

## A constraint analysis for an $N = 1/2, D = 2$ supersymmetric model

**S.A. Dias, J.L. Matheus Valle**

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rua Xavier Sigaud 150, Rio de Janeiro, 22290, RJ, Brasil

and

**R.M. Doria**

Departamento de Física, Universidade Católica de Petrópolis, Rua Barão do Amazonas, 124, Petrópolis, 25685, RJ, Brasil

Received December 19, 1989; in final form September 28, 1990

**Abstract** In order to understand about the presence of different potential fields transforming under the same local symmetry group, this work gauge covariantizes an  $N = 1/2, D = 2$  supersymmetric theory. Then, by relaxing the, so-called, conventional constraint, a second gauge-potential field naturally emerges.

### 1. Introduction

Supersymmetry is a rich laboratory to unveil the meaning of the gauge principle<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, this work intends to focus its different instructions through a very simple case: by covariantizing an  $U(1), N = 1/2$  supersymmetry in two dimensions<sup>2,3</sup>. For this we are going to explore the following two identities

$$[\nabla_A, \nabla_B] = T_{AB}^c \nabla_c + F_{AB} \quad (1)$$

and

$$[\nabla_A, \{\nabla_B, \nabla_c\}] + [\nabla_B, \{\nabla_c, \nabla_A\}] + [\nabla_c, \{\nabla_A, \nabla_B\}] = 0 \quad (2)$$

Thus, considering the superspace formulation

$$Z^A \equiv (x^+, x^-, \theta) \quad (3)$$

*S.A. Dias, J.L. Matheus Valle, R.M. Doria*

with the following supersymmetry transformations

$$\begin{aligned}x^{+'} &= x^+ \\x^{-'} &= x^- + i\epsilon\theta \\ \theta' &= \theta + \epsilon\end{aligned}\tag{4}$$

one gets a global U(1) action given by

$$S = \frac{i}{2} \int d^2x d\theta [(D\Phi)^* \partial_+ \Phi - (D\Phi)(\partial_+ \Phi)^*]\tag{5}$$

where  $\Phi$  is a complex scalar superfield defined by its component-field content according to

$$\Phi \equiv \{\phi(x), i2^{1/4}\psi(x)\}\tag{6}$$

where  $\phi(x)$  is a scalar and  $\psi(x)$  is a right-handed Majorana spinor. Elevating (5) to a local transformation

$$\Phi \rightarrow \Phi'(x, \theta) = e^{iq\Lambda(x, \theta)} \Phi(x, \theta)\tag{7}$$

where  $\Lambda(x, \theta)$  is a real scalar superfield and  $q$  is the U(1)-charge corresponding to the field  $\Phi$ , the gauge principle writes the following covariant derivatives

$$\nabla_+ \Phi \equiv (\partial_+ + iqq\Gamma_+) \Phi\tag{8}$$

$$\nabla \Phi \equiv (D + qq\Gamma) \Phi\tag{9}$$

$$\nabla_- \Phi \equiv (\partial_- + iqq\Gamma_-) \Phi\tag{10}$$

where  $\Gamma_+, \Gamma$  and  $\Gamma_-$  are superfield connections transforming under U(1) symmetry as

$$\Gamma'_+ = \Gamma_+ - \frac{i}{g} \partial_+ \Lambda\tag{11}$$

$$\Gamma' = \Gamma - \frac{i}{g} D\Lambda\tag{12}$$

$$\Gamma'_- = \Gamma_- - \frac{i}{g} \partial_- \Lambda\tag{13}$$

### *A constraint analysis for an $N = 1/2, D = 2$ supersymmetric model*

Thus, different connection superfields are generated by gauge covariantizing the space-time and supersymmetric covariant derivatives. In components, they are read as

