

NORDITA-95/63 NP  
hep-ph/9510338

# On the tensor formulation of effective vector Lagrangians and duality transformations

Johan Bijnens and Elisabetta Pallante

NORDITA, Blegdamsvej 17,  
DK-2100 Copenhagen, Denmark

## Abstract

Using two different methods inspired by duality transformations we present the equivalence between effective Lagrangians for massive vector mesons using a vector field and an antisymmetric tensor field. This completes the list of explicit field transformations between the various effective Lagrangian methods to describe massive vector and axial vector mesons.

# 1 Introduction

Dual transformations have been used to large extent to prove the equivalence of apparently different Lagrangian formulations with relevant consequences for solid state physics and gauge field theories [1].

Self-duality has been proven for massive vector theories in odd dimensions [2] and their equivalence with topologically massive abelian gauge theory in  $(2+1)$ -dimensions has been shown in [3]. Some physical implications of the dual formulation of various three-dimensional field theories have been studied in [4] and Ref. [6] therein.

Dual formulation of some gauge field theories in four dimensions has been also considered [5, 6] (for the construction of massive gauge theories in  $d=4$  see [7, 8]). This was also used to prove the equivalence of the Thirring model to a gauge theory [9]. The latter reference triggered the present work.

Recently, in the framework of chiral effective theories describing low energy strong interactions, a tensorial formalism to describe an ordinary vector field has been developed in [10] and an attempt to prove the equivalence of the vector and tensor formulation was done in [11] for the non anomalous sector of the low energy effective action and in [12] for the anomalous one.

Various relations between parameters of the two formulations were found as a phenomenological consequence of QCD dispersion relations. The equivalence of all the possible representations for massive vector fields in chiral Lagrangians was also conjectured in [11]. For those transforming as a vector gauge field this was shown in [13] and the relation to the vector matter field used here in [11].

In this letter we prove that a duality-type relationship connects the two different Lagrangian descriptions of the same physics at the classical level. This implies that the tensor and vector formulations give rise to the same partition function and the equivalence between them holds in the sense of the path integral. Nevertheless, we do not consider the quantum level since in order to describe massive vector fields in a renormalizable fashion we need to use the Higgs mechanism.

Our transformation also provides a simple way to obtain the form of terms in the tensor formalism that are equivalent to those in the more standard formulations. During the calculation it will also become obvious that there is no simple power-counting possible for the massive fields. In our method we explicitly show how the number of derivatives in interaction terms can be changed. The general approach shows some similarity with the so called first-order formulation in which the field strength ( $F = \partial$  for spin 0 and  $F = 2\partial_{[1} A_{\ ]}$  for spin 1) is treated as an independent variable.

We first describe in detail the method which is most easily generalized to terms with powers of quark masses or more derivatives and then shortly describe the other method that leads to identical results. We also present a few short comments on phenomenological consequences.

## 2 The equivalence

The theory we are going to use describes an ordinary (not gauge) massive vector field interacting with pseudoscalar mesons whose Lagrangian is explicitly local chiral invariant due to the addition of external sources.

We refer for the moment to the particular case which is the effective field theory of low energy QCD with the inclusion of vector mesons [11], although our derivation can be easily generalized.

