

Embeddings of Lie algebras, contractions and the state labelling problem

R. Campoamor-Stursberg
 I.M.I and Universidad Complutense de Madrid,
 Plaza de Ciencias 3, E-28040 Madrid.
 rutwig@pdi.ucm.es

1 Introduction

Since its introduction in Quantum Mechanics, group theory has shown to be a powerful tool to understand and interpret physical phenomena, from the crystalline structure of solids and the interpretation of atomic spectra to the classification of particles and the establishment of nuclei models. In all these applications, the groups are related usually to the symmetries of the system, either as spectrum-generating or dynamical groups, where the Casimir operators of the corresponding Lie algebra and those of distinguished subalgebras play a central role to describe the Hamiltonian or construct mass formulae. In this context, one of the main situations where group theoretical methods are applied to physical problems is concerned with classification schemes, where irreducible representations of a Lie group have to be decomposed into irreducible representations of a certain subgroup appearing in some relevant reduction chain

$$\left| \begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathfrak{s} & \supset & \mathfrak{s}' & \supset & \mathfrak{s}'' & \dots \supset & \mathfrak{s}^{(n)} & \dots \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ [\lambda] & & [\lambda'] & & [\lambda''] & \dots \supset & [\lambda^{(n)}] & \dots \end{array} \right\rangle. \quad (1)$$

This is the case for dynamical symmetries used for example in nuclear physics, where one objective of the algebraic model is to describe the Hamiltonian (or mass operator in the relativistic frame) as a function of the invariant operators of the chain elements. The corresponding energy formulae can be easily deduced from the expectation values in the reduced representations. As example, the Gell-Mann-Okubo mass formula is derived using this ansatz [1]. In many situations, the labels obtained from the reduction (1) are sufficient to solve the problem, e.g., if we require multiplicity free reductions, as used in $SU(N)$ tumbling gauge models [2] or the interacting boson model [3]. However, often the subgroup does not provide a sufficient number of labels to specify the basis states unambiguously, and multiplicities greater than one appear in the induced representations. This happens in many of the non-canonical embeddings and generic irreducible representations (IRREPs) of Lie algebras. Often this is not a constraint, since the interesting representations belong to a

certain type, like totally symmetric or anti-symmetric representations, and additional labels are not necessary to solve the problem, the degeneracies being solved directly with the available Casimir operators.

Many different methods and procedures to solve the so-called missing label problem (short MLP) have been developed in the literature, like projection of states, construction of states for the members of the reduction chain, the study of the enveloping algebras to determine all possible labelling operators, etc [4]. Even if the latter procedure allows to find the most general labelling operator, the effective computation of integrity bases is a rather complicated problem, and no effective method is available. Among the difficulties appearing in this approach, we remark that no general criterion to decide how many operators are necessary to generate an integrity bases is known. From the pure physical point of view, the question whether the found operators have some intrinsic meaning remains open, the operators having been obtained by a formal procedure. It is however expectable that labelling operators must have some interpretation in a physical context, as happens for the Elliott chain $\mathfrak{su}(3) \supset \mathfrak{so}(3)$ used in atomic physics, the Racah chain $\mathfrak{so}(7) \supset G_2 \supset \mathfrak{so}(3)$ used in the description of f -electron configurations, the Interacting Boson Model based on the spectrum generating unitary Lie algebra $\mathfrak{u}(6)$ or the K-matrix theory used in the nuclear $\mathfrak{sp}(3)$ model [3–8].

Using the original conception of Lie groups as groups of transformations with their infinitesimal generators, an analytical approach using differential equations is possible, and easily adaptable to the MLP [9]. This method generalizes previous procedures to compute the Casimir invariants of Lie algebras, and corresponds to interpret Casimir operators as functions that are constant on co-adjoint orbits. One of the advantages of the analytical ansatz is that it is not restricted to invariants of polynomial type. From this perspective, labelling operators can be seen as particular solutions of a certain subsystem of partial differential equations corresponding to an embedded subalgebra. Classical operators are recovered easily using the symmetrization map for tensors. In principle, the analytical method is more direct than the pure algebraic approach based on enveloping algebra, although integration of systems of differential equations is far from being a trivial task. Additional constraints like the orthogonality of labelling operators are still not expressible in analytical way.

Generally, labelling problems have been analyzed for specific chains of algebras, either combining some of the above mentioned techniques, or from an algebraic point of view, determining the operators of lowest degree that solve the state labelling. It is not unusual that a complete solution is still unknown, or that only certain types of labelling operators have been constructed. This is usually justified by the computational complexity of finding the general expression of the labelling operators. Another point of view involves the use of the properties and branching rules determined by each embedding of a Lie algebra into a larger one. ¹ In any application, the way how a subalgebra is embedded into a larger

¹Since non-equivalent embeddings of algebras lead to different branching rules, i.e., different decompositions of induced representations, the corresponding classification schemes are completely different.

symmetry algebra $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$ reflects the physics of the problem, corresponding to a coupling scheme or some symmetry breaking. It is not unreasonable to think that in the case of non-multiplicity free reductions, the labelling operators needed can be deduced from the data provided by the embedding. Since symmetry breaking is known to be related with contractions of Lie algebras [10], we can ask to which extent the labelling problem can be solved without using external formal machinery. In this context, the preserved symmetry corresponds to some subalgebra which remains unchanged by the contraction. We remark that this approach underlies the rotor expansion method developed in [6].

Assuming the relation of the missing label problem with contractions of Lie algebras, we can ask under which conditions they provide the labelling operators with the required properties. Formulated in another way: how many labelling operators of the reduction $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$ can be obtained using the symmetry breaking with respect to \mathfrak{s}' ? The first version of this approach to the missing label problem was developed in [11], having in mind the characterization of inhomogeneous algebras obtained from contractions of semisimple algebras [35]. It was observed that any reduction chain $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$ is naturally related to some types of inhomogeneous Lie algebras obtained by a contraction procedure. The next step was to give a certain meaning to the invariants of the contraction, and their possible connection with solutions to the corresponding MLP. This first development only considered the contracted invariants to generate labelling operators. This approach sufficed to solve physically relevant missing label problems, like those with one labelling operator, as well as other with a higher number. The results were in harmony with those obtained using other methods. The limits of validity of the method were also established, observing that for reductions satisfying the identity $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}) = n$ no complete solution was available. This failure is a consequence of an insufficient number of contracted invariants independent from the initial Casimir operators. It was also remarked that, for some special cases, although a sufficient number of independent solutions can be found, linear combinations of these are not mutually orthogonal.

The main objective of the generalized contraction ansatz in labelling problems can be resumed in the following points:

1. Find an effective method to solve the MLP using explicitly the properties of the embedding $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$ and the decomposition it induces on the Casimir operators.
2. Justify a physical choice of labelling operators as “broken Casimir operators” or linear functions of them.
3. Find a satisfactory explanation for the non-integer expectation values of labelling operators observed in the classical reduction chains.

The aim of this work is to review the actual progress on the missing label problem using the contraction ansatz, as well as some applications where this procedure could be of notable interest. The extrapolation of this approach to other types of reduction chains, like

the problem of the Racah operators, is also outlined. More specifically, we combine the analytical method of [9] for solving the MLP with contractions of Lie algebras with some refinements concerning the decomposition of Casimir operators. After recalling that for any embedding $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$ of (semisimple) Lie algebras we can find an associated simple Inönü-Wigner contraction of \mathfrak{s} onto an affine Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s}' \overrightarrow{\oplus}_R nL_1$, where nL_1 denotes an n -dimensional Abelian algebra and R is a representation of the subalgebra \mathfrak{s}' such that the adjoint representation ad of \mathfrak{s} satisfies the condition $ad(\mathfrak{s}) = ad(\mathfrak{s}') \oplus R$, we see that any invariant of the contraction \mathfrak{g} can be taken as a solution to the missing label operator. The first question to be solved is whether and under which constraints the invariants of the contraction \mathfrak{g} are sufficient in number to provide a set of missing label operators. We give sufficient conditions to solve the MLP by means of this associated contraction, and derive some useful consequences on their structure. At this point we observe that the missing label operators inherit a physical interpretation as the terms of Casimir operators that disappear during contraction. The possibility of recovering them by linear combinations show that they are internally determined by the group-subgroup chain. For some degenerate cases, where no missing labels exist, we observe that the invariants of the contraction arise as polynomial functions of the Casimir operators of the contracted Lie algebra \mathfrak{s} and the subalgebra \mathfrak{s}' . Generalizing this approach, for the cases where the contraction alone is not sufficient to find a set of labelling operators, a refinement based on a decomposition of the Casimir operators is proposed. It is proven that any of the terms of this decomposition are solutions to the labelling problem. This provides more possibilities to derive an orthogonal set, and explains some features already observed in the literature, like the minimal degree of the labelling operators. Finally, it is commented to which extent this refinement holds, and possible future outlines are presented.

2 Missing label operators

It is well known from classical theory that any semisimple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} possesses exactly $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) = l$ independent Casimir operators, i.e., polynomials in the generators that commute with all elements of the algebra, where l denotes the rank of the algebra.² The eigenvalues of Casimir operators are used to label without ambiguity the irreducible representations of \mathfrak{g} , while the states within a multiplet can be distinguished using the generators of the Cartan subalgebra. In some situations, however, these operators are not enough to separate multiplicities, and following Racah [13], we need $f = \frac{1}{2}(\dim \mathfrak{g} - 3l)$ additional operators (called Racah operators) to completely classify states. The total number of internal labels required is thus

$$i = \frac{1}{2}(\dim \mathfrak{g} - \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g})). \quad (2)$$

A similar situation holds whenever we use a some subalgebra \mathfrak{h} to label the basis states of irreducible representations of a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} .³ The subgroup provides

²We recall that the rank is defined as the dimension of the Cartan subalgebras.

³This is what we will call “missing label problem” (short MLP).

$\frac{1}{2}(\dim \mathfrak{h} + \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{h})) + l'$ labels, where l' denotes the number of invariants of \mathfrak{g} that depend only on variables of the subalgebra \mathfrak{h} [9]. To separate states within irreducible representations of \mathfrak{g} we thus need to find

$$n = \frac{1}{2} (\dim \mathfrak{g} - \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) - \dim \mathfrak{h} - \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{h})) + l' \quad (3)$$

additional operators, which we call missing label operators. The total number of available operators of this kind is easily shown to be twice the number of needed labels, i.e., $m = 2n$. For $n > 1$, it remains the problem of determining a set of n mutually commuting operators in order to prevent non-desired interactions.

The analytical approach to the missing label problem has the advantage of being formally very similar to the problem of finding the generalized Casimir invariants of Lie algebras. Although in general the missing label operators are neither invariants of the algebra nor any of its subalgebras, they can actually be determined by means of differential equations with the same ansatz as the general invariant problem [9, 14–20].

Given a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n \mid [X_i, X_j] = C_{ij}^k X_k\}$ in terms of generators and commutation relations, we are primarily interested in (polynomial) operators $C_p = \alpha^{i_1 \dots i_p} X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_p}$ in the generators of \mathfrak{s} such that the constraint $[X_i, C_p] = 0$, ($i = 1..n$) is satisfied. Such an operator can be shown to lie in the centre of the enveloping algebra of \mathfrak{s} , and is traditionally referred to as Casimir operator. However, in many dynamical problems, the relevant invariant functions are not polynomials, but rational or even transcendental functions (e.g. solvable groups in integrable systems or the inhomogeneous Weyl group). Thus the approach with the universal enveloping algebra has to be generalized in order to cover arbitrary Lie groups. The most convenient method is the analytical realization. The generators of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{s} are realized in the space $C^\infty(\mathfrak{g}^*)$ by means of the differential operators:

$$\widehat{X}_i = C_{ij}^k x_k \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}, \quad (4)$$

where $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is a dual basis of $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$. The invariants of \mathfrak{g} (in particular, the Casimir operators) are solutions of the following system of partial differential equations:

$$\widehat{X}_i F = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n. \quad (5)$$

Whenever we have a polynomial solution of (5), the symmetrization map defined by

$$Sym(x_{i_1}^{a_1} \dots x_{i_p}^{a_p}) = \frac{1}{p!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_p} x_{\sigma(i_1)}^{a_1} \dots x_{\sigma(i_p)}^{a_p} \quad (6)$$

allows to recover the Casimir operators in their usual form, i.e, as elements in the centre of the enveloping algebra of \mathfrak{g} . A maximal set of functionally independent invariants is usually called a fundamental basis. The number $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g})$ of functionally independent solutions of (5) is obtained from the classical criteria for differential equations, and is given by:

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) := \dim \mathfrak{g} - \text{rank} \left(C_{ij}^k x_k \right), \quad (7)$$

where $A(\mathfrak{g}) := \left(C_{ij}^k x_k \right)$ is the matrix associated to the commutator table of \mathfrak{g} over the given basis.

If we now consider an algebra-subalgebra chain $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$ determined by an embedding $f : \mathfrak{s}' \rightarrow \mathfrak{s}$, in order to compute the missing label operators we have to consider the equations of (5) corresponding to the generators of the subalgebra \mathfrak{s}' . This system, as proven in [9], has exactly $\mathcal{N}(f(\mathfrak{s}')) = \dim \mathfrak{s} - \dim \mathfrak{s}' - l'$ solutions. Using formula (3) it follows further that this scalar can be expressed in terms of the number of invariants of the algebra-subalgebra chain:

$$\mathcal{N}(f(\mathfrak{s}')) = m + \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}) + \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}') - l'. \quad (8)$$

This shows that the differential equations corresponding to the subalgebra generators have exactly n more solutions as needed to solve the missing label problem. The scalar m depends essentially on how the subalgebra is embedded. In general, to find a complete set of solutions for the labelling problem is a difficult task. One of the main objectives is to find a sufficient number of solutions without explicitly integrating the corresponding system, but using the properties of the inclusion $\mathfrak{s}' \text{ subsets } \mathfrak{s}$ and some related objects like contractions of Lie algebras.

Contractions have developed formal procedure to justify certain physical systems to a technique of considerable importance [10, 21–24]. It does not only allow to relate different symmetry or classification schemes by means of limiting processes, but also provides useful information on the behavior of certain observables and quantum numbers, codified in appropriate way by invariant functions or Lagrangians. Various types of contractions have been developed in the literature, and their equivalence or relations have been explored. For the MLP that interests us, only a quite specific type of contractions is of interest, that corresponds to the symmetry breaking with respect to some inner symmetry group. Therefore the presentation will be restricted to this type of contractions: Let \mathfrak{g} be a Lie algebra and $\Phi_t \in \text{End}(\mathfrak{g})$ a family of non-singular linear maps, where $t \in [1, \infty)$.⁴ For any $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$ we define

$$[X, Y]_{\Phi_t} := \Phi_t^{-1} [\Phi_t(X), \Phi_t(Y)], \quad (9)$$

which obviously represent the brackets of the Lie algebra over the transformed basis, and defines an isomorphic algebra. Suppose that the limit

$$[X, Y]_{\infty} := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_t^{-1} [\Phi_t(X), \Phi_t(Y)] \quad (10)$$

exists for any $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$. Then equation (10) defines a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}' called the contraction of \mathfrak{g} (by Φ_t), non-trivial if \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{g}' are non-isomorphic, and trivial otherwise [21, 23]. A contraction for which there exists some basis $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ such that the contraction matrix A_{Φ} is diagonal, that is, adopts the form

$$(A_{\Phi})_{ij} = \delta_{ij} t^{n_j}, \quad n_j \in \mathbb{Z}, t > 0, \quad (11)$$

⁴Other authors use the parameter range $t' \in (0, 1]$, which is equivalent to this by simply changing the parameter to $t' = 1/t$.

is called a generalized Inönü-Wigner contraction [23]. This is the only type of contractions that we will need in this work. Among the various properties of contractions, we enumerate a numerical inequality satisfied by them that will play a central role (for others see e.g. [24]): For an arbitrary contraction $\mathfrak{g} \rightsquigarrow \mathfrak{g}'$ the following must hold:

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) \leq \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}'). \quad (12)$$

In analogy to the limiting process of the structure tensor, a notion of contraction of invariants and Casimir operators can also be developed [25, 26]. The procedure is formally valid for polynomial and non-polynomial invariants, but we will only consider Casimir operators here. Suppose that the contraction is of the type (11). If $F(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \alpha^{i_1 \dots i_p} X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_p}$ is a Casimir operator of degree p , then the transformed invariant takes the form

$$F(\Phi_t(X_1), \dots, \Phi_t(X_n)) = t^{n_{i_1} + \dots + n_{i_p}} \alpha^{i_1 \dots i_p} X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_p}. \quad (13)$$

Now, defining

$$M = \max \{n_{i_1} + \dots + n_{i_p} \mid \alpha^{i_1 \dots i_p} \neq 0\}, \quad (14)$$

the limit

$$F'(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-M} F(\Phi_t(X_1), \dots, \Phi_t(X_n)) = \sum_{n_{i_1} + \dots + n_{i_p} = M} \alpha^{i_1 \dots i_p} X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_p} \quad (15)$$

gives a Casimir operator of degree p of the contraction \mathfrak{g}' . It should be remarked that, starting from an adequate fundamental system of invariants $\{C_1, \dots, C_p\}$ of \mathfrak{g} , it is always possible to obtain a set of p independent invariants of the contraction. It should be observed that it is not ensured that these invariants are of minimal degree in the contraction [11], or even that they split into a sum of more elementary invariants of the contraction.

3 Embeddings and contractions of Lie algebras

An embedding of a Lie algebra \mathfrak{s}' into a Lie algebra \mathfrak{s} is determined by an isomorphic mapping $f : \mathfrak{s}' \rightarrow \mathfrak{s}$. In the case of semisimple Lie algebras, the image of the subalgebra generators can be described in terms of the usual Cartan-Weyl basis $\{h_k, e_\alpha\}$ of \mathfrak{s} ⁵ by:

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\text{ranks}} a_k h_k + \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta} b_\alpha e_\alpha, \quad x \in \mathfrak{s}'.$$

Embeddings are classified up to inner automorphisms of \mathfrak{s} , and reduce the classification to the determination of the non-equivalent embeddings classes. The question that interest us is the behavior of representations of a simple Lie algebra when restricted to a (semisimple)

⁵ h_k denotes a generator in the Cartan subalgebra, while the e_α correspond to the root vectors.

subalgebra. An important fact is that any embedding determines a integer factor j_f given by the relation

$$(f(x), f(x')) = j_f (x, x'), \quad (16)$$

where $(.,.)$ is the usual scalar product defined on the dual Cartan subalgebras [27]. This scalar, being an invariant of the embedding class, constitutes a first label to distinguish reduction chains. Generally we call this scalar the index of \mathfrak{s}' in the Lie algebra \mathfrak{s} . The index has various important properties, from which we recall only those that will be of importance in the labelling problem. At first, given disjoint subalgebras \mathfrak{s}'_j of \mathfrak{s} , the direct sum of the subalgebras defines an embedding $f = \sum f_i$, the index of which is simply the sum of the various indices $j_{f,i}$. Further, for reduction chains $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}' \supset \mathfrak{s}''$, the index of the last algebra in \mathfrak{s} is the product of the corresponding indices of the chain members. The most important property used here concern the representations. Given $f : \mathfrak{s}' \rightarrow \mathfrak{s}$ and a linear representation Φ of the latter algebra, then the indices of the representations ⁶ are related by the formula:

$$j_f = \frac{l_{f\Phi}}{l_\Phi}, \quad (17)$$

where $l_{f\Phi}$ denotes the index of the induced representation on the subalgebra. We remark that this relation can be useful for checking the existence of embeddings with a fixed branching rule.

Among the different possibilities of embeddings, special types like regular subalgebra, which can be directly obtained from the Dynkin diagram of semisimple Lie algebras, or S -subalgebras, are of capital importance in the theory of semisimple Lie algebras, and are well known [28]. The key fact is that the index j_f serves to recognize the branching rules induced by the embedding. Complete tables of branching rules have not been obtained, although for simple complex Lie algebras and maximal semisimple subalgebras, these are tabulated up to rank eight [29]. As a special case of these branching rules, which is moreover the important case for the missing label problem, a reduction chain $\mathfrak{s}' \hookrightarrow_f \mathfrak{s}$ determines the following decomposition of the adjoint representation of \mathfrak{s} :

$$\text{ad}\mathfrak{s} = \text{ad}\mathfrak{s}' \oplus R. \quad (18)$$

Here R is a (completely reducible) representation of \mathfrak{s}' determined by the embedding index j_f .⁷ The latter equation reflects a basis of \mathfrak{s} that is obtained starting from an arbitrary basis of \mathfrak{s}' , and takes into account how the generators of the Lie algebra are coupled with those of the subalgebra (which determines the decomposition of the representation R into IRs of the subalgebra).

The crucial point is to construct the contraction related to the reduction chain $\mathfrak{s}' \subset \mathfrak{s}$. To this extent, consider a basis $\{X_1, \dots, X_s, X_{s+1}, \dots, X_n\}$ of \mathfrak{s} such that $\{X_1, \dots, X_s\}$ is a

⁶We recall that the index l_Φ of a representation R of highest weight Λ is determined by the eigenvalue of the quadratic Casimir operator of the algebra multiplied by the factor $\frac{\dim R}{\dim \text{ad}j}$, where $\text{ad}j$ denotes the adjoint representation [27].