$$\Gamma_+ = \{A_+, i2^{3/4}\rho\} \quad (14)$$

$$\Gamma = \{2^{3/4}\xi A_-\} \quad (15)$$

$$\Gamma_- = \{B_-, i2^{3/4}\chi\} \quad (16)$$

Observe that the two components of the gauge field  $A_+(\mathbf{x})$  and  $A_-(\mathbf{x})$  belong to different superfields.  $\rho(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\xi(\mathbf{x})$  are spinors, but  $\xi(\mathbf{x})$  does not have an appropriate, dimension for being interpreted as a physical field. Thus, the gaugino will be determined through a composition,  $\partial_+\xi(\mathbf{x}) + \rho(\mathbf{x})$ , that is gauge-invariant. The condition that the fields must be real guides spinorial fields for both possibilities of being hermitean or anti-hermitean. (8)-(10) definitions have chosen the first case. Both physics are equivalent, although do not necessarily contain the same terms. Finally, note that the space derivative  $\partial_-$  does not contribute to covariantization process. However, it influences in the constraint mechanism that the theory formulates. It is the main aspect of this work.

A study of gauge principle properties through a supersymmetric model  $N = 1/2$  in  $D = 2$  is the motivation of this work. In this introducing we have noted that, preceding any dynamics, there it already exist facts such as (1), (2), (8)-(13). Another intrinsic aspect that the gauge principle develops is about the possibility of supressing some physical regions through constraints. Sections 2 and 3 develop both sides of this relaxing strategy of the constraints. Finally, in the conclusion a comment about the nature of the physics of the gauge principle is made.

## 2. **Standard** case

The systematics to be followed here consists of two considerations. First, to impose constraints in the gauge covariant commutation relations and, then, to consult the Bianchi identities in order to stipulate relationships between the

*S.A. Dias, J.L. Matheus Valle, R.M. Doria*

various superfields. From (1) and taking the torsion identically to the case with ordinary supersymmetric-covariant derivatives one gets,

$$\{V, V\} = -2i\nabla_- \dagger W \quad (17)$$

Similarly the superfields field strength  $W_+, W_-$  and  $W_{+-}$  are obtained

$$[\nabla_+, \nabla] = W_+ \quad (18)$$

$$[V_-, V] = W_- \quad (19)$$

$$[V_+, V_-] = W_{+-} \quad (20)$$

Nonetheless, the determinism that symmetry generates for this model contain constraints. This means that it contains the property of imposing constraints. For this, take the following relationship

$$W = 0 \quad (21)$$

and substitute it in (17). Then, the connection  $\Gamma_-$  is eliminated through

$$\Gamma_- = D\Gamma \quad (22)$$

writing in components, such arranged dependence shows

$$B_- = A_-$$

$$\chi = -\partial_- \xi \quad (23)$$

A second limitation to be considered is that (18), (19) and (20) are related through the Bianchi identity. It yields,

$$W_- = 0 \quad (24)$$

$$W_{+-} = iDW_+ \quad (25)$$

Thus, there is only one independent field-strength

$$W_+ = qg(\partial_+ \Gamma - iD\Gamma_+) \quad (28)$$

*A constraint analysis for an  $N = 1/2, D = 2$  supersymmetric model*

that in components is written as

$$W_+ \equiv \{2^{3/4} qg\lambda, qgF_{+-}\} \quad (27)$$

where

$$\lambda = \partial_+ \xi + \rho \quad (28)$$

$$F_{+-} = \partial_+ A_- - \partial_- A_+ \quad (29)$$

Observe that  $W_+$  is real, gauge invariant, accommodates the gaugino and the gauge field strength.

(21) yields the standard case<sup>3</sup>,

$$S = S_{\text{gauge}} + S_{\text{g.f.}} + S_{\text{matter}} \quad (30)$$

where

$$S_{\text{gauge}} = -\frac{1}{2q^2g^2} \int d^2x d\theta W_+ DW_+ \quad (31)$$

$$S_{\text{g.f.}} = \frac{1}{2\alpha} \int d^2x d\theta G DG$$

with

$$G = \partial_+ \Gamma + iD\Gamma_+ \quad (32)$$

$$S_{\text{matter}} = \int d^2x d\theta \left\{ \frac{i}{2} [\nabla \Phi (\nabla_+ \Phi)^* - (\nabla \Phi)^* \nabla_+ \Phi] + \frac{1}{2} [\Psi^* \nabla \Psi + \Psi (\nabla \Psi)^*] + \frac{1}{2} m [\Phi^* \Psi + \Phi \Psi^*] \right\} \quad (33)$$

considering the field contents (6) and

$$\Psi = \{2^{1/4} \beta(x), F(x)\} \quad (34)$$

$$\Lambda = \{\alpha(x), ie^{1/4} \eta(x)\} \quad (35)$$

one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & -\frac{1}{2} F_{+-}^2 - i\sqrt{2}\lambda\partial_-\lambda + \\ & + \frac{1}{\alpha} \left[ \frac{1}{2} (\partial_+ A_- + \partial_- A_+)^2 + i\sqrt{2}(\partial_+ \xi - \rho)\partial_-(\partial_+ \xi - \rho) \right] + \end{aligned}$$