The Lagrangian for the interacting vector field  $V$  is written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_V &= \frac{1}{4} \langle V_\mu V_\mu \rangle + \frac{1}{2} m^2 \langle V_\mu V_\mu \rangle + \langle V_\mu J^\mu \rangle \\ J^\mu &= \frac{f_V}{2} \frac{\vec{p}}{p^2} = f_+ \quad i \frac{g_V}{2} \frac{\vec{p}}{p^2} [u^\dagger ; u]; \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  stands for the trace over colour indices. The formalism used here is the one of [11]. This allows us to directly compare our results to the ones in [11]. The current  $J^\mu$  contains two terms with couplings  $f_V$  and  $g_V$ . In principle there are more interaction terms with external sources which can appear at the leading order (i.e.  $O(p^3)$ ) and higher orders of the chiral expansion. It will be clear at the end how our analysis can be easily extended to a more general form of the interaction Lagrangian. The fields  $f_+$  and  $u$  are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} f_+ &= u F_L u^\dagger + u^\dagger F_R u \\ u &= i u^\dagger D_\mu U u^\dagger = u^\dagger; \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $F_{L(R)}$  is the field strength tensor associated with the non-abelian external source  $v = a$ ,  $(v + a)$  and  $u = \sqrt{\frac{p}{p^2}} \bar{U} = \exp(i f g)$  is the square root of the usual exponential representation of the pseudoscalar Goldstone boson field with flavour matrix  $\vec{V} = D_\mu V - D_\mu V$  is the field strength tensor of the vector field where the covariant derivative  $D_\mu = \partial_\mu + [\frac{1}{2} f u^\dagger \partial_\mu (v + a) + u \partial_\mu i (v - a) u^\dagger] g$  guarantees the local chiral invariance of the kinetic term. The fields  $V_\mu$ ,  $V_\mu$ ,  $f_+$  and  $u$  transform homogeneously and non linearly under a chiral transformation  $g_L = g_R \in G = SU(N)_L \times SU(N)_R$  as

$$O \xrightarrow{f} h(\cdot) O h^\dagger(\cdot); \quad (3)$$

where  $h(\cdot)$  is the non-linear realization of  $G$  which defines the action of the group on a coset element  $u(\cdot)$  via

$$u(\cdot) \xrightarrow{f} g_R u(\cdot) h^\dagger(\cdot) = h(\cdot) u(\cdot) g_L^\dagger; \quad (4)$$

This guarantees that the full vector Lagrangian (1) is local chiral invariant with the inclusion of the mass term for the vector field.

In the case of a global chiral invariant formulation the path integral for the vector Lagrangian (1), where the replacement  $D \rightarrow \partial$  has been done, would be

$$Z[\mathbb{L}; R; u] = \int D V \int (\partial V) e^{i \int d^4 x L_V} \quad (5)$$

where the transversality constraint  $\partial V = 0$  reduces to three the number of independent degrees of freedom in four dimensions. The transversality condition on the vector field in (3+1)-dimensions guarantees that it admits a representation in terms of its dual antisymmetric tensor field as  $V = \partial H$ , which automatically satisfies the constraint  $\partial V = 0$ . The extension to local chiral invariance is more delicate. In this case the correct dual transformation is the one which does not break the homogeneous transformation properties (3) of the vector field. A choice which reduces to the above one in the absence of other fields and sources is  $V \rightarrow D H$ , where the tensor field transforms homogeneously like in (3).

The transversality constraint  $\partial V = 0$  is no longer automatically satisfied. But at leading order in fields it is still  $\partial V = 0$  ( $^2$ ) with any field or source. The condition  $V = D H$  thus still removes one degree of freedom from the  $V$  field. The most general partition function can be written in terms of the most general transversality constraint (or gauge fixing term) as

$$Z[\mathbb{L}; R; u] = \int D V \int (F[V]) e^{i \int d^4 x L_V}; \quad (6)$$

where  $F[V] = 0$  is consistent with the dual transformation  $V \rightarrow D H$ . We notice that the difference in the constraints  $\partial V = 0$  and  $V = D H$  doesn't affect the interaction part of (1), while it acts at higher orders in the derivative expansion.

At the end of this section we briefly formulate an alternative method to prove the equivalence. The constraint there will be consistent with the dual transformation of the type  $V \rightarrow D H$ .

For the dual transformation of the vector field there are in fact two possibilities:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I)} \quad V &= \frac{1}{m} D H \\ \text{II)} \quad V &= \frac{1}{2m} D \tilde{H} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We notice also that the present dual transformation is strictly valid only for massive vector fields where the mass plays the role of an infrared cutoff of the theory. For an alternative method in (2+1)-dimensions that also works in the massless case see [9].

