Integrable SU (N) vertex m odels with general toroidal boundary conditions

GAP.Ribeiro, MJ.Martins and W.Galleas

Universidade Federal de Sao Carlos Departamento de Fisica C.P. 676, 13565-905 Sao Carlos(SP), Brasil

A bstract

We form ulate the algebraic Bethe ansatz solution of the SU (N) vertex models with rather general non-diagonal toroidal boundary conditions. The reference states needed in the Bethe ansatz construction are found by performing gauge transformations on the Boltzmann weights in the manner of Baxter [1]. The structure of the transfer matrix eigenvectors consists of multi-particle states over such pseudovacuums and the corresponding eigenvalues depend crucially on the boundary matrix eigenvalues. We also discuss for N = 2 the peculiar case of twisted boundaries associated to singular matrices.

PACS numbers: 05.50+q, 02.30.K

Keywords: A lgebraic Bethe Ansatz, Lattice M odels

July 2003

1 Introduction

The study of vertex m odels have led to important developments in the eld of exactly solvable m odels in two dimensions [1]. Their transfer matrices are in general constructed from local Boltzmann weights $L_{Ai}()$ where denotes a spectral parameter. This operator can be viewed as a matrix on the space of states A representing, for instance, the horizontal degrees of freedom of the vertex m odel on the square lattice. Its matrix elements are operators on V_i where V_i represents the space of states of the vertical degrees of freedom at each site i of a chain of size L. The corresponding transfer matrix can be expressed in terms of an ordered product of $L_{Ai}()$ operator over the space A denominated monodrom y operator $T_A()$ [2],

$$T_{A}() = L_{AL}()L_{AL-1}():::L_{A1}()$$
(1)

In term softhem onodrom y m atrix, a su cient condition for integrability is the Y ang-B axter algebra [2, 3] which reads

$$R(;)T_{A}() T_{A}() = T_{A}() T_{A}()R(;)$$
(2)

where R(;) is an invertible matrix over complex numbers acting on the tensor product A = A space.

The Yang-Baxter algebra is invariant by the transform ation T_A ()! $G_A T_A$ () provided that the group of c-num bers m atrices G_A satis as the following property [4]

$$[R (;); G_A \quad G_A] = 0$$
(3)

An immediate consequence of this symmetry is the possibility to de ne the operator

$$T() = Tr_{A}[G_{A}T_{A}()]$$
 (4)

which gives origin to generalized fam ilies of commuting transferm atrices.

W hen the matrix G_A is non singular a quantum spin chain can be associated with the transfer matrix (4). For sake of simplicity, consider the usual situation in which the spaces A and V_i are isomorphic and that the L_{Ai} () is proportional to the exchange operator P_{Ai} at

certain special point say = 0. The corresponding one-dimensional Ham iltonian is obtained as a logarithm ic derivative of the transfer matrix at point = 0, which reads [4, 11]

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^{K} P_{ii+1} \frac{dL_{ii+1}()}{d} j_{=0} + G_{L}^{1} P_{L1} \frac{dL_{L1}()}{d} j_{=0} G_{L}$$
(5)

C learly, the adm issible G_A m atrices play the role of more general toroidal boundary conditions than the particular periodic case when G_A is the identity matrix, the simplest possibility satisfying relation (3). From the point of view of a vertex model, such general twisted boundary conditions correspond to the introduction of a line of defects along the in nite direction on the cylinder. Though boundary conditions are not expected to in uence the in nite volum e properties it can change the nite-size corrections of massless systems in a strip of width L which contains fundamental informations concerning the underlying conformal eld theories [5]. For instance, in statistical mechanics boundary conditions provide the means to relate the critical behaviour of a variety of di erent lattice systems such as the H eisenberg spin chain, the A shkin-Teller and the Pottsm odels [6]. In this sense, it is highly desirable to study integrable m odels with as much general boundary conditions as possible.

If the boundary matrix G_A is diagonal the corresponding transferm atrix (4) can be diagonalized with very little di erence from the periodic case because it does not change in a drastic way the properties of the monodrom y matrix elements. The same does not occur when G_A is non-diagonal, starting from the fact that the reference state of the periodic case, essential to in plement B ethe ansatz approaches, is a priori no longer of utility due to the breaking of the original bulk symmetry by the boundary terms. In fact, progress towards solving commuting transferm atrices with general twists by B ethe ansatz techniques are modest as compared with the literature known for the periodic case, specially for solvable vertex models based on Lie algebras, e.g. refs.[7, 8, 9]. To our know ledge, the six vertex model and its higher spin descendants [10, 11] are the only solvable vertex system s analyzed so far with non-diagonal boundary conditions. Even in these cases, the functional relation method used in refs.[10, 11] gives the transferm atrix eigenvalues but not inform ation on the corresponding eigenvectors. The latter is certainly an important step in the program of solving integrable system s. The purpose of this paper is the form ulation of the quantum inverse scattering m ethod for the simplest multistate generalization of the six vertex m odel having N independent degrees of freedom on each lattice bond. This turns out to be the isotropic SU (N) vertex m odel w hose origin goes back to the work by U in in [12] and Sutherland [13] on generalized integrable H eisenberg chains with higher symmetry. Its corresponding L_{Ai} () operators can be written as [14, 15]

$$L_{Ai}() = I_{Ai} + P_{Ai}$$
(6)

where as usual $I_{A\,i}$ is the identity matrix on the space $A \,\,\,$ V_i.

The interesting feature of this system is that the adm issible symmetries constitute of arbitrary N N G_A matrices due to the standard property $P_{12}A_1$ $B_2 = B_2$ A_1P_{12} . Therefore this provides us a rich variety of possible diagonal and non-diagonal boundary conditions. In next section, we present the details of the solution of the eigenvalue problem for the transfer matrix in the simplest N = 2 case. Interesting enough, we not that the Bethe ansatz solution depends on the eigenvalue problem related to the boundary G_A matrix. In section 3 we generalize these results for arbitrary values of N by using the nested Bethe ansatz approach. O un conclusions are presented in section 4 as well as a discussion of singular boundaries for the model N = 2. In Appendix A we discuss brie y the completeness of the H ilbert space for N = 2 and nite L.

