Psi_e^\eta.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4.1}$$

Factoring out u, z , recognizing (anti)symmetrized indices, rewriting dummy indices, and reordering terms yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} \Psi_a^\gamma = & 2uv(\gamma_{[1]})_{\eta(\alpha} (\gamma^{[1]c})_{\beta)}^\gamma \partial_c \Psi_a^\eta \\
& - 2uv(\gamma_a)_{\eta(\alpha} (\gamma^{bc})_{\beta)}^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta \\
& + 6z(x+y)(\gamma^{[2]})_{\eta(\alpha} (\gamma_{[2]a}^{bc})_{\beta)}^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta \\
& + 6z(x-y)(\gamma_{[2]})_{\eta(\alpha} (\gamma^{[2]c})_{\beta)}^\gamma \partial_{[a} \Psi_{c]}^\eta \\
& - 12z(x-y)(\gamma_{[1]a})_{\eta(\alpha} (\gamma^{[1]bc})_{\beta)}^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4.2}$$

Notice that in the right-hand side of (2.4.2), the spinor indices α, β that originally belonged to the supercovariant derivatives are always on different gamma matrices. However, the closure condition (2.1.1) is expressed in terms of a gamma matrix with α, β on the same gamma matrix. It follows that (2.4.2) must be transformed into a form with α, β on the same gamma matrices in order to determine constraints on u, v, x, y, z by juxtaposition with (2.1.1), as well as to determine the true form of the closure. This is precisely the utility of Fierz identities, and in fact, each symmetrized product of gamma matrices above is precisely one derived in Appendix B.1. Directly substituting the Fierz expansions in Appendix B.1 for the symmetrized products above will yield a form useful for comparison with (2.1.1). If one wishes not to be bogged down by the intricate structure of these individual products, then one can instead Fierz-expand (2.4.2) with a priori knowledge of only the indices α, β on the supercovariant derivatives by applying “FierzExpand2Index” (§5.6), as below.

```
>>> fierz_expand_2index(ex, basis)
>>> factor_in(ex, Ex('u, v, x, y, z', False))
```

Either way, the Fierz expansion of $\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} \Psi_a^\gamma$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} \Psi_a^\gamma = & \left(-\frac{11}{8}uv + 27xz - 27yz\right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b \Psi_a^\gamma \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{8}uv - 27xz + 27yz\right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \Psi_b^\gamma \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{8}uv - 27xz - 15yz\right) (\gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc})^\gamma_\eta \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{8}uv - 15xz - 27yz\right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^c)^\gamma_\eta \partial_c \Psi_b^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{8}uv + 15xz + 27yz\right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^c)^\gamma_\eta \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4.3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left(\frac{1}{8}uv - 15xz + 15yz \right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_b^c)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_a \Psi_c^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{9}{8}uv + 15xz - 15yz \right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_b^c)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_c \Psi_a^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{8}uv - 6xz - 15yz \right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ab}^{cd})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_c \Psi_d^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{8}uv - 15xz - 27yz \right) (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{8}uv - 27xz - 15yz \right) (\gamma_a^c)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_c \Psi_b^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{8}uv + 27xz + 15yz \right) (\gamma_a^c)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{9}{8}uv - 15xz + 15yz \right) (\gamma_b^c)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_c \Psi_a^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{8}uv + 15xz - 15yz \right) (\gamma_b^c)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_a \Psi_c^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{8}uv + 15xz + 6yz \right) (\gamma_a^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_b^{cd})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_c \Psi_d^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{8}uv + 6xz + 15yz \right) (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ab}^d)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_d \Psi_c^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{8}uv - 6xz - 15yz \right) (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ab}^d)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_c \Psi_d^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{7}{16}uv + 3xz - 3yz \right) (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bc}^d)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_d \Psi_a^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{16}uv - 3xz + 3yz \right) (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bc}^d)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_a \Psi_d^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{16}uv + 3yz \right) (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abc}^{de})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_d \Psi_e^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{16}uv + 3xz \right) (\gamma_{abc}^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_d \Psi_e^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{48}uv - \frac{1}{2}xz \right) (\gamma_{bcd}^{ef})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^{bcd})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_e \Psi_f^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{48}uv - \frac{1}{2}yz \right) (\gamma_{abcd}^f)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bcde})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_f \Psi_e^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{48}uv + \frac{1}{2}yz \right) (\gamma_{abcd}^f)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bcde})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_e \Psi_f^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{64}uv + \frac{1}{8}xz - \frac{1}{8}yz \right) (\gamma_{bcde}^f)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bcde})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_f \Psi_a^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{192}uv - \frac{1}{8}xz + \frac{1}{8}yz \right) (\gamma_{bcde}^f)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bcde})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_a \Psi_f^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{23040}uv + \frac{1}{960}xz + \frac{1}{960}yz \right) \epsilon_{a'bcd e f} g^{hijk} \left(\gamma_a^{a'bcd} \right)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ghijk})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial^e \Psi^f{}^\eta
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left(\frac{1}{23040}uv + \frac{1}{960}xz + \frac{1}{960}yz \right) \epsilon_{aa'bcd f}{}^{ghijk} \left(\gamma^{a'b cde} \right)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ghijk})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial^f \Psi_e{}^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{23040}uv - \frac{1}{960}xz - \frac{1}{960}yz \right) \epsilon_{aa'bcd f}{}^{ghijk} \left(\gamma^{a'b cde} \right)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ghijk})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_e \Psi^f{}^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{115200}uv - \frac{1}{4800}xz + \frac{1}{4800}yz \right) \epsilon_{a'bcd e f}{}^{ghijk} \left(\gamma^{a'b cde} \right)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ghijk})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial^f \Psi_a{}^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{115200}uv + \frac{1}{4800}xz - \frac{1}{4800}yz \right) \epsilon_{a'bcd e f}{}^{ghijk} \left(\gamma^{a'b cde} \right)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ghijk})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_a \Psi^f{}^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{5760}uv - \frac{1}{240}yz \right) \epsilon_{abcde fgh}{}^{ijk} (\gamma^{bcdef})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ijk})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial^g \Psi^h{}^\eta.
\end{aligned}$$

With some work, this can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} \Psi_a{}^\gamma &= \left(-\frac{11}{4}uv + 63xz \right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b \Psi_a{}^\gamma \\
&+ \left(-\frac{1}{2}uv - 27xz - 63yz \right) (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_b \Psi_c{}^\eta \\
&+ \left(-\frac{9}{4}uv - 27xz \right) (\gamma_b{}^c)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_c \Psi_a{}^\eta \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{4}uv + \frac{3}{2}xz - \frac{9}{2}yz \right) (\gamma_{abc}{}^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_d \Psi_e{}^\eta \\
&+ \left(-\frac{1}{12}uv - \frac{3}{2}xz - \frac{3}{2}yz \right) (\gamma_{bcd}{}^{ef})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a{}^{bcd})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_e \Psi_f{}^\eta \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{32}uv + \frac{3}{8}xz \right) (\gamma_{bcde}{}^f)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bcde})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_f \Psi_a{}^\eta \\
&+ \left(-\frac{1}{8}uv - 27xz - 15yz \right) (\gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_b \Psi_c{}^\eta \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{4}uv - 21xz - 42yz \right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a \gamma^c)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_c \Psi_b{}^\eta \\
&+ \left(-\frac{1}{4}uv + 21xz + 42yz \right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a \gamma^c)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_b \Psi_c{}^\eta \\
&+ \left(-\frac{5}{4}uv + 21xz \right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_b \gamma^c)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_c \Psi_a{}^\eta \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{4}uv - 21xz \right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_b \gamma^c)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_a \Psi_c{}^\eta \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{8}uv - 6xz - 15yz \right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ab} \gamma^{cd})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_c \Psi_d{}^\eta \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{4}uv - 42xz - 21yz \right) (\gamma^b)^\gamma {}_\eta (\gamma_a{}^c)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c \Psi_b{}^\eta \\
&+ \left(-\frac{1}{4}uv + 42xz + 21yz \right) (\gamma^b)^\gamma {}_\eta (\gamma_a{}^c)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b \Psi_c{}^\eta \\
&+ \left(-\frac{1}{8}uv + 15xz + 6yz \right) (\gamma_a{}^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_b \gamma^{cd})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_c \Psi_d{}^\eta \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{4}uv + 6xz + 21yz \right) (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ab} \gamma^d)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_d \Psi_c{}^\eta
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left(-\frac{1}{4}uv - 6xz - 21yz \right) (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ab}\gamma^d)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_c \Psi_d^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{2}uv + 3xz \right) (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bc}\gamma^d)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_d \Psi_a^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{8}uv - 3xz \right) (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bc}\gamma^d)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_a \Psi_d^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{16}uv + 3yz \right) (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abc}\gamma^{de})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_d \Psi_e^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{24}uv + \frac{1}{2}xz + yz \right) (\gamma_a{}^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcd}\gamma^f)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_f \Psi_e^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{24}uv - \frac{1}{2}xz - yz \right) (\gamma_a{}^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcd}\gamma^f)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_e \Psi_f^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{192}uv + \frac{1}{8}xz + \frac{1}{8}yz \right) (\gamma_a{}^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcde}\gamma^f)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_f \Psi_g^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{96}uv + \frac{1}{8}xz + \frac{1}{4}yz \right) (\gamma^{bcdef})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abcde}\gamma^g)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_g \Psi_f^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{96}uv - \frac{1}{8}xz - \frac{1}{4}yz \right) (\gamma^{bcdef})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abcde}\gamma^g)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_f \Psi_g^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{480}uv - \frac{1}{40}xz \right) (\gamma^{bcdef})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcdef}\gamma^g)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_g \Psi_a^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{480}uv + \frac{1}{40}xz \right) (\gamma^{bcdef})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcdef}\gamma^g)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_a \Psi_g^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{115200}uv + \frac{1}{4800}yz \right) \epsilon_{abcdefghijk} (\gamma^{bcdef})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{ghijk}\gamma^{op})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_o \Psi_p^\eta \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{2}uv - 63xz \right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \Psi_b^\gamma \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{2}uv + 27xz \right) (\gamma_b{}^c)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_a \Psi_c^\eta \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{48}uv - \frac{3}{8}xz \right) (\gamma_{bcde}{}^f)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bcde})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_a \Psi_f^\eta,
\end{aligned}$$

which can be directly verified to match the hash table outputted by “SUSYSolve” in the second code block of §2.1. Finally, recognizing antisymmetrized indices and simplifying yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} \Psi_a^\gamma &= \left(-\frac{11}{4}uv + 63xz \right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b \Psi_a^\gamma \\
&+ \left(-\frac{1}{2}uv - 27xz - 63yz \right) (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta \\
&+ \left(-\frac{9}{4}uv - 27xz \right) (\gamma_b{}^c)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_c \Psi_a^\eta \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{4}uv + \frac{3}{2}xz - \frac{9}{2}yz \right) (\gamma_{abc}{}^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_d \Psi_e^\eta \\
&+ \left(\frac{1}{12}uv + \frac{3}{2}xz + \frac{3}{2}yz \right) (\gamma_{bcd}{}^{ef})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a{}^{bcd})^\gamma {}_\eta \partial_e \Psi_f^\eta
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left(-\frac{1}{32}uv - \frac{3}{8}xz \right) (\gamma_{bcde}^f)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bcde})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} \partial_f \Psi_a{}^{\eta} \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{8}uv - 27xz - 15yz \right) (\gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta} R^{\gamma} \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{8}uv - 6xz - 15yz \right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ab})^{\gamma\zeta} R_{\zeta} \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{8}uv + 15xz + 6yz \right) (\gamma_a{}^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_b)^{\gamma\zeta} R_{\zeta} \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{16}uv + 3yz \right) (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abc})^{\gamma\zeta} R_{\zeta} \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{192}uv + \frac{1}{8}xz + \frac{1}{8}yz \right) (\gamma_a{}^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcde})^{\gamma\zeta} R_{\zeta} \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{115200}uv + \frac{1}{4800}yz \right) \epsilon_{abcdefg h i j k} (\gamma^{bcdef})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{ghijk})^{\gamma\zeta} R_{\zeta} \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{4}uv - 21xz - 42yz \right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a)^{\gamma\zeta} E_{b\zeta} \\
& + \left(-\frac{5}{4}uv + 21xz \right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_b)^{\gamma\zeta} E_{a\zeta} \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{4}uv + 42xz + 21yz \right) (\gamma_a{}^c)_{\alpha\beta} E_c{}^{\gamma} \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{4}uv + 6xz + 21yz \right) (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ab})^{\gamma\zeta} E_{c\zeta} \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{2}uv + 3xz \right) (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bc})^{\gamma\zeta} E_{a\zeta} \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{24}uv + \frac{1}{2}xz + yz \right) (\gamma_a{}^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcd})^{\gamma\zeta} E_{e\zeta} \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{96}uv + \frac{1}{8}xz + \frac{1}{4}yz \right) (\gamma^{bcdef})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abcde})^{\gamma\zeta} E_{f\zeta} \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{480}uv - \frac{1}{40}xz \right) (\gamma^{bcdef})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcdef})^{\gamma\zeta} E_{a\zeta} \\
& + \left(\frac{3}{2}uv - 63xz \right) (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \Psi_b{}^{\gamma} \\
& - uv (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_b{}^c)_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} \partial_a \Psi_c{}^{\eta} \\
& + \left(\frac{5}{4}uv + 27xz \right) (\gamma_b{}^c)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} \partial_a \Psi_c{}^{\eta} \\
& - \frac{3}{8}uv (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bc}{}^d)_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} \partial_a \Psi_d{}^{\eta} \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{48}uv + \frac{3}{8}xz \right) (\gamma_{bcde}^f)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bcde})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} \partial_a \Psi_f{}^{\eta},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$R_{\alpha} = (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\eta} \partial_b \Psi_c{}^{\eta} \quad (2.4.6a)$$

$$E_{c\alpha} = (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\eta} \partial_{[b} \Psi_{c]}{}^{\eta}. \quad (2.4.6b)$$

The single term in black is of the desired form (2.1.1) for closure of the multiplet, and its coefficient must equal i . The terms in red are undesired terms whose coefficients must be set to zero. The terms in green are equation-of-motion terms, since they are proportional to the expressions in (2.4.6), which vanish identically on-shell under the Rarita-Schwinger equation ((5.4) in [13])

$$(\gamma^b)_\eta{}^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_a{}^\eta - (\gamma^b)_\eta{}^\gamma \partial_a \Psi_b{}^\eta = 0. \quad (2.4.7)$$

Finally, because they involve derivatives with respect to the free Lorentz index a , the terms in blue are gauge transformations (regardless of coefficient), so these terms can be ignored. The resulting constraints are as follows.

$$-\frac{11}{4}uv + 63xz = i \quad (2.4.8a)$$

$$-\frac{1}{2}uv - 27xz - 63yz = 0 \quad (2.4.8b)$$

$$-\frac{9}{4}uv - 27xz = 0 \quad (2.4.8c)$$

$$\frac{1}{4}uv + \frac{3}{2}xz - \frac{9}{2}yz = 0 \quad (2.4.8d)$$

$$\frac{1}{12}uv + \frac{3}{2}xz + \frac{3}{2}yz = 0 \quad (2.4.8e)$$

$$-\frac{1}{32}uv - \frac{3}{8}xz = 0. \quad (2.4.8f)$$

2.5 Distilling Independent Constraints from Closure

The foregoing work gave the closure expressions which will become the non-closure geometry in §3.4, as well as the nonlinear constraints (2.2.2), (2.3.3), and (2.4.8) on u, v, x, y, z . As a check on our closure results, we now verify that these lead to the three independent equations in (2.1.4). Indeed, it follows from (2.2.2) and (2.3.3a) that $u, z \neq 0$. Since $z \neq 0$, (2.3.3b) shows that $x = -3y$. Substituting into (2.3.3a) gives $-288yz = i$. Hence, if we include (2.2.2), we have the three equations

$$uv = -\frac{i}{8} \quad (2.5.1a)$$

$$xz = \frac{i}{96} \quad (2.5.1b)$$

$$yz = -\frac{i}{288}, \quad (2.5.1c)$$

which are exactly (2.1.4). It can be verified directly that these three equations are the only independent constraints, i.e., that the remaining constraints are redundant. In particular, it follows automatically from the above three equations that

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{11}{4}uv + 63xz &= -\frac{11}{4} \left(-\frac{i}{8} \right) + 63 \left(\frac{i}{96} \right) = i \\ -\frac{1}{2}uv - 27xz - 63yz &= -\frac{1}{2} \left(-\frac{i}{8} \right) - 27 \left(\frac{i}{96} \right) - 63 \left(-\frac{i}{288} \right) = 0 \\ -\frac{9}{4}uv - 27xz &= -\frac{9}{4} \left(-\frac{i}{8} \right) - 27 \left(\frac{i}{96} \right) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{4}uv + \frac{3}{2}xz - \frac{9}{2}yz &= \frac{1}{4} \left(-\frac{i}{8} \right) + \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{i}{96} \right) - \frac{9}{2} \left(-\frac{i}{288} \right) = 0 \\
\frac{1}{12}uv + \frac{3}{2}xz + \frac{3}{2}yz &= \frac{1}{12} \left(-\frac{i}{8} \right) + \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{i}{96} \right) + \frac{3}{2} \left(-\frac{i}{288} \right) = 0 \\
-\frac{1}{32}uv - \frac{3}{8}xz &= -\frac{1}{32} \left(-\frac{i}{8} \right) - \frac{3}{8} \left(\frac{i}{96} \right) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the three independent equations obtained from the explicit juxtaposition with (2.1.1) of the expressions for the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the various fields are precisely those obtained from the two multiplet solvers in §2.1.

3 SUSY-Invariance of the Action

3.1 Computationally Enforcing SUSY-Invariance

Now that we have independent constraints on the coefficients in (1.1.1) from closure, we want an additional set of constraints from the action. There are two sources of such constraints. The first is supersymmetry invariance. In particular, it is required that for some quantity \mathcal{J}_γ^e (i.e., the supercurrent)

$$D_\gamma S = \int d^{11}x \left[\partial_e \mathcal{J}_\gamma^e \right], \quad (3.1.1)$$

or equivalently, that the supercovariant derivative applied to the Lagrangian density gives a total derivative. It is generally assumed that the supercurrent vanishes at the boundary of integration, so that we have

$$D_\gamma S = 0. \quad (3.1.2)$$

This condition enables an integration-by-parts procedure of deriving the constraints from SUSY-invariance without explicitly calculating the supercurrent. The second source of constraints is normalization. Since this is primarily a matter of convention, its explanation and the derivation of the constraints which arise are relegated to Appendix C. Here, we focus on the constraints from SUSY-invariance of the action (1.1.4). The code below records the supercovariant derivative applied to the Lagrangian density.

```

>>> L = Ex(r'D_{\gamma}(1 (-1/4 c^{\{a b c\}} c_{\{a b c\}} + 1/2 c^{\{a b c\}} c_{\{c a b\}} + c^{\{a\}_{\{b\}^{\{b\}}
\rightarrow c_{\{a c\}^{\{c\}}) + m (1/12) (\Psi_{\alpha})^{\alpha} (\Gamma^{\{a b c\}})_{\alpha \beta}
\rightarrow \partial_b((\Psi_c)^{\beta}) + n (3/4) (\partial_a(A_{b c d}) - \partial_b(A_{a c d}))
\rightarrow + \partial_c(A_{a b d}) - \partial_d(A_{a b c})) (\partial^a(A^{\{b c d\}}) -
\rightarrow \partial^b(A^{\{a c d\}}) + \partial^c(A^{\{a b d\}}) - \partial^d(A^{\{a b c\}})))')

```

With this symbolically supersymmetry-transformed Lagrangian, one can apply “MakeActionSUSY-Inv” (§5.12) to obtain the constraints arising from (3.1.2), as in the code below. The “susy” we use is that from §2.1.

```

>>> make_action_susy_inv(L, susy, ['u', 'v', 'x', 'y', 'z', 'l', 'm', 'n'], [r'\Psi'])

```

The resulting constraints are

$$\ell u = \frac{1}{12} m v \quad (3.1.3a)$$

$$mx = 36nz \quad (3.1.3b)$$

$$my = -12nz. \quad (3.1.3c)$$

3.2 Constraints from SUSY-Invariance

Before moving on to the solution of the parameters in definition 1.2, it is worthwhile to flesh out the explicit derivation of the constraints (3.1.3) as a check. The code below expands the supercovariant derivative of the Lagrangian density and evaluates the output.

```
>>> susy_expand(L, susy)
>>> evaluate(L)
>>> factor_in(L, Ex('u, v, x, y, z, l, m, n', False))
```

The resulting density becomes²¹

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\gamma \mathcal{L} = & -\frac{1}{6}mv (\partial^{bc} h_{bc}) (\gamma_a)_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} + \frac{1}{6}mv (\partial^b h^c_c) (\gamma_a)_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} - \frac{1}{6}mv (\partial^c h_{ab}) (\gamma^b)_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} \\
& + \frac{1}{6}mv (\partial_b^c h_{ac}) (\gamma^b)_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} + \frac{1}{6}mv (\partial_a^c h_{bc}) (\gamma^b)_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} - \frac{1}{6}mv (\partial_{ab} h^c_c) (\gamma^b)_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} \\
& + \left(\frac{5}{4}mx + \frac{9}{4}my\right) (\partial^d A_{abc}) (\gamma^{bc})_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} + \left(\frac{5}{2}mx + \frac{9}{2}my\right) (\partial_b^d A_{acd}) (\gamma^{bc})_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} \\
& + \left(-\frac{5}{4}mx - \frac{9}{4}my\right) (\partial_a^d A_{bcd}) (\gamma^{bc})_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} + \left(-\frac{1}{4}mx - \frac{3}{4}my\right) (\partial^e A_{bcd}) (\gamma_a^{bcd})_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} \\
& + \left(\frac{3}{4}mx + \frac{9}{4}my\right) (\partial_b^e A_{cde}) (\gamma_a^{bcd})_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} + \left(\frac{1}{4}mx + \frac{3}{4}my\right) (\partial_{ab} A_{cde}) (\gamma^{bcde})_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} \\
& + \left(-4\ell u + \frac{1}{6}mv\right) (\partial^c h_{bc}) (\gamma^a)_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial^b \Psi_a^\alpha) + \left(4\ell u - \frac{1}{6}mv\right) (\partial_b h^c_c) (\gamma^a)_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial^b \Psi_a^\alpha) \\
& + 2\ell u (\partial^c h_{ac}) (\gamma^a)_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial^b \Psi_b^\alpha) - 2\ell u (\partial_a h^c_c) (\gamma^a)_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial^b \Psi_b^\alpha) \\
& + \left(2\ell u - \frac{1}{6}mv\right) (\partial^c h_{bc}) (\gamma^a)_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial_a \Psi^{b\alpha}) + \left(-2\ell u + \frac{1}{6}mv\right) (\partial_b h^c_c) (\gamma^a)_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial_a \Psi^{b\alpha}) \\
& + \left(2\ell u - \frac{1}{6}mv\right) (\partial_c h_{ab}) (\gamma^a)_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial^b \Psi^{c\alpha}) + \left(-4\ell u + \frac{1}{6}mv\right) (\partial_b h_{ac}) (\gamma^a)_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial^b \Psi^{c\alpha}) \\
& + 2\ell u (\partial_a h_{bc}) (\gamma^a)_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial^b \Psi^{c\alpha}) + \left(\frac{5}{4}mx + \frac{9}{4}my - 36nz\right) (\partial^c A_{ab}^d) (\gamma^{ab})_{\gamma\alpha} \partial_d \Psi_c^\alpha \\
& + \left(-\frac{5}{4}mx - \frac{9}{4}my + 36nz\right) (\partial^c A_{ab}^d) (\gamma^{ab})_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial_c \Psi_d^\alpha) \\
& + \left(-\frac{5}{2}mx - \frac{9}{2}my + 72nz\right) (\partial_a A_b^{cd}) (\gamma^{ab})_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial_c \Psi_d^\alpha) \\
& + \frac{1}{6}mv (\partial_b h_{cd}) (\gamma^{abc})_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial^d \Psi_a^\alpha) + \frac{1}{6}mv (\partial^d h_{cd}) (\gamma^{abc})_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial_a \Psi_b^\alpha) \\
& - \frac{1}{6}mv (\partial_c h^d_d) (\gamma^{abc})_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial_a \Psi_b^\alpha) - \frac{1}{6}mv (\partial_b h_{cd}) (\gamma^{abc})_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial_a \Psi^{d\alpha}) \\
& + \left(-\frac{1}{4}mx - \frac{3}{4}my\right) (\partial^e A_{abc}) (\gamma^{abcd})_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial_e \Psi_d^\alpha) + \left(\frac{1}{4}mx + \frac{3}{4}my\right) (\partial^e A_{abc}) (\gamma^{abcd})_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial_d \Psi_e^\alpha)
\end{aligned} \quad (3.2.1)$$

²¹ Note that ∂_{ab} is an abbreviation for $\partial_a \partial_b$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \left(\frac{3}{4}mx + \frac{9}{4}my \right) (\partial_a A_{bc}{}^e) (\gamma^{abcd})_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial_e \Psi_d{}^\alpha) + \left(-\frac{3}{4}mx - \frac{9}{4}my \right) (\partial_a A_{bc}{}^e) (\gamma^{abcd})_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial_d \Psi_e{}^\alpha) \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{1440}mx + \frac{1}{160}my \right) (\partial^a A^{bcd}) \epsilon_{abcdef}{}^{ghijk} (\gamma_{ghijk})_{\gamma\alpha} (\partial^e \Psi^f{}^\alpha).
\end{aligned}$$

Integrating this, using integration-by-parts to move the derivatives to the bosons, applying the boundary conditions, and collecting terms yields

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\gamma S = \int d^{11}x \Big[& \left(4\ell u - \frac{1}{3}mv \right) (\partial^{bc} h_{bc}) (\gamma_a)_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} + \left(-4\ell u + \frac{1}{3}mv \right) (\partial^b{}_b h^c{}_c) (\gamma_a)_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} \\
& + \left(4\ell u - \frac{1}{3}mv \right) (\partial^c{}_c h_{ab}) (\gamma^b)_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} + \left(-4\ell u + \frac{1}{3}mv \right) (\partial_b{}^c h_{ac}) (\gamma^b)_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} \\
& + \left(-4\ell u + \frac{1}{3}mv \right) (\partial_a{}^c h_{bc}) (\gamma^b)_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} + \left(4\ell u - \frac{1}{3}mv \right) (\partial_{ab} h^c{}_c) (\gamma^b)_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} \\
& + \left(\frac{5}{2}mx + \frac{9}{2}my - 36nz \right) (\partial^d{}_d A_{abc}) (\gamma^{bc})_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} + (5mx + 9my - 72nz) (\partial_b{}^d A_{acd}) (\gamma^{bc})_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} \\
& + \left(-\frac{5}{2}mx - \frac{9}{2}my + 36nz \right) (\partial_a{}^d A_{bcd}) (\gamma^{bc})_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} + \left(-\frac{1}{2}mx - \frac{3}{2}my \right) (\partial^e{}_e A_{bcd}) (\gamma_a{}^{bcd})_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} \\
& + \left(\frac{3}{2}mx + \frac{9}{2}my \right) (\partial_b{}^e A_{cde}) (\gamma_a{}^{bcd})_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} + \left(\frac{1}{2}mx + \frac{3}{2}my \right) (\partial_{ab} A_{cde}) (\gamma^{bcde})_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} \Big].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2.2}$$

Recognizing antisymmetrized indices,

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\gamma S = - \int d^{11}x \Big[& \left(4\ell u - \frac{1}{3}mv \right) (\partial_{[a}{}^b h_{b}{}^c] (\gamma_{c]})_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} \\
& + \left(\frac{5}{12}mx + \frac{3}{4}my - 6nz \right) (\partial_{[a}{}^d A_{bcd]}) (\gamma^{bc})_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} \\
& + \left(\frac{1}{12}mx + \frac{1}{4}my \right) (\partial_{[a}{}^b A_{bcd}) (\gamma_{e]}{}^{cde})_{\gamma\alpha} \Psi^{a\alpha} \Big].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2.3}$$

Hence, the constraints are

$$4\ell u - \frac{1}{3}mv = 0 \tag{3.2.4a}$$

$$\frac{5}{12}mx + \frac{3}{4}my - 6nz = 0 \tag{3.2.4b}$$

$$\frac{1}{12}mx + \frac{1}{4}my = 0. \tag{3.2.4c}$$

Isolating $\ell u, mx, my$ with a little algebra recovers (3.1.3), verifying those constraints.

3.3 Solving the Constraints on the 11D Supergravity Coefficients

We now solve the sets of constraints (2.1.4), (3.1.3). Notice that (2.1.4) implies that $u, v, x, y, z \neq 0$. Constraint (3.1.3c) is redundant with the combination of the other constraints (2.1.4b), (2.1.4c), (3.1.3b), since the latter three already give

$$my = mx \frac{yz}{xz} = -\frac{1}{3}mx = -12nz. \tag{3.3.1}$$

Hence, we need not further consider (3.1.3c). We now recast the other two constraints from SUSY-invariance of the action as expressions for m . Multiplying (3.1.3a) by u and applying (2.1.4a) gives

$$m = 96i\ell u^2. \quad (3.3.2)$$

Also, multiplying (3.1.3b) by z and applying (2.1.4b) gives

$$m = -3456inz^2. \quad (3.3.3)$$

Now that the relationship between ℓ, m, n, u, z has been clarified, it is time to integrate the values for ℓ and n given by normalization conventions in Appendix C.4. Substituting (C.4.6) into (3.3.2) yields

$$m = 24iu^2, \quad (3.3.4)$$

while substituting (C.4.8) into (3.3.3) yields

$$m = 96iz^2. \quad (3.3.5)$$

Setting these expressions for m equal, simplifying, and taking $u, z \in \mathbb{R}_+$ gives

$$u = 2z. \quad (3.3.6)$$

In summary, the two constraints given by SUSY-invariance of the action which are independent of each other, of the equations from closure of the algebra in §2, and of the equations from normalization of the bosonic action terms in Appendix C.4 are

$$m = 96iz^2 \quad (3.3.7a)$$

$$u = 2z. \quad (3.3.7b)$$

It can be seen that these constraints enable all of our unknowns (that are not fixed) to be expressed in terms of z . In particular, combining (2.1.4), (3.3.7), (C.4.6), and (C.4.8), we have

$$u = 2z, \quad v = -\frac{i}{16z}, \quad x = \frac{i}{96z}, \quad y = -\frac{i}{288z}, \quad \ell = \frac{1}{4}, \quad m = 96iz^2, \quad n = -\frac{1}{36}. \quad (3.3.8)$$

Indeed, examining (1.1.1) reveals that z represents an arbitrary scaling of the multiplet, so it can be fixed arbitrarily. We choose $z = 1/2$, which finally yields the solution

$$\boxed{u = 1, \quad v = -\frac{i}{8}, \quad x = \frac{i}{48}, \quad y = -\frac{i}{144}, \quad z = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \ell = \frac{1}{4}, \quad m = 24i, \quad n = -\frac{1}{36}.} \quad (3.3.9)$$

3.4 Final Closure Properties, and Geometry of Fermionic Non-Closure Terms

In light of this solution for the multiplet, we revisit the closure expressions in §2, formally writing the gauge and off-shell equation-of-motion terms implied by the ultimate values of the coefficients in (1.1.1). In particular, $\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}h_{ab}$ can be written

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}h_{ab} = i(\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c h_{ab} - \partial_{(a} \xi_{b)\alpha\beta}, \quad (3.4.1)$$

where

$$\xi_{b\alpha\beta} = \frac{i}{2} (\gamma^{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} h_{[1]b} \quad (3.4.2)$$

is a gauge transformation. Similarly, $\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}A_{abc}$ can be written

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}A_{abc} = i (\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d A_{abc} - \partial_{[a} \zeta_{bc] \alpha\beta}, \quad (3.4.3)$$

where

$$\zeta_{bc\alpha\beta} = \frac{i}{2} (\gamma^{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} A_{[1]bc} + \frac{i}{2} (\gamma^{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} h_{c[1]}. \quad (3.4.4)$$

is a gauge transformation. Finally, $\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}\Psi_a^\gamma$ can be written

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}\Psi_a^\gamma = i (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b \Psi_a^\gamma - \partial_a \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma - Z_{a\alpha\beta}^\gamma, \quad (3.4.5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma &= \frac{27i}{32} (\gamma^{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} \Psi_{[1]}^\gamma - \frac{i}{8} (\gamma_{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} \left(\gamma^{[1][\bar{1}]} \right)_\eta{}^\gamma \Psi_{[\bar{1}]}^\eta \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{8} \left(\gamma^{[1][\bar{1}]} \right)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[1]})_\eta{}^\gamma \Psi_{[\bar{1}]}^\eta - \frac{3i}{64} (\gamma_{[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[2][1]})_\eta{}^\gamma \Psi_{[1]}^\eta \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{768} (\gamma^{[4][1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[4]})_\eta{}^\gamma \Psi_{[1]}^\eta \end{aligned} \quad (3.4.6)$$

is a gauge transformation and

$$Z_{a\alpha\beta}^\gamma = Z_{a\alpha\beta}^{(1)\gamma\zeta} R_\zeta + Z_a^{(2)b}{}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma\zeta} E_{b\zeta} \quad (3.4.7)$$

is an off-shell equation-of-motion term. Here,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{a\alpha\beta}^{(1)\gamma\zeta} &= \frac{41i}{192} (\gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta} C^{\gamma\zeta} - \frac{5i}{192} (\gamma^{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[1]a})^{\gamma\zeta} \\ &\quad - \frac{29i}{192} (\gamma_{a[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[1]})^{\gamma\zeta} + \frac{7i}{384} (\gamma^{[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[2]a})^{\gamma\zeta} \\ &\quad - \frac{7i}{4608} (\gamma_{a[4]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[4]})^{\gamma\zeta} \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{552960} \epsilon_{a[5][\bar{5}]} (\gamma^{[5]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[\bar{5}]})^{\gamma\zeta} \end{aligned} \quad (3.4.8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Z_a^{(2)b}{}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma\zeta} &= \frac{5i}{48} (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a)^{\gamma\zeta} - \frac{3i}{8} (\gamma^{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[1]})^{\gamma\zeta} \delta_a{}^b \\ &\quad - \frac{19i}{48} (\gamma_a{}^b)_{\alpha\beta} C^{\gamma\zeta} + \frac{i}{24} (\gamma^{[1]b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[1]})^{\gamma\zeta} \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{32} (\gamma^{[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[2]})^{\gamma\zeta} \delta_a{}^b + \frac{i}{144} (\gamma_a{}^{b[3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[3]})^{\gamma\zeta} \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{1152} (\gamma^{[4]b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[4]})^{\gamma\zeta}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4.9)$$

4 Holoraumy of 11D Supergravity

Having solved for the constants that describe the on-shell 11D supergravity multiplet, we are desirous to study consequent invariants. In particular, we consider here the holoraumy, i.e., the commutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the fields in the multiplet. We apply the “Holoraumy” algorithm from §5.13 via the code below. Notice that the variable “subs” here encodes the solution (3.3.9) of the coefficients of the supersymmetry transformation rules. The inputs “susy,” “basis,” and “indices” are as in §2.1.

```
>>> fields = [Ex('h_{a b}'), Ex('A_{a b c}'), Ex(r'(\Psi_{a})^{\gamma}')')
>>> subs = Ex('u -> 1, v -> (-1/8) I, x -> (1/48) I, y -> (-1/144) I, z -> 1/2, l -> 1/4, m ->
-> 24 I, n -> -1/36', False)
>>> holoraumy(fields, susy, basis, subs, indices)
```

The next two sections detail the results, after which we consider the question of the presence of an electromagnetic duality rotation.

4.1 Bosonic Holoraumy

First, we consider the bosonic holoraumy of 11D supergravity, that is, the commutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to each boson. “Holoraumy” gives the following result for the commutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the graviton, which can also be verified by simply running “SUSYExpand” (§5.9) and “Evaluate” (§5.4) on the commutator.

$$\begin{aligned}
[D_\alpha, D_\beta]h_{ab} = & \frac{i}{2} (\gamma_a^{cd})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c h_{bd} + \frac{i}{2} (\gamma_b^{cd})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c h_{ad} \\
& + \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_a^{cde})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c A_{bde} - \frac{i}{12} (\gamma_a^{cde})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b A_{cde} \\
& + \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_b^{cde})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c A_{ade} - \frac{i}{12} (\gamma_b^{cde})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a A_{cde} \\
& + \frac{i}{18} \eta_{ab} (\gamma^{cdef})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c A_{def}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1.1}$$

Recognizing symmetrized indices and reordering gives

$$\begin{aligned}
[D_\alpha, D_\beta]h_{ab} = & \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_{(a|}^{cde})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c A_{|b)de} + \frac{i}{18} \eta_{ab} (\gamma^{cdef})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c A_{def} \\
& + \frac{i}{2} (\gamma_{(a|}^{cd})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c h_{|b)d} - \frac{i}{12} (\gamma_{(a}^{cde})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b A_{cde}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1.2}$$

Similarly, the result for the commutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the three-form is

$$\begin{aligned}
[D_\alpha, D_\beta]A_{abc} = & \frac{i}{2} (\gamma_a^{de})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d A_{bce} - \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_a^{de})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c A_{bde} \\
& + \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_a^{de})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b A_{cde} - \frac{i}{2} (\gamma_b^{de})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d A_{ace} \\
& + \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_b^{de})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c A_{ade} - \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_b^{de})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a A_{cde} \\
& + \frac{i}{2} (\gamma_c^{de})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d A_{abe} - \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_c^{de})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b A_{ade} \\
& + \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_c^{de})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a A_{bde} + \frac{i}{2} (\gamma_{ab}^{de})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d h_{ce}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1.3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{i}{2} (\gamma_{ac}{}^{de})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d h_{be} + \frac{i}{2} (\gamma_{bc}{}^{de})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d h_{ae} \\
& + \frac{i}{288} \epsilon_{abcdefg}{}^{hijk} (\gamma^{defg})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_h A_{ijk}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recognizing antisymmetrized indices and reordering gives

$$\begin{aligned}
[D_\alpha, D_\beta] A_{abc} &= \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_{[ab]}{}^{de})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d h_{|c]e} + \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_{[a]}{}^{de})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d A_{|bc]e} \\
&+ \frac{i}{288} \epsilon_{abcdefg}{}^{hijk} (\gamma^{defg})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_h A_{ijk} + \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_{[a]}{}^{de})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b A_{c]de}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1.4}$$

4.2 Fermionic Holoraumy

Now, we consider the fermionic holoraumy, i.e., the commutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the gravitino. Of the three holoraumy calculations, this is the only one which involves nontrivial manipulation after the expansion of the supercovariant derivatives ("SUSYExpand"). In particular, we need Fierz expansion and isolation of equation-of-motion terms. We make these parts of the derivation explicit before giving the result of "Holoraumy." Expanding the supercovariant derivatives in $[D_\alpha, D_\beta] \Psi_a{}^\gamma$ with the code below

```

>>> susy = r'D_{\alpha}(h_{a b}) -> (\Gamma_{a})_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} (\Psi_b)^{\beta} +
-> (\Gamma_b)_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} (\Psi_a)^{\beta}, D_{\alpha}((\Psi_b)^{\beta}) -> -1/4 I
-> \partial_e(h_{b d}) (\Gamma^{de})_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} + 1/48 I (\Gamma_b)_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} \Gamma^{cde}
-> f)_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} \partial_c(A_{def}) - 1/144 I (\Gamma^{cde} f)
-> (\Gamma_b)_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} \partial_c(A_{def}), D_{\alpha}(A_{bcd}) -> (\Gamma_b)_{\alpha}{}^{\beta}
-> c)_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} (\Psi_d)^{\beta} - (\Gamma_{bd})_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} (\Psi_c)^{\beta} +
-> (\Gamma_{cd})_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} (\Psi_b)^{\beta}'
>>> ex = Ex(r'D_{\alpha}(D_{\beta}((\Psi_a)^{\gamma})) -
-> D_{\beta}(D_{\alpha}((\Psi_a)^{\gamma})))
>>> susy_expand(ex, susy)
>>> evaluate(ex)

```

gives

$$\begin{aligned}
[D_\alpha, D_\beta] \Psi_a{}^\gamma &= \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_a)_{\alpha\eta} (\gamma^{bc})_\beta{}^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_c{}^\eta - \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_a)_{\beta\eta} (\gamma^{bc})_\alpha{}^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_c{}^\eta - \frac{i}{4} (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\eta} (\gamma_b^c)_\beta{}^\gamma \partial_c \Psi_a{}^\eta \\
&+ \frac{i}{4} (\gamma^b)_{\beta\eta} (\gamma_b^c)_\alpha{}^\gamma \partial_c \Psi_a{}^\eta + \frac{i}{6} (\gamma_a^b)_{\alpha\eta} (\gamma_b^{cd})_\beta{}^\gamma \partial_c \Psi_d{}^\eta \\
&- \frac{i}{6} (\gamma_a^b)_{\beta\eta} (\gamma_b^{cd})_\alpha{}^\gamma \partial_c \Psi_d{}^\eta - \frac{i}{12} (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\eta} (\gamma_{bc}^d)_\beta{}^\gamma \partial_d \Psi_a{}^\eta \\
&+ \frac{i}{12} (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\eta} (\gamma_{bc}^d)_\beta{}^\gamma \partial_a \Psi_d{}^\eta + \frac{i}{24} (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\eta} (\gamma_{abc}^{de})_\beta{}^\gamma \partial_d \Psi_e{}^\eta \\
&+ \frac{i}{12} (\gamma^{bc})_{\beta\eta} (\gamma_{bc}^d)_\alpha{}^\gamma \partial_d \Psi_a{}^\eta - \frac{i}{12} (\gamma^{bc})_{\beta\eta} (\gamma_{bc}^d)_\alpha{}^\gamma \partial_a \Psi_d{}^\eta \\
&- \frac{i}{24} (\gamma^{bc})_{\beta\eta} (\gamma_{abc}^{de})_\alpha{}^\gamma \partial_d \Psi_e{}^\eta.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2.1}$$

Recognizing antisymmetrized indices, rewriting dummy indices, and rearranging terms yields

$$\begin{aligned}
[D_\alpha, D_\beta] \Psi_a^\gamma = & -\frac{i}{4} (\gamma_{[1]}_\eta (\gamma^{[1]c})_\beta)^\gamma \partial_c \Psi_a^\eta \\
& + \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_a)_\eta (\gamma^{bc})_\beta)^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta \\
& + \frac{i}{24} (\gamma^{[2]}_\eta (\gamma_{[2]a}{}^{bc})_\beta)^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta \\
& + \frac{i}{12} (\gamma_{[2]}_\eta (\gamma^{[2]c})_\beta)^\gamma \partial_{[a} \Psi_{c]}^\eta \\
& - \frac{i}{6} (\gamma_{[1]a})_\eta (\gamma^{[1]bc})_\beta)^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2.2}$$

Just like in (2.4.2), the right-hand side of (4.2.2) has α, β on different gamma matrices. Like closure, holoraumy must be written with the indices α, β of the supercovariant derivatives on the same gamma matrices, so just like for (2.4.2), we use a Fierz expansion. In particular, it can be seen that each antisymmetrized product of gamma matrices above is precisely one from Appendix B.2. Directly substituting the Fierz expansions in Appendix B.2 for the antisymmetrized products above yields the desired form, which can be verified by applying the two-index Fierz expansion via the code below.

```
>>> fierz_expand_2index(ex, basis, indices)
```

The result is

$$\begin{aligned}
[D_\alpha, D_\beta] \Psi_a^\gamma = & -\frac{13i}{64} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)^\gamma_\eta \partial_b \Psi_a^\eta + \frac{23i}{64} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)^\gamma_\eta \partial_a \Psi_b^\eta - \frac{3i}{64} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a{}^{bc})^\gamma_\eta \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta \\
& + \frac{41i}{192} (\gamma_a{}^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b \Psi_c^\gamma - \frac{5i}{192} (\gamma_a{}^b)^\gamma_\eta (\gamma_b{}^{cd})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c \Psi_d^\eta \\
& - \frac{23i}{192} (\gamma^{bc})^\gamma_\eta (\gamma_{ab}{}^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d \Psi_c^\eta + \frac{23i}{192} (\gamma^{bc})^\gamma_\eta (\gamma_{ab}{}^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c \Psi_d^\eta \\
& + \frac{37i}{384} (\gamma^{bc})^\gamma_\eta (\gamma_{bc}{}^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d \Psi_a^\eta - \frac{19i}{384} (\gamma^{bc})^\gamma_\eta (\gamma_{bc}{}^d)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \Psi_d^\eta \\
& + \frac{3i}{128} (\gamma_a{}^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bc}{}^{de})^\gamma_\eta \partial_d \Psi_e^\eta - \frac{i}{384} (\gamma^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abc}{}^e)^\gamma_\eta \partial_e \Psi_d^\eta \\
& + \frac{i}{384} (\gamma^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abc}{}^e)^\gamma_\eta \partial_d \Psi_e^\eta - \frac{5i}{384} (\gamma^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcd}{}^e)^\gamma_\eta \partial_e \Psi_a^\eta \\
& + \frac{i}{384} (\gamma^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcd}{}^e)^\gamma_\eta \partial_a \Psi_e^\eta - \frac{i}{46080} \epsilon_{abcd}{}^{efghijk} (\gamma^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ghijk})^\gamma_\eta \partial_e \Psi_f^\eta \\
& + \frac{29i}{192} (\gamma^b)^\gamma_\eta (\gamma_{ab}{}^{cd})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c \Psi_d^\eta - \frac{7i}{384} (\gamma_a{}^{bc})^\gamma_\eta (\gamma_{bc}{}^{de})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d \Psi_e^\eta \\
& + \frac{5i}{128} (\gamma^{bcd})^\gamma_\eta (\gamma_{abc}{}^e)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_e \Psi_d^\eta - \frac{5i}{128} (\gamma^{bcd})^\gamma_\eta (\gamma_{abc}{}^e)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d \Psi_e^\eta \\
& - \frac{5i}{384} (\gamma^{bcd})^\gamma_\eta (\gamma_{bcd}{}^e)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_e \Psi_a^\eta + \frac{i}{384} (\gamma^{bcd})^\gamma_\eta (\gamma_{bcd}{}^e)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \Psi_e^\eta \\
& - \frac{5i}{1152} (\gamma_a{}^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcd}{}^{ef})^\gamma_\eta \partial_e \Psi_f^\eta + \frac{i}{128} (\gamma^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abcd}{}^f)^\gamma_\eta \partial_f \Psi_e^\eta \\
& - \frac{i}{128} (\gamma^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abcd}{}^f)^\gamma_\eta \partial_e \Psi_f^\eta + \frac{17i}{4608} (\gamma^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcde}{}^f)^\gamma_\eta \partial_f \Psi_a^\eta \\
& - \frac{11i}{4608} (\gamma^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcde}{}^f)^\gamma_\eta \partial_a \Psi_f^\eta + \frac{7i}{110592} \epsilon_{abcde}{}^{fghijk} (\gamma^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{hijk})^\gamma_\eta \partial_f \Psi_g^\eta.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2.3}$$

With some work, this can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
[D_\alpha, D_\beta] \Psi_a^\gamma = & \frac{i}{2} (\gamma_a^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b \Psi_c^\gamma + \frac{i}{3} (\gamma_{ab}^{cd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)^\gamma_\eta \partial_c \Psi_d^\eta + \frac{i}{8} (\gamma_{bc}^d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc})^\gamma_\eta \partial_d \Psi_a^\eta \\
& - \frac{i}{12} (\gamma_{bc}^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^{bc})^\gamma_\eta \partial_d \Psi_e^\eta - \frac{i}{24} (\gamma_{bcd}^e)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bcd})^\gamma_\eta \partial_e \Psi_a^\eta \\
& - \frac{i}{4} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)^\gamma_\eta \partial_b \Psi_a^\eta + \frac{13i}{32} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)^\gamma_\eta \partial_a \Psi_b^\eta \\
& - \frac{3i}{64} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a \gamma^{bc})^\gamma_\eta \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta + \frac{i}{6} (\gamma_a^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_b \gamma^d)^\gamma_\eta \partial_d \Psi_c^\eta \\
& - \frac{i}{6} (\gamma_a^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_b \gamma^d)^\gamma_\eta \partial_c \Psi_d^\eta + \frac{3i}{128} (\gamma_a^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bc} \gamma^{de})^\gamma_\eta \partial_d \Psi_e^\eta \\
& - \frac{i}{96} (\gamma^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abc} \gamma^e)^\gamma_\eta \partial_e \Psi_d^\eta + \frac{i}{96} (\gamma^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abc} \gamma^e)^\gamma_\eta \partial_d \Psi_e^\eta \\
& - \frac{i}{96} (\gamma^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcd} \gamma^e)^\gamma_\eta \partial_e \Psi_a^\eta - \frac{i}{384} (\gamma^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abcd} \gamma^{ef})^\gamma_\eta \partial_e \Psi_f^\eta \\
& - \frac{5i}{96} (\gamma_a^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bc} \gamma^e)^\gamma_\eta \partial_e \Psi_d^\eta + \frac{5i}{96} (\gamma_a^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bc} \gamma^e)^\gamma_\eta \partial_d \Psi_e^\eta \\
& - \frac{5i}{1152} (\gamma_a^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcd} \gamma^{ef})^\gamma_\eta \partial_e \Psi_f^\eta + \frac{i}{72} (\gamma^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abcd} \gamma^f)^\gamma_\eta \partial_f \Psi_e^\eta \\
& - \frac{i}{72} (\gamma^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abcd} \gamma^f)^\gamma_\eta \partial_e \Psi_f^\eta + \frac{i}{192} (\gamma^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcde} \gamma^f)^\gamma_\eta \partial_f \Psi_a^\eta \\
& - \frac{i}{256} (\gamma^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcde} \gamma^f)^\gamma_\eta \partial_a \Psi_f^\eta + \frac{7i}{4608} (\gamma^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abcde} \gamma^{fg})^\gamma_\eta \partial_f \Psi_g^\eta \\
& - \frac{3i}{64} (\gamma_{bc}^d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc})^\gamma_\eta \partial_a \Psi_d^\eta + \frac{5i}{192} (\gamma_{bcd}^e)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bcd})^\gamma_\eta \partial_a \Psi_e^\eta.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2.4}$$

The equation above is precisely the result which we obtain from the application of ‘‘Holoraumy’’ in the beginning of this chapter. Expressing appropriate terms in terms of the Rarita-Schwinger expressions in (2.4.6) and simplifying the remaining terms yields

$$\begin{aligned}
[D_\alpha, D_\beta] \Psi_a^\gamma = & \frac{i}{2} (\gamma_a^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b \Psi_c^\gamma + \frac{i}{3} (\gamma_{ab}^{cd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)^\gamma_\eta \partial_c \Psi_d^\eta + \frac{i}{8} (\gamma_{bc}^d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc})^\gamma_\eta \partial_d \Psi_a^\eta \\
& + \frac{i}{12} (\gamma_{bc}^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^{bc})^\gamma_\eta \partial_d \Psi_e^\eta + \frac{i}{24} (\gamma_{bcd}^e)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bcd})^\gamma_\eta \partial_e \Psi_a^\eta \\
& - \frac{3i}{64} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a)^{\gamma\zeta} R_\zeta + \frac{3i}{128} (\gamma_a^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bc})^{\gamma\zeta} R_\zeta \\
& - \frac{i}{384} (\gamma^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abcd})^{\gamma\zeta} R_\zeta - \frac{5i}{1152} (\gamma_a^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcd})^{\gamma\zeta} R_\zeta \\
& + \frac{7i}{4608} (\gamma^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abcde})^{\gamma\zeta} R_\zeta - \frac{i}{4} C_{\alpha\beta} E_a^\gamma \\
& + \frac{i}{6} (\gamma_a^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_b)^{\gamma\zeta} E_{c\zeta} - \frac{i}{96} (\gamma^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abc})^{\gamma\zeta} E_{d\zeta} \\
& - \frac{5i}{96} (\gamma_a^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bc})^{\gamma\zeta} E_{d\zeta} + \frac{i}{72} (\gamma^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abcd})^{\gamma\zeta} E_{e\zeta} \\
& + \frac{i}{192} (\gamma^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcde})^{\gamma\zeta} E_{a\zeta} - \frac{i}{96} (\gamma^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcd})^{\gamma\zeta} E_{a\zeta} \\
& + \frac{5i}{32} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)^\gamma_\eta \partial_a \Psi_b^\eta - \frac{5i}{64} (\gamma_{bc}^d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc})^\gamma_\eta \partial_a \Psi_d^\eta \\
& + \frac{i}{96} (\gamma^{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcd}^e)^\gamma_\eta \partial_a \Psi_e^\eta - \frac{i}{32} (\gamma_{bcd}^e)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bcd})^\gamma_\eta \partial_a \Psi_e^\eta
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2.5}$$

$$+ \frac{i}{768} (\gamma^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcde}^f)_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_a \Psi_f^\eta.$$

4.3 Absence of an Electromagnetic-Duality Rotation

We now consider the question of the presence of an electromagnetic-duality rotation in the holonomy of the on-shell 11D supergravity multiplet. The various forms of the holonomy electromagnetic-duality rotation reviewed in the introduction require ignoring gauge and equation-of-motion terms, so before further consideration, we wish to recast and tabulate the holonomy in the following form, separating out the gauge and equation-of-motion terms.

$$\begin{aligned} [D_\alpha, D_\beta] h_{ab} = & -\frac{i}{4} (\gamma^{[1][2]}_{(a|})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{[1]} A_{|b][2]} + \frac{i}{18} \eta_{ab} (\gamma^{[1][3]})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{[1]} A_{[3]} \\ & + \frac{i}{2} (\gamma^{[1][\bar{1}]}_{(a|})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{[1]} h_{|b][\bar{1}]} - \partial_{(a} \xi'_{b)\alpha\beta} \end{aligned} \quad (4.3.1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} [D_\alpha, D_\beta] A_{abc} = & \frac{i}{4} (\gamma^{[1][\bar{1}]}_{[ab|})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{[1]} h_{|c][\bar{1}]} + \frac{i}{4} (\gamma^{[1][\bar{1}]}_{[a|})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{[1]} A_{|bc][\bar{1}]} \\ & + \frac{i}{288} \epsilon_{abc}{}^{[4][1][3]} (\gamma_{[4]})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{[1]} A_{[3]} - \partial_{[a} \zeta'_{bc]\alpha\beta} \end{aligned} \quad (4.3.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} [D_\alpha, D_\beta] \Psi_a^\gamma = & \frac{i}{2} (\gamma_a{}^{[1][\bar{1}]})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{[1]} \Psi_{[\bar{1}]}^\gamma + \frac{i}{3} (\gamma_a{}^{[1][\bar{1}][\bar{1}]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[1]})_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_{[\bar{1}]} \Psi_{[\bar{1}]}^\eta \\ & + \frac{i}{8} (\gamma^{[2][1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[2]})_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_{[1]} \Psi_a^\eta + \frac{i}{12} (\gamma^{[2][1][\bar{1}]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[2]})_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_{[1]} \Psi_{[\bar{1}]}^\eta \\ & + \frac{i}{24} (\gamma^{[3][1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[3]})_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_{[1]} \Psi_a^\eta - \partial_a \epsilon'_{\alpha\beta}{}^\gamma - \mathcal{Z}_{a\alpha\beta}{}^\gamma, \end{aligned} \quad (4.3.3)$$

where

$$\xi'_{ba\alpha\beta} = \frac{i}{12} (\gamma_b{}^{[3]})_{\alpha\beta} A_{[3]} \quad (4.3.4)$$

$$\zeta'_{bc\alpha\beta} = \frac{i}{4} (\gamma^{[2]b})_{\alpha\beta} A_{c[2]} \quad (4.3.5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon'_{\alpha\beta}{}^\gamma = & -\frac{5i}{32} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[1]})_\eta {}^\gamma \Psi_{[1]}^\eta + \frac{5i}{64} (\gamma^{[2][1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[2]})_\eta {}^\gamma \Psi_{[1]}^\eta \\ & - \frac{i}{96} (\gamma_{[3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[3][1]})_\eta {}^\gamma \Psi_{[1]}^\eta + \frac{i}{32} (\gamma^{[3][1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[3]})_\eta {}^\gamma \Psi_{[1]}^\eta \\ & - \frac{i}{768} (\gamma_{[4]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[4][1]})_\eta {}^\gamma \Psi_{[1]}^\eta \end{aligned} \quad (4.3.6)$$

are gauge transformations and

$$\mathcal{Z}_{a\alpha\beta}{}^\gamma = \mathcal{Z}_{a\alpha\beta}^{(1)\gamma\zeta} R_\zeta + \mathcal{Z}_a^{(2)b}{}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma\zeta} E_{b\zeta} \quad (4.3.7)$$

is an off-shell equation-of-motion term. Here,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_{a\alpha\beta}^{(1)\gamma\zeta} = & \frac{3i}{64} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a)^\gamma{}^\zeta - \frac{3i}{128} (\gamma_{a[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[2]})^\gamma{}^\zeta \\ & - \frac{i}{384} (\gamma^{[3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[3]a})^\gamma{}^\zeta + \frac{5i}{1152} (\gamma_{a[3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[3]})^\gamma{}^\zeta \\ & - \frac{7i}{4608} (\gamma^{[4]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[4]a})^\gamma{}^\zeta \end{aligned} \quad (4.3.8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Z}_a^{(2)b}{}_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma\zeta} = & \frac{i}{4} C_{\alpha\beta} C^{\gamma\zeta} \delta_a{}^b + \frac{i}{6} (\gamma_a{}^{b[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[1]})^{\gamma\zeta} \\
& + \frac{i}{96} (\gamma^{[2]b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[2]})^{\gamma\zeta} + \frac{5i}{96} (\gamma_a{}^{b[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[2]})^{\gamma\zeta} \\
& - \frac{i}{72} (\gamma^{[3]b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[3]})^{\gamma\zeta} - \frac{i}{192} (\gamma^{[4]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[4]})^{\gamma\zeta} \delta_a{}^b \\
& + \frac{i}{96} (\gamma^{[3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[3]})^{\gamma\zeta} \delta_a{}^b.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.3.9}$$

It is not the case that the multiplet has a single vector-field boson, so we consider the first, second, and fourth forms of the electromagnetic-duality rotation discussed in §1.2.3. The first form is absent, since there is no consistent (α, β) -gamma matrix in the holoraumy terms. In particular, the (α, β) -gamma matrices in the various non-gauge and non-equation-of-motion terms vary between three-index and four-index gamma matrices. The second form of the rotation is absent. The first way to see this absence is that the commutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the graviton includes a non-gauge graviton term, and the commutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the three-form includes two non-gauge three-form terms; at the very least, this shows that the rotation cannot be through an angle of $\pi/2$. The more important way this form of the rotation fails to exist is that no dualization exists which can put the gradients of the graviton and three-form on an equal footing like was possible for the 4D tensor multiplet. Specifically, the gradients $\partial_a h_{bc}, \partial_a A_{bcd}$ of the graviton and three-form have three and four Lorentz indices, respectively, while the duals $\epsilon_{abcdefg hijk} \partial^j h^{k\ell}, \epsilon_{abcdefg hijk} \partial^h A^{ijk}$ have ten and seven free indices, respectively.²² Even if we *could* dualize one of the gradients to impart similar index-structures between the prospective rotating tensors, glancing at the bosonic holoraumy in (4.3.1) shows that no such dual is present, contrasting with the presence of the dual of the gradient of the tensor field in (1.2.9a). Finally, the fourth form of the rotation is absent, since there is no consistent (η, γ) -gamma matrix among the non-gauge and non-equation-of-motion terms in (4.3.3). Hence, like in the 10D super Maxwell multiplet [18], there is no electromagnetic-duality rotation in the 11D supergravity holoraumy.