The two choices in (7) correspond to two different assignments of parity transformation property of the dual tensor field. The vector field  $V$  is a  $J^{PC} = 1^-$  state i.e.  $V^P = (-) V$  and  $V^C = V^T$ . This implies that in choice I) the

tensor field is a vector-like field for a 1 state, with  $H^P = (\ ) (\ )H$  and  $H^C = H^T$ . While in choice II) the tensor field is an axial-like field for a state 1, with  $H^P = (\ ) (\ )H$  and  $H^C = H^T$ . In the case of axial vectors the choice is of course the opposite.

We present the full derivation of the equivalence for the choice I), while for choice II) we shall point out differences and the final result.

For any of the two choices, we refer to choice I) from now on, the path integral (6) on the vector field can be rewritten as a path integral on the dual tensor field due to the following identity

$$\int D V (F[V]) :: = \int D V D H (V \frac{1}{m} D H) :: \quad (8)$$

The integration over the vector field  $V$  then becomes trivial due to the  $\delta$ -function and one gets the path integral for the Lagrangian of the dual tensor field  $H$

$$\int [L; R; u] = \int D H e^{i \int d^4 x L_H} ; \quad (9)$$

where  $L_H$ , for the choice I), is given by

$$\begin{aligned} L_H = & \frac{1}{4m^2} < (D D H - D D H)^2 > + \frac{1}{2} < (D H)^2 > \\ & - \frac{f_v}{2} \frac{1}{2m} < (D D H - D D H) f_+ > \\ & - \frac{g_v}{2} \frac{1}{2m} < (D D H - D D H) [u; u] > : \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

At this level we have the problem that there is no explicit mass term for the  $H$ -field but there is both a two derivative and a four-derivative kinetic like term. The latter implies the naive existence of a second pole. This one is at zero mass, see below. The underlying reason for the appearance of the extra pole is the presence of a derivative in the field redefinition of (7). A constant field  $H$  does not contribute to  $V$ . We therefore would like to lower the number of derivatives in the kinetic terms.

We can remove the first term in (10) by adding a new auxiliary tensor field in a way that leaves the original path integral invariant. This is similar to the first order formalism for gauge theories. We can always write

$$\int [L; R; u] = \int D I^0 e^{i \int d^4 x I^0} \int D H e^{i \int d^4 x L_H} ; \quad (11)$$

The path integral in (11) is equivalent to the one in (9). They differ by an overall normalization constant given by the gaussian integral over the auxiliary tensor field  $I^0$ . Redefining  $I^0$  with a linear transformation with unit Jacobian

the original path integral (9) is equivalent to the one where we add to  $L_H$  the quadratic term

$$+ \frac{1}{4m^2} D_\mu D_\mu H_{\alpha\beta} D_\mu D_\mu H^{\alpha\beta} - I f^+ [u; u]^2 \quad (12)$$

and integrate over the original tensor field  $H$  and the new auxiliary field  $I$ . The full tensor Lagrangian contains now two tensor fields:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{H I} = & \frac{1}{2} \langle (D_\mu H_{\alpha\beta})^2 \rangle + \frac{1}{4m^2} \langle I I \rangle - \frac{1}{2m^2} \langle (D_\mu D_\nu H_{\alpha\beta} - D_\nu D_\mu H_{\alpha\beta}) I \rangle \\ & \left( -\frac{f_V}{2} \frac{p}{2m} + \frac{1}{2m^2} \right) \langle (D_\mu D_\nu H_{\alpha\beta} - D_\nu D_\mu H_{\alpha\beta}) f_+ \rangle \\ & \left( i\frac{g_V}{2} \frac{p}{2m} + \frac{1}{2m^2} \right) \langle (D_\mu D_\nu H_{\alpha\beta} - D_\nu D_\mu H_{\alpha\beta}) [u; u] \rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{2m^2} \langle I f_+ \rangle + \frac{1}{2m^2} \langle I [u; u] \rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{4m^2} \langle f_+ f^+ \rangle + \frac{1}{4m^2} \langle [u; u] [u; u] \rangle + \frac{1}{2m^2} \langle f^+ [u; u] \rangle : \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

There is no kinetic term for the auxiliary field  $I$  while it is coupled to the tensor field  $H$  via the last term in the first line of (13). At this stage both the fields  $H$  and  $I$  interact with external sources. Parameters  $f_\pm$  can be chosen in order to eliminate unwanted interaction terms with derivative couplings on the tensor field  $H$ . This implies the choice

$$= -\frac{m f_V}{p} = -\frac{m g_V}{p} : \quad (14)$$

As can be seen here we can choose to add interaction terms or not to (12). The number of derivatives in the interaction terms can thus be easily changed. This shows again that the usual chiral power counting is not possible for massive fields.