S.A. Dias, J.L. Matheus Valle, R.M. Doria

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{2}[(D_- \phi)(D_+ \phi)^* + (D_- \phi)^*(D_+ \phi)] + gq\xi[\psi(D_+ \phi)^* - \psi^* D_+ \phi] + \\
& + \frac{i\sqrt{2}}{2}A[(D_+ \psi)^* - igq\sqrt{2}\rho\phi^*] + \frac{i\sqrt{2}}{2}A^*[D_+ \psi + iqq\sqrt{2}\rho\phi] + \\
& + \frac{i\sqrt{2}}{2}\beta^*[(D_- \psi - i\sqrt{2}qq\xi F) + \frac{i\sqrt{2}}{2}\beta^*[(D_- \beta)^* + i\sqrt{2}qq\xi F^*] + \\
& + \frac{1}{2}[F^* B + FB^*] \frac{1}{2}m[i\sqrt{2}(\psi^* \beta + \psi\beta^*) + \phi^* F + \phi F^*] \tag{36}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\pm} &= \partial_{\pm} + iqqA_{\pm} \\
A &= \psi - i\sqrt{2}qq\xi\phi \\
B &= F + 2qq\xi\beta \tag{37}
\end{aligned}$$

with the following transformations

$$\begin{aligned}
F'_{+-} &= F_{+-} \\
\lambda' &= \lambda \\
A' &= e^{i\alpha(x)}A \\
B' &= e^{i\alpha(x)}B \tag{38}
\end{aligned}$$

For a more physical approach to analyze the quanta involved in (36), one can take the unitary Wess Zumino gauge.

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi(x) &= 0 \\
\rho(x) &= \lambda(x) \tag{39}
\end{aligned}$$

Calculating the equations of motion in terms of superfields, one gets for  $\Gamma_+$ ,

$$\partial_- W_+ + \frac{qq}{\alpha} \partial_- G = iq^2 g^2 J_- \tag{40}$$

For  $\Gamma$ ,

$$\partial_+ DW_+ - \frac{qq}{\alpha} \partial_+ DG = -q^2 g^2 J \tag{41}$$

Where

$$J_- = -\frac{i}{2}[\Phi(\nabla\phi)^* + \Phi^*\nabla\Phi] \tag{42}$$

A constraint analysis for an  $N = 1/2, D = 2$  supersymmetric model

$$J = \frac{i}{2}[\Phi(\nabla_+\Phi)^* - \Phi^*\nabla_+\Phi] + \Psi\Psi^* \quad (43)$$

For the matter superfield  $\Phi$ ,

$$\frac{i}{2}\{\nabla, \nabla_+\}\Phi - \frac{i}{2}m\Psi = 0 \quad (44)$$

and for  $\mathcal{Q}$

$$\nabla\Psi + \frac{m}{2}\Phi = 0 \quad (45)$$

In components, one reads for  $A_+$  and  $A_-$

$$\partial_-F_{+-} + \frac{1}{\alpha}\partial_-(\partial_+A_- + \partial_-A_+) = iqqj_- \quad (46)$$

$$\partial_-F_{-+} + \frac{1}{\alpha}\partial_+(\partial_+A_- + \partial_-A_+) = iqqj_+ \quad (47)$$

where

$$j_- = \frac{1}{2}[\phi(D_-\phi)^* - \phi^*D_-\phi] - qq\xi(\phi\psi^* + \phi^*\psi) + \frac{i\sqrt{2}}{2}(\psi^*A - \psi A^*) \quad (48)$$

$$j_+ = \frac{1}{2}[\phi(D_+\phi)^* - \phi^*D_+\phi] - i\sqrt{2}\beta\beta^8 \quad (49)$$