5 SusyPy: A Supersymmetry Multiplet Solver

5.1 Basic Use

In this chapter, we expound and demonstrate the symbolic algebra algorithms which we utilize for solving the 11D supergravity multiplet; we have christened these algorithms collectively “SusyPy.”²³ SusyPy is a Python module built on Cadabra for the purpose of handling explicit spinor-index arithmetic/canonicalization and crucial supersymmetry calculations. Cadabra has its own interpreted language “cdb,” but its functions are also accessible via Python. Since the authors are devout Python-ers, we have elected to continue purely in Python. However, documentation on Cadabra’s pure Python interface is rather scanty, so before moving forward, we briefly consider its use in Python concomitantly with SusyPy. After downloading both software, Cadabra and SusyPy can be imported via the code below.

²² We take the dual on one of the graviton indices here. See [12] for considerations of duals of higher-spin fields, including duals of the graviton.

²³ SusyPy = **S**upersymmetry **P**ython.

```
>>> import cadabra2 as cdb
>>> import susypy as susy
```

Input into Cadabra is in the form of pseudo-L^AT_EX strings into `Ex()` wrappers. Just like in L^AT_EX, sums are written via “+” and products via proximity, and Greek letters can even be entered by writing their name after a backslash as in L^AT_EX. In addition, covariant indices are written with a simple “_” and contravariant indices with a “^”. The `Ex()` wrappers themselves can also be added and multiplied after they are defined. The code below creates two Cadabra expressions and adds them. Cadabra’s output is printed as unicode.

```
>>> ex1 = cdb.Ex(r'(A_{a} B_{b} + E_{a b}) \Psi^{c}')
>>> ex2 = cdb.Ex(r'G_{a} \Theta_{b}^{c}')
>>> ex = ex1 + ex2
>>> ex
'(A_{a} B_{b} + E_{a b}) \Psi^{c} + G_{a} \Theta_{b}^{c}'
```

We can now manipulate whole tensor expressions via the `Ex()` wrappers. One important instance of this is substitution, which we will employ frequently in the algorithms later in this chapter. A series of substitution rules is entered as a comma-separated string of individual tensor substitution rules, with each substitution indicated by an arrow “->”, inputted into an `Ex()` wrapper with the optional parameter “False” signifying that it is not an ordinary tensor expression. Entering an expression together with a substitution rule into Cadabra’s function `substitute()` applies the latter to the former. The code below gives an example substitution applied to the expression generated above.

```
>>> sub = cdb.Ex(r'A_{a} -> G_{a}^{d} H_{d}, \Theta_{e}^{f} -> \Psi_{e}^{f}', False)
>>> cdb.substitute(ex, sub)
'(G_{a}^{d} H_{d} B_{b} + E_{a b}) \Psi^{c} + G_{a} \Psi_{b}^{c}'
```

As one can see, indices in the substitution rule dynamically adapt to the context of the expression. The first substitution introduces new dummy indices into the expression, which Cadabra readily introduces, and the second is written in terms of indices absent in the expression, which Cadabra has no trouble with, as the software only cares about relative index structures in substitution rules. Having briefly summarized the use of Cadabra, in the rest of this section, we illustrate the basic use of SusyPy. The rest of the chapter will consider the higher-level tools.

5.1.1 Setting up the Environment

Before completing arithmetic in SusyPy, let alone using the multiplet solver tools, one must create an environment which defines the essential tensor-spinors and fixes necessary properties of the Clifford algebra representation under consideration. This is achieved via SusyPy’s function `susy_env()`, which takes as input the following information about the problems with which the user is working: the dimension D , the array “lorentz_indices” of Lorentz indices with which one intends

to work (which must be of length at least the dimension),²⁴ the array “spinor_indices” of spinor indices with which one intends to work, a length-2 array “desired_syms” which determines the spinor-index symmetries of the gamma matrices, and a representation sign “rep” which determines the sign of the gamma-matrix reduction formula. (See §5.2 for explanations of these parameters.)²⁵ The line of code below creates a 4D environment with the Lorentz indices a, b, c, d and spinor indices $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \eta$, values $(t_0, t_1) = (1, 1)$ which make the spinor metric and 1-index gamma matrix antisymmetric, and the negative Clifford algebra representation (an input which is ignored because of the dimension but included for completeness). Note that whenever `susy_env()` is called, its output must be stored in a variable named `__cdbkernel__` in order for subsequent arithmetic to be run; this derives from an idiosyncrasy of Cadabra.

```
>>> __cdbkernel__ = susy.susy_env(D = 4, lorentz_indices=['a', 'b', 'c', 'd'],
→ spinor_indices=[r'\alpha', r'\beta', r'\gamma', r'\eta'], desired_syms=[1,1], rep=-1)
```

The environment created by `susy_env()` defines a variety of Cadabra objects, tabulated in table 1, including two new tensors corresponding to the spinor metric $C_{\alpha\beta}$ and highest-rank element γ_* of the Clifford algebra.

SusyPy Name	Cadabra Class	Use
“\Gamma”	GammaMatrix	Dirac Gamma Matrix
“\delta”	KroneckerDelta	Kronecker Delta
“\epsilon”	EpsilonTensor	Levi-Civita Symbol
“D”	Derivative	Supercovariant Derivative
“\partial”	PartialDerivative	Partial Derivative
“I”	ImaginaryI	Imaginary Unit
“Tr”	Trace	Trace Function
“C”	N/A	Spinor Metric
“\Gamma”	N/A	Highest-Rank Element

Table 1: Tensor objects created by `susy_env()` .

Our first use of the defined tensors will be to verify that `susy_env()` indeed created an environment with the inputted properties. The code below evaluates three expressions by applying

²⁴These Lorentz indices are also used for internal purposes. The requirement that the length of “lorentz_indices” be at least D is in order to allow the construction of Levi-Civita tensors.

²⁵“desired_syms” is only a relevant input in even dimensions, for the symmetries have fixed values in odd dimensions. Similarly, “rep” is only relevant in odd dimensions, for there is only a single representation in even dimensions.

SusyPy's simplification function `evaluate()`, introduced in the next subsection; Cadabra's function `canonicalise()`, which leverages symmetries to order indices in a standard lexicographic fashion; and Cadabra's function `rename_dummies()`, which renames dummies to lowest possible lexicographic degree within defined indices. Note that the first expression is a usual trace which in dimension D evaluates to

$$(\gamma_a)_\alpha^\beta (\gamma^b)_\beta^\alpha = 2^{\lfloor D/2 \rfloor} \delta_a^b, \quad (5.1.1)$$

so that for $D = 4$, the answer should be $4\delta_a^b$. The second expression is a 1-index gamma matrix with spinor indices α, β in reverse-lexicographic order; since 1-index gamma matrices were made antisymmetric in the input to `susy_env()`, applying `canonicalise()` should give $-(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}$. The third expression involves dummy-index pairs of d, γ ; examining the lexicographic ordering of the inputted lists of indices, if `susy_env()` correctly recorded the index lists, the answer should involve a, α . Indeed, the outputs from the code verify precisely these expected phenomena.

```
>>> ex1 = cdb.Ex(r'(\Gamma_{a})_{\alpha}^{\beta} (\Gamma^{b})_{\beta}^{\alpha}')
>>> susy.evaluate(ex1)
'4\delta_{a}^b'
>>> ex2 = cdb.Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a})_{\beta} \alpha')
>>> cdb.canonicalise(ex2)
'-\indexbracket{\Gamma^{a}}_{\alpha \beta}'
>>> ex3 = cdb.Ex(r'(A_{d} B^{d})_{\gamma}^{\gamma}')
>>> cdb.rename_dummies(ex3)
'\indexbracket{A_{a} B^{a}}_{\alpha}^{\alpha}'
```

Altering the environment is as simple as calling `susy_env()` again with appropriately modified parameters. The line of code below changes the dimension to $D = 11$, makes the Lorentz indices Greek letters and the spinor indices Latin letters, and selects the “positive” representation of the 11D Clifford algebra. “desired_syms” is no longer entered, since its value is determined from the odd dimension, but we know (from the considerations in §5.2) that it is $(1, -1)$, making the spinor metric antisymmetric but the 1-index gamma matrix symmetric.

```
>>> __cdbkernel__ = susy.susy_env(D = 11, lorentz_indices=[r'\alpha', r'\beta', r'\gamma',
→ r'\zeta', r'\eta', r'\theta', r'\iota', r'\kappa', r'\lambda', r'\mu', r'\nu'],
→ spinor_indices=['a', 'b', 'c', 'd'], rep=1)
```

The trace should now evaluate to $32\delta_\alpha^\beta$, the 1-index gamma matrix should no longer acquire a negative sign when its indices are swapped, and the renamed dummy index pairs must reflect the new associated index lists. Also, the positive representation reflects a plus sign in (5.2.6a), giving the equation

$$\gamma^{\alpha\beta\eta\gamma\theta\zeta} = -\frac{1}{120} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\eta\gamma\theta\zeta\iota\kappa\lambda\mu\nu} \gamma_{\iota\kappa\lambda\mu\nu}, \quad (5.1.2)$$

which must be recovered when evaluating a six-index gamma matrix. Indeed, all of these expected outcomes pan out in the code outputs below.

```
>>> ex1 = cdb.Ex(r'(\Gamma_{\alpha})_{a}^b (\Gamma^{\beta})_b^a')
>>> susy.evaluate(ex1)
```

```

'32δ_{α}^{β}'
>>> ex2 = cdb.Ex(r'(\Gamma^{\alpha})_{b a}')
>>> cdb.canonicalise(ex2)
'\indexbracket(\Gamma^{\alpha})_{a b}'
>>> ex3 = cdb.Ex(r'(A_{\gamma} B^{\gamma})_{d}^d')
>>> cdb.rename_dummies(ex3)
'\indexbracket(A_{\alpha} B^{\alpha})_{a}^a'
>>> ex4 = cdb.Ex(r'\Gamma^{\alpha \beta \eta \gamma \theta \zeta \iota \kappa \lambda \mu \nu} \Gamma_{\iota \kappa \lambda \mu \nu}')
>>> susy.evaluate(ex4)
'-1/120 \epsilon^{\alpha \beta \eta \gamma \theta \zeta \iota \kappa \lambda \mu \nu} \Gamma_{\iota \kappa \lambda \mu \nu}'

```

5.1.2 Simplifying Tensor Expressions

At its foundation, SusyPy is a spinor-index arithmetic tool; all of the procedures which form the multiplet solvers are constructed on the base of explicit spinor-index canonicalization and multiplication adhering to the NW-SE convention. We need a means of distinguishing spinor indices from vector indices on a tensor-spinor. The reader may have noticed in the examples of the prior subsection that spinor indices were entered in parentheses surrounding a tensor. Indeed, SusyPy latches on a Cadabra feature which interprets parentheses carrying indices as objects called “indexbrackets”; the object inside that indexbracket is interpreted as an argument.²⁶ Hence, we take spinor indices to be the indices on indexbrackets. That is, we write a tensor-spin with the underlying Lorentz tensor surrounded by parentheses which carry the spinor indices. For example, the code below creates a Cadabra object representing the tensor-spinor $\Psi_{a\eta}$, with a a Lorentz index and η a spinor index (see our conventions on indices and Latin/Greek letters in Appendix A), in a manner interpretable by SusyPy.²⁷

```

>>> __cdbkernel__ = susy.susy_env()
>>> cdb.Ex(r'(\Psi_{a})_{\eta}')
```

The problem of prodding an expression into a form in which tensor-spinors multiply via the NW-SE convention thereby transforms into the problem of prodding an expression into a form in which indexbrackets combine via the convention. The critical function which powers SusyPy’s handling of spinor indices in such a fashion is `spinor_combine()`, which takes advantage of symmetries, manipulation of the spinor metric, and especially favorable sorting of tensor-spinor chains in order to maximally combine indexbrackets in a manner adherent to the NW-SE convention. The code below applies `spinor_combine()` to an expression involving two gamma matrices and the spinor metric. It is readily seen that the function successfully contracts out the spinor metric and combines the indexbrackets in a fashion consistent with the ordinary multiplication of gamma matrices with

²⁶ It was possibly the hope for Cadabra that indexbrackets would eventually be used for this purpose. A very rudimentary Cadabra2 [49] function `combine()` enables the combination of indexbrackets, but in a naïve fashion which pays no attention to NW-SE convention and has no utility for actual spinor-index arithmetic.

²⁷ A call of `susy_env()` with none of the optional parameters entered yields the 11D Clifford algebra with the conventions in Appendix A, since this is the environment needed for the 11D supergravity calculations in the previous chapters.

spinor indices.²⁸

```
>>> ex = cdb.Ex(r'(\Gamma_{a})_{\alpha \beta} (\Gamma^b)^{\beta} \gamma C_{\gamma \eta}')
>>> susy.spinor_combine(ex)
'-\indexbracket{\Gamma_{a}}^{\Gamma^b}_{\alpha \eta}'
```

We now consider our broad simplification function `evaluate()`. This function is built to accomplish several goals with respect to an inputted expression:

1. apply `spinor_combine()` in order to maximally combine indexbrackets and order chains of multiplied indexbrackets in lexicographic order (i.e., canonicalize the spinor-index structure) to the greatest extent permissible by symmetries,
2. multiply all gamma matrices using Cadabra's Lorentz-tensor simplification sequence,
3. simplify all traces implicit in products of tensor-spinors, all derivatives, and all Kronecker-delta contractions,
4. draw all constants and pure Lorentz tensors (e.g., Kronecker deltas and Levi-Civita tensors) out of derivatives, Fourier transforms, and indexbrackets,
5. use `index_bracket_hex()` (see Appendix E) in order to apply Cadabra's Lorentz-index canonicalization²⁹ within indexbrackets, and
6. flatten the expression into the sum of products of single-term factors.

By the end, the expression is in a simplified, and more importantly, standard form to which we can consistently reduce in order to juxtapose expressions. The example below demonstrates a few of the aforementioned simplification features, applying `evaluate()` to draw coefficients and constants out of indexbrackets, contract a spinor metric and a Kronecker delta, combine indexbrackets per the NW-SE convention, multiply gamma matrices, and simplify and canonicalize the result. The validity of the answer is easily verified.

```
>>> ex = Ex(r'(\Gamma_{a})_{\alpha \beta} (I \Gamma^b)^{\beta} \gamma C_{\gamma \eta} (5
→ \delta_b^a \Psi_d)_{\zeta}')
>>> susy.evaluate(ex)
'-55I C_{\alpha \eta} \indexbracket{\Psi_d}_{\zeta}'
```

²⁸ N.B. The spinor metric with its first index covariant and its second contravariant is often written simply as δ_{α}^{β} . This is not permissible when using SusyPy, as Kronecker deltas are considered pure Lorentz tensors by the algorithm. One must use C_{α}^{β} . Incidentally, the spinor metric is the only tensor in SusyPy whose indices are interpreted as spinor indices without the tensor having an indexbracket.

²⁹ As noted in the introduction, when we say Cadabra's "Lorentz-index canonicalization," we are referring to the ordinary lexicographic sorting of indices without use of, e.g., spinor metric properties, which for our purposes is virtually only useful for canonicalizing pure Lorentz tensors.

5.1.3 Compatibility with Cadabra Functions

As the last topic in our overview of the basic use of SusyPy, we consider here the compatibility of SusyPy with Cadabra functions and tools. Virtually all functions of SusyPy take in expression input as Cadabra `Ex` objects, as well as give expression output as Cadabra `Ex` objects.³⁰ This means that expressions outputted by Cadabra functions can be inputted into SusyPy functions and vice versa without the need to reenter the expression. In addition, SusyPy’s algorithms work well with Cadabra’s ordinary means of defining new tensors and imparting them properties. For example, in the 4D code below, three tensors A_a, λ_γ, d (the last one is actually a pseudo-scalar) are defined via Cadabra’s `Depends` to be “differentiable” by the supercovariant derivative and partial derivative defined in `susy_env()`, or more precisely, to have nonzero derivatives. In addition, λ_γ is defined to anticommute with the supercovariant derivative, reflecting that both are fermionic. Notice the Cadabra idiosyncrasy that properties assigned to a tensor with spinor indices must be explicitly assigned both to the underlying Lorentz tensor and to the tensor within indexbrackets; this arises from the fact that indexbrackets are viewed as somewhat distinct objects. Also, notice that we must explicitly write out `'\indexbracket'` rather than simply use parentheses.

```
>>> __cdbkernel__ = susy.susy_env(D = 4, lorentz_indices=['a', 'b', 'c', 'd'],
→ spinor_indices=[r'\alpha', r'\beta', r'\gamma'])
>>> cdb.Depends(Ex(r''A{#}'''), Ex(r''D{#}, \partial{#}'''))
>>> cdb.Depends(Ex(r''\lambda{#}'''), Ex(r''D{#}, \partial{#}'''))
>>> cdb.Depends(Ex(r''\indexbracket{\lambda{#}}{#}'''), Ex(r''D{#}, \partial{#}'''))
>>> cdb.AntiCommuting(Ex(r''\lambda, D{#}'''))
>>> cdb.AntiCommuting(Ex(r''\indexbracket{\lambda{#}}{#}, D{#}'''))
>>> cdb.Depends(Ex(r''d'''), Ex(r''D{#}, \partial{#}'''))
```

We can now demonstrate the combined application of SusyPy and Cadabra functions to a single expression “ex,” which in this case is the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to λ_γ . In the code below, the SusyPy functions `susy_expand()`, `evaluate()`, and `fierz_expand_2index()` of §5.9, §5.4, and §5.6 are applied to “ex,” followed by the Cadabra function `factor_in()`, which combines like terms with different coefficients in the variables u, v, w, x, y . The careful reader will notice that this code computes the closure on the fermion of the off-shell 4D vector multiplet, but we will table more thorough consideration of this multiplet until §5.9.

```
>>> susy_rule = r''D_{\alpha}(A_{a}) -> u (\Gamma_{a})_{\alpha}^{\beta} (\lambda)_{\beta},
→ D_{\alpha}((\lambda)_{\beta}) -> v (\Gamma^{a b})_{\alpha \beta} \partial_{a}(A_{b}) + w
→ C_{\alpha \beta} \partial^a(A_{a}) + x (\Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta} d, D_{\alpha}(d) -> y
→ (\Gamma^a \Gamma^a)_{\alpha}^{\beta} \partial_a((\lambda)_{\beta})''
>>> basis = [Ex(r'C_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b})_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta}'),
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^a \Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta}')], Ex(r'(\Gamma^a \Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta}')], Ex(r'(\Gamma^a \Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta}')],
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^a \Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta}')], Ex(r'(\Gamma^a \Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta}')], Ex(r'(\Gamma^a \Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta}')]
>>> indices = [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\beta}']
>>> ex = cdb.Ex(r'D_{\alpha}(D_{\beta}((\lambda)_{\gamma})) +
→ D_{\beta}(D_{\alpha}((\lambda)_{\gamma})))
```

³⁰ Also, like Cadabra functions, virtually all functions of SusyPy actually modify the inputted expressions rather than simply outputting the result. This means that the output of a SusyPy function need not be stored in a new variable.

```

>>> susy.susy_expand(ex, susy_rule)
>>> susy.evaluate(ex, to_perform_subs=False)
>>> susy.fierz_expand_2index(ex, basis, indices)
''' - 3/2 \indexbracket(\Gamma^{\{a\}}_{\alpha \beta} \partial_{\{a}(\indexbracket(\lambda)_{\gamma\}) u v - 1/2
→ \indexbracket(\Gamma^{\{a\}}_{\alpha \beta} \partial_{\{a}(\indexbracket(\lambda)_{\gamma\}) u w + 1/2
→ \indexbracket(\Gamma^{\{a\}}_{\alpha \beta} \partial_{\{a}(\indexbracket(\lambda)_{\gamma\}) x y + 1/2
→ \indexbracket(\Gamma^{\{a\}}_{\alpha \beta} \indexbracket(\Gamma_{\{a\}^{\{b\}}_{\gamma\}^{\{\alpha\}})
→ \partial_{\{b}(\indexbracket(\lambda)_{\alpha \beta}) u v - 1/2 \indexbracket(\Gamma^{\{a\}}_{\alpha \beta}
→ \indexbracket(\Gamma_{\{a\}^{\{b\}}_{\gamma\}^{\{\alpha\}}) \partial_{\{b}(\indexbracket(\lambda)_{\alpha \beta}) u w + 1/2
→ \indexbracket(\Gamma^{\{a\}}_{\alpha \beta} \indexbracket(\Gamma_{\{a\}^{\{b\}}_{\gamma\}^{\{\alpha\}})
→ \partial_{\{b}(\indexbracket(\lambda)_{\alpha \beta}) x y + 1/2 \indexbracket(\Gamma^{\{a\}}_{\gamma\}^{\{\alpha\}})
→ \indexbracket(\Gamma_{\{a\}^{\{b\}}_{\alpha \beta} \partial_{\{b}(\indexbracket(\lambda)_{\alpha \beta}) x y + 1/4
→ \indexbracket(\Gamma^{\{a\}}_{\alpha \beta} \indexbracket(\Gamma_{\{a\}^{\{b\}}_{\gamma\}^{\{\alpha\}})
→ \partial_{\{c}(\indexbracket(\lambda)_{\alpha \beta}) u v + 1/4 \indexbracket(\Gamma_{\{a\}^{\{b\}}_{\alpha \beta}
→ \indexbracket(\Gamma_{\{a\}^{\{b\}}_{\gamma\}^{\{\alpha\}}) \partial_{\{c}(\indexbracket(\lambda)_{\alpha \beta}) u w +
→ 1/4 \indexbracket(\Gamma_{\{a\}^{\{b\}}_{\alpha \beta} \indexbracket(\Gamma_{\{a\}^{\{b\}}_{\gamma\}^{\{\alpha\}})
→ \partial_{\{c}(\indexbracket(\lambda)_{\alpha \beta}) x y'''
>>> cdb.factor_in(ex, cdb.Ex('u, v, w, x, y', False))
'''( - 3/2 u v - 1/2 u w + 1/2 x y) \indexbracket(\Gamma^{\{a\}}_{\alpha \beta}
→ \partial_{\{a}(\indexbracket(\lambda)_{\gamma\}) + ( 1/2 u v - 1/2 u w + 1/2 x y)
→ \indexbracket(\Gamma^{\{a\}}_{\alpha \beta} \indexbracket(\Gamma_{\{a\}^{\{b\}}_{\gamma\}^{\{\alpha\}})
→ \partial_{\{b}(\indexbracket(\lambda)_{\alpha \beta}) + ( 1/2 u v + 1/2 u w + 1/2 x y)
→ \indexbracket(\Gamma^{\{a\}}_{\gamma\}^{\{\alpha\}}) \indexbracket(\Gamma_{\{a\}^{\{b\}}_{\alpha \beta}
→ \partial_{\{b}(\indexbracket(\lambda)_{\alpha \beta}) + ( 1/4 u v + 1/4 u w + 1/4 x y)
→ \indexbracket(\Gamma_{\{a\}^{\{b\}}_{\alpha \beta} \indexbracket(\Gamma_{\{a\}^{\{b\}}_{\gamma\}^{\{\alpha\}})
→ \partial_{\{c}(\indexbracket(\lambda)_{\alpha \beta})'''

```

Now that we have adumbrated the elementary use of SusyPy, we can begin considering the algorithms which enable the solution of the 11D supergravity multiplet and its non-closure geometry. The principal functions which draw constraints on the coefficients of the supersymmetry transformation rules from closure will be expounded in §5.9 and §5.11, and the function which draws the remaining needed constraints from SUSY-invariance of the action will be presented in §5.12. These will be built upon tools which use propagators and recognition of gauge-invariant quantities to isolate equation-of-motion terms in the closure, and these depend heavily on the spinor-index arithmetic demonstrated here which will be discussed in detail over the next few sections. The same techniques will yield the function used for completing the critical additional calculation after the solution of a multiplet, namely, the multiplet's holoraumy, at the end of this chapter.

A few remarks are in order about our treatment of symbolic algebra results in the remainder of this paper. It would be impractical and inconvenient to continue to present results as true Python output. While that was instructive for demonstration of use of the software, the results we will present, including both computationally verified results from the literature in this chapter and new results elsewhere in the paper, merit neat exposition in veritable L^AT_EX. Hence, from here on out, the results of all code will be typeset, and occasionally modifications like the reordering of terms or the factoring out of a constant will be done implicitly where such modifi-

cations offer a tangible improvement in clarity and only a small algebraic jump from the code's actual output. In addition, for brevity, we omit calls to `susy_env()` and explicit tensor definitions in the code blocks in the remainder of this paper, since they would impose significant baggage on code blocks and would only provide information easily gleaned from context. Nevertheless, we *do* offer the full code corresponding to each computational calculation on GitHub at <https://github.com/IsaiahBHilz/susypy/tree/main/paper>, in the files with "code_blocks" in their names which correspond to chapters 2-5 and appendices B and E of this paper.

5.2 Procedures for Traces and Dimension-Specific Substitutions

The first algorithms which must be considered in setting the foundation for spinor-index arithmetic are those that treat dimension-dependent gamma-matrix symmetries. (3.63) in [13] gives that

$$(\gamma_{a_1 a_2 \dots a_r})_{\alpha\beta} = -t_r (\gamma_{a_1 a_2 \dots a_r})_{\beta\alpha}, \quad (5.2.1)$$

where t_r is the r th element of a sequence defined by fixing $t_0, t_1 \in \{-1, 1\}$ and setting $t_{r+2} = -t_r$. The values of t_0, t_1 depend on the dimension D , and are unique for odd D . The possible values for each D are tabulated in Table 3.1 of [13],³¹ but it is easy enough to calculate them on the fly. In particular, (3.106) of [13] shows that

$$t_0 \cos\left(\frac{m\pi}{2}\right) + t_1 \sin\left(\frac{m\pi}{2}\right) = -1, \quad (5.2.2)$$

where $m = \lfloor D/2 \rfloor$ is the greatest nonnegative integer no greater than half the dimension.³² It follows immediately from this equation that either $m\pi/2$ is an integer multiple of π and $t_0 = -\cos(m\pi/2)$, or $m\pi/2$ is a half-integer multiple of π and $t_1 = -\sin(m\pi/2)$. That is, one of t_0, t_1 is fixed by (5.2.2). If D is odd, then the other can be fixed by the fact that γ^{2m} is constructed by adjoining the highest-rank element $\pm\gamma_*$ in the $(D-1)$ -dimensional Clifford algebra. Since γ^{2m} has the symmetry t_1 while $\pm\gamma_*$ has the symmetry t_{2m} (γ_* is roughly proportional to a $2m$ -indexed gamma matrix), it follows that

$$t_1 = t_{2m} = (-1)^m t_0. \quad (5.2.3)$$

Hence, if D is odd and t_0 is fixed by (5.2.2), then $t_1 = (-1)^m t_0$, while if t_1 is fixed by (5.2.2), then $t_0 = (-1)^m t_1$. If, on the other hand, D is even, then (5.2.3) does not hold and the value of the unfixed symmetry is arbitrary. In general, though, for even D , one typically chooses t_0, t_1 equal if $D \equiv 0 \pmod{8}$ and opposite otherwise.

The algorithm "GenSyms" uses the foregoing considerations to determine t_0, t_1 .³³ In particular, it takes the dimension D , and optionally desired values for t_0, t_1 , as input and computes $-\cos(m\pi/2)$ and $-\sin(m\pi/2)$ to determine one of t_0, t_1 by (5.2.2). The program then computes the other of t_0, t_1 via (5.2.3) if D is odd, by the inputted desired values if D is even and the desired values agree with the fixed one of t_0, t_1 , or via the aforementioned conventions if D is even but desired values

³¹ It is possible to tabulate the possible values of t_0, t_1 for each D since by Bott periodicity, these symmetries repeat with period 8 as D is varied.

³² Note that (3.106) of [13] erroneously includes a factor of 2^{m-1} in the t_1 factor.

³³ In the program, "GenSyms" is manifested as a function `gen_syms()`. In this paper, the convention is that inline code represents the Python function while double-quoted camel-script text represents the algorithm abstractly.

are not inputted. If the desired values are impossible, an error is raised. Algorithm 5.2.1 shows detailed pseudo-code for this procedure. Note that $\text{int}(D\%8 \neq 0)$ represents the boolean condition $D \not\equiv 0 \pmod{8}$ viewed as a numeric value 0 or 1, so that $(-1)^{\text{int}(D\%8 \neq 0)}$ is short-hand for

$$(-1)^{\text{int}(D\%8 \neq 0)} = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } D \not\equiv 0 \pmod{8} \\ 1, & \text{if } D \equiv 0 \pmod{8}. \end{cases} \quad (5.2.4)$$

Algorithm 5.2.1 Find Values of t_0, t_1 per Dimension

Require: *desired_syms* equals $[0,0]$ (i.e., null), $[1,1]$, $[1,-1]$, $[-1,1]$, or $[-1,-1]$

```

1: function GENSYMS( $D$ , desired_syms $[0..1]$ )
2:    $m \leftarrow \lfloor D/2 \rfloor$ 
3:    $\text{syms} \leftarrow [-\cos(m\pi/2), -\sin(m\pi/2)]$ 
4:   if  $D$  is odd &  $\text{syms}[0] = 0$  then ▷ If  $D$  is odd, use (5.2.3).
5:      $\text{syms}[0] \leftarrow (-1)^m \cdot \text{syms}[1]$ 
6:   else if  $D$  is odd &  $\text{syms}[1] = 0$  then
7:      $\text{syms}[1] \leftarrow (-1)^m \cdot \text{syms}[0]$ 
8:   else if  $D$  is even &  $\text{syms}[0] = 0$  &  $\text{syms}[1] = \text{desired\_syms}[1]$  then ▷ If  $D$  is even, try desired values.
9:      $\text{syms}[0] \leftarrow \text{desired\_syms}[0]$ 
10:  else if  $D$  is even &  $\text{syms}[1] = 0$  &  $\text{syms}[0] = \text{desired\_syms}[0]$  then
11:     $\text{syms}[1] \leftarrow \text{desired\_syms}[1]$ 
12:  else if  $D$  is even &  $\text{syms}[0] = 0$  &  $\text{desired\_syms} = [0,0]$  then ▷ If desired values null, use conventions.
13:     $\text{syms}[0] \leftarrow (-1)^{\text{int}(D\%8 \neq 0)} \cdot \text{syms}[1]$ 
14:  else if  $D$  is even &  $\text{syms}[1] = 0$  &  $\text{desired\_syms} = [0,0]$  then
15:     $\text{syms}[1] \leftarrow (-1)^{\text{int}(D\%8 \neq 0)} \cdot \text{syms}[0]$ 
16:  end if
17:  if  $\text{syms} \neq \text{desired\_syms}$  &  $\text{desired\_syms} \neq [0,0]$  then ▷ If desired symmetries impossible, raise error.
18:    raise error because desired_syms must equal syms if desired_syms is not null
19:  end if
20:  return syms
21: end function

```

As mentioned earlier, t_r can be calculated for all $r > 1$ from t_0, t_1 via the rule $t_{r+2} = -t_r$. In particular, if $t_0 = 1$, then since $t_{r+4} = t_r$, $t_r = 1$ for all $r \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$. Similarly, if $t_0 = -1$, then $t_2 = 1$ and $t_r = 1$ for all $r \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$; if $t_1 = 1$, then $t_r = 1$ for all $r \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$; and if $t_1 = -1$, then $t_3 = 1$ and $t_r = 1$ for all $r \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. By (5.2.1), a gamma matrix with r vector indices is antisymmetric if and only if $t_r = 1$. Hence, the algorithm “AntisymmetricGammas” uses the foregoing considerations of the t_r to list all of the values r from 1 to $2\lfloor D/2 \rfloor$ ³⁴ for which r -index gamma matrices are antisymmetric. The inputs are the dimension D and a length-two array “syms” which contains the values of t_0, t_1 (in that order). Algorithm 5.2.2 presents detailed pseudo-code.

Besides the gamma matrices, two other tensors of import are the highest-rank element γ_* of the Clifford algebra (for D even) and the spinor metric (charge conjugation matrix) $C_{\alpha\beta}$ which is used to raise and lower spinor indices. γ_* is antisymmetric if and only if $t_{2m} = 1$, and $C_{\alpha\beta}$ is antisymmetric if and only if $t_0 = 1$. The symmetries of these two tensors and those of the gamma matrices can be employed to discern the symmetry of $\gamma^{a_1 a_2 \dots a_r} \gamma_*$ for a particular r , which proves

³⁴ Gamma matrices can have at most $2\lfloor D/2 \rfloor$ indices in dimension D (while maintaining properties like tracelessness).

Algorithm 5.2.2 Tabulate Antisymmetric Gamma Matrices

```

1: function ANTISYMMETRICGAMMAS( $D$ ,  $\text{syms}[0..1]$ )
2:    $\text{antisym\_gammas} \leftarrow []$ 
3:    $n \leftarrow 2\lfloor D/2 \rfloor$ 
4:   for  $i \in 1..n$  do
5:     if  $(i \equiv 0 \pmod{4} \ \& \ \text{syms}[0] = 1)$  or  $(i \equiv 1 \pmod{4} \ \& \ \text{syms}[1] = 1)$  or  $(i \equiv 2 \pmod{4} \ \& \ \text{syms}[0] = -1)$  or  $(i \equiv 3 \pmod{4} \ \& \ \text{syms}[1] = -1)$  then
6:       append  $i$  to  $\text{antisym\_gammas}$ 
7:     end if
8:   end for
9:   return  $\text{antisym\_gammas}$ 
10: end function

```

necessary in spinor-index canonicalization for even D . Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma^{a_1 a_2 \dots a_r} \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} &= (\gamma^{a_1 a_2 \dots a_r})_{\alpha}{}^{\gamma} (\gamma_*)_{\gamma\beta} \\
&= (-t_{2m}) (\gamma^{a_1 a_2 \dots a_r})_{\alpha}{}^{\gamma} (\gamma_*)_{\beta\gamma} \\
&= (-t_{2m}) (\gamma^{a_1 a_2 \dots a_r})_{\alpha}{}^{\gamma} (\gamma_*)_{\beta}{}^{\eta} C_{\eta\gamma} \\
&= (-t_{2m})(-t_0) (\gamma^{a_1 a_2 \dots a_r})_{\alpha}{}^{\gamma} C_{\gamma\eta} (\gamma_*)_{\beta}{}^{\eta} \\
&= (-t_{2m})(-t_0) (\gamma^{a_1 a_2 \dots a_r})_{\alpha\eta} (\gamma_*)_{\beta}{}^{\eta} \\
&= (-t_{2m})(-t_0)(-t_r) (\gamma_*)_{\beta}{}^{\eta} (\gamma^{a_1 a_2 \dots a_r})_{\eta\alpha} \\
&= (-t_{2m})(-t_0)(-t_r) (\gamma_* \gamma^{a_1 a_2 \dots a_r})_{\beta\alpha} \\
&= (-t_{2m})(-t_0)(-t_r)(-1)^r (\gamma^{a_1 a_2 \dots a_r} \gamma_*)_{\beta\alpha},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.2.5}$$

where the final step used that γ_* commutes with even-rank gamma matrices and anticommutes with odd-rank gamma matrices. Hence, a negative is introduced in the symmetry equation above for each of the following conditions: $t_{2m} = 1$, $t_0 = 1$, $t_r = 1$, and $r \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$. The function “isGammaGammaStarProdSym” calculates the overall sign by multiplying 1 by an additional factor of -1 for each of the aforementioned conditions which holds, and then returns the boolean given by setting this value equal to 1, which represents the validity of the proposition that $\gamma^{a_1 a_2 \dots a_r} \gamma_*$ is symmetric rather than antisymmetric. Algorithm 5.2.3 presents the detailed pseudo-code.³⁵

The foregoing three algorithms complete the consideration of dimension-dependent spinor-index symmetries. The other dimension-specific identities of import are the reductions of gamma matrices with more than $m = \lfloor D/2 \rfloor$ indices to those with at most m indices (multiplied by γ_* if D is even). In particular, (3.41) and (3.42) in [13] show that

$$\gamma_{\pm}^{a_1 \dots a_r} = \pm \frac{i^{m+1}}{(D-r)!} \epsilon^{a_1 \dots a_D} \gamma_{\pm a_D \dots a_{r+1}}, \quad D \text{ odd} \tag{5.2.6a}$$

$$\gamma^{a_1 \dots a_r} \gamma_* = (-1)^m \frac{i^{m+1}}{(D-r)!} \epsilon^{a_r \dots a_1 b_1 \dots b_{D-r}} \gamma_{b_1 \dots b_{D-r}}, \quad D \text{ even}, \tag{5.2.6b}$$

where the \pm in the identity for odd D reflects that there are two choices of representation for the Clifford algebra in dimension D odd. The second equation can be rewritten in a form more parallel

³⁵ We take into account the symmetry of γ_* via t_{2m} even if D is odd, as $\gamma_* = \pm \gamma^{2m}$ by convention for odd D , so it is well-defined and carries the same symmetry.

Algorithm 5.2.3 Check whether the Product of an r -Indexed Gamma Matrix with γ_* is Symmetric

```

1: function isGAMMAGAMMASTARPRODSYM( $r, D, \text{syms}[0..1]$ )
2:    $\text{antisym\_gammas} = \text{AntisymmetricGammas}(D, \text{syms})$ 
3:    $C \leftarrow 1$ 
4:   if  $2\lfloor D/2 \rfloor \in \text{antisym\_gammas}$  then ▷ i.e., if  $\gamma_*$  is antisymmetric
5:      $C \leftarrow -C$ 
6:   end if
7:   if  $\text{syms}[0] = 1$  then ▷ i.e., if  $C$  is antisymmetric
8:      $C \leftarrow -C$ 
9:   end if
10:  if  $r \in \text{antisym\_gammas}$  then ▷ i.e., if the  $r$ -index  $\gamma$  is antisymmetric
11:     $C \leftarrow -C$ 
12:  end if
13:  if  $r \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$  then ▷ i.e., if  $\gamma_*$  and the  $r$ -index  $\gamma$  anticommute
14:     $C \leftarrow -C$ 
15:  end if
16:  return  $C = 1$ 
17: end function

```

to the first as³⁶

$$\gamma^{a_1 \dots a_r} = (-1)^r \frac{i^{m+1}}{(D-r)!} \epsilon^{a_1 \dots a_D} \gamma_{a_D \dots a_{r+1}} \gamma_*, \quad D \text{ even.} \quad (5.2.7)$$

Such substitutions are particularly useful for reducing a gamma matrix into an element of a basis for the Clifford algebra. Since these substitutions are unavailable in Cadabra’s gamma-matrix arithmetic (Cadabra will simply keep concatenating indices in gamma-matrix products until the dimension limit is reached), we handle such substitutions in the “Evaluate” algorithm of §5.4 using an algorithm we present now, called “GenSubs,” which compiles all such substitutions for a particular dimension and representation. In particular, “GenSubs” takes the dimension and the representation $+1$ or -1 (only relevant for D odd) as input and loops through all possible values of r greater than m . For each r , the appropriate equation (5.2.6a) or (5.2.7) with that r is prepended to an array of such identities.³⁷ Finally, if D is even, (5.2.6b) is appended in the case $r = m$, which is occasionally necessary in even-dimensional Fierz expansions. This system of identities, serving as substitution rules to replace a gamma matrix with too many Lorentz indices, is the output of the algorithm. Algorithm 5.2.4 depicts the aforementioned procedure in pseudo-code.

The Python function `susy_env()` introduced in §5.1 interfaces with Cadabra to fix gamma-matrix objects, supercovariant derivative objects, trace objects, etc., as well as define tensors like γ_* , $C_{\alpha\beta}$, and products $\gamma^{a_1 \dots a_r} \gamma_*$ which are absent in Cadabra. The function takes the dimension D , desired values for t_0, t_1 , the representation for the basis of the Clifford algebra, and sets of vector and spinor indices as optional inputs. (By default, $D = 11$ and the representation is -1 ; see Appendix A.) The function uses “GenSyms” to obtain t_0, t_1 values for the inputted dimension D (and desired symmetries), and inputs the dimension and t_0, t_1 values into “AntisymmetricGammas” and “isGammaGammaStarProdSym” to obtain symmetries for the gamma matrices, γ_* , $C_{\alpha\beta}$, and appropriate products, as well as attach these symmetries to the corresponding Cadabra objects. Finally, the function establishes all of its inputs as global variables so that these inputs may be

³⁶ The change in sign comes from the reordering of the indices and the identity $(-1)^m (-1)^{r(r-1)/2} (-1)^{(D-r)(D-r-1)/2} = (-1)^r$ for D even.

³⁷ These identities are intended for use in reducing gamma matrices via repeated substitutions, so it is desirable that the substitutions be carried out in descending number of indices from $2m$ to $m+1$. Hence, it is preferable to prepend rather than append the substitution rules to the list as r increases.

Algorithm 5.2.4 Generate Substitution Rules for Gamma Matrices with More than $\lfloor D/2 \rfloor$ Indices

```

1: function GENSUBS( $D, rep$ )
2:    $m \leftarrow \lfloor D/2 \rfloor$ 
3:    $sub\_exs \leftarrow []$ 
4:   for  $r \in (m+1)..2m$  do
5:      $exstr \leftarrow \gamma^{a_1 \dots a_r}$ 
6:      $res\_str\_base \leftarrow \frac{i^{m+1}}{(D-r)!} \epsilon^{a_1 \dots a_r a_{r+1} \dots a_D} \gamma_{a_D \dots a_{r+1}}$ 
7:     if  $D \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$  then:
8:        $sub\_rule \leftarrow "exstr \rightarrow (-1)^r \cdot res\_str\_base \cdot \gamma_*$  ▷ i.e., (5.2.7)
9:     else
10:       $sub\_rule \leftarrow "exstr \rightarrow rep \cdot res\_str\_base"$  ▷ i.e., (5.2.6a)
11:     end if
12:     prepend  $sub\_rule$  to  $sub\_exs$ 
13:   end for
14:   if  $D \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$  then
15:      $exstr \leftarrow \gamma^{a_1 \dots a_m} \gamma_*$ 
16:      $res\_str\_base \leftarrow (-1)^m \frac{i^{m+1}}{m!} \epsilon^{a_1 \dots a_m a_{m+1} \dots a_D} \gamma_{a_D \dots a_{m+1}}$ 
17:      $sub\_rule \leftarrow "exstr \rightarrow res\_str\_base"$  ▷ i.e., (5.2.6b) with  $r = m$ 38
18:     append  $sub\_rule$  to  $sub\_exs$ 
19:   end if
20:   return  $sub\_exs$ 
21: end function

```

suppressed in other functions. As a result, these environmental parameters may be suppressed as inputs in further algorithms, even if they are used. Since the `susy_env()` procedure is long and highly technical, dealing largely with Cadabra idiosyncrasies, detailed pseudo-code for it is omitted here.

While `susy_env()` records the representation for use by “GenSubs,” it does not itself make use of the algorithm. Rather, the latter’s first application is in calculating traces, which are already naturally dimension-dependent via the fact that $\text{tr}(\mathbb{1}) = 2^{\lfloor D/2 \rfloor}$. The “Trace” function in Algorithm 5.2.5 presents a standard simplification sequence in Cadabra, consisting of the multiplication and simplification of gamma-matrix products and the use of `untrace()` to withdraw constant coefficients, Kronecker deltas, and Levi-Civita tensors from the trace.³⁹ However, there are several important modifications. The substitution rules generated by “GenSubs” are used to reduce the gamma matrices to those with at most $\lfloor D/2 \rfloor$ indices, which aids in simplification, and a substitution is also introduced to reflect that the square of γ_* is the identity. The while loop running the simplification sequence terminates when two consecutive steps yield the same result. After this and canonicalization with Cadabra,⁴⁰ the trace consists of constant coefficients, Kronecker deltas, and Levi-Civita tensors multiplied by traces of the identity, pure gamma matrices, γ_* , and products $\gamma^A \gamma_*$ or $\gamma_* \gamma^A$, where A is an arbitrary set of indices. The first of these traces is given by the earlier mentioned formula, while the rest are zero. The function concludes by replacing dummy Lorentz indices with primed equivalents to prevent conflicts in use by other functions.

Given that a goal of SusyPy is the accessible computation of expressions with spinor indices, the suite must take into account that traces are ubiquitous where dummy spinor indices are brought to

³⁹In the pseudo-code in this paper, camel-script functions are those created by the authors, while lower-case functions are those of Cadabra or Python.

⁴⁰We must apologize to the reader for the ostensibly inconsistent use of the American English “canonicalize” and the British English “canonicalise.” Cadabra2 uses the British spelling, but we use primarily American English conventions in this paper. Hence, we use American spelling except in the pseudo-code, where we feel obliged to follow Cadabra’s convention.

Algorithm 5.2.5 Calculate the Trace

```
1: function TRACE( $\mathcal{E}$ )
2:    $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{tr}(\mathcal{E})$  ▷ i.e., place  $\mathcal{E}$  in Cadabra's symbolic trace
3:    $\mathcal{E}_0 \leftarrow 1$ 
4:   while  $\mathcal{E} \neq \mathcal{E}_0$  do
5:      $\mathcal{E}_0 \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$ 
6:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{join\_gamma}(\text{ex})$ 
7:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{distribute}(\mathcal{E})$ 
8:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{sort\_product}(\mathcal{E})$ 
9:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{substitute}(\mathcal{E}, \text{GenSubs}())$ 
10:     $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{untrace}(\mathcal{E})$ 
11:     $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{substitute}(\mathcal{E}, \gamma_* \gamma_* \rightarrow \mathbb{1})$ 
12:  end while
13:   $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{canonicalise}(\mathcal{E})$ 
14:   $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{substitute}(\mathcal{E}, \text{tr}(\mathbb{1}) \rightarrow 2^{\lfloor D/2 \rfloor})$ 
15:   $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{substitute}(\mathcal{E}, \text{tr}(\gamma^A) \rightarrow 0)$ 
16:   $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{substitute}(\mathcal{E}, \text{tr}(\gamma_*) \rightarrow 0)$ 
17:   $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{substitute}(\mathcal{E}, \text{tr}(\gamma_* \gamma^A) \rightarrow 0)$ 
18:   $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{substitute}(\mathcal{E}, \text{tr}(\gamma^A \gamma_*) \rightarrow 0)$ 
19:  dummies  $\leftarrow$  dummy indices of  $\mathcal{E}$ 
20:  primed_dummies  $\leftarrow$  dummies primed
21:   $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$  with dummies replaced with primed_dummies
22:  return  $\mathcal{E}$ 
23: end function
```

the same factor after a series of operations. Given a product \mathcal{E} of factors with spinor indices, the function “EvaluateTraces” loops through the factors, recording the spinor indices of the factor and discerning whether a dummy pair exists. If so, then those spinor indices are removed to obtain the underlying Lorentz tensor, which is entered into the trace as input. If the contravariant index in the dummy pair is first, then a negative is introduced, as $(B)^\alpha_\alpha = -(B)_\alpha^\alpha = -\text{tr}(B)$. The resulting traces then replace the original factors in \mathcal{E} . The result is that all factors with dummy-spinor-index pairs are evaluated as traces, which will be needed in the “Evaluate” algorithm of §5.4 following the “SpinorCombine” algorithm of §5.3. Algorithm 5.2.6 shows detailed pseudo-code for this program.

Algorithm 5.2.6 Compute All Traces Implicit in a Product of Factors with Spinor Indices

```
1: function EVALUATETRACES( $\mathcal{E}$ )
2:   for spinor_factor in factors of  $\mathcal{E}$  with spinor indices do
3:     outer_indices  $\leftarrow$  spinor indices of spinor_factor
4:     if there are two indices in outer_indices with the same name then ▷ i.e., dummy spinor indices
5:       c  $\leftarrow$  coefficient of spinor_factor
6:       if spinor_factor is a spinor metric then
7:         inner_obj  $\leftarrow \mathbb{1}$  ▷  $C_\alpha^\alpha = \text{tr}(\mathbb{1})$ 
8:       else
9:         inner_obj  $\leftarrow$  spinor_factor without spinor indices ▷ This lacks the coefficient c.
10:      end if
11:      if outer_indices[0] is contravariant and outer_indices[1] is covariant then
12:        replace spinor_factor with Trace( $-c \cdot \text{inner\_obj}$ ) ▷  $(B)^\alpha_\alpha = \text{tr}(-B)$ 
13:      else if outer_indices[0] is covariant & outer_indices[1] is contravariant then
14:        replace spinor_factor with Trace( $c \cdot \text{inner\_obj}$ )
15:      end if
16:    end if
17:  end for
18:  return  $\mathcal{E}$ 
19: end function
```

To give a simple example of use, the code below evaluates the implicit trace $(\gamma_{ab}\gamma^{cd})_\alpha^\alpha$ in 11D.

```
>>> ex = Ex(r'(\Gamma_{a b} \Gamma^{c d})_{\alpha}^{\alpha}')
>>> evaluate_traces(ex)
```

The result is

$$(\gamma_{ab}\gamma^{cd})_{\alpha}^{\alpha} = 32\delta_a^d\delta_b^c - 32\delta_a^c\delta_b^d, \quad (5.2.8)$$

matching equation (A.20) in [19].