2 A lgebraic Bethe ansatz for Heisenberg model

The purpose of this section is to determ ine the eigenvalues and the eigenvectors of the follow ing transferm atrix

$$T() = Tr_{A} [G_{A} L_{AL} () :::: L_{A1} ()]$$
(7)

The operator L_{Ai} () is the elementary Boltzm ann weights of the isotropic six vertex model which can be written as

where A_{ji} and A_{ji}^{z} are Paulim atrices acting on the vertical space of states and the weights are a() = +1 and b() = . The boundary matrix G_A is an arbitrary 2 2 matrix over the complex numbers whose matrix elements are denoted by

$$G_{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ B & g_{11} & g_{12} & C \\ g_{21} & g_{22} \end{bmatrix}$$
(9)

An essential ingredient of the quantum inverse scattering is the existence of a reference state such that the action of the monodrom y operator in this state gives as a result a triangular matrix. Though each of the operators L_{Ai} () when acting on the trivial spin up $\frac{B}{C}$

0 1 or spin down $\stackrel{\circ}{e}$ $\stackrel{\circ}{}_{A}$ states becomes triangular, such property is not extended to the total monodromy because the o diagonal elements of G_A are in general non-null. Therefore the standard ferrom agnetic pseudovacuum is not useful when both g_{12} and g_{21} are dierent from zero. In order to nd an appropriate reference state we have to introduce a set of gauge transformations similar to that used by Baxter [1] in the solution of the eight vertex model. We replace the local operators $L_{Ai}()$ by new matrices $f_{Aj}^{e}()$ such that [2]

$$\mathbf{\hat{E}}_{Aj}() = \mathbf{M}_{j+1}^{1} \mathbf{L}_{Aj}() \mathbf{M}_{j}$$
 (10)

where M_j are arbitrary invertible 2 2 c-number matrices acting on the space A. After performing this gauge transform ations the transfer matrix (7) becomes

$$T() = Tr_{A} [M_{1}^{1}G_{A}M_{L+1}\hat{T}_{A}()]$$
(11)

where $\mathbf{\hat{T}}_{A}$ () = $\mathbf{E}_{A\,L}$ () ::: $\mathbf{E}_{A\,1}$ ().

The next step is to look for gauge transform ations M $_{j}$ such that $E_{Aj}()$ is annihilated for instance by its lower left element for arbitrary values of the spectral parameter. Representing the matrices M $_{j}$ by $_{0}$ 1

$$M_{j} = \begin{pmatrix} B & x_{j} & r_{j} & C \\ 0 & & A \\ & & y_{j} & s_{j} \end{pmatrix}$$
(12)

we can conclude [1] that such annihilation property occurs when the ratio $\frac{x_j}{y_j}$ is a constant for j = 1; :::; L + 1. As a consequence of that we can choose the local reference state j_{i_j} as

$$j0i_{j} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ B & \frac{x_{j}}{y_{j}} & C \\ 1 & 1 \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$
(13)

following that the action of the operator ${\rm E}_{\rm A\,j}$ () in this state is given by

$$\mathbf{E}_{A_{j}}(\mathbf{)} \mathbf{D}_{j} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ B & a(\mathbf{)}_{y_{j+1}} \mathbf{D}_{j} & \# & C \\ 0 & b(\mathbf{)}_{y_{j+1}} \frac{\det M_{j}}{\det M_{j+1}} \mathbf{D}_{j} \\ \end{bmatrix}$$
(14)

where the symbol # represents general non-null values.

The remaining freedom that we have on the matrix elements of M $_j$ is now used to choose matrices M $_1$ and M $_{L+1}$ in such way that they transform the boundary matrix G_A into a diagonal matrix. M ore precisely, by imposing that

$$M_{1}^{1}G_{A}M_{L+1} = \begin{matrix} 0 & 1 \\ B & g_{1} & 0 \\ 0 & A \\ 0 & g_{2} \end{matrix}$$
(15)

it follows that the constrains for the st column elements are

$$g_{11}x_{L+1} + g_{12}y_{L+1} = g_1x_1$$

$$g_{21}x_{L+1} + g_{22}y_{L+1} = g_1y_1$$
(16)

while for the second column elements we have

$$g_{11}r_{L+1} + g_{12}s_{L+1} = g_2r_1$$

$$g_{21}r_{L+1} + g_{22}s_{L+1} = g_2s_1$$
(17)

At this point we emphasize our assumption that we are dealing with a non-singular boundary matrix. While we have an enormous freedom to choose the second column elements the same does not occur for the rst ones because the ratio $\frac{x_j}{y_j}$ needs to be kept xed to preserve triangularity of $\mathbb{I}^{e}_{A,j}$ (). This latter fact together with relation (16) in pose a restriction to this ratio which is precisely the same satis ed by ratio of the components of the eigenvectors of the boundary matrix G_A . Therefore, we have two possibilities for the ratio $p^{(-)} = \frac{x_j}{v_j}$ which are

$$p^{()} = \frac{(g_{11} \quad g_{22})}{2g_{21}} \qquad (18)$$

Putting now all these informations together it is possible to build up two appropriate global reference states $\dot{p}i^{()}$ by the tensor product

$$p_{i}^{()} = \begin{cases} 0 & 1 \\ B & p^{()} \\ 0 & A \\ j=1 & 1 \\ j \end{cases}$$
(19)

At this point the state (19) preserves at least the desirable triangular property of the total monodrom y M₁ ${}^{1}G_{A}$ M_{L+1} \hat{T}_{A} (). Below we shall see that they are indeed eigenstates of the transfer matrix (7) independent of further choices of the elements of the gauge matrices M_j. Further progress is made by recasting the Y ang-B axter algebra for the gauge transform ed monodrom y \hat{T}_{A} () in the form of commutation relations for the creation and annihilation elds. In order to do that it is convenient to represent \hat{T}_{A} () by the following 2 2 matrix

$$\mathbf{\hat{T}}_{A}(\mathbf{r}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ B & \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{r}) & \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{r}) \\ 0 & A \\ \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{r}) & \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{r}) \end{bmatrix}$$
(20)

As a consequence of the triangular property (14) we are able to derive in portant relations for the diagonal elements of the transform ed m onodrom y m atrix

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{F}() \hat{p}i^{()} &= [a()]^{L} \frac{Y_{1}}{Y_{L+1}} \hat{p}i^{()} \\
\hat{F}() \hat{p}i^{()} &= [b()]^{L} \frac{Y_{L+1}}{Y_{1}} \frac{\det[M_{1}]}{\det[M_{L+1}]} \hat{p}i^{()}
\end{aligned}$$
(21)

besides the annihilation property

$$C^{e}() jDi^{()} = 0$$
 (22)

