arXiv:hep-th/0207232v1 25 Jul 2002

hep-th/0207232

Induced $N = 2$ composite supersymmetry in 2+1 dimensions

J. Alexandre, **N.E. Mavromatos** and **Sarben Sarkar**
Department of Physics, Theoretical Physics Group, King's College London,
Strand, London WC2R 2LS, UK

Abstract

Starting from $N = 1$ scalar supermultiplets in 2+1 dimensions, we build explicitly the composite superpartners which define a $N = 2$ superalgebra induced by the initial $N = 1$ supersymmetry. The occurrence of this extension is linked to the topologically conserved current out of which the composite superpartners are constructed.

The study of $2+1$ dimensional gauge theories has been motivated by the search for an understanding of confinement [1]. The degree to which they can be of help in understanding confinement at zero temperature in three space dimensions is unclear because the nature and possible configurations of textures, instantons and other non-perturbative features such as the locality of disorder variables are very different. Their attraction is that their comparative simplicity allows a much more complete understanding of the confinement phenomenon. However another reason for studying such theories is the interest in planar system in high temperature superconductors [2] where the phases are believed not to be of conventional type . In particular string-like structures which are features of confinement in the gauge theories occur as inhomogeneities in the charge and magnetic order [3] in certain parameter regimes of these materials. Both in the study of confinement and the condensed matter analogues, some of the reason for controversy is the room for error in the calculations that can be performed due to the intrinsic limitations of the methods themselves. It is thus important to pursue models with exact solutions. Unlike for $1+1$ dimensions where infinite-dimensional groups and the factorizability of the S-matrix are at play [4], dynamical supersymmetry is an important ingredient for obtaining exact information about the phases of the theory [5]. Although $N=1$ symmetry has been demonstrated for a condensed matter model [6], a lack of holomorphicity properties has meant that exact non-perturbative information is not available. The situation is much improved for $N=2$ supersymmetry. This paper demonstrates how that $N=1$ supersymmetry, which was in terms of constituent fields, can be elevated to a $N=2$ supersymmetry in terms of suitably constructed composite fields.

Our results may be of relevance in attempts towards an analytic understanding at a non-perturbative level of the dynamics of strongly-correlated electron systems, with relevance to high-temperature superconductivity and more generally to antiferromagnetism. Also our model may be viewed as a toy model for an understanding of ideas related to the so-called *scaleless limit* of gauge theories [7], where the gauge fields appear dynamically from more fundamental interacting constituents in the theory.

However, in the four-dimensional setting of [7], the emergent gauge bosons (photons) appeared as Goldstone bosons of a spontaneous breakdown of Lorentz symmetry, associated with non-zero vacuum expectation values (v.e.v.) of vector fields linearising the four-fermion Thirring interactions of the model. In three space-time dimensions, on the other hand, the photons have only a single degree of freedom and hence they are allowed to get a v.e.v without breaking Lorentz symmetry. It is this fact that allows the extension of such ideas in (2+1)-dimensions to incorporate supersymmetry, which is intimately related to Lorentz invariance. From a physical point of view, with relevance to strongly-correlated electrons, we have Lorentz symmetry since we restrict our attention to excitations near nodes of the fermi surface of such systems [6]; the rôle of the velocity of 'light' is played by the fermi velocity at the node.

We will first summarize the results of [8], dealing with distinct $N=1$ quadratic composite supermultiplets and then describe the procedure of adding higher order composites so as to generate the coupling between the scalar and vector supermultiplets. This coupling implies the $N=2$ structure of the transformations. Eventually, we give the explicit

construction of the quartic composites and show that their existence is intimately linked to the topologically conserved current.