The code below evaluates another implicit trace, this time with a non-unit coefficient and indices in the opposite orientation, viz., $(-1/32)(\gamma_a\gamma_b\gamma_c\gamma_d\gamma_e\gamma_f\gamma_g\gamma_h\gamma_i\gamma_j\gamma_k)_{\alpha}^{\alpha}$. Here, a few more simplification steps are needed; these will be built into the “Evaluate” function.

```
>>> ex = Ex(r'(-1/32) (\Gamma_{a} \Gamma_{b} \Gamma_{c} \Gamma_{d} \Gamma_{e} \Gamma_{f} \Gamma_{g} \Gamma_{h} \Gamma_{i} \Gamma_{j} \Gamma_{k})^{\alpha}_{\alpha}')
>>> evaluate_traces(ex)
>>> eliminate_kronecker(ex)
>>> canonicalise(ex)
>>> collect_terms(ex)
```

The result is

$$-\frac{1}{32}(\gamma_a\gamma_b\gamma_c\gamma_d\gamma_e\gamma_f\gamma_g\gamma_h\gamma_i\gamma_j\gamma_k)_{\alpha}^{\alpha} = \epsilon_{abcdefghijk}. \quad (5.2.9)$$

It can be immediately seen that this is the correct answer, for (5.2.6a) with $D = r = 11$ gives (in the default -1 representation)

$$\gamma^{a_1\cdots a_{11}} = -\frac{i^6}{(0)!}\epsilon^{a_1\cdots a_{11}} = \epsilon^{a_1\cdots a_{11}}, \quad (5.2.10)$$

and therefore, $\gamma_{abcdefghijk} = \epsilon_{abcdefghijk}$. Since every term in the completely multiplied expression $\gamma_a\gamma_b\gamma_c\gamma_d\gamma_e\gamma_f\gamma_g\gamma_h\gamma_i\gamma_j\gamma_k$ besides $\gamma_{abcdefghijk}$ involves a gamma matrix with at most $2m$ indices, which is traceless,⁴¹ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{32}(\gamma_a\gamma_b\gamma_c\gamma_d\gamma_e\gamma_f\gamma_g\gamma_h\gamma_i\gamma_j\gamma_k)_{\alpha}^{\alpha} &= \frac{1}{32}\text{tr}(\gamma_a\gamma_b\gamma_c\gamma_d\gamma_e\gamma_f\gamma_g\gamma_h\gamma_i\gamma_j\gamma_k) \\ &= \frac{1}{32}\text{tr}(\gamma_{abcdefghijk}) \\ &= \frac{1}{32}\epsilon_{abcdefghijk}\text{tr}(\mathbb{1}) \\ &= \epsilon_{abcdefghijk}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2.11)$$

5.3 Algorithm for Spinor-Index Canonicalization

At the heart of the spinor-index arithmetic utilized in the rest of the SusyPy module is spinor-index canonicalization. In particular, the algorithm “SpinorCombine” transforms an expression \mathcal{E} , involving terms which are products of elements with spinor indices, into a canonical expression

⁴¹ $\gamma_{abcdefghijk}$ is not traceless, since it is (arguably) not a proper gamma matrix, as it has too many indices. In fact, the true reason that $\gamma_{abcdefghijk} = \epsilon_{abcdefghijk}$ is that both are antisymmetric tensors in as many Lorentz indices as possible without making the expression identically zero. (5.2.6a) merely makes the two tensors equal rather than proportional.

which maximally combines factors by exploiting (monoterm) symmetries, the spinor metric, and sorting. “Combining” refers to multiplication of the form $(B)_\alpha^\beta (C)_\beta^\gamma = (BC)_\alpha^\gamma$ which attaches spinor indices to the product of pure Lorentz tensors following the NW-SE convention⁴² that this combination can only occur given a dummy pair in which the first index is contravariant and the second covariant. As mentioned in §5.1, spinor indices are distinguished from vector indices by attaching the former to a Cadabra “indexbracket” $(\cdot)_{\alpha\beta}$ surrounding an object rather than to an object directly. To achieve the maximum combination, “SpinorCombine” loops through each term in \mathcal{E} and breaks it down into a coefficient c_0 , the factors S involving spinor indices (i.e., those identified as indexbrackets), the set I of underlying Lorentz tensors of the latter (e.g., if $(B)_{\alpha\beta} \in S$, then $B \in I$), and the remaining factors S^c (the complement of S in the set of factors of the term). Each element $s \in S$ has at most two spinor indices,⁴³ so the set O of indices of the $s \in S$ is recorded as an array of 2-tuples $o(s)$ for all $s \in S$, where the second entry of $o(s)$ is left null if s carries only one spinor index. For example, if the term is $2(A)_{\alpha\beta}(B)_\gamma$, then $c_0 = 2$, $S = \{(A)_{\alpha\beta}, (B)_\gamma\}$, $I = \{A, B\}$, and $O = \{(\alpha, \beta), (\gamma, \text{None})\}$.⁴⁴

With this breakdown of the factors in the term, the algorithm determines whether it is necessary to consider the term further. Letting n be the cardinality of S , if $n \leq 1$, then there are no two factors with spinor indices to multiply or canonicalize, so the term is simply skipped over. On the other hand, if $n \geq 2$, then it is worthwhile to proceed. The procedure augments every 2-tuple $o \in O$ with a third element, viz., the boolean proposition that the factor $s(o) \in S$ corresponding to o has an (anti)symmetry, storing this set of 3-tuples as a separate array which is inputted into the algorithm “FindChain” (discussed later) to retrieve the ordering of the elements $s \in S$ which leads to maximal chains of consecutive spinor-indexed factors which can be combined. S, I, O are imparted this ordering, and then the program loops through the consecutive pairs of factors in this ordering.⁴⁵ This first part of the procedure which sets the stage for the actual multiplication of factors with dummy-spinor-index pairs is shown in pseudo-code as Algorithm 5.3.1.

The second and third parts concern the contents of the loop through consecutive factor pairs. The ordering from “FindChain” ensures that two consecutive factors can either not be combined or can be combined by simply taking advantage of symmetries of the factors and properties of the spinor metric, i.e., no further reordering of the factors is necessary for maximum combination, and this maximum combination can indeed be achieved by considering consecutive pairs one at a time. The second part of the “SpinorCombine” procedure (the first part of the loop) takes account of all minus signs introduced when combining the pair. Let (s_{i-1}, s_i) be the current pair and $o_{i-1} = o(s_{i-1}), o_i = o(s_i)$. There are seven possibilities. 1) If one of s_{i-1}, s_i has only one index, i.e., $\text{None} \in o_{i-1} \cup o_i$, then the pair is skipped over. The reason is that an element with a single spinor index is not a gamma matrix or similar object which can be meaningfully contracted with another element with which it shares a dummy index pair, but rather is a field λ_β ; the equation $(B)_\alpha^\beta \lambda_\beta = (B\lambda)_\alpha$ bears no significance, as there is no underlying tensor λ . 2) If each factor has

⁴² See footnote 15 regarding the relevance of NW-SE convention in particular dimensions.

⁴³ $s \in S$ with two spinor indices (and $s \in S^c$) is bosonic and $s \in S$ with one spinor index is fermionic. Hence, an element with 3 or more indices cannot carry any additional physical significance and is absent in any calculation of interest.

⁴⁴ In the next few sections, even when indices are given in isolation, we will frequently impart them the correct parity.

⁴⁵ Here, pairs $(s_1, s_2), (s_3, s_4)$ of consecutive spinor-indexed factors are considered consecutive if $s_2 = s_3$.

Algorithm 5.3.1 Spinor Index Canonicalization Part 1

```

1: function SPINORCOMBINE( $\mathcal{E}$ )
2:   for  $term$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  do
3:      $c_0 \leftarrow$  multiplier of  $term$ 
4:      $S \leftarrow$  factors of  $term$  that are a spinor metric or a Cadabra “indexbracket”
5:      $S^c \leftarrow$  other factors in  $term$ 
6:      $I \leftarrow \{s \text{ without spinor indices} \mid s \in S\}$ 
7:      $O \leftarrow []$ 
8:     for  $s \in S$  do
9:        $o \leftarrow$  spinor indices of  $s$ 
10:      if  $o$  has only one element then
11:        append  $[o[0], \text{None}]$  to  $O$ 
12:      else
13:        append  $o$  to  $O$ 
14:      end if
15:    end for
16:     $n \leftarrow |S|$ 
17:    if  $n \geq 2$  then
18:       $indices\_with\_syms \leftarrow \{(o[0], o[1], \text{symmetry of } s(o)) \mid o \in O\}$ 
19:       $order \leftarrow \mathbf{FindChain}(indices\_with\_syms)$ 
20:       $S \leftarrow$  reorder  $S$  based on  $order$ 
21:       $I \leftarrow$  reorder  $I$  based on  $order$ 
22:       $O \leftarrow$  reorder  $O$  based on  $order$ 
23:      for  $i \in 1..n - 1$  do
24:        continued...

```

two spinor indices, the second index in o_{i-1} is the same as the first index in o_i (up to parity, i.e., they have the same name), and the former is contravariant while the latter is covariant, then no manipulation is needed prior to combination of the factors, as the pair already satisfies NW-SE convention, whence no negative is introduced. (For this reason, the case is not even considered in this second part of the code.) 3) If the conditions in (2) hold except that the second index in o_{i-1} is covariant while the first index in o_i is contravariant, then the parities are flipped and a single negative is introduced if $t_0 = 1$.⁴⁶ The negative derives implicitly from antisymmetry of the spinor metric and the identity

$$C_{\beta\alpha}C^{\beta\gamma} = \delta_\alpha^\gamma \quad (5.3.1)$$

(3.60 in [13]), since, say,

$$(A)_{\alpha\beta}(B)^{\beta\gamma} = (A)_\alpha{}^\eta C_{\eta\beta}C^{\beta\rho}(B)_\rho{}^\gamma = (A)_\alpha{}^\eta(-\delta_\eta{}^\rho)(B)_\rho{}^\gamma = -(A)_\alpha{}^\beta(B)_\beta{}^\gamma, \quad (5.3.2)$$

where the dummy indices were renamed in the last step. 4) If the first index in o_{i-1} is the same as the first index in o_i and s_{i-1} is (anti)symmetric in its spinor indices, then the indices on s_{i-1} are swapped and the parities of the matching indices of the pair are flipped if necessary. A negative is introduced in the index-swapping if s_{i-1} is antisymmetric, and separately if a parity flip is necessary and $t_0 = 1$ by the argument in (3). For example, if $s_{i-1} = (A)_{\beta\alpha}$ and the spinor metric are antisymmetric, then $(A)_{\beta\alpha}(B)^{\beta\gamma} \mapsto -(A)_{\alpha\beta}(B)^{\beta\gamma} \mapsto (A)_\alpha{}^\beta(B)_\beta{}^\gamma$, which is in NW-SE convention. 5) Analogous to the situation in (4), if the second index in o_{i-1} is the same as the second index in o_i and s_i is (anti)symmetric in its spinor indices, then the indices on s_i are swapped and the parities of the matching indices are flipped if necessary, with a negative introduced if s_i is antisymmetric and separately if a parity flip is necessary and $t_0 = 1$. 6) In a sort-of composite of (4) and (5), if the

⁴⁶ Recall that the value of t_0 , along with the symmetries of the gamma matrices, γ_* , and appropriate products, was made accessible globally in `susy_env()`.

first index in o_{i-1} is the same as the second index in o_i and both s_{i-1}, s_i bear (anti)symmetry, then the indices are swapped in each factor and a parity flip is executed if necessary, with a negative introduced if s_{i-1} is antisymmetric, if s_i is antisymmetric, and if a parity flip is carried out and $t_0 = 1$. 7) If no matching indices are present or no symmetry is available to exploit such a dummy index pair, then no operation is applied to the pair. (This condition is obviously not included explicitly in the code.) The detailed pseudo-code for the part of "SpinorCombine" handling these cases can be found in Algorithm 5.3.2. Note that all of the foregoing operations were executed on o_{i-1}, o_i , and not on s_{i-1}, s_i explicitly.

Algorithm 5.3.2 Spinor Index Canonicalization Part 2

```

25:       $c \leftarrow 1$ 
26:      if  $S[i-1], S[i]$  are Cadabra "indexbrackets" but  $\text{None} \in O[i-1] \cup O[i]$  then                                 $\triangleright$  Case (1)
27:          continue to next iteration
28:      else if  $O[i-1][1], O[i][0]$  match &  $O[i-1][1]$  is covariant &  $O[i][0]$  is contravariant then                 $\triangleright$  Case (3)
29:           $c \leftarrow -c$  if  $t_0 = 1$ 
30:          make  $O[i-1][1]$  contravariant
31:          make  $O[i][0]$  covariant
32:      else if  $O[i-1][0], O[i][0]$  match & have opposite parity &  $S[i-1]$  is (anti)sym then                     $\triangleright$  Case (4)
33:          reverse order of  $O[i-1]$ 
34:           $c \leftarrow -c$  if  $S[i-1]$  is antisymmetric
35:           $c \leftarrow -c$  if  $O[i-1][1]$  is covariant &  $O[i][0]$  is contravariant &  $t_0 = 1$ 
36:          make  $O[i-1][1]$  contravariant
37:          make  $O[i][0]$  covariant
38:      else if  $O[i-1][1], O[i][1]$  match & have opp. parity &  $S[i]$  is (anti)sym then                         $\triangleright$  Case (5)
39:          reverse order of  $O[i]$ 
40:           $c \leftarrow -c$  if  $S[i]$  is antisymmetric
41:           $c \leftarrow -c$  if  $O[i-1][1]$  is covariant &  $O[i][0]$  is contravariant &  $t_0 = 1$ 
42:          make  $O[i-1][1]$  contravariant
43:          make  $O[i][0]$  covariant
44:      else if  $O[i-1][0], O[i][1]$  match & have opp. parity &  $S[i-1], S[i]$  are (anti)sym then                 $\triangleright$  Case (6)
45:          reverse order of  $O[i-1]$ 
46:          reverse order of  $O[i]$ 
47:           $c \leftarrow -c$  if  $S[i-1]$  is antisymmetric
48:           $c \leftarrow -c$  if  $S[i]$  is antisymmetric
49:           $c \leftarrow -c$  if  $O[i-1][1]$  is covariant &  $O[i][0]$  is contravariant &  $t_0 = 1$ 
50:          make  $O[i-1][1]$  contravariant
51:          make  $O[i][0]$  covariant
52:      end if
53:      continued...

```

Finally, in the third part of "SpinorCombine," which includes the trailing part of the loop through consecutive pairs of spinor-indexed factors, the combination of the factors in the pair is constructed. In particular, if after the operations of the second part, the second index in o_{i-1} matches the first index in o_i , with the former contravariant and the latter covariant, then the algorithm creates a combined product with the first index in o_{i-1} and the second index in o_i . If both of s_{i-1}, s_i are indexbrackets (i.e., neither is a spinor metric), then the product of the underlying Lorentz tensors $j_{i-1}, j_i \in I$ is placed in an indexbracket $(j_{i-1} \cdot j_i)_{o_{i-1} o_{i_2}}$, where the subscript is short-hand for any parity the indices might have. This indexbracket is then multiplied by the coefficients of s_{i-1}, s_i and the sign from the second part of the algorithm in order to ensure the correct coefficient for the new indexbracket, and this indexbracket replaces the pair of factors in the given term of \mathcal{E} .⁴⁷ If instead, both of s_{i-1}, s_i are spinor metrics, then they are replaced by a spinor metric $C_{o_{i-1} o_{i_2}}$ multiplied by

⁴⁷ This replacement is implemented by setting s_i equal to the new indexbracket and deleting s_{i-1} , and similarly for j_{i-1}, j_i and for o_{i-1}, o_i .

the coefficients of the factors and the sign from part 2. Finally, if one of s_{i-1}, s_i is an indexbracket and the other is a spinor metric, then the pair is replaced by an indexbracket like that in the pair except with indices $o_{i-1}o_{i2}$, and the indexbracket is multiplied by the appropriate coefficients as before. After processing every consecutive pair of factors in this manner,⁴⁸ the term being considered in \mathcal{E} is replaced by the symbolic product of the modified and combined elements of S , the elements of S^c , and the coefficient c_0 of the term recorded at the beginning. After looping through every term, the program returns the resulting maximally combined, spinor-index-canonicalized \mathcal{E} . Detailed pseudo-code for part 3 of “SpinorCombine” is in Algorithm 5.3.3.

Algorithm 5.3.3 Spinor Index Canonicalization Part 3

```

54:      if  $O[i-1][1], O[i][0]$  match &  $O[i-1][1]$  is contravariant &  $O[i][0]$  is covariant then
55:           $c_1 \leftarrow$  multiplier of  $S[i-1]$ 
56:           $c_2 \leftarrow$  multiplier of  $S[i]$ 
57:          if  $S[i-1]$  and  $S[i]$  are Cadabra “indexbracket”s then
58:               $S[i] \leftarrow c \cdot c_1 \cdot c_2 \cdot (I[i-1] \cdot I[i])_{O[i-1][0]O[i][1]}$ 
59:               $I[i] \leftarrow I[i-1] \cdot I[i]$ 
60:          else if  $S[i-1]$  and  $S[i]$  are spinor metrics then
61:               $S[i] \leftarrow c \cdot c_1 \cdot c_2 \cdot C_{O[i-1][0]O[i][1]}$ 
62:               $I[i] \leftarrow 1$ 
63:          else if  $S[i-1]$  is a Cadabra “indexbracket” &  $S[i]$  is a spinor metric then
64:               $S[i-1] \leftarrow c \cdot c_1 \cdot c_2 \cdot (I[i-1])_{O[i-1][0]O[i][1]}$ 
65:               $S[i] \leftarrow S[i-1]$ 
66:               $I[i] \leftarrow I[i-1]$ 
67:          else if  $S[i-1]$  is a spinor metric &  $S[i]$  is a Cadabra “indexbracket” then
68:               $S[i] \leftarrow c \cdot c_1 \cdot c_2 \cdot (I[i])_{O[i-1][0]O[i][1]}$ 
69:          end if
70:           $O[i][0] \leftarrow O[i-1][0]$ 
71:          delete  $S[i-1]$  from  $S$ 
72:          delete  $O[i-1]$  from  $O$ 
73:          delete  $I[i-1]$  from  $I$ 
74:      end if
75:  end for
76:  replace term in  $\mathcal{E}$  with  $c_0 \cdot \mathbf{prod}(S^c) \cdot \mathbf{prod}(S)$ 
77:  end if
78: end for
79: return  $\mathcal{E}$ 
80: end function

```

▷ **prod** is symbolic product

In “SpinorCombine,” the function “FindChain” was used to find the optimal ordering of the spinor-indexed factors. As mentioned earlier, the latter function’s input is a set A of 3-tuples whose entries are the two indices of a factor (one of which may be “None”) and the boolean proposition that the corresponding $s_i \in S$ is (anti)symmetric with respect to these indices. The first step in “FindChain” is to augment these 3-tuples with a number i which is the location of the 3-tuple in the array A .⁴⁹ The resulting array of 4-tuples is called B ; the goal of the algorithm is essentially to order these 4-tuples into optimal chains and read off the indices to obtain the best reordering of the elements of S . In particular, the goal will be to create chains of spinor factors ordered so that exploitation of symmetries and parity flips can combine the factors according to the NW-SE convention without commuting (reordering) the factors.

Once B is constructed, it is sorted such that the elements with no symmetries appear first, then

⁴⁸ Notice that the result of an iteration is included in the next pair.

⁴⁹ In ordinary programming jargon, i would be called the *index* of the 3-tuple in A , but we refer to it as the *location* to prevent confusion.

the elements with symmetries, and finally the elements with one spinor index.⁵⁰ The reason is that the algorithm loops through the elements of B in this order. Since the elements without symmetries cannot have their indices reordered, linking of such elements can only occur if the elements already share spinor indices in NW-SE convention (up to parity, which can always be flipped). The result after looping through all elements without symmetries is a set of rigid chains, each with fixed beginning and ending indices that cannot be swapped. Next, the program loops through elements with symmetries, which can be manipulated as much as possible to fit into a rigid chain if an index is shared with that chain. The elements with only a single spinor index are considered last, since if they fit into a chain, they terminate one end of that chain. For example, if a chain has beginning index α and ending index β , and an element with sole index β is added to the chain, then the resulting chain has only one end to which further elements may be joined, viz., α .

Now that the initial sorting of B has been justified, it is time to consider the details of chain construction. The chains are stored in an array C of length-5 arrays. Each length-5 array consists of the array of locations of the chain's elements as elements of A , the first spinor index in the chain, the last spinor index in the chain, the boolean proposition that exploitation of symmetries can enable the first and last indices to be swapped, and the location of the chain as an element of C . For example, if the third chain in C consists of the second, eighth, and tenth elements of A , has first index α , has last index β , and these two indices may be swapped by exploiting symmetries of the components of the chain, then this chain is represented by the array $[[2, 8, 10], \alpha, \beta, \text{True}, 2]$. Notice that only the first and last indices in the chain are relevant, because all other indices are paired within the chain. Also, the boolean proposition that exploitation of symmetries can swap the first and last indices of the chain is the same as the boolean proposition that every component of the chain bears a symmetry in its spinor indices. Since the algorithm functions by comparing elements of B to chains created from prior elements, a seed for the first chain is needed. This seed is the length-5 array representing the 1-element chain consisting of only the first element B_0 of B . This length-5 array consists of the 1-element array with the location of B_0 in A , the first index of B_0 , the second index of B_0 , the boolean proposition that B_0 has a symmetry,⁵¹ and the number 0 reflecting that this is the first chain.⁵²

With this trivial starting chain in place, the algorithm proceeds to loop through the remaining elements in B . Let B_j be the j th element of B , α_j be its first index, β_j be its second index, \mathfrak{s}_j be the boolean proposition of symmetry, and i_j be the location of B_j in A , so that $B_j = (\alpha_j, \beta_j, \mathfrak{s}_j, i_j)$. When B_j is reached in the loop through the elements of B (i.e., when the loop reaches its j th round), the algorithm loops through all elements of C , i.e., all stored chains. For each chain $c \in C$, let "chain" be the array of components of the chain, α_c be the first index, β_c be the last index, \mathfrak{s}_c be the boolean proposition of overall symmetry, and i_c be the location of c in C , so that $c = [\text{chain}, \alpha_c, \beta_c, \mathfrak{s}_c, i_c]$. If B_j has not yet been connected to any chain by the time c is reached in the loop, then there are three possibilities. 1) If α_c is not null and equals the second index β_j of

⁵⁰ The elements with one spinor index are considered "symmetric" in their indices in the algorithm, since the 2-tuple of indices, which contains the single index and null, can be trivially reordered by making null either the first or second index.

⁵¹ To say that an element B_0 of B has a symmetry is technically an abuse of notation, since it is the element of S corresponding to B_0 which has a symmetry, and B_0 simply carries the boolean of the existence of such a symmetry. Nevertheless, this minor misnomer improves brevity and should cause no confusion.

⁵² We follow the programming convention that the first element of an array has location 0.

B_j ,⁵³ then B_j can be prepended to the chain by prepending i_j to “chain”. For example, if the chain represented by c is $(D_1)_\alpha^{\gamma_1} \cdots (D_{r+1})_{\gamma_r}^\beta$ and the element represented by B_j is $(E)_\eta^\alpha$, then the latter can be prepended to the former to create the chain $(E)_\eta^\alpha (D_1)_\alpha^{\gamma_1} \cdots (D_{r+1})_{\gamma_r}^\beta$. Notice that the first index of B_j becomes the first index of the chain, and the new chain bears a symmetry in its first and last indices if and only if both c and B_j do. Hence, in the algorithm, α_c is replaced by α_j and \mathfrak{s}_c by the boolean $\mathfrak{s}_c \& \mathfrak{s}_j$. An equivalent situation can occur if α_c is equal to α_j and B_j bears a symmetry in its indices, for B_j can still be prepended to the chain. This is the situation that B_j represents $(E)_\eta^\alpha$ which is equal to $(E)_\eta^\alpha$ up to a sign, so that the same new chain can be constructed up to a sign. Of course, the indices of B_j take opposite roles here, so that α_c is replaced by β_j rather than α_j . In either case, B_j is marked as having been connected to a chain, and this chain’s location i_c is recorded. 2) If β_c is not null and equals α_j , then B_j can be appended to the chain by appending i_j to “chain.” For example, if c represents $(D_1)_\alpha^{\gamma_1} \cdots (D_{r+1})_{\gamma_r}^\beta$ and B_j represents $(E)_\beta^\eta$, then the latter can be appended to the former to create the chain $(D_1)_\alpha^{\gamma_1} \cdots (D_{r+1})_{\gamma_r}^\beta (E)_\beta^\eta$. Notice that the second index of B_j becomes the last index of the chain. Hence, β_c is replaced by β_j . Also, as in (1), \mathfrak{s}_c is replaced by the boolean $\mathfrak{s}_c \& \mathfrak{s}_j$. An equivalent situation can occur if β_c is equal to β_j and B_j bears a symmetry in its indices, for B_j can still be appended to the chain. This is the situation that B_j represents $(E)_\beta^\eta$ which is equal to $(E)_\beta^\eta$ up to a sign, so that the same new chain can be constructed up to a sign. In this case, β_c is replaced by α_j rather than β_j . As in (1), B_j is marked as having been connected to a chain, whose location i_c is recorded. 3) If neither of the two foregoing conditions holds, then B_j cannot be linked to c .

The loop through the chains $c \in C$ does not terminate when B_j is connected to a chain, for it may have two spinor indices and therefore connect to an additional chain. The result would be combining the two chains to which B_j is linked, which entails a distinct set of operations from those executed when B_j is first linked to a chain. Recall that if B_j is connected to a chain, the location k of that chain in C is recorded. There are six ways that B_j can be linked to another $c \in C$ if B_j has already been connected to the k th chain C_k . We continue the numbering from the discussion of cases where B_j has not yet been connected to a chain. 4) If the first index of C_k equals α_c , they are not null, and c bears a symmetry in its indices ($\mathfrak{s}_c = \text{True}$), then c can be reversed and prepended to C_k by reversing “chain” and prepending it to the first entry in the length-5 array C_k .⁵⁴ For example, if C_k represents the chain $(D_1)_\alpha^{\gamma_1} \cdots (D_{r+1})_{\gamma_r}^\beta$ and c represents the chain $(E_1)^{\alpha\eta_1} \cdots (E_{s+1})_{\eta_s\rho}$, then the two are replaced by the chain $(E_{s+1})_\rho^{\eta_s} \cdots (E_1)_{\eta_1}^\alpha (D_1)_\alpha^{\gamma_1} \cdots (D_{r+1})_{\gamma_r}^\beta$ (up to a sign). Evidently, the first index of the combined chain is the last index β_c of c , and the last index of the combined chain is the last index of C_k . 5) If the conditions of (4) hold except that C_k is the one bearing a symmetry, then C_k is reversed and c is appended to it.⁵⁵ In this case, the first index of the combined chain is the last index of C_k , and the last index of the combined chain is the last index β_c of c . 6) If the second index of C_k equals β_c , they are not null, and c bears a symmetry in its indices, then c is reversed and appended to C_k by reversing “chain” and appending it to the first entry of the length-5 array C_k . For example, if C_k represents $(D_1)_\alpha^{\gamma_1} \cdots (D_{r+1})_{\gamma_r}^\beta$ and c represents $(E_1)^{\rho\eta_1} \cdots (E_{s+1})_{\eta_s\beta}$, then the two are replaced by the combination $(D_1)_\alpha^{\gamma_1} \cdots (D_{r+1})_{\gamma_r}^\beta (E_{s+1})_\beta^{\eta_s} \cdots (E_1)_{\eta_1}^\rho$ (up to a

⁵³ By equality, we mean equality up to parity. Obviously, two spinor indices of the same parity cannot exist in the same product.

⁵⁴ Of course, formally, attaching $c \in C$ to an earlier $C_k \in C$ requires deleting c from C as a separate chain.

⁵⁵ The combined chain always replaces C_k .

sign). Evidently, the first index of the combined chain is the first index of C_k , and the last index of the combined chain is the first index α_c of c . 7) If the conditions of (6) hold except that C_k is the one bearing a symmetry, then C_k is reversed and c is prepended to it. In this case, the first index of the combined chain is the first index α_c of c , and the last index of the combined chain is the first index of C_k . 8) If the first index of C_k equals the second index β_c of c and they are not null, then c is prepended to C_k by prepending "chain" to the first entry in the length-5 array C_k . For example, if C_k represents $(D_1)_{\alpha}^{\gamma_1} \cdots (D_{r+1})_{\gamma_r}^{\beta}$ and c represents $(E_1)_{\rho}^{\eta_1} \cdots (E_{s+1})_{\eta_s}^{\alpha}$, then the combined chain is $(E_1)_{\rho}^{\eta_1} \cdots (E_{s+1})_{\eta_s}^{\alpha} (D_1)_{\alpha}^{\gamma_1} \cdots (D_{r+1})_{\gamma_r}^{\beta}$. Evidently, the first index of the combined chain is the first index α_c of c , and the last index of the combined chain is the last index of C_k . No symmetry is necessary on either chain. 9) If the second index of C_k equals the first index α_c of c and they are not null, then c is appended to C_k by appending "chain" to the first entry in the length-5 array C_k . In this case, the first index of the combined chain is the first index of C_k , and the last index of the combined chain is the last index β_c of c . In all of cases (4)-(9), the symmetry boolean of the combined chain is the boolean $\mathfrak{s}_c \& C_k[3]$ which is true if and only if both c and C_k bear symmetry in their indices.

After looping through every $c \in C$, if B_j could not connect to any existing chain, it is rendered its own 1-element chain. That is, the program appends the length-5 array $[[i_j], \alpha_j, \beta_j, \mathfrak{s}_j, |C|]$ to C , where the last entry of the array, the cardinality of C , reflects the chain's location at the end of C . Notice that a nontrivial example of a situation in which this can occur is when α_j is free and there exists a chain c such that β_c equals β_j but $\mathfrak{s}_j = \text{False}$, so that the indices of B_j cannot be swapped to achieve joining the chain according to the NW-SE convention. By the ordering of B , the chain c also cannot carry a helpful symmetry to resolve this. After looping through every $B_j \in B$, the only remaining task is to sort the resulting chains by indices in an extended lexicographic order in which null is greater than all other possibilities for the indices. First, for any chain $c \in C$ which bears symmetry in its indices, if β_c is lower lexicographically than α_c , then c is reversed.⁵⁶ Next, the chains $c \in C$ are ordered by lexicographic order of their first index α_c . Finally, from each length-5 array $c \in C$, the first entry, which contains the locations of the components of the chain in A , is drawn, and the ordered union of these first entries is returned as the output of the function.⁵⁷ From the foregoing, this outputted ordering of the elements in A is both canonical and representative of the maximum chaining of elements adhering to the NW-SE convention. Algorithm 5.3.4 shows detailed pseudo-code for the described procedure. In the long if/else if statement, the first two possibilities correspond to cases (1)-(2) above, while the remaining possibilities correspond to cases (4)-(9).

Given the ineluctable arduousness of slogging through the preceding technical depiction of "Find-Chain," we hope to impart here the procedure's conceptual underpinnings via an illustrated example in Fig. 1. Consider the ostensibly unwieldy expression

$$A_{\alpha\beta} B_{\gamma}^{\delta} \bar{C}_{\epsilon}^{\zeta} D_{\eta}^{\theta} \bar{E}_{\zeta}^{\beta} \bar{F}_{\iota}^{\kappa} G^{\lambda\eta} \bar{H}_{\kappa}^{\gamma} I_{\theta\delta} J_{\lambda} \bar{K}^{\alpha\iota}, \quad (5.3.3)$$

where the tensors with bars, viz., $\bar{C}_{\epsilon}^{\zeta}$, \bar{E}_{ζ}^{β} , \bar{F}_{ι}^{κ} , $\bar{H}_{\kappa}^{\gamma}$, \bar{K}_{α}^{ι} lack symmetries; the tensors without bars,

⁵⁶ Notice that this puts any single-indexed factor at the end of the chain.

⁵⁷ Specifically, the strict total order on the union is defined by setting $i < j$ if either there exists $c \in C$ such that $i, j \in c[0]$ and $i < j$, or given $c \ni i, c' \ni j$, c precedes c' in lexicographic order of their first index, i.e., α_c is lower lexicographically than $\alpha_{c'}$.

Algorithm 5.3.4 Sorting Objects with Spinor Indices

```

1: function FINDCHAIN( $A[0..n]$ )
2:    $B \leftarrow \{(A_i[0], A_i[1], A_i[2], i) \mid i \in 0..n\}$  ▷ add the location  $i$  of every  $a \in A$  to the end of  $a$ 
3:   move all  $b \in B$  with symmetries to the end of  $B$ 
4:   move all  $b \in B$  with only one spinor index to the end of  $B$ 
5:    $C \leftarrow [[B_0[3]], B_0[0], B_0[1], B_0[2], 0]]$  ▷ initialize our chain set with the first element of  $B$ 
6:   for  $j \in 1..n$  do
7:      $\alpha_j := B_j[0], \beta_j := B_j[1], \mathfrak{s}_j := B_j[2], i_j := B_j[3]$ 
8:      $connected \leftarrow \text{False}$ 
9:      $k = -1$  ▷ location of chain to which  $B_j$  is joined (N.B.  $-1$  means not joined)
10:    for  $c \in C$  do
11:       $chain := c[0], \alpha_c := c[1], \beta_c := c[2], \mathfrak{s}_c := c[3], i_c := c[4]$ 
12:      if not  $connected$  &  $\alpha_c \neq \text{None}$  & ( $\alpha_c = \beta_j$  or ( $\mathfrak{s}_j$  &  $\alpha_c = \alpha_j$ )) then ▷  $B_j$  can join  $c$  on the left
13:        prepend  $i_j$  to  $chain$ 
14:         $\alpha_c \leftarrow \alpha_j$  if  $\alpha_c \neq \alpha_j$  else  $\beta_j$ 
15:         $\mathfrak{s}_c \leftarrow \mathfrak{s}_c$  &  $\mathfrak{s}_j$  ▷ the combination has symmetry  $\Leftrightarrow$  both  $B_j$  &  $c$  have symmetry
16:         $connected \leftarrow \text{True}$ 
17:         $k \leftarrow i_c$ 
18:      else if not  $connected$  &  $\beta_c \neq \text{None}$  & ( $\beta_c = \alpha_j$  or ( $\mathfrak{s}_j$  &  $\beta_c = \beta_j$ )) then ▷  $B_j$  can join  $c$  on the right
19:        append  $i_j$  to  $chain$ 
20:         $\beta_c \leftarrow \alpha_j$  if  $\beta_c \neq \alpha_j$  else  $\beta_j$ 
21:         $\mathfrak{s}_c \leftarrow \mathfrak{s}_c$  &  $\mathfrak{s}_j$ 
22:         $connected \leftarrow \text{True}$ 
23:         $k \leftarrow i_c$ 
24:      else if  $connected$  &  $C_k[1] = \alpha_c$  &  $C_k[1], \alpha_c \neq \text{None}$  &  $\mathfrak{s}_c$  then ▷  $c$  flipped can join  $C_k$  on the left
25:         $C_k \leftarrow [\text{reverse}(chain) + C_k[0], \beta_c, C_k[2], \mathfrak{s}_c \& C_k[3]]$ 
26:        delete  $c$ 
27:      else if  $connected$  &  $C_k[1] = \alpha_c$  &  $C_k[1], \alpha_c \neq \text{None}$  &  $C_k[3]$  then ▷  $C_k$  flipped can join  $c$  on the left
28:         $C_k \leftarrow [\text{reverse}(C_k[0]) + chain, C_k[2], \beta_c, \mathfrak{s}_c \& C_k[3]]$ 
29:        delete  $c$ 
30:      else if  $connected$  &  $C_k[2] = \beta_c$  &  $C_k[2], \beta_c \neq \text{None}$  &  $\mathfrak{s}_c$  then ▷  $c$  flipped can join  $C_k$  on the right
31:         $C_k \leftarrow [C_k[0] + \text{reverse}(chain), C_k[1], \alpha_c, \mathfrak{s}_c \& C_k[3]]$ 
32:        delete  $c$ 
33:      else if  $connected$  &  $C_k[2] = \beta_c$  &  $C_k[2], \beta_c \neq \text{None}$  &  $C_k[3]$  then ▷  $C_k$  flipped can join  $c$  on the right
34:         $C_k \leftarrow [chain + \text{reverse}(C_k[0]), \alpha_c, C_k[1], \mathfrak{s}_c \& C_k[3]]$ 
35:        delete  $c$ 
36:      else if  $connected$  &  $C_k[1] = \beta_c$  &  $C_k[1], \beta_c \neq \text{None}$  then ▷  $c$  can join  $C_k$  on the left
37:         $C_k \leftarrow [chain + C_k[0], \alpha_c, C_k[2], \mathfrak{s}_c \& C_k[3]]$ 
38:        delete  $c$ 
39:      else if  $connected$  &  $C_k[2] = \alpha_c$  &  $C_k[2], \alpha_c \neq \text{None}$  then ▷  $c$  can join  $C_k$  on the right
40:         $C_k \leftarrow [C_k[0] + chain, C_k[1], \beta_c, \mathfrak{s}_c \& C_k[3]]$ 
41:        delete  $c$ 
42:      end if
43:    end for
44:    if not  $connected$  then
45:      append  $[[i_j], \alpha_j, \beta_j, \mathfrak{s}_j, |C|]$  to  $C$ 
46:    end if
47:  end for
48:  reverse  $c[0]$  and swap  $\alpha_c, \beta_c$  for any  $c \in C$  such that  $\mathfrak{s}_c$  and  $\beta_c < \alpha_c$  ▷ by convention, "None" > any value
49:  sort  $c \in C$  by  $\alpha_c$ 
50:  return  $\bigcup_{c \in C} c[0]$ 
51: end function

```

viz., $A_{\alpha\beta}, B_\gamma^\delta, D_\eta^\theta, G^{\lambda\eta}, I_{\theta\delta}, J_\lambda$, are symmetric;⁵⁸ and only J_λ is single-indexed. In Fig. 1(a), it is recognized the $\bar{C}_\epsilon^\zeta, \bar{E}_\zeta^\beta$ share the index ζ and are already in NW-SE form, so they can be combined into a chain. Similarly, $\bar{K}^{\alpha\iota}, \bar{F}_\iota^\kappa$ share ι and $\bar{F}_\iota^\kappa, \bar{H}_\kappa^\gamma$ share κ in NW-SE form, so $\bar{K}^{\alpha\iota}, \bar{F}_\iota^\kappa, \bar{H}_\kappa^\gamma$ can be combined into a chain. These two chains consist entirely of tensors without symmetries (indicated

⁵⁸ This is stronger than the tensors merely bearing a symmetry. The symmetry is assumed to be such that no negative is introduced by swapping indices. This simplifies the discussion. Also, notice that J_λ is included as symmetric. As mentioned earlier, tensors with a single spinor index are considered symmetric for the purpose of determining ordering.

by the solid circles), so they are rigid and the positions of the outer indices cannot be flipped; rather, the remaining tensors with symmetries may need to be flipped to accommodate these fixed chains. In Fig. 1(b), it is noticed that if one swaps the indices on $A_{\alpha\beta}$, which is symmetric and therefore manipulable (indicated by the dashed circle), then it will share β with the \bar{C} - \bar{E} chain in NW-SE form. The swapping of the indices is indicated by the positions of α, β to the right and left of A , respectively, rather than their original positions to the left and right of A , respectively. Notice that since the resulting chain still includes tensors without symmetry, i.e., solid circles, this chain is still rigid. In Fig. 1(c), it is noticed that despite this rigidity, the \bar{C} - A chain already shares α with the \bar{K} - \bar{H} chain in NW-SE form (up to parity), so these two chains are concatenated.⁵⁹ In Fig. 1(d), the algorithm moves on to the other 2-indexed symmetric tensors and finds that $D_\eta^\theta, G^{\lambda\eta}$ share η in NW-SE form and form a chain. Since $D_\eta^\theta, G^{\lambda\eta}$ are symmetric, so is the G - D chain. The algorithm also finds that B_γ^δ shares γ with the \bar{C} - \bar{H} chain in NW-SE form, forming a \bar{C} - B chain, and that if one swaps the indices on $I_{\theta\delta}$, then it will share δ with the \bar{C} - B chain in NW-SE form, forming a \bar{C} - I chain. The algorithm discovers the latter before it finds the shared index with the smaller chain because the larger chain was defined earlier, and therefore appears earlier when looping through the set of chains. In Fig. 1(e), the program continues looping through the set of chains while considering I and finds that if the G - D chain is flipped, then it will share θ with the \bar{C} - I chain in NW-SE form. Finally, in Fig. 1(f), it is recognized that the single-indexed tensor J_λ shares its one index λ with the \bar{C} - G chain, and the algorithm attaches the former to the latter, terminating one end of the chain. There are no symmetry issues in this attachment, as J has only a single spinor index and is therefore effectively symmetric. Reading off of Fig. 1(f), the optimal ordering which will enable all factors to be combined while adhering to NW-SE convention is

$$\bar{C}_\epsilon^\zeta \bar{E}_\zeta^\beta A_{\beta\alpha} \bar{K}^{\alpha\iota} \bar{F}_\iota^\kappa \bar{H}_\kappa^\gamma B_\gamma^\delta I_{\delta\theta} D^\theta_\eta G^{\eta\lambda} J_\lambda. \quad (5.3.4)$$

Notice that the expression is not yet in NW-SE convention in terms of parity. Since it is always possible to raise and lower the indices in a dummy-index pair at the cost of a minus sign (if $t_0 = 1$) by (5.3.2), this is not an ordering issue and is consigned to “SpinorCombine,” which incidentally gives the completed expression (assuming no underlying Lorentz tensors which would enable contraction of dummy spinor indices)

$$-\bar{C}_\epsilon^\zeta \bar{E}_\zeta^\beta A_{\beta\alpha} \bar{K}_\alpha^\iota \bar{F}_\iota^\kappa \bar{H}_\kappa^\gamma B_\gamma^\delta I_{\delta\theta} D^\theta_\eta G^{\eta\lambda} J_\lambda. \quad (5.3.5)$$

5.4 Evaluating Expressions

Now that arithmetic and canonicalization of products of factors with spinor indices is in place, the salient simplification system “Evaluate” can be erected, vastly extending the conventional simplification sequence of Cadabra to treat spinor-indexed expressions, γ_* , dimension-specific identities, implicit traces, and Fourier transforms (to be discussed later). So that the algorithm may be applied indiscriminately to any expression with vector indices, spinor indices, derivatives, Fourier transforms, etc., “Evaluate” methodically carries out an extended series of functions which each play a part in reducing the expression to a completely simplified canonical form. Given an expression \mathcal{E} , the initial sequence goes as follows. 1) Apply the Leibniz rule on supercovariant and partial

⁵⁹ N.B. We just as well could have made \bar{C} , or any other tensor, the top node. The choice of top node is purely aesthetic and has no interpretation with respect to the nodes’ ordering in “FindChain.”




Figure 1: A graphical illustration of the algorithm “FindChain” applied to the ordering of a product $A_{\alpha\beta}B_{\gamma}^{\delta}\bar{C}_{\epsilon}^{\zeta}D_{\eta}^{\theta}\bar{E}_{\zeta}^{\beta}\bar{F}_{\iota}^{\kappa}G^{\lambda\eta}\bar{H}_{\kappa}^{\gamma}I_{\theta\delta}J_{\lambda}\bar{K}^{\alpha\iota}$ of tensors, some with symmetries, some without, and one with only a single spinor index. a) Constructing chains from tensors without symmetries. b) Adding a tensor with symmetry. c) Combining chains. d) Introducing a separate chain of tensors with symmetry. e) Combining chains by reversing one. f) Adding a single-indexed tensor.

derivatives in \mathcal{E} . 2) Use “SpinorCombine” to multiply out all products involving spinor indices. 3) Use “EvaluateTraces” to evaluate all implicit traces $(B)_{\alpha}^{\alpha}$ which arise after the operations of “SpinorCombine.” 4) If permitted by the corresponding optional parameter,⁶⁰ multiply a pair of gamma matrices. 5) Distribute any factors which have several terms, and distribute derivatives among the terms of a sum. 6) Move all constant coefficients, Kronecker deltas, and Levi-Civita tensors outside of derivatives. 7) Apply Cadabra’s standard sorting functions to put the factors and terms of \mathcal{E} in canonical order. 8) Convert products of Levi-Civita tensors to expressions in Kronecker deltas with an algorithm “EpsilonToDelta.”⁶¹ 9) Contract Kronecker deltas with Lorentz tensors with which they share dummy indices. 10) Rename dummies into the lowest possible in lexicographic order for combination of like terms which differ only in dummy index names. 11) Apply the algorithm “IndexBracketHex” of Appendix E in order to canonicalize Lorentz indices within

⁶⁰ The gamma-splitting procedure used to identify off-shell equation-of-motion terms in §5.9 intentionally breaks apart gamma matrices into distinct factors which must not be multiplied in later steps. The optional parameter enables these split products to be left alone for the duration of the solver’s procedure.

⁶¹ Since Cadabra’s native `epsilon_to_delta()` cannot handle products involving more than two Levi-Civita tensors, the wrapper “EpsilonToDelta” computes such products pairwise.

indexbrackets. 12) Canonicalize again to take care of symmetries which are outside the scope of "IndexBracketHex," especially multi-term symmetries. 13) Convert all terms involving a factor of 0 within indexbrackets (i.e., $(0)_\alpha^\beta$) to zero with an algorithm "SubstituteSpinorZeros." 14) Replace the square of the highest-rank element γ_* in the Clifford algebra with the identity. 15) Combine like terms. 16) Move all constant coefficients, Kronecker deltas, and Levi Civita tensors outside of indexbrackets and Fourier transforms $\mathcal{F}_N(\cdot)$, and distribute indexbrackets among terms in a sum.

The aforementioned sequence is applied repeatedly until the result reached is no longer unique.⁶² "Evaluate" then, if the corresponding optional parameter permits,⁶³ applies the substitution rules obtained by "GenSubs" to reduce gamma matrices with over $\lfloor D/2 \rfloor$ indices, followed by select needed simplification functions. The algorithm concludes with combining like terms once more before outputting the evaluated \mathcal{E} . See Algorithm 5.4.1 for detailed pseudo-code.

Algorithm 5.4.1 Evaluate

```

1: function EVALUATE( $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $to\_perform\_subs = \text{True}$ ,  $to\_join\_gamma = \text{True}$ )
2:    $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{distribute}(\mathcal{E})$ 
3:    $prior\_exs \leftarrow []$ 
4:   while  $\mathcal{E}$  not in  $prior\_exs$  do
5:     append  $\mathcal{E}$  to  $prior\_exs$ 
6:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{product\_rule}(\mathcal{E})$  ▷ Leibniz rule
7:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{SpinorCombine}(\mathcal{E})$ 
8:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{EvaluateTraces}(\mathcal{E})$ 
9:     if  $to\_join\_gamma$  then:
10:       $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{join\_gamma}(\mathcal{E})$  ▷ Multiply a pair of gamma matrices
11:     end if
12:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{distribute}(\mathcal{E})$ 
13:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{unwrap}(\mathcal{E})$  ▷ Move coefficients out of derivatives
14:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{sort\_product}(\mathcal{E})$ 
15:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{sort\_sum}(\mathcal{E})$ 
16:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{EpsilonToDelta}(\mathcal{E})$ 
17:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{eliminate\_kronecker}(\mathcal{E})$  ▷ Contract out Kronecker deltas
18:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{rename\_dummies}(\mathcal{E})$ 
19:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{IndexBracketHex}(\mathcal{E})$ 
20:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{canonicalise}(\mathcal{E})$ 
21:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{SubstituteSpinorZeros}(\mathcal{E})$ 
22:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{substitute}(\mathcal{E}, \gamma_* \gamma_* \rightarrow \mathbb{1})$ 
23:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{collect\_terms}(\mathcal{E})$ 
24:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{SpinorExpand}(\mathcal{E})$  ▷ unwrap()/distribute() for indexbrackets
25:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{FourierExpand}(\mathcal{E})$  ▷ unwrap() for Fourier transforms
26:   end while
27:   if  $to\_perform\_subs$  then
28:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{substitute}(\mathcal{E}, \text{GenSubs}())$ 
29:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{SpinorExpand}(\mathcal{E})$ 
30:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{canonicalise}(\mathcal{E})$ 
31:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{SpinorCombine}(\mathcal{E})$ 
32:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{substitute}(\mathcal{E}, \gamma_* \gamma_* \rightarrow \mathbb{1})$ 
33:   end if
34:    $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{collect\_factors}(\mathcal{E})$ 
35:   return  $\mathcal{E}$ 
36: end function

```

⁶² The simplification sequence is not quite stable. That is, letting \mathcal{E}_n be the outcome of the n th loop, the sequence $\{\mathcal{E}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ might not be eventually constant, but rather eventually periodic with period greater than 1. Hence, "Evaluate" records all \mathcal{E}_n and terminates after loop $n = r$ if $\mathcal{E}_r \in \{\mathcal{E}_i \mid i < r\}$.

⁶³ Applying substitution rules introduces dummy indices via (5.2.6a) and (5.2.7), which is undesirable in the multiplet solvers of §5.9 and §5.11, as it increases canonicalization time. The optional parameter enables these substitutions to be withheld until virtually all canonicalization procedures in those solvers are complete.

5.5 Algorithm for Four-Index Fierz Expansion

Now that expressions involving gamma matrices and other tensors with both vector and spinor indices can be simplified into a canonical form, algorithms based on tensor arithmetic can be implemented. In particular, it is of widespread interest in field theory to calculate Fierz identities, which arise whenever four spinors or spinor indices must be rearranged and which have been seen in the earlier chapters to be essential when discussing 11D supergravity. In general, the spinor metric (i.e., the charge conjugation matrix), a set of gamma matrices, and for even dimensions, a highest rank element, form an orthogonal basis for the Clifford algebra. For example, in 4D, an orthogonal basis $\Gamma_{(4D)}^A$ for the Clifford algebra is

$$\Gamma_{(4D)}^A = \left\{ C_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma_*\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \right\}, \quad (5.5.1)$$

where $(\gamma_*\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}$ is essentially $(\gamma^{abc})_{\alpha\beta}$ by (5.2.6b). In 11D, an orthogonal basis $\Gamma_{(11D)}^A$ for the Clifford algebra is

$$\Gamma_{(11D)}^A = \left\{ C_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma^{abc})_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma^{abcd})_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma^{abcde})_{\alpha\beta} \right\}. \quad (5.5.2)$$

(See Appendix A.) An expression in four spinor indices can be written as a linear combination of “squares” of these basis elements, specifically, as a linear combination of products of basis elements multiplied with themselves, where one factor contains one pair of spinor indices and the other factor contains the other pair. This linear combination, summarized in the completeness identity (3.65) in [13] which is reproduced below, is referred to as the Fierz expansion, or Fierz rearrangement, of the expression.

$$\delta_\alpha^\beta \delta_\gamma^\delta = \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_A (\Gamma_A)_\alpha^\delta (\Gamma^A)_\gamma^\beta \quad (5.5.3)$$

(Here, $m = \lfloor D/2 \rfloor$, where D is the dimension.) Notice that the procedure in §5.2 reveals that the first, fourth, and fifth elements in each of $\Gamma_{(4D)}^A$ (under the usual conventions for t_0, t_1) and $\Gamma_{(11D)}^A$ are antisymmetric with respect to spinor indices, while the remaining elements are symmetric. In the standard use case for Fierz identities, an expression with four spinor indices which bears a particular (anti)symmetry in two of the indices is expanded in only those basis elements with the same symmetry. In Section B, which focuses solely on 11D Fierz expansions relevant to the computation of algebra closure and holonomy properties of 11D supergravity, the first five expansions bear symmetry of two spinor indices, while the last five bear antisymmetry of two indices.

The forthcoming algorithm is not the first algorithm for computing Fierz identities, but it is the most versatile for our purposes. Cadabra2 [49] itself features a function “fierz” for rearranging a product of four spinors, or of spinor bilinears, but as noted in the introduction, the literature on holonomy and supersymmetry genomics is entirely in terms of spinor indices rather than spinors, so a Fierz expansion algorithm for use with spinor-index-carrying expressions is necessary. The FieldsX module [14] for xAct in Mathematica features a function “FierzExpand” which expands a product of tensor-spinors in a more similar spirit to this aim. However, both Cadabra2 and FieldsX attempt computational simplicity by leveraging a completeness identity like (5.5.3). This somewhat parallels a typical approach to hand-computation, which would involve multiplying such an identity by appropriate factors in order to obtain the desired expression on one side of the equation and its Fierz expansion on the other. If one were to consider a complicated multi-term expression (such

as the two-term expressions in Appendix B) via the same procedure, such an abortive attempt would reveal the need to sift through each term, choose appropriate factors to which to multiply the completeness identity, compute several Fierz identities, and then synthesize the identities, a process which is not only inefficient but requires a bit of finesse (especially in the clever choice of factors) that one would be hard-pressed to expect of a computer program. Hence, such complex multi-term expressions are not handled by the two aforementioned programs. This is sensible for those programs' own purpose, which is largely to serve as an easy-to-use field-theory "scratchpad" that simply performs "tedious steps" in hand-derivations [46], as a human can be expected to prepare terms and select factors as needed. However, since the ultimate goal of SusyPy's Fierz algorithm is autonomous use by a computer while solving a multiplet, the systematic handling of complicated multi-term expressions is paramount. The goal of this and the next subsection is to present a program of suitable versatility.