Now taking into account that gauge matrices M $_{\rm j}$ are them selves symmetries allowed by the property (3) it is not dicult to show that the gauge transformed monodrom y $f_{\rm A}$ () matrix

satis es the same Yang-Baxter algebra as the original monodrom y matrix T_A (). In other words, we have that f_A () satis es the relation

$$R(;)f_{A}() = f_{A}() = f_{A}() R(;)$$
(23)

where in our case the R-matrix is given by

$$R(;) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & b(&) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b(&) & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & a(&) \end{bmatrix}$$
(24)

This means that we have the same set of commutation rules of the periodic six vertex model [2, 3] how ever now for the gauged matrix elements. Out of sixteen possible relations three of them are of great use, namely

$$\hat{R}()\hat{B}() = \frac{a()}{b()}\hat{B}()\hat{R}() - \frac{1}{b()}\hat{B}()\hat{R}()$$
 (25)

$$\vec{\mathbb{B}}(\)\vec{\mathbb{B}}(\) = \frac{a(\)}{b(\)}\vec{\mathbb{B}}(\)\vec{\mathbb{B}}(\) = \frac{a(\)}{b(\)} (26)$$

The elds $B^{e}()$ are then interpreted as a kind of creation operators over the pseudovacuum ${{{\rm Di}}^{(\)}}$ and a natural ansatz for the eigenvectors j i^() of the transferm atrix T () is

$$j i^{()} = \prod_{j=1}^{\frac{N}{2}} B (j^{)} j j i^{()}$$
 (28)

The eigenvalue problem T () j $i^{()} = i^{()}$ () j $i^{()}$ now becomes

$$\mathbf{g}_{1}\mathcal{R}() + \mathbf{g}_{2}\mathbf{\tilde{P}}() \mathbf{j}\mathbf{i}^{()} = {}^{()}()\mathbf{j}\mathbf{i}^{()}$$
(29)

and it can be solved in the same way as the periodic six vertex model [2], is by taking the elds $\hat{A}()$ and $\hat{B}()$ through the creation operators $\hat{B}()$ with the help of the commutation nules (25-27). One peculiarity here, however, is that the calculations involving the action of the diagonal elds $\hat{A}()$ and $\hat{B}()$ over the reference state $\hat{Di}^{()}$ requires extra simplications

to eliminate unnecessary dependence of the gauge matrices elements. They are carried out by using the help of Eqs. (16 - 18) and our nal result for the eigenvalues () () are

provided that the rapidities ${i \choose i}$ satisfy the following Bethe ansatz equations

$$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 4 \\ \underline{i} \\ \underline{g}^{()} \\ \underline{j}^{j-1} \\ \underline{j}^{j-1} \\ \underline{i} \\ \underline{j} \\ \underline{j} \\ \underline{i} \\ \underline{j} \\ \underline{j} \\ \underline{i} \\ \underline{i} \\ \underline{i} \\ \underline{j} \\ \underline{i} \\ \underline{i}$$

where we have perform ed the convenient shift $\begin{pmatrix} i \\ i \end{pmatrix} ! \begin{pmatrix} i \\ i \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2}$. The phase factors $g^{()}$ are just the eigenvalues of the matrix G_A

$$g^{()} = \frac{(g_{11} + g_{22})}{2} \frac{(g_{11} - g_{22})^2 + 4g_{12}g_{21}}{2}$$
(32)

Rather remarkably, we see that the nalform of the eigenvalues and Bethe ansatz equations resemble much that of the isotropic six vertex model with diagonal boundary if we replace the diagonal twists by the eigenvalues of the non-diagonal boundary GA matrix. The eigenvectors can also be thought as multi-particle states in which the integers n L play the role of particle number sectors. We emphasize, however, that the corresponding basic creation elds are much more sophisticated operators than that of the periodic six vertex model [2]. It is tem pting to think that the two possible ways we have at our disposal to build up the H ilbert space is related to the remaining Z_2 symmetry allowed by boundary terms. One expects therefore that it should be possible to obtain the eigenvalues of the transfer matrix either from the Di⁽⁺⁾ or Di⁽⁾ pseudovacuum s. Indeed, we have veried this fact by num erically solving the equations for some values of L and comparing them to exact diagonalization of the transferm atrix (7). We note, however, that a given eigenvalue of the transferm atrix is in general obtained at di erent particle sectors n over the $\mathfrak{Pi}^{()}$ reference states. For example, the eigenvalue $q^+ [a()]^L + q^- [b()]^L$ can be obtained either from the zero-particle state $Di^{(+)}$ or as a L-particle state over the pseudovacuum 'Di''. In Appendix A, we present details of our study for L = 2 in which Eqs.(30-31) can be solved by analytical means. Our num erical results

up to L = 4 suggest that two possible branches of the Bethe ansatz solutions (31) produce the complete spectrum of the transferm atrix (7). It would be interesting to further investigate the completeness of the Bethe ansatz (31) by adapting the recent arguments developed by Baxter [16] to the case of non-diagonal twists.

We now can derive similar results for the spin chain that commutes with the transferm atrix (7). The corresponding spin-1=2 XXX H amiltonian follows from expression (5) and it is given by !

$$H = J \begin{pmatrix} X^{L} & & \\ & j & \\ & j & j+1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} z & z & z \\ j & j+1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} z & z & z \\ j & j+1 \end{pmatrix}$$
(33)

with the following boundary condition

Its eigenvalues E () = $\frac{dLog[())}{d} j_{=0}$ are

$$E^{()} = J \frac{X}{j=1} \frac{1}{j^{2} \frac{1}{4}} + \frac{JL}{2}$$
(35)

where i satisfy the Bethe ansatz equations (31).

Our nal comment concerns with the comparison between our results (30-31) and that of refs.[10, 11] in the isotropic limit case when the trigonometric weights become rational functions. We see that they are in accordance for the common non-diagonal boundary $G_A = B \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g_{12} \\ g_{21} \end{pmatrix} A$ apart from the fact that our numbers of roots n can vary up to L while that of refs.[10, 11] are xed at L. This implies that for non-diagonal boundary conditions the complete solution of the isotropic limit does not follows directly from that found for the anisotropic six vertex model [10, 11]. This means that even for this particular non-diagonal boundary the results (30-31) are novel in the literature.