The dynamics for the gaugino-components  $\xi$  and  $\rho$  fields is

$$\partial_- \lambda + \frac{1}{\alpha}(\partial_+ \xi - \rho) = iqq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\alpha}[\phi^* A - \phi A^*] \quad (50)$$

$$\partial_+ \partial_- \lambda - \frac{1}{\alpha l} \partial_+ \partial_- (\partial_+ \xi - \rho) = -i\rho g D J|_{\theta=0} \quad (51)$$

Observe that, in order to show consistency between (46) and (47) and between (50) and (51), theory should provide another information. The matter-field components  $\phi$ ,  $\psi$ ,  $\beta$  and  $F$  yields, respectively, the following equations of motion,

$$(D_+ D_- \phi)^* - \frac{m}{2} F^* = -gqj_\phi \quad (52)$$

$$(D_+ \psi)^* + m\beta^* = -gqj_\psi \quad (53)$$

$$(D_- \beta)^* - \frac{1}{2} m \psi^* = -gqj_\beta \quad (54)$$

$$F^* + \frac{m}{2} \phi^* + 2gq\beta^* \xi = 0 \quad (55)$$

$$j_\phi = \psi^*(D_+\xi)^* + (D_+\psi)^* \xi + \psi^* \rho - \xi \partial_+ \psi^* + i2\sqrt{2}gq\xi\rho\phi^* \quad (56)$$

*S.A. Dias, J.L. Matheus Valle, R.M. Doria*

$$j_\psi = [i\sqrt{2}\xi(D_+\phi)^* + \frac{1}{gq}(\partial_+\xi - \rho)\psi^*] \quad (57)$$

$$j_\rho = i\sqrt{2}F^*\xi \quad (58)$$

A next information that the theory provides is the Noether current conservation. For a supersymmetric theory

$$\mathcal{L} = \int d\theta \mathcal{P}(\Phi_i, \partial_\pm \phi_i, D\Phi_i, \partial_\pm \Phi_i) \quad (59)$$

there are two independent invariances in the superspace that depend on the parameters  $\epsilon$  and  $\Lambda(x, \theta)$ . They are

$$\delta_{\text{su.sy.}} \mathcal{P} = -\epsilon \mathcal{P} \quad (60)$$

and

$$\delta_{\text{gauge}} \mathcal{P} = 0 \quad (61)$$

substituting (60) in (30) one gets a continuity equation in superspace that expresses the invariance under supersymmetry

$$\partial_+ \mathcal{G}_- + D\mathcal{G} = S$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_- &= \frac{i}{2} [(Q\Phi^*)\nabla\Phi - (Q\Phi)(\nabla\Phi)^*] - \frac{1}{qg}(Q\Gamma)DW_+ \\ \mathcal{G} &= \frac{i}{2} [Q\Phi^*)\nabla_+\Phi + (Q\Phi)(\nabla_+\Phi)^*] + \frac{1}{2} [(Q\Psi)\Psi^* + (Q\Psi^*)\Psi] + \\ &\quad + \frac{i}{qg}(Q\Gamma_+)DW_+ - \frac{1}{2q^2g^2}W_+QW_+ \\ S &= Q \left\{ \frac{i}{2} [\nabla\phi(\nabla_+\phi)^* - (\nabla\phi)^*\nabla_+\phi] + \frac{i}{2} [\Psi^*\nabla\Psi + \Psi(\nabla\Psi)^*] + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{1}{2}m(\Phi^*\Psi + \Phi\Psi^*) - 2q^2g^2W_+DW_+ \right\} \quad (62) \end{aligned}$$