We use a representation of the Clifford algebra where all the γ-matrices are real: $\gamma^0 = -i\sigma^2$, $\gamma^1 = \sigma^1$ and $\gamma^2 = \sigma^3$ and they satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \{\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu\} &= 2g^{\mu\nu}, \quad \text{with } g^{\mu\nu} = (-1,1,1) \\ [\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu] &= -2\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}\gamma_\rho. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

We start from two complex $N = 1$ scalar supermultiplets (z_a, ψ_a, f_a), $a = 1, 2$, containing the constituent fields which transform as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta z_a &= \overline{\varepsilon}\psi_a \\ \delta\psi_a &= \not{\partial} z_a \varepsilon + f_a \varepsilon \\ \delta f_a &= \overline{\varepsilon}\ \not{\partial}\psi_a, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where ε is a real Grassmann parameter and $\overline{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon^T\gamma^0$. We will use the following essential properties concerning the scalar quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\psi}_1\psi_2 &= (\overline{\psi}_2\psi_1)^\star \\ \overline{\psi}_1\gamma_\mu\psi_2 &= -(\overline{\psi}_2\gamma_\mu\psi_1)^\star, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

and the 2×2 matrix [8]:

$$\psi_2\overline{\psi}_1 = -\frac{1}{2}\left(\overline{\psi}_1\psi_2 + (\overline{\psi}_1\gamma_\mu\psi_2)\gamma^\mu\right), \tag{4}$$

where $\overline{\psi}_a = \psi_a^\dagger\gamma^0$.

It was found in [8] that the quadratic composites

$$\begin{aligned} \phi &= \overline{\psi}_1\psi_2 \\ A_\mu &= \overline{\psi}_1\gamma_\mu\psi_2 - z_1^\star\partial_\mu z_2 + z_2\partial_\mu z_1^\star \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

belong respectively to a $N = 1$ scalar supermultiplet (ϕ, ψ, f) and a $N = 1$ vector supermultiplet (A_μ, χ) where, in terms of the constituent fields, the composite superpartners read as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &= (f_1^\star - \not{\partial} z_1^\star)\psi_2 + (f_2 - \not{\partial} z_2)\psi_1^\star \\ \chi &= (f_1^\star + \not{\partial} z_1^\star)\psi_2 - (f_2 + \not{\partial} z_2)\psi_1^\star \\ f &= 2(f_1^\star f_2 - \partial_\mu z_1^\star\partial^\mu z_2) - \overline{\psi}_1\ \not{\partial}\psi_2 - (\overline{\psi}_2\ \not{\partial}\psi_1)^\star. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The transformation of A_μ has actually the expected form up to a gauge transformation, which implies that it must be a gauge field. The fields defined in Eqs.(5) are complex; although they are not the physical degrees of freedom, they have the generic composite structure that we want to study. The physical degrees of freedom form $SU(2)$ triplets of composites which are given in [8], such that we have three $N = 1$ scalar supermultiplets and three $N = 1$ vector supermultiplets. From the three scalar composite supermultiplets, we form one real and one complex $N = 1$ scalar supermultiplets, that we denote by (ϕ_r, ψ_r, f_r) and (ϕ_c, ψ_c, f_c) respectively. The $N = 1$ composite supersymmetric transformations, found in [8], are then

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\phi_r &= \overline{\varepsilon}\psi_r, \quad \delta\psi_r = (\not{\partial}\phi_r + f_r)\varepsilon, \quad \delta f_r = \overline{\varepsilon}\not{\partial}\psi_r, \\
\delta\phi_c &= \overline{\varepsilon}\psi_c, \quad \delta\psi_c = (\not{\partial}\phi_c + f_c)\varepsilon, \quad \delta f_c = \overline{\varepsilon}\not{\partial}\psi_c, \\
\delta A^a_\mu &= \overline{\varepsilon}\gamma_\mu\chi^a, \quad \delta\chi^a = -\frac{1}{2}F^a_{\mu\nu}\gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu\varepsilon,
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $F^a_{\mu\nu}$ is the *Abelian* field strength of A^a_μ (quadratic in the constituent fields), for each gauge index $a = 1, 2, 3$ and the gauginos χ^a are real.