Let Γ^A be an orthogonal basis for a Clifford algebra and $(\mathcal{E})_\alpha^{\eta\beta\gamma}$ be an expression in the algebra. It is desired to Fierz-expand $(\mathcal{E})_\alpha^{\eta\beta\gamma}$ as a linear combination of quadratic monomials in the basis elements as below.

$$(\mathcal{E})_\alpha^{\eta\beta\gamma} = \sum_{B \in \Gamma^A} c_B (B^A)_{\alpha\beta} (B_A)^{\eta\gamma} \quad (5.5.4)$$

It suffices to restrict attention to one element $(B^A)_{\alpha\beta} \in \Gamma^A$ and consider the projection of $(\mathcal{E})_\alpha^{\eta\beta\gamma}$ along it, that is, the term corresponding to $(B^A)_{\alpha\beta}$ in the above summation.⁶⁴ In particular, if each projection is found, then the the Fierz expansion is merely the sum of the projections. In order to find the projection along $(B^A)_{\alpha\beta}$, four variants of the basis element are needed, viz., $(B^A)_{\alpha\beta}$, $(B^{A'})_{\gamma\eta}$, $(B_A)^{\eta\gamma}$, and $(B_{A'})^{\eta\gamma}$, where $B^{A'}$ is B^A with its vector indices replaced by primed equivalents so that it may be multiplied with B^A without creating unwanted dummy index pairs.⁶⁵ Notice that one can multiply the second and third of these to get

$$(B_A)^{\eta\gamma} (B^{A'})_{\gamma\eta} = -(B_A B^{A'})_\eta{}^\eta = -\text{tr}(B_A B^{A'}) = c'_B \delta_A{}^{A'} \quad (5.5.5)$$

for some constant c'_B that arises from the trace. Multiplying by $(B^A)_{\alpha\beta}$ yields $c'_B (B^{A'})_{\alpha\beta}$, and since $(B^{A'})_{\alpha\beta}$ is known a priori, the value c'_B can be extracted. Notice that by orthogonality, multiplying the right-hand side of (5.5.4) by $(1/c'_B)(B^{A'})_{\gamma\eta}$ gives simply the product of this factor with the term corresponding to $(B^A)_{\alpha\beta}$, which (5.5.5) shows is $c_B (B^{A'})_{\alpha\beta}$. It is then immediately evident that multiplying by $(B_{A'})^{\eta\gamma}$ yields $c_B (B^{A'})_{\alpha\beta} (B_{A'})^{\eta\gamma}$. Hence, multiplying the left-hand side of (5.5.4), viz., $(\mathcal{E})_\alpha^{\eta\beta\gamma}$, which is known, by the same factors yields precisely the desired projection. Completing the foregoing computation for each basis element and (symbolically) adding up the results gives the Fierz expansion of $(\mathcal{E})_\alpha^{\eta\beta\gamma}$.

Notice the instances in which the prior algorithms are used. The "SpinorCombine" function from §5.3 computes the first equality in (5.5.5), while the "EvaluateTraces" function from §5.2 computes the last two. Then, the "Evaluate" function of §5.4 is utilized to complete the desired multiplication of the result of (5.5.5) by $(B^A)_{\alpha\beta}$, as well as compute all of the products on the transformed left-hand

⁶⁴ In fact, the "FierzExpand" algorithm works just as well if a single basis element is provided rather than a complete basis, and the procedure will dutifully compute the projection along that element.

⁶⁵ In this discussion, B^A is taken to be the Lorentz tensor without spinor indices, e.g., if $(B^A)_{\alpha\beta} = (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}$, then $B^A = \gamma^a$.

Algorithm 5.5.1 Four Spinor Index Fierz Expansion

A few examples indicate this system's utility. An example expression which bears antisymmetry in two of its indices is $\delta_\alpha^{[\eta} (\gamma_a)^{\rho]\gamma}$. The code below gives the 11D Fierz expansion of this expression into terms in which the first factor carries the indices α, γ , while the second carries the antisymmetrized indices η, ρ . Notice that when the indices are inputted into "FierzExpand," they are inputted as covariant, regardless of their parities in the expression. Also, notice that the basis elements can be inputted with arbitrary spinor indices and need not have spinor indices matching some pair in the expression.

The resulting Fierz expansion is

71

It is easy to see that this is equivalent to the identity

$$\delta_\alpha^{[\eta} (\gamma_a)^{\rho]\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \left\{ -(\gamma_a)_\alpha{}^\gamma C^{\eta\rho} + \frac{1}{2} (\gamma^{[2]})_\alpha{}^\gamma (\gamma_{a[2]})^{\eta\rho} - \frac{1}{3!} (\gamma_{a[3]})_\alpha{}^\gamma (\gamma^{[3]})^{\eta\rho} + \frac{1}{3!} (\gamma^{[3]})_\alpha{}^\gamma (\gamma_{a[3]})^{\eta\rho} - \frac{1}{4!} (\gamma_{a[4]})_\alpha{}^\gamma (\gamma^{[4]})^{\eta\rho} \right\}, \quad (5.5.7)$$

which is given as equation (A.26) in [19]. Notice, first, that in every term, the (η, ρ) -factor is an antisymmetric basis element, just as expected, since the given expression is antisymmetric in those indices. Also notice that while every term is a quadratic monomial in the basis elements, no term features a basis element multiplied by itself. This is because c_B need not, in general, be a scalar for a given $(B)_{\alpha\beta} \in \Gamma^A$, since the expression being Fierz-expanded may have free Lorentz indices. Another way to view the result is that it is an expansion of the expression as a linear combination of linear monomials with tensor coefficients, in which case the coefficients carry spinor indices. The latter vantagepoint is the guiding principle behind the algorithm in the following section.

Now that we have validated our algorithm on an antisymmetric Fierz expansion, it is worthwhile to consider an example expression which bears symmetry in two of its indices. Such an example is $(\gamma^{de})_{(\alpha}{}^\gamma \delta_{\beta)}{}^\eta$. The code below gives the 11D Fierz expansion of this expression into terms in which the first factor carries the symmetrized indices α, β , while the second carries the indices γ, η . (The basis variable is suppressed for brevity, as it is the same as above.)

```
>>> ex = Ex(r'(\Gamma^{d e})_{\alpha}^{\gamma} \delta_{\beta}^{\eta} + (\Gamma^{d e})_{\beta}^{\gamma} \delta_{\alpha}^{\eta})
>>> fierz_expand(ex, basis, [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\beta}'], [r'_{\gamma}', r'_{\eta}'])
```

The resulting Fierz expansion is

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma^{de})_{(\alpha}{}^\gamma \delta_{\beta)}{}^\eta &= -\frac{1}{16} (\gamma^{de})_{\alpha\beta} C^{\eta\gamma} - \frac{1}{16} (\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^e)^{\eta\gamma} + \frac{1}{16} (\gamma^e)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^d)^{\eta\gamma} \\ &+ \frac{1}{16} (\gamma^{ad})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^e)^{\eta\gamma} - \frac{1}{16} (\gamma^{ae})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^d)^{\eta\gamma} - \frac{1}{16} (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^{de})^{\eta\gamma} \\ &+ \frac{1}{96} (\gamma_{abc}^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{abc})^{\eta\gamma} + \frac{1}{32} (\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ab}^{de})^{\eta\gamma} \\ &- \frac{1}{46080} \epsilon^{de}{}_{abcf}{}^{ghijk} (\gamma_{ghijk})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{abcf})^{\eta\gamma} - \frac{1}{384} (\gamma^{abcdf})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abc}^e{}_f)^{\eta\gamma} \\ &+ \frac{1}{384} (\gamma^{abcef})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abc}^d{}_f)^{\eta\gamma} \end{aligned} \quad (5.5.8)$$

It is easy to see that this is equivalent to the identity

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma^{de})_{(\alpha}{}^\gamma \delta_{\beta)}{}^\eta &= \frac{1}{16} \left\{ (\gamma_{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[1]de})^{\eta\gamma} - (\gamma^{[d]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{e]})^{\eta\gamma} \right. \\ &- \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_{[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[2]de})^{\eta\gamma} - (\gamma^{[1][d]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{e][1]})^{\eta\gamma} + (\gamma^{de})_{\alpha\beta} C^{\eta\gamma} \\ &+ \frac{1}{5!4!} \epsilon^{de[5][4]} (\gamma_{[5]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[4]})^{\eta\gamma} \\ &\left. - \frac{1}{4!} (\gamma^{[4][d]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{e][4]})^{\eta\gamma} - \frac{1}{3!} (\gamma^{de[3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[3]})^{\eta\gamma} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.5.9)$$

which is given as equation (A.27) in [19]. Notice that in every term, the (α, β) factor is a symmetric basis element, just as expected, since the given expression is symmetric in those indices. As in the prior Fierz expansion, many terms are quadratic monomials in distinct basis elements. The foregoing demonstrates the efficacy of “FierzExpand” in computing even quite complicated Fierz identities, for any (anti)symmetrization of the indices or any combination of terms.

5.6 Algorithm for Two-Index Fierz Expansion

The Fierz expansion algorithm depicted in the prior section enables easy computation of intricate identities with many terms and indices, the power of which is made abundantly clear in Appendix B. As we have seen, those identities could be used to compute fermionic closure constraints (in §2.4) and fermionic holoraumy (in §4.2) for 11D supergravity via an explicit step-by-step derivation aided by SusyPy. However, the less explicit alternative presented in §2.1 and §4 is the use of the multiplet solvers in §5.9 and §5.11 and the holoraumy algorithm in §5.13, which compute Fierz identities on their own behind the scenes. The ease with which “FierzExpand” is used belies the difficulty in applying the function to an expression for, say, $\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}\Psi_a^\gamma$ or $[D_\alpha, D_\beta]\Psi_a^\gamma$ when only the two spinor indices on the supercovariant derivatives are known a priori.⁶⁶ Even if the two other needed spinor indices could be efficiently discerned a posteriori, the computer’s travail is compounded by the computational complexity of sifting through the expression to identify the gamma matrix products to which to apply four-index Fierz identities.

The solution is an algorithm which breaks further from the hand-computation approach of expanding the supercovariant derivative expression into gamma-matrix products and then Fierz-expanding those; instead, we Fierz-expand the entire supercovariant derivative expression in one go. Since four-index Fierz expansion involves more indices (two more indices in the factors introduced for isolating a projection), and hence more canonicalization time (see §6), it turns out that computing the Fierz expansion of such an expression in one go is more efficient than computing Fierz expansions for the various gamma-matrix products individually, even if one ignores the runtime contributed by synthesizing those disparate identities into one expansion for the supercovariant derivative expression. As a result, this solution is that used in the multiplet solvers and holoraumy algorithm, and the goal of this section is to present this two-index Fierz expansion algorithm.

As hinted in the previous section, the credo guiding this algorithm is that the coefficients in the expansion of an expression as a linear combination of basis elements need not be scalars. To draw parallels with the four-index algorithm, consider a basis Γ^A for a Clifford algebra, as before, but now suppose that the expression $\mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta}$ that we wish to expand has only two known spinor indices (but typically has other unknown spinor indices). The equivalent to (5.5.4) is

$$(\mathcal{E})_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_{B \in \Gamma^A} c_B (B^A)_{\alpha\beta}. \quad (5.6.1)$$

Restricting to one element $(B^A)_{\alpha\beta} \in \Gamma^A$, we can consider the four variants $(B^A)_{\alpha\beta}$, $(B^{A'})_{\alpha\beta}$, $(B_{A'})^{\beta\alpha}$, and $(B_A)_{\alpha\beta}$. Multiplying the first and the third gives

$$(B^A)_{\alpha\beta} (B_{A'})^{\beta\alpha} = -(B_{A'} B^A)_{\beta}{}^{\beta} = -\text{tr}(B_{A'} B^A) = c'_B \delta_{A'}{}^A \quad (5.6.2)$$

⁶⁶ The spinor index on the fermion is also known a priori, but it hardly plays a role in the Fierz expansion which moves the indices on the supercovariant derivatives onto the same gamma matrices.

for some c'_B . The sole purpose of the fourth variant $(B_A)_{\alpha\beta}$, referred to as the dummy field in Algorithm 5.6.1, is to multiply with the above trace so that c'_B can be isolated, for the product is $c'_B(B_{A'})_{\alpha\beta}$.⁶⁷ It follows from the foregoing and orthogonality of the basis elements that multiplying the right-hand side of (5.6.1) by $(1/c'_B)(B_{A'})^{\beta\alpha}$ yields $c_B\delta_{A'}^A$, so that multiplying by $(B^{A'})_{\alpha\beta}$ gives the desired projection $c_B(B^A)_{\alpha\beta}$. Hence, multiplying the left-hand side, viz., $(\mathcal{E})_{\alpha\beta}$, which is known, by the same factors yields the projection, and looping through the basis to add up the projections gives the Fierz expansion as in the four-index algorithm. Algorithm 5.6.1 shows detailed pseudo-code for this modified procedure. The only change in inputs is the obvious one, namely, that only one pair of indices need be provided.

Algorithm 5.6.1 Two Spinor Index Fierz Expansion

```

1: function FIERZEXPAND2INDEX( $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $\Gamma^A$ ,  $Inds[1..2]$ ,  $to\_perform\_subs = \text{True}$ )
2:    $projections \leftarrow []$ 
3:   for  $B \in \Gamma^A$  do
4:      $B \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(B, to\_perform\_subs = \text{False})$ 
5:      $primed\_inds \leftarrow$  Lorentz indices of  $B$  primed ▷ e.g.,  $A'$  if  $B = B^A$ 
6:      $unconj\_inds \leftarrow$   $Inds$  with parity as in  $\mathcal{E}$  ▷ e.g.,  $[\alpha, \beta]$  if  $Inds = [\alpha, \beta]$  and  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta}$ 
7:      $conj\_inds \leftarrow$   $Inds$  with opposite the parity in  $\mathcal{E}$  ▷ e.g.,  $[\alpha, \beta]$  if  $Inds = [\alpha, \beta]$  and  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta}$ 
8:      $primed\_unconj\_indices \leftarrow$   $unconj\_inds$  primed
9:      $element \leftarrow B$  with spinor indices replaced by  $unconj\_inds$  ▷ e.g.,  $(B^A)_{\alpha\beta}$ 
10:     $element\_primed \leftarrow$   $element$  with Lorentz indices replaced by  $primed\_inds$  ▷ e.g.,  $(B^{A'})_{\alpha\beta}$ 
11:     $element\_primed\_conj \leftarrow$   $element\_primed$  with Lorentz indices lowered and spinor indices replaced with  $conj\_inds$  in reverse ▷ e.g.,  $(B_{A'})^{\beta\alpha}$ 
12:     $order$ 
13:     $element\_squared \leftarrow element \cdot element\_primed\_conj$ 
14:     $dummy\_field \leftarrow$   $element$  with Lorentz indices lowered ▷ e.g.,  $(B_A)_{\alpha\beta}$ 
15:     $element\_squared \leftarrow \text{SpinorCombine}(element\_squared)$  ▷ e.g.,  $-(B_{A'}B^A)_{\beta}^{\beta}$ 
16:     $elsq\_trace \leftarrow \text{EvaluateTraces}(element\_squared)$  ▷ e.g.,  $c'_B\delta_{A'}^A$ 
17:     $rhs \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(elsq\_trace \cdot dummy\_field, to\_perform\_subs = \text{False})$  ▷ e.g.,  $c'_B(B_{A'})_{\alpha\beta}$ 
18:     $inv\_rhs\_const \leftarrow$  inverse, of constant coefficient of  $rhs$  divided by initial coefficient of  $B$  ▷ i.e.,  $c'_B$ 
19:     $lhs \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(inv\_rhs\_const \cdot element\_primed\_conj \cdot \mathcal{E}, to\_perform\_subs = \text{False})$ 
20:     $lhs \leftarrow$   $lhs$  with dummy spinor indices replaced by  $primed\_unconj\_indices$  ▷ to prevent index name conflicts
21:     $result \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(lhs \cdot element\_primed, to\_perform\_subs = to\_perform\_subs)$ 
22:    append  $result$  to  $projections$ 
23:  end for
24:  return symbolic sum of  $projections$ 
25: end function

```

An example of the typical use case is in calculating fermionic closure for the off-shell 4D vector multiplet. Specifically, the code below uses "SUSYExpand" to obtain an expression for $\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}\lambda_\gamma$ using the supersymmetry transformation rules for the multiplet (see §5.9), and then leverages "FierzExpand2Index" to produce the Fierz expansion using only the initially inputted indices α, β .

```

>>> susy = r'''D_{\alpha}(A_{\{a\}} -> (\Gamma_{\{a\}})_{\alpha}^{\beta} (\lambda_{\beta})_{\gamma},
  ↪ D_{\alpha}((\lambda_{\beta})_{\gamma}) -> -I (\Gamma^a{}_{\beta})_{\alpha}^{\gamma} \partial_a (\lambda_{\gamma})_{\beta} +
  ↪ (\Gamma^a{}_{\alpha})_{\beta}^{\gamma} d_a (\lambda_{\gamma})_{\beta} -> I (\Gamma^a{}_{\alpha})_{\beta}^{\gamma} (\lambda_{\gamma})_{\beta}
  ↪ \partial_a ((\lambda_{\beta})_{\gamma})'''
>>> basis = [Ex(r'C_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^a{}_{\alpha})_{\beta}^{\gamma}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^a{}_{\alpha})_{\beta}^{\gamma}'),
  ↪ Ex(r'(\Gamma^a{}_{\alpha})_{\beta}^{\gamma}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^a{}_{\alpha})_{\beta}^{\gamma}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^a{}_{\alpha})_{\beta}^{\gamma}')]
>>> ex = Ex(r'D_{\alpha}(D_{\beta}((\lambda_{\gamma})_{\delta})) +
  ↪ D_{\beta}(D_{\alpha}((\lambda_{\gamma})_{\delta})))

```

⁶⁷ As noted in Algorithm 5.5.1, $(B_A)_{\alpha\beta}$ may include a coefficient by which the coefficient of $c'_B(B_{A'})_{\alpha\beta}$ must be divided in order to truly reflect the value c'_B by which the basis element was multiplied.


```
>>> susy_expand(ex, susy)
>>> fierz_expand_2index(ex, basis, [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\beta}'])
```

The result given by “SUSYExpand” is

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} \lambda_\gamma = -i (\gamma^{ab})_{\beta\gamma} (\gamma_b)_\alpha{}^\eta \partial_a \lambda_\eta + i (\gamma_*)_{\beta\gamma} (\gamma_* \gamma^a)_\alpha{}^\eta \partial_a \lambda_\eta \\ - i (\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\gamma} (\gamma_b)_\beta{}^\eta \partial_a \lambda_\eta + i (\gamma_*)_{\alpha\gamma} (\gamma_* \gamma^a)_\beta{}^\eta \partial_a \lambda_\eta. \quad (5.6.3)$$

Clearly, the indices α, β must be on the same factors in a proper closure expression, so a Fierz transformation is in order. Notice that in this instance, the other spinor indices with which α, β are paired are not even consistent throughout the expression, which would further hamper an attempted solution via a four-index algorithm. The result given by “FierzExpand2Index” is

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} \lambda_\gamma = 2i (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \lambda_\gamma, \quad (5.6.4)$$

which is precisely the condition for off-shell closure. (See (20) in [16] for further reference on closure of the 4D vector multiplet.) As noted earlier, it is for just such a case that “FierzExpand2Index” will be used in §5.9.

Note that “FierzExpand2Index” can also treat four-index problems, with the equivalent of the “known” pair of spinor indices being one pair of indices that are intended to belong to the same factors. For example, the code below repeats the computation of the 11D Fierz expansion for $(\gamma^{de})_{(\alpha}{}^\gamma \delta_{\beta)}{}^\eta$ from the prior section.

```
>>> ex = Ex(r'(\Gamma^{d e})_{\alpha}^{\gamma} \delta_{\beta}^{\eta} + (\Gamma^{d e})_{\beta}^{\gamma} \delta_{\alpha}^{\eta})
>>> basis = [Ex(r'C_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^a)_{\alpha}^{\gamma} \delta_{\beta}^{\eta}), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{ab})_{\alpha \beta}^{\gamma \eta}), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{abc})_{\alpha \beta}^{\gamma \eta}), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{abcd})_{\alpha \beta}^{\gamma \eta}), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{abcde})_{\alpha \beta}^{\gamma \eta})]
>>> fierz_expand(ex, basis, [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\gamma}'], [r'_{\gamma}', r'_{\eta}'])
```

The result is

$$(\gamma^{de})_{(\alpha}{}^\gamma \delta_{\beta)}{}^\eta = -\frac{1}{16} (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a{}^{de})^{\eta\gamma} - \frac{1}{16} (\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^e)^{\eta\gamma} + \frac{1}{16} (\gamma^e)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^d)^{\eta\gamma} \\ - \frac{1}{16} (\gamma^{de})_{\alpha\beta} C^{\eta\gamma} + \frac{1}{32} (\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ab}{}^{de})^{\eta\gamma} + \frac{1}{16} (\gamma^{ad})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a{}^e)^{\eta\gamma} \\ - \frac{1}{16} (\gamma^{ae})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a{}^d)^{\eta\gamma} + \frac{1}{96} (\gamma_{abc}{}^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{abc})^{\eta\gamma} \\ - \frac{1}{384} (\gamma^{abcdf})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abc}{}^e{}_f)^{\eta\gamma} + \frac{1}{384} (\gamma^{abcef})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abc}{}^d{}_f)^{\eta\gamma} \\ - \frac{1}{46080} \epsilon^{de}{}_{abcf}{}^{hijk} (\gamma^{abcf}g)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{hijk})^{\eta\gamma}, \quad (5.6.5)$$

which is merely a rearrangement of (5.5.8), and thus likewise yields the correct identity (5.5.9).

5.7 Symbolic Fourier Transform

When analyzing the results of the Fierz expansion of the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to a fermion in the multiplet solvers of §5.9 and §5.11, it will be necessary

to filter out equation-of-motion terms, which vanish identically on-shell and therefore provide no constraints. It will turn out that in the solver of §5.9, this filtration will take the form of eliminating gauge-invariant quantities with particular Lorentz-index structure using the “FindNonGaugeInv” algorithm of §5.8. That algorithm will depend heavily on manipulating partial derivatives of fields and applying relevant substitutions, operations which are more easily executed in momentum-space, where the partial derivatives become indexed multipliers. In the solver of §5.11, momentum-space operations will play an even more prominent role in the handling of Feynman propagators. This needed transition to and from momentum-space requires a symbolic Fourier transform and a symbolic inverse Fourier transform. The goal of this section is to present algorithms for computing these transforms.

The procedure for computing the Fourier transform is based on a draft transform proposed in [50]. It is assumed that every field depends on an independent spatial parameter, unless several fields lie within the operand of the same partial derivative, in which case the fields share the spatial parameter with respect to which the operand is being differentiated.⁶⁸ Let \mathcal{E} be a position-space expression and “fields” be the set of fields which appear in the expression. For each term in \mathcal{E} , it is desired to replace every partial derivative ∂_a with a momentum-space parameter ik_a , and to replace every field A in the operand of the derivative with a Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}(A)$. Since there are typically multiple partial derivatives, which can be taken as differentiating with respect to distinct spatial parameters, distinct numbered momentum parameters are necessary. The intended transformation is accomplished for each term by defining a number N and looping through the factors of the term. If a factor is a partial derivative, then looping through the factors in the operand of the derivative,⁶⁹ each factor A is replaced with the Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}_N(A)$ with respect to the N th momentum parameter. Then, looping through the indices on the partial derivative (which may be a multiple derivative), for each index a , the parity of the index is gathered and a momentum parameter ik_N^a or ik_{N_a} is created. Finally, a new product is created consisting of the coefficient of the partial derivative, all k_N ’s (for the N corresponding to the partial derivative), and the Fourier-transformed operand of the derivative, and this product replaces the partial derivative and its original operand. N is augmented after each partial derivative so that the next partial derivative is converted to a unique momentum parameter, as desired. Algorithm 5.7.1 shows detailed pseudocode for this symbolic Fourier transform.

Notice that the output of “Fourier” is designed to ease the inverting process in “InverseFourier.” The labeling of momentum-space fields by $\mathcal{F}_N(\cdot)$ enables them to be recognized and converted to position-space equivalents without even inputting the fields into the function. Furthermore, the subscript N on the momentum parameters and the momentum-space fields enables the fields in the operands of the parameters’ partial-derivative spatial counterparts to be correctly and efficiently identified. Let $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ be a momentum-space expression. The algorithm loops through every term of $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$, defining a variable N for the term as before. For each value of N , the program checks if the term carries any momentum parameters with that subscript; if not, then clearly, the all

⁶⁸ Note that the Fourier transform algorithm does not convert a field A to a marked Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}_N(A)$ if A is not differentiated, for there is little purpose for the Fourier transform in that situation, and A might as well be taken to refer both to the field and its Fourier transform.

⁶⁹ Notice the tacit assumption that the operand of the derivative is a product and not a sum. This amounts to the supposition that \mathcal{E} has already been simplified and canonicalized, e.g., by “Evaluate.”

Algorithm 5.7.1 Symbolic Fourier Transform

```

1: function FOURIER( $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $fields[1..n]$ )
2:   for  $term$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  do
3:      $N \leftarrow 1$ 
4:     for  $factor$  in  $term$  do
5:       if  $factor$  is a partial derivative then
6:         for  $A$  in factors of partial's operand in  $factor$  do
7:           if  $A$  in  $fields$  then
8:             replace  $A$  in  $factor$  with  $\mathcal{F}_N(A)$ 
9:           end if
10:        end for
11:         $ks \leftarrow []$ 
12:        for index  $a$  on partial of  $factor$  do
13:          if  $a$  is contravariant then
14:            append  $ik_N^a$  to  $ks$ 
15:          else
16:            append  $ik_{N_a}$  to  $ks$ 
17:          end if
18:        end for
19:         $new\_prod = \text{coefficient of } factor \cdot \text{prod}(ks) \cdot \text{partial's new operand}$ 
20:        insert  $new\_prod$  after  $factor$  ▷ Introduce  $new\_prod$  as a factor of  $term$ 
21:        erase  $factor$ 
22:         $N \leftarrow N + 1$ 
23:      end if
24:    end for
25:  end for
26:   $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{FlattenProd}(\mathcal{E})$  ▷ Remove unnecessary nesting of products
27:  return  $\mathcal{E}$ 
28: end function

```

momentum parameters have already been eliminated, so the program can move to the next term. If momentum parameters with matching N are present, then looping through factors, all coefficients of momentum parameters and momentum-space fields are recorded (with coefficients of momentum parameters multiplied by $-i$), as are the indices on the momentum parameters and the operands of the Fourier transforms $\mathcal{F}_N(\cdot)$ with matching N . Finally, a partial derivative is created with the recorded coefficients, carrying the recorded indices, and having the product of the recorded Fourier transform operands as its own operand. This partial derivative replaces the momentum space parameters and momentum-space fields. The value of N is then augmented to treat the next class of momentum parameters (if there are any). Algorithm 5.7.2 shows detailed pseudo-code for this inverse Fourier transform.

As an example, consider the position-space expression $\partial_a(AB)\partial_{bc}C + \partial_{abc}(ABC)$, where A, B, C are fields. The code below runs “Fourier” to convert to momentum space and canonicalizes the result to clean up coefficients.

```

>>> ex = Ex(r'''\partial_{a}(A B) \partial_{b c}(C) + \partial_{a b c}(A B C)''')
>>> fourier(ex, [Ex('A'), Ex('B'), Ex('C')])
>>> canonicalise(ex)

```

The result is

$$-ik_{1_a}\mathcal{F}_1(A)\mathcal{F}_1(B)k_{2_b}k_{2_c}\mathcal{F}_2(C) - ik_{1_a}k_{1_b}k_{1_c}\mathcal{F}_1(A)\mathcal{F}_1(B)\mathcal{F}_1(C). \quad (5.7.1)$$

Notice that in the first term, A, B are each in the Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}_1(\cdot)$ associated to the momentum parameter k_{1_a} , while C is in the Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}_2(\cdot)$ associated to the momentum

Algorithm 5.7.2 Symbolic Inverse Fourier Transform

```

1: function INVERSEFOURIER( $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ )
2:   for  $term$  in  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$  do
3:      $N \leftarrow 1$ 
4:     while  $term$  has  $k_N^\bullet$  or  $k_{N_\bullet}$  factors do
5:        $c \leftarrow 1$ 
6:        $operand \leftarrow 1$ 
7:        $indices \leftarrow []$ 
8:       for  $factor$  in  $term$  do
9:         if  $factor$  has form  $k_N^\bullet$  or  $k_{N_\bullet}$  then
10:           $c \leftarrow c \cdot (-i) \cdot \text{coefficient of } factor$ 
11:          append Lorentz index of  $factor$  to  $indices$ 
12:          erase  $factor$ 
13:        else if  $factor$  has form  $\mathcal{F}_N(\cdot)$  then
14:           $c \leftarrow c \cdot \text{coefficient of } factor$ 
15:           $operand \leftarrow operand \cdot factor\text{'s operand}$ 
16:          erase  $factor$ 
17:        end if
18:      end for
19:      insert  $c \cdot \partial_{indices}(operand)$  to  $term$ 's factors ▷ individual indices can be co- or contravariant
20:       $N \leftarrow N + 1$ 
21:    end while
22:  end for
23:  return  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ 
24: end function

```

parameters k_{2_b}, k_{2_c} . In the second term, each of the three fields lies in the Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}_1(\cdot)$ associated to the momentum parameters $k_{1_a}, k_{1_b}, k_{1_c}$. This reflects precisely the relationship with the partial derivatives in position space. Also, notice that the coefficient of $-i$ in front of each term is just as expected, as there are three derivatives in each term and $i^3 = -i$. The code below reverts back to position space by running “InverseFourier” before canonicalizing.

```

>>> inverse_fourier(ex)
>>> canonicalise(ex)

```

The result is

$$\partial_a(AB)\partial_{bc}(C) + \partial_{abc}(ABC), \quad (5.7.2)$$

which is the original expression, just as expected.

5.8 Identifying Non-Gauge-Invariant Quantities

As already noted in the prior section, the solver in §5.9 will require the isolation of non-gauge-invariant quantities (i.e., the elimination of gauge-invariant quantities) from an expression. This is the purpose of the “FindNonGaugeInv” algorithm presented here. The goal should first be clarified. Strictly speaking, the problem of drawing non-gauge-invariant terms from an expression is ambiguous: adding any gauge-invariant quantity to a non-gauge invariant quantity gives a non-gauge-invariant quantity which is gauge-equivalent to the first. For example, take B_{ab} to be the Kalb-Ramond field from [35] with gauge transformation⁷⁰

$$\delta_G B_{ab} = \partial_a \xi_b - \partial_b \xi_a. \quad (5.8.1)$$

⁷⁰ See [32] for a modern reference.

It is well-known and easy to verify that the quantity

$$H_{abc} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_{[a} B_{bc]}, \quad (5.8.2)$$

known as the Kalb-Ramond field strength, is gauge-invariant. In contrast, $\partial_c B_{ab}$ is obviously not gauge-invariant. However, if one defines the expression $\mathcal{E} = \partial_c B_{ab}$, the “non-gauge-invariant part” could be said to be $\partial_c B_{ab} + t H_{abc}$ for any t (including tensorial t), e.g., $-\partial_a B_{bc} + \partial_b B_{ac}$ for $t = -1$. One could demand that the “non-gauge-invariant part” consist of terms originally in \mathcal{E} , but it is easy to see that this is of little mathematical meaning, and is thus difficult to enforce in a symbolic algebra procedure. We therefore frame the goal in the following way: “FindNonGaugeInv” must return an expression, no combination of terms of which is gauge-invariant, that is gauge-equivalent⁷¹ to the set of non-gauge-invariant terms originally appearing in \mathcal{E} and *with the same coefficients*.

The utility of these restrictions comes from the use of “FindNonGaugeInv” in the multiplet solver in §5.9. In that solver, a particular expression consisting of “potentially equation-of-motion” terms will be inputted into “FindNonGaugeInv,” and certain outputted terms will have their coefficients set equal to zero to give a system of equations. The idea is that we do not want to obtain equations from coefficients of gauge-invariant combinations of terms. For example, suppose we are given an expression⁷²

$$\mathcal{E} = v \partial_a B_{bc} - v \partial_b B_{ac} + (u + v) \partial_c B_{ab}. \quad (5.8.3)$$

We would like to set the coefficients of the terms in the non-gauge-invariant part to zero and ignore the coefficients of all terms in the gauge-invariant part. \mathcal{E} can be rewritten

$$\mathcal{E} = v H_{abc} + u \partial_c B_{ab}, \quad (5.8.4)$$

so that the output of “FindNonGaugeInv” should show that $u = 0$ and v is a free variable. That is, we want “FindNonGaugeInv” to give an expression

$$u \partial_c B_{ab} + ut H_{abc} \quad (5.8.5)$$

for some t , e.g., $u \partial_c B_{ab}$ for $t = 0$, or $-u \partial_a B_{bc} + u \partial_b B_{ac}$ for $t = -1$.⁷³ The simple way to begin obtaining such an expression is to replace B_{ab} in \mathcal{E} with its gauge transformation. Substituting (5.8.1) for B_{ab} in (5.8.3) yields

$$\delta_G \mathcal{E} = u \partial_{ca} \xi_b - u \partial_{cb} \xi_a. \quad (5.8.6)$$

In particular, substituting the gauge transformation into the expression resulted in the cancellation of all terms which combine into a gauge-invariant whole, leaving the expression which results from substituting the gauge transformation into the non-gauge-invariant term $u \partial_c B_{ab}$. Any expression \mathcal{E}' such that $\delta_G \mathcal{E}' = \delta_G \mathcal{E}$, and without superfluous gauge-invariant combinations of terms or extraneous parameters, will be an acceptable output, particularly the $t = 0, -1$ options in (5.8.5).

However, programmatically reversing the substitution of the gauge transformation to find such an \mathcal{E}' is quite challenging and carries most of the difficulty in the algorithm. The most natural

⁷¹ We say that an expression A is “gauge-equivalent” to another expression B if $A - B$ is gauge-invariant.

⁷² \mathcal{E} is not a realistic input into “FindNonGaugeInv” from “SUSYSolve,” but it makes the purpose of the former function for the latter quite explicit.

⁷³ Since we prefer not to have gauge-invariant combinations of terms present in the final expression, the results with $t = 0, -1$ are the only permissible answers.

approach one might essay is to imagine that (5.8.1) is, for the purpose of consideration of the substitution, an expression of B_{ab} as a linear combination of elements of the form $\partial_d \xi_e$ with $d, e \in \{a, b\}$, or equivalently, an expression of $\partial_c B_{ab}$ as a linear combination of elements of the form $\partial_{de} \xi_f$ with $d, e, f \in \{a, b, c\}$. Therefore, one might reverse the substitution by writing $\partial_{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} \xi_{\sigma_3}$, for each $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(\{a, b, c\})$, where $\mathfrak{S}(\{a, b, c\})$ is the set of permutations of a, b, c , as a linear combination of the elements $\partial_{\sigma'_1} B_{\sigma'_2 \sigma'_3} \sim \partial_{\sigma'_1 \sigma'_2} \xi_{\sigma'_3} - \partial_{\sigma'_1 \sigma'_3} \xi_{\sigma'_2}$ ⁷⁴ for $\sigma' \in \mathfrak{S}(\{a, b, c\})$. However, simple linear algebra shows the futility of this approach. The complete set \mathcal{B} of $\partial_{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} \xi_{\sigma_3}$ for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(\{a, b, c\})$ is

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\partial_{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} \xi_{\sigma_3} \mid \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(\{a, b, c\})\} = \{\partial_{ab} \xi_c, \partial_{ac} \xi_b, \partial_{bc} \xi_a\}. \quad (5.8.7)$$

In this basis, the set \mathcal{B}' of $\delta_G \partial_{\sigma_1} B_{\sigma_2 \sigma_3}$ for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(\{a, b, c\})$ can be written

$$[\mathcal{B}']_{\mathcal{B}} = \{[\partial_{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} \xi_{\sigma_3} - \partial_{\sigma_1 \sigma_3} \xi_{\sigma_2}]_{\mathcal{B}} \mid \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(\{a, b, c\})\} = \{\pm(1, -1, 0), \pm(1, 0, -1), \pm(0, 1, -1)\}. \quad (5.8.8)$$

It is an easy linear algebra exercise to show that none of $(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)$ are in the space spanned by \mathcal{B}' , which implies that none of the expressions of the form $\partial_{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} \xi_{\sigma_3}$ for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(\{a, b, c\})$ can be written as a linear combination of the elements of \mathcal{B}' for the purpose of a reverse substitution. Hence, this intuitive technique is abortive.⁷⁵

On the other hand, we know by construction that $\delta_G \mathcal{E}$ is in the subspace spanned by \mathcal{B}' (with linear combinations having coefficients in the Clifford algebra) if every term of \mathcal{E} has exactly one occurrence of B which is in the operand of exactly one first-order derivative. Therefore, making these assumptions on \mathcal{E} , we can reverse the gauge-transformation substitution on the whole expression at once if we solve for the linear combination of elements in \mathcal{B}' that equals $\delta_G \mathcal{E}$. For better demonstrative purposes, we switch to consideration of the expression

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} &= (u + v) (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a B_{bc} - v (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b B_{ac} + (u + v) (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c B_{ab} \\ &= u (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a B_{bc} + u (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c B_{ab} + v H_{abc}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.8.9)$$

Substitution of $\delta_G B$ for B yields

$$\delta_G \mathcal{E} = u (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \delta_G B_{bc} + u (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c \delta_G B_{ab} = u (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{ab} \xi_c - u (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{bc} \xi_a. \quad (5.8.10)$$

We now move to momentum space to better approximate the approach of the soon-to-be-shown algorithm, for which Cadabra2 manipulation of indexed momentum parameters created by “Fourier” is easier than the manipulation of partial derivatives. Taking the Fourier transforms of the elements in \mathcal{B} and negating gives⁷⁶

$$\hat{\mathcal{B}} = \{-\mathcal{F}(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}\} = \{k_a k_b \mathcal{F}(\xi_c), k_a k_c \mathcal{F}(\xi_b), k_b k_c \mathcal{F}(\xi_a)\}, \quad (5.8.11)$$

and the set of negated Fourier transforms of the elements of \mathcal{B}' in the basis \mathcal{B} is

$$[\hat{\mathcal{B}}']_{\hat{\mathcal{B}}} = \{[k_{\sigma_1} k_{\sigma_2} \mathcal{F}(\xi_{\sigma_3}) - k_{\sigma_1} k_{\sigma_3} \mathcal{F}(\xi_{\sigma_2})]_{\hat{\mathcal{B}}} \mid \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(\{a, b, c\})\} = \{\pm(1, -1, 0), \pm(1, 0, -1), \pm(0, 1, -1)\}. \quad (5.8.12)$$

⁷⁴ The sign \sim reflects that this is not a true equality.

⁷⁵ Incidentally, the same linear algebra considerations show that this naïve method *does* work when the field under consideration is a spin-3/2 fermion, e.g., the gravitino, rather than the Kalb-Ramond field. Of course, we prefer an approach of wider applicability than simply to gravitinos.

⁷⁶ Note that momentum parameters and Fourier transforms will actually be numbered in the output of “Fourier,” so that for example, the Fourier transform of the first element of \mathcal{B} is returned as $k_{1_a} k_{1_b} \mathcal{F}_1(\xi_c)$.

Also, the negated Fourier transform of the expression $\delta_G \mathcal{E}$ is

$$-\mathcal{F}(\delta_G \mathcal{E}) = u(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} k_a k_b \mathcal{F}(\xi_c) - u(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} k_b k_c \mathcal{F}(\xi_a), \quad (5.8.13)$$

so that the coordinates with respect to the basis $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ are

$$[-\mathcal{F}(\delta_G \mathcal{E})]_{\hat{\mathcal{B}}} = (u(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}, 0, -u(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}). \quad (5.8.14)$$

Solving for the linear combination of the elements $\hat{\mathcal{B}}'$ that equals $\mathcal{F}(\delta_G \mathcal{E})$ is ostensibly a linear algebra problem with Clifford algebra values, but the proof of the fault in the naïve solution method intimates that this Clifford-algebra linear algebra problem can be reduced to a linear algebra problem in \mathbb{Q} solvable by ordinary row-reduction. Let

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{b} = \begin{bmatrix} u(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \\ 0 \\ -u(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.8.15)$$

The problem which we are trying to solve amounts to the solution of the equation $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$.⁷⁷ Row-reducing $[A \mid I_3]$, where I_3 is the 3×3 identity matrix, shows that the row-reduced echelon matrix R row-equivalent to A is equal to PA , where

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad P = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.8.16)$$

It follows that one set of coordinates for $\mathcal{F}(\delta_G \mathcal{E})$ in the elements of $\hat{\mathcal{B}}'$ with positive first nonzero $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ -coordinates is⁷⁸

$$P\mathbf{b} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ u(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.8.17)$$

Hence,

$$-\mathcal{F}(\delta_G \mathcal{E}) = u(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (k_a k_b \mathcal{F}(\xi_c) - k_b k_c \mathcal{F}(\xi_a)). \quad (5.8.18)$$

Since the expression in $\hat{\mathcal{B}}'$ corresponding to the difference in parentheses above is known, we can finally reverse the gauge-transformation substitution. Accounting for a factor of -1 from negating the Fourier transforms earlier and another factor of $-i$ which must be introduced to compensate

⁷⁷We have omitted the elements of $\hat{\mathcal{B}}'$ with coordinates which are negative the columns of A because of the obvious redundancy. However, the program does not recognize and eliminate redundant combinations, since such a feature would simply introduce unnecessary complications in a linear algebra problem which is particularly easy to solve by computer.

⁷⁸Note that these coordinates are not unique, since the elements of $\hat{\mathcal{B}}'$ with positive first nonzero $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ -coordinates are not linearly independent.

for the one fewer partial derivative, it must be that, adding a prime to reflect the earlier-mentioned ambiguity in the result,

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{E}') = iu(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} k_b \mathcal{F}(B_{ac}), \quad (5.8.19)$$

so that the application of an inverse Fourier transform yields

$$\mathcal{E}' = u(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b B_{ac}. \quad (5.8.20)$$

Indeed, this is gauge-equivalent to the non-gauge-invariant part of \mathcal{E} in (5.8.9) with the same coefficient $-u$,⁷⁹ for

$$u(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b B_{ac} - \left[u(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a B_{bc} + u(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_c B_{ab} \right] = -u H_{abc}. \quad (5.8.21)$$

The algorithm "FindNonGaugeInv" implements precisely the approach in the above example. In particular, the first part treats the preparation of sets like $\hat{\mathcal{B}}, \hat{\mathcal{B}}'$. The function takes as input the expression \mathcal{E} from whom the non-gauge-invariant part must be drawn, the field A which the gauge-invariant terms must contain, an array "fields" of all fields which might appear in \mathcal{E} , and the gauge transformation $\delta_G A$. As in the above example, $\delta_G A$ is substituted for A in \mathcal{E} . The expression is then evaluated with "Evaluate" and moved to momentum space with "Fourier." Next, the algorithm finds the Lorentz indices on the momentum parameters k_1 ⁸⁰ and the gauge parameter ζ in $\delta_G A$, as well as the spinor index on ζ if there is one, storing these as tuples (one for each term) in the array "Inds_{kf}," from which duplicates are removed. (The Lorentz indices are sorted so that duplicates with initially different index orders can be removed.) Then the program creates (and distributes) the expression $\mathcal{H} = -\partial_{a'}(\delta_G A)$, which is essentially an instance of \mathcal{B}' in the above example but not yet with correct Lorentz indices. At the same time, the program generates the expression $\mathcal{G} = -i\partial_{a'} A$ which is to serve roughly as \mathcal{H} "pre-gauge transformation." The program then promptly uses "Fourier" to move to momentum space. In the example above, the momentum-space \mathcal{H} is essentially an element of $\hat{\mathcal{B}}'$, and the momentum-space \mathcal{G} is merely \mathcal{H} with $k_a \mathcal{F}(\zeta_b) - k_b \mathcal{F}(\zeta_a)$ replaced by $\mathcal{F}(B_{ab})$, matching the transition from (5.8.18) to (5.8.19) except for the factor of i , which is tabled until the end. Then, the program loops through the index tuples in "Inds_{kf}." For each such tuple, the program further loops through each permutation σ of the Lorentz indices and creates versions of \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H} , called $\mathcal{G}'_j, \mathcal{H}'_j$, respectively, with Lorentz indices σ and the spinor index from the tuple if one exists. For each permutation of each tuple, the algorithm generates a unique variable c_j with vector and spinor indices matching those in \mathcal{E} not in the tuple. Finally, each $c_j \mathcal{G}'_j$ is added to an expression \mathcal{E}' , and each $c_j \mathcal{H}'_j$ is added to an expression "zero_ex" which also contains \mathcal{E} . Notice that the values of the c_j that make "zero_ex" equal zero are the values such that

$$-\mathcal{E} = \sum_{i=0}^n c_j \mathcal{H}'_i. \quad (5.8.22)$$

For example, the column vector of c_j s in the example above is given in (5.8.17). By construction, these values make \mathcal{E}' the desired momentum-space expression of the non-gauge-invariant part of \mathcal{E} ,

⁷⁹ In general, by "having the same coefficient," we mean in the sense that the coefficients are alike, so that the difference between \mathcal{E}' and the non-gauge-invariant part of \mathcal{E} is the multiple of a gauge-invariant expressions, in this case H_{abc} .

⁸⁰ Since "Fourier" numbers momentum parameters and Fourier transforms, we will do so in this explanation except when referring to the above example.

analogous to (5.8.19) (except for the i factor). The detailed pseudo-code for this first part of the "FindNonGaugeInv" procedure is shown in Algorithm 5.8.1.

Algorithm 5.8.1 Find Non Gauge Invariant Part of \mathcal{E} Part 1

```

1: function FINDNONGAUGEINV( $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $A$ ,  $fields[1..n]$ ,  $\delta_G \mathcal{A}$ )
2:    $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{substitute}(\mathcal{E}, A \rightarrow \delta_G \mathcal{A})$ 
3:    $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(\mathcal{E}, to\_perform\_subs = \text{False})$ 
4:    $\zeta \leftarrow$  gauge parameter in  $\delta_G \mathcal{A}$  ▷ e.g.,  $\xi$  in  $\delta_G B_{ab}$ 
5:    $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{Fourier}(\mathcal{E}, fields + [\zeta])$ 
6:    $Inds_{kf} \leftarrow []$ 
7:   for  $term$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  do
8:      $LInds_t \leftarrow$  lexicographically sorted list of Lorentz indices in  $term$ 's "k1"s and  $\zeta$ s
9:      $SInds_t \leftarrow$  spinor index on  $\zeta$ 
10:    append ( $LInds_t$ ,  $SInds_t$ ) to  $Inds_{kf}$ 
11:  end for
12:  remove duplicates in  $Inds_{kf}$ 
13:   $\mathcal{G} \leftarrow -i\partial_{a'} A$  ▷ e.g.,  $-i\partial_{a'} B_{ab}$ 
14:   $\mathcal{H} \leftarrow -\partial_{a'}(\delta_G A)$  ▷ e.g.,  $-\partial_{a'}(\partial_a \xi_b - \partial_b \xi_a)$ 
15:  distribute( $\mathcal{E}$ )
16:   $\mathcal{G} \leftarrow \text{Fourier}(\mathcal{G}, [A])$  ▷ i.e.,  $k_{1_{a'}} \mathcal{F}_1(A)$ , e.g.,  $k_{1_{a'}} \mathcal{F}_1(B_{ab})$ 
17:   $\mathcal{H} \leftarrow \text{Fourier}(\mathcal{H}, [\zeta])$  ▷ e.g.,  $k_{1_{a'}} k_{1_a} \mathcal{F}_1(\xi_b) - k_{1_{a'}} k_{1_b} \mathcal{F}_1(\xi_a)$ 
18:   $\mathcal{E}' \leftarrow 0$ 
19:   $zero\_ex \leftarrow \mathcal{E}$ 
20:   $C \leftarrow []$ 
21:   $j \leftarrow 0$ 
22:  for  $LInds_t, SInds_t$  in  $Inds_{kf}$  do
23:     $c\_linds \leftarrow$  Lorentz indices in  $\mathcal{E}$  that are not in  $LInds_t$ 
24:     $c\_sinds \leftarrow$  spinor indices in  $\mathcal{E}$  that are not in  $SInds_t$ 
25:    for  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(LInds_t)$  do
26:       $\mathcal{G}'_j \leftarrow \mathcal{G}$  with its Lorentz indices replaced by  $\sigma$  and its spinor index replaced by  $SInds_t$ 
27:       $\mathcal{H}'_j \leftarrow \mathcal{H}$  with its Lorentz indices replaced by  $\sigma$  and its spinor index replaced by  $SInds_t$ 
28:       $c_j \leftarrow (c_{j_{LInds_t}})_{SInds_t}$ 
29:       $\mathcal{E}' \leftarrow \mathcal{E}' + c_j \mathcal{G}'_j$ 
30:       $zero\_ex \leftarrow zero\_ex + c_j \mathcal{H}'_j$  ▷ Introduce variable linear combination of the  $\mathcal{H}'_j$ s
31:      append  $c_j$  to  $C$  ▷ Store the variables for which to solve
32:       $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
33:    end for
34:  end for
35:  continued...

```

The goal of the second part of the procedure is to solve for the values of the c_j s. After simplifying "zero_ex," the algorithm factors out the instances of the momentum parameter k_1 and the Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}_1(\zeta)$ of the gauge parameter from each term, leaving a remaining factor in each term which is either a c_j or an expression in terms of the c_j s. The algorithm loops through the factors of each term, locates the factor which includes the c_j s, creates a row vector \mathbf{a} which contains the coefficient of each c_j and is appended to a matrix A , and appends the negative of the remaining expression after removing the c_j s to a column vector \mathbf{b} . For example, if one term is

$$\left(5c_0 + c_2 - (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}\right) k_{1_a} k_{1_b} \mathcal{F}_1(\zeta), \quad (5.8.23)$$

then the row vector $\mathbf{a} = (5, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ is appended to A and the expression $(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}$ is appended to \mathbf{b} . The result after looping through all terms is that the equation $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$, analogous to that in the earlier example, determines the values of the c_j s which make "zero_ex" equal zero, as desired. Just as in the example, we row-reduce $[A \mid I]$, where I is the identity matrix of appropriate dimensions, to get the row-reduced echelon form R of A and the invertible matrix P such that $R = PA$. The program then calculates $P\mathbf{b}$. We assume that every c_j which does not correspond to a pivot in

the matrix R is zero, and then the pivot c_j s are determined by the respective values in $P\mathbf{b}$. For example, if

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad P\mathbf{b} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ u(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5.8.24)$$

as in the Kalb-Ramond field example, then it is determined immediately that $c_2 = 0$, as it does not correspond to a pivot in R , and the values $c_0 = 0, c_1 = u(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}$ are read off from $P\mathbf{b}$. The procedure wraps up by substituting the solved values of the c_j s into \mathcal{E}' , multiplying by the corrective i factor, distributing, applying an inverse Fourier transform “InverseFourier,” and simplifying/canonicalizing with “Evaluate” to give the final form of the answer \mathcal{E}' . Algorithm 5.8.2 shows detailed pseudo-code for this procedure.

Algorithm 5.8.2 Find Non Gauge Invariant Part of \mathcal{E} Part 2

```

36:  zero_ex ← distribute(zero_ex)
37:  zero_ex ← canonicalise(zero_ex)
38:  zero_ex ← factor_out(zero_ex, all “k1”s & “F1”s, right = True)
39:  A ← []
40:  b ← []
41:  for term in zero_ex do
42:    for factor in term do
43:      if factor is a sum or in C then
44:        a ← [0, ..., 0]
45:        for sub_term in terms of factor do
46:          if sub_term ∈ C then
47:            a[index on sub_term] = multiplier of sub_term
48:            erase sub_term from factor
49:          end if
50:        end for
51:        append a to A
52:        append [-factor] to b
53:      end if
54:    end for
55:  end for
56:  [R | P] ← RREF of [A | I]
57:  Pb ← P * b
58:  subs ← []
59:  for row in R do
60:    append “C[index of pivot in row] → Pb(row)”
61:  end for
62:  E' ← substitute(E', subs)
63:  set all remaining cjs in E' to 0
64:  E' ← iE'
65:  E' ← distribute(E')
66:  E' ← InverseFourier(E')
67:  E' ← Evaluate(E', to_perform_subs = False)
68:  return E'
69: end function

```

▷ e.g., $\mathbf{a}[0] = 5$ if $sub_term = 5c_0$
 ▷ Remove the discovered c_j
 ▷ e.g., $\mathbf{a} = (5, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ if $5c_0, c_2$ are among the subterms
 ▷ e.g., $(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}$ if $factor = -(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}$ after removing the c_j s
 ▷ * denotes matrix multiplication
 ▷ Replace the c_j s in \mathcal{E}' with their values
 ▷ The correction for the sign and one fewer partial derivative

To offer an example of use, the below code finds the non-gauge-invariant part of the expression \mathcal{E} in (5.8.9).

```

>>> field = Ex(r'B_{a b}')
>>> gauge_trans = Ex(r'\partial_{a}(\zeta_{b}) - \partial_{b}(\zeta_{a})')

```

```

>>> ex = Ex(r'(u + v) (\Gamma^{a})_{\alpha \beta} \partial_a(B_{b c}) - v
→ (\Gamma^{a})_{\alpha \beta} \partial_b(B_{a c}) + (u + v) (\Gamma^{a})_{\alpha \beta}
→ \partial_c(B_{a b})')
>>> find_non_gauge_inv(ex, field, [field], gauge_trans)
>>> canonicalise(ex)

```

The result is precisely (5.8.20).

5.9 Multiplet Solver 1: Brute-Force Gamma-Matrix Splitting

Now that we have constructed algorithms for Fierz expansions and identifying non-gauge-invariant terms, founded on a robust spinor arithmetic, it remains to tackle the problem which we have set out to treat, namely, to “solve” a multiplet. More precisely, we are desirous to solve for the coefficients in the supersymmetry-transformation rules and action corresponding to a particular multiplet by deriving constraints on those coefficients from closure of the algebra and SUSY-invariance of the action. In particular, the symbolic-algebra approach developed here is that used to solve for the coefficients in (1.1.1) and (1.1.4), as seen in §§2-3. This subsection will treat the constraints arising from closure, which will also be handled via a quite different route in §5.11. §5.12 will present an algorithm to handle constraints from SUSY-invariance of the action.