Using (61) in (30) one gets the following relationship from gauge invariance

$$iq\Lambda[\partial_+J_- + DJ] = 0 \quad (63)$$



### A constraint analysis for an $N = 1/2, D = 2$ supersymmetric model

(63) coincides for  $\Lambda(\mathbf{x}, \theta)$  being global or local. Considering the global condition

$$D\Lambda = \partial_+\Lambda = 0$$

it yields,

$$\partial_+(DJ_-) - i\dot{a} - J|_{\theta=0} = \dot{a}, J_G^\mu = 0 \quad (64)$$

where  $J_G \equiv (iDJ_-, J)|_{\theta=0}$ . In components,

$$\partial_+j_- + \partial_-j_+ = 0 \quad (65)$$

Now the information **has** appeared that the equations of motion for the potential fields were expecting. (64) shows that although the structure of the field strength  $F_{+-}$  does not propitiate a conservation law, there is a combination between (46) and (47) such that there appears a conserved current  $J_G(\mathbf{x})$ , whose componets are coupled to the potential fields  $A_+(\mathbf{x}), A_-(\mathbf{x})$ , respectively. Similarly, the spinorial equations (50) and (51) work consistently with (64) by showing the **presence of** only one equation of motion for the photino. These **aspects** show that the gauge **principle** offers a closure relation for the field-dynamics. It is important to note that, though the parameter  $\Lambda(\mathbf{x}, \theta)$  contains two parameters  $\alpha(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\eta(\mathbf{x})$ , the symmetry of the theory does not work as a  $U(1) \times U(1)$  mechanism with **two** conservation laws. (64) prints out the presence of just one conserved current as in ordinary QED. The other current, the one **coupled** to the photino, contains **just** a gauge invariant behaviour, as shown in (50). **Again**, such **results** carry consistency due to the fact that while the potential fields suffer gauge **transformations**, the gaugino is properly **an** invariant.

### 3. Natural action

The most immediate action taken from **the** gauge principle is the one for which no constraints are used. Practical **experiences** with the reality constraint, as in four dimensions, have been showing that degrees of freedom of the fields can be eliminated from the theory by imposing **suitable** constraints on the superfields. This **shows** that the same symmetry is **realized** in different layers depending on the constraints' nature. Thus this section intends to explore this fact by digging

S.A. Dias, J.L. Matheus Valle, R.M. Doria

down the su.sy. region for  $N = 1/2$ ,  $\mathbf{d} = 2$  until one finds out a **symmetry layer** with no constraint<sup>4</sup>.

Relaxing (21), we have

$$W = 2qg(D\Gamma - \Gamma_-) \quad (66)$$

The field-strength superfields  $W_-$  and  $W_{+-}$  are fixed from (2) as

$$W_- = \frac{i}{2}(DW) \quad (67)$$

and

$$W_{+-} = -i\left(\frac{1}{2}\partial_- W_- - DW_+\right) \quad (68)$$

Thus (66)-(68) shows the existence of three independent potential superfields:  $\Gamma_+$ ,  $\Gamma$  and  $\Gamma_-$ . Reading off the gauge invariant W components, one gets

$$A'_\pm(x) = A_\pm(x) - \frac{1}{g}\partial_\pm\alpha(x) \quad (69)$$

$$B'_-(x) = A_-(x) - \frac{1}{g}\partial_-\alpha(x) \quad (70)$$

$$\xi' = \xi + \frac{1}{g\sqrt{2}}\eta \quad ; \quad \rho' = \rho - \frac{1}{g\sqrt{2}}\partial_+\eta \quad (71)$$

$$\chi' = \chi - \frac{1}{g\sqrt{2}}\partial_-\eta \quad (72)$$

where (70) informs about the existence of a second gauge potential in theory.

A next stage is to show that (69) and (70) do not represent a **version** of a same field obtained from a linear combination. Thus, it becomes necessary to study the quanta and interaction between such fields. The following bilinear **terms** are added to (31)

$$S_1 = \frac{\lambda_1}{(2qg)^2} \int d^2x d\theta W_+(\partial_+ W) \quad (73)$$

$$S_2 = \frac{\lambda_1}{(2qg)^2} \int d^2x d\theta\theta(DW_+)(\partial_+ W) \quad (74)$$

$$S_3 = \frac{\lambda_1}{(2qg)^2} \int d^2x d\theta\theta(\partial_+ W)^2 \quad (75)$$