In order to elevate the $N = 1$ supersymmetry to a $N = 2$ (Abelian) supersymmetry, we should couple the complex composite scalar supermultiplet to one of the composite vector supermultiplets, which we denote as (A_μ, χ). For this, we will construct explicitly the covariant derivative of ϕ_c by adding to the complex quadratic scalar field a *higher order composite* which will generate the minimal coupling. We take into account the quartic contribution only and neglect the higher orders: we are looking for a quartic composite scalar M whose supersymmetric transformations generate the quartic fermion Λ and the quartic auxiliary field $\mathcal{F}$ such that, under the transformations (2), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta M &= \overline{\varepsilon}\Lambda \\
\delta\Lambda &= (-i\not{A}\phi_c + \not{\partial}M + \mathcal{F})\,\varepsilon \\
\delta\mathcal{F} &= \overline{\varepsilon}(-i\not{A}\psi_c + \not{\partial}\Lambda)
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

We shall find that the transformation (8) of the fermion is satisfied in the gauge defined by the *complex* equation

$$\partial^\nu\left(A_\nu\Box\phi_c\right) = 0, \tag{9}$$

which consequently implies two gauge conditions. This is possible in (2+1) dimensions, since a gauge field has one physical degree of freedom [9]. The transformation (8) of the auxiliary field will be satisfied up to irrelevant operators which are higher order derivative operators. We will neglect these derivative interactions between the composites. This approximation is in the spirit of the low-energy effective theories that concern us. Such terms will not affect the infrared universality class of the model in which we are interested.

Making the substitutions:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_c &\rightarrow \Phi = \phi_c + gM \\ \psi_c &\rightarrow \Psi = \psi_c + g\Lambda \\ f_c &\rightarrow F = f_c + g\mathcal{F}, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where g is a dimensionful constant, we shall then obtain the expected covariant derivatives

$$\begin{aligned} D_\mu\Phi &= (\partial_\mu - igA_\mu)\Phi \\ &= \partial_\mu\phi_c - igA_\mu\phi_c + g\partial_\mu M + \text{sixth order composite} \\ D_\mu\Psi &= (\partial_\mu - igA_\mu)\Psi \\ &= \partial_\mu\psi_c - igA_\mu\psi_c + g\partial_\mu\Lambda + \text{sixth order composite} \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

in the (supersymmetry) transformation laws of the complex fermion Ψ and auxiliary field F respectively. Next, we shall construct the complex gaugino $\lambda = \psi_r + i\chi$ and obtain from Eqs.(7) the following transformations

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\Phi &= \overline{\varepsilon}\Psi, \qquad \delta\Psi = (\not{D}\Phi + F)\varepsilon, \\ \delta\phi_r &= \overline{\varepsilon}\psi_r, \qquad \delta A_\mu = \overline{\varepsilon}\gamma_\mu\chi, \\ \delta\lambda &= \left(\not{\partial}\phi_r + f_r - \frac{i}{2}F_{\mu\nu}\gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu\right)\varepsilon \\ \delta f_r &= \overline{\varepsilon}\not{\partial}\psi_r \qquad \delta F \simeq \overline{\varepsilon}\not{D}\Psi, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where the reason for the symbol $\simeq$ in the transformation of the auxiliary field F will become clear later on (see discussion after Eq.(35)).

The above equations (12) constitute an off-shell set of $N = 2$ transformations if and only if the parameter ε is complex, i.e. when the transformations (12) are followed by a phase rotation of the spinors λ and Ψ (note that a phase rotation of λ is equivalent to the same phase rotation for χ and ψ_r, which is necessary in order to keep the fields ϕ_r and A_μ real). In [10], where "elementary" and not composite fields are considered, the authors write a set of *on-shell* $N = 2$ transformations in the context of the Abelian Higgs model and use the equations of motion of the auxiliary fields. These auxiliary fields are then expressed in terms of the scalar fields ϕ_r and Φ and the coupling g' of the Higgs potential [10]. This Higgs self-coupling g' *does not* appear in our purely algebraic considerations above. Nevertheless, at a Lagrangian level, the $N = 2$ superalgebra structure imposes a relation [10] between the couplings g and g'. Since we are dealing here with only algebraic aspects of the composite supersymmetry, we shall not go into such detailed discussions on the dynamics of the model and the associated physical consequences for strongly-correlated electron systems. Such issues have been briefly mentioned in [8], and a more detailed analysis will be postponed to a forthcoming publication.