At this point we show that a two-steps orthogonal transformation of the tensor fields permits to rewrite the two-tensors Lagrangian in terms of rotated tensor fields which simultaneously are eigenstates of the kinetic operator and diagonalize the mass term. Since the jacobian of the transformation is trivial the final path integral will be equivalent to the original one.

The first orthogonal transformation ensures the diagonalization of the kinetic term. Defining the rotated fields as

$$\begin{aligned} H &= s G + c G^0 \\ I &= c G - s G^0 ; \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

the Lagrangian for the fields  $G$  and  $G^0$  becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{GG^0} = & \frac{s^2}{2} + \frac{1}{m^2} s c^2 < (\partial_\mu G)^2 > + \frac{c^2}{2} \frac{1}{m^2} s c^2 < (\partial_\mu G^0)^2 > \\
& + \frac{1}{4m^2} c^2 < G G > + s^2 < G^0 G^0 > - 2s c < G G^0 > \\
& + \frac{1}{2m^2} c < G f_+ > + < G [u; u] > \\
& \frac{1}{2m^2} s < G^0 f_+ > + < G^0 [u; u] > \\
& + s c + \frac{1}{m^2} (c^2 - s^2) < \partial_\mu G \partial^\mu G^0 > \\
& + \frac{1}{4m^2} < f_+ f_+ > + \frac{1}{4m^2} < [u; u][u; u] > + \frac{1}{2m^2} < f_+^+ [u; u] > : (16)
\end{aligned}$$

In (16) five types of terms appear in order: kinetic terms, mass terms, interaction terms for  $G$  and  $G^0$  individually,  $G G^0$  mixed terms and local or contact terms with only external fields or the other degrees of freedom. These latter terms are precisely the ones that in [11] were required by the high energy constraints. In this approach they appear automatically.

The condition that the mixed derivative term  $< \partial_\mu G \partial^\mu G^0 >$  vanishes implies one constraint on the parameter

$$= \frac{m^2}{2} \tan 2\alpha : \quad (17)$$

With this constraint the kinetic terms of  $G$  and the  $G^0$  fields become

$$L_{kin} = \frac{s^2}{2 \cos 2\alpha} < (\partial_\mu G)^2 > + \frac{c^2}{2 \cos 2\alpha} < (\partial_\mu G^0)^2 > : \quad (18)$$

For a given choice of the rotation angle the kinetic terms of the two fields have opposite signs. The choice of the correct relative sign of kinetic and mass terms is determined in the Minkowski case by the requirement that there be no tachyons in the final theory. Hence, the physical solution has to be the one where the tensor field with the unphysical ("wrong") sign in the kinetic term "decouples" in the sense that it acquires zero mass and it does not interact with any other field.

Choosing  $\cos 2\alpha > 0$ , this is always allowed by (17), the rescaled  $G$  and  $G^0$  fields are defined via the wave function renormalization constant as:

$$K = \frac{s}{\cos 2\alpha} G \quad K^0 = \frac{c}{\cos 2\alpha} G^0 : \quad (19)$$

The rescaled fields  $K$  and  $K^0$  are not mass eigenstates since the mixed term  $< G G^0 >$  is present in (16).

