

Off-Shell Nilpotent Symmetries of a General $\mathcal{N} = 2$ Supersymmetric Quantum Mechanical Model: Supervariable Approach

S. Krishna^(a), A. Shukla^(a), R. P. Malik^(a,b)

^(a) *Physics Department, Centre of Advanced Studies,
Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi - 221 005, (U.P.), India*

and

^(b) *DST Centre for Interdisciplinary Mathematical Sciences,
Faculty of Science, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi - 221 005, India*
e-mails: skrishna.bhu@gmail.com; ashukla038@gmail.com; rpmaalik1995@gmail.com

Abstract: Using the supersymmetric (SUSY) invariant restrictions on the (anti-)chiral supervariables, we derive the off-shell nilpotent symmetries of a *general* one $(0 + 1)$ -dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY quantum mechanical (QM) model which is considered on a $(1, 2)$ -dimensional supermanifold (parametrized by a bosonic variable t and a pair of Grassmannian variables θ and $\bar{\theta}$ with $\theta^2 = \bar{\theta}^2 = 0$, $\theta\bar{\theta} + \bar{\theta}\theta = 0$). We provide the geometrical meaning to the *two* SUSY transformations of our present theory which is valid for any arbitrary type of superpotential. We express the conserved charges and Lagrangian of the theory in terms of the supervariables (that are obtained after the application of SUSY invariant restrictions) and provide the geometrical interpretation for the nilpotency property and SUSY invariance of the Lagrangian for the general $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY quantum theory.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Pb; 03.65.-w; 11.30.-j

Keywords: General $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY QM model; Supervariable approach; (Anti-)chiral supervariables; SUSY invariants restrictions; Specific $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY algebra; Nilpotency

1 Introduction

The local gauge theories are at the heart of theoretical description of three out of four fundamental interactions of nature. The Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) formalism is one of the most intuitive approaches for the covariant canonical quantization of the p -form ($p = 1, 2, 3, \dots$) gauge theories where the local gauge symmetry of the original theory is traded with the “quantum” gauge [i.e. (anti-)BRST] symmetries. A couple of decisive properties of the (anti-)BRST symmetries are their nilpotency and absolute anticommutativity. The former property encodes the fermionic nature of these symmetries and the latter property establishes the linear independence of BRST and anti-BRST symmetries. These mathematical properties are explained *geometrically* by the well-known superfield formalism (see, e.g. [1-4]) where the horizontality condition (HC) plays a key role.

For the interacting gauge theories, one requires more restrictions than the celebrated HC. In a set of papers (see, e.g. [5-7]), the additional gauge invariant restrictions have been exploited, besides HC, to obtain the full set of off-shell nilpotent and absolutely anticommuting (anti-)BRST symmetries for the gauge, matter and ghost fields of a given gauge theory. It has been a challenging problem to apply the appropriate form of the above superfield formalisms [1-7] to the supersymmetric (SUSY) theories where the nilpotency property exists but the absolute anticommutativity property *does* not exist. In our present endeavor, we address this problem in the context of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY quantum mechanical (QM) model which happens to be a one $(0 + 1)$ -dimensional (1D) SUSY system.

The central theme of our present investigation is to exploit the strength of SUSY invariant restrictions on the (anti-)chiral supervariables to capture the nilpotency property of the SUSY symmetry transformations for the general $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY QM model and derive the full set of SUSY symmetries in an accurate manner. We also provide the geometrical basis for the SUSY symmetry invariance of the Lagrangian of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY QM system. We lay emphasis on the fact that, to avoid the absolute anticommutativity* property of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY transformations, we are theoretically compelled to choose the (anti-)chiral supervariables defined on the $(1, 1)$ -dimensional super-submanifold of the $(1, 2)$ -dimensional supermanifold. The latter is parameterized by the superspace coordinate $Z^M = (t, \theta, \bar{\theta})$ with a pair of Grassmannian variables θ and $\bar{\theta}$ and an evolution parameter t .

The following factors have propelled us to pursue our present investigation. First, a geometrically intuitive approach to derive the SUSY transformations for the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY QM model would be always preferred by a theoretical physicist than the mundane mathematical superspace approach to derive the same. Second, the fermionic nilpotent property of the SUSY transformations should *not* remain a mathematical observation only. Rather, we should be able to say it in the language of geometry. This is what we accomplish in our present endeavor. Third, it is an urgent problem for us to generalize our earlier work on *free* SUSY theory [8] to the general $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY QM system which incorporates any arbitrary superpotential. Finally, our present paper is our modest attempt towards our main goal of applying the superfield formalism to $\mathcal{N} = 2$ and $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Yang-Mills gauge theories which have their relevance in the context of (super)string theories.