3 Nested Bethe ansatz for SU(N) model

The purpose of this section is to generalize the results of the previous section for general N . We wish to diagonalize the transferm atrix (7), where now the operator L_{Ai} () is

$$L_{Ai}() = a() \overset{X^{N}}{=} e^{(A)} e^{(A)} e^{(A)} + b() \overset{X^{N}}{=} e^{(A)} e^{(A)}$$

where $e_{ij}^{(V)}$ are the standard W eylm atrices whose elements acting on the space V are $[e_{ij}^{(V)}]_{kl} = _{ik jl}$. In this basis the boundary matrix G_A is generally represented by

$$G_{A} = \int_{i=1}^{X^{N}} g e^{(A)}$$
(37)

A s before we have to seek for suitable references states by in posing the gauge transform ation (10) for each operator (36) and require that they are up triangular when acting on such pseudovacuum. D enoting the gauge matrices by $M_j = \begin{pmatrix} X^N \\ & m_j \\ & & m_j \end{pmatrix} e^{(A_j)}$ we match that such ; = 1

$$p_{j} = \frac{m_{j}(j)}{m_{j}(N_{j})} = \frac{m_{j+1}(j)}{m_{j+1}(N_{j})}; \quad j = 1; :::; N \qquad 1$$
(38)

for each j = 1; :::; L + 1. In term s of these ratios the local reference state \mathcal{D}_{i_j} assume the form

O ther important ingredient is the action of the gauge transform ed operator $I_{A\,j}^{e}$ () over the local state of reference. This now can be represented by the following N N m atrix on the space A

$$\mathbf{E}_{A,j} \mathbf{D}_{i_{j}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & a() \frac{f_{i}^{j}}{f_{1}^{j+1}} \mathbf{D}_{i_{j}} & \# & \# & \# & \# & \\ 0 & b() \frac{f_{2}^{j}}{f_{2}^{j+1}} \mathbf{D}_{i_{j}} & \# & \# & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & b \frac{f_{N}^{j}}{f_{N}^{j+1}} \mathbf{D}_{i_{j}} & \\ & & & & & \\ \end{bmatrix}$$
(40)

where the variables f^j are given by

$$f^{j} = \begin{cases} 8 \\ \ge \\ m_{j}(N;); \\ \frac{NY}{2} \\ \frac{1}{m_{j}(N; i)} \end{cases} det[M_{j}]; = N$$
(41)

Similarly to the previous section we can take advantage of the remaining freedom of the elements of the gauge matrices to transform $M_1^{-1}G_A M_{L+1}$ into a diagonal matrix. By imposing this condition the matrices elements of M_1 and M_{L+1} become related by the expression

$$X^{N}$$
 g $m_{L+1}(;) = m_{1}(;)g; ; = 1; :::;N$ (42)

where g represent the diagonal elements of the transform ed boundary matrix.

Equations (38) and (42) together in pose constrains to the possible values ratios p; which turns out to be same conditions satis ed by the ratio of the components of the eigenvectors of boundary matrix G_A . This means that we have N possible choices for $p_{j1}^{(l)} l = 1; ...; N$ and consequently from Eq.(39) N kind of suitable local references states $\mathfrak{Di}_j^{(l)}$. A natural ansatz for the N possible choices of global reference states are

$$\dot{D}i^{(l)} = \int_{j=1}^{Y^L} \dot{D}i^{(l)}_j \quad l = 1; \dots; N$$
 (43)

The next step is to write a suitable representation for the gauge transform ed m onodrom y m atrix in the auxiliary space A. The triangular property (40) suggests us to seek for the structure used in nested Bethe ansatz diagonalization of the periodic SU (N) vertex m odels

[14, 15] which is

$$\mathbf{\hat{T}}(\mathbf{n}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & & 1 \\ & \mathbf{\hat{K}}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{N-1}(\mathbf{n}) & & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{11}(\mathbf{n}) & & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{1N-1}(\mathbf{n}) & & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{11}(\mathbf{n}) & & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{1N-1}(\mathbf{n}) & & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{11}(\mathbf{n}) & & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{1N-1}(\mathbf{n}) & & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{11}(\mathbf{n}) & & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{1N-1}(\mathbf{n}) & & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{11}(\mathbf{n}) & & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{1N-1}(\mathbf{n}) & & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{11}(\mathbf{n}) & & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{1N-1}(\mathbf{n}) & & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{11}(\mathbf{n}) & & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{1N-1}(\mathbf{n}) & & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{11}(\mathbf{n}) & & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{1N-1}(\mathbf{n}) & & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{11}(\mathbf{n}) & & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{1N-1}(\mathbf{n}) & & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{11}(\mathbf{n}) & & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{1N-1}(\mathbf{n}) & & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{11}(\mathbf{n}) & & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{1N-1}(\mathbf{n}) & & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{11}(\mathbf{n}) & & \mathbf{\hat{B}}_{1N-1}(\mathbf{n}) & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \\ & \mathbf{\hat{C}}_{1}(\mathbf{n}) & \mathbf{\hat{C}}$$

The triangularity property (40) in plies that the elds $\mathbb{B}_{i}()$ play the role of creations operators, $\mathfrak{E}_{i}()$ are annihilation elds while the diagonal operator $\mathcal{R}()$ and $\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{ii}()$ acts on the reference state $\mathfrak{P}i^{(l)}$ as

$$\hat{R}()\hat{D}i^{(l)} = [a()]^{L} \frac{f_{1}^{l}}{f_{1}^{L+1}} \hat{D}i^{(l)}$$
(45)

$$\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{\underline{i}\underline{i}}()\hat{\mathbb{D}}\underline{i}^{(\underline{l})} = [\mathbb{D}()]^{\underline{L}} \frac{f_{\underline{i}+1}^{1}}{f_{\underline{i}+1}^{\underline{L}+1}} \hat{\mathbb{D}}\underline{i}^{(\underline{l})}; \underline{i} = 1; \dots; \mathbb{N} \quad 1$$
(46)