We also remark that the extension of the composite $N = 1$ transformations (7) to a $N = 2$ *non-Abelian* superalgebra would involve too many gauge conditions. Besides the addition of a quartic scalar, this extension requires quartic gauge fields $\mathcal{A}_\mu^a$ in order to generate the covariant derivatives.The $\mathcal{A}_\mu^a$ would transform into quartic gauginos Ξ^a as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mathcal{A}_\mu^a &= \overline{\varepsilon}\gamma_\mu\Xi^a \\ \delta\Xi^a &= f^{abc}\ \not{A}^b\ \not{A}^c\varepsilon, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

so as to generate the non-Abelian field strength in the transformation of the gauginos (f^{abc} are the $SU(2)$ structure constants). We found that the transformations (13) of the quartic gauginos are satisfied provided we impose two new constraints on each colour of the gauge field. This shows that a non-Abelian model of the type considered in [11], cannot be obtained with the composite procedure developed here.

Finally, we note that no new constraints arise if we consider higher order composites: the quartic composite can be seen as the truncation of a series of composite operators which lead to the exact covariant derivatives if they are ressummed. The gauge condition (9) gives rise to a gauge fixing term in the Lagrangian which is also the truncation of a series of gauge fixing terms.

We now proceed to construct explicitly the quartic-order superpartners which lead to the transformations (12). First we note that, in order for the expression (11) of the covariant derivative to be consistent, the mass dimension of g should be -1, such that the mass dimension of M should be 3. Let us consider the following possibilities

$$\begin{aligned} \Box M^{(1)} &= \phi_c\partial^\mu A_\mu \\ \Box M^{(2)} &= A_\mu\partial^\mu\phi_c \\ \Box M^{(3)} &= \overline{\psi}_c^\star\chi. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The supersymmetric transformation of $M^{(1)}$ under (2) leads to $\delta M^{(1)} = \overline{\varepsilon}\Lambda^{(1)}$ with

$$\Box\Lambda^{(1)} = \partial^\mu A_\mu\psi_c + \phi_c\ \not{\partial}\chi. \tag{15}$$

Taking into account the properties (3), we find that the transformation of $\Box\Lambda^{(1)}$ reads

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\Box\Lambda^{(1)} &= (\ \not{\partial}\left(\phi_c\partial^\mu A_\mu\right) - \phi_c\ \not{\partial}\ \not{\partial}\ \not{A} + f_c\partial^\mu A_\mu)\,\varepsilon \\ &\quad + \Big(\ \not{\partial}\chi\overline{\psi}_c^\star - \psi_c\partial^\nu\overline{\chi}\gamma_\nu\Big)\,\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Finally, the property (4) gives

$$\delta\Box\Lambda^{(1)} = \ \not{\partial}\Box M^{(1)}\varepsilon + (f_c\partial^\mu A_\mu - \phi_c\Box\ \not{A})\,\varepsilon - \Big(\overline{\psi}_c^\star\ \not{\partial}\chi\Big)\,\varepsilon. \tag{17}$$

If we define $\delta M^{(2)} = \overline{\varepsilon}\Lambda^{(2)}$ and $\delta M^{(3)} = \overline{\varepsilon}\Lambda^{(3)}$ and proceed in a similar way, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \Box\Lambda^{(2)} &= \not{\partial}\phi_c\chi + A_\mu\partial^\mu\psi_c \\ \Box\Lambda^{(3)} &= (f_c - \not{\partial}\phi_c)\chi + (\not{\partial}\not{A} - \partial_\mu A^\mu)\psi_c, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

and the transformations of $\Box\Lambda^{(2)}$ and $\Box\Lambda^{(3)}$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\Box\Lambda^{(2)} = {} & \not{\partial}\Box M^{(2)}\varepsilon - \left(\partial^\mu\overline{\psi}_c^\star\gamma_\mu\chi\right)\varepsilon \\ & + (A_\mu\partial^\mu f_c - \partial^\mu\phi_c\not{\partial}A_\mu + \not{\partial}\phi_c\partial^\mu A_\mu - \not{\partial}\phi_c\not{\partial}\not{A})\,\varepsilon \\ \delta\Box\Lambda^{(3)} = {} & \not{\partial}\Box M^{(3)}\varepsilon + \partial^\mu\left(\overline{\psi}_c^\star\gamma_\mu\chi\right)\varepsilon \\ & + (2\not{\partial}\phi_c\not{\partial}\not{A} + 2\not{\partial}A_\mu\partial^\mu\phi_c - 2\partial_\mu\phi_c\partial^\mu\not{A} - 2\not{\partial}\phi_c\partial_\mu A^\mu)\,\varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