*The (anti-)BRST and $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY symmetry transformations are nilpotent of order two. However, they differ drastically in their anticommutativity property. Whereas the former symmetries turn out to be absolutely anticommuting, the latter symmetries do not obey the same rule.

The contents of our present endeavor are organized as follows. In Sec. 2, we discuss the continuous symmetries of the Lagrangian for the general $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY QM model and show that *two* of these are fermionic (SUSY) symmetries and *one* of them is bosonic in nature. Our Sec. 3 contains the discussion on the derivation of the *first* SUSY symmetry by imposing the appropriate SUSY restrictions on the anti-chiral supervariables. Our Sec. 4 is devoted to the derivation of the *second* SUSY symmetry from the SUSY restrictions on the chiral supervariables. In the forthcoming Sec. 5, we deal with the proof of nilpotency of the SUSY transformations and invariance of the Lagrangian in the language of supervariables (obtained after the imposition of the above SUSY invariant restrictions). Finally, we make some concluding remarks and point out a few future directions in our Sec. 6.

2 Preliminaries: General $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY QM system

Let us begin with the Lagrangian for the *general* $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY QM model as (see, e.g. [9])

$$L_0 = \frac{1}{2} \dot{x}^2 + i \bar{\psi} \dot{\psi} + W' A + \frac{1}{2} A^2 + W'' \bar{\psi} \psi, \quad (1)$$

where the dot and primes (i.e. $\dot{x} = dx/dt$, $\dot{\psi} = d\psi/dt$, $W'(x) = dW/dx$, $W'' = d^2W/dx^2$) are the notations for the time derivative and space derivatives, respectively. The evolution parameter in our theory is t and *classically* we have the absolute anticommutativity property ($\psi \bar{\psi} + \bar{\psi} \psi = 0$) between the fermionic ($\psi^2 = \bar{\psi}^2 = 0$) variables ψ and $\bar{\psi}$. The superpotential $W(x)$ is only a function of $x(t)$ and is *not* explicitly dependent on the evolution parameter t . This function is arbitrary for the case of general $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY QM model and the auxiliary variable $A(t)$ is connected (i.e. $A(t) = -W'(x)$) with the space derivative on the superpotential $W(x)$. The above Lagrangian is actually derived from the general $\mathcal{N} = 2$ superspace approach (see, e.g. [10,11] for details) to SUSY quantum mechanics.

Our theory being $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY QM model, we have the following *two* nilpotent ($s_1^2 = s_2^2 = 0$) fermionic SUSY transformations s_1 and s_2 (see, e.g. [9]):

$$\begin{aligned} s_1 x &= i \psi, & s_1 \psi &= 0, & s_1 \bar{\psi} &= -(\dot{x} + i A), & s_1 A &= -\dot{\psi}, \\ s_2 x &= i \bar{\psi}, & s_2 \bar{\psi} &= 0, & s_2 \psi &= -(\dot{x} - i A), & s_2 A &= \dot{\bar{\psi}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

under which the Lagrangian (1) transforms to the total time derivatives, as:

$$s_1 L_0 = \frac{d}{dt} [-W' \psi], \quad s_2 L_0 = \frac{d}{dt} [i \bar{\psi}(\dot{x} - i A) + \bar{\psi} W']. \quad (3)$$

As a consequence, the action integral ($S = \int dt L_0$) remains invariant (due to Gauss's divergence theorem) under the above SUSY symmetry transformations s_1 and s_2 . It should be noted that s_1 and s_2 are off-shell nilpotent ($s_1^2 = s_2^2 = 0$) because we do *not* use *anywhere* the following Euler-Lagrange (EL) equations of motion:

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{x} &= W'' A + W''' \bar{\psi} \psi, & \ddot{\psi} + (W'')^2 \psi - i W''' \dot{x} \psi &= 0, & A &= -W', \\ \ddot{\bar{\psi}} + (W'')^2 \bar{\psi} + i W''' \dot{x} \bar{\psi} &= 0, & \dot{\psi} &= i W'' \psi, & \dot{\bar{\psi}} &= -i W'' \bar{\psi}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

in the proof of nilpotency. The above EL equations of motion emerge from the Lagrangian (1) of our theory when we demand the least action principle.