⁷Complete reducibility is actually ensured only if the subalgebra \mathfrak{s}' is semisimple.

basis of \mathfrak{s}' , and $\{X_{s+1}, \dots, X_n\}$ spans the representation space of the induced R . This basis adapted to the subalgebra exactly reproduces the specific structure of the embedding. The structure tensor of \mathfrak{s} can thus be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned} [X_i, X_j] &= \sum_{k=1}^s C_{ij}^k X_k, \quad 1 \leq i, j, k \leq s, \\ [X_i, X_j] &= \sum_{k=s+1}^n C_{ij}^k X_k, \quad 1 \leq i \leq s, \quad s+1 \leq j, k \leq n, \\ [X_i, X_j] &= \sum_{k=1}^s C_{ij}^k X_k + \sum_{l=s+1}^n C_{ij}^l X_l, \quad s+1 \leq i, j \leq n. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we consider the non-singular linear transformations

$$\Phi_t(X_i) = \begin{cases} X_i, & 1 \leq i \leq s \\ \frac{1}{t} X_i, & s+1 \leq i \leq n \end{cases}. \quad (20)$$

Expressing the brackets over the transformed basis $\{X'_i = \Phi_t(X_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} [X'_i, X'_j] &= \sum_{k=1}^s C_{ij}^k X'_k, \quad 1 \leq i, j, k \leq s, \\ [X'_i, X'_j] &= \sum_{k=s+1}^n C_{ij}^k X'_k, \quad 1 \leq i \leq s, \quad s+1 \leq j, k \leq n, \\ [X'_i, X'_j] &= \sum_{k=1}^s \frac{1}{t^2} C_{ij}^k X'_k + \sum_{l=s+1}^n \frac{1}{t} C_{ij}^l X'_l, \quad s+1 \leq i, j \leq n. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

It is straightforward to verify that the subalgebra \mathfrak{s}' remains invariant, as well as the representation R of \mathfrak{s}' over its complementary in \mathfrak{s} . This is related to the fact that contractions cannot modify branching rules, and therefore the type of Levi decompositions [11]. These equations also show that the limit

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_t^{-1} [\Phi_t(X), \Phi_t(Y)] \quad (22)$$

exists for any pair of generators $X, Y \in \mathfrak{s}$, we thus obtain a non-trivial contraction (actually a simple Inönü-Wigner contraction) of \mathfrak{s} denoted by \mathfrak{g} and with non-vanishing brackets

$$\begin{aligned} [X'_i, X'_j] &= \sum_{k=1}^s C_{ij}^k X'_k, \quad 1 \leq i, j, k \leq s, \\ [X'_i, X'_j] &= \sum_{k=s+1}^n C_{ij}^k X'_k, \quad 1 \leq i \leq s, \quad s+1 \leq j, k \leq n. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

We observe that if \mathfrak{s}' is semisimple, then it coincides with the Levi subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} , and the Levi decomposition of this contraction equals

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s}' \overset{\rightarrow}{\oplus} (n-s)L_1, \quad (24)$$

where $(n-s)L_1$ denotes the Abelian algebra of dimension $n-s$. This Lie algebra is affine, and by the contraction we know that $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) \geq \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s})$. Applying the analytical method, the invariants of \mathfrak{g} are obtained from the solutions of the system:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{X}_i F &= C_{ij}^k x_k \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_j} = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq s, \\ \widehat{X}_{s+i} F &= C_{s+i,j}^{s+k} x_{s+k} \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_j} = 0, \quad 1 \leq i, k \leq n-s, \quad 1 \leq j \leq s. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

The subsystem (25) corresponds to the generators of \mathfrak{s}' realized as subalgebra of \mathfrak{s} , while the remaining equations (25) describe the representation. Written in matrix form, the system is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \dots & C_{1s}^k x_k & C_{1,s+1}^k x_k & \dots & C_{1,n}^k x_k \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ -C_{1s}^k x_k & \dots & 0 & C_{s,s+1}^k x_k & \dots & C_{s,n}^k x_k \\ -C_{s,s+1}^k x_k & \dots & -C_{s,s+1}^k x_k & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ -C_{1n}^k x_k & \dots & -C_{s,n}^k x_k & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{x_1} F \\ \vdots \\ \partial_{x_s} F \\ \partial_{x_{s+1}} F \\ \vdots \\ \partial_{x_n} F \end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

Since the first s first rows reproduce exactly the system of PDEs needed to compute the missing label operators, we conclude that any invariant of \mathfrak{g} is a candidate for missing label operator whenever it is functionally independent from the invariants of \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{s}' .

The following questions arise naturally from this ansatz:

1. Do polynomial functions of the invariants of these algebras suffice to determine n mutually orthogonal missing label operators?
2. Are all available operators obtainable by this procedure?

Although the answer to both question is in the negative in the most general case, it is in the affirmative for the first question for those reduction chains for which the contraction provides a number of independent invariants exceeding the number of needed labelling operators. It can fails when these two quantities coincide, which suggests that the procedure has to be refined. In some cases, the necessary operators cannot be obtained from this refinement, and we have to develop additional machinery to construct a set with the required operators. As concerns the second question, in general there will be solutions that do not arise from the contraction and successive refinements, although it cannot be excluded that in some special cases we are able to recover a complete set of independent labelling operators. As a general observation, only half of the available operators should be expected, since all operators obtained are the result, in some sense, of “breaking” the original Casimir operators. This fact also suggest some “inner” hierarchy of labelling operators, one of the classes corresponding to pure formal labelling operators without an apparent physical meaning, in the sense that they cannot be obtained or deduced from the initial data of the problem, and another class obtained as “broken” Casimir operators, which have a physical meaning as the terms of the original invariants that remain preserved by the limit. This idea will be precised more carefully later.

In any case, for the contraction following inequality holds: $\mathcal{N}(f(\mathfrak{s}')) \geq \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g})$. Combining the latter with formula (8), we conclude that

$$\mathcal{N}(f(\mathfrak{s})) = m + \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}) + \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}') - l' \geq \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) \geq \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}). \quad (26)$$

The term $\mathcal{N}(f(\mathfrak{s}))$ on the left hand side gives the total number of available labelling operators, the invariants of \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{s}' comprised, as shown in [9, 30]. Therefore, if the contraction \mathfrak{g} has enough invariants, we can extract a set of n commuting missing label operators and solve the missing label problem completely.

Usually, we will be concerned with reduction chains of the type $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$, where \mathfrak{s} is semisimple and \mathfrak{s}' is a reductive Lie algebra. We remark that the contraction method remains completely valid for reductions involving non-reductive algebra-subalgebra chains. as a special type involving Cartan subalgebras, that turns out to be of interest in labelling problems of semisimple Lie algebras of higher rank in connection with spectroscopical applications, where they were first considered [13]. More recently, this unusual class of MLP has been considered in classification schemes in chemical physics [31, 33].

4 MLPs solved with contractions only

We begin analyzing the cases where the contraction \mathfrak{g} allows to solve the MLP in satisfactory manner, and to set the limitations of this first approach. Some secondary results will emerge, specially concerning bounds for the number of invariants in Lie algebras arising by contraction. We assume that \mathfrak{s} is a semisimple Lie algebra of rank p , \mathfrak{s}' is a reductive subalgebra and denote by $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s}' \overrightarrow{\oplus}_R (\dim \mathfrak{s} - \dim \mathfrak{s}') kL_1$ the contraction associated to the chain $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$. Let $\{C_1, \dots, C_p\}$ be the Casimir operators of \mathfrak{s} , and $\{D_1, \dots, D_q\}$ the invariants of \mathfrak{s}' . Contracting the invariants C_i or some appropriate combination of them, we can always obtain p independent invariants of \mathfrak{g} . Completing if necessary to a maximal set of invariants of \mathfrak{g} , we obtain the fundamental system $\{C'_1, \dots, C'_p, \dots, C'_r\}$ ($r \geq p$). In order to solve the missing label problem using the latter set of functions, the system $\mathcal{F} = \{C'_1, \dots, C'_r\}$ must contain at least n functions that are independent on the Casimir invariants of \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{s}' , i.e.,

$$\text{rank } \mathcal{F} \pmod{\{C_1, \dots, C_p, D_1, \dots, D_q\}} \geq n. \quad (27)$$

By construction, $\{C_1, \dots, C_p, D_1, \dots, D_{q-l'}\}$ are functionally independent. Now the question arises whether adding the invariants of \mathfrak{g} some dependence relations appear. In general, and whenever no invariant is preserved by the contraction, the functions C_i and C'_i are independent. In this case a dependence relation means that some C_i is a function of C'_i and the invariants of \mathfrak{s}' . Such dependence relations appears for the quadratic Casimir operator C_1 .⁸ Writing C_1 over the transformed basis (20) we obtain the following decomposition of C_1 as polynomial in the contraction variable t :

$$C_1 = F + t^2 C'_1,$$

where F is a quadratic invariant of \mathfrak{s}' . This decomposition follows from the well known fact that, over the given basis, the quadratic Casimir operator of a reductive subalgebra is

⁸Is either \mathfrak{s} or \mathfrak{s}' is not reductive, this is not applicable, since existence of quadratic operators is not ensured.

always a summand of the quadratic Casimir operator of \mathfrak{s} .⁹ As a consequence, we obtain the upper bound

$$\text{rank} \{C_1, \dots, C_p, C'_1, \dots, C'_r, D_1, \dots, D_q\} < \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) + \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}) + \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}') - l'. \quad (28)$$

Combining the bounds (27) and (28) respectively, we obtain a necessary numerical condition on the number of invariants of the contraction \mathfrak{g} :

$$n < \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}). \quad (29)$$

These facts, put together, allow us to decide when the contraction \mathfrak{g} provides enough labelling operators to solve the missing label problem for $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$.

Theorem 1 *A necessary and sufficient condition for solving the missing label problem for the reduction $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$ by means of the invariants of the associated contraction $\mathfrak{s} \rightsquigarrow \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s}$ is that the affine Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} satisfies the constraints*

1. $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) \geq n + 1$,
2. *there are at least n invariants of \mathfrak{g} that are functionally independent from the invariants of \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{s}' .*

The first condition, the easiest to evaluate, provides a numerical criterion to decide whether the missing labels can be found by means of the affine algebra \mathfrak{g} . A sufficient condition can be obtained, namely:

Corollary 1 *If the contraction \mathfrak{g} satisfies the numerical condition $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) \geq \{n + 1, \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}) + \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}') + 1 - l'\}$, then it solves the MLP.*

Let $\mathfrak{s}' \hookrightarrow_{f_1} \mathfrak{s}$ be an embedding and $\mathfrak{s} \rightsquigarrow \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s}' \overset{\rightarrow}{\oplus} \text{Rk}L_1$ the associated contraction. The subalgebra \mathfrak{s}' is invariant by the contraction, we naturally obtain the embedding $f_2 : \mathfrak{s}' \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$. Consider the missing label problem for the latter embedding.¹⁰ It follows that the system of PDEs to be solved is exactly the same as for the embedding f_1 . This means that the solutions coincide, and, in particular, their number. Therefore that $\mathcal{N}(f_1(\mathfrak{s}')) = \mathcal{N}(f_2(\mathfrak{s}'))$. Recall that for each embedding the number of independent solutions is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}(f_1(\mathfrak{s}')) &= \dim \mathfrak{s} - \dim \mathfrak{s}' + l', \\ \mathcal{N}(f_2(\mathfrak{s}')) &= \dim \mathfrak{g} - \dim \mathfrak{s}' + l'_1, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where l'_1 denotes the number of common invariants of \mathfrak{s}' and \mathfrak{g} . Since contractions preserve the dimension, we conclude from formula (30) that $l' = l'_1$, that is, the subalgebra \mathfrak{s}' has the

⁹For higher order invariants, dependence relations could also appear, depending on the homogeneity degree of the invariants of \mathfrak{s} with respect to the generators of the subalgebra.

¹⁰Actually the mappings f_1 and f_2 are the same, but we distinguish the target algebra by the indices.

same number of common invariants with \mathfrak{s} than with the contraction \mathfrak{g} . On the other hand, using the reformulation (8)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}(f_1(\mathfrak{s}')) &= m + \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}) + \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}') - l' \\ \mathcal{N}(f_2(\mathfrak{s}')) &= \tilde{m} + \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) + \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}') - l'_1\end{aligned}\quad (31)$$

we deduce that

$$m - \tilde{m} = \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) - \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}) \geq 0. \quad (32)$$

This result tells us that the number of available labelling operators for the reduction chain $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$ is always higher than that of the chain $\mathfrak{g} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$. From this we obtain an interesting relation between the number of available operators for the different embeddings f_1 and f_2 : Let $\mathfrak{s} \rightsquigarrow \mathfrak{g}$ be such that the subalgebra \mathfrak{s}' is (maximal) invariant. Then following equality holds:

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}) + m - \tilde{m},$$

where m and \tilde{m} is the number of available missing label operators for the algebra subalgebra chain $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$ and $\mathfrak{g} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$, respectively.

As special case, we get the following upper bound

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) \leq \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}) + m. \quad (33)$$

This bound points out that the number of invariants of a contraction is, in some sense, determined by the number of available missing label operators for the missing label problem with respect to a maximal subalgebra of \mathfrak{s} that remains invariant by the contraction. Observe that the essential vanishing of brackets occurs in the maximal solvable ideal, since the subalgebra and the branching rule remains fixed.

Thus, for low values of n the contraction is an effective tool to solve the MLP, as well as for cases with a large number of invariants for the contracted Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}' . We review some of these cases with their most representative physical chains.

4.1 The case $n = m = 0$

In the case of zero missing labels, the invariants of the algebra-subalgebra chain provide a complete description of the states. This situation is not uncommon for certain canonical embeddings, such as the inclusions $\mathfrak{so}(p, q) \subset \mathfrak{so}(p, q + 1)$ of (pseudo)-orthogonal Lie algebras. Even if this case is trivial, its interpretation in terms of the associated contraction provides some interesting information concerning the invariants of the contraction.

If $m = 0$, then formula (32) implies that $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s})$, that is, the contraction associated to the embedding $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$ preserves the number of invariants (the converse does not necessarily hold). Moreover, by formula (3), we have

$$0 = m = \dim \mathfrak{s} - \dim \mathfrak{s}' - \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}) - \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}') + 2l'. \quad (34)$$

In absence of additional internal labels, the system $\widehat{X}_i F = 0$ for the generators of \mathfrak{s}' has exactly

$$\mathcal{N}(f(\mathfrak{s})) = \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}) + \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}') - l' \quad (35)$$

solutions. Since any invariant of the contraction $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s}' \overrightarrow{\oplus}_R (\dim \mathfrak{s} - \dim \mathfrak{s}') L_1$ is a special solution of this system, the latter equation tells that any invariant of \mathfrak{g} is functionally dependent on the invariants of \mathfrak{s} and the subalgebra \mathfrak{s}' . That is, the Casimir invariants of the algebra-subalgebra chain completely determine the invariants of the contraction.¹¹ Expressed in another way, in this situation, polynomial functions of the invariants of \mathfrak{s} and the contraction \mathfrak{g} allow to recover naturally the invariants of the subalgebra.

Typical chains where the number of labelling operators is zero are the pseudo-orthogonal reductions $\mathfrak{so}(p, q) \supset \mathfrak{so}(p-1, q)$ and $\mathfrak{so}(p, q) \supset \mathfrak{so}(p, q-1)$. This has been used to analyze the corresponding inhomogeneous algebras [35], and justifies to some extent the validity of the Gel'fand method for non-semisimple Lie algebras. Another interesting class of algebras where $m = 0$ holds is the extended Schrödinger algebra, $\widehat{S}(N)$, which is the invariance algebra of the Schrödinger equation in $(N+1)$ -dimensional spacetime. The remarkable fact is that this algebra is no more semisimple, but a semidirect product of a semisimple algebra with a Heisenberg-Weyl algebra [36].

4.2 The case $n = 1, m = 2$

For the case of one missing label operator, any solution of the contraction \mathfrak{g} that is independent of the invariants of the algebra-subalgebra chain is an admissible labelling operator. Formula (33) establishes the maximal possible number for the invariants of \mathfrak{g} :

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) \leq \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}) + 2.$$

Observe that two is exactly the number of available operators. There are eight cases with one missing label [9, 37], semisimple Lie algebra \mathfrak{s} and maximal reductive subalgebra \mathfrak{s}' . Most of these chains have been solved explicitly finding finite integrity bases, that is, a set of elementary subgroup scalar such that any other can be expressed by a polynomial in them. All these can also be solved applying the contraction method. The eight possibilities are resumed in Table 1.¹²

4.3 The $\mathfrak{su}(3) \supset \mathfrak{so}(3)$ reduction

This reduction, also called the Elliott chain, was introduced in order to generalize the group theoretical analysis developed for $L - S$ and $j - j$ coupling schemes to the mixing of two different orbital shells [4]. This case is without doubt the best studied missing label problem. A complete set of commuting operators and their eigenvalues for different irreducible

¹¹Of course, if $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}') = 0$, this assertion fails, but for reductive subalgebras this situation is excluded.

¹²This enumeration should be understood in a broad sense. The number of labelling operators does not depend on the embedding class, thus various different reduction chains are considered as one possibility. Further, the different real forms of the algebras also give rise to different MLPs, although the type is still the same.

representations of $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ were determined in [38].

The $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ subalgebra is naturally identified with the three orbital angular momentum operators, while the remaining five generators transform under rotations like the elements of a second rank tensor [4, 6]. Here we consider a basis $\{L_i, T_{jk}\}$ formed by rotations L_i and the operators T_{ik} and commutation relations

$$\begin{aligned} [L_j, L_k] &= i\varepsilon_{jkl}L_l, & [L_j, T_{kl}] &= i\varepsilon_{jkm}T_{lm} + i\varepsilon_{jlm}T_{km}, \\ [T_{jk}, T_{lm}] &= \frac{i}{4} \left\{ \delta_j^l \varepsilon_{kmn} + \delta_j^m \varepsilon_{kln} + \delta_k^l \varepsilon_{jmn} + \delta_k^m \varepsilon_{jln} \right\} L_n, \end{aligned}$$

where $T_{33} + (T_{11} + T_{22}) = 0$. The symmetrized Casimir operators, following the notation of [38], are given by $C^{(2)} = L_i L_i + 2T_{ik} T_{ik}$, $C^{(3)} = L_i T_{ik} L_k - \frac{4}{3} T_{ik} T_{kl} T_{li}$ and $C^{(2,0)} = L_i L_i$. The contraction \mathfrak{g} associated to this reduction has Levi decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}(3) \overrightarrow{\oplus}_{R_5^I} 5L_1$, where R_5^I denotes the five dimensional irreducible representation of $\mathfrak{so}(3)$. This is equivalent to the rotor algebra $[\mathbb{R}^5]SO(3)$ studied in [5]. It is straightforward to verify that $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) = 2$. Therefore, a basis of invariants of \mathfrak{g} can be obtained by contraction of $C^{(2)}$ and $C^{(3)}$. Specifically, we get the (unsymmetrized) Casimir invariants

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 &= 2t_{ik}t^{ik}, \\ C_3 &= t_{ik}t^{kl}t_{li}. \end{aligned}$$

As already observed, C_2 is functionally dependent on $C^{(2)}$ and $C^{(2,0)}$, therefore of no use for the MLP. The independence of $\{C^{(2)}, C^{(3)}, C^{(2,0)}, C_3\}$ follows from the Jacobian

$$\frac{\partial \{C^{(2)}, C^{(3)}, C^{(2,0)}, C_3\}}{\partial \{l_2, l_3, t_{11}, t_{12}\}} \neq 0.$$

The invariant C_3 is therefore sufficient to solve the missing label problem. In fact, we can recover the missing label operator $X^{(3)}$ from [38] by simply considering the linear combination

$$X^{(3)} = C^{(3)} + \frac{4}{3} \{C_3\}_{symmetrized}.$$

This operator is equivalent to the third order operator obtained by Bargmann and Moshinsky in [39], and also to the operator determined in [5] using the K-matrix approach. It is observed that the fourth order operator $X^{(4)} = L_i T_{ij} T_{jk} L_k$ cannot be obtained from the invariants of $\mathfrak{su}(3)$, $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ and the contraction \mathfrak{g} . This is essentially due to the fact that the fundamental Casimir operators of $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ have degree two and three. Another recent approach to this reduction chain can be found in [40].