To construct other eigenvectors we shall use the commutation relations between the gauge transform ed m onodrom y m atrix elements. The arguments used in section 2 allows to conclude that these commutation rules are the same as that already known for the periodic SU (N) m odels [14, 15]. The most useful relations for subsequent derivations are

$$\mathcal{A}()\mathcal{B}_{i}() = \frac{a()}{b()}\mathcal{B}_{i}()\mathcal{A}() - \frac{1}{b()}\mathcal{B}_{i}()\mathcal{A}()$$
(47)

$$\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{ij}()\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{k}() = \frac{1}{b()}\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{p}()\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{iq}()r^{(1)}() \qquad \gamma_{pq}^{jk} = \frac{1}{b()}\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{j}()\hat{\mathbb{B}}_{ik}() \qquad (48)$$

$$\hat{B}_{i}()\hat{B}_{j}() = \hat{B}_{p}()\hat{B}_{q}()r^{(1)}()^{ij}_{pq}$$
(49)

where r⁽¹⁾ ()^{ij}_{pq} are the elements of the R -m atrix associated to the SU (N 1) vertex m odel. In terms of the gauge transformed elds, the eigenvalue problem for the transfer m atrix T () becomes

$$\mathbf{g}_{1}\hat{A}^{0}() + \prod_{i=1}^{N_{X}} \mathbf{g}_{i+1} \mathbf{\tilde{b}}_{ii}() \mathbf{j} \mathbf{i}^{(1)} = \mathbf{g}_{i+1}() \mathbf{j} \mathbf{i}^{(1)}$$
(50)

where $j i^{(l)}$ denotes the eigenvectors. Previous experience with these models [14, 15] suggests us to suppose that eigenvectors can be written in terms of the following linear combination

$$j i^{(l)} = \mathcal{B}_{a_{1}} \begin{pmatrix} {}^{(1;l)}_{1} \end{pmatrix} ::: \mathcal{B}_{a_{m_{1}}} \begin{pmatrix} {}^{(1;l)}_{m_{1}} \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}^{a_{m_{1}}} \overset{a_{m_{1}}}{\longrightarrow} j j i^{(l)}$$
(51)

where sum over repeated indices $a_n = 1$; ::: N 1 is assumed. At this stage the components $F^{a_{m_1}::a_1}$ are thought as coecients of an arbitrary linear combination that are going to be determined a posteriori.

By carrying on the elds $\hat{A}()$ and $\hat{B}_{ii}()$ over the multi-particle state (51) we generate term s that are proportional to j i⁽¹⁾ and those that are not the so-called unwanted term s. The rst ones will contribute directly to the eigenvalue ⁽¹⁾() and are obtained by keeping only the rst term of the commutation rules (47-48). These calculations are by now standard in the literature and here we present only the main results of the action of the transferm atrix on the eigenvector j i⁽¹⁾ which is

All the pieces entering the above expression can be summarized as follows. The terms $T^{(1)}$ (; $f_{i}^{(1;1)}g)_{b_{1}:::b_{m\frac{1}{1}}}^{a_{1}:::a_{m\frac{1}{1}}}$ are transfer matrix elements of an auxiliary inhomogeneous problem related to the SU (N 1) vertex model with twisted boundaries G de ned by

$$T^{(1)}(;f_{i}^{(1;1)}g)_{b_{1}::b_{m_{1}}}^{a_{1}::a_{m_{1}}} = r^{(1)}(\frac{(1;1)}{1})_{b_{1}d_{1}}^{aa_{1}}r^{(1)}(\frac{(1;1)}{2})_{b_{2}d_{2}}^{d_{1}a_{2}}:::r^{(1)}(\frac{(1;1)}{m_{1}^{1}})_{b_{m_{1}}d_{m_{1}}}^{d_{m_{1}}1,a_{m_{1}}} \mathfrak{G}_{ad_{m_{1}}}$$
(53)

where $\ensuremath{\mathfrak{G}}_{\ensuremath{\mathsf{ab}}}$ denotes the elements of the boundary matrix $\ensuremath{\mathfrak{G}}$ given by

$$\mathfrak{E} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{g}_{2} \frac{f_{2}^{1}}{f_{2}^{L+1}} & \# & \# & \# \\ \mathbf{g}_{2} \frac{f_{2}^{1}}{f_{2}^{L+1}} & \# & \# \\ \mathbf{g}_{2} \frac{f_{2}^{1}}{f_{2}^{L+1}} & \# & \# \\ \mathbf{g}_{2} \frac{f_{2}^{1}}{f_{2}^{L+1}} & \# & \# \\ \mathbf{g}_{3} \frac{f_{3}^{1}}{f_{3}^{L+1}} & \# & \# \\ \mathbf{g}_{3} \frac{f_{3}^{1}}{f_{3}^{L+1}} & \# & \# \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{g}_{1} \frac{f_{2}^{1}}{f_{3}^{L+1}} & \mathbf{g}_{2} \frac{f_{3}^{1}}{f_{3}^{L+1}} \\ \mathbf{g}_{1} \frac{f_{3}^{1}}{f_{3}^{L+1}} & \# & \# \\ \mathbf{g}_{2} \frac{f_{2}^{1}}{f_{2}^{L+1}} & \# & \# \\ \mathbf{g}_{3} \frac{f_{3}^{1}}{f_{3}^{L+1}} & \# \\ \mathbf{g}_{3} \frac{f_{3}^{1}}{f_{3}} & \# \\ \mathbf{g$$

The unwanted term s are originated when the variables ${}^{(1,1)}_{i}$ of the multi-particle state (51) are exchanged with the spectral parameter due to the second part of the commutation rules (47-48). It is possible to collect these terms in closed forms, thanks to the commutation rule

(49) which makes possible to relate di erent ordered multi-particle states. It turns out that all the unwanted term s are canceled out provided that the rapidities $_{i}^{(1;1)}$ satisfy the following restriction,

$$g_{1} \frac{f_{1}^{1}}{f_{1}^{L+1}} 4 \frac{a\left(\frac{(1;l)}{i}\right)}{b\left(\frac{(1;l)}{i}\right)} 5 \int_{\substack{j=1\\ j \in i}}^{a_{1}} b\left(\frac{(1;l)}{j}\right) \frac{a\left(\frac{(1;l)}{j}\right)}{b\left(\frac{(1;l)}{j}\right)} F^{\frac{a_{n}}{1}} F^{\frac{a_{n}}{1}} = T^{(1)} \left(= \frac{(1;l)}{i}; f^{\frac{(1;l)}{j}}g_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}} + \frac{a_{n}^{1}}{m_{1}^{2}} F^{\frac{b_{n}}{1}} F^{\frac{b_{n}}{1}} ; j = 1; :::; m^{\frac{1}{1}}$$
(55)

Now we reached a point which is fundamental to diagonalize $T^{(1)}(;f_i^{(1;1)}g)$ in order to compute the eigenvalues of T() and at the same time to solve Eq.(55). This becomes possible if we require that $F^{a_{m1}^{-1} \cdots a_1}$ is an eigenvector of the auxiliary transfer matrix with eigenvalue ⁽¹⁾(;f_i^{(1;1)}g), namely

$$T^{(1)}(;f_{i}^{(1;1)}g)_{a_{1}}^{b_{1}} \xrightarrow{m_{1}}{}_{a_{1}}^{b}F^{b_{m_{1}}} \xrightarrow{m_{1}}{}_{a_{1}}^{b_{m_{1}}} = (1)(;f_{i}^{(1)}g)F^{a_{m_{1}}} \xrightarrow{a_{m_{1}}}{}_{a_{1}}^{a_{m_{1}}}$$
(56)