According to Noether's theorem, the invariance of the action integral ($S = \int dt L_0$) under s_1 and s_2 leads to the derivation of the conserved charges as

$$Q = (i\dot{x} - A)\psi \equiv (ip - A)\psi, \quad \bar{Q} = \bar{\psi}(i\dot{x} + A) \equiv \bar{\psi}(ip + A), \quad (5)$$

where $p = \dot{x}$ is the momentum corresponding to the bosonic variable. These charges turn out to be the generators of transformations s_1 and s_2 because we have the following:

$$s_1 \Phi = -i[\Phi, Q]_{\pm}, \quad s_2 \Phi = -i[\Phi, \bar{Q}]_{\pm}, \quad \Phi = x, \psi, \bar{\psi}, \quad (6)$$

where the subscripts (\pm) , on the square bracket, correspond to the (anti)commutator for the generic variable Φ being (fermionic)bosonic in nature. The above charges Q and \bar{Q} are conserved ($\dot{Q} = \dot{\bar{Q}} = 0$) as can be directly checked by using the EL equations of motion (4). They are also the generator of transformations s_1 and s_2 . In the proof of the sanctity of (6), we have to use the basic *quantum* brackets $[x, p] = i$, $\{\psi, \bar{\psi}\} = -1$.

One of the decisive features of the general $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY QM model is the observation that the anticommutator of s_1 and s_2 is *not* zero and it must generate the time translation. This can be checked to be true in our theory as we have the following:

$$\{s_1, s_2\} \Phi = s_{\omega} \Phi = (-2i)\dot{\Phi}, \quad s_{\omega} = \{s_1, s_2\}, \quad \Phi = x, \psi, \bar{\psi}, A, W', W''. \quad (7)$$

The above equation establishes that the two successive operations of SUSY transformations s_1 and s_2 leads to the time derivative on a specific variable of the theory [modulo a factor of $-2i$]. Thus, we have the continuous symmetry transformation s_{ω} [modulo a factor $(-2i)$] under which the Lagrangian L_0 transforms as

$$s_{\omega} L_0 = (s_1 s_2 + s_2 s_1) L_0 = \frac{dL_0}{dt}, \quad (8)$$

thereby keeping the action integral invariant. According to Noether's theorem, this transformation, too, results in the derivation of a conserved charges Q_{ω} as:

$$Q_{\omega} = \frac{p^2}{2} - \frac{1}{2}A^2 - AW' - W''\bar{\psi}\psi \equiv H, \quad (9)$$

where H is the Hamiltonian of the theory. It can be readily checked that one of the specific forms of the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY QM algebra: $Q^2 = 0$, $\bar{Q}^2 = 0$, $\{Q, \bar{Q}\} = H$, $[H, Q] = [H, \bar{Q}] = 0$ is satisfied by the generators of the above *three* continuous symmetry transformations (s_1, s_2, s_{ω}) if we modify the basic SUSY transformations s_1 and s_2 by a constant numerical factor (see, e.g. [8,9] for details). There is no central extension in the above algebra. This is why the above algebra is a very specific algebra of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY quantum mechanics.

3 Off-shell nilpotent SUSY symmetry transformations: anti-chiral supervariables

It is clear from (8) that the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY transformations s_1 and s_2 are *not* absolutely anticommuting. Thus, to derive the SUSY transformations s_1 , we have to concentrate on

the (1, 1)-dimensional super-submanifold (of the general (1, 2)-dimensional supermanifold) that is parametrized by the superspace variables $(t, \bar{\theta})$. We have to impose SUSY invariant restrictions on the anti-chiral supervariables which are function of $(t, \bar{\theta})$ *only*. The first step towards our main goal of deriving s_1 is to generalize all the ordinary (explicitly time-dependent) variables [cf. (1)] to their counterpart supervariables as[†]

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &\longrightarrow X(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\theta=0} \equiv X(t, \bar{\theta}) = x(t) + \bar{\theta} f_1(t), \\ \psi(t) &\longrightarrow \Psi(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\theta=0} \equiv \Psi(t, \bar{\theta}) = \psi(t) + i \bar{\theta} b_1(t), \\ \bar{\psi}(t) &\longrightarrow \bar{\Psi}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\theta=0} \equiv \bar{\Psi}(t, \bar{\theta}) = \bar{\psi}(t) + i \bar{\theta} b_2(t), \\ A(t) &\longrightarrow \tilde{A}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\theta=0} \equiv \tilde{A}(t, \bar{\theta}) = A(t) + \bar{\theta} f_2(t), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the pair of secondary variables (b_1, b_2) and (f_1, f_2) are bosonic and fermionic in nature, respectively. We also observe that the total number of bosonic (x, A, b_1, b_2) and fermionic $(\psi, \bar{\psi}, f_1, f_2)$ variables (and their corresponding degrees of freedom) do match which is one of the basic requirements of a general SUSY theory.