5 The exceptional chain $G_2 \supset \mathfrak{su}(3)$

The exceptional Lie group G_2 has been shown to have interesting physical applications, as followed from Racah's on atomic spectroscopy, where it is essential for the understanding of the $f = 3$ shell [13, 41]. This group was also considered as candidate to describe strong

interactions, prior to the success of the unitary group $\mathfrak{su}(3)$, as well as in the development of an eight-fold way for the electronic f -shell [42, 43]. The fact that the latter is contained as maximal subgroup in G_2 has made the exceptional group an interesting object in hadron spectroscopy. For these applications, it is convenient to express G_2 in a $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ basis. It is easy to see the adjoint representation $\Gamma_{(1,0)}$ of G_2 decomposes like follows with respect to $\mathfrak{su}(3)$:

$$\Gamma_{(1,0)} = 8 + 3 + \bar{3} \quad (36)$$

According to this decomposition, we label the generators as E_{ij}, a_k, b^l ($i, j, k, l = 1, 2, 3$) (with the constraint $E_{11} + E_{22} + E_{33} = 0$). We have the brackets:

$$\begin{aligned} [E_{ij}, E_{kl}] &= \delta_{jk}E_{il} - \delta_{il}E_{kj} \\ [E_{ij}, a_k] &= \delta_{jk}a_i \\ [E_{ij}, b^k] &= -\delta_{ik}b^j \\ [a_i, a_j] &= -2\varepsilon_{ijk}b^k \\ [b^i, b^j] &= 2\varepsilon_{ijk}a_k \\ [a_i, b^j] &= 3E_{ij} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

The subalgebra is clearly spanned by the operators E_{ij} . We moreover choose the Cartan subalgebra generated by the operators $H_1 = E_{11} - 2E_{22} + E_{33}$ and $H_2 = E_{22} - E_{33}$. The operators $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ correspond to the fundamental quark representation $\mathbf{3}$, while $\{b^1, b^2, b^3\}$ corresponds to the antiquark representation $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$.¹³ Considering the reduction chain $G_2 \supset \mathfrak{su}(3)$, we see that separation of multiplicities requires

$$n = \frac{1}{2} (14 - 2 - 8 - 2) = 1$$

additional labelling operator.

The contraction associated to the reduction $G_2 \supset \mathfrak{su}(3)$ has at least two Casimir operators, thus the preceding results apply and the missing label problem can be solved. As expected, the quadratic invariant of G_2 can be neglected for providing no information. Following the procedure developed in [44, 45], the sixth order Casimir operator is rewritten as¹⁴

$$C_6 = 3C_{[2,4],1} - 6C_{[4,2],1} - \frac{3}{4}C_{[2,4],2} - 9C_{[2,4],3} + 9C_{[4,2],2} + 27C_{[3,3]}, \quad (38)$$

where the $C_{[i,j],k}$ denote operators of degree i in the $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ generators and degree j in the representation space variables, k being an additional index to separate operators of the same degree. It follows at once that $3C_{[2,4],1} - \frac{3}{4}C_{[2,4],2} - 9C_{[2,4],3}$ is the Casimir operator of the corresponding contraction, for having the highest power in the variables of the representation of $\mathfrak{su}(3)$. It can be verified that the operator $\Omega = 9C_{[4,2],2} + 27C_{[3,3]} - 6C_{[4,2],1}$ is independent on the Casimir operators of both G_2 and $\mathfrak{su}(3)$. In the absence of orthogonality conditions, Ω provides a labelling operator for the reduction.

¹³The corresponding brackets for the adjoint representation are given in Table 1.

¹⁴The invariant has 432 terms over this basis, we therefore skip its explicit expression here.

Table 1: The adjoint representation of G_2 in the A_2 -basis

	V_1	V_2	V_3	V_4	V_5	V_6	V_7	V_8	V_9	V_{10}	V_{11}	V_{12}	V_{13}	V_{14}
H_1	0	0	$2V_3$	$-2V_4$	$-3V_5$	$3V_6$	$-V_7$	V_8	V_9	$-V_{10}$	$3V_{11}$	$-3V_{12}$	0	0
H_2	0	0	$-V_3$	V_4	$2V_5$	$-2V_6$	V_7	$-V_8$	0	0	$-V_{11}$	V_{12}	V_{13}	$-V_{14}$
E_{12}	$-3V_{11}$	V_{11}	0	V_9	V_{13}	0	0	0	0	$-V_3$	0	W_1	0	$-V_6$
E_{21}	$3V_{12}$	$-V_{12}$	$-V_{10}$	0	0	$-V_{14}$	0	0	V_4	0	$-W_1$	0	V_5	0
E_{23}	$3V_5$	$-2V_5$	$-V_7$	0	0	V_2	0	V_4	0	0	$-V_{13}$	0	0	V_{12}
E_{32}	$-3V_6$	$2V_6$	0	V_8	$-V_2$	0	$-V_3$	0	0	0	0	V_{14}	$-V_{11}$	0
E_{13}	0	$-V_{13}$	0	0	0	V_{11}	0	V_9	0	$-V_7$	0	$-V_5$	0	W_2
E_{31}	0	V_{14}	0	0	$-V_{12}$	0	$-V_{10}$	0	V_8	0	V_6	0	$-W_2$	0
a_1	$-3V_9$	0	$3V_{11}$	$-2V_7$	0	0	$3V_{13}$	$2V_3$	0	W_3	0	$-V_4$	0	$-V_8$
a_2	$2V_4$	$-V_4$	$-V_1$	0	0	$-V_8$	$3V_5$	$-2V_{10}$	$2V_7$	$3V_{12}$	$-V_9$	0	0	0
a_3	$-3V_8$	V_8	$3V_6$	$2V_{10}$	$-V_4$	0	$-W_4$	0	$-2V_3$	$3V_{14}$	0	0	$-V_9$	0
b^1	V_{10}	0	$2V_8$	$-3V_{12}$	0	0	$-2V_4$	$-3V_{14}$	$-W_3$	0	V_3	0	V_7	0
b^2	$-2V_3$	V_3	0	V_1	V_7	0	$2V_9$	$-3V_6$	$-3V_{11}$	$-2V_8$	0	V_{10}	0	0
b^3	V_7	$-V_7$	$-2V_9$	$-3V_5$	0	V_3	0	W_4	$-3V_{13}$	V_4	0	0	0	V_{10}

$W_1 = V_1 + V_2, W_2 = V_1 + 2V_2, W_3 = 2V_1 + 3V_2, W_4 = V_1 + 3V_2$

5.1 The $\mathfrak{so}(5) \supset \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)$ chain

The study of this reduction, also called the seniority model, was motivated by the close connection between the Wigner coefficients involving the standard representation of $\mathfrak{so}(5)$ with the fractional parentage coefficients of spin-2 systems in the seniority scheme [13, 46, 47].

To analyze this case, we consider the same basis $\{U_{\pm}, U_3, V_3, V_{\pm}, S_{\pm}, T_{\pm}\}$ used in [48, 49]. The $\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)$ subalgebra is generated by the operators $\{U_{\pm}, U_3, V_3\}$. The nonzero brackets are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 [U_{\pm}, U_3] &= \mp U_{\pm}, & [U_+, U_-] &= 2U_3, & [U_{\pm}, V_{\pm}] &= \mp 2S_{\pm}, & [U_{\pm}, V_{\mp}] &= \mp 2T_{\pm}, \\
 [U_{\pm}, S_{\mp}] &= \pm V_{\mp}, & [U_{\pm}, T_{\mp}] &= \pm V_{\mp}, & [U_3, S_{\pm}] &= \pm S_{\pm}, & [U_3, T_{\pm}] &= \pm T_{\pm}, \\
 [V_3, S_{\pm}] &= \pm S_{\pm}, & [V_3, T_{\pm}] &= \mp T_{\pm}, & [V_+, V_-] &= 2V_3, & [V_{\pm}, V_3] &= \mp V_{\pm}, \\
 [V_{\pm}, S_{\mp}] &= \mp U_{\mp}, & [V_{\pm}, T_{\pm}] &= \pm U_{\pm}, & [S_+, S_-] &= U_3 + V_3, & [T_+, T_-] &= U_3 - V_3.
 \end{aligned}$$

Using standard methods, the (unsymmetrized) Casimir operators of $\mathfrak{so}(5)$ can be chosen as

$$\begin{aligned}
 C_2 &= u_+ u_- + u_3^2 + v_3^2 + v_+ v_- + 2(s_+ s_- + t_+ t_-), \\
 C_4 &= (u_+ u_- + u_3^2) v_3^2 + u_+ u_- (s_+ s_- + t_+ t_-) + u_+^2 s_- t_- + u_-^2 s_+ t_+ + 2u_3 v_3 s_+ s_- \\
 &\quad + ((t_- v_- - s_- v_+) u_+ + (t_+ v_+ - s_+ v_-) u_-) v_3 + (t_+ v_+ + s_+ v_-) u_- \\
 &\quad + v_+ v_- s_+ s_- + u_3^2 v_+ v_- + (s_+ s_- - t_+ t_-)^2 - v_+^2 s_- t_+ - v_-^2 s_+ t_- + v_+ v_- t_+ t_- \\
 &\quad + s_- v_+ u_+ u_3 + t_- v_- u_- u_3 - 2u_3 v_3 t_+ t_-.
 \end{aligned}$$

Those of the subalgebra are very easy to find: $C_{21} = u_+ u_- + u_3^2$ and $C_{22} = v_3$. In this case, the associated contraction \mathfrak{g} is inhomogeneous with Levi part isomorphic to

Table 2: Missing label operators through contraction

$\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$	$\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g})$	$\mathcal{N}(f(\mathfrak{s}'))$	rank \mathcal{F}	Order of Φ
$\mathfrak{su}(3) \supset \mathfrak{so}(3)$	2	5	4	3
$\mathfrak{so}(5) \supset \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)$	2	6	5	4
$G_2 \supset \mathfrak{su}(3)$	2	5	4	6
$\mathfrak{sp}(6) \supset \mathfrak{sp}(4) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$	3	8	7	6
$\mathfrak{so}(7) \supset G_2$	3	7	6	6
$\mathfrak{su}(4) \supset [\mathfrak{su}(2)]^2 \times \mathfrak{u}(1)$	3	7	6	4
$\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(3) \supset \mathfrak{su}(3)$	2	8	7	3
$[\mathfrak{su}(2)]^3 \supset \mathfrak{su}(2)$	3	6	5	2

$\mathfrak{su}(2)$, and it preserves the number of invariants. Contracting the operators above, we get the invariants:

$$\begin{aligned} C'_2 &= v_+v_- + 2(s_+s_- + t_+t_-), \\ C'_4 &= v_+v_-s_+s_- + (s_+s_- - t_+t_-)^2 - v_+^2s_-t_+ - v_-^2s_+t_- + v_+v_-t_+t_-. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

As expected, the quadratic Casimir operator does not provide useful operators. Thus only C'_4 can be used. In order to check the independence of the latter from the Casimir operators of $\mathfrak{so}(5)$ and the subalgebra, we compute the Jacobian

$$\frac{\partial \{C_2, C_4, C'_4, C_{21}, C_{22}\}}{\partial \{u_+, u_-, v_3, v_+, v_-\}} \neq 0,$$

that shows the possibility of solving the missing label problem for this chain. Some manipulation of the preceding functions leads us to the labelling operator $\Omega_4 = C_4 - C'_4 - C_{21}C_{22}^2$ given explicitly by

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_4 &= u_+u_-(s_+s_- + t_+t_-) + u_3^2v_+v_- + u_+^2s_-t_- + u_-^2s_+t_+ + 2u_3v_3(s_+s_- - t_+t_-) \\ &\quad + ((t_-v_- - s_-v_+)u_+ + (t_+v_+ - s_+v_-)u_-)v_3 + (t_+v_+ + s_+v_-)u_-u_3 \\ &\quad + s_-v_+u_+u_3 + t_-v_-u_+u_3. \end{aligned}$$

Symmetrizing this operator Ω_4 , we conclude that it coincides with the fourth order operator UVL^2 constructed in [9]. Since $m = 2$, there is another possibility for the labelling operator, of degree three. This cannot however be recovered by the procedure, since odd Casimir operators do not exist for the orthogonal algebra $\mathfrak{so}(5)$.

6 Reductions with $n > 1, m > 2$

Reduction chains with more than two missing labels are notably more complicated, mainly because of the requirement that the labelling operators found must commute. Many physically important cases belonging to this type have been analyzed in the literature, although only for a small number the complete solution has been found. The best known example

is the Wigner supermultiplet $\mathfrak{su}(4) \supset \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$, studied algebraically by various authors, and for which the numerical values of the labelling operators have been computed for large classes of irreducible representations [50–52]. In this section we show that the approach of using only the invariants of the contraction associated to the reduction holds for more than one labelling operator, and sometimes coincide with those operators found by different procedures.

6.1 The supermultiplet model

This reduction was considered to describe light nuclei, in opposition to the isospin-strange spin contents of $\mathfrak{su}(4)$, which uses the canonical embedding of $\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$ into the Lie algebra. For the multiplet model, the set of available operators is partitioned into two separate sets, the Moshinky-Nagel operators Ω, Φ and two other operators O_1, O_2 found in [50]. An approach using contractions can be found in [11]. We resume that result. Using the same basis $\{S_i, T_j, Q_{\alpha\beta}\}$ of [52], where $1 \leq i, j, \alpha, \beta \leq 3$, the non-vanishing brackets of $\mathfrak{su}(4)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} [S_i, S_j] &= i\varepsilon_{ijk}S_k, \quad [T_i, T_j] = i\varepsilon_{ijk}T_k, \quad [S_i, Q_{j\alpha}] = i\varepsilon_{ijk}Q_{k\alpha}, \quad [T_\alpha, Q_{i\beta}] = i\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}Q_{i\gamma}, \\ [Q_{i\alpha}, Q_{j\beta}] &= \frac{i}{4} \{ \delta_{\alpha\beta}\varepsilon_{ijk}S_k + \delta_{ij}\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}T_\gamma \}, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where ε_{ijk} is the completely antisymmetric tensor. Clearly $\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$ is generated by the operators $\{S_i, T_j\}$. The branching rule correspond to the representation

$$R = (D_1 \otimes D_0) \oplus (D_0 \otimes D_1) \oplus (D_1 \otimes D_1), \quad (41)$$

where D_1 denotes the adjoint representation of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ and D_0 the trivial representation. The two missing label operators are found integrating the system

$$\widehat{S}_i F = \varepsilon_{ijk}s_k \frac{\partial F}{\partial s_j} + \varepsilon_{ijk}q_{kl} \frac{\partial F}{\partial q_{kl}} = 0, \quad \widehat{T}_\alpha F = \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}t_\gamma \frac{\partial F}{\partial t_\beta} + \varepsilon_{\beta\gamma\mu}q_{\alpha\mu} \frac{\partial F}{\partial q_{\beta\mu}} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3 \quad (42)$$

corresponding to the generators of the subalgebra. Five of the nine independent solutions correspond to invariants of $\mathfrak{su}(4)$ and $\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$. The Casimir operators of $\mathfrak{su}(4)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 &= s_\alpha s^\alpha + t_\beta t^\beta + 4q_{\alpha\beta}q^{\alpha\beta}, \\ C_3 &= s_\alpha t_\beta q^{\alpha\beta} - 4\varepsilon^{ijk}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma}q_{i\alpha}q_{j\beta}q_{k\gamma}, \\ C_4 &= 16 \left\{ \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^2 (q_{\alpha\beta}^2 (q_{\alpha\gamma}^2 + q_{\gamma\beta}^2) + 2q_{\alpha\alpha}^2 (q_{\alpha\gamma}^2 + q_{\beta\alpha}^2) - 2q_{\alpha\alpha}q_{\alpha\beta}q_{\gamma\alpha}q_{\gamma\beta} + 3q_{\alpha\beta}^2 (q_{\gamma\alpha}^2 + q_{\gamma\beta}^2)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{\alpha < \beta} \left(3 (q_{\alpha\alpha}^2 q_{\beta\beta}^2 + q_{\alpha\beta}^2 q_{\beta\alpha}^2) - 2q_{\alpha\alpha}q_{\beta\beta}q_{\alpha\beta}q_{\beta\alpha} \right) \right\} + (s_\alpha s^\alpha)^2 + (t_\beta t^\beta)^2 + 3s_\alpha s^\alpha t_\beta t^\beta \\ &\quad + 16q_{\alpha\beta}^4 + 2^3 q_{\alpha\beta}^2 (s_\alpha s^\alpha + t_\beta t^\beta) + 4 \{ t_\alpha t_\beta q_{\gamma\alpha}q_{\gamma\beta} + s_\alpha s_\beta q_{\alpha\gamma}q_{\beta\gamma} - \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho} s_\mu t_\alpha q_{\nu\beta}q_{\rho\gamma} \}, \end{aligned}$$

while $C_{21} = s_\alpha s^\alpha$, $C_{22} = t_\beta t^\beta$ are those of the subalgebra. The contraction associated to the chain has the Levi decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = (\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)) \xrightarrow{\overrightarrow{\oplus}}_{D_1 \otimes D_1} 9L_1$, and it is

not difficult to verify that $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) = 3$. Contraction of the invariants give respectively

$$\begin{aligned} C'_2 &= 4q_{\alpha\beta}q^{\alpha\beta}, \\ C'_3 &= -4\varepsilon^{ijk}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma}q_{i\alpha}q_{j\beta}q_{k\gamma}, \\ C_4 &= 16\left\{\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^2(q_{\alpha\beta}^2(q_{\alpha\gamma}^2 + q_{\gamma\beta}^2) + 2q_{\alpha\alpha}^2(q_{\alpha\gamma}^2 + q_{\beta\alpha}^2) - 2q_{\alpha\alpha}q_{\alpha\beta}q_{\gamma\alpha}q_{\gamma\beta} + 3q_{\alpha\beta}^2(q_{\gamma\alpha}^2 + q_{\gamma\gamma}^2))\right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{a<\beta} \left(3(q_{\alpha\alpha}^2q_{\beta\beta}^2 + q_{\alpha\beta}^2q_{\beta\alpha}^2) - 2q_{\alpha\alpha}q_{\beta\beta}q_{\alpha\beta}q_{\beta\alpha}\right) + 16q_{\alpha\beta}^4\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

To see that $\mathcal{F} = \{C_2, C_3, C_4, C_{21}, C_{22}, C'_3, C'_4\}$ is a functionally independent set, we consider the Jacobian with respect to the variable set $\{s_2, s_3, t_1, t_2, q_{11}, q_{12}, q_{23}\}$:

$$\frac{\partial(C_{21}, C_2, C_3, C_4, C'_2, C'_3, C'_4)}{\partial(s_2, s_3, t_1, t_2, q_{11}, q_{12}, q_{23})} \neq 0. \quad (43)$$

Therefore the contraction method provides two of the four available operators. To construct suitable labelling operators, we take the difference of the cubic invariants of $\mathfrak{su}(4)$ and \mathfrak{g} . In this way we recover exactly the cubic operator Ω of Moshinsky and Nagel [52]:

$$C_3 - C'_3 = \Omega = s_\alpha t_\beta q^{\alpha\beta}. \quad (44)$$

This operator is known to commute only with the fourth order operator Φ defined by

$$\Phi = S_i S_j Q_{i\alpha} Q_{j\alpha} + Q_{i\alpha} Q_{i\beta} T_\alpha T_\beta - \varepsilon_{ijk}\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} S_i T_\alpha Q_{j\beta} Q_{k\gamma}. \quad (45)$$

Algebraic manipulation of the fourth order operators of $\mathfrak{su}(4)$ and the contraction leads to the following result:

$$\Phi = \frac{1}{4} \{C_4 - C'_4 + C_{21}^2 - C_2^2 + C_2'^2 - C_{21}(C_2' - C_2)\}. \quad (46)$$

This means that the commuting $\Omega - \Phi$ operators of [52] can be completely recovered by the contraction associated to the embedding of spin-isospin subalgebra in $\mathfrak{su}(4)$. We observe that the remaining operators are contained in the expression of Φ , and cannot be isolated by the contraction only.