If we define the scalar $\tilde{M}$ to be the linear combination

$$\tilde{M} = M^{(1)} + 2M^{(2)} + M^{(3)}, \tag{20}$$

and note that $\delta\tilde{M} = \overline{\varepsilon}\tilde{\Lambda} = \overline{\varepsilon}(\Lambda_1 + 2\Lambda_2 + \Lambda_3)$, then we find

$$\delta\Box\tilde{\Lambda} = \left(-\phi_c\Box\not{A} - 2\partial_\mu\phi_c\partial^\mu\not{A} + \not{\partial}\Box\tilde{M} + \Box\tilde{\mathcal{F}}\right)\varepsilon \tag{21}$$

where the auxiliary field $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ satisfies

$$\Box\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = 2A_\mu\partial^\mu f_c + f_c\partial^\mu A_\mu - \partial^\mu\overline{\psi}_c^\star\gamma_\mu\chi. \tag{22}$$

In order to generate the expected minimal coupling $\Box\,(\phi_c\not{A})$, we still need to add to (21) the operator $-\Box\phi_c\not{A}$, which will be obtained by the introduction of the scalar $M^{(4)}$ defined by the following equation

$$\partial^\rho\Box M^{(4)} = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}f_c\partial_\mu A_\nu. \tag{23}$$

Note that the occurrence of this scalar is specific to 2+1 dimensions, as it is proportional to the topologically conserved current $J^\rho = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}\partial_\mu A_\nu$, which plays a central role in the elevation of an $N = 1$ supersymmetry to an extended $N = 2$ supersymmetry [12]. If we consider the identity (1), we find that

$$\not{\partial}\not{\partial}\Box M^{(4)} = \Box^2 M^{(4)} = \not{\partial}\left(f_c(\partial^\nu A_\nu - \not{\partial}\not{A})\right), \tag{24}$$

which will be used in the supersymmetric transformations of $M^{(4)}$. The gaugino $\Lambda^{(4)}$, defined by $\delta M^{(4)} = \overline{\varepsilon}\Lambda^{(4)}$, satisfies

$$\partial^\rho\Box\Lambda^{(4)} = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}\left(\partial_\mu A_\nu\not{\partial}\psi_c + f_c\gamma_\nu\partial_\mu\chi\right), \tag{25}$$

such that

$$\not{\partial}\Box\Lambda^{(4)} = (\partial^\nu A_\nu - \not{\partial}\ \not{A})\ \not{\partial}\psi_c - 2f_c\ \not{\partial}\chi. \tag{26}$$

The supersymmetric transformation of $\Lambda^{(4)}$ then gives, when using (4),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta\left(\ \not{\partial}\Box\Lambda^{(4)}\right) \\
&= ((\partial^\nu A_\nu - \not{\partial}\ \not{A})(\ \not{\partial} f_c + \Box\phi_c) - 2f_c\ \not{\partial}(\partial^\nu A_\nu - \not{\partial}\ \not{A}))\,\varepsilon \\
&\quad + \gamma_\rho\left(\partial_\sigma\overline{\psi}_c^\star\gamma^\rho\partial^\sigma\chi - \partial^\rho\overline{\psi}_c^\star\ \not{\partial}\chi\right)\varepsilon + \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}\left(\partial_\nu\overline{\psi}_c^\star\partial_\mu\chi\right)\gamma_\rho\varepsilon \\
&= \not{\partial}\left(-\Box\phi_c\ \not{A} + \not{\partial}\Box M^{(4)} + \Box\mathcal{F}^{(4)}\right)\varepsilon + \partial^\nu\left(A_\nu\Box\phi_c\right)\varepsilon,
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where the quartic auxiliary field $\mathcal{F}^{(4)}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial^\rho\Box\mathcal{F}^{(4)} &= \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}A_\mu\partial_\nu\Box\phi_c + 2\partial_\nu\left(f_c\partial^{[\nu}A^{\rho]}\right) + f_c\left(\Box A^\rho - \partial^\rho\partial^\nu A_\nu\right) \\
&\quad + \partial_\sigma\overline{\psi}_c^\star\gamma^\rho\partial^\sigma\chi - \partial^\rho\overline{\psi}_c^\star\ \not{\partial}\chi + \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}\partial_\nu\overline{\psi}_c^\star\partial_\mu\chi.
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