It is obvious from (2) that $s_1 \psi = 0$. Hence, the fermionic variable ψ is a SUSY invariant quantity under s_1 [‡]. We demand that this quantity should remain independent of the “soul” variable $\bar{\theta}$. As a consequence, we have the SUSY invariant restriction

$$\Psi(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\theta=0} \equiv \Psi(t, \bar{\theta}) = \psi(t) \quad \implies \quad b_1(t) = 0. \quad (11)$$

Furthermore, we note that $s_1(x\psi) = 0$ and $s_1(\dot{x}\psi) = 0$ (primarily due to the fermionic nature of ψ where $\psi^2 = 0$). Thus, we *also* have the other SUSY restrictions as

$$X(t, \bar{\theta}) \Psi(t, \bar{\theta}) = x(t) \psi(t), \quad \dot{X}(t, \bar{\theta}) \Psi(t, \bar{\theta}) = \dot{x}(t) \psi(t). \quad (12)$$

Using the result from (11), we obtain (from the above SUSY restrictions) the following:

$$f_1(t) \psi(t) = 0, \quad \dot{f}_1(t) \psi(t) = 0. \quad (13)$$

The non-trivial solution of the above restrictions is $f_1(t) \propto \psi(t)$. For the algebraic convenience, however, we choose $f_1(t) = i \psi(t)$.

A close look at the transformations (2) shows that the nilpotency of s_1 [i.e. $s_1^2 \bar{\psi} = -s_1(\dot{x} + i A) = 0$] implies that we have a SUSY invariant quantity $(\dot{x} + i A)$ under s_1 . Thus, we impose the following SUSY restriction

$$\dot{X}(t, \bar{\theta}) + i \tilde{A}(t, \bar{\theta}) = \dot{x}(t) + i A(t), \quad (14)$$

which leads to the relationship $f_2 + \dot{\psi} = 0$. This implies that $f_2 = -\dot{\psi}$. Finally, from the symmetry invariance of L_0 , we observe that the following specific combination

$$s_1 \left[\frac{1}{2} \dot{x}^2(t) + i \bar{\psi}(t) \dot{\psi}(t) + \frac{1}{2} A^2(t) \right] = 0, \quad (15)$$

[†]The expansion (10) should be contrasted with the expansions that are used in the context of BRST formalism where the superfields are expanded, in their full blaze of glory, along all the Grassmannian directions $(1, \theta, \bar{\theta}, \theta\bar{\theta})$ of the (D, 2)-dimensional superfield for a given D-dimensional gauge theory [3-7].

[‡]In the augmented versions of superfield formalism [5-7], the gauge invariant (physical) quantities are taken to be independent of the “soul” (i.e. Grassmannian) variables because the latter are merely a mathematical artifact and they have no physical realizations. This idea has been promoted in our SUSY invariant theory where we have tapped the potential and power of SUSY invariant restrictions.

is a SUSY invariant quantity. Thus, we have the following SUSY restriction:

$$\frac{1}{2} \dot{X}^2(t, \bar{\theta}) + i \bar{\Psi}(t, \bar{\theta}) \dot{\Psi}(t, \bar{\theta}) + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{A}^2(t, \bar{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2} \dot{x}^2(t) + i \bar{\psi}(t) \dot{\psi}(t) + \frac{1}{2} A^2(t). \quad (16)$$

The above restriction leads to the following relationship

$$\dot{x} f_1 - b_2 \dot{\psi} + f_2 A = 0. \quad (17)$$

The substitution of $f_1 = i \psi$ and $f_2 = -\dot{\psi}$ in the above, implies the following

$$b_2 = i \dot{x} - A. \quad (18)$$

We conclude that the SUSY restrictions (11), (12), (14) and (16) lead to the following expansions of the anti-chiral supervariables [cf. (10)] as:

$$\begin{aligned} X^{(1)}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\theta=0} &\equiv X^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) = x(t) + \bar{\theta}(i\psi) \equiv x(t) + \bar{\theta}(s_1 x), \\ \Psi^{(1)}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\theta=0} &\equiv \Psi^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) = \psi(t) + \bar{\theta}(0) \equiv \psi(t) + \bar{\theta}(s_1 \psi), \\ \bar{\Psi}^{(1)}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\theta=0} &\equiv \bar{\Psi}^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) = \bar{\psi}(t) + \bar{\theta}(-\dot{x} - iA) \equiv \bar{\psi}(t) + \bar{\theta}(s_1 \bar{\psi}), \\ \tilde{A}^{(1)}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\theta=0} &\equiv \tilde{A}^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) = A(t) + \bar{\theta}(-\dot{\psi}) \equiv A(t) + \bar{\theta}(s_1 A). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Here the superscript (1) denotes the expansion of supervariables after SUSY restrictions. Thus, we have derived the SUSY transformations s_1 [cf. (2)] in a very clear fashion using the SUSY invariant restrictions on the anti-chiral supervariables.