6.2 The $\mathfrak{su}(5) \supset \mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$ reduction

Reduction chains of the type $\mathfrak{su}(p+q) \supset \mathfrak{su}(p) \times \mathfrak{su}(q)$ are very common in particle physics, and constitute the natural generalization of the well known breaking of symmetry of $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ down to the isospin and hypercharge $\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)$. The unitary group $\mathfrak{su}(5)$ is a central object in the study how leptons get mass, and the adjoint representation of $\mathfrak{su}(5)$ with a vacuum value in the direction of the $\mathfrak{u}(1)$ generator is a good choice for the Higgs field [53] in the symmetry breaking $\mathfrak{su}(5) \supset \mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)$. Leaving aside $\mathfrak{u}(1)$, the corresponding reduction chain also presents some interest. In this case, the number of needed labelling operators is

$$n = \frac{1}{2}(24 - 4 - 8 - 2 - 3 - 1) = 3.$$

We will see that this chain can be solved using only the associated contraction to the chain.¹⁵

In this work we will use the basis of $\mathfrak{u}(N)$ given by the operators $\{E_{\mu\nu}, F_{\mu\nu}\}_{1 \leq \mu, \nu \leq N}$ with the constraints $E_{\mu\nu} + E_{\nu\mu} = 0$, $F_{\mu\nu} - F_{\nu\mu} = 0$. The commutation relations over this basis are:

$$\begin{aligned} [E_{\mu\nu}, E_{\lambda\sigma}] &= E_{\nu\sigma} + E_{\lambda\nu} - E_{\mu\sigma} - E_{\lambda\mu}, \\ [E_{\mu\nu}, F_{\lambda\sigma}] &= F_{\nu\sigma} + F_{\lambda\nu} - F_{\mu\sigma} - F_{\lambda\mu}, \\ [F_{\mu\nu}, F_{\lambda\sigma}] &= E_{\nu\sigma} + E_{\mu\sigma} - E_{\lambda\mu} - E_{\lambda\nu}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Since $\mathfrak{u}(N) = \mathfrak{su}(N) \oplus \mathbb{R}$, it follows at once that $\mathfrak{u}(N)$ has N independent Casimir operators, one of them being central element, while the other $(N - 1)$ invariants correspond to the simple part. To recover $\mathfrak{su}(N)$, we take the Cartan subalgebra spanned by the vectors $H_\mu = F_{\mu\mu} - F_{\mu+1, \mu+1}$ for $\mu = 1..N - 1$. The centre of $\mathfrak{u}(N)$ is then obviously generated by $\delta^{\mu\mu} F_{\mu\mu}$, and the remaining can be deduced using an algebraic approach similar to the Gel'fand method. For the case that interests us here, a maximal set of independent Casimir invariants of $\mathfrak{su}(5)$ is given by the coefficients D_k of the characteristic polynomial $|iA_5 - \lambda \text{Id}_5| = \lambda^5 + \sum_{k=2}^5 D_k \lambda^{5-k}$, where A_5 is the matrix defined by

$$\begin{pmatrix} -iY_1 & -e_{12} - i f_{12} & -e_{13} - i f_{13} & -e_{14} - i f_{14} & -e_{15} - i f_{15} \\ e_{12} - i f_{12} & -iY_2 & -e_{23} - i f_{23} & -e_{24} - i f_{24} & -e_{25} - i f_{25} \\ e_{13} - i f_{13} & e_{23} - i f_{23} & -iY_3 & -e_{34} - i f_{34} & -e_{35} - i f_{35} \\ e_{14} - i f_{14} & e_{24} - i f_{24} & e_{34} - i f_{34} & -iY_4 & -e_{45} - i f_{45} \\ e_{15} - i f_{15} & e_{25} - i f_{25} & e_{35} - i f_{35} & e_{45} - i f_{45} & -iY_5 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (48)$$

where the vectors Y_i are given respectively by

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1 &= \frac{4}{5}h_1 + \frac{3}{5}h_2 + \frac{2}{5}h_3 + \frac{1}{5}h_4, & Y_2 &= -\frac{1}{5}h_1 + \frac{3}{5}h_2 + \frac{2}{5}h_3 + \frac{1}{5}h_4, \\ Y_3 &= -\frac{1}{5}h_1 - \frac{2}{5}h_2 + \frac{2}{5}h_3 + \frac{1}{5}h_4, & Y_4 &= -\frac{1}{5}h_1 - \frac{2}{5}h_2 - \frac{3}{5}h_3 + \frac{1}{5}h_4, \\ Y_5 &= -\frac{1}{5}h_1 - \frac{2}{5}h_2 - \frac{3}{5}h_3 - \frac{4}{5}h_4. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Before symmetrization, the Casimir operators D_2, \dots, D_5 obtained by this method have 30, 140, 575 and 1848 terms. For this reduction chain, the subalgebra $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$ is generated by $\left\{ \{H_1, H_2, E_{\mu\nu}, F_{\mu\nu}\}_{1 \leq \mu, \nu \leq 3}, \{H_4, E_{45}, F_{45}\} \right\}$. In particular, the inhomogeneous contraction \mathfrak{g} has Levi part isomorphic to $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$, and from the properties of contractions it has at least four invariants. Since we need three labelling operators, the conditions to solve the MLP by this method are given. Contracting only the Casimir operators D_3, D_4 and D_5 , the result leads to

$$\begin{aligned} D_3 &= t^4 D'_3 + \text{l.o.t.}, \\ D_4 &= t^4 D'_4 + \text{l.o.t.}, \\ D_5 &= t^4 D'_5 + \text{l.o.t.}, \end{aligned}$$

¹⁵Whether this solution is optimal is another question. Using the decompositions introduced later, the result can be simplified to obtain more elementary labelling operators.

where l.o.t. refers to those terms having lower power in the contraction variable t . The contracted invariants D'_i all have degree i in the variables of the representation space complementary to the subalgebra in $\mathfrak{su}(5)$. We now define the operators

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_3 &= D_3 - D'_3 - F_3, \\ \Omega_4 &= D_4 - D'_4 - F_4, \\ \Omega_5 &= D_5 - D'_5 - F_5,\end{aligned}\tag{50}$$

where F_i are the terms of the Casimir operators D_i that only depend on the variables of $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$. The operator Ω_3 has 89 terms, Ω_4 has 427 and Ω_5 1618 terms before symmetrization. A long computation shows that Ω_3, Ω_4 and Ω_5 are independent on the D_i and the Casimir operators of the subalgebra. To completely solve the labelling problem, we still have to check the orthogonality conditions on the symmetrized operators:¹⁶

$$[\Omega_3, \Omega_4] = 0, \quad [\Omega_3, \Omega_5] = 0, \quad [\Omega_4, \Omega_5] = 0.\tag{51}$$

This proves that $\{\Omega_3, \Omega_4, \Omega_5\}$ is a complete set of labelling operators for the studied reduction chain. It should be remarked that the main difficulty of this procedure is purely technical, and corresponds to checking the commutator of the labelling operators. For similar reduction chains of higher rank the procedure still remains valid.

6.3 $\widehat{S}(3) \supset \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathfrak{so}(2)$

First considered in [54], the invariance algebra of the Schrödinger equation in $(N+1)$ -dimensional space time has attracted considerable interest in recent physical literature ([55] and references therein). The Schrödinger algebra $\widehat{S}(3)$ in $(3+1)$ -dimensional space-time is a 13-dimensional Lie algebra with non-trivial commutators

$$\begin{aligned}[J_{\mu\nu}, J_{\lambda\sigma}] &= \delta_{\mu\lambda}J_{\nu\sigma} + \delta_{\nu\sigma}J_{\mu\lambda} - \delta_{\mu\sigma}J_{\nu\lambda} - \delta_{\nu\lambda}J_{\mu\sigma}, \\ [J_{\mu\nu}, P_\lambda] &= \delta_{\mu\lambda}P_\nu - \delta_{\nu\lambda}P_\mu, \quad [J_{\mu\nu}, G_\lambda] = \delta_{\mu\lambda}G_\nu - \delta_{\nu\lambda}G_\mu, \\ [P_t, G_\mu] &= P_\mu; \quad [K, P_\mu] = -G_\mu, \\ [D, G_\mu] &= G_\mu, \quad [D, P_\mu] = -P_\mu, \\ [D, K] &= 2K, \quad [D, P_t] = -2P_t, \\ [K, P_t] &= -D. \quad [P_\mu, G_\nu] = \delta_{\mu\nu}M\end{aligned}\tag{52}$$

over the basis $\{J_{ij}, P_k, G_k, K, D, P_t, M\}$, where $J_{\mu\nu} + J_{\nu\mu} = 0$ are rotations, P_μ are spatial translation generators, P_t the time translation, G_μ special Galilei transformations, D the generator of scale transformations, K the generator of galilean conformal transformations and M commutes with all generators. It follows from the brackets that the Levi decomposition is $(\mathfrak{so}(3) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})) \overrightarrow{\oplus} P\mathfrak{h}_N$, where the representation P can be identified with $(D_{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \Lambda) \oplus D_0$, where $D_{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \Lambda$ is the tensor product of the standard representations $D_{\frac{1}{2}}$ of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$ and Λ of $\mathfrak{so}(3)$, respectively, and denotes D_0 the trivial representation. Let us consider the subalgebra $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathfrak{so}(2)$ generated by $\{J_{12}, D, P_t, M\}$ and the corresponding

¹⁶As usual, we denote the symmetrized and non-symmetrized operators by the same symbol.

reduction chain $\widehat{S}(3) \supset \mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathfrak{so}(2)$. In this case, the number of labelling operators equals

$$n = \frac{1}{2}(13 - 3 - 3 - 1 - 1 - 1) + 0 = 2.$$

The system to be solved is therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{J}_{12}F &= j_{2\sigma} \frac{\partial F}{\partial j_{1\sigma}} - j_{2\lambda} \frac{\partial F}{\partial j_{\lambda 1}} - j_{1\sigma} \frac{\partial F}{\partial j_{2\sigma}} + j_{1\lambda} \frac{\partial F}{\partial j_{\lambda 2}} + r_2 \frac{\partial F}{\partial r_1} - r_1 \frac{\partial F}{\partial r_2} + g_2 \frac{\partial F}{\partial g_1} - g_1 \frac{\partial F}{\partial g_2} = 0 \\ \widehat{D}F &= 2k \frac{\partial F}{\partial k} - 2p_t \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_t} + g_\mu \frac{\partial F}{\partial g_\mu} - r_\mu \frac{\partial F}{\partial r_\mu} = 0 \\ \widehat{K}F &= -2k \frac{\partial F}{\partial d} - d \frac{\partial F}{\partial p_t} - g_\mu \frac{\partial F}{\partial r_\mu} = 0 \\ \widehat{P}_t F &= 2p_t \frac{\partial F}{\partial d} + d \frac{\partial F}{\partial k} + r_\mu \frac{\partial F}{\partial g_\mu} = 0\end{aligned}$$

In [36] an algorithm was given to compute the Casimir operators of the extended Schrödinger algebra. It is easy to see that $\widehat{S}(3)$ has three invariants, one of them corresponding to the central charge m . The other two can be chosen as

$$\begin{aligned}C_{41} &= z^2 j_{kl}^2 + 2z(g_k p_l - g_l p_k) j_{kl} + p_k^2 g_l^2 - 2p_k p_l g_k g_l, \\ C_{42} &= 2z k p_k^2 + 2a p_t g_k^2 + z^2(d^2 - 4k p_t) - 2g_k p_k d z + z^2 j_{kl}^2 + 2z(g_k p_l - g_l p_k) j_{kl},\end{aligned}$$

where $1 \leq k < l \leq 3$. The invariants of $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathfrak{so}(2)$ are simply $C_{21} = d^2 - 4k p_t$ and $C_{22} = j_{12}$. The contraction associated to the chain is obtained from the scale transformations

$$J'_{kl} = \frac{1}{t} J_{kl} \quad (kl \neq 12), \quad G'_i = \frac{1}{t} G_i, \quad P'_i = \frac{1}{t} P_i, \quad M' = \frac{1}{t} M.$$

In this case, we still obtain a kind of inhomogeneous Lie algebra, the Levi part of which is given by $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$. It satisfies the preceding conditions, thus the MLP can be solved using the invariants of the contraction. It follows at once that only C_{41} and C_{42} are of interest, since the central invariant remains untouched by the contraction. The corresponding contracted invariants are

$$\begin{aligned}C'_{41} &= z^2 j_{kl}^2 + 2z(g_k p_l - g_l p_k) j_{kl} + p_k^2 g_l^2 - 2p_k p_l g_k g_l, \\ C'_{42} &= z^2 j_{kl}^2 + 2z(g_k p_l - g_l p_k) j_{kl},\end{aligned}$$

where $j_{kl} \neq j_{12}$. We consider the differences

$$\begin{aligned}O_1 &= C_{41} - C'_{41} - m^2 C_{22}^2 = j_{12}(g_1 p_2 - p_1 g_2) z \\ O_2 &= C_{42} - C'_{42} - m^2 C_{21}^2 - O_1 = 2z(k p_i^2 + p_t g_i^2 - d g_i p_i)\end{aligned}$$

The independence of these operators from the Casimir operators is checked by means of the Jacobian

$$\frac{\partial \{C_{21}, C_{22}, C_{41}, C_{42}, M, O_1, O_2\}}{\partial \{m, j_{12}, d, p_t, j_{23}, g_1, p_2\}} \neq 0. \quad (53)$$

Finally, we compute the brackets

$$[O_1, O_2] = 0, \tag{54}$$

showing that the found operators commute.

The interest of this example is that the Lie algebra used is not semisimple, showing that the method can be applied also to general Lie algebras having non-trivial Levi decompositions¹⁷. For higher dimensions of n the procedure still works, although the refinement developed later is probably more effective to find the suitable labelling operators.

7 Chains solved only by contraction

The contraction method constitutes a first approximation to systematically solve the labelling problem in physical applications of group theory. Even in cases with a high number of labelling operators, this first step remains valid whenever the conditions of theorem 1 are satisfied. In this sense, the method can be applied for large classes of embeddings like $\mathfrak{sp}(2N) \supset \mathfrak{sp}(2N - 2) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)$ or $\mathfrak{sp}(2N) \supset \mathfrak{sp}(2N - 2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$, solutions of which were developed in [56]. However, the contraction fails if the contraction \mathfrak{g} has “to few” invariants with respect to the number of necessary labelling operators. This is not an uncommon situation for reductive Lie algebras \mathfrak{s}' and semisimple \mathfrak{s} if the constraint $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{s}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) = n$ is given. These reduction chains provide at most $n - 1$ labelling operators. Up to some special kinds of multiplets that can be solved using these operators, for a general IR the remaining operator has to be computed in some different manner. It is reasonable to think that a refinement of the contraction procedure leads to the solution of this obstruction, at least for a considerable number of embedding chains. The reduction chain $G_2 \supset \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$ (G_2 being the rank two exceptional Lie algebra) reflects the failure using only the contracted invariants. In [57] a particular solution was found by means of heavy algebra. It was moreover observed that both labelling operators should have at least degree six. This fact suggests to look more closely at the Casimir operator C_6 of G_2 , in order to analyze whether some of the terms that cancel during contraction provide an additional operator to that of the contraction. This ansatz, corresponding to the second step of the contraction method, is equal to study how the Casimir operators decompose by contraction.

8 Decomposing Casimir operators with respect to contractions

In this section we go further into a detailed analysis of the decomposition procedure of Casimir operators. We point out that the contraction associated to a reduction chain induces a decomposition of the corresponding Casimir operators of \mathfrak{s} , which allow, among other properties, to determine the invariants of the contraction \mathfrak{g} as the non-vanishing term in the limit. However, other terms will also be relevant for the missing label problem, and will provide additional labelling operators.

¹⁷By this we mean that the maximal solvable ideal is not reduced to zero.

In the general context developed earlier, let $C_p(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \alpha^{i_1 \dots i_p} X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_p}$ be a p^{th} -order Casimir operator of \mathfrak{s} . Using a contraction of the type (11), the invariant over the transformed basis takes the form

$$F(\Phi_t(X_1), \dots, \Phi_t(X_n)) = t^{n_{i_1} + \dots + n_{i_p}} \alpha^{i_1 \dots i_p} X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_p}, \quad (55)$$

where $n_{i_j} = 0, 1$. Taking the maximal power in t ,

$$M = \max \{n_{i_1} + \dots + n_{i_p} \mid \alpha^{i_1 \dots i_p} \neq 0\}, \quad (56)$$

the limit

$$\begin{aligned} F'(X_1, \dots, X_n) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-M} F(\Phi_t(X_1), \dots, \Phi_t(X_n)) \\ &= \sum_{n_{i_1} + \dots + n_{i_p} = M} \alpha^{i_1 \dots i_p} X_{i_1} \dots X_{i_p} \end{aligned}$$

provides a Casimir operator of degree p of the contraction \mathfrak{g}' , as previously used. Now, instead of extracting only the term with the highest power of t , we consider the whole decomposition

$$C_p = t^M C'_p + \sum_{\alpha} t^{\alpha} \Phi_{\alpha} + \Phi_0, \quad (57)$$

where $\alpha < M \leq p$ and Φ_0 is a function of the Casimir operators of the subalgebra \mathfrak{s}' (these generators have not been re-scaled). It is straightforward to verify that C'_p is not only an invariant of the contraction \mathfrak{g} , but also a solution to the MLP. Equation (57) actually shows how a Casimir operator decomposes into homogeneous polynomials in the variables of the subalgebra and the complementary space over the original basis when a contraction is performed. This first term corresponds to the first approximation of [11]. The remaining terms are also individually of interest to construct new labelling operators. Formally this fact can be described as follows:

Proposition 1 *The functions Φ_{α} are solutions of the missing label problem, that is, they satisfy the system*

$$\widehat{X}_i \Phi_{\alpha} = C_{ij}^k x_k \frac{\partial \Phi_{\alpha}}{\partial x_j} = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq s. \quad (58)$$

Proof. Decomposition (57) tells how a Casimir operator C_p can be rewritten as a sum of homogeneous polynomials C'_p, Φ_{α} with the property that C'_p is of homogeneity degree $p - M$ in the variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_s\}$ associated to subalgebra generators and degree M in the remaining variables $\{x_{s+1}, \dots, x_n\}$ corresponding to the representation space induced by the embedding. In similar way, any Φ_{α} is of degree $p - \alpha$ in the variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_s\}$ and α in the $\{x_{s+1}, \dots, x_n\}$. We denote this by simply saying that these functions are of bi-degree $(p - \alpha, \alpha)$.

Now the equations (25) corresponding to subalgebra generators remain unaltered by the contraction procedure, since the re-scaling of generators does not affect them. Thus for any $1 \leq i \leq s$ and any homogeneous polynomial Ψ of bi-degree $(p - q, q)$ we obtain

$$\widehat{X}_i \Psi = C_{ij}^k x_k \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x_j} + C_{ij+s}^{k+s} x_{k+s} \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x_j}, \quad (59)$$

and the result is easily seen to be again a polynomial with the same bi-degree. This means that evaluating $C_p = t^M C'_p + \sum_{\alpha} t^{\alpha} \Phi_{\alpha} + \Phi_0$ is a sum of polynomials of different bi-degree, and since C_p is a Casimir operators, the only possibility is that each term is a solution of the system. Therefore the functions Φ_{α} are solutions of (25). ■

The first question that arises from decomposition (57) is how many independent additional solutions we obtain. Since all Φ_{α} together sum the Casimir operator, some dependence relations must exist.

Lemma 1 *Let C_p be a Casimir operator of \mathfrak{s} of order p . Suppose that*

$$C_p = \Phi_{(p-\alpha_1, \alpha_1)} + \dots + \Phi_{(p-\alpha_q, \alpha_q)}, \quad 0 \leq \alpha_i < \alpha_{i+1} \leq p \quad (60)$$

is the decomposition of C_p into homogeneous polynomials of bi-degree (p, q) .

1. *If $\Phi_{(0,p)} \neq 0$, then at most $q - 2$ polynomials $\Phi_{(p-\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}$ are functionally independent on the Casimir operators of \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{s}' .*
2. *If $\Phi_{(0,p)} = 0$, then at most $q - 1$ polynomials $\Phi_{(p-\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}$ are functionally independent on the Casimir operators of \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{s}' .*

The proof is an immediate consequence of the fact that $\Phi_{(0,p)}$ is a function of the Casimir operators of the subalgebra \mathfrak{s}' . The independence on the Casimir operators of \mathfrak{s}' does not imply in general that the $\Phi_{(p-\alpha, \alpha)}$ obtained are all functionally independent between themselves. The number of independent terms depends on the representation R induced by the reduction [24]. In any case, at least one independent term is obtained for any Casimir operator of degree at least three. In many cases, however, we can take more terms of the same degree. This explains why for certain reduction chains the labelling operators have the same degree in the generators. If we find a functionally independent set of solutions to system (25), half the labelling problem has been solved. In order to accomplish the orthogonality requirements, we have to look for all commutators among the symmetrized operators $\Phi_{(p-\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}$. We denote by $\Phi_{(p-\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}^{symm}$ the symmetrized polynomial. Then $\left[\Phi_{(p-\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}^{symm}, \Phi_{(q-\alpha_k, \alpha_k)}^{symm} \right]$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree $p + q - 1$, and also constitutes a missing label operator. Actually this bracket is expressible as sum of polynomials of different bi-degree, and these terms constitute themselves labelling operators [58].

The decomposition of Casimir operators leads to a first generalization of the contraction method, resumed in the following algorithmic procedure:

- Decompose the Casimir operators of \mathfrak{s} of degree $p \geq 3$ with respect to the contraction determined by the embedding.
- Extract a maximal family of independent labelling operators.
- Compute the commutators of all symmetrized polynomials $\Phi_{(p-\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}^{symm}$ with $\alpha_j \neq 0$.
- Extract n operators that are functionally independent from the Casimir operators of \mathfrak{s} and the subalgebra \mathfrak{s}' and commute among themselves.