In the multiplet solver presented here, it is assumed that any equation-of-motion terms are on the closure on Lorentz-symmetric fermions, which already offers flexibility much broader than is generally needed, since fermions of interest in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry are generally spin-1/2 particles and spin-3/2 particles, which have zero and one vector indices, respectively, and are thus vacuously Lorentz-symmetric. It follows that all equation-of-motion terms within the algorithm’s scope vanish upon application of the equations of motion for symmetric fermions. The study of the equations of motion for (symmetric) fermions of arbitrary spin (i.e., arbitrary numbers of vector indices) can be traced to [11], but we rely on the more recent formulation in [42], altering the notation somewhat to make spinor-index orientations more explicit and make the subsequent equations more concordant with the rest of the paper. Let the rank- s tensor-spinor $\Psi_{a_1 \dots a_s}^\gamma$ be a fermion of spin $s + 1/2$, and let $U_i = \{a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_s\}$, so that $\Psi_{bU_i}^\gamma = \Psi_{ba_1 \dots a_{i-1} a_{i+1} \dots a_s}^\gamma$. The gauge transformation of the fermion is ((3.3.1) in [42])

$$\delta_G \Psi_{a_1 \dots a_s}^\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^s \partial_{a_i} \kappa_{U_i}^\gamma, \quad (5.9.1)$$

where the gauge parameter $\kappa_{U_i}^\gamma$ is a rank- $(s-1)$ tensor-spinor assumed to satisfy ((3.3.2) in [42])

$$(\gamma^b)_\eta^\gamma \kappa_{bb_3 \dots b_s}^\eta = 0. \quad (5.9.2)$$

The equation of motion of the spin- $(s + 1/2)$ fermion is ((3.3.4) in [42])

$$(\gamma^b)_\eta^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_{a_1 \dots a_s}^\eta - \sum_{i=1}^s (\gamma^b)_\eta^\gamma \partial_{a_i} \Psi_{bU_i}^\eta = 0. \quad (5.9.3)$$

Notice that if $s = 0$, then the equation becomes precisely the Dirac equation (1.2.4), while if $s = 1$, then the equation becomes the Rarita-Schwinger equation (2.4.7). (5.9.3) is, of course, gauge-invariant, and proposition D.1 verifies that every gauge-invariant combination of terms of the form

$$(\gamma^b)_\eta \gamma \partial_{a'} \Psi_E^\eta, \quad b \in \{a'\} \cup E, \quad (5.9.4)$$

is proportional to the left-hand side of (5.9.3). It is important to consider one other variant of the equation of motion before the first main component of the algorithm is depicted. Proposition D.2 and corollary D.3 show that

$$\left(\gamma^{a'E} \right)_\eta \gamma \partial_{a'} \Psi_E^\eta \quad (5.9.5)$$

can be considered an equation-of-motion term. It could certainly be reduced to a multiple of the equation of motion (5.9.3), but since it appears empirically frequently when considering spin-3/2 fermions, it is more efficient to recognize this term and skip the reduction.

The general idea of the multiplet solver is to use the foregoing considerations to sift through the terms in the Fierz expansion of the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to each field;⁸¹ recognize the desired translation, gauge terms, (off-shell) equation-of-motion terms, and other “undesired terms”; record the equation setting the coefficient of the desired translation equal to $c \cdot i$ (see (1.2.1)); and record the equations arising from setting the coefficients of the undesired terms equal to zero. Independent constraints are then culled from the equations produced while sifting through the terms.⁸² The task of sifting through the terms is handled, in part, by an algorithm “FilterTerms.” The algorithm takes the expression \mathcal{E} for the Fierz-expanded anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to a field, the field A in question (which may be bosonic or fermionic), the indices “Inds” of the supercovariant derivatives, and an optional boolean parameter, by default false, dictating whether to look for potential off-shell equation-of-motion terms. The algorithm records the set T of terms in \mathcal{E} and defines an iterated integer n to initially be zero. The program then runs a “while” loop which continues until n reaches the cardinality of T ; the loop is structured in this manner rather than as a “for” loop through T in order to enable the consistent operation of the loop as terms are added to T .

Within the loop, the algorithm defines t to be the n th element of T , and the next operation varies among five cases. 1) If t is of the form of the first term of the right-hand side of (1.2.1) applied to A , notwithstanding the coefficient and with the indices given by “Inds,” then t is of the form of the desired translation and is appended to an array “desired_terms” of terms of this form. 2) If the optional parameter specifies that the program should be looking for potential equation-of-motion terms and if t is of the form $(\gamma^D)_{Inds} (\gamma^{a'EF})_{\alpha' \beta'} \partial_{a'} (A_E)_{\beta'}$ for some α' ,⁸³ then the gamma matrix in the middle factor can be decomposed to give $\gamma^F \gamma^{a'E}$ and some remainder R , each of

⁸¹ The Fierz expansion is needed to ensure that the spinor indices of the supercovariant derivatives are attached to the same gamma matrices, as will be discussed in a moment.

⁸² Notice that the sole purpose of recognizing gauge and equation-of-motion terms is to allow the coefficients of these terms to be anything, thereby preventing the addition of unwarranted equations to the ultimate list of constraints.

⁸³ N.B. Cases (2) and (3) assume that A is a fermion. α' is the free spinor index of the fermion before the supercovariant derivatives are applied, but this fact on its own has no utility in “FilterTerms,” with the fermion’s free spinor index not even inputted. In the algorithm for “SUSYSolve,” whenever A is a boson, “identify_lorentz_proper” will be set false so that cases (2) and (3) are not considered.

which are substituted into the middle factor, resulting in two expressions.⁸⁴ The first is of the form $(\gamma^D)_{Inds}(\gamma^F)_{\alpha'}\gamma'(\gamma^{a'E})_{\gamma'\beta'}\partial_{a'}(A_E)_{\beta'}$, so that the last two factors are of the form (5.9.5). This expression is appended to an array "lorentz_proper_terms" of terms of the appropriate Lorentz-index structure to, if gauge-invariant when combined with similar terms, constitute off-shell equation-of-motion terms.⁸⁵ The second expression, upon simplification via "Evaluate," forms a set of terms similar to the original but with some Lorentz indices on the original middle factor relegated to Kronecker deltas. The terms of this second expression are appended to T to be considered later in the loop. 3) If the optional parameter is set "true," as in (2), and if t is of the form $(\gamma^D)_{Inds}(\gamma^E)_{\alpha'}\gamma'\partial_{a'}(A_F)_{\beta'}$, where $E \cap (\{a'\} \cup F) \neq 0$, then the latter intersection is lexicographically sorted and the last index g is drawn; the lexicographic sorting ensures that the choice of g is canonical. Then, analogously to the procedure in case (2), the middle factor is decomposed into $\gamma^{E \setminus \{g\}}\gamma^g$ and some remainder R , each of which are substituted into the middle factor to give two different expressions. The first expression is of the form $(\gamma^D)_{Inds}(\gamma^{E \setminus \{g\}})_{\alpha'}\gamma'(\gamma^g)_{\gamma'\beta'}\partial_{a'}(A_F)_{\beta'}$, so that the last two factors are of the form (5.9.4). This expression is appended to "lorentz_proper_terms." The second expression, as in case (2), has some Lorentz indices from the original middle factor relegated to Kronecker deltas, and this expression is appended to T after an "Evaluate." 4) If the prior conditions are not satisfied and the partial derivative in the term carries a free index, then the term is a gauge term, and hence is appended to an array "gauge_terms" of such terms. 5) Finally, if conditions (1)-(4) are not satisfied, then the only conclusion is that the term is not one of the permissible "other terms" in (1.2.1), and it is appended to an array "undesired_terms." Regardless of the conditions satisfied, at the end of the round of the loop, n is augmented by 1 to move to the next term. After a finite number of steps, the "while" loop terminates. Note that this is true despite the addition of terms to T in cases (2) and (3), for the fact that gamma-matrix decomposition can only occur finitely many times ensures that eventually, the additional terms will not satisfy (2) or (3), leaving only finitely many further iterations through the remaining terms, which may satisfy (1) or (4), or may be assigned to (5). After the loop, the arrays "desired_terms," "lorentz_proper_terms," "gauge_terms," and "undesired_terms" are organized in a hash table, which is the output of the program. Algorithm 5.9.1 presents detailed pseudo-code for the foregoing procedure. The isolation of (potential) equation-of-motion terms in cases (2) and (3) by means of explicit gamma-matrix decompositions is what we dub "brute-force gamma-matrix splitting," in contrast to the use of Feynman propagators, i.e., Green's functions, to isolate equation-of-motion non-closure terms in §5.11.

Now that a procedure for filtering terms in the closure has been expounded, the (first) multiplet solver algorithm "SUSYSolve" can be treated. "SUSYSolve" takes as input the array "bosons" of bosonic fields in the multiplet, the array "fermions" of fermionic fields in the multiplet, the corresponding array "gauge_transs" of gauge transformations for the fermions, the supersymmetry transformation rules "susy" (e.g., (1.1.1)) for whose coefficients it is desired to solve, a basis Γ^A for

⁸⁴The procedure for executing this decomposition is actually quite intricate and technical and is suppressed here. Fundamentally, the procedure relies on the Cadabra2 [49] function `split_gamma()` (which is incidentally similar to the FieldsX [14] function `SplitGammaMatrix()`), which splits off a 1-gamma matrix from a multi-indexed gamma matrix. The subtlety is in splitting gamma matrices, and then joining them, in a consistent way to yield $\gamma^F\gamma^{a'E}$ given the desired indices $\{a'\} \cup E$ on one factor.

⁸⁵It follows from corollary D.3 and proposition D.1 that this expression is gauge-invariant, so we could already ascertain that the expression is an off-shell equation-of-motion term, but there is no need to handle this classification here when it can be handled wholesale together with less obvious cases in "SusySolve."

Algorithm 5.9.1 Filter Closure/Non-Closure Terms

```

1: function FILTERTERMS( $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $A$ ,  $Inds[1..2]$ ,  $identify\_lorentz\_proper = \text{False}$ )
2:    $desired\_terms \leftarrow []$ 
3:    $gauge\_terms \leftarrow []$ 
4:    $undesired\_terms \leftarrow []$ 
5:    $lorentz\_proper\_terms \leftarrow []$ 
6:    $T \leftarrow \text{terms of } \mathcal{E}$ 
7:    $n = 0$ 
8:   while  $n < |T|$  do
9:      $t \leftarrow T[n]$ 
10:    if  $t$  has form  $(\gamma^{a'})_{Inds} \partial_{a'} A$  then
11:      append  $t$  to  $desired\_terms$ 
12:    else if  $identify\_lorentz\_proper$  &  $t$  has form  $(\gamma^D)_{Inds} (\gamma^{a'EF})_{\bullet}^{\beta'} \partial_{a'} (A_E)_{\beta'}$  then
13:       $\gamma^{a'EF} \rightarrow \gamma^F \gamma^{a'E} + R$ 
14:       $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow (\gamma^D)_{Inds} (R)_{\bullet}^{\beta'} \partial_{a'} (A_E)_{\beta'}$ 
15:       $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(\mathcal{R}, to\_perform\_subs = \text{False})$ 
16:      append  $(\gamma^D)_{Inds} (\gamma^F \gamma^{a'E})_{\bullet}^{\beta'} \partial_{a'} (A_E)_{\beta'}$  to  $lorentz\_proper\_terms$ 
17:      append terms of  $\mathcal{R}$  to  $T$ 
18:    else if  $identify\_lorentz\_proper$  and  $t$  has form  $(\gamma^D)_{Inds} (\gamma^E)_{\bullet}^{\beta'} \partial_{a'} (A_F)_{\beta'}$  &  $E \cap (\{a'\} \cup F) \neq \emptyset$  then
19:       $G \leftarrow \{\text{last index of the sorted array } E \cap (\{a'\} \cup F)\}$   $\triangleright G = \{g\}$ , with  $g$  from the discussion above
20:       $\gamma^E \rightarrow \gamma^{E \setminus G} \gamma^G + R$ 
21:       $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow (\gamma^D)_{Inds} (R)_{\bullet}^{\beta'} \partial_{a'} (A_F)_{\beta'}$ 
22:       $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(\mathcal{R}, to\_perform\_subs = \text{False})$ 
23:      append  $(\gamma^D)_{Inds} (\gamma^{E \setminus G} \gamma^G)_{\bullet}^{\beta'} \partial_{a'} (A_F)_{\beta'}$  to  $lorentz\_proper\_terms$ 
24:      append terms of  $\mathcal{R}$  to  $T$ 
25:    else if the  $\partial$  in  $t$  has a free index then
26:      append  $t$  to  $gauge\_terms$ 
27:    else:
28:      append  $t$  to  $undesired\_terms$ 
29:    end if
30:     $n \leftarrow n + 1$ 
31:  end while
32:  return {"desired_terms":  $desired\_terms$ , "gauge_terms":  $gauge\_terms$ , "undesired_terms":  $undesired\_terms$ ,
    "lorentz_proper_terms":  $lorentz\_proper\_terms$ }
33: end function

```

the Clifford algebra (e.g., (A.0.4)),⁸⁶ an array "consts" of the unknown coefficients, a length-2 array "Inds" of indices for the supercovariant derivatives, and optionally the desired value of c in (1.2.1). (By default, $c = 1$.) The algorithm is largely a loop through "bosons" and "fermions" which adds classified terms to a hash table "susy_dict" and constraints on the coefficients of the multiplet to a system S of equations. In each round of the loop, a single field A is considered and the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives is applied to A and recorded as an expression \mathcal{E} . The supersymmetry transformation rules "susy" are then used by an algorithm "SusyExpand"⁸⁷ to expand the supercovariant derivatives, that is, to explicitly apply them to A in appropriate order. An application of the "Evaluate" function from §5.4 simplifies the expanded closure \mathcal{E} and preps it for input, along with the basis Γ^A of the Clifford algebra and the indices "Inds," into "FierzExpand2Index" from §5.6, which moves the indices "Inds" onto the same gamma matrices in order to make the expression \mathcal{E} comparable with the closure condition (1.2.1). Next, \mathcal{E} , the field A , and "Inds" are inputted into

⁸⁶ For consistency of notation, we always write Γ^A for the basis of the Clifford algebra. Note that this basis is always unrelated to any field that might be called A .

⁸⁷ "SUSYExpand" is a function which given an expression and supersymmetry transformation rules expands every instance in the expression of the supercovariant derivative applied to a field. Since the algorithm behind it is of little conceptual interest, and most of its contents consider rather technical complexities in the passing of supercovariant derivatives past partial derivatives in Cadabra, detailed discussion of this algorithm is suppressed.

"FilterTerms,"⁸⁸ and the outputted hash table is recorded as T_0 . Then, the algorithm unpacks T_0 in order to retrieve the arrays of terms of the form of the desired translation, the gauge terms, the terms of proper Lorentz structure to potentially be equation-of-motion terms, and the undesired terms which are not allowed in (1.2.1). The sum of each array is evaluated and stored in four variables "desired_terms," "pre_gauge_terms," "pre_undesired_terms," and "lorentz_proper_exp," with the coefficients of the first three factored in the coefficients "consts" of the multiplet.⁸⁹ To give an indication of the result and utility of factoring in this way, suppose that the terms classified as undesired are $2uv(\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_a)_\eta^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta$, $xz(\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_a)_\eta^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta$, where u, v, x, z are elements of "consts." Factoring in "consts" gives "pre_undesired_terms" as $(2uv + xz)(\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_a)_\eta^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta$, so that this undesired term can be later set equal to zero to give the constraint $2uv + xz = 0$. The described first part of the "SUSYSolve" procedure has the detailed pseudo-code displayed in Algorithm 5.9.2.

Algorithm 5.9.2 Find Coefficients That Enforce Multiplet Closure Part 1

```

1: function SUSYSOLVE(bosons[1..n], fermions[1..m], gauge_transs[1..m], susy,  $\Gamma^A$ , consts[1..p], Inds[1..2], c = 1)
2:   susy_dict  $\leftarrow$  empty hash table
3:   S  $\leftarrow$  []
4:   for A  $\in$  fermions  $\cup$  bosons do
5:      $\delta_G A \leftarrow$  gauge_transs(A) if A  $\in$  fermions
6:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow D_{Ind[0]} D_{Ind[1]} A + D_{Ind[1]} D_{Ind[0]} A$ 
7:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow$  SUSYExpand( $\mathcal{E}$ , susy)
8:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow$  Evaluate( $\mathcal{E}$ , to_perform_subs = False)
9:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow$  FierzExpand2Index( $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $\Gamma^A$ , Inds, to_perform_subs = False)
10:     $T_0 \leftarrow$  FilterTerms( $\mathcal{E}$ , A, Inds, identify_lorentz_proper = A  $\in$  fermions)
11:    desired_terms  $\leftarrow$   $T_0$ ["desired_terms"]
12:    gauge_terms  $\leftarrow$   $T_0$ ["gauge_terms"]
13:    undesired_terms  $\leftarrow$   $T_0$ ["undesired_terms"]
14:    lorentz_proper_terms  $\leftarrow$   $T_0$ ["lorentz_proper_terms"]
15:    desired_terms  $\leftarrow$  Evaluate(sum(desired_terms))
16:    pre_gauge_terms  $\leftarrow$  Evaluate(sum(gauge_terms))
17:    pre_undesired_terms  $\leftarrow$  Evaluate(sum(undesired_terms))
18:    lorentz_proper_exp  $\leftarrow$  Evaluate(sum(lorentz_proper_terms), to_perform_subs = False, to_join_gamma = False)
19:    pre_desired_terms  $\leftarrow$  factor_in(pre_desired_terms, consts)
20:    pre_gauge_terms  $\leftarrow$  factor_in(pre_gauge_terms, consts)
21:    pre_undesired_terms  $\leftarrow$  factor_in(pre_undesired_terms, consts)
22:    continued...

```

Before constraints can be drawn from the factored terms, some more steps may be necessary depending on whether A is a fermion or a boson; these additional steps, as well as the procedure of drawing constraints, are the focus of the second part of the "SUSYSolve" algorithm. Notice that "lorentz_proper_exp" is nonzero only if A is a fermion. (See footnote 88.) If A is a fermion, these terms' gauge-invariance must be analyzed. That is, the algorithm enters (a copy of)⁹⁰ "lorentz_proper_exp," as well as the field A , the set "fields" of all fields in the multiplet, and the gauge transformation $\delta_G A$ drawn from "gauge_transs," into "FindNonGaugeInv." In particular, "FilterTerms" specifically gave "proper Lorentz" terms as those which are multiples (by other tensors) of the forms (5.9.4) and (5.9.5). Terms which are of the latter form are gauge-

⁸⁸Notice in Algorithm 5.9.2 that "FilterTerms" is set to look for potential equation-of-motion terms if and only if A is a fermion, i.e., A has a spinor index, or equivalently, it *is* an indexbracket.

⁸⁹In Algorithm 5.9.2, it can be seen that in the evaluation of the sum producing "lorentz_proper_exp," multiplication of gamma matrices is not allowed, in order to prevent the reversal of the gamma-matrix decompositions in cases (2) and (3) of "FilterTerms."

⁹⁰Python links variables, and we would still like to keep "lorentz_proper_exp" and return it later, so we must introduce a copy for inputting into "FindNonGaugeInv."

invariant by proposition D.1 and corollary D.3, so they are eliminated in "FindNonGaugeInv," and any gauge-invariant combinations of terms of the form (5.9.4) are stamped out as well.⁹¹ The output of "FindNonGaugeInv" is a set of terms gauge-equivalent to the non-gauge-invariant terms of "lorentz_proper_exp" and with the same coefficients, as elaborated on in §5.8. Sifting through this output with "FilterTerms" (this time not looking for potential equation-of-motion terms, as any have already been removed), any newly found gauge and undesired terms are added to those from the first "FilterTerms," evaluated, factored in the elements of "consts," and recorded as "gauge_terms" and "undesired_terms."⁹² In contrast, if A is a boson, then "lorentz_proper_exp" is zero, and "pre_gauge_terms" and "pre_undesired_terms" are merely copied as "gauge_terms" and "undesired_terms."

Now that all sifting through the terms in the closure is complete, it remains to prepare the output. Note that "lorentz_proper_exp" was not altered by "FindNonGaugeInv" (rather, a copy of it was used; see footnote 90), as it is of separate utility if one is desirous to determine the equation-of-motion terms explicitly, as in §2.4, in order to compute the non-closure geometry. Similarly, "desired_terms," "pre_gauge_terms," and "pre_undesired_terms" may be of interest in studying the closure structure of the multiplet, so these four expressions⁹³ are added to the hash table "susy_dict" with the field A as the key. In addition, the algorithm appends to the system of equations S the constraints that the coefficient (an expression in "consts") of "desired_terms" (which must be one term by this point) equals $c \cdot i$ and that the coefficient of each term in "undesired_terms" equal zero. For example, if $c = 1$, the contents of "desired_terms" is $(uv - xz)(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}\partial_a A_b$, and the contents of "undesired_terms" is $5yz(\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_a)_\eta \gamma^\eta \partial_b \Psi_c^\eta$, then the constraints $uv - xz = i$, $5yz = 0$ are appended to S . After looping through all fields, an algorithm "DistillConstrs"⁹⁴ is run on S and "consts" to cull and simplify independent constraints on the elements of "consts" from S . Since these remaining constraints are nonlinear, and it is anyway desirable to simply have a system with which to combine that from the action solver in §5.12, this is as far as the algorithm goes in terms of solving the constraints. The program ends by returning the distilled constraints and the hash table "susy_dict" containing the closure structure. Algorithm 5.9.3 offers detailed pseudo-code for the foregoing second part of the "SUSYSolve" algorithm.

To test out this multiplet solver, it is desirable to apply it to a few on- and off-shell multiplets. The first multiplet we consider is the on-shell 4D chiral multiplet, whose supersymmetry rules, with

⁹¹ If A is not a gauge field, so that its gauge transformation is $\delta_G A = 0$, then all expressions are trivially gauge-invariant, and as seen in Algorithm 5.9.3, the program gives the non-gauge-invariant terms as zero.

⁹² N.B. No terms of the form of the desired translation can be in the output of "FindNonGaugeInv," since they would not be classified in "lorentz_proper_exp," and neither would any gauge-equivalent expressions, as it is easy to see that such expressions must consist of the desired translation plus simple gauge transformations.

⁹³ The terms in "lorentz_proper_exp" are summed up and factored in "consts" to make "lorentz_proper_exp" an expression.

⁹⁴ "DistillConstrs" is too technical to be described in detail here, but to give a word on its functioning, the algorithm is a linear solver which solves for the values of the pairwise products of elements in "consts." Note that this procedure places a tacit requirement on the inputted multiplet that each term in each part of the supersymmetry transformation rule has exactly one unknown variable in its coefficient, so that every term in the closure includes the product of exactly two elements from "consts." This, of course, is not at all restrictive, for any additional unknown variable in the coefficient of a term in the supersymmetry transformation rules would necessarily be redundant.

Algorithm 5.9.3 Find Coefficients That Enforce Multiplet Closure Part 2

```

23:   if  $A \in \text{fermions}$  then
24:      $\text{added\_terms} \leftarrow \text{FindNonGaugeInv}(\text{copy of } \text{lorentz\_proper\_exp}, A, \text{bosons} \cup \text{fermions}, \delta_G A)$  if  $\delta_G A \neq 0$  else 0
25:      $T_1 \leftarrow \text{FilterTerms}(\text{added\_terms}, \text{field}, \text{Inds}, \text{identify\_lorentz\_proper} = \text{False})$ 
26:      $\text{gauge\_terms} \leftarrow \text{gauge\_terms} + T_1[\text{"gauge\_terms"}]$ 
27:      $\text{undesired\_terms} \leftarrow \text{undesired\_terms} + T_1[\text{"undesired\_terms"}]$ 
28:      $\text{gauge\_terms} \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(\text{sum}(\text{gauge\_terms}))$ 
29:      $\text{undesired\_terms} \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(\text{sum}(\text{undesired\_terms}))$ 
30:      $\text{gauge\_terms} \leftarrow \text{factor\_in}(\text{gauge\_terms}, \text{consts})$ 
31:      $\text{undesired\_terms} \leftarrow \text{factor\_in}(\text{undesired\_terms}, \text{consts})$ 
32:   else
33:      $\text{gauge\_terms} \leftarrow \text{copy of } \text{pre\_gauge\_terms}$ 
34:      $\text{undesired\_terms} \leftarrow \text{copy of } \text{pre\_undesired\_terms}$ 
35:   end if
36:    $\text{lorentz\_proper\_exp} \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(\text{lorentz\_proper\_exp}, \text{to\_join\_gamma} = \text{False})$ 
37:    $\text{lorentz\_proper\_exp} \leftarrow \text{factor\_in}(\text{lorentz\_proper\_exp}, \text{consts})$ 
38:   append "coefficient of  $\text{desired\_terms}$  in terms of  $\text{consts} = c \cdot i$ " to  $S$ 
39:   for coefficient  $k$ , in terms of  $\text{consts}$ , of each term in  $\text{undesired\_terms}$  do
40:     append " $k = 0$ " to  $S$ 
41:   end for
42:    $\text{susy\_dict}[A] \leftarrow \{\text{"desired\_terms": } \text{desired\_terms}, \text{"gauge\_terms": } \text{pre\_gauge\_terms}, \text{"undesired\_terms": } \text{pre\_undesired\_terms}, \text{"lorentz\_proper\_terms": } \text{lorentz\_proper\_exp}\}$ 
43: end for
44:  $\text{sol} \leftarrow \text{DistillConstrs}(S, \text{consts})$ 
45: return  $\text{sol}, \text{susy\_dict}$ 
46: end function

```

variable coefficients, are

$$D_\alpha A = u \Psi_\alpha \quad (5.9.6a)$$

$$D_\alpha B = v (\gamma_*)_\alpha{}^\beta \Psi_\beta \quad (5.9.6b)$$

$$D_\alpha \Psi_\beta = w (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a A + x (\gamma_* \gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a B. \quad (5.9.6c)$$

The code below finds constraints from closure for the coefficients of this multiplet. Note that the fermion is not a gauge field, and therefore has gauge transformation equal to zero; that the basis of the 4D Clifford algebra is that from (5.5.1); and that $c = 2$ in (1.2.1) for 4D multiplets.

```

>>> bosons = [Ex('A'), Ex('B')]
>>> fermions = [Ex(r'(\Psi)_{\gamma})]
>>> gauge_trans = [Ex(r'0')]
>>> susy = r'''D_{\alpha}(A) -> u (\Psi)_{\alpha}, D_{\alpha}(B) -> v
-> (\Gamma)_{\alpha}^{\beta} (\Psi)_{\beta}, D_{\alpha}((\Psi)_{\beta}) -> w
-> (\Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta} \partial_a(A) + x (\Gamma_* \Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta} \partial_a B
-> \partial_a(B)'''
>>> basis = [Ex(r'C_{\alpha \beta}), Ex(r'(\Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta}), Ex(r'(\Gamma^a
-> b)_{\alpha \beta}), Ex(r'((\Gamma)_{\alpha \beta}')), Ex(r'((\Gamma
-> \Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta}'))]
>>> consts = ['u', 'v', 'w', 'x']
>>> indices = [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\beta}']
>>> susy_solve(bosons, fermions, gauge_trans, susy, basis, consts, indices, comm_coef=2)

```

The resulting independent constraints are

$$uw = i \quad (5.9.7a)$$

$$vx = -i. \quad (5.9.7b)$$

If one fixes $u = 1, v = i$, then $w = i, x = -1$, matching (4) of [16] and (2.1) of [25]. Hence, "SUSY-Solve" gives valid constraints. As further indication of the validity of the results of "SUSYSolve," the outputted closure structure shows that

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}A = 2uw (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a A \quad (5.9.8a)$$

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}B = -2vx (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a B \quad (5.9.8b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}\Psi_\gamma = & (uw - vx) (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \Psi_\gamma + (uw + vx) (\gamma_a^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^a)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_b \Psi_\eta \\ & + \left(-\frac{1}{2}uw + \frac{1}{2}vx\right) (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a \gamma^b)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_b \Psi_\eta \\ & + \left(-\frac{1}{4}uw - \frac{1}{4}vx\right) (\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ab} \gamma^c)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_c \Psi_\eta, \end{aligned} \quad (5.9.8c)$$

where the terms in black are those identified as of the form of the desired translation, the term in red is identified as undesired, and the terms in green are those identified as "Lorentz proper," i.e., as potentially being equation-of-motion terms.⁹⁵ It can be seen that both of the terms in green vanish under the Dirac equation (1.2.4), verifying that they are equation-of-motion terms. Inputting the values for the pairwise products from (5.9.7) yields

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}A = 2i (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a A \quad (5.9.9a)$$

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}B = 2i (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a B \quad (5.9.9b)$$

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}\Psi_\gamma = 2i (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \Psi_\gamma - i (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a \gamma^b)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_b \Psi_\eta, \quad (5.9.9c)$$

which matches (5) of [16] and (3.5), (3.6), (3.8) of [25].

As an example with a gauge field, consider the on-shell 4D vector multiplet, whose supersymmetry rules, with variable coefficients, are

$$D_\alpha A_a = u (\gamma_a)_\alpha{}^\beta \lambda_\beta \quad (5.9.10a)$$

$$D_\alpha \lambda_\beta = v (\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a A_b. \quad (5.9.10b)$$

The code below finds the constraints that can be obtained from closure. The basis of the Clifford algebra is suppressed, as it is the same as before.

```
>>> bosons = [Ex('A_{a}')]
>>> fermions = [Ex(r'(\lambda\lambda bda)_{\gamma\gamma}')]
>>> gauge_transs = [Ex(r'0')]
>>> susy = r''D_{\alpha\alpha}(A_{a}) -> u (\Gamma_{a})_{\alpha\alpha}^{\beta\beta} (\lambda\lambda bda)_{\beta\beta},
  \hookrightarrow D_{\alpha\alpha}((\lambda\lambda bda)_{\beta\beta}) -> v (\Gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\alpha}^{\beta\beta} \partial_a (A_{b\beta})'''
>>> consts = ['u', 'v']
>>> indices = [r'_{\alpha\alpha}', r'_{\beta\beta}']
>>> susy_solve(bosons, fermions, gauge_transs, susy, basis, consts, indices, comm_coef=2)
```

⁹⁵ That "SUSYSolve" returns the closure structure as it was prior to the elimination of equation-of-motion terms by "FindNonGaugeInv" is somewhat a matter of taste, but we preferred this earlier closure structure since it is not influenced by the arbitrariness in the output of "FindNonGaugeInv." Hence, all of the outputs of "SUSYSolve" remain consistent irrespective of lexicographic order of the indices at play.

The sole resulting constraint is

$$uv = -i. \quad (5.9.11)$$

Fixing $u = 1$ gives $v = -i$, giving supersymmetry transformation rules equivalent to those in (22) of [16] and (2.2) of [25].⁹⁶ Also, "SUSYSolve" gives the closure structure as

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}A_a = -2uv (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b A_a + 2uv (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a A_b \quad (5.9.12a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}\lambda_\beta &= -2uv (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \lambda_\gamma + \frac{1}{2}uv (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a \gamma^b)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_b \lambda_\eta \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4}uv (\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ab} \gamma^c)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_c \lambda_\eta, \end{aligned} \quad (5.9.12b)$$

where the terms in black are of the form of the desired translation, the term in blue is a gauge term (correctly identified by the free index a on the partial derivative), and the terms in green are possible equation-of-motion terms. Indeed, the terms in green vanish under the Dirac equation, so they are equation-of-motion terms. Inputting the value of uv from (5.9.11) yields

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}A_a = 2i (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b A_a - 2i (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a A_b \quad (5.9.13a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}\lambda_\beta &= 2i (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \lambda_\gamma - \frac{i}{2} (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a \gamma^b)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_b \lambda_\eta \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{4} (\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ab} \gamma^c)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_c \lambda_\eta, \end{aligned} \quad (5.9.13b)$$

which is equivalent to (3.9)-(3.11) in [25].

As a final example, we consider an off-shell multiplet, namely, the off-shell 4D vector multiplet, whose supersymmetry rules, with variable coefficients, are

$$D_\alpha A_a = u(\gamma_a)_\alpha{}^\beta \lambda_\beta \quad (5.9.14a)$$

$$D_\alpha \lambda_\beta = v(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a A_b + w C_{\alpha\beta} \partial^a A_a + x(\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} d \quad (5.9.14b)$$

$$D_\alpha d = y(\gamma_* \gamma^a)_\alpha{}^\beta \partial_a \lambda_\beta. \quad (5.9.14c)$$

The code below finds the constraints that can be obtained from closure.

```
>>> bosons = [Ex('A_{a}'), Ex(r'd')]
>>> fermions = [Ex(r'(\lambda)_{\gamma}')]]
>>> gauge_trans = [Ex(r'0')]
>>> susy = r''D_{\alpha}(A_{a}) -> u (\Gamma_{a})_{\alpha}^{\beta} (\lambda)_{\beta},
-> D_{\alpha}((\lambda)_{\beta}) -> v (\Gamma^{a b})_{\alpha \beta} \partial_a (A_b) + w
-> C_{\alpha \beta} \partial^a (A_a) + x (\Gamma^*)_{\alpha \beta} d, D_{\alpha}(d) -> y
-> (\Gamma^* \Gamma^a)_{\alpha}^{\beta} \partial_a ((\lambda)_{\beta})'''
>>> consts = ['u', 'v', 'w', 'x', 'y']
>>> indices = [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\beta}']
>>> susy_solve(bosons, fermions, gauge_trans, susy, basis, consts, indices, comm_coef=2)
```

⁹⁶ The results in [16, 25] are written in terms of 1-index gamma matrices, but it is a trivial exercise to convert those to 2-index gamma matrices where appropriate, and the outcomes match precisely the results of "SUSYSolve."

The resulting constraints are

$$uv = -i \quad (5.9.15a)$$

$$uw = 0 \quad (5.9.15b)$$

$$xy = i. \quad (5.9.15c)$$

Fixing $u = x = 1$ ⁹⁷ gives $v = -i, w = 0, y = i$, giving supersymmetry transformation rules equivalent to those in (19) of [16]. Also, "SUSYSolve" gives the closure structure as

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}A_a = -2uv (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b A_a + 2uv (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a A_b - 2uw (\gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial^b A_b \quad (5.9.16a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}\lambda_\beta = & -2uv (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \lambda_\gamma + \left(\frac{1}{2}uv - \frac{1}{2}uw + \frac{1}{2}xy \right) (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a \gamma^b)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_b \lambda_\eta \\ & + \left(\frac{1}{4}uv + \frac{1}{4}uw + \frac{1}{4}xy \right) (\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ab} \gamma^c)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_c \lambda_\eta \end{aligned} \quad (5.9.16b)$$

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}d = 2xy (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a d, \quad (5.9.16c)$$

where the terms in black are of the form of the desired translation, the blue term is a gauge term, the red term is an undesired term, and the green terms are "potentially equation-of-motion" terms. Indeed, the green terms vanish under the Dirac equation, but an off-shell multiplet cannot have non-closure terms. Should these actually be classified as undesired terms? They need not be, for the property of the multiplet being off-shell manifests itself in the guarantee that whatever constraints are derived from the desired and other undesired terms will make the coefficients of the equation-of-motion terms vanish. That is, we lose nothing by not obtaining separate constraints from these terms. Indeed, inputting the values in (5.9.15) yields

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}A_a = 2i (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b A_a - 2i (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a A_b \quad (5.9.17a)$$

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}\lambda_\beta = 2i (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a \lambda_\gamma \quad (5.9.17b)$$

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\}d = 2i (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a d, \quad (5.9.17c)$$

so that the green terms vanish and the closure structure matches (20) of [16].

Having shown the great success of "SUSYSolve" as applied to a variety of supermultiplets, we must admit its limitations. In particular, not all off-shell equation-of-motion terms can be identified and isolated by the gamma-splitting procedure of "FilterTerms," for they can be multiples of the equation of motion by a variety of intricate tensors which may contract indices with the equation-of-motion terms in a manner not easily reversible by brute-force gamma-matrix decomposition. The result is that equation-of-motion terms are misclassified as undesired terms,⁹⁸ imposing additional constraints on the coefficients of the multiplet that make the system of constraints inconsistent. It can be verified that this occurs when applying "SUSYSolve" to the on-shell 4D matter-gravitino and supergravity multiplets in [25], and it is for this reason that we present an alternative solver using Feynman propagators in §5.11 which does not suffer of this issue and is therefore of much wider applicability. Nevertheless, this is an on-shell issue, so "SUSYSolve" still works for all off-shell

⁹⁷This multiplet will be taken up as an example in §5.12, where the value of u will be justified.

⁹⁸The problem is actually a bit subtler: terms which might be decomposed into undesired terms and equation-of-motion terms are simply classified as undesired.

multiplets. Also, even in the on-shell case, the issue does not detract from the answer when the constraints are consistent. The only manner in which the algorithm errs is by adding too many constraints, so as long as the system of constraints is consistent (with itself and with the constraints from the action), then one can be assured that the system is valid. This is the case with the on-shell chiral and vector multiplets above, as well as for the on-shell 11D supergravity multiplet. The disadvantage of the solver in §5.11 compared to “SUSYSolve” is that the use of Feynman propagators introduces a large number of indices, which increases canonicalization time. When working with a multiplet that already involves many indices, like one in 11D, it is therefore preferable, in terms of runtime, to use “SUSYSolve” if the outputted system is consistent. Finally, even if the outputted system for an on-shell multiplet is inconsistent, the outputted Fierz-expanded closure structure is still useful in determining the constraints without further computer aid, by a procedure paralleling the step-by-step derivation of the results of “SUSYSolve” for 11D supergravity in §2.

5.10 Procedure for Computing Feynman Propagators

The multiplet solver of §5.11 will require Feynman propagators for half-integer-spin particles, but these may be a bit unwieldy to calculate and input by hand. Hence, in this section, we present functions used to calculate these propagators for arbitrary-spin fields. Since the construction of Feynman propagators for arbitrary spin in 4D is well-documented, we provide algorithms for handling the 4D case to improve ease of use of our suite of tools. Since the computation of boson and fermion propagators is rather intertwined, the functions also calculate propagators for integer-spin particles for completeness.⁹⁹ The procedure of computation is founded on the work in [33, 42]. At the end of the section, we will introduce the more limited function we use for our 11D computations.

Before calculating propagators, one must first consider projection operators. These can be constructed recursively, starting with the (momentum-space) definition of the spin-1 projection operator as

$$P^{ab} = \eta^{ab} - k^a k^b \hat{\square}^{-1}, \quad (5.10.1)$$

where

$$\hat{\square}^{-1} = -\mathcal{F}(\hat{\square})^{-1} = \frac{1}{k^2} \quad (5.10.2)$$

is (negative) the inverse of the Fourier transform of the d’Alembert operator.¹⁰⁰ If s is an integer, then let $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_s\}$, $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_s\}$. Given the projection operators for integer spin $\leq s-1$, the projection operator for spin s is computed via ((8-9) in [33] and (6.1.18-6.1.19) in [42]).¹⁰¹

$$P^{AB} = \left(\frac{1}{s!}\right)^2 \sum_{(\sigma, \sigma') \in \mathfrak{S}(A) \times \mathfrak{S}(B)} \sum_{r=0}^{\lfloor s/2 \rfloor} \frac{(-1)^r s!}{2^r r! (s-2r)! q_r} \prod_{i=1}^r P^{\sigma_{2i-1} \sigma_{2i}} P^{\sigma'_{2i-1} \sigma'_{2i}} \prod_{i=2r+1}^s P^{\sigma_i \sigma'_i}, \quad (5.10.3)$$

⁹⁹ Note a few conditions on the bosonic field here. Like in the fermionic case in §5.9, the boson is assumed to be a symmetric tensor, which has rank equal to its spin. In addition, letting $A^{a_1 \dots a_s}$ be a boson of spin s , it is assumed that $k_{a_1} A^{a_1 \dots a_s} = 0$ and $A^{a_1 a_1 a_3 \dots a_s} = 0$.

¹⁰⁰ We feel justified in adopting this notation for the inverse momentum-space d’Alembert operator, in spite of its simple formula, because of its role as the “spin-0 Feynman propagator,” or more accurately, the (Euclidean) Green’s function of the Klein-Gordon equation for a (massless) scalar field. The inverse Fourier transform of $\hat{\square}^{-1}$ is often denoted by the symbol chosen for arbitrary integer-spin propagators, Δ_F in [33] and G in §4.1.3 of [13], but without Lorentz indices, corresponding to spin 0.

¹⁰¹ This projection operator construction appears in other incarnations in older work on higher-spin particles. See the references in [33].

where $\mathfrak{S}(A), \mathfrak{S}(B)$ are the sets of permutations of A, B , respectively, and

$$q_r = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } r = 0 \\ \prod_{i=1}^r (2s - 2i + 1), & \text{if } r \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.10.4)$$

The projection operator for half-integer spin s can then be computed from that for spin $\lceil s \rceil$ via ((23b) in [33] and (6.1.59-6.1.60) in [42])¹⁰²

$$(Q^{a_1 \dots a_{\lceil s \rceil} b_1 \dots b_{\lceil s \rceil}})_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{\lceil s \rceil}{2s + 2} (\gamma_a \gamma_b)_{\alpha\beta} P^{aa_1 \dots a_{\lceil s \rceil} bb_1 \dots b_{\lceil s \rceil}}. \quad (5.10.5)$$

Algorithm 5.10.1, called ‘‘SymProjDecomp,’’ computes the projection operator for arbitrary spin s . It takes as input the spin (and an optional parameter dictating whether to perform a gamma-matrix substitution in the calculation of a half-integer-spin projection operator, which is not relevant for most dimensions of interest) and returns a substitution rule which takes the expression $P^{a_1 \dots a_s b_1 \dots b_s}$ or $(Q^{a_1 \dots a_{\lceil s \rceil} b_1 \dots b_{\lceil s \rceil}})_{\alpha\beta}$ into its decomposition in terms of spin-1 projection operators P^{ab} . The procedure is precisely to work out the equations above. Note the substitutions which handle contracted vector indices in the half-integer case; these follow the easily verified identities

$$P_a^a = 3 \quad (5.10.6a)$$

$$P_{ab} P^{bc} = P_a^c. \quad (5.10.6b)$$

Note also that the symmetrizations are weight-1, yielding the needed $1/s!$ factor.

Algorithm 5.10.1 Compute the Projection Operator for a Field of Spin s

Require: s is an integer or half-integer

```

1: function SYMPROJDECOMP( $s, to\_perform\_subs = \text{False}$ )
2:   if  $s$  is an integer then
3:      $P_0 \leftarrow 0$ 
4:     for  $r \in 0..\lfloor \frac{s}{2} \rfloor$  do ▷ Compute the inner sum in (5.10.3)
5:        $q \leftarrow \prod_{i=1..r} (2s - 2i + 1)$  if  $r \geq 1$  otherwise 1 ▷ Compute  $q_r$ 
6:        $P_0 \leftarrow P_0 + \frac{(-1)^r s!}{2^r r! (s-2r)! q} \prod_{i=1..r} P^{\sigma_{2i-1} \sigma_{2i}} P^{\sigma'_{2i-1} \sigma'_{2i}} \prod_{i \in (2r+1)..s} P^{\sigma_i \sigma'_i}$  ▷ Add a summand
7:     end for
8:     if  $s > 1$  then
9:       symmetrise  $P_0$  in  $a_1 \dots a_s$  ▷ Sum over  $\mathfrak{S}(A)$ 
10:      symmetrise  $P_0$  in  $b_1 \dots b_s$  ▷ Sum over  $\mathfrak{S}(B)$ 
11:     end if
12:      $P_0 \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(P_0, to\_perform\_subs = \text{False})$ 
13:     return ‘‘ $P^{a_1 \dots a_s b_1 \dots b_s} \rightarrow P_0$ ’’
14:   else if  $s$  is a half-integer then
15:      $Q_0 \leftarrow \frac{\lceil s \rceil}{2s+2} (\gamma_a \gamma_b)_{\alpha\beta} P^{aa_1 \dots a_{\lceil s \rceil} bb_1 \dots b_{\lceil s \rceil}}$  ▷ Write (5.10.5)
16:      $Q_0 \leftarrow \text{substitute}(Q_0, \text{SymProjDecomp}(\lceil s \rceil))$  ▷ Decompose  $P^{aa_1 \dots a_{\lceil s \rceil} bb_1 \dots b_{\lceil s \rceil}}$ 
17:      $Q_0 \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(Q_0, to\_perform\_subs = \text{False})$ 
18:      $Q_0 \leftarrow \text{substitute}(Q_0, P_a^a \rightarrow 3)$ 
19:      $Q_0 \leftarrow \text{substitute}(Q_0, P_{ab} P^{bc} \rightarrow P_a^c)$ 
20:      $Q_0 \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(Q_0, to\_perform\_subs = to\_perform\_subs)$ 
21:     return ‘‘ $(Q^{a_1 \dots a_{\lceil s \rceil} b_1 \dots b_{\lceil s \rceil}})_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow Q_0$ ’’
22:   end if
23: end function
```

As an example, the single line of code below computes the spin-3 projection operator, which is labeled a ‘‘relatively tough calculation’’ in [42].

¹⁰² Notice that the projection operator has spinor indices, as it must. A particle of half-integer spin s is a tensor-spinor of (Lorentz) rank $\lceil s \rceil$ with one spinor index. Note that when discussing fermions in this section, for brevity, we break slightly from our notation elsewhere and use s , not $s + 1/2$, to denote a half-integral spin.

```
>>> sym_proj_decomp(3)
```

The result is the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}
P^{a_1 a_2 a_3 b_1 b_2 b_3} \rightarrow & -\frac{1}{15} P^{a_1 a_2} P^{a_3 b_1} P^{b_2 b_3} - \frac{1}{15} P^{a_1 a_2} P^{a_3 b_2} P^{b_1 b_3} - \frac{1}{15} P^{a_1 a_2} P^{a_3 b_3} P^{b_1 b_2} \\
& - \frac{1}{15} P^{a_1 a_3} P^{a_2 b_1} P^{b_2 b_3} - \frac{1}{15} P^{a_1 a_3} P^{a_2 b_2} P^{b_1 b_3} - \frac{1}{15} P^{a_1 a_3} P^{a_2 b_3} P^{b_1 b_2} \\
& - \frac{1}{15} P^{a_1 b_1} P^{a_2 a_3} P^{b_2 b_3} + \frac{1}{6} P^{a_1 b_1} P^{a_2 b_2} P^{a_3 b_3} + \frac{1}{6} P^{a_1 b_1} P^{a_2 b_3} P^{a_3 b_2} \\
& - \frac{1}{15} P^{a_1 b_2} P^{a_2 a_3} P^{b_1 b_3} + \frac{1}{6} P^{a_1 b_2} P^{a_2 b_1} P^{a_3 b_3} + \frac{1}{6} P^{a_1 b_2} P^{a_2 b_3} P^{a_3 b_1} \\
& - \frac{1}{15} P^{a_1 b_3} P^{a_2 a_3} P^{b_1 b_2} + \frac{1}{6} P^{a_1 b_3} P^{a_2 b_1} P^{a_3 b_2} + \frac{1}{6} P^{a_1 b_3} P^{a_2 b_2} P^{a_3 b_1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.10.7}$$

This can be readily rewritten

$$\begin{aligned}
P^{a_1 a_2 a_3 b_1 b_2 b_3} \rightarrow & \frac{1}{6} \left\{ P^{a_1 b_1} P^{a_2 b_2} P^{a_3 b_3} + P^{a_1 b_1} P^{a_2 b_3} P^{a_3 b_2} + P^{a_1 b_2} P^{a_2 b_1} P^{a_3 b_3} \right. \\
& + P^{a_1 b_2} P^{a_2 b_3} P^{a_3 b_1} + P^{a_1 b_3} P^{a_2 b_2} P^{a_3 b_1} + P^{a_1 b_3} P^{a_2 b_1} P^{a_3 b_2} \left. \right\} \\
& - \frac{1}{15} \left\{ P^{a_1 a_2} P^{b_1 b_2} P^{a_3 b_3} + P^{a_1 a_3} P^{b_1 b_2} P^{a_2 b_3} + P^{a_2 a_3} P^{b_1 b_2} P^{a_1 b_3} \right. \\
& + P^{a_1 a_2} P^{b_1 b_3} P^{a_3 b_2} + P^{a_1 a_3} P^{b_1 b_3} P^{a_2 b_2} + P^{a_2 a_3} P^{b_1 b_3} P^{a_1 b_2} \\
& + P^{a_1 a_2} P^{b_2 b_3} P^{a_3 b_1} + P^{a_1 a_3} P^{b_2 b_3} P^{a_2 b_1} + P^{a_2 a_3} P^{b_2 b_3} P^{a_1 b_1} \left. \right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.10.8}$$

which matches (7a) of [33] and (6.1.28) of [42], validating the function. For a fermionic example, the code below computes the spin-3/2 projection operator.

```
>>> sym_proj_decomp(3/2)
```

The result is the decomposition

$$(Q^{a_1 b_1})_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow \frac{2}{3} C_{\alpha\beta} P^{a_1 b_1} - \frac{1}{3} (\gamma_{ab})_{\alpha\beta} P^{aa_1} P^{bb_1}. \tag{5.10.9}$$

Such a form is desirable for our purposes, since a single 2-indexed gamma matrix is clearly convenient. However, this propagator is traditionally written with 1-indexed gamma matrices, so for comparison with the literature, we split the gamma matrix to give

$$(Q^{a_1 b_1})_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow C_{\alpha\beta} P^{a_1 b_1} - \frac{1}{3} (\gamma_a \gamma_b)_{\alpha\beta} P^{aa_1} P^{bb_1}, \tag{5.10.10}$$

which matches (21b) in [33], again validating the results of the program.

It is then rather straightforward to compute the Feynman propagator. For a field of integral

spin s , the propagator is¹⁰³

$$D_F^{a_1 \dots a_s b_1 \dots b_s} = \hat{\square}^{-1} P^{a_1 \dots a_s b_1 \dots b_s}. \quad (5.10.11)$$

For a field of half-integer spin s , the propagator is¹⁰⁴

$$\left(S_F^{a_1 \dots a_{\lfloor s \rfloor} b_1 \dots b_{\lfloor s \rfloor}} \right)_{\alpha\beta} = i \hat{\square}^{-1} (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} k_b Q^{a_1 \dots a_{\lfloor s \rfloor} b_1 \dots b_{\lfloor s \rfloor}}. \quad (5.10.12)$$

The function “SymProp” uses the equations above to compute the Feynman propagator. In particular, the function takes the spin (and the usual gamma-matrix substitution parameter) as input, and it records the appropriate expression among (5.10.11), (5.10.12). The program then decomposes the projection operator appearing in the expression into spin-1 projection operators using the substitution rule from “SymProjDecomp,” after which it applies (5.10.1) and evaluates to leave an expression purely in terms of Kronecker deltas, gamma matrices, and momentum parameters. Next, the function “SubstituteKleinGordon” is called, which cleans up all instances of $\hat{\square}^{-1} k^2$, and the propagator is returned. This procedure is detailed in Algorithm 5.10.2.

Algorithm 5.10.2 Compute the Feynman Propagator for a Field of Spin s

Require: s is an integer or half-integer

```

1: function SYMPROP( $s$ ,  $to\_perform\_subs = \text{False}$ )
2:   if  $s$  is an integer then
3:      $G \leftarrow \hat{\square}^{-1} P^{a_1 \dots a_s b_1 \dots b_s}$  ▷ Write (5.10.11)
4:   else if  $s$  is a half-integer then
5:      $G \leftarrow i \hat{\square}^{-1} (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\gamma} k_{1b} (Q^{a_1 \dots a_{\lfloor s \rfloor} b_1 \dots b_{\lfloor s \rfloor}})_{\gamma\beta}$  ▷ Write (5.10.12)
6:   end if
7:    $G \leftarrow \text{substitute}(G, \text{SymProjDecomp}(s))$  ▷ Decompose  $P^{a_1 \dots a_s b_1 \dots b_s}$  or  $(Q^{a_1 \dots a_{\lfloor s \rfloor} b_1 \dots b_{\lfloor s \rfloor}})_{\alpha\beta}$ 
8:    $G \leftarrow \text{substitute}(G, P^{a_1 b_1} \rightarrow \delta^{a_1 b_1} - (k_1^{a_1} k_1^{b_1}) \hat{\square}^{-1})$  ▷ Apply (5.10.1)
9:    $G \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(G, to\_perform\_subs = to\_perform\_subs)$ 
10:   $G \leftarrow \text{SubstituteKleinGordon}(G)$  ▷ Replace  $\hat{\square}^{-1} k^2$  with 1
11:   $G \leftarrow \text{collect\_terms}(G)$ 
12:  return  $G$ 
13: end function

```

To give a use example, the code below computes the Feynman propagator for a spin-2 particle, e.g., a graviton.¹⁰⁵

```
>>> sym_prop(2)
```

¹⁰³ This is essentially (6.2.2) in [42], but we omit the coefficient of $-i$ to more closely reflect the conventions in [13]. There can also be an additional function of momentum added to the expression for the propagator; see (6.2.1) of [42] or (73) of [33]. We follow [42] and assume this added function is zero. One might argue that we are abusing notation by calling the factor multiplying the projection operator in (5.10.11) “ $\hat{\square}^{-1}$ ”; one could perhaps attempt to view this rigorously as a limit of masslessness (although this is not quite the massless expression), but this level of rigor is superfluous, and the symbolic algebra procedures are simpler without a separate treatment of this factor.

¹⁰⁴ This corresponds to (6.2.4) of [42], which again assumes no added function of momentum.

¹⁰⁵ This seemed to the authors the most interesting demonstration within the ambient domain, supergravity, of our work. We will otherwise not be making much use of bosonic propagators.