The second step of the orthogonal transformation is the one which leaves invariant the kinetic piece and diagonalizes the mass term :

$$\begin{aligned} K &= \text{ch } I + \text{sh } I^0 \\ K^0 &= \text{sh } I + \text{ch } I^0 : \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

With this substitution and defining

$$c_1 = \frac{c^2}{4m^2 s^2} \cos 2\alpha \quad c_2 = \frac{s^2}{4m^2 c^2} \cos 2\alpha ; \quad (21)$$

with  $\sin 2\alpha > 0$  the Lagrangian for the  $I; I^0$  fields becomes

$$\begin{aligned} L_{I;I^0} = & \frac{1}{2} \langle (\partial_\mu I)^2 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle (\partial_\mu I^0)^2 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{p}{c_1} \text{ch} - \frac{p}{c_2} \text{sh} \right)^2 \langle I I \rangle + \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{p}{c_1} \text{sh} - \frac{p}{c_2} \text{ch} \right)^2 \langle I^0 I^0 \rangle + \\ & + 2 (c_1 + c_2) \text{sh} \text{ch} \frac{1}{2} \frac{p^2}{c_1 c_2} (\text{sh}^2 + \text{ch}^2) \langle I I^0 \rangle + \\ & + \frac{1}{m} \left( \frac{p}{c_1} \text{ch} - \frac{p}{c_2} \text{sh} \right) \langle I f_+ \rangle + \langle I [u; u] \rangle + \\ & + \frac{1}{m} \left( \frac{p}{c_1} \text{sh} - \frac{p}{c_2} \text{ch} \right) \langle I^0 f_+ \rangle + \langle I^0 [u; u] \rangle + \\ & + \frac{1}{4m^2} \langle f_+ f_+^\dagger \rangle + \frac{1}{4m^2} \langle [u; u] [u; u] \rangle + \frac{1}{2m^2} \langle f_+^\dagger [u; u] \rangle : \quad (22) \end{aligned}$$

From (22) one deduces that the constraint equation which diagonalizes the mass term is given by

$$(c_1 + c_2) \text{sh} \text{ch} \frac{1}{2} \frac{p^2}{c_1 c_2} (\text{sh}^2 + \text{ch}^2) = 0 : \quad (23)$$

The solution in terms of  $\text{ch} 2\alpha = \text{ch}^2 + \text{sh}^2$  is  $\text{ch}^2 2\alpha = (c_1 + c_2)^2 = (c_1 - c_2)^2$ . Then it is easy to find by direct substitution that the mass terms for  $I$  and  $I^0$  fields are

$$L_{\text{mass}} = (c_1 - c_2) \langle I I \rangle + 0 \langle I I^0 \rangle : \quad (24)$$

Using eqs. (21) and (17) we find  $c_1 - c_2 = m^2 = 4$  so that the free Lagrangian is

$$L_{II^0}^0 = \frac{1}{2} \langle (\partial_\mu I)^2 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle (\partial_\mu I^0)^2 \rangle + \frac{1}{4} m^2 \langle I I \rangle : \quad (25)$$

As we expected, the tensor field which is massive is the one with the correct relative sign for the kinetic and mass terms (i.e. it has causal propagation), while the tensor field with the "wrong" sign assignment (i.e. it has tachyonic propagation) remains massless and is the artefact expected from the transformation



(7). At the same time all the interaction terms of the unphysical field  $\tilde{\Gamma}^0$  with external currents vanish as a consequence of eq. (23) and the final Lagrangian for the physical tensor field  $\tilde{I}$  becomes

$$\begin{aligned} L &= L_T + \frac{1}{4m^2} \langle f_+ f^+ \rangle + \frac{1}{4m^2} \langle [u; u][u; u] \rangle + \frac{1}{2m^2} \langle f^+ [u; u] \rangle \\ L_T &= \frac{1}{2} \langle (D \tilde{I})^2 \rangle + \frac{m^2}{4} \langle \tilde{I} \tilde{I} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \tilde{I} f_+ \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \tilde{I} [u; u] \rangle : \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