The third step is reduced to pure computation. No simple method to decide whether two missing label operators are mutually orthogonal has been observed yet, although various symbolic routines have been developed to compute these brackets (see e.g. [59]). For certain special types of reduction chains it has been observed that orthogonality follows at once from the second step. If no solutions of bi-degree (r, s) exists for some fixed $r + s = p + q$, and if two labelling operators such that $\left[\Phi_{(p-\alpha_j, \alpha_j)}^{symm}, \Phi_{(q-\alpha_k, \alpha_k)}^{symm} \right]$ is a sum of polynomials of bi-degree (s, r) are given, the commutation is immediate. This idea was systematically developed in [58]. Observe that in the commutative frame, it would suffice to show that no polynomial function of bi-degree (r, s) is a solution to subsystem (25). It should however be remarked that the validity of this fact is reduced to quite specific types of embeddings, and is therefore of no use in the general labelling problem.

9 Reduction chains solved with decomposition

In this section we show how the decomposition of Casimir operators of higher order provide solutions to missing label problem that could not be solved completely by only using the contraction, or for which no proposed set of labelling operators has been computed yet. We insist on the fact that the main difficulty in the formal approach to the MLP resides in obtaining a sufficient number of (functionally) independent labelling operators, from which a commuting set can be extracted.

9.1 $G_2 \supset \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$

This chain was already observed in [11] to be unsolvable using only the contraction invariants. In this case we need $n = \frac{1}{2}(14 - 2 - 6 - 2) = 2$ labelling operators, and the inhomogeneous contraction $G_2 \rightsquigarrow (\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)) \xrightarrow{\oplus_R} \mathfrak{sl}_1$ preserves the number of invariants. The quadratic invariant being discarded, the decomposition of the Casimir operator of degree six must be used to obtain the pair of (commuting) labelling operators. We consider the same tensor basis used in [57] consisting of the generators $\{j_0, j_{\pm}, k_0, k_{\pm}, R_{\mu, \nu}\}$ with $\mu = \pm\frac{3}{2}, \pm\frac{1}{2}$, $\nu = \pm\frac{1}{2}$. The generators $R_{\mu, \nu}$ are related to an irreducible tensor representation R of $\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$ of order eight. In this case, the contraction $G_2 \rightsquigarrow (\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)) \xrightarrow{\oplus_R} \mathfrak{sl}_1$ is obtained considering the transformations:

$$j'_0 = j_0, j'_{\pm} = j_{\pm}, k'_0 = k_0, k'_{\pm} = k_{\pm}, R'_{\mu, \nu} = \frac{1}{t} R_{\mu, \nu}.$$

Decomposing now the Casimir operators C_2 and C_6 over the transformed basis, we get the following

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 &= t^2 C_{(2,0)} + C_{(0,2)}, \\ C_6 &= t^6 C_{(6,0)} + t^4 C_{(4,2)} + t^2 C_{(2,4)} + C_{(0,6)}, \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where $C_{(0,2)}, C_{(0,6)}$ are functions of the Casimir operators of $\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$. Now it can be verified that

$$\frac{\partial(C_2, C_6, C_{21}, C_{22}, C_{(2,4)}, C_{(4,2)})}{\partial\left(k_0, k_-, j_0, j_+, R_{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}, R_{-\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}\right)} \neq 0, \quad (62)$$

where C_{21} and C_{22} are the quadratic Casimir operators of $\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$. This provides us with six independent operators. A long and tedious computation, due to the quite high number of terms before and after symmetrization, shows moreover that the chosen operators commute:

$$\begin{aligned} [C_i, C_{(2,4)}] &= [C_i, C_{(4,2)}] = 0, \quad i = 2, 6 \\ [C_{(4,2)}, C_{(2,4)}] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

Therefore the set $\{C_2, C_6, C_{21}, C_{22}, C_{(2,4)}, C_{(4,2)}\}$ can be taken to solve the labelling problem.

It should be remarked that a direct comparison with the operators obtained in [57] is quite difficult, for various reasons. At first, there the scalars in the enveloping algebra were considered, not symmetrizations of functions, which implies that lower order terms were considered when explicitly indicating the labelling operators. On the other hand, we have only distinguished the bi-degree, that is, the degree of the polynomials in the variables of the $\mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$ subalgebra and the tensor representation R , while in [57] the order with respect to any of the copies of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ was considered, resulting in operators labelled with three indices. Therefore the operators $C_{(p,q)}$ considered here correspond to the sum of several scalars there. In addition, our solution contains the term $C^{(114)}$ excluded in [57],¹⁸ confirming that the pair of commuting operators obtained above is different from that found previously. We also remark that a further distinction of the degrees of the polynomials $\Phi_{(a,b)}^{symm}$ in the variables of the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ copies is not possible due to the contraction.

9.2 The chain $\mathfrak{so}(7) \supset \mathfrak{so}(5) \times \mathfrak{so}(2)$

Reduction chains of orthogonal algebras have been analyzed in [56] from the algebraic point of view, proving interesting formulae based on symmetric and antisymmetric tensor operators. We show that the decomposition of the Casimir operators is also a valid approach to the problem. For the reduction chain $\mathfrak{so}(7) \supset \mathfrak{so}(5) \times \mathfrak{so}(2)$ the number of missing label operators is

$$n = \frac{1}{2}(21 - 3 - 10 - 2 - 1 - 1) + 0 = 2.$$

As follows from the work of Gel'fand, the Casimir operators of orthogonal Lie algebras can be recovered in a quite simple manner using the generic matrix of standard representation

¹⁸This is a scalar having degree one in each of the copies of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ and four in the $R_{\mu,\nu}$ generators.

and evaluating the corresponding characteristic polynomial. The operators are then recovered by the symmetrization procedure. Taking the usual basis generated by the $\frac{7}{2}(7-1)$ operators $E_{\mu\nu} = -E_{\nu\mu}$ with brackets:

$$[E_{\mu\nu}, E_{\lambda\sigma}] = E_{\nu\sigma} + E_{\lambda\nu} - E_{\mu\sigma} - E_{\lambda\mu}, \quad (64)$$

the Casimir operators are obtained using the formula [60]:

$$P(\lambda) = |M - \lambda \text{Id}_7| = \lambda^7 + C_2\lambda^5 + C_4\lambda^3 + C_6\lambda, \quad (65)$$

M being the matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -e_{12} & -e_{13} & -e_{14} & -e_{15} & -e_{16} & -e_{17} \\ e_{12} & 0 & -e_{23} & -e_{24} & -e_{25} & -e_{26} & -e_{27} \\ e_{13} & e_{23} & 0 & -e_{34} & -e_{35} & -e_{36} & -e_{37} \\ e_{14} & e_{24} & e_{34} & 0 & -e_{45} & -e_{46} & -e_{47} \\ e_{15} & e_{25} & e_{35} & e_{45} & 0 & -e_{56} & -e_{57} \\ e_{16} & e_{26} & e_{36} & e_{46} & e_{56} & 0 & -e_{67} \\ e_{17} & e_{27} & e_{37} & e_{47} & e_{57} & e_{67} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (66)$$

For the chain considered, the $\mathfrak{so}(5) \times \mathfrak{so}(2)$ subalgebra is generated by the operators E_{ij} with $1 \leq i, j \leq 5$ and E_{67} . Therefore the contraction related to the MLP is determined by the transformations

$$E'_{ij} = \frac{1}{t}E_{ij}, \quad E'_{67} = \frac{1}{t}E_{67}, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq 5.$$

As usual, the quadratic Casimir operator is of no use, we therefore decompose the remaining ones:

$$\begin{aligned} C_4 &= C_{[4,0]} + t^2 C_{[2,2]} + t^4 C_{[0,4]}, \\ C_6 &= C_{[6,0]} + t^2 C_{[4,2]} + t^4 C_{[2,4]}. \end{aligned}$$

The functions $C_{[4,0]}$ and $C_{[6,0]}$ are functions of the subalgebra generators, and therefore not further interesting. The remaining operators $C_{[2,2]}$, $C_{[0,4]}$, $C_{[4,2]}$ and $C_{[2,4]}$ have 140, 30, 420 and 390 terms before symmetrization. We observe that each Casimir operator provides at most one independent labelling operator, which can be taken either as $C_{[2,2]}$ or $C_{[0,4]}$ for C_4 and $C_{[4,2]}$ or $C_{[2,4]}$ for C_6 . Taking for example the pair $C_{[2,2]}$ and $C_{[2,4]}$, we check their independence on the invariants of $\mathfrak{so}(7)$ and the subalgebra:

$$\frac{\partial \{C_{21}, C_{41}, C_{22}, C_2, C_4, C_6, C_{[2,2]}, C_{[2,4]}\}}{\partial \{e_{12}, e_{13}, e_{16}, e_{34}, e_{46}, e_{56}, e_{57}, e_{67}\}} \neq 0,$$

where C_{21} and C_{41} are the Casimir operators of $\mathfrak{so}(5)$ and $C_{22} = e_{67}$. A routine computation shows that the orthogonality constraints are verified:

$$\begin{aligned} [C_{[2,2]}, C_{21}] &= 0, & [C_{[2,2]}, C_{41}] &= 0, & [C_{[2,2]}, C_{22}] &= 0, \\ [C_{[2,4]}, C_{21}] &= 0, & [C_{[2,4]}, C_{41}] &= 0, & [C_{[2,4]}, C_{22}] &= 0, \\ [C_{[2,2]}, C_p] &= 0, & [C_{[2,4]}, C_p] &= 0, & [C_{[2,2]}, C_{[2,4]}] &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

for $p = 2, 4, 6$. The last brackets shows that the labelling operators commute, therefore they constitute an admissible solution to the MLP given by the embedding.

9.3 The chain $\mathfrak{sp}(6) > \mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)$

The unitary reduction of the symplectic Lie algebra of rank three has found ample applications in the nuclear collective model [61]. In this case, nuclear states are classified by means of irreducible representations of $\mathfrak{sp}(6)$ reduced with respect to the unitary subalgebra $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)$. Since the induced representations are not multiplicity free, we have to add $n = 3$ labelling operators to distinguish the states. Generating functions for this chain were studied in [62], but without obtaining explicitly the three required operators. In this section, we will determine a commuting set of labelling operators that solves the MLP for this reduction. As we shall see, this case cannot be solved using only the invariants of the associated contraction.

We will use the Racah realization for the symplectic Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sp}(6, \mathbb{R})$. We consider the generators $X_{i,j}$ with $-3 \leq i, j \leq 3$ satisfying the condition

$$X_{i,j} + \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j X_{-j,-i} = 0, \quad (68)$$

where $\varepsilon_i = \text{sgn}(i)$. Over this basis, the brackets are given by

$$[X_{i,j}, X_{k,l}] = \delta_{jk} X_{il} - \delta_{il} X_{kj} + \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j \delta_{j,-l} X_{k,-i} - \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j \delta_{i,-k} X_{-j,l}, \quad (69)$$

where $-3 \leq i, j, k, l \leq 3$. The three Casimir operators C_2, C_4, C_6 of $\mathfrak{sp}(6, \mathbb{R})$ are easily obtained as the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial

$$|A - T \text{Id}_6| = T^6 + C_2 T^4 + C_4 T^2 + C_6, \quad (70)$$

where

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} x_{1,1} & x_{2,1} & x_{3,1} & -Ix_{-1,1} & -Ix_{-1,2} & -Ix_{-1,3} \\ x_{1,2} & x_{2,2} & x_{3,2} & -Ix_{-1,2} & -Ix_{-2,2} & -Ix_{-2,3} \\ x_{1,3} & x_{2,3} & x_{3,3} & -Ix_{-1,3} & -Ix_{-2,3} & -Ix_{-3,3} \\ Ix_{1,-1} & Ix_{1,-2} & Ix_{1,-3} & -x_{1,1} & -x_{1,2} & -x_{1,3} \\ Ix_{1,-2} & Ix_{2,-2} & Ix_{2,-3} & -x_{2,1} & -x_{2,2} & -x_{2,3} \\ Ix_{1,-3} & Ix_{2,-3} & Ix_{3,-3} & -x_{3,1} & -x_{2,3} & -x_{3,3} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (71)$$

The symmetrized operators give the usual polynomials in the enveloping algebra. Since the unitary algebra $\mathfrak{u}(3)$ is generated by $\{X_{i,j} | 1 \leq i, j \leq 3\}$, in order to write $\mathfrak{sp}(6, \mathbb{R})$ in a $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)$ basis, it suffices to replace the diagonal operators $X_{i,i}$ by suitable linear combinations. Taking $H_1 = X_{1,1} - X_{2,2}$, $H_2 = X_{2,2} - X_{3,3}$ and $H_3 = X_{1,1} + X_{2,2} + X_{3,3}$ we obtain the Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{su}(3)$, while H_3 commutes with all $X_{i,j}$ with positive indices i, j . The invariants over this new basis are simply obtained replacing the $x_{i,i}$ by the corresponding linear combinations of h_i . The contraction $\mathfrak{sp}(6) \rightsquigarrow (\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)) \oplus_R 12L_1$, where R is the complementary to $(\text{ad}(\mathfrak{su}(3)) \otimes (1))$ in the adjoint representation of $\mathfrak{sp}(6)$.¹⁹

$$\text{ad}\mathfrak{sp}(6) = (\text{ad}\mathfrak{su}(3) \otimes (1)) \oplus R.$$

¹⁹More precisely, R decomposes into a sextet and antisextet with $\mathfrak{u}(1)$ weight ± 1 and a singlet with $\mathfrak{u}(1)$ weight 1.

The contraction is determined by the transformations

$$H'_i = H_i, \quad X'_{i,j} = X_{i,j}, \quad X'_{-i,j} = \frac{1}{t}X_{-i,j}, \quad X'_{i,-j} = \frac{1}{t}X_{i,-j}, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq 3. \quad (72)$$

The contraction $(\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)) \xrightarrow{R} 12L_1$ satisfies $\mathcal{N} = 3$, thus has 3 Casimir operators that can be obtained as contraction of C_2, C_4, C_6 . Note however that $n = 3$, thus the invariants of the contraction will provide at most two independent missing label operators. This means that using only the contraction, we cannot solve the MLP for this chain. In order to find a third labelling operator, we have to consider the decomposition of the fourth and sixth order Casimir operators of $\mathfrak{sp}(6)$. Over the preceding transformed basis we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} C_4 &= t^4 C_{(4,0)} + t^2 C_{(2,2)} + C_{(0,4)}, \\ C_6 &= t^6 C_{(6,0)} + t^4 C_{(4,2)} + t^2 C_{(2,4)} + C_{(0,6)}, \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

where $C_{(k,l)}$ denotes a homogeneous polynomial of k in the variables of R and degree l in the variables of the unitary subalgebra. The $C_{(0,k)}$ are functions of the Casimir operators of $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)$, and therefore provide no labelling operators. We remark that, before symmetrization, $C_{(2,2)}$ has 126 terms, $C_{(2,4)}$ 686 terms, and $C_{(4,2)}$ 444 terms. The symmetrized operators $C_{(2,2)}, C_{(4,2)}$ and $C_{(2,4)}$ can be added to the Casimir operators of $\mathfrak{sp}(6)$ and the subalgebra $\mathfrak{su}(3) \times \mathfrak{u}(1)$, and the 9 operators can be seen to be functionally independent.

$$\begin{aligned} [C_i, C_{(2,2)}] &= 0, & [C_i, C_{(4,2)}] &= 0, & [C_i, C_{(2,4)}] &= 0, & i &= 2, 4, 6 \\ [C_{(2,2)}, C_{(4,2)}] &= 0, & [C_{(2,2)}, C_{(2,4)}] &= 0, & [C_{(2,4)}, C_{(4,2)}] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

For symplectic algebras of higher rank, the decomposition method still provides the required labelling operators. As expected, the main difficulty lies in the computation of the brackets of the operators, where the number of terms increases exponentially.

10 Complete solutions

Even if the decomposition of the Casimir operators constitute a great improvement of the contraction method in the MLP, there exist reduction chains where the problem cannot be solved completely. In this case, the failure is related to the additional orthogonality constraint. Even if in almost any case we can find a sufficient number of independent labelling operators, these do not provide linear combinations that lead to mutually orthogonal operators. As already observed, we cannot introduce a further refinement of the decomposition without altering the contraction, and, therefore the reduction chain itself. In order to obtain integrity bases, we must look for new labelling operators that do not arise from the decomposition. In these cases, we are forced to find additional solutions to the subsystem of PDEs associated to the subalgebra generators. The search for such operators can be simplified if we require them to have a specific bi-degree. This requirement has been systematically used in the literature.

Table 3: $\mathfrak{so}(5)$ brackets in a $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ basis.

\square	Q_3	Q_2	Q_1	Q_0	Q_{-1}	Q_{-2}	Q_{-3}
L_0	$3Q_3$	$2Q_2$	Q_1	0	$-Q_{-1}$	$-2Q_{-2}$	$-3Q_{-3}$
L_1	0	$6Q_3$	Q_2	$2Q_1$	$6Q_0$	$10Q_{-1}$	Q_{-2}
L_{-1}	Q_2	$10Q_1$	$6Q_0$	$2Q_{-1}$	Q_{-2}	$6Q_{-3}$	0
Q_3	0	0	0	Q_3	Q_2	$10Q_1 + 15L_1$	$5Q_0 - 15L_0$
Q_2		0	$-6Q_3$	$-Q_2$	$-15L_1$	$30Q_0 + 60L_0$	$10Q_{-1} - 15L_{-1}$
Q_1			0	$3L_1 - Q_1$	$-3L_0 - 3Q_0$	$15L_{-1}$	Q_{-2}
Q_0				0	$-Q_{-1} - 3L_{-1}$	$-Q_{-2}$	Q_{-3}
Q_{-1}					0	$-6Q_{-3}$	0
Q_{-2}						0	0

10.1 The nuclear surfon model

The reduction chain $\mathfrak{so}(5) \supset \mathfrak{so}(3)$ appears in many applications involving the subalgebra of angular momentum, and also plays an important role in the Interacting Boson Model [3, 63], where it appears in the chains $\mathfrak{u}(5) \supset \mathfrak{so}(5) \supset \mathfrak{so}(3) \supset \mathfrak{so}(2)$ and $\mathfrak{so}(6) \supset \mathfrak{so}(5) \supset \mathfrak{so}(3) \supset \mathfrak{so}(2)$. The corresponding $n = 2$ missing label problem has been analyzed in [64], where two commuting missing label operators of degrees four and six were found. The constructed two operators, using heavy algebraic methods, are of lowest possible degree to solve the labelling problem. The general shape of the labelling operators was however not found. Combining the decomposition of Casimir operators with the traditional analytical approach to the MLP, we give the complete solution for this embedding. In particular, it is verified that the pair of commuting operators found in [64] correspond to the simplest possible solution, and the conjecture on the degree of these operators is confirmed.

We choose the basis of the orthogonal Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(5)$ to consist of generators $\{L_0, L_1, L_{-1}\}$ with brackets $[L_0, L_{\pm 1}] = \pm L_{\pm 1}$, $[L_1, L_{-1}] = 2L_0$ together with an irreducible tensor representation Q_μ ($\mu = -3..3$) of dimension seven. The brackets of $\mathfrak{so}(5)$ over this basis are specified given in Table 3.