A **constraint analysis** for an  $N = 1/2, D = 2$  supersymmetric **model**

where  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$  are free coefficients. Expressing the kinetic part in momentum **space**, one gets the following set of propagators

$$\begin{aligned}
 F.T. \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} \langle A_+ A_+ \rangle & \langle A_+ A_- \rangle & \langle A_+ B_- \rangle \\ \langle A_- A_+ \rangle & \langle A_- A_- \rangle & \langle A_- B_- \rangle \\ \langle B_- A_+ \rangle & \langle B_- A_- \rangle & \langle B_- B_- \rangle \end{array} \right] \\
 = \frac{1}{4\Delta} \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} \frac{p}{k_+^2} & \frac{m}{k_+ k_-} & \frac{n}{k_+ k_-} \\ \frac{m}{k_+ k_-} & \frac{p}{k_-^2} & \frac{\ell}{k_-^2} \\ \frac{n}{k_+ k_-} & \frac{\ell}{k_-^2} & \frac{p+q}{k_-^2} \end{array} \right] \quad (76)
 \end{aligned}$$

Where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Delta &= \lambda_1^2 + 2\lambda_2 \\
 p &= 2\lambda_2(1 - \alpha) + \alpha\lambda_1^2 \\
 m &= -2\lambda_2(1 + \alpha) - \alpha\lambda_1^2 \\
 n &= -2\lambda_2(1 + \alpha) - \lambda_1(2 + \alpha\lambda_1) \\
 \ell &= 2\lambda_2(1 - \alpha) + \lambda_1(2 - \alpha\lambda_1) \\
 q &= -4 \left[ 1 - \lambda_1(1 - \alpha) + \frac{1}{2}\alpha\lambda_1^2 \right] \quad (77)
 \end{aligned}$$

(76) is not to be **diagonalized**, otherwise it would loose its local interpretation. This is due to the fact that its eigenvalues would be determined in **terms of non-polynomial** functions of the momentum. Nevertheless, (76) is enough to inform about the theory spectrum. From the first line, one reads that there is a probability related to the residue  $p$  to **create** a quantum of  $A_+$ . Similarly, the  $A_-$  and  $B_+$  quanta are determined with probabilities related to  $p$  and  $p+q$ . In order to obtain the mass eigenvalue, that is expressed from the square of a quadrimomentum operator, it is necessary to read off the **pole** of a corresponding two-point Green function. Thus, observing (76), we note that each line contain at **least** one term whose denominator is in the Lorentz manifest form  $k_+ k_-$ . This yields that the quanta associated with  $A_+, A_-, B$  are massless. Note that a **massive** term might be obtained from (69) and (70), but it would violate Lorentz covariance.

**Thus**, (70) and (76) show that  $B_-(x)$  does not belong to the class of **compensating** fields. However it is still necessary to **analyse** its physical consistency. First,

*S.A. Dias, J.L. Matheus Valle, R.M. Doria*

the inclusion of a  $B_-(x)$  field without a partner  $B_+(x)$  does not break the manifest Lorentz covariance. However, the propagator is able to reproduce a **well-defined mass** term. Second, about the presence of ghosts: considering that residues  $p$  and  $p + q$  depend on parameters  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \mathbf{a}$ , the theory is provided with enough constraints to build up probabilities with same sign. Thus, a healthy quantum for  $B_-(x)$  exists.

Now, we should understand the presence of this non-covariant  $B_-(x)$  field through its interactions. Selection rules brought in by Lorentz weight, dimensional analysis and renormalizability are guiding aspects for possible interacting terms. As an **example** to show how the interaction terms are selected, we are going to study the case involving the field-strengths  $W_+$  and  $W_-$ . The general expression is

$$\frac{1}{g^s} \int d\theta W^m W_+^n D^p \partial_+^q \partial_-^r \quad (77)$$

Then, considering the above conditions, respectively, this yields

$$\frac{1}{2} + m - \frac{n}{2} + \frac{p}{2} - q + r = 0 \quad (78)$$

$$-s + \frac{1}{2} + m + \frac{3n}{2} + \frac{p}{2} + q + r = 2 \quad (79)$$

$$m + n \geq s \quad (80)$$

and including the interaction condition.