The result is¹⁰⁶

$$\begin{aligned}
D_F^{a_1 a_2 b_1 b_2} = & -\frac{1}{3} \hat{\square}^{-1} \delta^{a_1 a_2} \delta^{b_1 b_2} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\square}^{-1} \delta^{a_1 b_1} \delta^{a_2 b_2} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{\square}^{-1} \delta^{a_1 b_2} \delta^{a_2 b_1} \\
& + \frac{1}{3} \hat{\square}^{-2} \delta^{a_1 a_2} k^{b_1} k^{b_2} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\square}^{-2} \delta^{a_1 b_1} k^{a_2} k^{b_2} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\square}^{-2} \delta^{a_1 b_2} k^{a_2} k^{b_1} \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\square}^{-2} \delta^{a_2 b_1} k^{a_1} k^{b_2} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\square}^{-2} \delta^{a_2 b_2} k^{a_1} k^{b_1} + \frac{1}{3} \hat{\square}^{-2} \delta^{b_1 b_2} k^{a_1} k^{a_2} \\
& + \frac{2}{3} \hat{\square}^{-3} k^{a_1} k^{a_2} k^{b_1} k^{b_2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.10.13}$$

With a bit of factoring, this can be rewritten more neatly as

$$\begin{aligned}
D_F^{a_1 a_2 b_1 b_2} = & \hat{\square}^{-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (\delta^{a_1 b_1} \delta^{a_2 b_2} + \delta^{a_1 b_2} \delta^{a_2 b_1} - \delta^{a_1 a_2} \delta^{b_1 b_2}) \right. \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\square}^{-1} (\delta^{a_1 b_1} k^{a_2} k^{b_2} + \delta^{a_2 b_2} k^{a_1} k^{b_1} + \delta^{a_1 b_2} k^{a_2} k^{b_1} + \delta^{a_2 b_1} k^{a_1} k^{b_2}) \\
& \left. + \frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{1}{2} \delta^{a_1 a_2} + \hat{\square}^{-1} k^{a_1} k^{a_2} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} \delta^{b_1 b_2} + \hat{\square}^{-1} k^{b_1} k^{b_2} \right) \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.10.14}$$

This is equivalent to the expression obtained from Feynman diagrams in §2 of [55], validating the algorithm “SymProp.”¹⁰⁷

As promised, we present one more function, this time for general dimension, which is employed to provide input to multiplet solver 2 when completing 11D calculations in §2.1. The function `rarita_schwinger_prop()` returns the massless Rarita-Schwinger Feynman propagator in a given dimension D using the equation

$$S_{F_{ab\alpha\beta}} = i \hat{\square}^{-1} \eta_{ab} (\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} k_c + \frac{i}{D-2} \hat{\square}^{-1} (\gamma_a \gamma^c \gamma_b)_{\alpha\beta} k_c, \tag{5.10.15}$$

which is (5.31) in [13] with gauge terms set to zero (or more accurately, making a particular choice of gauge terms). We omit pseudo-code here, as it is not of particular conceptual interest, but we provide a use example below returning the Rarita-Schwinger propagator for $D = 11$.

```
>>> __cdbkernel__ = susy_env(D=11)
>>> rarita_schwinger_prop()
```

The result is

$$S_{F_{ab\alpha\beta}} = i \hat{\square}^{-1} \eta_{ab} (\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} k_c + \frac{i}{9} \hat{\square}^{-1} (\gamma_a \gamma^c \gamma_b)_{\alpha\beta} k_c, \tag{5.10.16}$$

just as expected.

5.11 Multiplet Solver 2: Feynman Propagator Substitution

The object is now, as in §5.9, to apply the closure condition (1.2.1) to obtain constraints on the coefficients of a multiplet. As in that section, the primary difficulty is in ferreting out equation-of-motion terms in the closure for an on-shell multiplet. In §5.9, the approach was to split gamma

¹⁰⁶ Note that the momentum-space inverse d’Alembert operator $\hat{\square}^{-1}$ is represented in the code output by the text `KleinGordon`.

¹⁰⁷ Conventions differ on whether this quantity should be called the graviton propagator. This essentially reflects the arbitrary term which may be added: see footnote 103.

matrices to isolate terms with Lorentz-index structures matching the equation of motion, and then apply the function “FindNonGaugeInv” from §5.8 to eliminate the gauge-invariant quantities, which form the equation-of-motion terms. In this section, we take the different route of moving to momentum space via the symbolic Fourier transform “Fourier” of §5.7, and then substituting the product of a Feynman propagator and a coupling current for the field. In particular, for a spin- $(s + 1/2)$ fermion Ψ^U_α with Feynman propagator $(S_F^{UV})_{\alpha\beta}$, the coupling current J^U_α is defined so that

$$\mathcal{F}(\Psi^U_\alpha) = -S_{F_{UV}\alpha}^\beta \mathcal{F}(J^V_\beta), \quad (5.11.1)$$

with the additional current conservation condition

$$k_a \mathcal{F}(J^{aa_2 \dots a_s}_\beta) = 0. \quad (5.11.2)$$

In position-space, this means that the fermion is (negative) the convolution of the propagator and the coupling current; see the spin-3/2 case in (5.26) of [13]. Since the Feynman propagator is fundamentally a Green’s function for the relevant equation of motion, it follows that inputting this convolution into the left-hand side of (5.9.3) yields a scalar multiple of the coupling current.¹⁰⁸ This obviously carries into momentum-space, so that

$$(\gamma^b)_\eta^\gamma k_b \mathcal{F}(\Psi_{a_1 \dots a_s}^\eta) - \sum_{i=1}^s (\gamma^b)_\eta^\gamma k_{a_i} \mathcal{F}(\Psi_{bU_i}^\eta) = \alpha \mathcal{F}(J_{a_1 \dots a_s}^\gamma) \quad (5.11.3)$$

for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. Notice that all occurrences of $\hat{\square}^{-1}$ are furtively contracting away. That is, the effect of substituting the right-hand side of (5.11.1) into the field equation is to effect contractions between momentum parameters which cancel the instances of $\hat{\square}^{-1}$. A moment’s thought reveals that this uniquely determines the equation of motion: a momentum-space expression in terms of the fermion of interest (and not itself including instances of $\hat{\square}^{-1}$) is a (not necessarily scalar) multiple of the left-hand side of (5.11.3) if and only if the result of substituting the right-hand side of (5.11.1) for the fermion lacks any occurrence of $\hat{\square}^{-1}$. When considering the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the fermion, such multiples of the equation of motion are precisely the equation-of-motion terms. This will be the route for isolating and eliminating equation-of-motion terms in this iteration of the multiplet solver.

In order to implement this new equation-of-motion term filtration technique, we use a new procedure “FilterTermsMomentumSpace” which adapts “FilterTerms.” As input, just like “FilterTerms,” the function takes an expression \mathcal{E} , the relevant field A , and the spinor indices “Inds” which were used in the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives. However, “FilterTermsMomentumSpace” also requires the input of a substitution rule \tilde{G}_A of the form of (5.11.1) above, taking the Fourier transform of A to its expression as the product of a (momentum-space) Feynman propagator and the Fourier transform of a coupling current J_A . Two assumptions are made as to the input. First, the expression \mathcal{E} is assumed to represent the closure after a Fierz transformation placing the indices “Inds” on the same gamma matrices, and is presumed fully simplified, being a simple sum of products of single-term factors, as well as having been moved to momentum-space via a Fourier transform.

¹⁰⁸ The convention for the coefficient of the propagator can be chosen so that this scalar coefficient equals 1, but it need not be for our purposes.

Second, the propagator is assumed to have a (single) term of the form $\hat{\square}^{-1} \eta_{a_1 b_1} \cdots \eta_{a_s b_s} (\gamma^{a'})_\gamma \eta k_{a'}$, which when contracted with $\mathcal{F}(J_A^{b_1 \cdots b_s} \eta)$ gives rise to a term of the form $\hat{\square}^{-1} (\gamma^{a'})_\gamma \eta k_{a'} \mathcal{F}(J_{A_{a_1 \cdots a_s \eta}})$ in \tilde{G}_A , with a single 1-index gamma matrix contracted with a momentum parameter, and with all indices a_1, \dots, a_s, γ free. This is a reasonable assumption: all fermionic propagators of interest can be made to meet this requirement via the manipulation of gauge and equation-of-motion terms, and propagators are typically written with such a term, as seen in the Rarita-Schwinger case in (5.10.15). The significance of this singular term is to serve as a hook when reconstructing the left-hand side of (5.11.1) from the right-hand side. In fact, the first action (after variable and array definitions) of the algorithm is to set the foundation for such reconstruction. In particular, given a field A with a set G of vector indices and a spinor index γ , the program constructs the left-hand side of (5.11.1) (which becomes $\mathcal{F}(A_{G\gamma})$), recorded as \mathcal{E}' , and applies the substitution rule \tilde{G}_A to get the right-hand side. A selection of the procedure of "Evaluate" is then applied without the renaming of dummy indices in order to preserve the Lorentz-index structure for ease of filtration (this is suppressed in the pseudo-code of Algorithm 5.11.1), and then the dummy indices are renamed with an added prime, e.g., a is replaced with a' . Next, the algorithm loops through the terms in \mathcal{E}' to find the single term of the aforementioned form. The inverse of the coefficient of this term is stored in a variable ℓ , and all other terms are compiled in an array \mathcal{R} . This groundwork for the procedure is detailed in Algorithm 5.11.1.¹⁰⁹

Algorithm 5.11.1 Filter Closure/Non-Closure Terms Involving Coupling Currents in Momentum Space, Part 1

```

1: function FILTERTERMSMOMENTUMSPACE( $\mathcal{E}$ ,  $A$ ,  $\tilde{G}_A$ ,  $Inds[1..2]$ )
2:    $desired\_terms \leftarrow []$ 
3:    $ignored\_terms \leftarrow []$ 
4:    $gauge\_terms \leftarrow []$ 
5:    $eqom\_terms \leftarrow []$ 
6:    $undesired\_terms \leftarrow []$ 
7:    $normalized\_schouten\_terms \leftarrow []$ 
8:    $\ell \leftarrow 1$ 
9:    $\mathcal{E}' \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_1((A_G) \bullet)$ 
10:   $\mathcal{E}' \leftarrow \text{substitute}(\mathcal{E}', \tilde{G}_A)$ 
11:  simplify  $\mathcal{E}'$  without renaming indices
12:  prime dummy indices in  $\mathcal{E}'$ 
13:   $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow []$ 
14:  for  $term$  in  $\mathcal{E}'$  do
15:    if  $term$  has form  $\hat{\square}^{-1} (\gamma^{a'})_\bullet \beta' k_{1_{a'}} \mathcal{F}_1((J_{A_G})_{\beta'})$  then
16:       $\ell \leftarrow$  inverse of the coefficient of  $term$  ▷ including imaginary factors in the coefficient of  $term$  (see footnote 109)
17:    else
18:      append  $term$  to  $\mathcal{R}$ 
19:    end if
20:  end for
21:  continued...

```

As in "FilterTerms," the next step is to loop through the terms T of \mathcal{E} (which may be augmented dynamically during the loop). Letting t be the n th element of T , i.e., the n th term, there are six cases. 1) t has the form of the distinguished term $\hat{\square}^{-1} (\gamma^{a'})_\gamma \eta k_{a'} \mathcal{F}(J_{A_{a_1 \cdots a_s \eta}})$ multiplied by

¹⁰⁹ It is worth making a technical note about isolating the coefficient of a term in the loop in Algorithm 5.11.1. Cadabra does not treat the imaginary unit i like a real scalar, and ordinary means of drawing the coefficient of a term in Cadabra only return the real multiplier, e.g., 5 even if the constant coefficient is $5i$. There is a bit of manipulation and substitution involved in drawing the full coefficient, including i , and in inverting the result to get ℓ , but this is a purely technical concern and is suppressed here.

$(\gamma^{a''})_{Inds} k_{a''}$. Notice that this is a term of the expression obtained by taking the Fourier transform of the desired translation term, i.e., the first term of (1.2.1) applied to A , and substituting in (5.11.1). This signifies that the desired term, in terms of A , can be reconstructed from t . Notice that if one multiplies the distinguished term in \mathcal{E}' by the product of ℓ , the scalar coefficient of t , and $(\gamma^{a''})_{Inds} k_{a''}$, then one gets precisely t . For example, suppose that $A = \Psi_{a\gamma}$ is a Rarita-Schwinger field and that

$$t = 2\hat{\square}^{-1}(\gamma^{a''})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{a'})_{\gamma}{}^{\eta} k_{a'} k_{a''} \mathcal{F}(J_{A_{a\eta}}). \quad (5.11.4)$$

When simplifying the gamma matrix product, the 4D Rarita-Schwinger propagator (5.10.15) becomes

$$S_{F_{ab\alpha\beta}} = \frac{i}{2}\hat{\square}^{-1}(\gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta} k_b + \frac{i}{2}\hat{\square}^{-1}(\gamma_b)_{\alpha\beta} k_a + \frac{1}{2}\hat{\square}^{-1}k_c \epsilon_{ab}{}^{cd}(\gamma_d \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{i}{2}\hat{\square}^{-1}\eta_{ab}(\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} k_c, \quad (5.11.5)$$

so that¹¹⁰

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}' &= -S_{F_{ab\gamma}}{}^{\eta} \mathcal{F}(J_A{}^b{}_{\eta}) \\ &= -\frac{i}{2}\hat{\square}^{-1}(\gamma_b)_{\gamma}{}^{\eta} k_a \mathcal{F}(J_A{}^b{}_{\eta}) - \frac{1}{2}\hat{\square}^{-1}k_c \epsilon_{ab}{}^{cd}(\gamma_d \gamma_*)_{\gamma}{}^{\eta} \mathcal{F}(J_A{}^b{}_{\eta}) \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{2}\hat{\square}^{-1}(\gamma^c)_{\gamma}{}^{\eta} k_c \mathcal{F}(J_{A_{a\eta}}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.11.6)$$

Clearly, the distinguished term in \mathcal{E}' is the last one, whose coefficient is $\ell^{-1} = -i/2$. Multiplying this last term by $2\ell(\gamma^{a''})_{\alpha\beta} k_{a''} = 4i(\gamma^{a''})_{\alpha\beta} k_{a''}$ yields t , just as claimed. Notice also that by the procedure in Algorithm 5.11.1, the first two terms in \mathcal{E}' form \mathcal{R} . Returning to the general consideration of case (1), let ℓ' be the coefficient of t . From the foregoing,

$$t + \ell\ell'(\gamma^{a''})_{Inds} k_{a''} \mathcal{R} = \ell\ell'(\gamma^{a''})_{Inds} k_{a''} \mathcal{E}' = \ell\ell'(\gamma^{a''})_{Inds} k_{a''} \mathcal{F}(A_{G\gamma}). \quad (5.11.7)$$

The last expression is of the desired form in (1.2.1). Hence, the algorithm isolates the desired term by replacing t with $\ell\ell'(\gamma^{a''})_{Inds} k_{a''} \mathcal{F}(A_{G\gamma}) - \ell\ell'(\gamma^{a''})_{\alpha\beta} k_{a''} \mathcal{R}$, or more specifically, by discarding t , appending $\ell\ell'(\gamma^{a''})_{Inds} k_{a''} \mathcal{F}(A_{G\gamma})$ to an array “desired_terms” of terms which have the desired closure form, and finally appending $-\ell\ell'(\gamma^{a''})_{\alpha\beta} k_{a''} \mathcal{R}$ to the terms T to be considered later in the loop. None of the terms in the latter remainder can be of the same form as case (1), so no infinite loop results.

The next few cases are rather simple. 2) If in t , some momentum parameters share indices with the coupling current, then by (5.11.2), $t = 0$, and t is consigned to the suitably named array “ignored_terms.” 3) If in t , at least one momentum parameter has a free index, then t is a gauge term and is appended to the array “gauge_terms.” 4) If in t , $\hat{\square}^{-1}$ is absent, then by the discussion at the beginning of this section, t is an equation-of-motion term, and it is therefore sent to the array “eqom_terms.” In all of cases (2)-(4), the classification of t implies that its coefficient will not contribute to any constraints on the coefficients of the multiplet, as t is permitted in (1.2.1) (trivially in case (2)). The only remaining difficult case is one that involves a Schouten identity. In particular, a term might not fit the criteria for any of (1)-(4) but still not be a simple undesired

¹¹⁰ We have eliminated a term using (5.11.2). This elimination is actually not done by the algorithm here, but later as part of the sorting process; see case (2).

term (i.e., a term which is set to zero to get a constraint) because it is actually related to terms fitting (1)-(4) by a Schouten identity. For example, in 4D, suppose that¹¹¹

$$t = -\frac{3}{2}uv\hat{\square}^{-1}(\gamma^{cd})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{abc}{}^e)_{\gamma}{}^{\eta}k_dk_e\mathcal{F}(J_A{}^b{}_{\eta}). \quad (5.11.8)$$

This is ostensibly an undesired term not permitted in (1.2.1), and assuming no like terms, one might jump to the conclusion that $uv = 0$. However, an application of a Schouten identity shows otherwise. Notice that the second gamma matrix involves $D = 4$ vector indices. Since a Schouten identity arises from the fact that a totally antisymmetric tensor of rank $D + 1$ must be zero, it seems reasonable to draw another index in the expression, d , and antisymmetrize to find the right identity. Antisymmetrizing (without the coefficient) in the indices a, b, c, d, e yields¹¹²

$$\begin{aligned} t' = & \frac{2}{5}uv\hat{\square}^{-1}(\gamma^{cd})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{abc}{}^e)_{\gamma}{}^{\eta}k_dk_e\mathcal{F}(J_A{}^b{}_{\eta}) - \frac{1}{5}uv(\gamma^{cd})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{abcd})_{\gamma}{}^{\eta}\mathcal{F}(J_A{}^b{}_{\eta}) \\ & + \frac{1}{5}uv\hat{\square}^{-1}(\gamma^{cd})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{acd}{}^e)_{\gamma}{}^{\eta}k_bk_e\mathcal{F}(J_A{}^b{}_{\eta}) - \frac{1}{5}uv\hat{\square}^{-1}(\gamma^{cd})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{bcd}{}^e)_{\gamma}{}^{\eta}k_ak_e\mathcal{F}(J_A{}^b{}_{\eta}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.11.9)$$

The first term, which we denote t'_0 , is a scalar multiple of t , while the other terms are respectively an equation-of-motion term (no $\hat{\square}^{-1}$), an “ignored term” (b is shared by the current and a momentum parameter), and a gauge term (the free index a is on a momentum parameter). Remembering that $t' = 0$, multiplying the terms after t'_0 by negative the quotient of the coefficient of t divided by the coefficient of t'_0 gives

$$\begin{aligned} t = & -\frac{3}{4}uv(\gamma^{cd})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{abcd})_{\gamma}{}^{\eta}\mathcal{F}(J_A{}^b{}_{\eta}) + \frac{3}{4}uv\hat{\square}^{-1}(\gamma^{cd})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{acd}{}^e)_{\gamma}{}^{\eta}k_bk_e\mathcal{F}(J_A{}^b{}_{\eta}) \\ & - \frac{3}{4}uv\hat{\square}^{-1}(\gamma^{cd})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{bcd}{}^e)_{\gamma}{}^{\eta}k_ak_e\mathcal{F}(J_A{}^b{}_{\eta}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.11.10)$$

Hence, if we append the terms of this new formulation of t to T and allow the program to reach these terms, none of them will be classified as undesired terms. In order to incorporate the insights from the foregoing example, we formulate the conditions which arose in this example as an additional case as follows. 5) Suppose t is of the form $\hat{\square}^{-1}(\gamma^E)_{Inds}(\gamma^F)_{\gamma}{}^{\eta}k_{a_1}\cdots k_{a_n}\mathcal{F}(J_{AG\eta})$, where the second gamma matrix has $|F| = D$ indices and where at least one of the a_i is not in F . Paralleling the example, the program chooses such an index a_i and antisymmetrizes t in the $D + 1$ indices $F \cup \{a_i\}$ to get t' . A selection of simplification functions is executed without the sorting of terms (Cadabra’s `sort_sum()`), so that the term t'_0 which is a multiple of t can be extracted immediately as the first term in t' . We then take $r = t' - t'_0$ to be the sum of the other terms in t' . Unfortunately, we might not be so lucky as to have t become terms of strictly other forms than this case (5), so if we naïvely add the terms of r (after scaling) to T , we could have an infinite loop. To remedy this, the algorithm stores every t matching the criteria of (5), normalized by stripping off its coefficient, in an array “normalized_schouten_terms.” If any terms of r appear (when normalized) in “normalized_schouten_terms,” then it is clear that further consideration of the terms in r will give rise to an infinite loop. Instead, t is simply consigned to “undesired_terms.” If, however, none of the terms

¹¹¹ This particular term comes from an intermediate step in the solution for the coefficients of the 4D supergravity multiplet.

¹¹² Note that (5.11.9) is a weight-1 antisymmetrization of (5.11.8) (without the coefficient of the latter). That is, a normalization factor $1/120$ is introduced. This reflects the normalization of antisymmetrization in Cadabra.

in r have appeared as prior Schouten terms, then as in the example, r is multiplied by negative the quotient of the coefficient of t divided by the coefficient of t'_0 , and its terms are appended to T . In the final case 6), if t matches none of the criteria (1)-(5), then it is relegated to “undesired_terms.” “FindTermsMomentumSpace” returns a hash map containing the classification of the terms of \mathcal{E} as desired terms, ignored terms, gauge terms, equation-of-motion terms, and undesired terms. The details of the loop are provided in pseudo-code in Algorithm 5.11.2.

Algorithm 5.11.2 Filter Closure/Non-Closure Terms Involving Coupling Currents in Momentum Space, Part 2

```

22:   $T \leftarrow$  terms of  $\mathcal{E}$ 
23:   $n = 0$ 
24:  while  $n < |T|$  do
25:     $t \leftarrow T[n]$ 
26:    if  $t$  has form  $\hat{\square}^{-1}(\gamma^{a'})_{Inds}(\gamma^{b'}) \bullet^{\beta'} k_{1_{a'}} k_{1_{b'}} \mathcal{F}_1((J_{AG})_{\beta'})$  then
27:      append  $\ell \cdot$  (coefficient of  $t$ )  $\cdot (\gamma^{a'})_{Inds} k_{1_{a'}} \mathcal{F}_1((AG) \bullet)$  to desired_terms ▷ including “i”s in  $t$ 
28:      append terms of  $-\ell \cdot$  (coefficient of  $t$ )  $\cdot (\gamma^{a'})_{Inds} k_{1_{a'}} \mathcal{R}$  to  $T$ 
29:    else if the indices on the “ $k_1$ ”s have a nonempty intersection with the indices on  $J_A$  then
30:      append  $t$  to ignored_terms
31:    else if at least one “ $k_1$ ” factor of  $t$  has a free index then
32:      append  $t$  to gauge_terms
33:    else if  $\hat{\square}^{-1}$  is not a factor of  $t$  then
34:      append  $t$  to eqom_terms
35:    else if  $t$  has form  $\hat{\square}^{-1}(\gamma^E)_{Inds}(\gamma^F) \bullet^{\beta'} k_{1_{a'_1}} \cdots k_{1_{a'_n}} \mathcal{F}_1((J_{AG})_{\beta'})$  &  $|F| = D$  &  $\{a'_1, \dots, a'_n\} \not\subset F$  then
36:      append normalized  $t$  to normalized_schouten_terms
37:       $a_i \leftarrow$  an element of  $\{a'_1, \dots, a'_n\} \setminus F$ 
38:       $t' \leftarrow t$  antisymmetrized in the indices  $F \cup \{a_i\}$ 
39:      simplify  $t'$  without sorting terms
40:       $t'_0 \leftarrow$  first term of  $t'$ 
41:       $r \leftarrow t' - t'_0$ 
42:       $r \leftarrow$  collect_terms( $r$ )
43:      if terms of  $r \cap$  normalized_schouten_terms  $\neq \emptyset$  then
44:        append  $t$  to undesired_terms
45:      else:
46:        append terms of  $-[(\text{coefficient of } t)/(\text{coefficient of } t'_0)] \cdot r$  to  $T$ 
47:      end if
48:    else
49:      append  $t$  to undesired_terms
50:    end if
51:     $n \leftarrow n + 1$ 
52:  end while
53:  return {“desired_terms”: desired_terms, “ignored_terms”: ignored_terms, “gauge_terms”: gauge_terms, “eqom_terms”: eqom_terms, “undesired_terms”: undesired_terms}
54: end function

```

A further remark is necessary about case (5). This handling of Schouten identities is necessarily very specific. Such specificity is necessary for such complicated dimension-specific identities, at the very least to reduce computational complexity. Indeed, Cadabra2’s [49] function `decompose_product()`, which attempts to broadly treat all Schouten identities (in the sense of proving expressions zero under Schouten identities) through decomposition of tensors into irreducible Young tableau representations, is of impractical computational complexity for higher dimensions like $D = 11$. The difficulty is primarily that Schouten identities represent dimension-dependent multi-term symmetries. Handling such multi-term identities in symbolic algebra is a famously difficult task (see the references in [37]), inspiring daunting brute-force solutions like Invar’s database of $6 \cdot 10^5$ Riemann tensor identities [41]. Perhaps only time will tell whether such a massive database will be necessary for the efficient computational treatment of all Schouten identities that might

appear in the filtration of closure terms after the substitution of coupling currents. However, since Schouten identities require the complete antisymmetry of $D+1$ indices, virtually all of these indices must be on the gamma matrices. (The momentum parameters commute and the coupling current is symmetric, so they could take up at most two indices together.) Hence, if an ostensibly undesired term can be transformed into non-undesired terms via a Schouten identity, it must be rather close in form to case (5). Indeed, the Schouten identities treated in case (5) empirically enable the solution of all of the on-shell 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ multiplets in [25], as will be shown below. It seems reasonable, then, to conjecture that case (5) represents the only possible situation in which a Schouten identity could impact term classification.

Now that the closure filtration procedure has been outlined, it is time to adumbrate the procedure of the second multiplet solver, "SUSYSolvePropagator." Just like "SUSYSolve," "SUSYSolvePropagator" takes as input the array "bosons" of bosons in the multiplet, the array "fermions" of fermions in the multiplet, the supersymmetry transformation rules "susy" for whose coefficients we are solving, a basis Γ^A for the Clifford algebra, an array "consts" of the unknown coefficients of the multiplet, the array "Inds" of spinor indices on the supercovariant derivatives, and optionally the value of c in (1.2.1). However, instead of taking in the array "gauge_transs" of gauge transformations for the fermions, "SUSYSolvePropagator" takes in the array "fermion_propagators" of Feynman propagators for the fermions. In this algorithm, the route of solution differs more drastically between bosons and fermions, so the first function call in "SUSYSolvePropagator" is actually to "SUSYSolve," running that solver on the bosons to get the system S of constraints arising from the bosons alone. "SUSYSolvePropagator" then loops through the fermions to obtain the constraints from those fields. As in "SUSYSolve," for each fermion A , the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives, with indices from "Inds," applied to A is recorded in \mathcal{E} , "SUSYExpand" is applied to expand the supercovariant derivatives, "Evaluate" is applied to simplify (and especially flatten) and canonicalize the result, and "FierzExpand2Index" is applied to move the indices "Inds" onto the same gamma matrices. This time, though, all further operations will need to be in momentum-space, so the symbolic Fourier transform "Fourier" is also applied to \mathcal{E} .¹¹³ The next function called is "GenPropSub," which again is a function too technical to merit further exposition, but which is necessary here to construct a substitution rule taking the left-hand side of (5.11.1) to the right-hand side in a Cadabra-interpretable way. The program stores the substitution rule \tilde{G}_A corresponding to A for later use in "FilterTermsMomentumSpace," but it also uses "GenPropSub" for all of the fermions to complete the coupling current substitution for every fermion in \mathcal{E} .¹¹⁴ After this substitution, the algorithm simplifies the expression \mathcal{E} , now in terms of the coupling currents, by applying another "Evaluate" and by using the function "SubstituteKleinGordon," mentioned in the prior section, to replace all instances of $\hat{\square}^{-1}k^2$ with 1. Next, the program submits the expression \mathcal{E} , the field A , the propagator substitution rule \tilde{G}_A , and the indices "Inds" into "FilterTermsMomentumSpace" to get

¹¹³ The careful reader might have noticed that only "fermions" is inputted into "Fourier" in Algorithm 5.11.3, rather than the combined array of bosons and fermions. Recall from §5.7 that the input of an array of fields into "Fourier" is supposed to represent all fields appearing in the inputted expression. In this case, simply counting spinor indices reveals that \mathcal{E} is fermionic, and since each term includes only one instance of a field, it follows that each field appearing in \mathcal{E} must be a fermion.

¹¹⁴ Incidentally, the coupling currents corresponding to different fields are distinguished in the code via a hexadecimal based on the field's name in a manner similar to (but simpler than) the procedure of "IndexBracketHex" in Appendix E.

the classification of terms in \mathcal{E} as a hash table, which is stored in a variable T . Note that unlike in the output of “FilterTerms” in “SUSYSolve,” in the output of “FilterTermsMomentumSpace,” there are no “potentially equation-of-motion” terms which need further evaluation; the filtration has determined the equation-of-motion terms definitively. The only terms which give rise to constraints are the desired terms, which must match (1.2.1), and the undesired terms, which must be made zero. The algorithm draws these sets of terms from T and adds them up in expressions “desired_terms” and “undesired_terms,” which are subsequently evaluated and factored in the unknown coefficients “consts.” Ultimately, the “desired_terms” add up to single term, and the equation which sets the coefficient of that term to $-c$ is appended to the system S . Notice that the coefficient is set equal to $-c$, not $c \cdot i$ as in (1.2.1), to correct for the factor of i introduced by moving to momentum-space. Also, the algorithm loops through the undesired terms, and for each, it appends to S the equation setting the coefficient to zero. A final call to “DistillConstrs” to cull independent constraints from S is made after the loop through the fermions, and this final system of constraints is returned. See Algorithm 5.11.3 for detailed pseudo-code for this procedure.

Algorithm 5.11.3 Find Coefficients That Enforce Multiplet Closure Using Propogators

```

1: function SUSYSOLVEPROPAGATOR(bosons[1..n], fermions[1..m], fermion_propagators[1..m], susy,  $\Gamma^A$ , consts[1..p], Inds[1..2],  $c =$ 
  1)
2:    $S, \_ \leftarrow \text{SUSYSolve}(\text{bosons}, [], [], \text{susy}, \Gamma^A, \text{consts}, \text{Inds}, c = c)$ 
3:   for  $A$  in fermions do
4:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow D_{Ind[0]} D_{Ind[1]} A + D_{Ind[1]} D_{Ind[0]} A$ 
5:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{SUSYExpand}(\mathcal{E}, \text{susy})$ 
6:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(\mathcal{E}, \text{to\_perform\_subs} = \text{False})$ 
7:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{FierzExpand2Index}(\mathcal{E}, \Gamma^A, \text{Inds}, \text{to\_perform\_subs} = \text{False})$ 
8:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{Fourier}(\mathcal{E}, \text{fermions})$  ▷ Differs from “SUSYSolve” starting here
9:      $\tilde{G}_A \leftarrow \text{GenPropSub}(A, \text{element of } \text{fermion\_propagators} \text{ corresponding to } A)$ 
10:    for  $i \in 1..m$  do ▷ Apply (5.11.1) to each fermion
11:       $f := \text{fermions}[i], G_f := \text{fermion\_propagators}[i]:$ 
12:       $\text{sub\_rule} \leftarrow \text{GenPropSub}(f, G_f)$ 
13:       $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{substitute}(\mathcal{E}, \text{sub\_rule})$ 
14:    end for
15:     $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(\mathcal{E}, \text{to\_perform\_subs} = \text{False})$ 
16:     $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{SubstituteKleinGordon}(\mathcal{E})$ 
17:     $T \leftarrow \text{FilterTermsMomentumSpace}(\mathcal{E}, A, \tilde{G}_A, \text{Inds})$ 
18:     $\text{desired\_terms} \leftarrow T[\text{“desired\_terms”}]$ 
19:     $\text{undesired\_terms} \leftarrow T[\text{“undesired\_terms”}]$ 
20:     $\text{desired\_terms} \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(\text{sum}(\text{desired\_terms}))$ 
21:     $\text{undesired\_terms} \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(\text{ex\_sum}(\text{undesired\_terms}))$ 
22:     $\text{desired\_terms} \leftarrow \text{factor\_in}(\text{desired\_terms}, \text{consts})$ 
23:     $\text{undesired\_terms} \leftarrow \text{factor\_in}(\text{undesired\_terms}, \text{consts})$ 
24:    append “coefficient of desired_terms in terms of consts =  $-c$ ” to  $S$ 
25:    for coefficient  $k$ , in terms of consts, of each term in undesired_terms do
26:      append “ $k = 0$ ” to  $S$ 
27:    end for
28:  end for
29:  return  $\text{DistillConstrs}(S, \text{consts})$ 
30: end function

```

It is now time to treat a few examples. The impetus of “SUSYSolvePropagator” was to handle those cases which “SUSYSolve” could not, but note that “SUSYSolvePropagator” works perfectly for all multiplets which are solved by “SUSYSolve”; it can be easily verified that “SUSYSolvePropagator” gives precisely (5.9.7), (5.9.11), and (5.9.15) when applied to the 4D on-shell chiral multiplet, on-shell vector multiplet, and off-shell vector multiplet. It is more interesting, though, to detail some new examples. Consider the on-shell 4D axial-vector multiplet, whose supersymmetry

transformation rules, with variable coefficients, are

$$D_\alpha U_a = u(\gamma_* \gamma_a)_\alpha^\beta \lambda_\beta \quad (5.11.11a)$$

$$D_\alpha \lambda_\beta = v(\gamma_* \gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a U_b. \quad (5.11.11b)$$

The code below finds the constraints that can be obtained from closure. Notice the use of the function “SymProp” from §5.10, with the input corresponding to the fact that the fermion λ_γ has spin 1/2.

```
>>> bosons = [Ex('U_{a}')]
>>> fermions = [Ex(r'(\lambda)_{\gamma}')]
>>> fermion_propagators = [sym_prop(1/2)]
>>> susy = r'''D_{\alpha}(U_{a}) -> u (\Gamma_{a})_{\alpha}^{\beta} (\lambda)_{\beta},
↪ D_{\alpha}((\lambda)_{\beta}) -> v (\Gamma_{ab})_{\alpha}^{\beta} \partial_b U_a
↪ \partial_a U_b'''
>>> basis = [Ex(r'C_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^a
↪ b)_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'((\Gamma)_{\alpha \beta}'))], Ex(r'((\Gamma
↪ \Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta}'))]
>>> consts = ['u', 'v']
>>> indices = [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\beta}']
>>> susy_solve_propagator(bosons, fermions, fermion_propagators, susy, basis, consts, indices,
↪ comm_coef=2)
```

The result is the constraint

$$uv = i. \quad (5.11.12)$$

Fixing $u = i$ gives $v = 1$, giving supersymmetry transformation rules equivalent to those in (2.3) of [25]. Hence, “SUSYSolvePropagator” gives valid constraints. It can be verified that “SUSYSolve” yields the same constraint.

Of course, now we wish to treat examples for which “SUSYSolve” cannot produce consistent constraints, but “SUSYSolvePropagator” can. We start with the on-shell 4D matter-gravitino multiplet, whose supersymmetry transformation rules, with variable coefficients, are

$$D_\alpha B_a = u \Psi_{a\alpha} \quad (5.11.13a)$$

$$D_\alpha \Psi_{a\beta} = v(\gamma_a \gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b B_c. \quad (5.11.13b)$$

The code below finds the constraints on the coefficients. (The basis is omitted for brevity.) Notice the use of the function `rarita_schwinger()` introduced in §5.10, since the gravitino $\Psi_{a\gamma}$ has spin 3/2.

```
>>> bosons = [Ex('B_{a}')]
>>> fermions = [Ex(r'(\Psi)_{\gamma}')]
>>> fermion_propagators = [rarita_schwinger_prop()]
>>> susy = r'''D_{\alpha}(B_{a}) -> u (\Psi)_{\alpha}^{\beta} B_{\beta}, D_{\alpha}((\Psi)_{\beta}) -> v
↪ (\Gamma_{ab})_{\alpha}^{\beta} \partial_b B_a \partial_a B_b'''
>>> consts = ['u', 'v']
>>> indices = [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\beta}']
>>> susy_solve_propagator(bosons, fermions, fermion_propagators, susy, basis, consts, indices,
↪ comm_coef=2)
```

The result is the constraint

$$uv = -i. \quad (5.11.14)$$

Fixing $u = 1$ gives $v = -i$, giving supersymmetry transformation rules equivalent to those in (2.4) of [25].

As a final example, closest to the aims of this program, we consider on-shell 4D supergravity, whose supersymmetry rules, with variable coefficients, are

$$D_\alpha h_{ab} = u(\gamma_a)_\alpha^\beta \Psi_{b\beta} + u(\gamma_b)_\alpha^\beta \Psi_{a\beta} \quad (5.11.15a)$$

$$D_\alpha \Psi_{a\beta} = v(\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b h_{ca}. \quad (5.11.15b)$$

The code below finds the constraints.

```
>>> bosons = [Ex('h_{a b}')]
>>> fermions = [Ex(r'(\Psi_{a})_{\gamma})]
>>> fermion_propagators = [rarita_schwinger_prop()]
>>> susy = r'''D_{\alpha}(h_{a b}) -> u (\Gamma_{a})_{\alpha}^{\beta} (\Psi_{b})_{\beta} + u
→ (\Gamma_{b})_{\alpha}^{\beta} (\Psi_{a})_{\beta}, D_{\alpha}(\Psi_{a})_{\beta} -> v
→ (\Gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b(h_{c a})'''
>>> consts = ['u', 'v']
>>> indices = [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\beta}']
>>> susy_solve_propagator(bosons, fermions, fermion_propagators, susy, basis, consts, indices,
→ comm_coef=2)
```

The result is

$$uv = -\frac{i}{2}. \quad (5.11.16)$$

Fixing $u = 1/2$ gives $v = -i$, giving supersymmetry transformation rules equivalent to those in (2.5) of [25].

This completes the discussion of algorithms for finding constraints from closure conditions. The code snippets above and in §5.9 have successfully found constraints solving for the coefficients of every single on-shell multiplet treated in [25], and the results have proven correct every time. This is the culmination of all of the arithmetic foundations in the prior sections, and the only remaining work is in finding constraints from the action in the next section and completing additional calculations like holonomy in §5.13. Of course, the full power of the solvers presented here and in §5.9 is not circumscribed to verification of results in the literature; §2.1 successfully demonstrated the use of these solvers for the purpose of solving for the coefficients of the 11D supergravity multiplet (1.1.1). The steep rise in number of indices renders this problem, if solved by hand, dramatically more complicated than the 4D cases, but with the help of these solvers, the difference when solved by computer was merely a change in inputs.

5.12 SUSY-Invariant Action Solver

§5.9 and §5.11 have introduced two methods to obtain constraints on the coefficients of a multiplet by requiring closure up to gauge transformations and fermionic equation-of-motion terms. However, other constraints arise from requiring supersymmetry-invariance of the action corresponding

to the multiplet. Recall that the supersymmetry transformation, i.e., the supercovariant derivative, is not viewed as a “finite-length” transformation operator under which invariance of the action S takes the form $D_\alpha S = S$, but rather, the supersymmetry transformation is viewed as an infinitesimal operation which should introduce no net change in the action. That is, $D_\alpha S = 0$, i.e., the action is stationary with respect to variation by the supersymmetry transformation, in the spirit of variational calculus.¹¹⁵ The supercovariant derivative can pass through the integral, so that the condition becomes $\int dx^D D_\alpha \mathcal{L} = 0$, where \mathcal{L} is the Lagrangian density. The input to “MakeActionSUSYInv” is the integrand to that expression (with the supercovariant derivative applied symbolically; it need not be evaluated), the supersymmetry transformation rules for the multiplet, the coefficients of the multiplet and the action components, and the names of the fermions in the multiplet.

The “MakeActionSUSYInv” algorithm applies “SUSYExpand” and “Evaluate” on $D_\alpha \mathcal{L}$ in order to apply the derivative and simplify the resulting expression. Then, this expression is integrated, with Cadabra’s “integrate_by_parts” function used to move all partial derivatives to the bosons so that like terms may be combined or cancelled. Next, the integrand is withdrawn from the integral and factored in the desired multiplet coefficients; SUSY-invariance demands that this expression be zero. At this point, each term is clearly independent, as the terms involve distinct fields or partial-derivative indices. Hence, each coefficient can be set to zero, giving a system of constraints. Finally, the “DistillConstrs” procedure from §5.9 is applied to cull independent constraints from the aforementioned system, and these constraints are the output. Algorithm 5.12.1 shows detailed pseudo-code for “MakeActionSUSYInv.”

Algorithm 5.12.1 Make Action SUSY Invariant

```

1: function MAKEACTIONSUSYINV( $D_\alpha \mathcal{L}$ ,  $susy$ ,  $consts[1..n]$ ,  $fermion\_names[1..m]$ )
2:    $D_\alpha \mathcal{L} \leftarrow \text{SUSYExpand}(D_\alpha \mathcal{L}, susy)$ 
3:    $D_\alpha \mathcal{L} \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(D_\alpha \mathcal{L})$ 
4:    $D_\alpha S \leftarrow \int dx^D D_\alpha \mathcal{L}$  ▷ Symbolically integrating in Cadabra
5:   for  $i \in 1..m$  do
6:      $D_\alpha S \leftarrow \text{integrate\_by\_parts}(D_\alpha S, fermion\_names[i])$ 
7:   end for
8:    $integrand \leftarrow \text{nth\_arg}(D_\alpha S, 0).\text{ex}()$  ▷ extract the integrand, the 0th argument of  $D_\alpha S$ ’s ExNode structure
9:    $integrand \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(integrand)$ 
10:   $integrand \leftarrow \text{factor\_in}(integrand, consts)$ 
11:   $system \leftarrow []$ 
12:  for  $term$  in  $integrand$  do
13:    append “coefficient of  $term = 0$ ” to  $system$ 
14:  end for
15:   $sol \leftarrow \text{DistillConstrs}(system, consts)$ 
16:  return  $sol$ 
17: end function

```

An example of the function’s use is in obtaining constraints from SUSY-invariance of the off-shell 4D vector multiplet action. In particular, corresponding to the multiplet (5.9.14) is the action

$$S = \int dx^D \left\{ \ell F_{ab} F^{ab} + m (\gamma^a)^{\alpha\beta} \lambda_\alpha \partial_a \lambda_\beta + n d^2 \right\}, \quad (5.12.1)$$

where ℓ, m, n are variable coefficients and

$$F_{ab} = \partial_a A_b - \partial_b A_a \quad (5.12.2)$$

¹¹⁵ Under standard boundary conditions, this is equivalent to the supercovariant derivative of the Lagrangian being a total derivative.

is the field strength tensor. The code below enters the symbolically SUSY-transformed Lagrangian density and the off-shell 4D vector multiplet SUSY-rule¹¹⁶ into “MakeActionSUSYInv.”

```
>>> L = Ex(r'D_{\gamma}(1 F_{a b} F^{a b} + m (\Gamma^a)^{\alpha \beta} (\lambda)_{\alpha}
↪ \partial_a((\lambda)_{\beta}) + n d d)')
>>> susy = r''D_{\alpha}(A_a) -> u (\Gamma_a)_{\alpha}^{\beta} (\lambda)_{\beta},
↪ D_{\alpha}((\lambda)_{\beta}) -> v (\Gamma^{a b})_{\alpha \beta} \partial_a(A_b) + w
↪ C_{\alpha \beta} \partial_a(A_a) + x (\Gamma')_{\alpha \beta} d, D_{\alpha}(d) -> y
↪ (\Gamma' \Gamma^a)_{\alpha}^{\beta} \partial_a((\lambda)_{\beta}), F_{a b} ->
↪ \partial_a(A_b) - \partial_b(A_a)'''
>>> make_action_susy_inv(L, susy, ['l', 'm', 'n', 'u', 'v', 'w', 'x', 'y'], [r'\lambda'])
```

The result is the set of constraints

$$\ell u = -\frac{1}{2}mv \quad (5.12.3a)$$

$$mx = ny \quad (5.12.3b)$$

$$mw = 0. \quad (5.12.3c)$$

One can now verify that the nonlinear equations above along with those in (5.9.15) enable a solution of the off-shell 4D vector multiplet. It is verified in Appendix C.2 that the action is normalized when $\ell = -1/4, n = 1/2$. This turns the first two equations above into

$$u = 2mv \quad (5.12.4a)$$

$$mx = \frac{1}{2}y. \quad (5.12.4b)$$

Multiplying (5.12.4a) by u , applying (5.9.15a), and simplifying gives

$$m = \frac{i}{2}u^2, \quad (5.12.5)$$

while multiplying (5.12.4b) by y , applying (5.9.15c), and simplifying gives

$$m = -\frac{i}{2}y^2, \quad (5.12.6)$$

so that

$$y = \pm ui. \quad (5.12.7)$$

Also, since (5.9.15a) shows that $u \neq 0$, (5.9.15b) implies that $w = 0$, which also takes care of (5.12.3c). Clearly, then, ℓ, n, w are fixed and the remaining coefficients of the multiplet and its action can be fixed by fixing u , which corresponds to an arbitrary scaling in (5.9.14), and the phase of y . Setting $u = 1$ and choosing $y = +ui = i$ gives the solution as

$$u = 1, \quad v = -i, \quad w = 0, \quad x = 1, \quad y = i, \quad \ell = -\frac{1}{4}, \quad m = \frac{i}{2}, \quad n = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (5.12.8)$$

These are indeed the correct values for the multiplet, as seen, for example, in (19) of [16] and (2.12) of [8], validating the system of constraints outputted by “MakeActionSUSYInv.” Notice that the solution of the 11D supergravity multiplet in §3.3 works in much the same fashion.

¹¹⁶ Notice that a substitution rule for the field strength tensor has been added so that the tensor can be recognized and converted into a gauge field expression more tractable for the program.

5.13 Algorithm for Computing Holoraumy

The final principal algorithm presented here is that which computes the holoraumy tensors. The distinction between holoraumy and closure is simply in taking the commutator rather than the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives. As a result, the procedure for computing holoraumy is similar to the procedure of “SUSYSolve,” i.e., Algorithms 5.9.2 and 5.9.3, except that the goal is to compute the classification of terms given values for the coefficients of the supersymmetry rules, rather than apply such a classification to find the values. This classification is useful, since in every single on-shell 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ multiplet studied in [25], the fermionic holoraumy included equation-of-motion terms; in 4D supergravity, there were even gauge terms. To obtain the holoraumy, with terms classified, the function “Holoraumy” takes as input an array “fields” of fields, the supersymmetry transformation rules “susy” for the multiplet, a basis Γ^A for the Clifford algebra, substitution rules “subs” which take the coefficients of the multiplets to their values,¹¹⁷ and the indices “Inds” to be used in the commutator of supercovariant derivatives. The function loops through the fields; let A be one such field. Analogously to “SUSYSolve,” “Holoraumy” stores the commutator of supercovariant derivatives with indices “Inds” to A and applies “SUSYExpand” with the SUSY rules “susy” to expand the supercovariant derivatives, then applying a substitution adhering to “subs” which replaces the variable coefficients of the multiplet with their values. After simplifying, flattening, and canonicalizing \mathcal{E} with “Evaluate,” the program uses “FierzExpand2Index” with the basis Γ^A in order to move the indices “Inds” onto the same gamma matrices.¹¹⁸ The algorithm “FilterTerms” is then used to obtain a hash map, recorded as T . This classifies the terms as desired, undesired, gauge, and “Lorentz proper” (i.e., potentially an equation-of-motion term), but there is no meaning to the classification of desired and undesired terms here, since we are not fitting to a condition like (1.2.1). Hence, the desired and undesired terms are compiled together in an array “regular_terms” of terms in the holoraumy which are neither gauge nor (potentially) equation-of-motion terms, while the gauge and Lorentz proper terms are assigned to arrays “gauge_terms” and “lorentz_proper_terms.” These three arrays are organized into a hash table, with the keys being the names of the classification, and this hash table is appended to a hash table “holoraumy_dict,” analogous to “susy_dict” in Algorithms 5.9.2 and 5.9.3, with the field name as the key. After looping through all of the fields, the function returns “holoraumy_dict.” Algorithm 5.13.1 shows detailed pseudo-code for this procedure.

The outputted hash table contains the commutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to each field, with the terms classified in the desired fashion. Note that we have chosen to leave the set of “Lorentz proper” terms as is without determining which among them are bona fide equation-of-motion terms. The reason is that neither approach for definitively discerning and removing equation-of-motion terms is guaranteed to return terms which were originally present in the expression \mathcal{E} : “FindNonGaugeInv” merely finds terms which are equivalent to the non-equation-of-motion terms up to gauge-invariant quantities which have the same coefficients as the non-equation-of-motion terms in the original expression, while “FilterTermsMomentumSpace” reformulates \mathcal{E} in terms of

¹¹⁷ The imagined use of “Holoraumy” is as a calculation which follows the solution of a multiplet. It would be inconvenient to rewrite the supersymmetry transformation rules with the solved coefficients; for this reason, we have preferred to enable a separate listing of the computed values. See the end of this section for examples.

¹¹⁸ Like for the closure, the convention for the holoraumy is that it be expressed with the spinor indices of the supercovariant derivatives on the same gamma matrices; see (6.1) of [25] for fermionic holoraumy.

Algorithm 5.13.1 Calculate the Holoraumy

```

1: function HOLORAUMY(fields[1..n], susy,  $\Gamma^A$ , subs, Inds[1..2])
2:   holoraumy_dict  $\leftarrow$  empty hash table
3:   for A  $\in$  fields do
4:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow D_{Ind[0]} D_{Ind[1]} A - D_{Ind[1]} D_{Ind[0]} A$ 
5:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{SUSYExpand}(\mathcal{E}, \textit{susy})$ 
6:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{substitute}(\mathcal{E}, \textit{subs})$ 
7:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{distribute}(\mathcal{E})$ 
8:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(\mathcal{E}, \textit{to\_perform\_subs} = \text{False})$ 
9:      $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{FierzExpand2Index}(\mathcal{E}, \Gamma^A, \textit{Inds}, \textit{to\_perform\_subs} = \text{False})$ 
10:    T  $\leftarrow \text{FilterTerms}(\mathcal{E}, A, \textit{Inds}, \textit{identify\_lorentz\_proper} = A \text{ is a fermion})$ 
11:    regular_terms  $\leftarrow T["desired\_terms"] + T["undesired\_terms"]$ 
12:    gauge_terms  $\leftarrow T["gauge\_terms"]$ 
13:    lorentz_proper_terms  $\leftarrow T["lorentz\_proper\_terms"]$ 
14:    regular_terms  $\leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(\text{sum}(\textit{regular\_terms}))$ 
15:    gauge_terms  $\leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(\text{sum}(\textit{gauge\_terms}))$ 
16:    lorentz_proper_terms  $\leftarrow \text{Evaluate}(\text{sum}(\textit{lorentz\_proper\_terms}), \textit{to\_join\_gamma} = \text{False})$ 
17:    holoraumy_dict[A]  $\leftarrow \{\text{"regular\_terms": } \textit{regular\_terms}, \text{"gauge\_terms": } \textit{gauge\_terms}, \text{"lorentz\_proper\_terms": } \textit{lorentz\_proper\_terms}\}$ 
18:   end for
19:   return holoraumy_dict
20: end function

```

coupling currents without reconstructing the expression in terms of the field A .¹¹⁹ Indeed, recall that in “SUSYSolve,” although the outputted constraints are obtained from the expression following the application of “FindNonGaugeInv,” the filtered expression returned as “susy_dict” is that prior to the application of “FindNonGaugeInv.” It was our preference both there and here in “Holoraumy” to output an expression which is a favorable rewriting of the Fierz expansion of the (anti)commutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to a field rather than an expression which is physically equivalent to the former by unknown gauge-invariant quantities and multiples of the equations of motion.

We now consider two examples, one of which demonstrates the case of multiple fields of the same statistics and the other of which demonstrates the most intricate form a holoraumy tensor might take. The first example is the on-shell 4D chiral multiplet (5.9.6), which has two bosons. The code below finds the holoraumy of this multiplet with the values $u = 1, v = i, w = i, x = -1$ obtained in §5.9 from (5.9.7).

```

>>> fields = [Ex('A'), Ex('B'), Ex(r'(\Psi)_{\gamma}') ]
>>> susy = r''D_{\alpha}(A) -> u (\Psi)_{\alpha}, D_{\alpha}(B) -> v
  \rightarrow (\Gamma^{\alpha})_{\alpha\beta} (\Psi)_{\beta}, D_{\alpha}((\Psi)_{\beta}) -> w
  \rightarrow (\Gamma^{\alpha})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{\alpha}(A) + x (\Gamma^{\alpha})_{\alpha\beta} \partial_{\alpha}(B)
  \rightarrow \partial_{\alpha}(B)'''
>>> basis = [Ex(r'C_{\alpha\beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{\alpha})_{\alpha\beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{\alpha})_{\alpha\beta}'),
  \rightarrow Ex(r'(\Gamma^{\alpha})_{\alpha\beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{\alpha})_{\alpha\beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{\alpha})_{\alpha\beta}')]
>>> subs = Ex('u -> 1, v -> I, w -> I, x -> -1', False)
>>> indices = [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\beta}']
>>> holoraumy(fields, susy, basis, subs, indices)

```

The result for the commutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to each field is

$$[D_{\alpha}, D_{\beta}]A = 2(\gamma^a \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a B \quad (5.13.1a)$$

¹¹⁹ Such reconstruction of parts of the expression which have the desired form in (1.2.1) was already fairly subtle.

$$[D_\alpha, D_\beta]B = -2(\gamma^a \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_a A \quad (5.13.1b)$$

$$[D_\alpha, D_\beta]\Psi_\gamma = -2i(\gamma^a \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_*)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_a \Psi_\eta + i(\gamma^a \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a \gamma^b \gamma_*)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_b \Psi_\eta. \quad (5.13.1c)$$

The term in green is identified as potentially an equation-of-motion term, and indeed, it is easily seen that it vanishes under the Dirac equation (1.2.4). These results are equivalent to the findings in §6.1 of [25], validating the algorithm “Holoraumy.”