According to the computations developed in [64], the Casimir operators of $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ and $\mathfrak{so}(5)$ are given respectively by the following (unsymmetrized) polynomials:

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{21} &= l_0^2 + l_1 l_{-1}, \\
C_2 &= l_0^2 + l_1 l_{-1} - \frac{2}{5}(q_3 q_{-3} + q_1 q_{-1}) + \frac{1}{15} q_2 q_2 + q_0^2, \\
C_4 &= \frac{1}{6} \left(l_{-1} q_1 - l_1 q_{-1} + \frac{l_1 l_{-1}}{2} \right) q_0^2 + \frac{1}{6} (q_3 q_{-1} q_{-2} + q_2 q_1 q_{-3} + \frac{1}{3} (q_1^2 q_{-2} + q_2 q_{-1}^2)) q_0 \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{1}{9} l_{-1} q_{-1} + \frac{1}{6} l_0 q_{-2} + \frac{2}{9} l_1 q_{-3} \right) q_1^2 + \left(\frac{2}{9} l_{-1} q_3 + \frac{1}{9} l_1 q_1 - \frac{1}{6} l_0 q_2 \right) q_{-1}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{1}{20} q_2 q_{-2} - q_1 q_{-1} - 3 l_{-1} q_1 + \frac{7}{4} q_0^2 + 3 l_1 q_{-1} + \frac{1}{5} q_3 q_{-3} \right) l_0^2 + \frac{1}{18} l_0 q_3 q_{-1} q_{-2} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{18} l_0 q_2 q_1 q_{-3} + \frac{3}{100} q_3^2 q_{-3}^2 + \frac{1}{12} (q_{-1}^2 - 3 l_{-1} q_{-1} + 3 l_0 q_{-2} + q_1 q_{-3} - q_0 q_{-2}) l_1^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4} (l_1 q_2 q_{-3} - \frac{1}{9} l_{-1} q_2 q_{-1} + \frac{1}{9} l_1 q_1 q_{-2} - l_{-1} q_3 q_{-2}) q_0 + \frac{q_2^2 q_{-2}^2}{675} + l_0^3 q_0 - l_0 q_0^3 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{12} ((q_2 q_{-3} - q_1 q_{-2}) l_1 l_0 + (-q_3 q_{-2} + q_2 q_{-1}) l_{-1} l_0) - \frac{1}{6} (l_{-1} q_1 - l_1 q_{-1}) l_0 q_0 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{5} \left(\frac{7}{6} q_1 q_{-1} + \frac{1}{20} q_2 q_{-2} \right) q_{-3} q_3 + \frac{1}{12} (3 l_0 q_2 + q_3 q_{-1} + q_1^2 + 3 l_1 q_1 - q_2 q_0) l_{-1}^2 \\
&\quad + \left(\frac{l_{-1} q_1}{3} - \frac{l_1 q_{-1}}{3} \right) q_{-3} q_3 + \frac{1}{6} \left(\frac{1}{10} l_1 l_{-1} - \frac{q_{-2} q_2}{6} l_1 q_{-1} + \frac{2}{3} l_0 q_0 + \frac{1}{6} l_{-1} q_1 \right) q_3 q_{-3} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{36} (q_2^2 q_{-1} q_{-3} - l_1 q_3 q_{-2}^2 + q_3 q_1 q_{-2}^2 + l_{-1} q_2^2 q_{-3}) - \frac{1}{9} (q_1^3 q_{-3} + q_3 q_{-1}^3) \\
&\quad - \frac{5}{108} q_1^2 q_{-1}^2 - \frac{1}{12} (l_1 l_{-1} - \frac{34}{3} l_0 q_0) q_{-1} q_1 - \frac{q_{-2} q_2}{540} (q_1 q_{-1} + 36 q_0^2) + \frac{1}{4} l_1^3 q_{-3} \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{11}{60} l_1 l_{-1} + \frac{1}{2} l_0 q_0 \right) q_{-3} q_3 - \frac{9}{6} l_1 l_{-1} l_0 q_0 - \frac{3}{5} q_0^2 q_3 q_{-3} - \frac{1}{4} l_{-1}^3 q_3
\end{aligned}$$

For this Lie algebras, the transformations (20) defining the associated contraction \mathfrak{g} are given by $L'_i = L_i$, $Q'_\mu = \frac{1}{t} Q_\mu$. The inhomogeneous contraction has an Abelian radical of dimension seven, which implies that the invariants will only depend on the q_μ -variables [24]. It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) = 4$, and from the four Casimir operators, two can be obtained by contraction of the invariants C_2 and C_4 of $\mathfrak{so}(5)$. We decompose C_4 with respect to the given contraction, and obtain

$$C_4 = [4, 0] + [3, 1] + [2, 2] + [1, 3], \quad (75)$$

where the operators $[i, j]$ are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
[1, 3] &= \frac{1}{4} l_0 l_1^2 q_{-2} - \frac{3}{2} l_0 l_1 l_{-1} q_0 + \frac{1}{4} l_1^3 q_{-3} - l_0^2 l_{-1} q_1 + l_0^2 l_1 q_{-1} + l_0^3 q_0 + \frac{1}{4} l_0 l_{-1}^2 q_2 - \frac{1}{4} l_{-1}^3 q_3 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{4} l_1^2 l_{-1} q_{-1} + \frac{1}{4} l_1 l_{-1}^2 q_1 \\
[2, 2] &= -\frac{1}{12} l_{-1}^2 q_2 q_0 + \frac{1}{12} l_0 l_{-1} q_2 q_{-1} + \frac{1}{6} l_0 l_1 q_0 q_{-1} + \frac{1}{12} l_1^2 q_1 q_{-3} - \frac{1}{3} l_0^2 q_1 q_{-1} + \frac{7}{12} l_0^2 q_0^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{60} l_1 l_{-1} q_2 q_{-2} + \frac{1}{12} l_{-1}^2 q_3 q_{-1} - \frac{1}{12} l_0 l_{-1} q_3 q_{-2} + \frac{1}{12} l_1 l_{-1} q_0^2 - \frac{1}{12} l_1^2 q_0 q_{-2} + \frac{1}{12} l_1^2 q_{-1}^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{6} l_0 l_{-1} q_1 q_0 - \frac{1}{12} l_1 l_{-1} q_1 q_{-1} + \frac{1}{12} l_{-1}^2 q_1^2 + \frac{1}{15} l_0^2 q_3 q_{-3} + \frac{1}{60} l_0^2 q_2 q_{-2} - \frac{1}{12} l_0 l_1 q_1 q_{-2} \\
&\quad - \frac{11}{60} l_1 l_{-1} q_3 q_{-3} + \frac{1}{12} l_0 l_1 q_2 q_{-3}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
[3, 1] = & \frac{1}{4}l_1q_2q_0q_{-3} + \frac{1}{9}l_0q_2q_0q_{-2} - l_0q_0^3 - \frac{1}{2}l_0q_3q_0q_{-3} + \frac{17}{18}l_0q_1q_0q_{-1} + \frac{1}{36}l_{-1}q_2q_1q_{-2} \\
& + \frac{1}{36}l_{-1}q_2q_1q_{-2} - \frac{2}{9}l_1q_1^2q_{-3} + \frac{1}{36}l_1q_3q_2^2 + \frac{1}{9}l_1q_1q_2^2 + \frac{1}{18}l_0q_3q_{-1}q_{-2} - \frac{1}{9}l_{-1}q_1^2q_{-1} \\
& + \frac{1}{36}l_1q_1q_0q_{-2} - \frac{1}{6}l_0q_2q_2^2 - \frac{1}{3}l_1q_3q_{-1}q_{-3} + \frac{2}{9}l_{-1}q_3q_2^2 - \frac{1}{36}l_{-1}q_2^2q_{-3} - \frac{1}{6}l_0q_1^2q_{-2} \\
& - \frac{1}{6}l_1q_0^2q_{-1} + \frac{1}{6}l_{-1}q_1q_0^2 - \frac{1}{36}l_{-1}q_2q_0q_{-1} - \frac{1}{36}l_1q_2q_{-1}q_{-2} + \frac{1}{3}l_{-1}q_3q_1q_{-3} \\
& + \frac{1}{18}l_0q_2q_1q_{-3} - \frac{1}{4}l_{-1}q_3q_0q_{-2}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
[4, 0] = & -\frac{1}{9}q_1^3q_{-3} - \frac{3}{5}q_3q_0^2q_{-3} - \frac{1}{36}q_2^2q_{-1}q_{-3} + \frac{1}{675}q_2^2q_2^2 + \frac{1}{100}q_3q_2q_{-2}q_{-3} - \frac{1}{9}q_3q_3^3 \\
& - \frac{1}{15}q_2q_0^2q_{-2} - \frac{5}{108}q_1^2q_2^2 - \frac{1}{540}q_2q_1q_{-1}q_{-2} + \frac{1}{18}q_1^2q_0q_{-2} + \frac{7}{30}q_3q_1q_{-1}q_{-3} \\
& + \frac{1}{18}q_2q_0q_2^2 - \frac{3}{100}q_3^2q_2^2 - \frac{1}{36}q_3q_1q_2^2 + \frac{1}{6}q_2q_1q_0q_{-3} + \frac{1}{6}q_3q_0q_{-1}q_{-2}
\end{aligned}$$

A basis of invariants of \mathfrak{g} can be completed with two additional operators C'_6 and C'_8 of degrees 6 and 8 respectively. The explicit expression for the sixth order invariant is

$$\begin{aligned}
C'_6 = & -729q_0^6 - 54q_1^4q_2^2 + 54q_3q_{-3} (9q_2q_0^2q_{-2} + 162q_1q_0^2q_{-1} - 32q_1^2q_2^2 + 6q_2q_1q_{-1}q_{-2}) \\
& + 6q_2q_{-2} (6q_3q_3^3 - 10q_1^2q_2^2 + 6q_{-3}q_1^3 - 63q_1q_0^2q_{-1}) - 162q_0^2 (q_{-2}^2q_3q_1 + q_2^2q_{-3}q_{-1}) \\
& + 54 (q_0^2 (27q_3^2q_2^2 - 8q_{-3}q_1^3 - 8q_3q_3^3 - 13q_1^2q_2^2) - q_3^2 (-q_0q_3^2 + q_{-1}^2q_2^2)) \\
& - 54 (q_1^2q_2^2 + q_{-1}^4) q_2^2 - 3q_2^2q_2^2 (4q_1q_{-1} + 9q_0^2) - 324q_0^3 (q_1^2q_{-2} + q_2q_2^2) + q_3^2q_0q_2^2 \\
& - 18q_{-2}q_2 (q_{-2}^2q_3q_1 + q_2^2q_{-3}q_{-1}) - 756q_0q_1q_{-1} (q_3q_{-1}q_{-2} + q_2q_1q_{-3}) - 64q_1^3q_{-1}^3 \\
& + 972 (q_0^3 (q_3q_{-1}q_{-2} + q_2q_1q_{-3}) - (q_3^2q_{-1}q_{-2}q_{-3} + (q_2q_1q_{-3}^2 + q_1^2q_{-2}q_{-3}) q_3) q_0) \\
& + 243 (6q_1q_{-1} - 30q_3q_{-3} + q_2q_{-2}) q_0^4 + 288q_{-1}q_1 (q_{-3}q_1^3 + q_3q_{-1}^3) 864q_{-3}^2q_3q_1^3 \\
& + 972q_2q_{-1}q_{-3}q_3q_0 + 90q_{-2}q_2 (q_1^2q_{-2} + q_2q_2^2) q_0 + 396q_{-1}q_0q_1 (q_1^2q_{-2} + q_2q_2^2) \\
& + 180q_1q_{-1} (q_{-2}^2q_3q_1 + q_2^2q_{-3}q_{-1}) + 864q_{-3}q_3^2q_{-1}^3 + q_2^3q_{-2}^3
\end{aligned}$$

It turns out, however, that the invariants C'_6 and C'_8 are not sufficient to provide the labelling operators with the orthogonality conditions. We have to consider additional operators of degree six which are however not obtained by contraction²⁰. Denoting the previous C'_6 by $[6, 0]$, according to its degree in the q_μ variables, we introduce the following additional operators of degree four depending on the parameters α and β :

$$\begin{aligned}
X_1^1 &= [4, 0] + [3, 1] + (4 - 3\alpha) [2, 2] + \alpha [1, 3], \quad \alpha \neq 1, \\
X_1^2 &= \left(\frac{4}{3} - \beta\right) [4, 0] + \frac{3}{2} (1 - \beta) [3, 1] + 3\beta [2, 2] + [1, 3], \quad \beta \neq \frac{1}{3}
\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

and the two operators of degree six:

$$\begin{aligned}
X_2^1 &= -\frac{27}{5} [6, 0] - 162 [5, 1] + [4, 2] - 216 [3, 3] - [2, 0] (5310 [2, 2] + \frac{2025}{2} [4, 0]) \\
& + [0, 2] (2124 [3, 1] + 528 [1, 3]) + 768 [2, 4] \\
X_2^2 &= -\frac{12}{5} [6, 0] + 108 [5, 1] + [4, 2] + 324 [3, 3] - [2, 0] (180 [2, 2] - 1035 [3, 1]) \\
& - [0, 2] (17172 [2, 2] + 1728 [2, 4] + 3998 [1, 3]),
\end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

where $[2, 4]$, $[3, 3]$, $[4, 2]$ and $[5, 1]$ are defined in Table 4:

²⁰This is due to the fact that $\mathfrak{so}(5)$ has no primitive Casimir operator of degree six.

Table 4: Sixth order operators

[2, 4] =	$\begin{aligned} & (q_{-3}q_3 - \frac{1}{4}q_0^2)l_0^4 + \frac{1}{2}(q_0(q_1l_{-1} - q_{-1}l_1) + l_1q_2q_{-3} - l_{-1}q_3q_{-2})l_0^3 + l_0^2(l_1l_{-1}q_0^2 - \frac{1}{8}(l_{-1}^2q_2 + l_1^2q_{-2})q_0 - \frac{1}{4}l_1l_{-1}(-2q_1q_{-1} + q_{-2}q_2 - 2q_{-3}q_3) \\ & + \frac{1}{4}((5q_3q_{-1} - q_1^2)l_{-1}^2 + (5q_1q_{-3} - q_{-1}^2)l_1^2)) + (\frac{3}{16}q_{-1}q_{-3} - \frac{1}{64}q_{-2}^2)l_1^4 + \frac{1}{32}l_{-1}^2l_1^2(26q_1q_{-1} - 1q_{-2}q_2 - 50q_0^2 + 2q_{-3}q_3) + (\frac{3}{16}q_3q_1 - \frac{1}{64}q_2^2) \\ & + \frac{1}{8}l_1^3((9q_0q_{-3} - 1q_{-1}q_{-2})l_0 + \frac{1}{16}(6q_{-1}^2 + 2q_1q_{-3} - 5q_0q_{-2})l_{-1}) + \frac{1}{16}l_{-1}^3((6q_1^2 + 2q_3q_{-1} - 5q_2q_0)l_1 + \frac{1}{8}(q_2q_1 - 9q_3q_0)l_0) \\ & + \frac{1}{8}l_{-1}^2l_1l_0(4q_2q_{-1} - q_3q_{-2} - 11q_1q_0) + \frac{1}{8}l_0l_1^2l_{-1}(+q_2q_{-3} - 4q_1q_{-2} + 11q_0q_{-1}). \end{aligned}$
[3, 3] =	$\begin{aligned} & (q_2q_0q_{-2} - \frac{4}{3}(q_1^2q_{-2} - q_2q_{-1}^2) + 8q_1q_0q_{-1} - 9q_0^3)l_0^3 + \frac{1}{12}(6q_0q_{-1}q_{-2} + 12q_1q_{-1}q_{-3} - 27q_0^2q_{-3} - 4q_{-1}^3 - q_1q_{-2}^2)l_1^3 + \frac{4}{3}(q_1q_{-1}^2 - q_2q_{-1}q_{-2} \\ & + \frac{1}{12}(q_2^2q_{-1} - 12q_3q_1q_{-1} + 4q_1^3 + 27q_3q_0^2 - 6q_2q_1q_0)l_{-1}^3 + (3(q_2q_0q_{-3} - q_0^2q_{-1}) + q_1q_0q_{-2} - 4q_1^2q_{-3})l_1l_0^2 + 12l_0l_1^2(q_2q_{-1}q_{-3} - q_0q_{-1}^2) \\ & + \frac{1}{3}l_{-1}(12q_3q_{-1}^2 + 9(q_1q_0^2 - q_3q_0q_{-2}) + q_2q_1q_{-2} - 3q_2q_0q_{-1} - 4q_1^2q_{-1})l_0^2 + \frac{1}{12}l_0(9q_0^2q_{-2} - 36q_1q_0q_{-3} + 4q_1q_{-1}q_{-2} - q_2q_{-2}^2)l_1^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{2}l_0l_1l_{-1}(10q_1q_0q_{-1} - 9q_0^3 - 2q_2q_{-1}^2 + 2q_2q_1q_{-3} + 2q_3q_{-1}q_{-2} - 2q_1^2q_{-2} - 18q_3q_0q_{-3} + q_2q_0q_{-2}) + \frac{1}{3}(q_2q_1q_{-1} + q_3q_1q_{-2} - q_1^2q_0)l_{-1}^2l_0 \\ & + \frac{1}{12}(9q_2q_0^2 - 36q_3q_0q_{-1} - q_2^2q_{-2})l_{-1}^2l_0 - \frac{1}{12}l_1l_{-1}(((8q_1^2q_{-1} - 9q_1q_0^2 - 36q_3q_1q_{-3} + 18q_3q_0q_{-2} - 2q_2q_1q_{-2} - 12q_3q_{-1}^2 + 3q_2^2q_{-3})l_{-1}) \\ & + ((36q_3q_{-1}q_{-3} + 9q_0^2q_{-1} + 2q_2q_{-1}q_{-2} - 3q_3q_{-2}^2 - 8q_1q_{-1}^2 - 18q_2q_0q_{-3} + 12q_1^2q_{-3})l_1)) \end{aligned}$
[4, 2] =	$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2}(27l_1l_{-1} - 135l_0^2)q_0^4 + (27(l_0l_{-1}q_1 - l_0l_1q_{-1}) - 9/2(l_1^2q_{-2} + l_{-1}^2q_2))q_0^3 + q_0^2(l_0(\frac{3}{2}(l_1q_1q_{-2} - l_{-1}q_2q_{-1}) + \frac{27}{2}(l_{-1}q_3q_{-2} - l_1q_2q_{-3})) \\ & + (27q_3q_{-3} + 81q_1q_{-1} + 9q_2q_{-2})l_0^2 + \frac{27}{2}l_{-1}(5q_3q_{-3} - q_1q_{-1})l_1 + \frac{1}{2}(3q_1^2 + 9q_3q_{-1})l_{-1}^2 + \frac{1}{2}(3q_{-1}^2 + 9q_1q_{-3})l_1^2) + 16l_0^2(q_1^3q_{-3} + q_3q_{-1}^3) \\ & - \frac{1}{6}l_0^2(108(q_3q_0q_{-1}q_{-2} + q_2q_1q_0q_{-3}) - 6(q_3q_1q_{-2}^2 + q_2^2q_{-1}q_{-3}) + 84(q_1^2q_0q_{-2} + q_2q_0q_{-1}^2) - 20q_2q_1q_{-1}q_{-2} + q_2^2q_{-2}^2 + 64q_1^2q_{-1}^2) + 9l_1^2q_3q_{-3} \\ & - \frac{1}{2}l_1^2q_2q_{-2}q_{-1}^2 - l_1^2((q_{-1}q_{-3} + \frac{3}{4}q_{-2}^2)q_1^2 + (4q_1q_{-1}q_{-2} - 3q_2q_{-1}q_{-3} - 9q_3q_{-2}q_{-3} + \frac{1}{2}q_2q_{-2}^2)q_0 - q_1q_{-1}^3 + 9q_3q_1q_{-2}^3 + q_2q_1q_{-2}q_{-3} - \frac{3}{4}q_2^2q_{-1}^2 \\ & + l_{-1}^2((-9q_3q_2q_{-3} - 3q_3q_1q_{-2} + \frac{1}{2}q_2^2q_{-2} + 4q_2q_1q_{-1})q_0 + (9q_3q_{-3} - \frac{1}{2}q_2q_{-2})q_1^2 - (q_3q_1 + \frac{3}{4}q_2^2)q_{-1}^2 + 9q_3^2q_{-1}q_{-3} - q_1^3q_{-1} + q_3q_2q_{-1}q_{-2} - \\ & + (-6l_0l_1q_2 + 4l_1l_{-1}q_3)q_{-1}^3 + (6l_0l_{-1}q_{-2} + 4l_1l_{-1}q_{-3})q_1^3 + q_1^2(l_0((-28q_{-1}l_{-1} + 12l_1q_{-3})q_0 - (6l_{-1}q_2q_{-3} + 8l_1q_{-1}q_{-2})) + \frac{1}{3}l_{-1}l_1(3q_0q_{-1} \\ & + q_{-1}^2)((-12l_0l_{-1}q_3 + l_1l_{-1}q_2 + 28l_0l_1q_1)q_0 + (8l_{-1}q_2q_1 + 6q_{-2}q_3l_1)l_0) + l_1l_{-1}(\frac{5}{2}q_3q_1q_{-2}^2 - 9q_3q_0q_{-1}q_{-2} + \frac{1}{3}q_2q_1q_{-1}q_{-2} + \frac{5}{2}q_2^2q_{-1}q_{-3} - \\ & - 36q_3q_1q_{-1}q_{-3} - 9q_2q_1q_0q_{-3}) + l_0l_1((6l_{-1}q_2^2q_{-3} + 5l_1q_2q_{-1}q_{-2} - 6l_1q_3q_{-2}^2 - 5l_{-1}q_2q_1q_{-2})q_0 + (6q_3q_1q_{-2}q_{-3} + \frac{1}{2}(q_2q_1q_{-2}^2 - q_2^2q_{-2}q_{-3} \\ & + 2l_0l_1q_2q_1q_{-1}q_{-3} + l_0l_{-1}(\frac{1}{2}(q_3q_2q_{-2}^2 - q_2^2q_{-1}q_{-2}) - 6q_3q_2q_{-1}q_{-3} - 2q_3q_1q_{-1}q_{-2})). \end{aligned}$
[5, 1] =	$\begin{aligned} & -8l_0q_0^5 - \frac{4}{3}(l_1q_{-1} - l_{-1}q_1)q_0^4 + \frac{2}{9}q_0^3((2q_2q_{-2} - 9q_3q_{-3} + 58q_1q_{-1})l_0 + (6q_2q_{-3} + q_1q_{-2})l_1 - (q_2q_{-1} + 6q_3q_{-2})l_{-1}) + q_2^2q_{-3}l_1(\frac{1}{12}q_3q_{-3} - \\ & + \frac{43}{81}(l_{-1}q_1^3q_{-1}^2 - l_1q_1^2q_{-1}^3) - \frac{1}{108}(l_0q_3^2q_{-3}^2 + l_0q_2^2q_{-2}^3) + q_0^2(\frac{5}{27}(l_{-1}q_2q_1q_{-2} - l_1q_2q_{-1}q_{-2}) + \frac{1}{3}(l_1q_3q_{-2}^2 - l_{-1}q_2^2q_{-3} + l_0q_2q_1q_{-3} + l_0q_3q_{-1}q_0) \\ & + (\frac{11}{9}(l_{-1}q_3q_{-1}^2 - l_1q_1^2q_{-3}) + \frac{5}{3}(l_{-1}q_3q_1q_{-3} - l_1q_3q_{-1}q_{-3}) + \frac{16}{9}(l_1q_1q_{-1}^2 - l_{-1}q_1^2q_{-1}) - \frac{38}{27}(l_0q_2q_{-1}^2 + l_0q_1^2q_{-2}))q_0^2 + \frac{1}{36}(l_1q_1^3q_{-2}^2 - l_{-1} \\ & - \frac{1}{18}(l_1q_3q_2q_{-1}q_{-2}q_{-3} - l_{-1}q_3q_2q_1q_{-2}q_{-3}) + \frac{4}{27}(l_1q_3q_{-1}^4 - l_{-1}q_1^4q_{-3}) + l_0q_0(\frac{4}{27}(q_1^3q_{-3} + q_3q_{-1}^3) + \frac{1}{18}(q_3q_1q_{-2}^2 + q_2^2q_{-1}q_{-3}) + q_2^2q_{-3}^2(l_1q_0 \\ & + \frac{10}{81}q_1q_{-1}(l_{-1}q_2^2q_{-3} - l_1q_3q_{-2}^2) + \frac{1}{18}l_0q_0(20q_1q_{-1} - 11q_2q_{-2} + 18q_3q_{-3})q_3q_{-3} + \frac{4}{81}q_2^2q_{-2}^2l_0q_0 - (\frac{403}{81}q_1^2q_{-1}^2 + \frac{5}{54}q_2q_1q_{-1}q_{-2})l_0q_0 + \frac{68}{81}q_1^3q_{-1}^3 \\ & + (\frac{8}{9}q_1q_{-1} - \frac{1}{12}q_{-2}q_2 + \frac{8}{27}q_3q_{-3})(q_{-1}^2q_2 + q_1^2q_{-2})l_0 + (\frac{7}{162}q_{-2}q_2 - \frac{32}{81}q_1q_{-1})(q_3q_{-1}q_{-2} + q_1q_{-3}q_2)l_0 + \frac{19}{162}q_2q_{-2}(l_{-1}q_3q_{-1}^2 - l_1q_{-3}q_1^2) \\ & + q_0(\frac{41}{162}q_1q_{-1} + \frac{7}{18}q_3q_{-3} + \frac{2}{81}q_{-2}q_2)(q_2l_{-1}q_{-1} - l_1q_{-2}q_1) + q_0(\frac{4}{27}q_{-2}q_2 - \frac{47}{54}q_1q_{-1} - \frac{5}{6}q_3q_{-3})(q_{-3}q_2l_1 - l_{-1}q_3q_{-2}) - \frac{27}{27}l_0l_1q_{-1}^2(q_{-1}q_2 + \\ & + \frac{27}{27}q_0q_1^2l_{-1}(q_1q_{-2} + 4q_{-3}q_2) - (\frac{38}{27}q_{-3}q_3q_{-1}q_1 + \frac{17}{81}q_1q_{-1}q_{-2}q_2 - \frac{1}{81}q_2^2q_{-2}^2)(q_1l_{-1} - l_1q_{-1}) + l_1q_1q_{-2}^3(\frac{8}{9}q_3q_1 - \frac{1}{108}q_2^2) + l_1q_{-3}q_{-1}(\frac{68}{81}q_1^3 - \\ & - \frac{5}{108}l_1q_{-3}q_{-1}^2q_2^2 + (\frac{1}{81}q_2q_{-2} - \frac{1}{12}q_3q_{-3})q_3q_{-2}^2l_1 + l_{-1}q_3^2q_{-1}(\frac{1}{108}q_{-2}^2 - \frac{8}{9}q_{-1}q_{-3}) + l_{-1}q_1q_3(\frac{5}{108}q_1q_{-2}^2 - \frac{68}{81}q_{-1}^3) \end{aligned}$