$$m + n \geq 3 \quad (81)$$

one gets only one possibility. It is the non-abelian term

$$\frac{1}{g^4} \int d^2x d\theta \text{Tr}(W W_+^3) \quad (82)$$

Similarly, through explicitly breaking the abelian supersymmetric case, one obtains

$$\frac{\lambda_3}{g^4} \int d^2x d\theta W^2 W_+ (\partial_+ W_+) \quad (83)$$

Matter couplings involving  $\Gamma_-$  are also obtained by breaking supersymmetry,

$$\lambda_4 \int d^2x d\theta (\nabla_+ \Phi)^\dagger (\nabla_- \Phi) (\Phi^\dagger \Phi)^n + h.c. \quad (84)$$

A constraint analysis for an  $N = 1/2, D = 2$  supersymmetric model

$$\lambda_5 \int d^2x d\theta \Psi^* (\nabla_- \Psi) (\Phi^* \Phi)^r + h.c. \quad (85)$$

Finally, there is a massive term

$$S_{\text{mass}} = \int d^2x d\theta (m \Phi^* \Psi + m \Phi \Psi^*) \quad (86)$$

The new equations of motion for this, considered as the natural region, are:

For  $\Phi$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{i}{2} \{ \nabla, \nabla_+ \} \Phi - \frac{1}{2} m \Psi + \frac{\lambda_4 \theta}{2} \{ \nabla_+ [(\nabla_- \Phi) (\Phi \Phi^*)^n] + \\ & + \nabla_- [(\nabla_+ \Phi) (\Phi \Phi^*)^n] - \frac{n}{2} [(\nabla_+ \Phi)^* \nabla_- \Phi + (\nabla_+ \Phi) (\nabla_- \Phi)^*] (\Phi \Phi^*)^{n-1} \Phi \} + \\ & - \frac{i \lambda_5 r}{4} \theta \{ [\Psi^* \nabla_- \Psi + \Psi (\nabla_- \Psi)^*] (\Phi \Phi^*)^{r-1} \Phi \} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

For  $\Psi$ ,

$$\nabla \Psi + \frac{1}{2} m \Phi + \frac{i \theta \lambda_5}{2} \{ \nabla_- [\Psi (\Phi \Phi^*)^r] + (\nabla_- \Psi) (\Phi \Phi^*)^r \} = 0 \quad (88)$$

For  $\Gamma_+$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_- W_+ - \frac{i \lambda_1}{4} (\partial_+ DW - i \theta \partial_- \partial_+ W) + \\ & - \frac{1}{4(2qg)^2} D[\theta W^2 \partial_+ W_+ + \theta \partial_+ (W^2 W_+)] = i q^2 g^2 J'_- \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

For  $\Gamma$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_+ DW_+ + \frac{i \theta}{(2qg)^2} D[WW_+ \partial_+ W] - \partial_+ \left[ \frac{\lambda_1 \theta}{4} \partial_+ W - \frac{i \theta}{4(2qg)^2} W^2 \partial_+ W_+ \right] + \\ & - \partial_+ D \left[ \frac{\lambda_1 \theta}{4} \partial_+ W + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_1 W_+ + \frac{\lambda_1 \theta}{2} DW_+ + \lambda_2 \theta \partial_+ W \right] + \\ & + \partial_+ \partial_+ \left[ \frac{i \theta}{4(2qg)^2} W^2 W_+ \right] = -q^2 g^2 J' \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

For  $\Gamma_-$ ,

$$\partial_+ \left[ -\frac{\lambda_1}{2} W_+ - \frac{\lambda_1 \theta}{2} DW_+ - \lambda_2 \theta \partial_+ W \right] + \frac{i \theta}{(2qg)^2} WW_+ \partial_+ W_+ = i q^2 g^2 J'_+ \quad (91)$$

where

$$J'_- = J_- + \frac{\lambda_4 \theta}{2} [\Phi (\nabla_- \Phi)^* - \Phi^* \nabla_- \Phi] (\Phi \Phi^*)^n \quad (92)$$

S.A. Dias, J.L. Matheus Valle, R.M. Doria

$$J'_+ = \frac{\lambda_4 \theta}{2} [ @ (V+@)^* - @^* V+ @ ] ( @ @ i \lambda_4 \theta (\Psi^* \Psi) (\Phi \Phi^*) \quad (93)$$

$$J' = J \quad (94)$$

Finally, the Noether theorem gives the following conserved current

$$\partial_+ J'_- + \partial_- J'_+ + DJ = 0 \quad (95)$$

#### 4. Conclusion

The main effort in this work **has** been an attempt at understanding some **of** the instructions that the gauge principle displays. Whenever combined with supersymmetry, their discussion becomes more enlightening **as** the latter touches clearly the organization of the degrees of freedom of theory.