We have shown that the vector Lagrangian (1) is equivalent in the sense of the path integral and through the dual representation I) of (7) to the tensor Lagrangian (26) for a tensor-vector-like field describing a  $1^-$  state, where additional local terms (i.e. terms with external sources only) are present. These terms are precisely the ones whose presence was required by the constraints in [11]. Using the values of  $\tilde{f}_+$  and  $\tilde{g}_V$  given by eq. (14) the following equivalence relation holds

$$L_T = L_V = \frac{f_V^2}{8} \langle f_+ f^+ \rangle + \frac{g_V^2}{8} \langle [u; u][u; u] \rangle - i \frac{f_V g_V}{4} \langle f^+ [u; u] \rangle : (27)$$

For the choice II) of (7), where the dual tensor field  $\tilde{H}^*$  is an axial-like tensor field, we are also able to produce the equivalence of the vector Lagrangian (1) with a Lagrangian for an axial-like tensor field describing a  $1^-$  state. Exactly the same procedure as before can be followed but using instead of  $I; \tilde{I}^0; G; :::$  the fields  $\tilde{I}; \tilde{I}^0; \tilde{G}; :::$  with

$$X^* = \frac{1}{2} X : \quad (28)$$

The two-steps diagonalization proceeds as for choice I). Elimination of unwanted interaction terms with derivative couplings leads again to the constraints (14) for  $\tilde{f}_+$  and  $\tilde{g}_V$  and the elimination of non diagonal terms induces again constraint (17) on the parameter  $\tilde{b}$ . Of the two normal mass eigenstates only  $\tilde{I}$  (the one with the correct sign of the kinetic term) gets massive as before and the final Lagrangian for the tensor field  $\tilde{I}$  follows

$$\begin{aligned} L_T &= \frac{1}{4} \langle D \tilde{I} D \tilde{I} - 2 D \tilde{I} D \cdot \tilde{I}^0 \rangle + \frac{m^2}{4} \langle \tilde{I} \tilde{I} \rangle \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \langle \tilde{I} f_+ \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \langle \tilde{I} [u; u] \rangle \\ &+ \frac{1}{4m^2} \langle f_+ f^+ \rangle + \frac{1}{4m^2} \langle [u; u][u; u] \rangle + \frac{1}{2m^2} \langle f^+ [u; u] \rangle : \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Notice that the structure of the kinetic term corresponds to the case  $a+2b=0$  in Appendix A of [11]. The choice I) led to the case  $b=0$ . Both choices are possible and lead to a good description for a vector meson. Notice that because of the opposite intrinsic parity required for case II) the interaction terms also

contain an extra Levi-Civita tensor. The signs of the interaction terms can also be changed by multiplying the dual transformations of (7) by  $\pm 1$ .

In the end we have four possibilities. Case I) and II) and both with an extra minus sign in (7). Case I) corresponds to the case where the components  $I^{0i}$ ,  $i = 1;2;3$ , propagate in the rest frame. Obtaining the correct parity for these requires  $I$  to have positive intrinsic parity as already remarked above. In case II) are the components  $I^{ij}$ , with  $i,j = 1;2;3$ , that propagate in the rest frame. This in turn requires  $I$  to have negative intrinsic parity so that the  $I^{ij}$  can describe the propagating components of a vector.

In all cases we proved the equivalence to the original vector Lagrangian in the sense of the path integral with the addition of the SAME set of local terms.

The alternative approach we mentioned before is more similar to the well known first-order formalism. In order to treat  $V$  and  $V$  as independent fields let us rewrite the partition function (6) as

$$Z[J] = \int D V \int D V \left( \int D V \int D V \right) \int D V (F[V]) e^{i \int d^4 x L_V} : \quad (30)$$

The first function can be rewritten as a gaussian integral over an auxiliary tensor field in two possible ways:

$$\begin{aligned} \int D V \int D V \left( \int D V \int D V \right) &::: \\ \text{(I)} &= \int D V \int D H e^{i \int d^4 x H \left( \int D V \int D V \right)} ::: \\ \text{(II)} &= \int D V \int D \tilde{H} e^{i \int d^4 x \tilde{H} \left( \int D V \int D V \right)} ::: \quad (31) \end{aligned}$$