From the expansion (19), it is clear that we have the following relationship[§] between the Grassmannian derivative $\partial_{\bar{\theta}}$ and the SUSY transformations s_1 , namely;

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} \Omega^{(1)}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\theta=0} \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} \Omega^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) = s_1 \Omega(t), \quad (20)$$

where $\Omega^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta})$ is the generic supervariable obtained after the application of SUSY restriction and $\Omega(t)$ is generic variable in the one $(0 + 1)$ -dimensional ordinary space. Geometrically, it is clear that the SUSY transformations (s_1) for a generic one $(0 + 1)$ -dimensional variable $\Omega(t)$ is equivalent to the translation of its corresponding supervariable $\Omega^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta})$ along the $\bar{\theta}$ -direction of super-submanifold where the anti-chiral supervariables are defined. In view of the definition of the generator (i.e. $s_1 \Phi = -i[\Phi, Q]_{\pm}$), it is obvious that the translational generator $\partial_{\bar{\theta}}$, along the $\bar{\theta}$ -direction of the $(1, 1)$ -dimensional anti-chiral super-submanifold, is *also* connected with the super charge Q . Finally, we have the mapping $\partial_{\bar{\theta}} \leftrightarrow s_1 \leftrightarrow Q$ where the nilpotency property of the operators $(s_1, Q, \partial_{\bar{\theta}})$ is intertwined in a beautiful fashion as they are inter-dependent on one-another.

[§]The generic supervariable $\Omega^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta})$ is actually the anti-chiral limit of the general supervariable $\Omega^{(1)}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})$ [i.e. $\Omega^{(1)}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\theta=0} \equiv \Omega^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta})$]. This is precisely the reason that we have continued with the partial nature of the derivative $\partial_{\bar{\theta}}$ and have not taken the total derivative (i.e. $d/d\bar{\theta}$) w.r.t. $\bar{\theta}$.

4 Off-shell nilpotent SUSY symmetry transformations: chiral supervariables

To derive the SUSY transformations s_2 , we focus on the chiral super-submanifold (of the general (1, 2)-dimensional supermanifold) which is parametrized by the superspace variables (t, θ) . The basic and auxiliary variables of Lagrangian (1) are, first of all, generalized onto the (1, 1)-dimensional chiral super-submanifold as:

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &\longrightarrow X(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\bar{\theta}=0} \equiv X(t, \theta) = x(t) + \theta \bar{f}_1(t), \\ \psi(t) &\longrightarrow \Psi(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\bar{\theta}=0} \equiv \Psi(t, \theta) = \psi(t) + i\theta \bar{b}_1(t), \\ \bar{\psi}(t) &\longrightarrow \bar{\Psi}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\bar{\theta}=0} \equiv \bar{\Psi}(t, \theta) = \bar{\psi}(t) + i\theta \bar{b}_2(t), \\ A(t) &\longrightarrow \tilde{A}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\bar{\theta}=0} \equiv \tilde{A}(t, \theta) = A(t) + \theta \bar{f}_2(t), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where the secondary variables (\bar{f}_1, \bar{f}_2) are fermionic and their counterparts (\bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2) are bosonic in nature. On the r.h.s. of (21), we observe that the fermionic $(\bar{f}_1, \bar{f}_2, \psi, \bar{\psi})$ degrees of freedom match with the bosonic $(\bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, x, A)$ degrees of freedom. Thus, there is a perfect $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetry in our present theory.

The above secondary variables $(\bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \bar{f}_1, \bar{f}_2)$ can be determined in terms of the basic variables if we impose the proper SUSY invariant restrictions on the chiral supervariables. For instance, we observe that $s_2 \bar{\psi} = 0$. Thus, we impose the SUSY restriction

$$\bar{\Psi}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\bar{\theta}=0} \equiv \bar{\Psi}(t, \theta) = \bar{\psi}(t) \implies \bar{b}_2(t) = 0. \quad (22)$$

We also observe that $s_2(x\bar{\psi}) = 0$, $s_2(\dot{x}\bar{\psi}) = 0$ because of the fermionic nature of $\bar{\psi}$ (where $\bar{\psi}^2 = 0$, $d/dt[\bar{\psi}^2] = \dot{\bar{\psi}}\bar{\psi} = 0$). As a result, we have the following two SUSY restrictions on the composite chiral supervariables:

$$X(t, \theta) \bar{\Psi}(t, \theta) = x(t) \bar{\psi}(t), \quad \dot{X}(t, \theta) \bar{\Psi}(t, \theta) = \dot{x}(t) \bar{\psi}(t). \quad (23)$$

With the help from (22), we find that

$$\bar{f}_1(t) \bar{\psi}(t) = 0, \quad \dot{\bar{f}}_1(t) \bar{\psi}(t) = 0. \quad (24)$$

The non-trivial solution of the above is $\bar{f}_1 = i\bar{\psi}$. We have taken i factor for the algebraic convenience which will become clear later.