The second example is the on-shell 4D supergravity multiplet (5.11.15), which will be seen to have both equation-of-motion terms and gauge terms in its holoraumy. The code below finds the holoraumy of this multiplet with the values $u = 1/2, v = -i$ obtained in §5.11 from (5.11.16). (The basis is the same as in the prior example.)

```
>>> fields = [Ex('h_{a b}'), Ex(r'(\Psi_{a})_{\gamma}'))]
>>> susy = r''D_{\alpha}(h_{a b}) -> u (\Gamma_{a})_{\alpha\beta} (\Psi_b)_{\beta} + u
-> (\Gamma_b)_{\alpha\beta} (\Psi_a)_{\beta}, D_{\alpha}((\Psi_a)_{\beta}) -> v
-> (\Gamma^b c)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_b (h_{c a})'''
>>> subs = Ex('u -> 1/2, v -> -I', False)
>>> indices = [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\beta}']
>>> holoraumy(fields, susy, basis, subs, indices)
```

The result is

$$[D_\alpha, D_\beta]h_{ab} = -\epsilon_a{}^{cde} (\gamma_c \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d h_{be} - \epsilon_b{}^{cde} (\gamma_c \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d h_{ae} \quad (5.13.2a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} [D_\alpha, D_\beta]\Psi_{a\gamma} = & 2i(\gamma^b \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_*)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_b \Psi_{a\eta} - \frac{5i}{4} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_b \Psi_{a\eta} \\ & + \frac{i}{2} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_a \Psi_{b\eta} - \frac{i}{4} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a \gamma^{bc})_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_b \Psi_{c\eta} \\ & + \frac{5i}{4} (\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b \gamma_*)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_b \Psi_{a\eta} - \frac{i}{2} (\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b \gamma_*)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_a \Psi_{b\eta} \\ & - \frac{1}{8} \epsilon_{bc}{}^{de} (\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a \gamma_{de})_\gamma{}^\eta \partial^b \Psi^c{}_\eta + \frac{1}{8} \epsilon_{bc}{}^{de} (\gamma_a \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{de})_\gamma{}^\eta \partial^b \Psi^c{}_\eta \\ & + \frac{i}{2} (\gamma^b \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a \gamma^c \gamma_*)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_c \Psi_{b\eta} - \frac{i}{2} (\gamma^b \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a \gamma^c \gamma_*)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_b \Psi_{c\eta} \\ & - \frac{3i}{4} (\gamma^b \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_b \gamma^c \gamma_*)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_c \Psi_{a\eta} + \frac{i}{2} (\gamma^b \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_b \gamma^c \gamma_*)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_a \Psi_{c\eta} \\ & - \frac{1}{8} \epsilon_{ab}{}^{ef} (\gamma^b \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ef} \gamma_{cd})_\gamma{}^\eta \partial^c \Psi^d{}_\eta - i(\gamma^b \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_*)_\gamma{}^\eta \partial_a \Psi_{b\eta}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.13.2b)$$

where the terms in green are identified as potentially equation-of-motion terms and the term in blue is a gauge term. This can be rewritten

$$[D_\alpha, D_\beta]h_{ab} = \epsilon_{(a}{}^{cde} (\gamma_* \gamma_c)_{\alpha\beta} \partial_d h_{|b)e} \quad (5.13.3a)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
[D_\alpha, D_\beta]\Psi_{a\gamma} = & 2i (\gamma^b \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_*)_\gamma {}^\eta \partial_b \Psi_{a\eta} + \frac{i}{4} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a)_\gamma {}^\eta R_\eta \\
& + \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_* \gamma_a)_\gamma {}^\eta R_\eta - \frac{1}{8} \epsilon_{ab}{}^{ef} (\gamma_* \gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ef})_\gamma {}^\eta R_\eta \\
& - \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_* \gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_*)_\gamma {}^\eta R_\eta + \frac{5i}{4} C_{\alpha\beta} E_{a\gamma} \\
& + \frac{5i}{4} (\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_*)_\gamma {}^\eta E_{a\gamma} - \frac{3i}{4} (\gamma_* \gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_* \gamma_b)_\gamma {}^\eta E_{a\eta} \\
& + \frac{i}{2} (\gamma_* \gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_* \gamma_a)_\gamma {}^\eta E_{b\eta} - \frac{3i}{4} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)_\gamma {}^\eta \partial_a \Psi_{b\eta} \\
& - \frac{3i}{4} (\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_* \gamma^b)_\gamma {}^\eta \partial_a \Psi_{b\eta} + \frac{i}{4} (\gamma_* \gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_* \gamma_b \gamma^c)_\gamma {}^\eta \partial_a \Psi_{c\eta} \\
& - i (\gamma^b \gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_*)_\gamma {}^\eta \partial_a \Psi_{b\eta},
\end{aligned} \tag{5.13.3b}$$

where $R_\alpha, E_{c\alpha}$ are as in (2.4.6).¹²⁰ Since $R_\alpha, E_{c\alpha}$ vanish under the Rarita-Schwinger equation (2.4.7), the first eight terms of the “potentially equation-of-motion” terms are indeed equation-of-motion terms. In contrast, the last three “potentially equation-of-motion” terms are gauge terms.¹²¹ Remember that this classification of non-equation-of-motion terms as potentially equation-of-motion terms is a result of not applying “FindNonGaugeInv” or another method to determine (and eliminate) equation-of-motion terms definitively; still, though, this classification successfully classifies all equation-of-motion terms as potential equation-of-motion terms. The validity of the program’s results can be verified by comparing with the results in (6.38) of [25], which are

$$[D_\alpha, D_\beta]h_{ab} = -2i \mathcal{B}_{abcde\alpha\beta} \partial^c h^{de} \tag{5.13.4a}$$

$$[D_\alpha, D_\beta]\Psi_{a\gamma} = -2i \mathcal{F}_{abc\alpha\beta\gamma} {}^\eta \partial^b \Psi^c_\eta - \mathcal{Z}_{a\alpha\beta\gamma} - \partial_a \zeta_{\alpha\beta\gamma}, \tag{5.13.4b}$$

where¹²²

$$\mathcal{B}_{abcde\alpha\beta} = \frac{i}{2} \eta_{e(a} \epsilon_{b)cdf} (\gamma_* \gamma^f)_{\alpha\beta} \tag{5.13.5a}$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{abc\alpha\beta\gamma} {}^\eta = -\frac{3}{4} \eta_{a[b} (\gamma_* \gamma_{c]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_*)_\gamma {}^\eta - \frac{i}{8} \epsilon_{abcd} (\gamma_* \gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} \delta_\gamma {}^\eta + \frac{1}{8} (\gamma_* \gamma_{[b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_* \gamma_{c]a})_\gamma {}^\eta \tag{5.13.5b}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Z}_{a\alpha\beta\gamma} = & i \left\{ -C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a)_\gamma {}^\eta - (\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_* \gamma_a)_\gamma {}^\eta + \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_* \gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_* \gamma_d \gamma_a)_\gamma {}^\eta - \frac{1}{4} (\gamma_* \gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_*)_\gamma {}^\eta \right\} (\gamma^{ef})_\eta {}^\rho \partial_e \Psi_{f\rho} \\
& + \frac{1}{4} \left\{ 5C_{\alpha\beta} \delta_\gamma {}^\eta + 5(\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_*)_\gamma {}^\eta - 2(\gamma_* \gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_* \gamma_d)_\gamma {}^\eta \right\} \epsilon_a{}^{efg} (\gamma_* \gamma_e)_\eta {}^\rho \partial_f \Psi_{g\rho}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.13.5c}$$

$$\zeta_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \frac{3i}{4} \left\{ C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)_\gamma {}^\eta + (\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_* \gamma^b)_\gamma {}^\eta + (\gamma_* \gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_*)_\gamma {}^\eta - \frac{1}{3} (\gamma_* \gamma_c)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_* \gamma^{cb})_\gamma {}^\eta \right\} \Psi_{b\eta}. \tag{5.13.5d}$$

It can immediately be seen that the expressions for $[D_\alpha, D_\beta]h_{ab}$ match perfectly. Comparison of the expressions for $[D_\alpha, D_\beta]\Psi_a{}^\gamma$ is subtler: in principle, given the complexity of the terms involved,

¹²⁰ The definitions of R_α and $E_{c\alpha}$ here differ from those in [25].

¹²¹ “FilterTerms” identifies these terms as “potentially equation-of-motion” terms because it correctly recognizes that they are of suitable structure to combine with other terms to form multiples of the equation of motion, but in this case, the combination does not completely subsume all gauge terms. Notice also that our classification of the terms is not strictly unique here, since gauge terms are related to “regular” terms (i.e., non-gauge and non-equation-of-motion terms) via equation-of-motion terms.

¹²² We have corrected small typographical errors in the signs in this expression present in [25].

we would like to prove equivalence by subtracting (5.13.4b) from (5.13.3b) and demonstrating computationally that this difference simplifies to zero. It turns out that this requires attention to Schouten identities. Since the gamma-matrix-splitting procedure of “FilterTerms” makes the resulting expression further removed from the Fierz expansion of $[D_\alpha, D_\beta]\Psi_a^\gamma$, which is naturally close to the hand-derived result, the easiest way to compare the expressions is to calculate the difference between (5.13.4b) and our expression prior to the application of “FilterTerms”; this results in a simpler expression for the difference which is more tractable for Cadabra2’s [49] Schouten-identity-recognizing function `decompose_product()`.¹²³ The code below stores the Fierz expansion of the commutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the gravitino as “ex1” and the negatives of the terms in (5.13.4b) as “ex2a,” “ex2b,” and “ex2c,” adding them to give the desired difference.¹²⁴

```
>>> ex1 = Ex(r'D_{\alpha}(D_{\beta}((\Psi_{a})_{\gamma})) -
→ D_{\beta}(D_{\alpha}((\Psi_{a})_{\gamma}))')
>>> ex2a = Ex(r''2 I (-3/4) \delta_{a b} (\Gamma' \Gamma_{c})_{\alpha \beta}
→ (\Gamma')_{\gamma}^{\eta} + (3/4) \delta_{a c} (\Gamma' \Gamma_{b})_{\alpha \beta}
→ (\Gamma')_{\gamma}^{\eta} - (1/8) I \epsilon_{a b c d} (\Gamma' \Gamma_{d})_{\alpha \beta}
→ C_{\gamma}^{\eta} + (1/8) (\Gamma' \Gamma_{b})_{\alpha \beta} (\Gamma' \Gamma_{c}
→ a)_{\gamma}^{\eta} - (1/8) (\Gamma' \Gamma_{c})_{\alpha \beta} (\Gamma' \Gamma_{b}
→ a)_{\gamma}^{\eta} \partial_b((\Psi^c)_{\eta})''')
>>> ex2b = Ex(r''I (-C_{\alpha \beta} (\Gamma_{a})_{\gamma}^{\eta} - (\Gamma')_{\alpha \beta}
→ (\Gamma' \Gamma_{a})_{\gamma}^{\eta} + (1/2) (\Gamma' \Gamma_{d})_{\alpha \beta} (\Gamma'
→ \Gamma_{d} \Gamma_a)_{\gamma}^{\eta} - (1/4) (\Gamma' \Gamma_{a})_{\alpha \beta}
→ (\Gamma')_{\gamma}^{\eta} (\Gamma^e f)_{\eta}^{\rho} \partial_e((\Psi_f)_{\rho}) +
→ (1/4) (5 C_{\alpha \beta} C_{\gamma}^{\eta} + 5 (\Gamma')_{\alpha \beta}
→ (\Gamma')_{\gamma}^{\eta} - 2 (\Gamma' \Gamma_{d})_{\alpha \beta} (\Gamma'
→ \Gamma_{d} \Gamma_a)_{\gamma}^{\eta} \epsilon_{a}^{efg} (\Gamma' \Gamma_e)_{\eta}^{\rho}
→ \partial_f((\Psi_g)_{\rho})''')
>>> ex2c = Ex(r'''(3/4) I (C_{\alpha \beta} (\Gamma^b)_{\gamma}^{\eta} + (\Gamma')_{\alpha \beta}
→ \beta) (\Gamma' \Gamma_{b})_{\gamma}^{\eta} + (\Gamma' \Gamma_{b})_{\alpha \beta}
→ (\Gamma')_{\gamma}^{\eta} - (1/3) (\Gamma' \Gamma_{c})_{\alpha \beta} (\Gamma' \Gamma_{c}
→ b)_{\gamma}^{\eta} \partial_a((\Psi_b)_{\eta})''')
>>> susy_expand(ex1, susy)
>>> substitute(ex1, subs)
>>> distribute(ex1)
>>> evaluate(ex1, to_perform_subs=False)
>>> fierz_expand_2index(ex1, basis, indices)
>>> ex = ex1 + ex2a + ex2b + ex2c
>>> evaluate(ex)
>>> evaluate(ex)
```

¹²³ While `decompose_product()` is impractical, in terms of computational complexity, for higher dimensions, we happen to be working only in 4D here.

¹²⁴ Notice that we apply “Evaluate” twice here. This is because the expressions involve gamma matrices that have already been reduced via the rule (5.2.7). (We would have prevented this reduction in “FierzExpand2Index” via the optional parameter if the expression (5.13.4b) were not expressed in terms of reduced gamma matrices.) It follows that in order to produce like terms to be collected, the substitutions from “GenSubs” must be used in the middle of the calculation, which is equivalent to applying it at the end of one “Evaluate” call and then applying “Evaluate” again. We only apply the substitutions from “GenSubs” at the end of the “Evaluate” procedure in Algorithm 5.4.1 for efficiency: gamma-matrix reduction introduces dummy indices on Levi-Civita tensors which slow canonicalization. The result is occasionally the need for two “Evaluate” calls, but only if the inputted expression involves reduced gamma matrices contracted with Levi-Civita tensors.

The result is

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{4}\epsilon_a{}^{bcd}(\gamma^e\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{bc})_\gamma{}^\eta\partial_e\Psi_{d\eta} + \frac{1}{4}\epsilon_a{}^{bcd}(\gamma^e\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{bc})_\gamma{}^\eta\partial_d\Psi_{e\eta} \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_a{}^{bcd}(\gamma_e\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_b{}^e)_\gamma{}^\eta\partial_c\Psi_{d\eta} + \frac{1}{4}\epsilon^{bcde}(\gamma_a\gamma_*)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{bc})_\gamma{}^\eta\partial_d\Psi_{e\eta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.13.6}$$

We now wish to apply Cadabra's `decompose_product()`, but the same idiosyncrasy which necessitates the use of "IndexBracketHex" (see Appendix E) renders `decompose_product()` unusable for tensor-spinors. A work-around is to recognize that a Schouten identity which reduces (5.13.6) depends purely on the Lorentz-index structure of the expression, including symmetries but not any special features of gamma matrices, and certainly not spinor-index-related features. Hence, we computationally consider the proxy expression

$$-\frac{1}{4}\epsilon_a{}^{bcd}A^eB_{bc}\partial_eE_d + \frac{1}{4}\epsilon_a{}^{bcd}A^eB_{bc}\partial_dE_e + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_a{}^{bcd}A_eB_b{}^e\partial_cE_d + \frac{1}{4}\epsilon^{bcde}A_aB_{bc}\partial_dE_e, \tag{5.13.7}$$

where B_{bc} is made antisymmetric. The code below defines the relevant tensors and their properties (particularly the dependence of E_d on its partial derivative and the antisymmetry of B_{bc}) and then applies `decompose_product()` to (5.13.7) before canonicalizing.

```

>>> __cdbkernel__ = susy_env(D = 4)
>>> Depends(Ex(r''E{#}'''), Ex(r'''\partial{#}'''))
>>> AntiSymmetric(Ex(r''B{#}'''))
>>> ex = Ex(r''- 1/4 \epsilon_{a}{}^{b c d} A^{[e} B_{[b c} \partial_{d]}(E_{e}) + 1/4
→ \epsilon_{a}{}^{b c d} A^{[e} B_{[b c} \partial_{d]}(E_{e}) + 1/2 \epsilon_{a}{}^{b c d} A_{[e}
→ B_{b]}{}^{e} \partial_{c]}(E_{d}) + 1/4 \epsilon^{b c d e} A_{[a} B_{b c}
→ \partial_{d]}(E_{e})''')
>>> decompose_product(ex)
>>> canonicalise(ex)
>>> collect_terms(ex)

```

The result is zero, proving the equivalence of our expression for $[D_\alpha, D_\beta]\Psi_a{}^\gamma$ and that in the literature, thereby again validating the output of "Holoraumy."

6 Discussion

We should like to conclude with a few comments about the nature of our results and future directions. In the foregoing, we have derived a form for 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity analogous to the forms studied for 4D theories in the genomics project and [25]. Using this newly derived form, we have provided, in our view, the most explicit results for the non-closure geometry of 11D supergravity to date. These computations have been achieved through the use of novel symbolic algebra procedures and tools for solving multiplets, whose validity we have thoroughly demonstrated via the reproduction of all on-shell multiplets in [25], and well as the correct reproduction of various Fierz identities and free-field action coefficients in the literature on 4D and 11D supersymmetry.

One principal aim has been to augment the literature on the 11D supergravity off-shell problem (question 1.1), asking whether the multiplet might be made to close without the enforcement of Bianchi identities by adjoining new fields. In particular, we believe that a viable future direction for

making inroads into this question may be to explore, with the aid of SusyPy, the rapport between auxiliary fields and the non-closure geometry as formulated in [25], and whether the obstructive behavior of non-closure geometry with respect to finding suitable auxiliary fields for the double-tensor multiplet can be refashioned into a constructive method for rendering some class of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ multiplets off-shell. The non-closure functions we have computed here should serve as the groundwork for such an approach.

At the same time, we have applied a variant of our algorithm for solving supermultiplets to the task of computing holoraumy, validated via reproduction of on-shell 4D holoraumy computations in [25]. Using this tool, we have derived, for the very first time, the on-shell holoraumy for 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity. This has enabled us to study whether any of four distinct manifestations of electromagnetic-duality rotations are present in the 11D supergravity holoraumy. We have proven that all four are absent, answering question 1.3 in the negative and providing only the second known counterexample, after 10D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ super Maxwell theory [18], to the conjectured ubiquity of such electromagnetic-duality rotations across supermultiplets [25].

We qualify, however, that the search for such symmetries in 11D supersymmetry should not be consigned to the wastebasket. The fact that 11 dimensions extends beyond our 4D empirics urges one to search for lower-dimensional shadows of symmetries of 11D theories. Recall that the curvature of a surface in a third dimension can be discerned by the change of orientation after parallel transport along a closed curve, closely related to holonomy. As a supergeometric analogue of holonomy, holoraumy appears a ripe candidate for a supersymmetric measure of higher-dimensional geometry that remains accessible to low-dimensional empirics. While more research must be done on the usefulness of electromagnetic-duality-type symmetries in holoraumy with respect to this goal, the promise carried by any such shadows of higher-dimensional symmetries entices one to repeat the computation answering question 1.3 for variants of the 11D supergravity multiplet used here. In particular, future work should consider the non-closure geometry and holoraumy of the alternative linearized $\mathcal{N} = 1$, 11D supergravity multiplet obtained by replacing the three-form A_{abc} with a six-form \tilde{A}_{abcdef} [43]. This multiplet is dual to the one used here (i.e., to that from the field content of [10]), and a result on whether the answer to question 1.3 changes for this dual multiplet would both indicate the strength of holoraumy as an invariant (e.g., if the absence of electromagnetic-duality rotations remains, then this would intimate that the presence or absence of some symmetries of on-shell holoraumy is invariant under duality) and the comparative fruitfulness of the two versions of 11D supergravity from the perspective of holography (e.g., if question 1.3 is answered in the positive for the dual theory, then that theory would have stronger phenomenological SUSY holography properties.)

Hand-in-hand with these further explorations will need to be extensions of the symbolic algebra tools which we have explicated. A significant target for generalization is in the hypotheses of our multiplet solver algorithm, specifically, that any off-shell non-closure functions are on symmetric fermions. This hypothesis will likely need to be weakened in order to treat the dual supergravity multiplet, due to its similarity to the 4D double-tensor multiplet. In particular, as studied in [54], the pathological nature of the double-tensor multiplet arises from terms in the closure which do not vanish upon enforcement of the equations of motion, but rather become gauge transformations upon enforcement of the equations of motion. These transformations effect bosonic non-closure

functions. Importantly, [54] posits that the same behavior exists in the dual 11D supergravity multiplet. Hence, an adaptation of our procedure will need to be developed in order to isolate bosonic equation-of-motion terms. In principle, this can be tackled by applying the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives to the field strength of each boson, introducing terms with second-order partial derivatives that [54] shows *do vanish* under the equations of motion. The difficulty is that the equations of motion need not be the conventional ones, but can instead be those arising from the equations of motion of the dual fields. For instance, consider the method of our second multiplet solver applied to identify equation-of-motion terms for the Kalb-Ramond field (or equivalently, one of the bosons in the double-tensor multiplet). The equation of motion is [35]¹²⁵

$$\partial_a H^{abc} = 0, \quad (6.0.1)$$

where H_{abc} is as in (5.8.2). The dual field equation is

$$\partial_e \bar{H}_a - \partial_a \bar{H}_e = 0, \quad (6.0.2)$$

where $\bar{H}_a = \epsilon_{abcd} H^{bcd}$ is the dual field. This second equation can be rewritten

$$\epsilon_{abcd} \partial_e{}^b B^{cd} - \epsilon_{ebcd} \partial_a{}^b B^{cd} = 0. \quad (6.0.3)$$

In momentum space, the two forms of the equation of motion above become

$$-k^2 B^{bc} - k_a k^b B^{ca} - k_a k^c B^{ab} = 0 \quad (6.0.4a)$$

$$-\epsilon_{abcd} k_e k^b B^{cd} + \epsilon_{ebcd} k_a k^b B^{cd} = 0. \quad (6.0.4b)$$

The reader can verify that the momentum-space Kalb-Ramond Feynman propagator ((5.15) in [51])¹²⁶

$$G^{acbd} = \frac{1}{k^2} (\eta^{ad} \eta^{bc} - \eta^{ac} \eta^{bd}) \quad (6.0.5)$$

is a Green's function for the first form of the equation of motion¹²⁷ but not for the second. It turns out [16] that the latter form of the equation of motion is that which appears in $\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} H_{abc}$. Hence, the procedure of the second multiplet solver will not produce consistent results.¹²⁸ The extension of our algorithm which will be able to treat the double-tensor multiplet and ultimately dual 11D supergravity will need to have the flexibility of handling dual bosonic equations of motion simultaneously through limited, perhaps stepwise, substitution of Green's functions for the equations.¹²⁹

Yet another extension of the current work demands exploration. As noted in [19], question 1.1 can also be asked in the cases of the various 10D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity theories. Hence, the

¹²⁵ We use the notation of the recent paper [32].

¹²⁶ We have broken gauge-invariance here, but this should not matter, since the field equation is gauge-invariant.

¹²⁷ Substituting (6.0.5), multiplied by a Fourier-transformed coupling current $\mathcal{F}(J_{cd})$, for B^{ab} in the left-hand side of (6.0.4a) gives $2\mathcal{F}(J^{bc})$.

¹²⁸ For the first multiplet solver, the Lorentz-proper structure which we used to identify and decompose candidate equation-of-motion terms will clearly not carry over to the bosonic case.

¹²⁹ In particular, one can likely find a Green's function for the second form of the Kalb-Ramond equation of motion. By stepwise substitution, we mean some mechanism of deciding which Green's function to use at any particular point in the isolation of equation-of-motion terms, e.g., whether to use the Green's function for the first or second form of the Kalb-Ramond equation of motion to isolate equation-of-motion terms meeting particular criteria.

non-closure geometry of each of these multiplets should be of interest by the same reasoning as in this work. However, in even dimensions (typically besides $D = 4$), and especially in dimensions $D \equiv 2 \pmod{8}$ for which both the Weyl and Majorana conditions give reductions in the number of independent components, it is more natural to consider Pauli sigma matrices over Dirac gamma matrices. These sigma matrices have their own arithmetic, a symbolic algebra implementation for which will be necessary in tackling 10D problems. The work [27] provided a Mathematica tool for sigma-matrix products which employed underlying matrix properties rather than a purely symbolic approach. That paper succeeded in deriving a number of sigma-matrix identities using the software presented therein, but the approach could not derive Fierz identities that were not direct consequences of matrix multiplication. Version 1 of Cadabra [48] also seems to have included an attempt at implementing sigma matrices using the conventions of [56] with separate σ and $\bar{\sigma}$ matrices, but without any computer arithmetic created for these objects. An implementation based on the spinor-index arithmetic in the present work might be especially useful for achieving an implementation of sigma matrices which is purely symbolic and therefore of greater flexibility with respect to computing Fierz identities. In particular, rather than following the conventions in [56], we can use the conventions in Appendix B of [19], which considers only σ (not $\bar{\sigma}$) matrices but with distinct classes of spinor indices. In this formulation, the sigma matrices could be implemented as pseudo-gamma objects in Cadabra whose dimension-specific spinorial behavior is determined purely by an adaptation of our spinor-index canonicalization.

Finally, we briefly make some remarks about computational complexity. We have not paid special attention to the construction of nominally efficient procedures, primarily because of the inevitably high cost of ordinary index canonicalization (in the original sense of lexicographic ordering of indices via the exploitation of tensor symmetries). Cadabra uses the Butler-Portugal algorithm [7, 39] (in a form drawn from [40]) for canonicalization, which is relatively state-of-the-art, but unfortunately still suffers cost factorial in the number of indices for tensor expressions in high dimensions involving a high degree of intrinsic symmetries as well as relabeling symmetries among dummy indices [44]. As a result, the running time of the foregoing computations varied quite drastically with the number of indices involved. For instance, solving the on-shell 4D chiral multiplet with our first multiplet solver takes 8.72 seconds on a computer with a processor of measured average speed 4.2 GHz, while solving the 11D supergravity multiplet takes 1 hour, 31 minutes, and 16 seconds. The source of this difference is that 11D gamma matrices carry many more Lorentz indices in 11D than in 4D. Similarly, the fastest Fierz identity to compute among those in Appendix B.1 is the expansion of $(\gamma_a)_{\eta(\alpha}(\gamma^{ac})_{\beta)}{}^\gamma$, which involves only 3 Lorentz indices and takes 24.2 seconds to generate, while the slowest Fierz identity to compute is the expansion of $(\gamma^{de})_{\eta(\alpha}(\gamma_{deabc})_{\beta)}{}^\gamma$, which involves 7 Lorentz indices and takes 5 hours, 48 minutes, and 37 seconds to generate.¹³⁰ However, there is certainly room for efficiency improvements in SusyPy itself.¹³¹ In particular, future iterations of the module presented here should focus on reducing the number of calls to Cadabra’s canonicalization function, perhaps identifying criteria which discern whether canonicalization is necessary after a given loop

¹³⁰ Notice how much time our multiplet solver saves by using the two-index Fierz expansion procedure. Solving the entire 11D supergravity multiplet takes about a quarter of the time that it takes to compute one of the four-index Fierz identities which would be used in the more conventional approach.

¹³¹ It should be noted that a significant reduction in runtime might be achieved if Cadabra used the improved canonicalization algorithm in [44], which broadens the number of cases that can be treated in polynomial-time.

of “Evaluate.” Possible adaptations to different paradigms for tensor symbolic algebra, such as the index isomorphism approach of Redberry [52] which demonstrated shorter runtimes than Cadabra, also merit exploration.

In summary, then, we have established a powerful new suite of symbolic algebra procedures capable of vastly extending the computations of [25], as demonstrated by answering critical questions about 11D supergravity. Future work should focus on extending these procedures to treat bosonic equation-of-motion terms in the closure and to offer automatic sigma-matrix algebra, enabling analogous questions for the dual formulation of 11D supergravity and for 10D supergravity multiplets to be answered. One other possible future direction of investigation involves explicit computation of the action of the 11D Pauli-Lubanski 3-form operator on the fields of the supergravity supermultiplet derived from the holonomy calculations in this work. In addition, further study from the perspective of algorithmic complexity should be applied to reduce the runtime of our procedures as the problems which the software will be asked to tackle invariably grow vastly in size and available symmetries. We fervently look forward to continuing into these endeavors.

“For I have every confidence that the effort I have applied to the science reported upon here, which has occupied a considerable span of my lifetime and demanded the most intense exertions of my powers, is not to be lost. ... For truth is eternal, it is divine; and no phase in the development of truth, however small the domain it embraces, can pass away without a trace. It remains even if the garments in which feeble men clothe it fall into dust.”

- H. G. Grassmann [29]
(translated by L. C. Kannenberg)

Acknowledgments

S.J.G. was supported in this research in part by the endowment of the Ford Foundation Professorship of Physics at Brown University and the Brown Theoretical Physics Center. S.J.G. is also grateful to acknowledge the support the endowment of the Clark Leadership Chair in Science at the University of Maryland - College Park. Additionally, I.B.H. and S.H. would like to thank S.J.G. and the other organizers of the 2020 SSPTRS (Summer Student Theoretical Physics Research Session) at Brown University for immensely valuable mentorship from which this research originated. Finally, the authors wish to express deep appreciation to Yangrui Hu and S.-N. Hazel Mak for discussions that played a central role at the inauguration of this work.

A Notation and Conventions

Here, we briefly summarize the notation and conventions we use in this paper. Following [19], we denote Lorentz, or vector, indices by early-alphabet lowercase Latin letters, while we denote Dirac, or spinor, indices by lowercase Greek letters. Indices contained in parentheses, e.g., a, b, c in the

expression $A_{(a}B_bC_{c)}$, are symmetrized, i.e., expressions with indices in parentheses are summed over all permutations of those indices. Indices contained in square brackets, e.g., a, b, c in the expression $A_{[a}B_bC_{c]}$, are antisymmetrized, so that the sign of a summand is determined by the parity of the corresponding permutation of the indices. We use pipes to block out indices of the same parity (co- or contravariance) from the (anti)symmetrized set of indices, e.g., in the expression $A_{(a|}B_bC_{|c)}$, only a, c are symmetrized. Unlike in [13], for simplicity, we do not normalize symmetrizations; that is, we do not divide by the number of permutations.

Moving on from indices, we define $[A, B]$ not to be the \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded Lie bracket, but always to be $AB - BA$. Similarly, $\{A, B\} = AB + BA$ always. It is simpler to use these conventions for the commutator and anticommutator for our purposes, since both come into play when considering simultaneously calculations regarding closure of a supermultiplet and a supermultiplet's holonomy. Finally, when considering multiplets in even dimension D in §5, we follow [13] and use the dimension-independent notation γ_* for the highest-rank element

$$\gamma_* = (-i)^{(D/2)+1} \gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_{D-1}, \quad (\text{A.0.1})$$

rather than a dimension-dependent notation, like γ^5 for $D = 4$.

Now that we have summarized our notation, we describe our conventions for the 11D Clifford algebra and relevant tensors. We follow the conventions of [19]; see Appendix A in that paper for details. We content ourselves here with sketching the most essential of these points. The gamma matrices with spinor indices are of the form $(\gamma^{a_1 \cdots a_n})_{\alpha_1 \alpha_2}$ for $n \leq 10$. The algebra itself is defined by the usual equation

$$\{\gamma^a, \gamma^b\} = 2\eta^{ab} \mathbb{1}, \quad (\text{A.0.2})$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ is the 32×32 identity matrix and η^{ab} is the metric, for which we choose the signature

$$\eta^{ab} = \text{diag}(-1, +1, +1, +1, +1, +1, +1, +1, +1, +1, +1, +1). \quad (\text{A.0.3})$$

We take the basis

$$\Gamma^A = \left\{ C_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma^{abc})_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma^{abcd})_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma^{abcde})_{\alpha\beta} \right\}. \quad (\text{A.0.4})$$

Of these basis elements, the elements

$$\Gamma_+^A = \left\{ (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma^{abcde})_{\alpha\beta} \right\} \quad (\text{A.0.5})$$

are symmetric in their spinor indices and the elements

$$\Gamma_-^A = \left\{ C_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma^{abc})_{\alpha\beta}, (\gamma^{abcd})_{\alpha\beta} \right\} \quad (\text{A.0.6})$$

are antisymmetric. Since $C_{\alpha\beta}$ is antisymmetric, we enforce the NW-SE convention for multiplication of tensor-spinors. The representation we have chosen for our basis is the "negative" one obtained by adjoining to the basis for the 10D Clifford algebra the negative $-\gamma_*$ of the canonical highest-rank element. This implies the gamma-matrix reduction rule

$$\gamma^{a_1 \cdots a_r} = \frac{1}{(11-r)!} \epsilon^{a_1 \cdots a_{11}} \gamma_{a_{11} \cdots a_{r+1}}. \quad (\text{A.0.7})$$

Finally, we define the Levi-Civita tensor, as in [13], so that the product of Levi-Civita tensors with shared indices first has a negative coefficient, viz.,

$$\epsilon_{a_1 \cdots a_n b_1 \cdots b_{11-n}} \epsilon^{a_1 \cdots a_n c_1 \cdots c_{11-n}} = -n! \delta_{b_1}^{[c_1} \cdots \delta_{b_{11-n}}^{c_{11-n}]}. \quad (\text{A.0.8})$$

B Ten 11D Fierz Identities

B.1 Five Symmetric Fierz Identities

The goal of this and the next section is to compute and tabulate a series of intricate 11D Fierz identities. Here, we apply our symbolic algebra tools to produce five novel 11D Fierz identities which crop up when calculating the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the gravitino in §2.4; the next section will produce five additional identities. Since Fierz identities have broad use throughout field theory, our hope is that our efforts to neatly tabulate these identities may aid further forays into 11D supersymmetry.

B.1.1 Fierz Expanding $(\gamma^{[2]})_{\eta(\alpha}(\gamma_{[2]abc})_{\beta)}{}^\gamma$

Running the code

```
>>> fierz1 = fierz_expand(Ex(r'(\Gamma^{d e})_{\eta \alpha} (\Gamma_{d e a b}
→ c)_{\beta} \gamma + (\Gamma^{d e})_{\eta \beta} (\Gamma_{d e a b}
→ c)_{\alpha} \gamma), [Ex(r'C_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta}'),
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b})_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c})_{\alpha \beta}'),
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c d})_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c d e})_{\alpha \beta}'),
→ [r'_{\alpha}, r'_{\beta}], [r'_{\eta}, r'_{\gamma}])
```

gives the Fierz expansion¹³²

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma^{de})_{\eta(\alpha}(\gamma_{deabc})_{\beta)}{}^\gamma = \frac{1}{16} \Big\{ & -56(\gamma_a)_\eta{}^\gamma(\gamma_{bc})_{\alpha\beta} + 56(\gamma_b)_\eta{}^\gamma(\gamma_{ac})_{\alpha\beta} - 56(\gamma_c)_\eta{}^\gamma(\gamma_{ab})_{\alpha\beta} \\
& -56(\gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{bc})_\eta{}^\gamma + 56(\gamma_b)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{ac})_\eta{}^\gamma - 56(\gamma_c)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{ab})_\eta{}^\gamma \\
& + 4(\gamma^{de})_\eta{}^\gamma(\gamma_{abcde})_{\alpha\beta} - 28(\gamma^d_a)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{bcd})_\eta{}^\gamma + 28(\gamma^d_b)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{acd})_\eta{}^\gamma \\
& - 28(\gamma^d_c)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{abd})_\eta{}^\gamma - \frac{1}{180}(\gamma^{def})_\eta{}^\gamma \epsilon_{abcdef}{}^{ghijk}(\gamma_{ghijk})_{\alpha\beta} \\
& + 28(\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{abcd})_\eta{}^\gamma + \frac{2}{3}(\gamma^{def})_\eta{}^\gamma(\gamma_{bcdef})_{\alpha\beta} \\
& - \frac{2}{3}(\gamma^{def})_\eta{}^\gamma(\gamma_{acdef})_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{2}{3}(\gamma^{def})_\eta{}^\gamma(\gamma_{abdef})_{\alpha\beta} \\
& + 4(\gamma^{de})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{abcde})_\eta{}^\gamma + \frac{1}{360}(\gamma^{a'def})_\eta{}^\gamma \epsilon_{bca'def}{}^{ghijk}(\gamma_{ghijk})_{\alpha\beta} \\
& - \frac{1}{360}(\gamma^{a'def})_\eta{}^\gamma \epsilon_{aca'def}{}^{ghijk}(\gamma_{ghijk})_{\alpha\beta} \\
& + \frac{1}{360}(\gamma^{a'def})_\eta{}^\gamma \epsilon_{aba'def}{}^{ghijk}(\gamma_{ghijk})_{\alpha\beta} \Big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.1.1}$$

Recognizing antisymmetrized indices, rewriting dummy indices, and reordering terms gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma^{[2]})_{\eta(\alpha}(\gamma_{[2]abc})_{\beta)}{}^\gamma = \frac{1}{16} \Big\{ & 28(\gamma^{[1]})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{abc[1]})_\eta{}^\gamma - 28(\gamma_{[a})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{bc]})_\eta{}^\gamma \\
& + 4(\gamma^{[2]})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{abc[2]})_\eta{}^\gamma + 14(\gamma^{[1]})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{bc[1]})_\eta{}^\gamma \\
& - 28(\gamma_{[ab})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{c]})_\eta{}^\gamma + \frac{1}{5!3!}\epsilon_{[5][4][ab}(\gamma^{[5]})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{c]^{[4]})_\eta{}^\gamma
\end{aligned} \tag{B.1.2}$$

¹³²In every Fierz identity in this and the next section, we factor out 1/16 to match the conventions in [19].

$$+ \frac{1}{180} \epsilon_{abc}^{[5][3]} (\gamma_{[5]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[3]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{3} (\gamma_{[3]}^{[ab]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{c[3]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ + 4 (\gamma_{abc}^{[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[2]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \Big\}.$$

B.1.2 Fierz Expanding $(\gamma_{[2]})_{\eta(\alpha}(\gamma^{[2]c})_{\beta)}^{\gamma}$

Running the code

```
>>> fierz2 = fierz_expand(Ex(r'(\Gamma_{a b})_{\eta} \alpha (\Gamma^{a b c})_{\eta} \beta^{\gamma} +
→ (\Gamma_{a b})_{\eta} \beta (\Gamma^{a b c})_{\eta} \alpha^{\gamma}), [Ex(r'C_{\alpha} \beta),
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^a)_{\alpha} \beta), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b})_{\alpha} \beta), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c})_{\alpha} \beta),
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c d})_{\alpha} \beta), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c d e})_{\alpha} \beta)], [r'_{\alpha}, r'_{\beta}], [r'_{\eta}, r'_{\gamma}])
```

gives the Fierz expansion

$$(\gamma_{ab})_{\eta(\alpha}(\gamma^{abc})_{\beta)}^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \Big\{ -90 C_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} + 54 (\gamma^{a'})_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma_{a'}^c)_{\alpha\beta} - 54 (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^c)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ + 13 (\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ab}^c)_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{4} (\gamma^{a'b'c'd'})_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma_{a'b'c'd'}^c)_{\alpha\beta} \\ + \frac{1}{1440} (\gamma^{a'b'c'd'e'})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \epsilon^{c a'b'c'd'e'}{}^{ghijk} (\gamma_{ghijk})_{\alpha\beta} \Big\}. \quad (B.1.3)$$

Rewriting dummy indices and reordering terms gives

$$(\gamma_{[2]})_{\eta(\alpha}(\gamma^{[2]c})_{\beta)}^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \Big\{ -54 (\gamma_{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[1]c})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 90 (\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} \delta_{\eta}^{\gamma} + 13 (\gamma_{[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[2]c})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ - 54 (\gamma^{c[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[1]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{4} (\gamma^{c[4]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[4]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ - \frac{1}{12 \cdot 5!} \epsilon^{c[5][5]} (\gamma_{[5]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[5]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \Big\}. \quad (B.1.4)$$

B.1.3 Fierz Expanding $(\gamma_{[1]})_{\eta(\alpha}(\gamma^{[1]c})_{\beta)}^{\gamma}$

Running the code

```
>>> fierz3 = fierz_expand(Ex(r'(\Gamma_a)_{\eta} \alpha (\Gamma^{a c})_{\eta} \beta^{\gamma} +
→ (\Gamma_a)_{\eta} \beta (\Gamma^{a c})_{\eta} \alpha^{\gamma}), [Ex(r'C_{\alpha} \beta),
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^a)_{\alpha} \beta), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b})_{\alpha} \beta), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c})_{\alpha} \beta),
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c d})_{\alpha} \beta), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c d e})_{\alpha} \beta)], [r'_{\alpha}, r'_{\beta}], [r'_{\eta}, r'_{\gamma}])
```

gives the Fierz expansion

$$(\gamma_a)_{\eta(\alpha}(\gamma^{ac})_{\beta)}^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \Big\{ -10 C_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} - 8 (\gamma^{a'})_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma_{a'}^c)_{\alpha\beta} - 8 (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^c)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ - 3 (\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{ab}^c)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{12} (\gamma^{a'b'c'd'})_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma_{a'b'c'd'}^c)_{\alpha\beta} \Big\}. \quad (B.1.5)$$

Rewriting dummy indices and reordering terms gives

$$(\gamma_{[1]})_{\eta(\alpha)}(\gamma^{[1]c})_{\beta})^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \left\{ -8 (\gamma_{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[1]c})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 10 (\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} \delta_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 3 (\gamma_{[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{[2]c})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \right. \\ \left. + 8 (\gamma^{c[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[1]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{12} (\gamma^{c[4]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[4]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \right\}. \quad (\text{B.1.6})$$

B.1.4 Fierz Expanding $(\gamma_a)_{\eta(\alpha)}(\gamma^{bc})_{\beta})^{\gamma}$

Running the code

```
>>> fierz4 = fierz_expand(Ex(r'(\Gamma_{a})_{\eta} \alpha (\Gamma^{bc})_{\beta})_{\gamma} +
→ (\Gamma_a)_{\eta} \alpha (\Gamma^{bc})_{\beta})_{\gamma}, [Ex(r'C_{\alpha\beta}),
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta}), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{abc})_{\alpha\beta}),
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^{abcd})_{\alpha\beta}), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{abc d})_{\alpha\beta}), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{abcd})_{\alpha\beta}),
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^{abcd})_{\alpha\beta})], [r'_{\alpha}, r'_{\beta}], [r'_{\eta}, r'_{\gamma}])
```

gives the Fierz expansion

$$(\gamma_a)_{\eta(\alpha)}(\gamma^{bc})_{\beta})^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \left\{ -C_{\eta}^{\gamma} \delta_a^b (\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} + C_{\eta}^{\gamma} \delta_a^c (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} + (\gamma_a)_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} + (\gamma^b)_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma_a^c)_{\alpha\beta} \right. \\ - (\gamma^c)_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma_a^b)_{\alpha\beta} + \delta_a^b (\gamma^d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma^c_d)_{\alpha\beta} - \delta_a^c (\gamma^d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma^b_d)_{\alpha\beta} \\ + (\gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^c)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - (\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^b)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ - \frac{1}{2} (\gamma^{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma_a^{bc}{}_{de})_{\alpha\beta} + \delta_a^b (\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^c_d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \delta_a^c (\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b_d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ - (\gamma_a^d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc}{}_d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - (\gamma^{bd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^c{}_d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} + (\gamma^{cd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^b{}_d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ + \frac{1}{720} (\gamma^{def})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \epsilon_a^{bc}{}_{def}{}^{ghijk} (\gamma_{ghijk})_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{2} \delta_a^b (\gamma^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^c_{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ + \frac{1}{2} \delta_a^c (\gamma^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b_{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + (\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^{bc}{}_d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{6} (\gamma_a^{def})_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma^{bc}{}_{def})_{\alpha\beta} \\ - \frac{1}{6} (\gamma^{bdef})_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma_a^c{}_{def})_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{6} (\gamma^{cdef})_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma_a^b{}_{def})_{\alpha\beta} \\ - \frac{1}{24} \delta_a^b (\gamma^{defg})_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma^c_{defg})_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{24} \delta_a^c (\gamma^{defg})_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma^b_{defg})_{\alpha\beta} \\ - \frac{1}{2} (\gamma^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^{bc}{}_{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{2880} (\gamma_a^{a'def})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \epsilon^{bc}{}_{a'def}{}^{ghijk} (\gamma_{ghijk})_{\alpha\beta} \\ + \frac{1}{2880} (\gamma^{ba'def})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \epsilon_a^c{}_{a'def}{}^{ghijk} (\gamma_{ghijk})_{\alpha\beta} \\ - \frac{1}{2880} (\gamma^{ca'def})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \epsilon_a^b{}_{a'def}{}^{ghijk} (\gamma_{ghijk})_{\alpha\beta} \\ + \frac{1}{14400} \delta_a^b (\gamma^{a'b'def})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \epsilon^c{}_{a'b'def}{}^{ghijk} (\gamma_{ghijk})_{\alpha\beta} \\ - \frac{1}{14400} \delta_a^c (\gamma^{a'b'def})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \epsilon^b{}_{a'b'def}{}^{ghijk} (\gamma_{ghijk})_{\alpha\beta} \left. \right\}. \quad (\text{B.1.7})$$

Recognizing antisymmetrized indices, rewriting dummy indices, and reordering terms gives

$$(\gamma_a)_{\eta(\alpha)}(\gamma^{bc})_{\beta})^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \left\{ (\gamma_{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^{bc[1]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + (\gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - (\gamma^{[b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c]}_a)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \right. \quad (\text{B.1.8})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \delta_a^{[b} (\gamma_{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c][1]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \delta_a^{[b} (\gamma^c]_{\alpha\beta} \delta_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_{[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^{bc[2]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& + (\gamma_{[1]a})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc[1]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - (\gamma^{[1]b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^c_{a[1]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \delta_a^{[b} (\gamma_{[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c][2]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \delta_a^{[b} (\gamma^{c][1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[1]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - (\gamma_a^{[b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^c]_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{5!4!} \epsilon^{bc[5][4]} (\gamma_{[5]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[4]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - \frac{1}{6!} \epsilon_a^{bc[5][3]} (\gamma_{[5]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[3]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{4!} \delta_a^{[b} (\gamma^{c][4]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[4]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - \frac{1}{3!} (\gamma^{[3]bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[3]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{3!} (\gamma_{[3]a}^{[b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c][3]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_a^{bc[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[2]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{5!4!} \epsilon^{[4][5]}_a{}^{[b} (\gamma_{[5]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^c_{[4]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - \frac{1}{5!5!} \delta_a^{[b} \epsilon^{c][5][\bar{5}]} (\gamma_{[5]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[\bar{5}]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

B.1.5 Fierz Expanding $(\gamma_{[1]a})_{\eta(\alpha} (\gamma^{[1]bc})_{\beta)}^{\gamma}$

Running the code

```

>>> fierz5 = fierz_expand(Ex(r'(\Gamma_{d a})_{\eta} \alpha (\Gamma^{d b c})_{\eta} \beta \gamma +
\hookrightarrow (\Gamma_{d a})_{\eta} \alpha \beta (\Gamma^{d b c})_{\eta} \alpha \beta \gamma'), [Ex(r'C_{\alpha} \beta \gamma'),
\hookrightarrow Ex(r'(\Gamma^a)_{\alpha} \beta \gamma'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^a b)_{\alpha} \beta \gamma'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^a b
\hookrightarrow c)_{\alpha} \beta \gamma'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^a b c d)_{\alpha} \beta \gamma'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^a b c d
\hookrightarrow e)_{\alpha} \beta \gamma')], [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\beta}'], [r'_{\eta}', r'_{\gamma}'])

```

gives the Fierz expansion

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma_{da})_{\eta(\alpha} (\gamma^{dbc})_{\beta)}^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \Big\{ & -9C_{\eta}^{\gamma} \delta_a^b (\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} + 9C_{\eta}^{\gamma} \delta_a^c (\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} - 8(\gamma_a)_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} \\
& - 8(\gamma^b)_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma_a^c)_{\alpha\beta} + 8(\gamma^c)_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma_a^b)_{\alpha\beta} - 7\delta_a^b (\gamma^d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma^c_d)_{\alpha\beta} \\
& + 7\delta_a^c (\gamma^d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma^b_d)_{\alpha\beta} + 8(\gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + 8(\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^c)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - 8(\gamma^c)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^b)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 2(\gamma^{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma_a^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} + 7\delta_a^b (\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^c_d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - 7\delta_a^c (\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b_d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} + 6(\gamma_a^d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc}_d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} + 6(\gamma^{bd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^c)_d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - 6(\gamma^{cd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^b)_d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{360} (\gamma^{def})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \epsilon_a^{bc}{}^{def}{}^{ghijk} (\gamma_{ghijk})_{\alpha\beta} \tag{B.1.9} \\
& + \frac{5}{2} \delta_a^b (\gamma^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^c_{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{5}{2} \delta_a^c (\gamma^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b_{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + 6(\gamma^d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^{bc}_d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - \frac{1}{3} (\gamma_a^{def})_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma^{bc}_{def})_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{3} (\gamma^{bdef})_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma_a^c_{def})_{\alpha\beta} \\
& + \frac{1}{3} (\gamma^{cdef})_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma_a^b_{def})_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{24} \delta_a^b (\gamma^{defg})_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma^c_{defg})_{\alpha\beta} \\
& + \frac{1}{24} \delta_a^c (\gamma^{defg})_{\eta}^{\gamma} (\gamma^b_{defg})_{\alpha\beta} + 2(\gamma^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^{bc}_{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& + \frac{1}{14400} \delta_a^b (\gamma^{a'b'def})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \epsilon^{c}_{a'b'def}{}^{ghijk} (\gamma_{ghijk})_{\alpha\beta} \\
& - \frac{1}{14400} \delta_a^c (\gamma^{a'b'def})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \epsilon^b_{a'b'def}{}^{ghijk} (\gamma_{ghijk})_{\alpha\beta} \Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recognizing antisymmetrized indices, rewriting dummy indices, and reordering terms gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma_{[1]a})_{\eta}(\gamma^{[1]bc})_{\beta})^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \Big\{ & 6 (\gamma_{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^{bc[1]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + 8 (\gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 8 (\gamma^{[b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c]}_a)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& + 7 \delta_a^{[b} (\gamma_{[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c][1]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 9 \delta_a^{[b} (\gamma^{c]})_{\alpha\beta} \delta_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& + 2 (\gamma_{[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^{bc[2]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 6 (\gamma_{[1]a})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc[1]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& + 6 (\gamma^{[1]b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c]}_{a[1]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{5}{2} \delta_a^{[b} (\gamma_{[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c][2]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - 7 \delta_a^{[b} (\gamma^{c][1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[1]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 8 (\gamma^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a)_{\eta}^{\gamma} + 8 (\gamma_a^{[b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c]}_a)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \quad (\text{B.1.10}) \\
& - \frac{1}{4!} \delta_a^{[b} (\gamma^{c][4]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[4]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{3} (\gamma_{[3]a}^{[b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c][3]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - \frac{1}{3} (\gamma^{[3]bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[3]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{3 \cdot 5!} \epsilon_a^{bc[5][3]} (\gamma_{[5]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[3]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - 2 (\gamma_a^{bc[2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[2]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{5!5!} \delta_a^{[b} \epsilon^{c][5][5]} (\gamma_{[5]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[5]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

B.2 Five Antisymmetric Fierz Identities

One might have noticed that the preceding five Fierz identities were all symmetric in the indices α, β . This symmetry originates in their purpose: they arise from the anticommutator of supercovariant derivatives applied to the gravitino, which is by definition symmetric in the indices α, β of the supercovariant derivatives. In §4.2, five other Fierz identities arose in the context of the fermionic holonomy. Since this is the *commutator* of supercovariant derivatives applied to the gravitino, it should be no surprise that the expressions which we wish to Fierz-expand in this context are merely the expressions in the prior section except *antisymmetric* in the indices α, β . Of course, this means completely different Fierz expansions, since the relevant basis elements are now the antisymmetric ones rather than the symmetric ones.