Integrating out the field  $V$  one gets for choice (I)

$$Z[J] = \int D V \int D H (F[V]) e^{i \int d^4 x L_{V,H}} \quad (32)$$

$$L_{V,H} = \frac{1}{2} m^2 \langle V V \rangle + \langle (J + H)^2 \rangle + \langle H \left( \int D V \int D V \right) \rangle :$$

The integration over  $V$  can be done simply if we integrate by parts in the last term. If the boundary condition  $\int d^4 x \langle D(H V) \rangle = 0$  is satisfied, which is obviously the case, this can be done. Then the integral over  $V$  reduces to a gaussian integral and the final partition function is the one for a tensor Lagrangian

$$L_T = \frac{1}{2m^2} \langle D H D H \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle H^2 \rangle + 2 \langle H J \rangle + \langle J^2 \rangle : \quad (33)$$

It is immediate to verify that the choices  $m=2$  reproduce choice I) of the previous approach with both possible signs for the interaction terms. The analogous procedure for choice (II) of (31) leads to the tensor Lagrangian of case II) of the first approach.

Notice that in both methods the presence of the mass term in the original Lagrangian was crucial. In the first method it directly produced the nonkinetic term and in the second method it produced the quadratic part of the Gaussian integral. We could of course have expected this since in the massless case there is a singularity of the type  $1=q^2$  possible while in the tensor formalism this singularity is at most  $q \cdot q = q^2$  in interactions with other fields. In the approach of [9] the presence at intermediate stages of inverse derivatives in the Lagrangian shows the same problem.

### 3 Some implications of the equivalence

In [11] relations among the parameters of the vector and tensor Lagrangians and constraints on the coefficients of additional local terms necessary to guarantee the equivalence of the two formulations were found as an implication of the correct QCD behaviour through the use of subtracted dispersion relations. All the requirements found there on a more phenomenological ground are here automatically implied by the equivalence of the two Lagrangians in the sense of the path integral.

We notice first that the two tensor Lagrangians obtained with choice I) or II) in (7) correspond to the two possible choices  $a + 2b = 0$  and  $b = 0$  in the appendix of [10]. These two choices of the parameters in the most general tensor Lagrangian are all the possible ones which reduce from six to three the propagating components of the tensor field. In the case  $b=0$ , which corresponds to choice I) in our formalism, the usual tensor Lagrangian for vector meson fields is written in terms of two couplings  $F_V$  and  $G_V$  of the tensor field to the external currents as [10]

$$L_T = \frac{1}{2} \langle (\partial \cdot I)^2 \rangle + \frac{1}{4} m^2 \langle I \cdot I \rangle + \frac{F_V}{2} \langle I \cdot f_+ \rangle + \frac{G_V}{2} \langle I \cdot [u; u] \rangle : \quad (34)$$

Comparing with eq. (26) and using the constraints (14) we get

$$F_V = -m f_V \quad G_V = -m g_V ; \quad (35)$$

where only the relative sign between  $F_V$  and  $G_V$  is fixed due to the arbitrariness in (7).

The other peculiarity concerns the presence of local terms (i.e. terms containing only the other fields and currents) in the Lagrangian (26). It was already noticed in [11] that the equivalence requirement of the vector and the tensor formulations implied the presence of additional local terms in the vector Lagrangian, which otherwise did not reproduce the correct low energy limit of the

pseudo-Goldstone bosons interactions (Chiral Perturbation Theory). Again this requirement is explained in terms of the path integral equivalence of the vector and tensor field formulations.

Local terms which guarantee the path integral equivalence of the vector and tensor Lagrangians are the last three terms on the right hand side of (27). Writing  $f^+$  and  $u$  in terms of the external left and right-handed currents and the pseudo-Goldstone boson field as given in (2) we get some of the  $O(p^4)$  terms of the CHPT Lagrangian [14]:

$$\langle f_+ f^+ \rangle = \langle F_L^2 + F_R^2 + 2F_L U^\dagger F_R U \rangle = P_{H_1} + 2P_{10} \quad (36)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle [u; u]^2 \rangle &= 2 \langle D U D U^\dagger D U D U^\dagger - D U D U^\dagger D U D U^\dagger \rangle \\ &= 6P_3 + P_1 + 2P_2 \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$$i \langle f^+ [u; u] \rangle = 2i \langle F_L D U^\dagger D U + F_R D U D U^\dagger \rangle = 2P_9 \quad (38)$$

The  $P_i$  are the usual terms of the  $O(p^4)$  chiral Lagrangian [14].