Observe that for the excluded values of the parameters, we recover the Casimir operator of degree four of $\mathfrak{so}(5)$. We claim that the operators $[0, 2], [2, 0], C_4, X_1^1, X_1^2, X_2^1, X_2^2$ are functionally independent, where $[0, 2] = C_{21}$ and $[2, 0] = C_2 - C_{21}$. To prove this, we simply consider the following Jacobian

$$\frac{\partial ([0, 2], [2, 0], C_4, X_1^1, X_1^2, X_2^1, X_2^2)}{\partial (l_0, l_{-1}, q_0, q_{-1}, q_{-2}, q_{-3}, q_3)} \neq 0 \quad (78)$$

Therefore the operators are independent, and from them a set of commuting operators can be extracted.

Proposition 2 *The sets $\mathcal{F}_{1,\alpha} = \{X_1^1, X_2^1\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{2,\beta} = \{X_1^2, X_2^2\}$ are inequivalent set of commuting missing label operators.*

The non-equivalence of the sets of labelling operators refer to their independence and to the fact they they are not mutually orthogonal. This shows that the class of labelling operators is divided into two types with respect to the orthogonality requirement. It cannot however excluded that some mixed functions can have the same property.

We finally remark that the solution found in [64] is equivalent to the symmetrized solution $\{X_1^1, X_1^2\}$ for $\alpha = 0$. In fact, we obtain $X' = X_1^1 - C_4 = 3[2, 2] - [1, 3]$, therefore the only solution with two components. In this sense, the pair proposed in [64] is actually the simplest possible choice for solving the missing label problem.

11 Cartan subalgebras and the MLP

As already observed, the eigenvalues of the Casimir operators of a (semisimple) Lie algebra serve to characterize the irreducible representations. The next step is to find out how many internal labels are necessary to distinguish the different eigenvectors of a given weight. Obviously the eigenvalues of the Cartan subalgebra generators serve to this purpose, but with the exception of the Lie algebras $[\mathfrak{su}(2)]^n$, they are not sufficient. It is well known from the classical theory that for (semisimple) algebras, exactly $\frac{1}{2}(\dim \mathfrak{g} - \text{rank } \mathfrak{g})$ labels are needed.²¹ This means that in addition to the generators of the Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} , we need to find $f = \frac{1}{2}(\dim \mathfrak{g} - 3\text{rank } \mathfrak{g})$ additional operators to separate multiplicities. These must of course commute among themselves and with the elements of the Cartan subalgebra. The number f is usually called the Racah number, and the corresponding operators the Racah operators. As follows from the expression of f , this number increases quickly for high dimensions, and so, for example, for the exceptional algebra E_8 we need as many as 112 additional operators. The problem to completely characterize the Racah operators is still open, and only for some special cases it has been studied. The problem is however quite similar to that of the MLP, and this suggest to emply the same technique to look for

²¹This is exactly the number of positive roots. Using the Maurer-Cartan equations of the algebra, it can be shown [65] that this number appears naturally

these labelling operators. The main difference is that the reduction chain $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{h}$ involves an Abelian subalgebra, and therefore the contraction will generally be not an inhomogeneous Lie algebra. In any case, the decomposition of the Casimir operators of \mathfrak{s} provides solutions to the problem, since they are particular solutions to the system of differential equations determined by the Cartan subalgebra. A suggested procedure to obtain Racah operators is therefore the following:

1. Decompose the Casimir operators of \mathfrak{s} according to the contraction associated to the reduction $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{h}$.
2. Extract a maximal number of independent operators that are moreover independent on the generators of \mathfrak{h} and the Casimir operators of \mathfrak{s}
3. Compute the brackets of these operators in order to obtain a set of commuting operators.

Observe in particular that since the Racah operators are solutions to the corresponding differential operators, commutation with the Cartan subalgebra generators follows at once. Once the brackets of the Racah operators between themselves and the Casimir operators of the algebra must be computed. It is clear from this procedure that an exact knowledge of the Casimir operators of simple Lie algebras is necessary. Formulae for these are well known [9], although in some cases the corresponding expressions are not very manageable. Specially for the E_i series, where the higher order Casimir operators are quite difficult to compute, this approach would require alternative derivations of the invariants, as done for the classical series. The question *how many* of the Racah operators can be obtained using this method is still an open problem, actually in progress.

In this paragraph, we show that this ansatz works, even if the nature of the corresponding missing label problem is quite different to the usual one, due to the non-inhomogeneous nature of the contracted algebra. The examples exhibited point out that the interpretation of labelling operators as “broken Casimir operators” is valid, and gives to the Racah operators a certain physical meaning absent in other approaches to their computation.

11.1 Racah operators of $\mathfrak{su}(3)$

The lowest dimensional simple algebra where such operators are required is the type A_2 . In this case, $f = 1$, thus we need to determine one additional operator. As follows from (3), there are two possibilities. For simplicity, we consider a basis $\{L_i, T_j\}$ ($i = 0, 1, -1, j = -2, \dots, 2$) similar to that considered for the Elliott chain, but changing the indices for the

second rank tensor. The commutator table in matrix form is given by:

$$A(\mathfrak{su}(3)) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & l_1 & -l_{-1} & 2t_2 & t_1 & 0 & -t_{-1} & -2t_{-2} \\ -l_1 & 0 & l_0 & 0 & -2t_2 & -3t_1 & t_0 & t_{-1} \\ l_{-1} & -l_0 & 0 & -t_1 & -t_0 & 3t_{-1} & 2t_{-2} & 0 \\ -2t_2 & 0 & t_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -l_1 & l_0 \\ -t_1 & 2t_2 & t_0 & 0 & 0 & -3l_1 & l_0 & -l_{-1} \\ 0 & 3t_1 & -3t_{-1} & 0 & 3l_1 & 0 & -3l_{-1} & 0 \\ t_{-1} & -t_0 & -2t_{-2} & l_1 & -l_0 & 3l_{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 2t_{-2} & -t_{-1} & 0 & -l_0 & l_{-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

In this case, the Cartan subalgebra is easily seen to be generated by T_0 and L_0 . To compute the Racah operators, we have to solve the system:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{T}_0 F &:= l_1 \frac{\partial F}{\partial l_1} - l_{-1} \frac{\partial F}{\partial l_{-1}} + 2t_2 \frac{\partial F}{\partial t_2} + t_1 \frac{\partial F}{\partial t_1} - t_{-1} \frac{\partial F}{\partial t_{-1}} - 2t_{-2} \frac{\partial F}{\partial t_{-2}} = 0, \\ \widehat{T}_0 F &:= 3t_1 \frac{\partial F}{\partial t_1} - 3t_{-1} \frac{\partial F}{\partial t_{-1}} + 3l_1 \frac{\partial F}{\partial l_1} - 3l_{-1} \frac{\partial F}{\partial l_{-1}} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Instead of integrating the system, we decompose the Casimir operators. Over this basis, the unsymmetrized invariants are $C^2 = 2l_1 l_{-1} + l_0^2 + 4t_2 t_{-2} + 2t_1 t_{-1} + \frac{1}{3}t_0^2$ and

$$C^3 = 9(l_1 l_{-1} t_0 - l_0^2 t_0 + t_1 t_0 t_{-1}) - 36t_2 t_0 t_{-2} + t_0^3 + 27(t_2 t_{-1}^2 + t_1^2 t_{-2} - l_0 l_1 t_{-1} - l_0 l_{-1} t_1 - l_1^2 t_{-2} - l_{-1}^2 t_2).$$

Only the decomposition of the cubic operator can lead to an independent labelling operator. In this case, the contraction is determined by the transformations

$$L'_0 = L_0; L'_i = \frac{1}{t} L_i, \quad i = \pm 1; T'_0 = T_0; T'_i = \frac{1}{t} T_i, \quad i = \pm 1, 2.$$

The re-scaled cubic operator is therefore

$$C^3 = (t_0^3 - 9l_0^2 t_0) + t^2 (9(l_1 t_0 l_{-1} + t_1 l_0 t_{-1}) - 27(t_{-1} l_0 l_1 + l_{-1} l_0 t_{-1}) - 36t_0 t_2 t_{-2}) - t^3 (l_1^2 t_{-2} + l_{-1}^2 t_2 - t_2 t_{-1}^2 - t_1^2 t_{-2}).$$

The first term is obviously non useful, for being a function of the Cartan generators. Choosing $\Phi = 9(l_1 t_0 l_{-1} + t_1 l_0 t_{-1}) - 27(t_{-1} l_0 l_1 + l_{-1} l_0 t_{-1}) - 36t_0 t_2 t_{-2}$ provides an independent labelling operator, as follows from the Jacobian

$$\frac{\partial \{T_0, L_0, C^2, C^3, \Phi\}}{\partial \{l_0, t_0, t_2, t_1, t_{-1}\}} \neq 0. \quad (80)$$

The orthogonality is straightforward. Therefore the symmetrization of Φ constitutes an admissible Racah operator for the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(3)$.

11.2 Racah operators of $\mathfrak{sp}(4)$

Symplectic groups naturally appear in physical applications from the boson formalism: the generators of the corresponding Lie algebra correspond to operators changing the number of particles. In the study of the $j-j$ -coupling shell model, the algebra $\mathfrak{sp}(4)$ played a notorious role, since they commute with the quasi-spin operators and moreover cannot change the seniority number ν . More recently, they have been shown to be important in the nuclear collective model, among other applications to nuclear physics [47,66]. Since the symplectic algebra $\mathfrak{sp}(4)$ has dimension ten and rank two, the Racah number is $f = 2$, and therefore we have to find two commuting labelling operators. Using the same basis and brackets of (69), i.e., the Racah realization of the algebra, where the indices run from -2 to 2 , the Casimir operators can be computed using the matrix formula (71) adapted to it. The unsymmetrized invariants are

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 &= -x_{1,1}^2 - x_{2,-2}x_{-2,2} - x_{2,2}^2 - 2x_{-1,2}x_{1,-2} - x_{1,-1}x_{-1,1} - 2x_{2,1}x_{1,2}, \\ C_4 &= 2x_{1,1}x_{-1,2}x_{1,-2}x_{2,2} + x_{1,-1}x_{-1,1}x_{2,2}^2 + x_{2,-2}x_{-2,2}x_{1,1}^2 - 2x_{1,1}x_{2,2}x_{2,1}x_{1,2} \\ &\quad - 2x_{1,-1}x_{2,1}x_{-1,2}x_{2,2} - 2x_{1,1}x_{1,-2}x_{-2,2}x_{2,1} - 2x_{1,1}x_{2,-2}x_{-1,2}x_{1,2} + x_{-1,2}^2x_{1,-2}^2 \\ &\quad - 2x_{1,2}x_{1,-2}x_{-1,1}x_{2,2} + x_{2,1}^2x_{1,2}^2 - x_{1,-2}^2x_{-1,1}x_{-2,2} - x_{1,-1}x_{2,-2}x_{-2,2}^2 + x_{1,1}^2x_{2,2}^2 \\ &\quad + x_{1,-1}x_{-2,2}x_{2,1}^2 + 2x_{2,1}x_{-1,2}x_{1,-2}x_{1,2} + x_{1,-1}x_{2,-2}x_{-1,1}x_{-2,2} + x_{2,-2}x_{-1,1}x_{1,2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the contraction defined by the transformations $X'_{i,j} = \frac{1}{t}X_{i,j}$ for all indices i, j $|i \neq j$, the quartic Casimir operator is decomposed as:

$$C_4 = x_{1,1}^2x_{2,2}^2 + t^2C_{[2,2]} + t^3C_{[1,3]} + t^4C_{[0,4]}, \quad (81)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_{[2,2]} &= 2x_{1,1}x_{-1,2}x_{1,-2}x_{2,2} + x_{1,-1}x_{-1,1}x_{2,2}^2 + x_{2,-2}x_{-2,2}x_{1,1}^2 - 2x_{1,1}x_{2,2}x_{2,1}x_{1,2}, \\ C_{[1,3]} &= -2x_{1,-1}x_{2,1}x_{-1,2}x_{2,2} - 2x_{1,1}x_{1,-2}x_{-2,2}x_{2,1} - 2x_{1,1}x_{2,-2}x_{-1,2}x_{1,2} \\ &\quad - 2x_{1,2}x_{1,-2}x_{-1,1}x_{2,2} \\ C_{[0,4]} &= x_{2,1}^2x_{1,2}^2 - x_{1,-2}^2x_{-1,1}x_{-2,2} - x_{1,-1}x_{2,-2}x_{-2,2}^2 + x_{-1,2}^2x_{1,-2}^2 + x_{1,-1}x_{-2,2}x_{2,1}^2 \\ &\quad + 2x_{2,1}x_{-1,2}x_{1,-2}x_{1,2} + x_{1,1}^2x_{2,2}^2 + x_{1,-1}x_{2,-2}x_{-1,1}x_{-2,2} + x_{2,-2}x_{-1,1}x_{1,2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

Taking for example the operators $C_{[2,2]}$ and $C_{[1,3]}$, we verify their independence on the Casimir operators of $\mathfrak{sp}(4)$ and the Cartan generators by computing the Jacobian:

$$\frac{\partial \{X_{1,1}, X_{2,2}, C_2, C_4, C_{[2,2]}, C_{[1,3]}\}}{\partial \{x_{1,1}, x_{2,2}, x_{1,2}, x_{2,1}, x_{1,-1}, x_{-1,2}\}} \neq 0.$$

Taking the symmetrization of these operators (denoted by the same symbol), we finally compute the brackets:

$$\begin{aligned} [C_{[2,2]}, C_{[1,3]}] &= 0, & [C_{[2,2]}, C_2] &= 0, & [C_{[2,2]}, C_4] &= 0, \\ [C_{[1,3]}, C_2] &= 0, & [C_4, C_{[1,3]}] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

This shows that the commuting Racah operators also arise as ‘‘broken Casimir operators’’

The symplectic algebra $\mathfrak{sp}(6)$ shows more clearly to which extent the described procedure is valid. In this case, the Racah number equals $f = 6$, thus we have to determine six commuting labelling operators. Again, taking the realization used before, the invariants follow from formula (70). Before symmetrization, the Casimir operators C_2, C_4 and C_6 have 12, 123 and 388 terms, respectively. Performing the contraction determined by $X'_{i,j} = \frac{1}{t} X_{i,j}$ for $i \neq j$, the quartic and hexic Casimir operators decompose as

$$\begin{aligned} C_4 &= C_{[4,0]} + t^2 C_{[2,2]} + t^3 C_{[1,3]} + t^4 C_{[0,4]}, \\ C_6 &= C_{[6,0]} + t^2 C_{[4,2]} + t^3 C_{[3,3]} + t^4 C_{[2,4]} + t^5 C_{[1,5]} + t^6 C_{[0,6]}. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

Here $C_{[4,0]}$ and $C_{[6,0]}$ are functions of the Cartan generators, while $C_{[2,2]}, C_{[1,3]}, C_{[0,4]}, C_{[4,2]}, C_{[3,3]}, C_{[2,4]}, C_{[1,5]}$ and $C_{[0,6]}$ are polynomials with 18, 36, 66, 9, 20, 72, 132 and 154 terms, respectively.²² Taking the six independent operators $C_{[2,2]}, C_{[1,3]}, C_{[4,2]}, C_{[3,3]}, C_{[2,4]}$ and $C_{[1,5]}$, their independence with the C_i and the Cartan subalgebra is proved by means of the Jacobian

$$\frac{\partial \{X_{1,1}, X_{2,2}, X_{3,3}, C_2, C_4, C_6, C_{[2,2]}, C_{[1,3]}, C_{[4,2]}, C_{[3,3]}, C_{[2,4]}, C_{[1,5]}\}}{\partial \{x_{1,1}, x_{2,2}, x_{3,3}, x_{1,2}, x_{1,3}, x_{2,1}, x_{2,3}, x_{-1,2}, x_{-1,3}, x_{1,-1}, x_{-1,2}, x_{2,-3}\}} \neq 0.$$

A straightforward but tedious computation shows moreover the orthogonality conditions required:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} C_{[2,2]}, C_{[1,3]} \\ C_{[2,2]}, C_{[2,4]} \\ C_{[1,3]}, C_{[3,3]} \\ C_{[4,2]}, C_{[3,3]} \\ C_{[3,3]}, C_{[2,4]} \end{bmatrix} &= 0, & \begin{bmatrix} C_{[2,2]}, C_{[4,2]} \\ C_{[2,2]}, C_{[1,5]} \\ C_{[1,3]}, C_{[2,4]} \\ C_{[4,2]}, C_{[2,4]} \\ C_{[3,3]}, C_{[1,5]} \end{bmatrix} &= 0, & \begin{bmatrix} C_{[2,2]}, C_{[3,3]} \\ C_{[1,3]}, C_{[4,2]} \\ C_{[1,3]}, C_{[1,5]} \\ C_{[4,2]}, C_{[1,5]} \\ C_{[2,4]}, C_{[1,5]} \end{bmatrix} &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

Orthogonality with the Casimir operators follows similarly. This suggest that a complete characterization of the Racah operators by means of the decomposition of the Casimir operators is possible. This problem is in progress.