To determine all the secondary variables, we note further that $s_2[\dot{x}(t) - iA(t)] = 0$. This invariance emerges from the nilpotency of s_2 because we observe that $s_2^2\psi = s_2(-[\dot{x} - iA]) = 0$ in equation (2). This shows that $(\dot{x} - iA)$ is a SUSY invariant quantity. Thus, we have the following SUSY invariant restriction on the chiral supervariables:

$$\dot{X}(t, \theta) - i\tilde{A}(t, \theta) = \dot{x}(t) - iA(t). \quad (25)$$

The above condition yields $\bar{f}_2 = \dot{\bar{\psi}}$. A part of the modified form of Lagrangian (1) also remains invariant under s_2 . In fact, we note that the following sum of the composite terms are invariant under s_2 , namely;

$$s_2 \left[\frac{1}{2} \dot{x}^2(t) - i\dot{\bar{\psi}}(t) \psi(t) + \frac{1}{2} A^2(t) \right] = 0. \quad (26)$$

Thus, we have the following SUSY restriction on the composite chiral supervariables:

$$\frac{1}{2} \dot{X}^2(t, \theta) - i \dot{\Psi}(t, \theta) \Psi(t, \theta) + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{A}^2(t, \theta) = \frac{1}{2} \dot{x}^2(t) - i \dot{\psi}(t) \psi(t) + \frac{1}{2} A^2(t), \quad (27)$$

which leads to the determination of $\bar{b}_1 = i\dot{x} + A$.

Plugging in the value $\bar{f}_1 = i\bar{\psi}$, $\bar{b}_2 = 0$, $\bar{f}_2 = \dot{\bar{\psi}}$ and $\bar{b}_1 = i\dot{x} + A$, we obtain the following expansions (which encompass the transformations s_2 in a subtle way):

$$\begin{aligned} X^{(2)}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\bar{\theta}=0} &\equiv X^{(2)}(t, \theta) = x(t) + \theta(i\bar{\psi}) \equiv x(t) + \theta(s_2 x), \\ \Psi^{(2)}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\bar{\theta}=0} &\equiv \Psi^{(2)}(t, \theta) = \psi(t) + \theta(-\dot{x} + iA) \equiv \psi(t) + \theta(s_2 \psi), \\ \bar{\Psi}^{(2)}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\bar{\theta}=0} &\equiv \bar{\Psi}^{(2)}(t, \theta) = \bar{\psi}(t) + \theta(0) \equiv \bar{\psi}(t) + \theta(s_2 \bar{\psi}), \\ \tilde{A}^{(2)}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\bar{\theta}=0} &\equiv \tilde{A}^{(2)}(t, \theta) = A(t) + \theta(\dot{\bar{\psi}}) \equiv A(t) + \theta(s_2 A). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Furthermore, we have found that the following relationship is true, namely;

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \Omega^{(2)}(t, \theta, \bar{\theta})|_{\bar{\theta}=0} \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \Omega^{(2)}(t, \theta) = s_2 \Omega(t). \quad (29)$$

The above relation demonstrates that the translation of the generic chiral supervariable $\Omega^{(2)}(t, \theta) \equiv X^{(2)}(t, \theta)$, $\Psi^{(2)}(t, \theta)$, $\bar{\Psi}^{(2)}(t, \theta)$, $\tilde{A}^{(2)}(t, \theta)$ along the Grassmannian direction θ of the chiral (1, 1)-dimensional super-submanifold generates the SUSY transformations s_2 on the 1D ordinary generic variable $\Omega(t)$ [cf. (1)]. However, as we know from (6), \bar{Q} is also the generator of s_2 because $s_2 \Omega = -i[\Omega, \bar{Q}]_{\pm}$. Thus, we conclude that the following mapping

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \leftrightarrow s_2 \leftrightarrow \bar{Q}, \quad (30)$$

exists amongst the translation generator (∂_θ), symmetry transformation (s_2) and conserved charge \bar{Q} . The nilpotency of s_2 (i.e. $s_2^2 = 0$) is also encoded in the nilpotency of SUSY charge \bar{Q} which, in turn, is deeply related to the nilpotency ($\partial_\theta^2 = 0$) of the Grassmannian derivative (∂_θ). Thus, the nilpotency of ($s_2, \bar{Q}, \partial_\theta$) are inter-related. Within the framework of supervariable approach, the nilpotency of s_2 and \bar{Q} is encoded in the two successive translations along θ -direction [cf. (29), (30)].