Referring to the conventional definition of the coefficients of the  $O(p^4)$  CHPT Lagrangian  $L_1; L_2; \dots; L_{10}; H_1; H_2$  we find that the path integral equivalence of vector and tensor models a) fixes the contribution of vector mesons to some of the low energy coefficients and b) implies relations among them. Both a) and b) classes of identities have been derived in other ways, but never proven at the formal level as it is shown here. The structure of the local term in eq. (36) implies

$$H_1^V = \frac{f_V^2}{8}; \quad L_{10}^V(\frac{II}{10}) = \frac{f_V^2}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad L_{10}^V = 2H_1^V \quad (39)$$

The coefficient  $L_{10}^V$  is also the coefficient  $\frac{II}{10}$  of [11] of the same local term added to the vector Lagrangian in order to satisfy the equivalence with the tensor one.

The local term in eq. (37) can be reduced to a more familiar form via the use of SU(3) relations for flavour traces [14]. Its structure implies

$$L_1^V; \frac{II}{1} = \frac{g_V^2}{8} \quad L_2^V; \frac{II}{2} = \frac{g_V^2}{4} \quad L_3^V; \frac{II}{3} = \frac{3}{4}g_V^2 \quad (40)$$

which give the identities  $L_2^V = 2L_1^V$  and  $L_3^V = 3L_2^V$ .

Local term (38) fixes the vector contribution to the low energy parameter  $L_9$  (which also corresponds to the coefficient  $\frac{II}{9}$  of the same local term in [11]) to be:

$$L_9^V = \frac{f_V g_V}{2} \quad (41)$$

We thus derive the same relations as those obtained earlier.

## 4 Conclusions

In this letter we have shown explicitly the relation between a standard vector field transforming as a vector and as a antisymmetric tensor field. We can thus

immediately obtain the Lagrangians that are exactly equivalent in both pictures. The relation of the vector representation used here to the Hidden gauge model and others can be found in [11, 13].

The present work has added to the list of known field redefinitions also the one that ends up with the tensor representation. The method here can be easily generalized to terms that contain powers of quark masses and derivatives beyond those explicitly considered here, as well as to the "anomalous" or abnormal intrinsic parity sector of vector meson Lagrangians. The extension to axial vector mesons is similarly trivial.

## Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by NorFA grant 93.15.078/00. JB thanks IPN-Osney, where part of this work was done, for hospitality. The work of EP was supported by the EU Contract N.r. ERBCHBGCT 930442.

## References

- [1] R. Savit, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 52 (1980) 453.
- [2] P. K. Townsend, K. P. Ilch and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Phys. Lett. B* 136 (1984) 38.
- [3] S. Deser, R. Jackiw, *Phys. Lett. B* 139 (1984) 371.
- [4] Y. Kim, K. Lee, *Phys. Rev. D* 49 (1994) 2041.
- [5] R. L. Davis, E. P. S. Shellard, *Phys. Lett. B* 214 (1988) 219.
- [6] A. Sugamoto, *Phys. Rev. D* 19 (1979) 1820.
- [7] R. Jackiw and C. Rebbi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 37 (1976) 172.
- [8] R. Jackiw, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 52 (1980) 661.
- [9] T. Itoh, Y. Kim, M. Sugiura and K. Yamawaki, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 93 (1995) 417.
- [10] G. Ecker et al. *Nucl. Phys. B* 321 (1989) 311.
- [11] G. Ecker et al. *Phys. Lett. B* 223 (1989) 425.
- [12] E. Pallante and R. Petronzio, *Nucl. Phys. B* 396 (1993) 205.
- [13] K. Yamawaki, *Phys. Rev. D* 35 (1987) 412.
- [14] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *Nucl. Phys. B* 250 (1985) 465.