Here, we have adopted to work with a sypersymmetry of the **(1,0)** - type **in** order to illustrate that the gauge principle does not compel us to necessarily **fix** the number of vector potentials appearing in a given gauge model. We have **explicitly** constructed an **(1,0)** - supersymmetric Abelian gauge theory characterized by the preserve of two gauge potential transforming similarly, under a common **U(1)** group. This has been achieved upon the relaxation of typical superspace constraint imposed on the algebra of gauge-covariant derivatives: the **so-called** conventional constraint.

In our study, we have been **able** to identify three **independent** gauge connection superfields that accomodate **two independent** component-field gauge potentials,  $A_\mu(x)$  and  $B_\mu(x)$ . Though in terms of light-cone coordinates only the component  $B_-(x)$  of  $B_\mu(x)$  appears in the superspace expansion for the superfield  $\Gamma_-(x, \theta)$ , the model can be shown to **exhibit manifest Lorentz** covariance and the propagators  $\langle A_\mu A_\nu \rangle$ ,  $\langle B_\mu B_\nu \rangle$  **and**  $\langle A_\mu B_\nu \rangle$  for the vectors can be written down which display the right structure of **poles**<sup>5</sup>.

The question of explicit soft breakings of **(1,0)** - supersymmetry **has** also been addressed to and possible interactions for the extra potential,  $B_-(x)$ , have been found out and written down based on general grounds. It is noterworthy to stress

### *A constraint analysis for an $N = 1/2, D = 2$ supersymmetric model*

that such interactions respect supersymmetry for the non-Abelian case: the need for a soft breaking is a peculiarity of the  $U(1)$  version of the  $(1,0)$  gauge model.

The next step of our investigation concerns the study of more general  $(p,q)$  - supersymmetric gauge models, once we have found a **less** constrained  $(1,0)$  gauge theory. The possibility of extending the results found in this work to the more interesting case of  $(2,0)$  and  $(4,0)$  supersymmetries is now under consideration **and** we shall soon report on the results elsewhere.

### **Acknowledgments**

We are **very** grateful to J.A. Helayel Neto and J.E. Stephany Ruiz for **useful** discussions. Two of the authors (R.M.D. and J.L.M.V.) also acknowledge the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (**CNPq**) for their fellowships.

One of the authors (R.M.D.) **would** like to express his gratitude to **Coca-Cola** of Brazil, through Sonia **Barreto** and Johnson & Higgins (Corretores de Seguros, through Dr. Michel Wyles, for invaluable financial **help**.

### **References**

1. Grauert, C.W. Misner, K. Thorne, J.A. Wheeler, edited by W.H. Freedman and Company.
2. M. Sakamoto, Phys. Lett. **151B**, 115 (1985); C.M. Hull and E. Witten, Phys. Lett. **160B**, 398 (1985); E. Begshoeff, E. Sezgin and H. Nishino, Phys. Lett. **166B**, 141 (1986); M. Evans and B.A. Ovrut, Phys. Lett. **171B**, 177 (1986), and Phys. Lett. **175B**, 145 (1986).
3. R. Brooks, F. Muhammada and S.J. Gates Jr., Nucl. Phys. **B268**, 599 (1986); S.J. Gates Jr., M. T. Grisaru, L. Mezincescu and P.K. Townsend, "(1,0) - Supergravity" - Harvard University preprint 1987.
4. C.M. Doria, R.M. Doria and F.A.B. Rabelo de Carvalho, "A superspace origin for an extended gauge model" - UCP preprint 88/6.

*S.A. Dias, J.L. Matheus Valle, R.M. Doria*

### **Resumo**

**Para entender-se sobre a existência de diferentes potenciais de calibre transformando-se sob um mesmo grupo local de simetria, este trabalho estuda a teoria supersimétrica  $N = 1/2$ ,  $D = 2$ . Então, relaxando-se o assim chamado vínculo convencional, um segundo potencial de calibre emerge naturalmente.**