5 Symmetry invariance and off-shell nilpotency: supervariable approach

In this section, we capture the symmetry invariance of the Lagrangian under SUSY transformations s_1 and s_2 and the off-shell nilpotency of the charges Q and \bar{Q} in the language of supervariables obtained after the application of SUSY invariant restrictions. Using the expansion (19), it can be seen that the Lagrangian (1) can be generalized [onto (1, 1)-dimensional chiral super-submanifold] in terms of the anti-chiral supervariables as:

$$\begin{aligned} L_0 \implies \tilde{L}_0^{(ac)} &= \frac{1}{2} \dot{X}^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) \dot{X}^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) + i \bar{\Psi}^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) \dot{\Psi}^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{A}^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) \dot{\tilde{A}}^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) \\ &+ \tilde{W}'(X^{(1)}) \tilde{A}^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) + \tilde{W}''(X^{(1)}) \bar{\Psi}^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) \Psi^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where the superscript (ac) denotes the expression for the Lagrangian in terms of the anti-chiral supervariables. It can be checked explicitly that:

$$\tilde{W}'(X^{(1)}) = W'(x) + \bar{\theta} \left[i W''(x) \psi(t) \right], \quad \tilde{W}''(X^{(1)}) = W''(x) + \bar{\theta} \left[i W'''(x) \psi(t) \right], \quad (32)$$

where we have used the Taylor expansion for $X^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) = x(t) + i \bar{\theta} \psi(t) \equiv x(t) + s_1 x(t)$. In view of the mapping $s_1 \leftrightarrow \partial_{\bar{\theta}}$ [cf. (20)], we note that the invariance of the Lagrangian (1) under s_1 can be expressed in the following fashion as the Grassmannian derivative on $\tilde{L}_0^{(ac)}$:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} \tilde{L}_0^{(ac)} = \frac{d}{dt} \left[-W' \psi \right] \iff s_1 L_0 = \frac{d}{dt} \left[-W' \psi \right]. \quad (33)$$

Geometrically, the invariance $s_1 L_0 = d/dt (-W' \psi)$ can be explained in the following manner (in the language of the supervariables obtained after the application of SUSY restrictions [cf. (20)]). The translation of the super Lagrangian (31) along the direction of $\bar{\theta}$ is such that the result is a total derivative. In other words, the super Lagrangian (31) is a combination of composite supervariables, obtained after the application of SUSY restrictions, such that its translation along $\bar{\theta}$ -direction of the $(1, 1)$ -dimensional super-submanifold produces a result which is nothing but the total time derivative (that is equal to $s_1 L_0$).

In exactly similar fashion, the starting Lagrangian (1) can *also* be expressed in terms of the chiral supervariables, obtained after SUSY restrictions [cf. (28)], as

$$\begin{aligned} L_0 \implies \tilde{L}_0^{(c)} &= \frac{1}{2} \dot{X}^{(2)}(t, \theta) \dot{X}^{(2)}(t, \theta) + i \bar{\Psi}^{(2)}(t, \theta) \dot{\Psi}^{(2)}(t, \theta) + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{A}^{(2)}(t, \theta) \tilde{A}^{(2)}(t, \theta) \\ &+ \tilde{W}'(X^{(2)}) \tilde{A}^{(2)}(t, \theta) + \tilde{W}''(X^{(2)}) \bar{\Psi}^{(2)}(t, \theta) \Psi^{(2)}(t, \theta), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where $\tilde{W}'(X^{(2)})$ and $\tilde{W}''(X^{(2)})$ have the same expansions as quoted in (32) with the replacements: $\bar{\theta} \rightarrow \theta$ and $\psi \rightarrow \bar{\psi}$. The invariance of the original Lagrangian (1) under s_2 can be captured in the following fashion:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \tilde{L}_0^{(c)} = \frac{d}{dt} \left[i \bar{\psi} (\dot{x} - iA - iW') \right] \iff s_2 L_0 = \frac{d}{dt} \left[i \bar{\psi} (\dot{x} - iA - iW') \right]. \quad (35)$$