Inspection of Eq.(52) and Eq.(55) together with Eq.(56) shows that the eigenvalue of T () is

$$()^{(l)} = \mathbf{g}_{l} \frac{\mathbf{f}_{1}^{l}}{\mathbf{f}_{1}^{L+1}} [\mathbf{a}()]^{L} \frac{\mathbf{\tilde{y}}_{1}^{l}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{b}(\frac{(1;l)}{i})} + [\mathbf{b}()]^{L} \frac{\mathbf{\tilde{y}}_{1}^{l}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{b}(\frac{(1;l)}{i})} \stackrel{(1)}{=} (\mathbf{j}_{1}^{l} \mathbf{f}_{1}^{(1;l)})$$
(57)

and the nested Bethe ansatz equations (55) become

$$\mathbf{g}_{1} \frac{f_{1}^{1}}{f_{1}^{L+1}} \frac{4}{2} \frac{\mathbf{a} \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix}}{\mathbf{b} \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix}} 5 \int_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \in i}}^{m} \mathbf{b} \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} \frac{\mathbf{a} \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ j \end{pmatrix}}{\mathbf{b} \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ j \end{pmatrix}} \frac{\mathbf{a} \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ j \end{pmatrix}}{\mathbf{b} \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ j \end{pmatrix}} = (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1) \\ (1) \\ (1) \end{pmatrix} = (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} (1) = (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ j \end{pmatrix} (1) = (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ j \end{pmatrix} (1) = (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ j \end{pmatrix} (1) = (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ j \end{pmatrix} (1) = (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ j \end{pmatrix} (1) = (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ j \end{pmatrix} (1) = (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} (1) = (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} (1) \end{pmatrix} (1) = (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} (1) \end{pmatrix} (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} (1) \end{pmatrix} (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;1) \\ i \end{pmatrix} (1) \begin{pmatrix} (1;$$

In order to solve the eigenvalue problem (56) it is necessary to introduce a second algebraic Bethe ansatz for the eigenvectors $F^{a_{m_{1}}:::a_{1}}$. Because the boundary matrix \mathfrak{G} is triangular there is no need to perform gauge transformations to nd an appropriate reference state for T⁽¹⁾(;f^(1,1)_ig). We can use, for instance, the usual ferror agnetic pseudovacuum build up by

tensor product of elementary (N 1)-dimensional $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ vectors. As a result the solution

(56) becomes very similar to that of the periodic SU (N 1) vertex model in the presence of inhomogeneities. Since this problem has been extensively discussed in the literature we will only present our nal results for the main eigenvalue problem (50). It turns out that the eigenvalues of the transfer matrix ⁽¹⁾ () is given by

⁽¹⁾ (; f ^(1;1)_i g; :::; f ^(N 1;1)_i g) =
$$g_1 \frac{f_1^1}{f_1^{L+1}} [a()]^L \frac{{}^{N}_{2} {}^{1}_{1}}{b(\frac{j}{j})} \frac{a(\frac{j}{j})}{b(\frac{j}{j})} + [b()]^L \frac{{}^{N}_{2} {}^{2}_{k=1}}{k_{\pm 1}} \frac{g_{k+1}}{f_{k+1}^{L+1}} \frac{{}^{N}_{k}}{j_{\pm 1}} \frac{a(\frac{j}{j})}{b(\frac{j}{j})} \frac{{}^{N}_{2} {}^{1}_{k+1}}{j_{\pm 1}} \frac{a(\frac{j}{j})}{b(\frac{j}{j})} + [b()]^L \frac{g_N}{f_N^{L+1}} \frac{f_N^1}{f_N^{L+1}} \frac{{}^{N}_{2}}{j_{\pm 1}} \frac{a(\frac{j}{j})}{b(\frac{j}{j})} \frac{{}^{N}_{2} {}^{1}_{j=1}}{b(\frac{j}{j})} \frac{f_N^{(1;1)}}{b(\frac{j}{j})} + [b()]^L \frac{g_N}{f_N^{L+1}} \frac{f_N^1}{f_N^{L+1}} \frac{{}^{N}_{2}}{j_{\pm 1}} \frac{a(\frac{j}{j})}{b(\frac{j}{j})} \frac{f_N^{(1;1)}}{b(\frac{j}{j})} \frac{f_N^{(1;1)}}{b(\frac{j}{j})$$

The rapidities $f_{i}^{(k;l)}g = 1; :::; N$ parameterize the multi-particle states of the nesting problem at step k and are required to satisfy the following nested Bethe ansatz equations

$$\frac{\mathbf{g}_{1}}{\mathbf{g}_{2}} \frac{f_{1}^{1}f_{2}^{L+1}}{f_{1}^{L+1}f_{2}^{1}} \frac{4}{\mathbf{a}\left(\frac{(1;l)}{i}\right)}^{2}_{\mathbf{b}\left(\frac{(1;l)}{i}\right)}^{5}_{\mathbf{b}\left(\frac{(1;l)}{i}\right)}^{5}_{\mathbf{b}\left(\frac{(1;l)}{i}\right)}^{5}_{\mathbf{b}\left(\frac{(1;l)}{i}\right)}^{5}_{\mathbf{b}\left(\frac{(1;l)}{j}\right)}^$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{g}_{k}}{\mathbf{g}_{k+1}} \frac{f_{k}^{1} f_{k+1}^{L+1}}{f_{k}^{L+1} f_{k+1}^{1}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_{k}^{1}} \frac{a\left(\begin{array}{c} (k;l) \\ j\end{array}\right)}{b\left(\begin{array}{c} (k;l) \\ j\end{array}\right)} = \frac{m_{k}^{1}}{j} \\ \frac{a\left(\begin{array}{c} (k;l) \\ i\end{array}\right)}{a\left(\begin{array}{c} (k;l) \\ j\end{array}\right)} = \frac{m_{k}^{1}}{j} \\ \frac{a\left(\begin{array}{c} (k;l) \\ i\end{array}\right)}{a\left(\begin{array}{c} (k;l) \\ j\end{array}\right)} \frac{m_{k+1}^{1}}{j} \\ \frac{a\left(\begin{array}{c} (k+1;l) \\ j\end{array}\right)}{b\left(\begin{array}{c} (k+1;l) \\ j\end{array}\right)} \\ \frac{a\left(\begin{array}{c} (k+1;l) \\ j}{b\left(\begin{array}{c} (k+1;l) \\ j\end{array}\right)} \\ \frac{a\left(\begin{array}{c} (k+1;l) \\ j}{b\left(\begin{array}{c} (k+1;l) \\ j}\right)} \\ \frac{a\left(\begin{array}{c} (k+1;l) \\ j}{b\left(\begin{array}{c} (k+1;l) \\ j}\right)} \\ \frac{a\left(\begin{array}{c} (k+1;l) \\ j}{b\left(\begin{array}{c} (k+1;l) \\ j}{b\left(\begin{array}{c} (k+1;l) \\ j}\right)} \\ \frac{a\left(\begin{array}{c} (k+1;l) \\ j}{b\left(\begin{array}{c} (k+1;l) \\$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{g}_{N-1}}{\mathbf{g}_{N}} \frac{f_{N-1}^{1}f_{N}^{L+1}f_{N}^{1}}{f_{N-1}^{L+1}f_{N}^{1}} \xrightarrow[j=1]{j\in i}^{m \frac{1}{2}-2} \frac{a\left(\begin{array}{ccc} (N-1;l) & (N-2;l) \\ i & j \end{array}\right)}{b\left(\begin{array}{ccc} (N-1;l) & (N-2;l) \\ j & j \end{array}\right)} = \xrightarrow[j=1]{m \frac{1}{2}-1} \frac{a\left(\begin{array}{ccc} (N-1;l) & (N-1;l) \\ i & j \end{array}\right)}{a\left(\begin{array}{ccc} (N-1;l) & (N-1;l) \\ j & i \end{array}\right)}$$
(62)