B.2.1 Fierz Expanding $(\gamma^{[2]})_{\eta}(\gamma_{[2]abc})_{\beta})^{\gamma}$

Running the code

```

>>> fierz6 = fierz_expand(Ex(r'(\Gamma^{d e})_{\eta} \alpha) (\Gamma_{d e a b}
→ c)_{\beta} \gamma - (\Gamma^{d e})_{\eta} \beta) (\Gamma_{d e a b}
→ c)_{\alpha} \gamma), [Ex(r'C_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta}'),
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b})_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c})_{\alpha \beta}'),
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c d})_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c d e})_{\alpha \beta}')],
→ [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\beta}'], [r'_{\eta}', r'_{\gamma}'])

```

gives the Fierz expansion

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma^{[2]})_{\eta}(\gamma_{[2]abc})_{\beta})^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \Big\{ & 56 (\gamma_{abc})_{\alpha\beta} C_{\eta}^{\gamma} + 28 (\gamma_{abcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 28 (\gamma_{bcd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& + 28 (\gamma_{acd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_b^d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 28 (\gamma_{abd})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_c^d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} + 56 C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abc})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \quad (\text{B.2.1}) \\
& - 4 (\gamma_{bcde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + 4 (\gamma_{acde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_b^{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 4 (\gamma_{abde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_c^{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - 4 (\gamma_a^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{bcde})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + 4 (\gamma_b^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{acde})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 4 (\gamma_c^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{abde})_{\eta}^{\gamma}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{72}\epsilon_{abcdefg}{}^{hijk}(\gamma_{hijk})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{defg})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} + \frac{2}{3}(\gamma_a{}^{def})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{bcdef})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} \\
& -\frac{2}{3}(\gamma_b{}^{def})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{acdef})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} + \frac{2}{3}(\gamma_c{}^{def})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{abdef})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} \\
& + \frac{1}{180}\epsilon_{abcdefgh}{}^{ijkl}(\gamma_{ijkl})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{defgh})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} \Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recognizing antisymmetrized indices, rewriting dummy indices, and reordering terms gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma^{[2]})_{\eta[\alpha}(\gamma_{[2]abc})_{\beta]}{}^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \Big\{ & 56C_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{abc})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} + 56(\gamma_{abc})_{\alpha\beta}C_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} - 14(\gamma_{[1][ab})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{c]}^{[1]})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} \\
& - 2(\gamma^{[2]}_{[a})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{bc][2])}_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{180}\epsilon_{abc}{}^{[3][5]}(\gamma_{[3]})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{[5]})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} \\
& + 28(\gamma_{abc[1]})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{[1]})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} - 2(\gamma_{[2][ab})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{c]}^{[2]})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} \\
& - \frac{1}{72}\epsilon_{abc}{}^{[4][\bar{4}]}(\gamma_{[4]})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{[\bar{4}]})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{3}(\gamma^{[3]}_{[a})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{bc][3]})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} \Big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.2.2}$$

B.2.2 Fierz Expanding $(\gamma_{[2]})_{\eta[\alpha}(\gamma^{[2]c})_{\beta]}{}^{\gamma}$

Running the code

```
>>> fierz7 = fierz_expand(Ex(r'(\Gamma_{a b})_{\eta \alpha} (\Gamma^{a b c})_{\beta}^{\gamma} -
→ (\Gamma_{a b})_{\eta \beta} (\Gamma^{a b c})_{\alpha}^{\gamma}'), [Ex(r'C_{\alpha \beta}^{\gamma}'),
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b})_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b}
→ c)_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c d})_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c d
→ e})_{\alpha \beta}')], [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\beta}'], [r'_{\eta}', r'_{\gamma}']])
```

gives the Fierz expansion

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma_{[2]})_{\eta[\alpha}(\gamma^{[2]c})_{\beta]}{}^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \Big\{ & 90C_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^c)_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} - 13(\gamma_{ab}{}^c)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{ab})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} - (\gamma_{ab}{}^c d)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{abd})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} \\
& + (\gamma^{abd})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{ab}{}^c d)_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{4}(\gamma^{abde})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{ab}{}^c de)_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} \Big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.2.3}$$

Rewriting dummy indices and reordering terms gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma_{[2]})_{\eta[\alpha}(\gamma^{[2]c})_{\beta]}{}^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \Big\{ & 90C_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^c)_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} - 13(\gamma^{c[2]})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{[2]})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} - (\gamma_{[3]})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{[3]c})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} \\
& - (\gamma^{c[3]})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{[3]})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{4}(\gamma_{[4]})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{[4]c})_{\eta}{}^{\gamma} \Big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.2.4}$$

B.2.3 Fierz Expanding $(\gamma_{[1]})_{\eta[\alpha}(\gamma^{[1]c})_{\beta]}{}^{\gamma}$

Running the code

```
>>> fierz8 = fierz_expand(Ex(r'(\Gamma_a)_{\eta \alpha} (\Gamma^a c)_{\beta}^{\gamma} -
→ (\Gamma_a)_{\eta \beta} (\Gamma^a c)_{\alpha}^{\gamma}'), [Ex(r'C_{\alpha \beta}^{\gamma}'),
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^a)_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b})_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b}
→ c)_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c d})_{\alpha \beta}'), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c d
→ e})_{\alpha \beta}')], [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\beta}'], [r'_{\eta}', r'_{\gamma}']])
```

gives the Fierz expansion

$$(\gamma_{[1]})_{\eta[\alpha}(\gamma^{[1]c})_{\beta]}^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \left\{ -10C_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^c)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 3(\gamma_{ab}^c)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{ab})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{2}{3}(\gamma_{ab}^c d)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{abd})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{2}{3}(\gamma^{abd})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{ab}^c d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{12}(\gamma^{abde})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{ab}^c de)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \right\}. \quad (\text{B.2.5})$$

Rewriting dummy indices and reordering terms gives

$$(\gamma_{[1]})_{\eta[\alpha}(\gamma^{[1]c})_{\beta]}^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \left\{ -10C_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^c)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 3(\gamma^{c[2]})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{[2]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{2}{3}(\gamma_{[3]})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{[3]c})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{2}{3}(\gamma^{c[3]})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_{[3]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{12}(\gamma_{[4]})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{[4]c})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \right\}. \quad (\text{B.2.6})$$

B.2.4 Fierz Expanding $(\gamma_a)_{\eta[\alpha}(\gamma^{bc})_{\beta]}^{\gamma}$

Running the code

```
>>> fierz9 = fierz_expand(Ex(r'(\Gamma_{a})_{\eta \alpha} (\Gamma^{b c})_{\eta \beta}^{\gamma} -
→ (\Gamma_{a})_{\eta \beta} (\Gamma^{b c})_{\eta \alpha}^{\gamma}), [Ex(r'C_{\alpha \beta}^{\gamma}),
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a})_{\alpha \beta}^{\gamma}), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b})_{\alpha \beta}^{\gamma}), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c})_{\alpha \beta}^{\gamma}),
→ Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c d})_{\alpha \beta}^{\gamma}), Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c d e})_{\alpha \beta}^{\gamma})], [r'_{\alpha}', r'_{\beta}'], [r'_{\eta}', r'_{\gamma}'])
```

gives the Fierz expansion

$$(\gamma_a)_{\eta[\alpha}(\gamma^{bc})_{\beta]}^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \left\{ -(\gamma_a^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} C_{\eta}^{\gamma} + (\gamma_a^{bc} d)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \delta_a^b C_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^c)_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \delta_a^c C_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^b)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \right. \\ - (\gamma^{bc} d)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_a^d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - (\gamma_a^c d)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{bd})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + (\gamma_a^b d)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{cd})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ - \frac{1}{2}\delta_a^b(\gamma^{cde})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_a^c(\gamma^{bde})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - C_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_a^{bc})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ + \frac{1}{2}(\gamma^{bcde})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_a^{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_a^c de)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{bde})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_a^b de)_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{cde})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ + \frac{1}{6}\delta_a^b(\gamma^{cdef})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{def})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{6}\delta_a^c(\gamma^{bdef})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{def})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \quad (\text{B.2.7}) \\ + \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_a^{de})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{bc} de)_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{2}(\gamma^{bde})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_a^c de)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{2}(\gamma^{cde})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_a^b de)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ - \frac{1}{576}\epsilon_a^{bc}{}_{defg}{}^{hijk}(\gamma_{hijk})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{defg})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{6}\delta_a^b(\gamma^{def})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{cdef})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ - \frac{1}{6}\delta_a^c(\gamma^{def})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{bdef})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{6}(\gamma_a^{def})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{bcdef})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ - \frac{1}{6}(\gamma^{bdef})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_a^c def)_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{6}(\gamma^{cdef})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_a^b def)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ - \frac{1}{720}\epsilon_a^{bc}{}_{defgh}{}^{ijkl}(\gamma_{ijkl})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{defgh})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{24}\delta_a^b(\gamma^{defg})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{cdefg})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\ \left. + \frac{1}{24}\delta_a^c(\gamma^{defg})_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{bdefg})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \right\}.$$

Recognizing antisymmetrized indices, rewriting dummy indices, and reordering terms gives

$$(\gamma_a)_{\eta[\alpha}(\gamma^{bc})_{\beta]}^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \left\{ -\delta_a^{[b} C_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma^{c]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - C_{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_a^{bc})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - (\gamma_a^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} C_{\eta}^{\gamma} \right. \quad (\text{B.2.8})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - (\gamma^{[1]bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[1]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + (\gamma_{[1]a}^{[b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c[1]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{2} \delta_a^{[b} (\gamma^{c][2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[2]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& + \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_{[2]a})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc[2]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{2} (\gamma^{[2][b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c]}_{a[2]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& + \frac{1}{6} \delta_a^{[b} (\gamma_{[3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c[3]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + (\gamma_a^{bc[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[1]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& + \frac{1}{720} \epsilon_a^{bc[3][5]} (\gamma_{[3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[5]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{2} (\gamma^{[2]bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[2]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_{[2]a}^{[b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c][2]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{6} \delta_a^{[b} (\gamma^{c][3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[3]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - \frac{1}{576} \epsilon_a^{bc[4][\bar{4}]} (\gamma_{[4]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[\bar{4}]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{6} (\gamma_{[3]a})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc[3]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - \frac{1}{6} (\gamma^{[3][b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c]}_{a[3]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{24} \delta_a^{[b} (\gamma_{[4]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c][4]})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

B.2.5 Fierz Expanding $(\gamma_{[1]a})_{\eta[\alpha} (\gamma^{[1]bc})_{\beta]}^{\gamma}$

Running the code

```

>>> fierz10 = fierz_expand(Ex(r'(\Gamma_{d a})_{\eta} \alpha (\Gamma^{d b c})_{\eta} \beta)_{\gamma}
\rightarrow - (\Gamma_{d a})_{\eta} \alpha (\Gamma^{d b c})_{\eta} \beta)_{\gamma}, [Ex(r'C_{\alpha}
\rightarrow \beta)_{\eta}, Ex(r'(\Gamma^a)_{\alpha} \beta)_{\eta}, Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b})_{\alpha} \beta)_{\eta},
\rightarrow Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c})_{\alpha} \beta)_{\eta}, Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c d})_{\alpha} \beta)_{\eta},
\rightarrow Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b c d e})_{\alpha} \beta)_{\eta}], [r'_{\alpha}, r'_{\beta}], [r'_{\eta},
\rightarrow r'_{\gamma}])

```

gives the Fierz expansion

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma_{[1]a})_{\eta[\alpha} (\gamma^{[1]bc})_{\beta]}^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{16} \Big\{ & - 8 (\gamma_a^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} C_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 6 (\gamma_a^{bc d})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} + 9 \delta_a^b C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^c)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - 9 \delta_a^c C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 6 (\gamma^{bc d})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^d)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 6 (\gamma_a^c d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bd})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& + 6 (\gamma_a^b d)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{cd})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{5}{2} \delta_a^b (\gamma^{c de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& + \frac{5}{2} \delta_a^c (\gamma^{b de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + 8 C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^{bc})_{\eta}^{\gamma} - 2 (\gamma^{bc de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^{de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - 2 (\gamma_a^c de)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bde})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + 2 (\gamma_a^b de)_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{cde})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \delta_a^b (\gamma^{c def})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{def})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{2} \delta_a^c (\gamma^{b def})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{def})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& + 2 (\gamma_a^{de})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc de})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + 2 (\gamma^{bde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^c de)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - 2 (\gamma^{cde})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^b de)_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{2} \delta_a^b (\gamma^{def})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^c def)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \delta_a^c (\gamma^{def})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b def)_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{3} (\gamma_a^{def})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc def})_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& + \frac{1}{3} (\gamma^{bdef})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^c def)_{\eta}^{\gamma} - \frac{1}{3} (\gamma^{cdef})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^b def)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - \frac{1}{360} \epsilon_a^{bc defgh} i^{jkl} (\gamma_{ijk})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{defgh})_{\eta}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{24} \delta_a^b (\gamma^{defg})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^c defg)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \\
& - \frac{1}{24} \delta_a^c (\gamma^{defg})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^b defg)_{\eta}^{\gamma} \Big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.2.9}$$

Recognizing antisymmetrized indices, rewriting dummy indices, and reordering terms gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma_{[1]a})_\eta (\gamma^{[1]bc})_\beta]^\gamma = \frac{1}{16} \Big\{ & 9\delta_a^{[b} C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c]}_\eta)^\gamma + 8C_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_a^{bc})_\eta)^\gamma - 8(\gamma_a^{bc})_{\alpha\beta} C_\eta^\gamma \\
& - 6(\gamma^{[1]bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[1]})_\eta)^\gamma + 6(\gamma_{[1]a}^{[b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c][1]})_\eta)^\gamma \\
& - \frac{5}{2}\delta_a^{[b} (\gamma^{c][2]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[2]})_\eta)^\gamma + 2(\gamma_{[2]a})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc[2]})_\eta)^\gamma \\
& - 2(\gamma^{[2]b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c]}_{a[2]})_\eta)^\gamma + \frac{1}{2}\delta_a^{[b} (\gamma_{[3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c][3]})_\eta)^\gamma \\
& + \frac{1}{360}\epsilon_a^{bc[3][5]} (\gamma_{[3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[5]})_\eta)^\gamma - 6(\gamma_a^{bc[1]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[1]})_\eta)^\gamma \\
& - 2(\gamma^{[2]bc})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{a[2]})_\eta)^\gamma + 2(\gamma_{[2]a}^{[b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c][2]})_\eta)^\gamma \\
& - \frac{1}{2}\delta_a^{[b} (\gamma^{c][3]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma_{[3]})_\eta)^\gamma - \frac{1}{3}(\gamma_{[3]a})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{bc[3]})_\eta)^\gamma \\
& + \frac{1}{3}(\gamma^{[3]b})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c]}_{a[3]})_\eta)^\gamma + \frac{1}{24}\delta_a^{[b} (\gamma_{[4]})_{\alpha\beta} (\gamma^{c][4]})_\eta)^\gamma \Big\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.2.10}$$

C Action Normalization

As part of the solution of the 11D supergravity multiplet, we apply a convention which fixes the coefficients of the bosonic parts of the action (1.1.4), viz., ℓ, n . Here, we frame this convention for actions which have no interaction terms, so that each field A has its own free-field Lagrangian density \mathcal{L}_A . The rule essentially regards 0-brane reduction: if a dynamical field A (i.e., a field which has non-trivial equations of motion) is replaced with a field \hat{A} with only time dependence (i.e., no spatial dependence), then the Lagrangian density takes the form of a standard 1D mass-1 kinetic energy term

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_A = \frac{1}{2}(\dot{\hat{A}})^2. \tag{C.0.1}$$

If A is a gauge field, then the requirement is that replacement with a solely time-dependent field yields a Lagrangian density for A which is the sum of standard 1D mass-1 kinetic energy terms, plus other terms not of the form of a squared derivative. If, on the other hand, A is an auxiliary (i.e., non-dynamical) field,¹³³ then we simply require that its free-field Lagrangian be of the form

$$\mathcal{L}_A = \frac{1}{2}A^2. \tag{C.0.2}$$

Since use of this normalization convention varies in the literature, we explicate the satisfaction of the convention for the actions corresponding to several multiplets before computing the implications of the convention for 11D supergravity.

C.1 4D Chiral Multiplet

As a first example, we consider the 4D chiral multiplet. The Lagrangian densities for the dynamical bosons in the multiplet are¹³⁴

$$\mathcal{L}_A = -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_a A)(\partial^a A) \tag{C.1.1}$$

¹³³ All of the fields in the 11D supergravity multiplet are dynamical, but we include the non-dynamical case for completeness and for the example multiplet solution in §5.12.

¹³⁴ See §2 of [8] for a compilation of Lagrangian densities for 4D multiplets and their 0-brane reductions.

$$\mathcal{L}_B = -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_a B)(\partial^a B). \quad (\text{C.1.2})$$

Replace the bosons with fields only dependent on time, as below.

$$\begin{aligned} A(t, \mathbf{x}) &\mapsto \hat{A}(t) \\ B(t, \mathbf{x}) &\mapsto \hat{B}(t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.1.3})$$

Since the fields only depend on time, all components of the four-gradient should vanish except the time-component. Hence, the Lagrangian density for A becomes (using the signature $\eta^{ab} = \text{diag}(-1, +1, +1, +1)$)

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_A &= -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_a \hat{A})(\partial^a \hat{A}) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_0 \hat{A})(\partial^0 \hat{A}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\dot{\hat{A}})^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.1.4})$$

and the Lagrangian density for B similarly becomes

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_B = \frac{1}{2}(\dot{\hat{B}})^2. \quad (\text{C.1.5})$$

Also, the Lagrangian densities for the auxiliary bosons in the multiplet are

$$\mathcal{L}_F = \frac{1}{2}F^2 \quad (\text{C.1.6})$$

$$\mathcal{L}_G = \frac{1}{2}G^2. \quad (\text{C.1.7})$$

Therefore, the 4D chiral multiplet's action satisfies our convention.

C.2 4D Vector Multiplet

We now consider a multiplet with a gauge field, making the 0-brane reduction of the field's Lagrangian a sum of 1D kinetic energies. The Lagrangian for the dynamical vector boson in the 4D vector multiplet is

$$\mathcal{L}_A = -\frac{1}{4}F_{ab}F^{ab}, \quad (\text{C.2.1})$$

where

$$F_{ab} = \partial_a A_b - \partial_b A_a. \quad (\text{C.2.2})$$

Replace the vector field with a field only dependent on time, as below.

$$A_a(t, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto \hat{A}_a(t). \quad (\text{C.2.3})$$

This makes

$$F_{ab} \mapsto \hat{F}_{ab} = \partial_a \hat{A}_b - \partial_b \hat{A}_a. \quad (\text{C.2.4})$$

The Lagrangian becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathcal{L}}_A &= -\frac{1}{4}\hat{F}_{ab}\hat{F}^{ab} \\
&= -\frac{1}{4}(\partial_a\hat{A}_b - \partial_b\hat{A}_a)(\partial^a\hat{A}^b - \partial^b\hat{A}^a) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_a\hat{A}_b)(\partial^a\hat{A}^b) + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_a\hat{A}_b)(\partial^b\hat{A}^a) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_0\hat{A}_b)(\partial^0\hat{A}^b) + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_0\hat{A}_0)(\partial^0\hat{A}^0) \\
&= -\sum_{i=1}^3(\partial_0\hat{A}_i)(\partial^0\hat{A}^i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^3(\partial_0\hat{A}_i)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(\dot{A}_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\dot{A}_2)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\dot{A}_3)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.2.5}$$

Hence, even though the 0-brane reduction was a bit subtler, our convention for the dynamical boson is still perfectly satisfied. The convention for the auxiliary boson is also satisfied, since the Lagrangian density for the auxiliary pseudoscalar boson of the 4D vector multiplet is

$$\mathcal{L}_d = \frac{1}{2}d^2. \tag{C.2.6}$$

C.3 4D Tensor Multiplet

The normalized Lagrangian densities for the scalar and tensor bosons in the 4D tensor multiplet are

$$\mathcal{L}_\varphi = -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_a\varphi)(\partial^a\varphi) \tag{C.3.1}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_B = -\frac{1}{12}H_{abc}H^{abc}, \tag{C.3.2}$$

where H_{abc} is as in (5.8.2). When we say normalized, we mean modified to fit our convention, i.e., the convention established by the standard examples of the chiral and vector multiplets. Often, however, the tensor field's Lagrangian density is written with a coefficient of $-1/3$ rather than $-1/12$. (See, for instance, (2.17) of [8].) We demonstrate now that the coefficient we have chosen fits our convention. Replace the scalar and tensor fields with fields only dependent on time, as below.

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(t, \mathbf{x}) &\longmapsto \hat{\varphi}(t) \\
B_{ab}(t, \mathbf{x}) &\longmapsto \hat{B}_{ab}(t).
\end{aligned} \tag{C.3.3}$$

This makes

$$H_{abc} \longmapsto \hat{H}_{abc} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_{[a}\hat{B}_{bc]}. \tag{C.3.4}$$

The same calculation as in Appendix C.1 gives

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_\varphi = \frac{1}{2}(\dot{\varphi})^2. \tag{C.3.5}$$

The Lagrangian density for the tensor field becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathcal{L}}_B &= -\frac{1}{12} \hat{H}_{abc} \hat{H}^{abc} \\
&= -\frac{1}{48} \left\{ \left[\partial_{[a} \hat{B}_{bc]} \right] \left[\partial^{[a} \hat{B}^{bc]} \right] \right\} \\
&= -\frac{1}{8} \left\{ \left[\partial_a \hat{B}_{bc} \right] \left[\partial^{[a} \hat{B}^{bc]} \right] \right\} \\
&= -\frac{1}{4} \left\{ (\partial_a \hat{B}_{bc}) (\partial^a \hat{B}^{bc} - \partial^b \hat{B}^{ac} + \partial^c \hat{B}^{ab}) \right\} \\
&= -\frac{1}{4} \left\{ (\partial_0 \hat{B}_{bc}) (\partial^0 \hat{B}^{bc}) - (\partial_0 \hat{B}_{0c}) (\partial^0 \hat{B}^{0c}) - (\partial_0 \hat{B}_{b0}) (\partial^0 \hat{B}^{b0}) \right\} \\
&= -\frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{j=1}^3 (\partial_0 \hat{B}_{ij}) (\partial_0 \hat{B}^{ij}) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^3 (\partial_0 \hat{B}_{ij})^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{j=i+1}^3 (\partial_0 \hat{B}_{ij})^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} (\dot{\hat{B}}_{12})^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\dot{\hat{B}}_{13})^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\dot{\hat{B}}_{23})^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.3.6}$$

Hence, the action is properly normalized. Notice that using a coefficient of $-1/3$ in (C.3.2) would have resulted in coefficients of 2, rather than $1/2$, in (C.3.6).

C.4 11D Supergravity Multiplet

Having discussed a few examples, we now use our convention to fix ℓ, n in (1.1.4). The Lagrangian densities for the graviton and three-form in the 11D supergravity multiplet are

$$\mathcal{L}_h = \ell \left\{ -\frac{1}{4} c^{abc} c_{abc} + \frac{1}{2} c^{abc} c_{cab} + (c^a{}_b{}^b)^2 \right\} \tag{C.4.1}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_A = \frac{n}{48} \left\{ \left[\partial_{[a} A_{bcd]} \right] \left[\partial^{[a} A^{bcd]} \right] \right\}. \tag{C.4.2}$$

Replace the graviton and three-form with fields only dependent on time, as below.

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{ab}(t, \mathbf{x}) &\longmapsto \hat{h}_{ab}(t) \\
A_{abc}(t, \mathbf{x}) &\longmapsto \hat{A}_{abc}(t)
\end{aligned} \tag{C.4.3}$$

This makes

$$c_{abc} \longmapsto \hat{c}_{abc} = \partial_a \hat{h}_{bc} - \partial_b \hat{h}_{ac}. \tag{C.4.4}$$

Since the fields only depend on time, all components of the 11-gradient other than the time-component vanish. Hence, the graviton Lagrangian becomes (using the signature from Appendix

A)

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathcal{L}}_h &= \ell \left\{ -\frac{1}{4} \hat{c}^{abc} \hat{c}_{abc} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{c}^{abc} \hat{c}_{cab} + (\hat{c}^a{}_b{}^b)^2 \right\} \\
&= \ell \left\{ -\frac{1}{4} (\partial^a \hat{h}^{bc} - \partial^b \hat{h}^{ac}) (\partial_a \hat{h}_{bc} - \partial_b \hat{h}_{ac}) + \frac{1}{2} (\partial^a \hat{h}^{bc} - \partial^b \hat{h}^{ac}) (\partial_c \hat{h}_{ab} - \partial_a \hat{h}_{cb}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\partial^a \hat{h}_b{}^b - \partial_b \hat{h}^{ab}) (\partial_a \hat{h}_c{}^c - \partial_c \hat{h}_a{}^c) \right\} \\
&= \ell \left\{ -(\partial^a \hat{h}^{bc}) (\partial_a \hat{h}_{bc}) + (\partial^a \hat{h}^{bc}) (\partial_b \hat{h}_{ac}) + (\partial^a \hat{h}_b{}^b) (\partial_a \hat{h}_c{}^c) - 2(\partial^a \hat{h}_b{}^b) (\partial_c \hat{h}_a{}^c) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\partial_b \hat{h}^{ab}) (\partial_c \hat{h}_a{}^c) \right\} \\
&= \ell \left\{ -(\partial^0 \hat{h}^{bc}) (\partial_0 \hat{h}_{bc}) + (\partial^0 \hat{h}^{0c}) (\partial_0 \hat{h}_{0c}) + (\partial^0 \hat{h}^{b0}) (\partial_0 \hat{h}_{b0}) + (\partial^0 \hat{h}_b{}^b) (\partial_0 \hat{h}_c{}^c) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - (\partial^0 \hat{h}_b{}^b) (\partial_0 \hat{h}_0{}^0) - (\partial^0 \hat{h}_0{}^0) (\partial_0 \hat{h}_c{}^c) \right\} \tag{C.4.5} \\
&= -\ell \sum_{i=1}^{10} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{10} (\partial^0 \hat{h}^{ij}) (\partial_0 \hat{h}_{ij}) + \ell \sum_{i=1}^{10} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{10} (\partial^0 \hat{h}_i{}^i) (\partial_0 \hat{h}_j{}^j) \\
&= \ell \sum_{i=1}^{10} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{10} (\partial_0 \hat{h}_{ij})^2 - \ell \sum_{i=1}^{10} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{10} (\partial_0 \hat{h}_{ii}) (\partial_0 \hat{h}_{jj}) \\
&= 2\ell \sum_{i=1}^9 \sum_{j=i+1}^{10} (\dot{\hat{h}}_{ij})^2 - 2\ell \sum_{i=1}^9 \sum_{j=i+1}^{10} \dot{\hat{h}}_{ii} \dot{\hat{h}}_{jj}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\ell = \frac{1}{4}. \tag{C.4.6}$$

The substitution makes the three-form Lagrangian become

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mathcal{L}}_A &= \frac{n}{48} \left\{ \left[\partial_{[a} \hat{A}_{bcd]} \right] \left[\partial^{[a} \hat{A}^{bcd]} \right] \right\} \\
&= \frac{n}{2} \left\{ \left[\partial_a \hat{A}_{bcd} \right] \left[\partial^{[a} \hat{A}^{bcd]} \right] \right\} \\
&= 3n \left\{ (\partial_a \hat{A}_{bcd}) (\partial^a \hat{A}^{bcd} - \partial^b \hat{A}^{acd} + \partial^c \hat{A}^{abd} - \partial^d \hat{A}^{abc}) \right\} \\
&= 3n \left\{ (\partial_a \hat{A}_{bcd}) (\partial^a \hat{A}^{bcd}) - (\partial_a \hat{A}_{bcd}) (\partial^b \hat{A}^{acd}) + (\partial_a \hat{A}_{bcd}) (\partial^c \hat{A}^{abd}) - (\partial_a \hat{A}_{bcd}) (\partial^d \hat{A}^{abc}) \right\} \\
&= 3n \left\{ (\partial_0 \hat{A}_{bcd}) (\partial^0 \hat{A}^{bcd}) - (\partial_0 \hat{A}_{0cd}) (\partial^0 \hat{A}^{0cd}) + (\partial_0 \hat{A}_{b0d}) (\partial^0 \hat{A}^{0bd}) - (\partial_0 \hat{A}_{bc0}) (\partial^0 \hat{A}^{0bc}) \right\} \tag{C.4.7} \\
&= 3n \left\{ (\partial_0 \hat{A}_{bcd}) (\partial^0 \hat{A}^{bcd}) - (\partial_0 \hat{A}_{0cd}) (\partial^0 \hat{A}^{0cd}) - (\partial_0 \hat{A}_{b0d}) (\partial^0 \hat{A}^{b0d}) - (\partial_0 \hat{A}_{bc0}) (\partial^0 \hat{A}^{bc0}) \right\} \\
&= 3n \sum_{i=1}^{10} \sum_{j=1}^{10} \sum_{k=1}^{10} (\partial_0 \hat{A}_{ijk}) (\partial^0 \hat{A}^{ijk})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -3n \sum_{i=1}^{10} \sum_{j=1}^{10} \sum_{k=1}^{10} (\dot{A}_{ijk})^2 \\
&= -18n \sum_{i=1}^8 \sum_{j=i+1}^9 \sum_{k=j+1}^{10} (\dot{A}_{ijk})^2.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$n = -\frac{1}{36}. \quad (\text{C.4.8})$$

Note that our convention as applied to the graviton, like the convention as applied to the tensor boson in the tensor multiplet, differs somewhat from the literature. In particular, as seen in (3.10) and (4.10) of [8] for 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ minimal and non-minimal supergravity, respectively, the coefficient of the graviton part of the Lagrangian density is often chosen so that the coefficients of the graviton terms in the 0-brane-reduced Lagrangian all equal 1. Nevertheless, we choose to be consistent with the most broadly used convention following the chiral and vector multiplets.

D Propositions on Arbitrary-Spin Fermions

Proposition D.1. If $\Psi_{a_1 \dots a_s}{}^\gamma$ is a (Lorentz-symmetric) spin- $(s+1/2)$ fermion, then a combination of terms of the form $\mathcal{E} = c_0 (\gamma^b)_\eta{}^\gamma \partial_b \Psi_{a_1 \dots a_s}{}^\eta - \sum_{i=1}^s c_i (\gamma^b)_\eta{}^\gamma \partial_{a_i} \Psi_{b U_i}{}^\eta$ is gauge-invariant if and only if it is proportional to the left-hand side of (5.9.3), i.e., if and only if $c_0 = c_1 = \dots = c_s$.

Proof. We use the notation of §5.9, particularly (5.9.1) and (5.9.3). Any multiple of the left-hand side of the equation of motion (5.9.3) is trivially of the form \mathcal{E} . Such a multiple is always gauge-invariant,¹³⁵ for letting $V_{ij} = U_i \setminus a_j$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_G \mathcal{E} &\propto (\gamma^b)_\eta{}^\gamma \partial_b \delta_G \Psi_{a_1 \dots a_s}{}^\eta - \sum_{i=1}^s (\gamma^b)_\eta{}^\gamma \partial_{a_i} \delta_G \Psi_{b U_i}{}^\eta \\
&= (\gamma^b)_\eta{}^\gamma \partial_b \left(\sum_{i=1}^s \partial_{a_i} \kappa_{U_i}{}^\eta \right) - \sum_{i=1}^s (\gamma^b)_\eta{}^\gamma \partial_{a_i} \left(\partial_b \kappa_{U_i}{}^\eta + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^s \partial_{a_j} \kappa_{b V_{ij}}{}^\eta \right) \\
&= - \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^s \partial_{a_i a_j} (\gamma^b)_\eta{}^\gamma \kappa_{b V_{ij}}{}^\eta \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.0.1})$$

¹³⁵ This side of the proposition is necessary in order for (5.9.3) to be a true equation of motion. The proof presented here is intended to be simple and accessible without further machinery, as well as reminiscent of the procedure in §5.8. In [42], gauge-invariance follows immediately from considerations regarding generalized Christoffel symbols.

where the last step used (5.9.2). Conversely, suppose that \mathcal{E} is gauge-invariant. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \delta_G \mathcal{E} \\
&= c_0 (\gamma^b)_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_b \delta_G \Psi_{a_1 \dots a_s}{}^\eta - \sum_{i=1}^s c_i (\gamma^b)_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_{a_i} \delta_G \Psi_{b U_i}{}^\eta \\
&= c_0 (\gamma^b)_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_b \left(\sum_{i=1}^s \partial_{a_i} \kappa_{U_i}{}^\eta \right) - \sum_{i=1}^s c_i (\gamma^b)_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_{a_i} \left(\partial_b \kappa_{U_i}{}^\eta + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^s \partial_{a_j} \kappa_{b V_{ij}}{}^\eta \right) \\
&= (\gamma^b)_\eta {}^\gamma (c_0 - c_i) \partial_b \left(\sum_{i=1}^s \partial_{a_i} \kappa_{U_i}{}^\eta \right) - \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^s c_i \partial_{a_i a_j} (\gamma^b)_\eta {}^\gamma \kappa_{b V_{ij}}{}^\eta \\
&= (\gamma^b)_\eta {}^\gamma (c_0 - c_i) \partial_b \left(\sum_{i=1}^s \partial_{a_i} \kappa_{U_i}{}^\eta \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{D.0.2}$$

so that the obvious independence of the terms in the remaining sum requires $c_0 = c_1 = \dots = c_s \equiv c$, and the combination of terms is actually c times the equation of motion, as desired. \square

Proposition D.2. If $\Psi_{a_1 \dots a_s}{}^\gamma$ is a (Lorentz-symmetric) spin- $(s + 1/2)$ fermion, then

$$(\gamma^E)_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_a \Psi_{E \setminus \{a\}}{}^\eta = 0, \tag{D.0.3}$$

where E is a set of indices, $a \in E$, and $|E| = s + 1$.

Proof. If $s = 0$, then $E \setminus \{a\} = \emptyset$ and (D.0.3) is simply the Dirac equation (1.2.4). If $s = 1$, then the Rarita-Schwinger equation (2.4.7) shows that

$$0 = (\gamma^a)_\eta {}^\rho \partial_{[a} \Psi_{b]}{}^\eta. \tag{D.0.4}$$

Multiplying by $(\gamma^b)_\rho {}^\gamma$ gives

$$0 = (\gamma^a \gamma^b)_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_{[a} \Psi_{b]}{}^\eta = (\gamma^{[a} \gamma^{b]})_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_a \Psi_b{}^\eta = 2 (\gamma^{ab})_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_a \Psi_b{}^\eta, \tag{D.0.5}$$

so that

$$(\gamma^{ab})_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_a \Psi_b{}^\eta = 0, \tag{D.0.6}$$

which is (D.0.3) for $s = 1$.¹³⁶ Finally, if $s > 1$, then let $a', a'' \in E \setminus \{a\}$ and $E' = E \setminus \{a', a''\}$. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\gamma^E)_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_a \Psi_{E \setminus \{a\}}{}^\eta &\propto (\gamma^{a' a'' E'})_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_a \Psi_{a' a'' (E' \setminus \{a\})}{}^\eta && \text{A negative may be introduced.} \\
&= (\gamma^{a' a'' E'})_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_a \Psi_{a'' a' (E' \setminus \{a\})}{}^\eta && \Psi \text{ is symmetric.} \\
&= - (\gamma^{a'' a' E'})_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_a \Psi_{a'' a' (E' \setminus \{a\})}{}^\eta && \gamma \text{ is antisymmetric.} \\
&= - (\gamma^{a' a'' E'})_\eta {}^\gamma \partial_a \Psi_{a' a'' (E' \setminus \{a\})}{}^\eta && \text{We can rename dummy-index pairs.}
\end{aligned}$$

¹³⁶ This proof for $s = 1$ comes from the discussion following (5.4) in [13].

A quantity equal to negative itself is zero, so that

$$(\gamma^E)_\eta{}^\gamma \partial_a \Psi_{E \setminus \{a\}}{}^\eta = 0, \quad (\text{D.0.7})$$

proving (D.0.3) for $s > 1$. \square

Corollary D.3. The left-hand side of (D.0.3) is a Clifford-algebra multiple of the equation of motion for $\Psi_{E \setminus \{a\}}{}^\gamma$.

Proof. This is really more a corollary of the proof of proposition D.2 than of the proposition itself. It was shown in that proof that if $s = 0$, the left-hand side of (D.0.3) is precisely the left-hand side of the Dirac equation (1.2.4); that if $s = 1$, the left-hand side of (D.0.3) is obtained by multiplying the Rarita-Schwinger equation (2.4.7) by a 1-gamma matrix and a number; and if $s > 1$, then the left-hand side of (D.0.3) is zero by index considerations irrespective of the equation of motion, making it a trivial multiple of the equation of motion. \square

E Indexbracket Hexadecimals

The spinor-index calculus constructed in §5 depends on Cadabra’s indexbrackets as crutches, in the sense that the distinction between vector and spinor indices is rendered by SusyPy as the distinction between indices within and indices outside indexbrackets. While the operations which must be applied to the indices outside indexbrackets are primarily original constructions in SusyPy, it is still necessary that Cadabra’s ordinary functions apply to the contents of an indexbracket, which form a tensor without spinor indices which should, in theory, be completely suitable for treatment by Cadabra. Paramount among these ordinary functions is Cadabra’s `canonicalise()`. However, `canonicalise()` does not pass into the contents of an indexbracket to canonicalize ordinary Lorentz indices within the indexbracket. For example, consider the expression $\gamma^{ab}\Theta_{ba} + \gamma^{ab}\Theta_{ab}$, where Θ_{ab} is an arbitrary rank-2 tensor. It is easy to see that this expression is zero if one canonicalizes the Lorentz indices of the first term by exploiting the antisymmetry of the gamma matrix, for

$$\gamma^{ab}\Theta_{ba} + \gamma^{ab}\Theta_{ab} = \gamma^{ba}\Theta_{ab} + \gamma^{ab}\Theta_{ab} = -\gamma^{ab}\Theta_{ab} + \gamma^{ab}\Theta_{ab} = 0. \quad (\text{E.0.1})$$

Indeed, running the code below yields the value zero for this expression.

```
>>> ex = Ex(r'\Gamma^{a b} \Theta_{b a} + \Gamma^{a b} \Theta_{a b}')
>>> canonicalise(ex)
>>> collect_terms(ex)
```

Now introduce indexbrackets, say by making the expression $(\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta} (\Theta_{ba})_{\gamma\eta} + (\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta} (\Theta_{ab})_{\gamma\eta}$. The situation is precisely the same: regardless of the added spinor indices, vector-index canonicalization should show that the expression is zero. However, running the code below shows that canonicalization fails to pass into the indexbrackets to achieve this simplification.

```
>>> ex = Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b})_{\alpha \beta} (\Theta_{b a})_{\gamma \eta} + (\Gamma^{a b})_{\alpha \beta} (\Theta_{a b})_{\gamma \eta}')
>>> canonicalise(ex)
>>> collect_terms(ex)
```

The output after `canonicalise()` is simply the original expression, unchanged. Hence, Cadabra is unable to handle the necessary Lorentz canonicalization within indexbrackets, ostensibly circumscribing its utility for arithmetic on tensors with both vector and spinor indices.¹³⁷

However, a direct solution is to convert the indexbrackets into pure Lorentz tensors in a reversible way and canonicalize them in that form. This is the scheme which is implemented in the algorithm "IndexBracketHex." Let \mathcal{E} be an expression inputted into "IndexBracketHex." The algorithm first loops through all occurrences of indexbrackets in \mathcal{E} . For each indexbracket, the multiplier (i.e., the constant coefficient) of the indexbracket is recorded. If the contents of the indexbracket include operators (e.g., partial derivatives or Fourier transforms) or sums, then nothing is done, as the expression must undergo, e.g., "SpinorExpand" and "FourierExpand" in "Evaluate" to draw the operators out of the indexbrackets and distribute indexbrackets among the terms of the sums. If, on the other hand, the indexbracket's contents include no operators or sums, then the algorithm loops through the factors inside the indexbracket.¹³⁸ For each factor, a string is created including the name of the factor, the number of Lorentz indices, and the set of spinor indices of the indexbracket, with these three pieces of data separated by pipes "|". This string is converted to a hexadecimal with the prefix "ibh" (for indexbracket hexadecimal),¹³⁹ and a tensor with this hexadecimal as its name and the Lorentz indices of the factor as its Lorentz indices is defined. This tensor is made self-non-commuting via Cadabra to obviate reordering that would prevent reconstruction of the ordering of factors within the indexbracket.¹⁴⁰ In addition, the tensor is imparted all relevant properties from the factor, including antisymmetry or symmetry.¹⁴¹ Notice the necessity of the elements of the hexadecimal. The set of spinor indices uniquely identifies the indexbracket from which the tensor originated, while the name enables reconstruction of the factor with the Lorentz indices attached to the tensor. The sole purpose of the inclusion of the number of Lorentz indices is to help distinguish the tensors which arise from gamma matrices with different numbers of indices, and to do so in more fundamental a manner than recording the number of indices on the tensor itself. Any multiplier of the individual factor is consigned to the total multiplier of the indexbracket. After the program loops through all of the factors, the indexbracket is replaced by this total multiplier multiplied by the symbolic product of the transformed factors to give a reversibly pure Lorentz expression. After looping through all indexbrackets in \mathcal{E} , the program applies Cadabra's `canonicalise()` to \mathcal{E} , which functions as expected in the absence of indexbrackets.

To reconstruct the now-canonicalized expression involving indexbrackets, the program loops through the union of the set of products in \mathcal{E} and the set of isolated (i.e., not in a product)

¹³⁷ It is easy to see the reason Cadabra has this difficulty. As described in [47], Cadabra utilizes a tree-based ExNode structure. In this framework, it seems that `canonicalise()` functions when the relevant vector indices are on the same "branch." If vector indices lie within distinct indexbrackets, then they are positioned on distinct branches, and `canonicalise()` is unable to jump between branches to canonicalize the indices of Θ_{ba} using the antisymmetry of γ^{ab} .

¹³⁸ We treat the contents of the indexbracket uniformly as a product, since even if the contents are a single Lorentz tensor, this tensor can obviously be viewed as a product with one factor.

¹³⁹ For this reason, "ibh" is a reserved symbol in SusyPy.

¹⁴⁰ N.B. By default, distinct Lorentz tensors are non-commuting, so no reordering of distinct terms will occur either.

¹⁴¹ "IndexBracketHex" is not built to handle multi-term symmetries or partial monotermin symmetries, so an ordinary `canonicalise()` call is still necessary in "Evaluate" to handle such symmetries where possible. This limitation has not posed issues in any of the supermultiplet calculations appearing in this paper.

occurrences of a tensor (more formally, a Cadabra ExNode) beginning with the key "ibh." In the following discussion, an element in this union is assumed to be a product, since the isolated element case can be treated as a product with one factor. Suppose that one round of the loop treats a product p . An empty hash table is established to compile the factors which belong to an indexbracket identified by its spinor indices. Looping through the factors of p , if the name of the factor begins with "ibh," then it clearly belongs to an indexbracket. In this case, the hexadecimal following "ibh" in the factor's name is inverted. The factor is reconstructed using the name which appears before the first pipe "|" in the inverted string and the Lorentz indices associated to the hexadecimal tensor. The spinor indices are found after the second pipe, and if no entry corresponding to these spinor indices has yet been created in the hash table, then such an entry is created and populated with the recovered factor. If such an entry has already been created, then the recovered factor is merely appended to that entry. The algorithm reassigns the coefficient of the hexadecimal tensor to p as a whole before deleting the hexadecimal tensor factor. After looping through all of the factors, the program creates an indexbracket for each entry in the hash table and inserts these indexbrackets as factors of p to replace the deleted hexadecimal tensors. After looping through all products (and isolated hexadecimal tensors), the program uses Cadabra's `sort_product()` to sort the products p , since hash tables are unsorted, and then returns the recovered and canonicalized expression \mathcal{E} . See Algorithm E.0.1 for detailed pseudo-code.¹⁴²

To see that it works, consider the motivating example of this section. The code below applies "IndexBracketHex" to canonicalize the expression $(\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta} (\Theta_{ba})_{\gamma\eta} + (\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha\beta} (\Theta_{ab})_{\gamma\eta}$.

```
>>> ex = Ex(r'(\Gamma^{a b})_{\alpha \beta} (\Theta_{b a})_{\gamma \eta} + (\Gamma^{a
↪ b})_{\alpha \beta} (\Theta_{a b})_{\gamma \eta}')
>>> indexbracket_hex(ex)
>>> collect_terms(ex)
```

The result is zero, just as expected.

¹⁴² Note that "SelfNonCommuting," "AntiSymmetric," "Symmetric," "KroneckerDelta", "EpsilonTensor," "ImaginaryI" are the names of Cadabra properties.

Algorithm E.0.1 Allow Cadabra to Canonicalize Lorentz Indices within Indexbrackets

```
1: function INDEXBRACKETHEX( $\mathcal{E}$ )
2:   for indexbracket in  $\mathcal{E}$  do
3:      $c \leftarrow$  multiplier of indexbracket
4:     ibhds  $\leftarrow$  [ ]
5:     if indexbracket contains no operators or sums then
6:       for factor in factors inside indexbracket do
7:         spinor_ind  $\leftarrow$  spinor indices of indexbracket
8:         lorentz_ind  $\leftarrow$  lorentz indices of indexbracket
9:         obj_str  $\leftarrow$  "name of factor | number of lorentz_ind | spinor_ind"
10:         $H \leftarrow$  "ibh" + hex(obj_str)  $\triangleright$  e.g., for  $(\gamma^{ab})_{\alpha}^{\beta}$ ,  $H = \text{"ibh"} + \text{hex}(\text{"\gamma | 2 | \alpha^{\beta}"})$ 
11:        ibhd  $\leftarrow H_{\text{lorentz\_ind}}$   $\triangleright H_{\text{lorentz\_ind}}$  is the tensor named  $H$  with indices lorentz_ind
12:        make ibhd SelfNonCommuting
13:        make ibhd inherit AntiSymmetric, Symmetric, KroneckerDelta, EpsilonTensor, & ImaginaryI from factor if present
14:         $c \leftarrow c \cdot$  multiplier of factor
15:        append ibhd to ibhds
16:      end for
17:      replace indexbracket in  $\mathcal{E}$  with  $c \cdot \text{prod}(\text{ibhds})$ 
18:    end if
19:  end for
20:   $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow$  canonicalise( $\mathcal{E}$ )
21:  for  $p$  in Cadabra products of  $\mathcal{E}$  plus "pure" single "Exnode"s with names beginning with "ibh" do
22:     $c \leftarrow 1$ 
23:    objects  $\leftarrow$  empty hash table
24:    for factor in  $p$  do:
25:      if name of factor begins with "ibh" then
26:        obj_data  $\leftarrow$  inverse_hex(name of factor after "ibh")
27:         $A \leftarrow$  obj_data before 1st "|"
28:        spinor_ind  $\leftarrow$  obj_data after 2nd "|"
29:        lorentz_ind  $\leftarrow$  lorentz indices of factor
30:        obj  $\leftarrow A_{\text{lorentz\_ind}}$ 
31:        if spinor_ind not in objects then
32:          objects[spinor_ind]  $\leftarrow$  [obj]
33:        else
34:          append obj to objects[spinor_ind]
35:        end if
36:         $c \leftarrow c \cdot$  multiplier of factor
37:        erase factor
38:      end if
39:    end for
40:     $p \leftarrow p \cdot c$ 
41:    for spinor_ind in objects do
42:      inner_obj  $\leftarrow \text{prod}(\text{objects}[\text{spinor\_ind}])$ 
43:      insert (inner_obj)spinor_ind as factor to  $p$   $\triangleright$  (inner_obj)spinor_ind is the indexbracket with indices spinor_ind
44:    end for
45:  end for
46:   $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{sort\_product}(\mathcal{E})$ 
47:  return  $\mathcal{E}$ 
48: end function
```

References

- [1] S. Belluci, S.J. Gates Jr., B. Radak, and S. Vashakidze. Improved supergeometries for type-ii green-schwarz nonlinear σ models. *Modern Physics Letters A*, 04(21):1985–1998, 1989.
- [2] Z. Bern, J.J. Carrasco, W.-M. Chen, A. Edison, H. Johansson, J. Parra-Martinez, R. Roiban, and M. Zeng. Ultraviolet properties of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity at five loops. *Physical Review D*, 98:086021, Oct 2018.
- [3] Z. Bern, J.J. Carrasco, L.J. Dixon, H. Johansson, D.A. Kosower, and R. Roiban. Three-Loop Superfiniteness of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ Supergravity. *Physical Review Letters*, 98:161303, 2007.
- [4] Z. Bern, L.J. Dixon, and R. Roiban. Is $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity ultraviolet finite? *Physics Letters B*, 644(4):265–271, 2007.
- [5] P. Breitenlohner. A geometric interpretation of local supersymmetry. *Physics Letters B*, 67(1):49–51, 1977.
- [6] L. Brink and P. Howe. Eleven-dimensional supergravity on the mass shell in superspace. *Physics Letters B*, 91(3):384–386, 1980.
- [7] G. Butler. *Fundamental Algorithms for Permutation Groups*. Springer-Verlag Berlin, Heidelberg, Germany, 1991.
- [8] I. Chappell, S.J. Gates Jr., W.D. Linch, J. Parker, S. Randall, A. Ridgway, and K. Stiffler. 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ Supergravity Genomics. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2013(10), 2013.
- [9] E. Cremmer and S. Ferrara. Formulation of 11-dimensional supergravity in superspace. *Physics Letters B*, 91(1):61–66, 1980.
- [10] E. Cremmer, B. Julia, and J. Scherk. Supergravity in theory in 11 dimensions. *Physics Letters B*, 76(4):409–412, 1978.
- [11] J. Fang and C. Fronsdal. Massless fields with half-integral spin. *Phys. Rev. D*, 18:3630–3633, Nov 1978.
- [12] D. Francia and C.M. Hull. Higher-spin gauge fields and duality. In *1st Solvay Workshop on Higher Spin Gauge Theories*, pages 35–48, 2004.
- [13] D.Z. Freedman and A. Van Proeyen. *Supergravity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2013.
- [14] M.B. Fröb. FieldsX – An extension package for the xAct tensor computer algebra suite to include fermions, gauge fields and BRST cohomology, 2021. arXiv: 2008.12422.
- [15] S.J. Gates Jr. Superconformal symmetry in 11D superspace and the M-theory effective action. *Nuclear Physics B*, 616(1):85–105, 2001.

- [16] S.J. Gates Jr., J. Gonzales, B. MacGregor, J. Parker, R. Polo-Sherk, V.G.J. Rodgers, and L. Wassink. 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ Supersymmetry Genomics (I). *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2009(12):008–008, 2009.
- [17] S.J. Gates Jr., J. Hallett, J. Parker, V.G.J. Rodgers, and K. Stiffler. 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ Supersymmetry Genomics (II). *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 06:071, 2012.
- [18] S.J. Gates Jr., G. Hannon, R.X. Siew, and K. Stiffler. Infinite-dimensional algebraic $\mathfrak{Spin}(N)$ structure in extended/higher dimensional SUSY holonomy for valise and on shell supermultiplet representations. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 05:173, 2022.
- [19] S.J. Gates Jr., Y. Hu, H. Jiang, and S.-N.H. Mak. A codex on linearized Nordström supergravity in eleven and ten dimensional superspaces. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2019(7), 2019.
- [20] S.J. Gates Jr., Y. Hu, and S.-N.H. Mak. Adinkra foundation of component decomposition and the scan for superconformal multiplets in 11D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ superspace. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2020(9), 2020.
- [21] S.J. Gates Jr., Y. Hu, and S.-N.H. Mak. Superfield Component Decompositions and the Scan for Prepotential Supermultiplets in 10D Superspaces. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 02:176, 2020.
- [22] S.J. Gates Jr., Y. Hu, and S.-N.H. Mak. Advancing to adinkrafields: Young tableaux to component fields of the 10D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ scalar superfield. *Advances in Theoretical and Mathematical Physics*, 25(6):1449, 2021.
- [23] S.J. Gates Jr., Y. Hu, and S.-N.H. Mak. Weyl covariance, and proposals for superconformal prepotentials in 10D superspaces. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 03:074, 2021.
- [24] S.J. Gates Jr., T. Hübsch, and K. Stiffler. On Clifford-algebraic dimensional extension and SUSY holography. *International Journal of Modern Physics A*, 30(09):1550042, 2015.
- [25] S.J. Gates Jr., D. Lay, S.-N.H. Mak, B. Peters, A. Ramakrishnan, K. Stiffler, Z. Wimpee, X. Xiao, Y. Yuan, J. Zhang, and P.V. Zhou. On the ubiquity of electromagnetic-duality rotations in 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ holonomy tensors for on-shell 4D supermultiplets. *International Journal of Modern Physics A*, 35(01):2050008, 2020.
- [26] S.J. Gates Jr., W.D. Linch III, J. Phillips, and L. Rana. The fundamental supersymmetry challenge remains. *Gravitation and Cosmology*, 8:96–100, 2002.
- [27] S.J. Gates Jr., B. Radak, and V.G.J. Rodgers. Irreducible decomposition of products of 10D chiral sigma matrices. *Computer Physics Communications*, 136(1):173–181, 2001.
- [28] U. Gran. GAMMA: A Mathematica package for performing gamma-matrix algebra and Fierz transformations in arbitrary dimensions, 2001. arXiv: hep-th/0105086.
- [29] H.G. Grassmann. *Extension Theory*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 2000. Translated by L.C. Kannenberg.

- [30] M.T. Grisaru, P. Howe, L. Mezincescu, B.E.W. Nilsson, and P.K. Townsend. $\mathcal{N} = 2$ superstrings in a supergravity background. *Physics Letters B*, 162(1):116–120, 1985.
- [31] R. Haag, J.T. Łopuszański, and M. Sohnius. All possible generators of supersymmetries of the S-matrix. *Nuclear Physics B*, 88(2):257–274, 1975.
- [32] L. Heisenberg and G. Trenkler. Generalization of the 2-form interactions. *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2020(05):019–019, 2020.
- [33] S.-Z. Huang, P.-F. Zhang, T.-N. Ruan, Y.-C. Zhu, and Z.-P. Zheng. Feynman propagator for a particle with arbitrary spin. *The European Physical Journal C*, 42:375–389, 2005.
- [34] W. Isaacson. *Einstein: His Life and Universe*. Simon and Schuster, New York City, New York, US, 2007.
- [35] M. Kalb and P. Ramond. Classical direct interstring action. *Physical Review D*, 9:2273–2284, Apr 1974.
- [36] P. Kuusela. “GammaMaP” - A Mathematica Package for Clifford Algebras, Gamma Matrices and Spinors, 2019. arXiv: 1905.00429.
- [37] H. Li, Z. Li, and Y. Li. Riemann tensor polynomial canonicalization by graph algebra extension. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, ISSAC ’17, page 269–276, New York, NY, USA, 2017. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [38] S.-N.H. Mak and K. Stiffler. 4D, $\mathcal{N} = 1$ Matter Gravitino Genomics. *Symmetry*, 11(2), 2019.
- [39] L.R.U Manssur, R. Portugal, and B.F. Svaiter. Group-theoretic approach for symbolic tensor manipulation. *International Journal of Modern Physics C*, 13(7):859–879, 2002.
- [40] J.M. Martín-García. xPerm: fast index canonicalization for tensor computer algebra. *Computer Physics Communications*, 179(8):597–603, 2008.
- [41] J.M. Martín-García, D. Yllanes, and R. Portugal. The Invar tensor package: Differential invariants of Riemann. *Computer Physics Communications*, 179(8):586–590, 2008.
- [42] T. Miyamoto. Kinematics of Higher-Spin Fields. Master’s thesis, Department of Physics, Imperial College London, 2011.
- [43] H. Nicolai, P. K. Townsend, and P. van Nieuwenhuizen. Comments on 11-dimensional supergravity. *Lettere al Nuovo Cimento*, 30:315, 1981.
- [44] B.E. Niehoff. Faster tensor canonicalization. *Computer Physics Communications*, 228:123–145, 2018.
- [45] H. Nishino and S.J. Gates Jr. Toward an off-shell 11D supergravity limit of M-theory. *Physics Letters B*, 388(3):504–511, 1996.

- [46] K. Peeters. Cadabra. <https://cadabra.science/>. Accessed: 11/20/2022.
- [47] K. Peeters. Cadabra: a field-theory motivated symbolic computer algebra system. *Computer Physics Communications*, 176(8):550–558, 2007.
- [48] K. Peeters. Cadabra: Tutorial and reference guide. <https://cadabra.science/static/pdf/cadabra.pdf>, 2012.
- [49] K. Peeters. Cadabra2: computer algebra for field theory revisited. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 3(32):1118, 2018.
- [50] K. Peeters. Fourier Transform. <https://cadabra.science/qa/605/fourier-transform?show=605>, 2018.
- [51] T.G. Pilling. *Gauge Torsion Gravity, String Theory, and Antisymmetric Tensor Interactions*. PhD thesis, Department of Physics, North Dakota State University, 2011.
- [52] S. Poslavsky and D. Bolotin. Redberry: a computer algebra system designed for tensor manipulation. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 608:012060, 2015.
- [53] W. Siegel and S.J. Gates Jr. Superfield supergravity. *Nuclear Physics B*, 147(1):77–104, 1979.
- [54] P.K. Townsend and P. van Nieuwenhuizen. Which field representations are allowed in interacting locally supersymmetric field theories? *Physics Letters B*, 109(3):179–182, 1982.
- [55] M.J.G. Veltman. Quantum Theory of Gravitation. In R. Balian and J. Zinn-Justin, editors, *Methods in Field Theory*, chapter 5, pages 265–327. North-Holland, Singapore, 1981.
- [56] J. Wess and J. Bagger. *Supersymmetry and Supergravity*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 2nd edition, 1992.
- [57] J. Wess and B. Zumino. Consequences of anomalous Ward identities. *Physics Letters B*, 37(1):95–97, 1971.
- [58] N. Wiener. *The Fourier Integral & Certain of its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1933.
- [59] E. Witten. String theory dynamics in various dimensions. *Nuclear Physics B*, 443(1):85–126, 1995.