11.3 Applications to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(2, 4)$

The conformal group $SO(2, 4)$ is one of the physically most relevant groups, and appears in many different context. One one hand, it is the symmetry group of the Maxwell equations of electromagnetism, as well as the dynamical non-invariance group of hydrogen-like atoms. In General Relativity, this group and their De Sitter subgroups also constitute a powerful tool. This group was also found to be at the basis of the group-theoretical construction of the Periodic Table of chemical Elements, being first considered in [32]. various authors followed the analysis of the chemical elements using the conformal symmetry [31]. It is nowadays at the centre of the program KGR [33], whose finality is to obtain quantitative predictions on the elements [33, 34]. The Casimir and Racah operators are the main tool

²²For this reason we omit the explicit expressions of the operators.

to construct the needed quantum numbers to characterize physical and chemical properties. Since the Lie algebra is of dimension 15 and rank 3, we need three additional operators to obtain a complete set of commuting operators that solves the labelling problem. Once again we try to solve it via the MLP associated to the Cartan subalgebra. We use the important fact that $\mathfrak{so}(2, 4)$ is isomorphic to the unitary Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2, 2)$. Taking the basis formed by the operators $\{E_{\mu\nu}, F_{\mu\nu}\}_{1 \leq \mu, \nu \leq p+q=n}$ with the constraints

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mu\nu} + E_{\nu\mu} &= 0, \quad F_{\mu\nu} - F_{\nu\mu} = 0, \\ g_{\mu\mu} &= ((1, 1, -1, -1)), \end{aligned}$$

the brackets are then given by

$$\begin{aligned} [E_{\mu\nu}, E_{\lambda\sigma}] &= g_{\mu\lambda}E_{\nu\sigma} + g_{\mu\sigma}E_{\lambda\nu} - g_{\nu\lambda}E_{\mu\sigma} - g_{\nu\sigma}E_{\lambda\mu} \\ [E_{\mu\nu}, F_{\lambda\sigma}] &= g_{\mu\lambda}F_{\nu\sigma} + g_{\mu\sigma}F_{\lambda\nu} - g_{\nu\lambda}F_{\mu\sigma} - g_{\nu\sigma}F_{\lambda\mu} \\ [F_{\mu\nu}, F_{\lambda\sigma}] &= g_{\mu\lambda}E_{\nu\sigma} + g_{\nu\lambda}E_{\mu\sigma} - g_{\nu\sigma}E_{\lambda\mu} - g_{\mu\sigma}E_{\lambda\nu} \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

To recover the conformal algebra, we take the Cartan subalgebra spanned by the vectors $H_\mu = g_{\mu+1, \mu+1}F_{\mu\mu} - g_{\mu\mu}F_{\mu+1, \mu+1}$ for $\mu = 1..3$. The centre of $\mathfrak{u}(p, q)$ is obviously generated by $g^{\mu\mu}F_{\mu\mu}$.²³ The advantage of this basis is that the Casimir operators can be determined by means of a determinantal formula. Indeed, a maximal set of independent Casimir invariants of $\mathfrak{su}(2, 2)$ is given by the coefficients C_k of the characteristic polynomial $|IA - \lambda \text{Id}_N| = \lambda^4 + \sum_{k=2}^4 D_k \lambda^{4-k}$, where A is the matrix defined by:

$$\begin{pmatrix} -I(\frac{3}{4}h_1 - \frac{1}{2}h_2 + \frac{1}{4}h_3) & -e_{12} - If_{12} & e_{13} + If_{13} & e_{14} + If_{14} \\ e_{12} - If_{12} & I(\frac{1}{4}h_1 + \frac{1}{2}h_2 - \frac{1}{4}h_3) & e_{23} + If_{23} & e_{24} + If_{24} \\ e_{13} - If_{13} & e_{23} - If_{23} & I(\frac{1}{4}h_1 - \frac{1}{2}h_2 - \frac{1}{4}h_3) & e_{34} + If_{34} \\ e_{14} - If_{14} & e_{24} - If_{24} & -e_{34} + If_{34} & I(\frac{1}{4}h_1 - \frac{1}{2}h_2 + \frac{3}{4}h_3) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (86)$$

The Casimir operators follow from the corresponding symmetrization of the functions C_k . The corresponding contraction is defined by the non-singular transformations

$$E'_{ij} = \frac{1}{t}E_{ij}, \quad F'_{ij} = \frac{1}{t}F_{ij}, \quad i = 1..4.$$

According to this scheme, the Casimir operators decompose as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 &= C_{[2,0]} + t^2 C_{[(,2]}, \\ C_3 &= C_{[3,0]} + t^2 C_{[1,2]} + t^3 C_{[0,3]}, \\ C_4 &= C_{[4,0]} + t C_{[1,3]} + t^2 C_{[2,2]} + t^4 C_{[0,4]}, \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

where the $C_{[0,i]}$ are functions of the Cartan generators. The functions $C_{[i,j]}$ all constitute solutions to the MLP. To complete the set of orthogonal operators $\{H_1, H_2, H_3, C_2, C_3, C_4\}$

²³Another useful basis is that spanned by the so-called Yao generators.

with three mutually commuting labelling operators, we chose those triples that are functionally independent from the Casimir operators of $\mathfrak{su}(2, 2)$ and the h_i . We can take for example $C_{[2,1]}$, $C_{[3,1]}$ and $C_{[2,2]}$. Since

$$\frac{\partial(H_1, H_2, H_3, C_2, C_3, C_4, C_{[2,1]}, C_{[1,3]}, C_{[2,2]})}{\partial(h_1, h_2, h_3, e_{12}, e_{13}, e_{14}, f_{23}, f_{24}, f_{34})} \neq 0, \quad (88)$$

these operators are independent. A laborious computation shows that the symmetrized forms of these operators are orthogonal:

$$\begin{aligned} [C_i, C_{[1,2]}] &= 0, & [C_i, C_{[1,3]}] &= 0, & [C_i, C_{[2,2]}] &= 0, \\ [C_{[1,2]}, C_{[1,3]}] &= 0, & [C_{[1,2]}, C_{[2,2]}] &= 0, & [C_{[2,2]}, C_{[1,3]}] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

In this case, the number of terms before symmetrization is 36, 48 and 72 for $C_{[1,2]}$, $C_{[1,3]}$ and $C_{[2,2]}$, respectively. Thus the set $\{H_1, H_2, H_3, C_2, C_3, C_4, C_{[2,1]}, C_{[1,3]}, C_{[2,2]}\}$ is complete formed by commuting operators. The main objective of the KGR program is to find suitable linear combinations of the three Racah operators to describe physical properties like ionization energy or magnetic susceptibility, as well as to obtain information on the stability island among the superheavy nuclei. This identification is the second step after the simultaneous diagonalization of these operators, and is heavily of numerical nature. The computation of the corresponding eigenvalues for irreducible representations (IRREPs) of $\mathfrak{su}(2, 2)$ constitutes the essential step to be compared with the existing experimental data. This task is in progress.

12 Final remarks

It seems natural to think, whenever we are confronted with a (non-canonical) embedding of Lie algebras and the corresponding MLP which is not multiplicity free, the information lost is somehow determined by the chain itself, and not by a priori external techniques. In this sense, the missing label operators which arise from the contraction \mathfrak{g} should correspond to a natural choice of physical labelling operators, as they are obtained using only the available information on the algebra-subalgebra chain, their invariants and the induced decomposition. This suggests that these could be the correct physical operators to be considered for the labelling of states. An argument supporting this interpretation is the equivalence of the contraction procedure with the K-matrix method in the Elliott model $\mathfrak{su}(3) \supset \mathfrak{so}(3)$ chain or the supermultiplet model. Whether the remaining possibilities that arise from the general algebraic solution of the missing label problem are physically more relevant than those operators found by contraction, remains a question that should be analyzed for any specific physical situation. In all examples analyzed, the contraction method provides at most n of the $2n$ available operators, thus induces a kind of partition in the set of labelling operators. This suggests the existence of a certain kind of hierarchy among these operators, as well as the fact that some of them are not directly related to the properties of the embedding of the subalgebra, and therefore not equivalent to these. The next natural step is to analyze if the contraction \mathfrak{g} can also be used to derive the eigenvalues of the missing label operators.

We have shown that many missing label problems relevant to Physics can be completely solved by using the properties of the reduction chain $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$, by means of a Lie algebra contraction associated to this reduction or the decomposition induced on the Casimir operators of the original Lie algebra. Analyzing the set of invariants of the involved Lie algebras, suitable commuting operators can be found that solve the missing label problem. From this perspective, the operators found inherit an intrinsic meaning, namely as terms of the Casimir operators of \mathfrak{s} being re-scaled by the contraction, up to some combination of lower order invariants of \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{s}' . We have recomputed some classical reductions appearing in atomic and nuclear physics, obtaining complete agreement with the result obtained by different authors and techniques. We believe to we also have furnished a natural explanation of the order of these operators, which are directly related to the order of the Casimir operators of the contracting Lie algebra. For the special case of $n = m = 0$, a direct relation among the invariants of \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{s}' with those of the contraction \mathfrak{g} has been observed.

The generalized contraction method is useful to solve the MLP when the number of invariants of the contraction associated to the reduction chain $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$ exceeds the number of needed commuting labelling operators. In the case where the invariants do not suffice to find a complete solution of the missing label problem, it is expectable that labelling operators of the same degree appear. This suggests that further terms of the Casimir operators of \mathfrak{s} that disappear during the contraction can be useful to complete the set of missing label operators. We have thus introduced a decomposition of the Casimir operators, the terms of which are all constitute solutions to the labelling problem. From these terms a set of n independent labelling operators can be extracted, reducing the problem to determine which (linear) combinations are mutually orthogonal. In this sense, the method proposed in [11] is a first approximation to solve the MLP using the properties of reduction chains turns out to be useful in many practical cases. The bi-degree of the Casimir operators of a Lie algebra with respect to the variables associated to the generators of a subalgebra are further a relevant tool to obtain and classify these labelling operators, although further distinction of terms, for example when the subalgebra consists of various copies, is also convenient to deduce additional operators.²⁴ We remark that this additional labelling depends on each particular, case, since it is related to the distinction of the generators of the subalgebra and on their possible splitting into direct sums.

Certain aspects related to the decomposition method of Casimir operators based on the contractions and its use in labelling problems are specially emphasized:

- The solutions agree with the “natural” choice for the labelling operators. Their interpretation as “broken” Casimir operators confers them a physical meaning, in contrast to some operators obtained by other techniques, where the physical content of the operator is sometimes not entirely clear.

²⁴This has been done for the chain $\mathfrak{su}(4) \supset \mathfrak{su}(2) \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$ [4] for the Wigner supermultiplet and the isospin-strange spin classification schemes, although this supplementary subdivision cannot be deduced using only the bi-degree defined by the contraction.

- The decomposition provides also a consistent explanation to the question why for a number of reduction chains the labelling operators must have the same degree. This fact is related to the number of terms when the decomposition is applied.
- This could probably explain why the eigenvalues of such labelling operators are not integers, as already indicated by Racah [13] and verified in some models. The decomposition implies that the eigenvalues of the labelling operators contribute to the eigenvalues of the Casimir operators, being parts of them. In this context, the interpretation of a labelling operator as “broken” Casimir operator leads to the idea of “broken” integer eigenvalues.

Some questions still remain open. For example, whether there exist reductions $\mathfrak{s} \supset \mathfrak{s}'$ for which the method followed here provides all available labelling operators. An answer in this direction implies to find the general solution to the MLP for each considered chain. At the present time, only for a few number of algebras these computations have been carried out completely [4, 51]. A complete study of all physically relevant reduction chains involving simple Lie algebras up to some fixed rank will certainly provide new insights to this problem. We have also observed the existence of reduction chains where the terms of the decomposition are not sufficient to construct a set of orthogonal labelling operators. This means that the requirement that they commute is not directly related to the functional independence of these operators. How to compute these operators and their relation with the original embedding is still an open problem that must be analyzed. Another similar problem, which is being analyzed by the author, is to obtain complete sets of commuting Racah operators for all simple Lie algebras, using the labelling problem determined by the Cartan subalgebra. Such types of reduction have been shown to be of interest in algebraic models of molecular physics and nuclear spectroscopy [63], and a systematized approach would certainly be a step forward in their study.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the research project MTM2006-09152 of the Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia and the project CCG07-UCM/ESP-2922 of the U.C.M. The author expresses his gratitude to R. Ferraro and M. A. Castagnino of the Instituto de Astronomía y Física del Espacio of the UBA, where part of this work was done.

References

- [1] Okubo S 1962 *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **27** 949; Goldberg H and Lehrer-Ilamed Y 1962 *J. Math. Phys.* **4** 501; Burakovsky L and Horwitz L P 1997 *Found. Phys. Lett.* **10** 131
- [2] Süalp G and Kaptanoglu S 1983 *Ann. Phys.* **147** 460; Kitazawa N 1994 *Tumbling and Technicolor Theory* DPNU-94-03 (Nagoya: Japan).

- [3] Iachello F and Arima A 1987 *The interacting boson model*, (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge).
- [4] Elliott J P 1958 *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **245** 128, 562; Bargmann V and Moshinsky M 1965 *Nuclear Physics* **23** 177; Green H S and Bracken A J 1974 *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **11** 157; Judd B R, Miller W, Patera J and Winternitz P 1974 *J. Math. Phys.* **15** 1787; Hecht K T 1994 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **27** 3445; Turner P S, Rowe D J and Repka J 2006 *J. Math. Phys.* **47** 023507
- [5] Rowe D J 1995 *J. Math. Phys.* **36** 1520
- [6] Rowe D J, Le Blanc R and Repka J 1989 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **22** L309
- [7] Wigner E P 1937 *Phys. Rev.* **51** 106; Lipkin H J 1964 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13** 590; Khanna F C and Umezawa H 1994 *Chinese J. Phys.* **32** 1317; von Isacker P and Juillet O 1999 *Nuclear Phys.* **A564** 739; Valencia J P and Wu H C 2004 *Braz. J. Phys.* **34** 837
- [8] Rumer Yu B and Fet A I 1970 *Teoriya unitarnoi' simmetrii* (Nauka: Moscow)
- [9] Peccia A and Sharp R T 1976 *J. Math. Phys.* **17** 1313
- [10] Vitiello G and de Concini C 1976 *Nuclear Phys.* **B116** 141 Anderson J T 1981 *Phys. Rev.* **D23** 1856 Celeghini E, Tarlini M and Vitiello G 1984 *Nuovo Cimento A* **84** 19
- [11] Campoamor-Stursberg 2007 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **40** 14773 (hep-th/arXiv:0706.2581)
- [12] Campoamor-Stursberg R 2006 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **39** 2325
- [13] Racah G 1949 *Phys. Rev.* **76** 1352 1951 *Group Theory and Spectroscopy*, (Princeton Univ. Press, New Jersey); Fano U and Racah G 1959 *Irreducible tensorial Sets* (Academic Press: New York)
- [14] Patera J, Sharp R T, Winternitz P and Zassenhaus H 1976 *J. Math. Phys.* **17** 986
- [15] Campoamor-Stursberg R 2006 *SIGMA* **2** p28
- [16] Chaichian M, Demichev A P and Nelipa N F 1983 *Comm- Math. Phys.* **90** 353
- [17] Campoamor-Stursberg R 2007 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **40** 5355
- [18] Beltrametti E G and Blasi A 1966 *Physics Letters* **20** 62
- [19] Abellanas L and Martínez Alonso L 1975 *J. Math. Phys.* **16** 1580
- [20] Boyko V, Patera J and Popovych R 2006 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **39** 5749; 2007 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **40** 113

- [21] Segal I E 1951 *Duke Math. J.* **18** 221; Inönü E and Wigner E P 1953 *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci U.S.A.* **39** 510; Domokos G and Tindle G L 1968 *Commun. Math. Phys.* **7** 160
- [22] Lykhmus Ya Kh 1969 *Predel'nye gruppy Li*, (Institut Fiziki AN Estonskoi' SSR, Tartu)
- [23] Weimar-Woods E 2000 *Rev. Math. Phys.* **12** 1505
- [24] Campoamor-Stursberg R 2003 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **36** 1357 ; 2003 *Acta Physica Polonica B* **34** 3901
- [25] Weimar-Woods E 1996 *Proc. XXI Int. Colloq. Group Theoretical Methods in Physics (Goslar)*, vol 1, (Singapore: World Scientific) p 132
- [26] Weimar-Woods E 2008 *J. Math. Phys.* **49** 033507
- [27] Serre J P 1965 *Algèbres de Lie semi-simples complexes* (Benjamin Inc., N.Y.); Cahn R N 1969 *Semisimple Lie algebras* (Benjamin Inc. N.Y.)
- [28] Dynkin E P 1952 *Mat. Sb.* **30** 349; Gruber B and Lorente M 1972 *J. Math. Phys.* **13** 1639
- [29] Patera J and Sankoff D 1973 *Tables of Branching Rules for Representations of Simple Lie algebras* (Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal)
- [30] Sharp R T 1975 *J. Math. Phys.* **16**, 2050
- [31] Rumer Yu B and Fet A I 1971 *Teor. Mat. Fiz.* **9** 203; Konopel'chenko B G and Rumer Yu B 1979 *Uspekhi Fiz. Nauk* **129** 339; Byakov V M, Kulakov Yu I, Rumer Yu B and Fet A I 1976 Preprint ITEP-26, ITEP-90; Kibler M R 1989 *J. Mol. Struct.* **187** 83; Carlson C M, Hefferlin R A and Zhuvikin G V 1995 *Analysis of Group Theoretical Periodic Systems of Molecules using Tabulated Data* Joint Report SC/SPBU-2
- [32] Barut A O 1972 in *The Structure of Matter* (Proc. Rutherford Centennial Symp., 1971) (Christchurch, New Zealand)
- [33] Kibler M R 2004 *Mol. Phys.* **102** 1221
- [34] Kibler M R 2004 *The Mathematics of the Periodic Table*, ed D H Rouvray and R B King (Baldock: Research Studies Press)
- [35] Campoamor-Stursberg R 2006 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **39** 2325 2007 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **40** 5355
- [36] Campoamor-Stursberg R 2005 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **38** 4187
- [37] Louck J D 1976 *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Mathematical Physics*, Mexico City, Mexico

- [38] Judd B R, Miller W, Patera J and Winternitz P 1974 *J. Math. Phys.* **15** 1787
- [39] Bargmann V and Moshinsky M 1965 *Nuclear Physics* **23** 177
- [40] Jarvis P D and Zhang R B 2005 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **38** L219
- [41] Wybourne B G 1965 *Spectroscopic properties of rare earths* (Wiley: N.Y.)
- [42] Judd B R and Lister G S M 1992 *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt.* **25** L205
- [43] Wybourne B R 1992 *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt.* **25** 1683
- [44] Bincer A M 1994 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **27** 3847
- [45] Campoamor-Stursberg 2004 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **37** 9451
- [46] Hecht K T 1965 *Nuclear Physics* **63** 177
- [47] Helmers K 1961 *Nuclear Phys.* **23** 594
- [48] Sharp R T and Pieper S C 1968 *J. Math. Phys.* **9** 663
- [49] Giroux Y and Sharp R T 1987 *J. Math. Phys.* **28** 1671
- [50] Quesne Ch 1976 *J. Math. Phys.* **17**, 1452; **18**, 1210 (1977).
- [51] Partensky A and Maguin C 1978 *J. Math. Phys.* **19** 511
- [52] Moshinsky M and Nagel J G 1963 *Phys. Letters* **5** 173
- [53] Georgi H and Glashow S L 1974 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **32** 438
- [54] Niederer U 1972 *Helv. Phys. Acta* **45** 802
- [55] Barut A O and Xu B-W 1981 *Phys. Lett.* **A82** 218
- [56] Bincer A M 1980 *J. Math. Phys.* **21** 671 1983 *J. Math. Phys.* **24** 1695
- [57] Hughes J W B and Van der Jeugt J 1985 *J. Math. Phys.* **26** 894
- [58] Van der Jeugt 1984 *J. Math. Phys.* **25** 1221
- [59] De Meyer H, Vanden Berghe G and De Wilde P 1987 *Comput. Phys. Comm.* **44** 197
- [60] Gel'fand I M 1950 *Mat. Sbornik* **26** 103
- [61] Rosensteel G 1977 *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **16** 63 Graber J L and Rosensteel G 2003 *Phys. Rev. C* **68** 014301
- [62] Gaskell R, Rosensteel G and Sharp R T 1981 *J. Math. Phys.* **22** 2732

- [63] Frank A and van Isacker P 1994 *Algebraic Methods in Molecular and Nuclear Structure Physics* (Wiley: New York); Iachello F and Levine R D 1995 *Algebraic Theory of Molecules* (Oxford Univ. Press: Oxford)
- [64] De Meyer H, Vanden Berghe G, Van der Jeugt J and De Wilde P 1985 *J. Math. Phys.* **26** 2124
- [65] Campoamor-Stursberg R 2004 *Phys. Lett. A* **327** 138
- [66] Draayer J 1970 *J. Math. Phys.* **11** 3225