The nal step is to carry out simplications on the phase factors $g_{i}\frac{f_{i}^{1}}{f_{i}^{L+1}}$ with the help of the constraints (38) and (42). A fler a cumbersom e algebra it is possible to show that such factors are just the eigenvalues $g^{(i)}$ of the boundary matrix G_{A} . To make sure that the dimension of the ratios $p_{i}^{(l)}$ do not lead us to singular gauge matrices we choose to order them for each 1-th choice of pseudovacuum by $g^{(l)} = g^{(l+N)}$ for $l = 1; \ldots; N$. Taking into account this ordering as well as performing the shifts $f_{j}^{(k;l)}g! = f_{j}^{(k;l)}g$ k=2 our

result (59) for the eigenvalue becom es

⁽¹⁾ (; f ^(1;1)_i g; :::; f ^(N-1;1)_i g) = g⁽¹⁾ [a ()]^L
$$\frac{\Psi^{\frac{1}{1}}}{j} \frac{\frac{(1;1)}{j}}{j} \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2}}$$

+ [b()]^L $\frac{N_{X}}{k=1}^{2} g^{(1+k)} \frac{\Psi^{\frac{1}{k}}}{j=1} \frac{\frac{(k;1)}{j} + \frac{k+2}{2}}{j} \frac{M_{Y^{\frac{1}{k}}}{k-1}}{\frac{(k+1;1)}{j} \frac{(k+1;1)}{k-1}} \frac{\frac{(k+1;1)}{j} + \frac{1-\frac{k}{2}}{\frac{k+1}{2}}}{\frac{(k+1;1)}{j} \frac{(k+1;1)}{k-1}}$
+ [b()]^L g^(1+N-1) $\frac{M_{Y}}{2} \frac{1}{j} \frac{(1+k)}{j} \frac{M_{Y}}{2} \frac{(1+k)}{j} \frac{M_{Y}}{j} \frac{1}{j} \frac{(1+k)}{j} \frac{(1+$

and the nested Bethe ansatz equations can be compactly written as

where ${\rm C}_{\rm ab}$ is the Cartan m atrix elements of the SU (N) Lie algebra.

We see that the results for the eigenvalues and the Bethe ansatz equations is similar to that expected from the SU (N) vertex model with diagonal twists giving by the eigenvalues of the boundary matrix G_A . It remains to be investigated whether this interesting feature is particular of the SU (N) symmetry or it also works in other isotropic vertex models such as those invariant by the O (N) and Sp (2N) Lie algebras.

4 Concluding rem arks

In this paper we have been able to apply the quantum inverse scattering program to solve exactly the isotropic SU (N) vertex model with non-diagonal twisted boundary conditions. We not that the eigenvectors can be constructed in terms of multi-particle states over N possible pseudovacuum s. The Bethe ansatz results for the eigenvalues are similar to that of the SU (N) model with diagonal boundaries in which the eigenvalues of the boundary matrix G_A play the role of the diagonal twists.

W e expect that our results can be generalized without further di culties to accom m odate the solution of vertex m odels based on the SL (N M) super Lie algebra [13, 17, 18] with

general non-diagonal twists. These will include interesting systems of correlated electrons on a lattice such as the one-dimensional supersymmetric t-J model [19] and the so-called Essler, K orepin and Schoutens superconducting model [20] with arbitrary symmetry breaking boundary conditions. With more e ort we hope that our approach can be further generalized to include the trigonometric deformation of those vertex models based on the U_q [SL (N M)] symmetry. In these cases, however, we recall that the possible G_A matrices compatible with integrability belong to a smaller group formed by one-dimensional dilatations and the discrete Z_{N+M} symmetry.

O ther interesting issue that deserves investigation is the situation when the boundary matrix G_A becomes singular. For example, one would like to ask it is still possible to exhibit eigenvectors of the transferm atrix that are given by direct tensor product of N -dimensional vectors such as the reference states of sections 2 and 3. We have studied this problem in the simplest case N = 2 and surprisingly we found a family of such states j i⁽ⁿ⁾ which are

$$j i^{(n)} = \begin{cases} 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \frac{g_{22}}{2} & Y^{L} & \frac{g_{11}}{2} \\ 0 & \frac{g_{21}}{2} & A & 0 \\ \frac{g_{21}}{2} & A & 0 \\ \frac{g_{21}}{2} & A & 0 \\ 1 & \frac{g_{21}}{2} & A & 0 \end{cases} , n = 0;1;:::;L$$
(65)

whose corresponding eigenvalues (n) () have also the following simple factorized form

⁽ⁿ⁾ () =
$$(q_{11} + q_{22}) [a()]^{L n} [b()]^{n}$$
 (66)