We now assume the gauge choice

$$\partial^\nu\left(A_\nu\Box\phi_c\right) = 0, \tag{29}$$

which allows us to write the transformation of $\Box\Lambda^{(4)}$ in the expected form, i.e.

$$\delta\left(\Box\Lambda^{(4)}\right) = \left(-\Box\phi_c\ \not{A} + \not{\partial}\Box M^{(4)} + \Box\mathcal{F}^{(4)}\right)\varepsilon, \tag{30}$$

such that the final quartic spinor that has the expected transformation (8) is

$$\Lambda = i(\tilde{\Lambda} + \Lambda^{(4)}), \tag{31}$$

and the quartic scalar M and auxiliary field $\mathcal{F}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
M &= i(\tilde{M} + M^{(4)}) \\
\mathcal{F} &= i(\tilde{\mathcal{F}} + \mathcal{F}^{(4)}).
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Let us now consider the auxiliary field $\mathcal{F}$. It can be easily checked that

$$\begin{aligned}
-i\Box^2\mathcal{F} &= \Box\left(2A_\mu\partial^\mu f_c + f_c\partial^\mu A_\mu\right) + \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}\partial_\rho A_\mu\partial_\nu\Box\phi_c \\
&\quad - \partial^\mu\left(\Box\overline{\psi}_c^\star\gamma_\mu\chi + \partial^\nu\overline{\psi}_c^\star\gamma_\nu\partial_\mu\chi\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

The supersymmetric transformation of $\Box^2\mathcal{F}$ is then

$$\delta\left(\Box^2\mathcal{F}\right) = \overline{\varepsilon}\Box^2(-i\ \not{A}\psi_c + \not{\partial}\Lambda) + \overline{\varepsilon}S, \tag{34}$$

where the spinor S reads

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \partial^\mu f_c \partial_\mu \not\partial \chi - \not\partial f_c \Box \chi - \Box(\phi_c \Box \chi + 2\partial^\mu \phi_c \partial_\mu \chi) \\ &+ \Box\,(2\Box \not{A}\psi_c + 4\partial^\mu \not{A}\partial_\mu \psi_c + \not{A}\Box\psi_c - \not\partial A^\mu \partial_\mu \psi_c) \\ &+ \partial^\sigma(\partial^\nu A_\nu - \not\partial \not{A})(\gamma_\sigma \Box \psi_c - \partial_\sigma \not\partial \psi_c) \\ &- \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \not\partial \partial_\mu A_\nu \partial_\rho \not\partial \psi_c \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

As we can now see, setting S to zero amounts to imposing irrelevant constraints on the dynamics and neglecting higher order derivative operators, which can be omitted in the context of low energy effective theories, given that they do not affect the infrared universality class of the model. Hence, up to such terms, one obtains the following supersymmetry transformation for $\mathcal{F}$:

$$\delta\mathcal{F} \simeq \overline{\varepsilon}(-i \not{A}\psi_c + \not\partial\Lambda). \tag{36}$$

which, on account of (10) and (7), yields the standard $N = 2$ supersymmetry transformation (12) for the auxiliary field F.

Finally, the quartic scalar M that we were looking for satisfies:

$$-i\partial^\rho \Box M = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} f_c \partial_\mu A_\nu + \partial^\rho \left(2\partial^\mu \phi_c A_\mu + \phi_c \partial^\mu A_\mu + \overline{\psi}_c^\star \chi\right). \tag{37}$$

This completes the off-shell closure of the $N = 2$ supersymmetric algebra for the composite operators at a quartic order in the constituent fields.

As we have seen, with the specific choice of composite operators discussed here, of quartic order in the constituent spinon and holon fields [1], we have arrived at an $N = 2$ supersymmetric extension which coupled the two N=1 supersymmetries of the quadratic composites of [8]. The coupling was done in a way consistent with a supersymmetric Abelian Higgs model [10]. The emergence of a N=2 supersymmetry algebra at a composite level is consistent with the elevation of N=1 supersymmetry to N=2 in the constituent theory [6], due to the existence of topological currents in 2+1 dimensions.

It should be remarked at this stage that, from a physical point of view, one starts from a microscopic lattice system, an appropriately extended $t - j$ model [6] with nodes in its fermi surface. Upon assuming spin-charge separation one arrives at a continuum low-energy theory of *nodal* spinons and holon excitations, which has the form of a relativistic CP^1 σ-model (magnon-spinons) coupled to Dirac-like fermions (holon degrees of freedom). At supersymmetric points in the microscopic model phase space [6] one recovers a supersymmetric theory between the spinon and holon constituents without any dynamical gauge fields. This is the constituent theory. The non-dynamical gauge fields simply express contact interactions between spinons and holons.

[1] The form of the quadratic parts (in the constituent fields) of these operators was motivated by microscopic lattice system considerations [13, 6].

Although at first sight the model appears to have only a $N = 1$ supersymmetry, it actually has a hidden $N = 2$ supersymmetry due to its low dimensionality (2+1 dimensions), for reasons stated above. At the composite operator level, obtained after integrating out the non-dynamical gauge fields, one generates *dynamical gauge fields*, made out of appropriate combinations of spinon and holons. It is interesting to notice that the choice of composite operators made in this paper seem to necessitate an Abelian nature of the gauge field involved in the N=2 supersymmetric multiplet. We were unable to find a choice of composite operators that generate the full non-Abelian SU(2) supersymmetric model of [11].

In view of this Abelian nature of the gauge group, an interesting question arises as to whether the composite Abelian gauge field, which emerges from this construction, is compact or not. The two cases lead to very different non-perturbative dynamics [14], as exemplified by the confinement properties of the relevant three-dimensional gauge theory. Such matters will be investigated in more detail in future works.

We believe that this work, together with our earlier works on the subject [6, 8], opens up a way for a formal discussion of exact non-perturbative results for the phase-space dynamics of strongly correlated electron systems, even if, in realistic situations, the latter lie away from such supersymmetric points. If one understands analytically some aspects of the non-perturbative dynamics at supersymmetric points, then one might hope of using such knowledge to draw conclusions for the theory away from these points, where the supersymmetry is explicitly broken. We intend to continue working along these lines with a view to applying the results to realistic condensed-matter situations of relevance to high-temperature superconductivity, and more generally to antiferromagnetic systems.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by the Leverhulme Trust (U.K.).

References

[1] A. Kovner and B. Rosenstein, J. High. Energy Physics **09** (1998) 003; J. M Cornwall, Phys. Rev. **D59** (1999) 125015.

[2] C. M. Varma, Z. Nussinov and W. M. van Saarloos, Phys. Rep. **361** (2002) 267.

[3] B. Lake, H. M. Rennow, N. B. Christensen, G. Aeppli *et al.*, Nature **415** (2002) 299.

[4] A. B. Zamolodchikov and Al. B. Zamolodchikov, Ann. Phys. **120** (1979) 253; H. B. Thacker, Rev. Mod. Phys. **53** (1981) 253.

[5] O. Aharony, A. Hanany, K. Intriligator, N. Seiberg and M. J. Strassler, Nucl Phys **B499** (1997) 67.

[6] N. E. Mavromatos and Sarben Sarkar, Phys. Rev. **B62** (2000) 3438 [arXiv:cond-mat/9912323].

[7] J. Bjorken, arXiv:hep-th/0111196, and references therein.

[8] J. Alexandre, N. E. Mavromatos and Sarben Sarkar, New Jour. Phys. **4** (2002) 24 [arXiv:hep-th/0202047].

[9] B. Binegar, J. Math. Phys. **23**(8) (1982) 1511.

[10] J.Edelstein, C.Núñez, F.Schaposnik, Phys. Lett. **B329** (1994) 39.

[11] I. Affleck, J. Harvey and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B206** (1982) 413.

[12] Z. Hlousek and D. Spector, Nucl. Phys. **B370** (1992) 143.

[13] K. Farakos and N.E. Mavromatos, Phys. Rev. **B57** (1998) 317 [arXiv:cond-mat/9611072]; Mod. Phys. Lett. A **13** (1998) 1019 [arXiv:hep-lat/9707027].

[14] M. J. Strassler, arXiv:hep-th/9912142.