This result prompted us to study further properties of the transfer matrix (7) when G_A is a singular matrix. Our study for nite L up to six sites reveals that the roots of the characteristic polynomial of T () are exactly the eigenvalues (66) whose degeneracy is the binomial coe cient $d_n = \frac{L!}{(L-n)!n!}$. In the case of singular boundary matrix T () becomes defective since it has fewer than 2^L independent eigenvectors. To each distinct eigenvalue

 $^{(n)}$ () we nd only one eigenvector which is precisely the state (65) and therefore the total number of independent states is L + 1. These results are strong evidences that T () behaves as a non-derogatory matrix and we conjecture that its Jordan decomposition for arbitrary L should be

$$T() = diag(J_0; J_1; L)J$$
 (67)

where J_n is a d_n dn Jordan matrix is given by

$$J_{n} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & & & & 1 \\ 0 & (n) & 1 & 0 & & 0 \\ 0 & (n) & (1) & 1 & & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) & (1) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) & (1) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & (n) \\ 0 & 0 & 0$$

This turns out to be a rem arkable example how boundary conditions can change in a drastic way the H ilbert space of integrable m odels. At this point it is natural to ask what happens to the Bethe ansatz states (28) when one gradually varies the boundary m atrix towards the singular m anifold. In particular, if we can gure out the kind of Bethe states in each sector n that should collapse to the eigenvectors (65). A precise answer to this question as well as possible generalizations of these results for arbitrary N has eluded us so far.

A cknow ledgem ents

W e would like to thank the organizers of the W orkshop Flux, Charge, Topology and Statistics 2003, Am sterdam, where part of this work was carried out. The authors G A P R ibeiro and W. G alleas thank Fapesp (Fundaceo de Am paro a Pesquisa do E stado de Seo Paulo) for nancial support. The work of M.J. M artins has been partially support by the Brazilian Research Council-CNPq and Fapesp.

Appendix A : C om pleteness for L = 2

This appendix is concerned with the study of the completeness of the Bethe ansatz solution (31) for L = 2, i.e. that all four eigenvalues of the transferm atrix are obtained either by starting with $\text{Di}^{(+)}$ or with $\text{Di}^{(-)}$. Let us ret begin with $\text{Di}^{(+)}$ whose corresponding eigenvalue $\binom{(+)}{0}$ () is clearly

$$g_{0}^{(+)}(x) = g_{0}^{(+)}[a(x)]^{2} + g_{0}^{(-)}[b(x)]^{2}$$
(A.1)

The next step is to solve the Bethe ansatz equations for the one-particle state $\mathbb{B}(1)$ $\mathbb{D}i^{(+)}$. As a result we nd two possible rapidities given by

$${}_{1} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{q}{q^{(+)}} \frac{q}{q^{(-)}} \frac{q}{q^{(-)}}$$
(A 2)

giving us the following one-particle 1 eigenvalues

$$a_{1} = a(b() g^{(+)} + g^{()} q^{(+)} g^{(-)}$$
 (A.3)

Repeating similar exercise for the two-particle state $\mathbb{B}(1)\mathbb{B}(2)\mathbb{D}^{(+)}$ we have

$$_{1;2} = \frac{g^{(+)} + g^{(-)} \quad 2I}{2 (g^{(-)} \quad g^{(+)})}$$
(A.4)

and the corresponding eigenvalue is

$$_{2}() = g^{()}[a()]^{2} + g^{(+)}[b()]^{2}$$
 (A.5)

An exact diagonalization of the transferm atrix (7) corroborates these four possible eigenvalues for L = 2. Note also that (A 5) is exactly the eigenvalue associated to reference state $jDi^{()}$. The others eigenvalues (A 1) and (A 3) are easily obtained from jDi by noticing that to each solution $_{i}^{(+)}$ one can not the corresponding $_{i}^{(-)}$ through the rejection $_{i}^{(-)} = _{i}^{(+)}$ symmetry. We have also investigated numerically this problem for L = 3;4 and found that both references states can lead to the complete spectrum of T ().

References

- R.J.Baxter, \Exactly Solved M odels in Statistical M echanics", A cadem ic P ress, New York, 1982.
- [2] LA. Takhta jan and LD. Faddeev, Russ. Math. Sur., 34 (1979) 11.
- [3] V E.K orepin, G. Izergin and N M. Bogoliubov, \Quantum Inverse Scattering M ethod, C orrelation Functions and A lgebraic Bethe ansatz", C am bridge University P ress, 1992, C am bridge.

- [4] H.J. de Vega, Nucl. Phys. B, 240 (1984) 495
- [5] JL.Cardy, Nucl. Phys. B, 275 (1986) 200
- [6] F.C.Akaraz, M.N.Barber and M.T.Batchelor, Ann. Phys. 182 (1988) 280
- [7] N.Yu.Reshitikhin, Lett. Math. Phys. 14 (1987) 235
- [8] A.Kuniba and J.Suzuki, Commun.Math.Phys. 173 (1995) 225
- [9] M.J.Martins and P.B.Ramos, Nucl. Phys. B, 500 (1997) 579
- [10] M.T.Batchelor, R.J.Baxter, M.J.O.Rourke, C.M.Yung, J.Phys.A: Math.Gen. 28 (1995) 2759
- [11] C M . Yung and M .T . Batchelor, Nucl. Phys. B, 446 (1995) 461
- [12] V.G.Uimin, JETP Lett. 12 (1970) 225
- [13] B. Sutherland, Phys. Rev. B 12 (1975) 3795
- [14] P.P.Kulish and N.Yu. Reshetikhin, Sov.Phys.JETP 53 (1981) 108, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 16 (1983) L591
- [15] O.Babelon, H.J. de Vega and C.M. Viallet, Nucl. Phys. B, 200 (1982) 266
- [16] R J. Baxter, J. Stat. Phys. 108 (2002) 1
- [17] C L.Schultz, Physica A, 122 (1983) 71; J.H.H.Perk and C L.Schultz, Non-linear Integrable system s - C lassical and Q uantum Theory, Eds. M. Jim bo and T.M iwa, W orld Scientic, p. 135
- [18] P.P.Kulish, J.Sov. Math. 35 (1986) 2648
- [19] P. Schlottm ann, Phys. Rev. B, 36 (1987) 5177; H J. de Vega and E. Lopes, Phys. Rev.
 Lett. 67 (1991) 489; A. Foerster and M. Korowski, Nucl. Phys. B, 396 (1993) 611; F H L.
 Essler and V E. Korepin, Phys. Rev. B, 46 (1992) 9147

[20] F.H.L.Essler, V.E..Korepin and K.Schoutens, Phys. Rev. Lett., 68 (1992) 2960, ibid 70 (1993)73