Geometrically, the SUSY invariance of Lagrangian (1), is equivalent to the translation of the composite supervariables present in $\tilde{L}_0^{(c)}$ [cf. (34)] such that the outcome of the translation is a total derivative. Finally, we observe that the action integral can be expressed as:

$$S = \int dt L_0 \longleftrightarrow S = \int dt \tilde{L}_0^{(ac)} \longleftrightarrow S = \int dt \tilde{L}_0^{(c)}, \quad (36)$$

which is self-evident from (31) and (34) because we observe that $\tilde{L}_0^{(ac)} = L_0 + \bar{\theta} \frac{d}{dt} \left[-W' \psi \right]$ and $\tilde{L}_0^{(c)} = L_0 + \theta \frac{d}{dt} \left[i \bar{\psi} (\dot{x} - iA - iW') \right]$. Thus, the inter-relationships, given in (36), are correct because the total derivatives vanish due to Gauss's divergence theorem.

We can express the supercharge Q in terms of the supervariables, obtained after the application of SUSY restrictions, in two different ways as:

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\theta}} \left[-i \bar{\Psi}^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) \Psi^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) \right] \equiv \int d\bar{\theta} \left[-i \bar{\Psi}^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) \Psi^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) \right], \\ Q &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left[(\dot{x} + iA) X^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) \right] \equiv \int d\bar{\theta} \left[(\dot{x} + iA) X^{(1)}(t, \bar{\theta}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

In view of the mappings (20) and (29), the above charges can be *also* expressed as follows:

$$Q = s_1 \left[-i \bar{\psi} \psi \right], \quad Q = s_1 \left[(\dot{x} + i A) x \right], \quad (38)$$

which prove the nilpotency of the charge Q in the language of the nilpotency of transformations (2) as well as in terms of the nilpotency ($\partial_\theta^2 = 0$) of the translational generator ($\partial_{\bar{\theta}}$). Thus can be seen by $s_1 Q = -i \{Q, Q\} = 0$ and $\partial_{\bar{\theta}} Q = 0$.

In exactly similar fashion, we can express the supercharge \bar{Q} in terms of the supervariables (28), obtained after the application of SUSY invariant restrictions, in two different ways as illustrated below:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Q} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left[i \bar{\Psi}^{(2)}(t, \theta) \Psi^{(2)}(t, \theta) \right] \equiv \int d\theta \left[i \bar{\Psi}^{(2)}(t, \theta) \Psi^{(2)}(t, \theta) \right], \\ \bar{Q} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left[(\dot{x} - i A) X^{(2)}(t, \theta) \right] \equiv \int d\theta \left[(\dot{x} - i A) X^{(2)}(t, \theta) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

The above relationships can be re-expressed in terms of the ordinary 1D variables and transformations s_2 of (2) as follows

$$\bar{Q} = s_2 \left[i \bar{\psi} \psi \right], \quad \bar{Q} = s_2 \left[(\dot{x} - i A) x \right], \quad (40)$$

which establish the nilpotency of \bar{Q} in the ordinary space due to $s_2 \bar{Q} = -i \{\bar{Q}, \bar{Q}\} = 0$. In the superspace, we observe that $\partial_\theta \bar{Q} = 0$ due to the nilpotency of translational generator ∂_θ ($\partial_\theta^2 = 0$) along the Grassmannian direction θ of the (1, 1)-dimensional chiral supermanifold. Hence, we have proven the nilpotency in a clear fashion.

6 Conclusions

The main result of our present investigation is the derivation of the full set of off-shell nilpotent SUSY symmetries (s_1 and s_2) [cf. (2)] for the general $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY QM model with any arbitrary superpotential ($W(x)$) using the supervariable approach. We have defined the supervariables [corresponding to the 1D ordinary variables of Lagrangian (1)] on the (1, 1)-dimensional (anti-)chiral super-submanifolds of the general (1, 2)-dimensional supermanifold. It is the strength of the SUSY invariant restrictions on the (anti-)chiral supervariables that we have been able to derive the above SUSY transformations s_1 and s_2 . Primarily, we have demanded that the SUSY invariant 1D quantities must remain independent of the “soul” coordinates θ and $\bar{\theta}$ when these are generalized onto the appropriate supermanifold. This requirement is physically cogent and appealing.

Geometrically, we have shown that the translation of the supervariables, obtained after the application of SUSY invariant restrictions, along the Grassmannian directions θ and $\bar{\theta}$ produces the SUSY transformations s_1 and s_2 (cf. Sec. 3 and 4). The nilpotency of s_1 and s_2 are deeply connected with two successive translations along the Grassmannian directions θ and $\bar{\theta}$ which are generated by the nilpotent ($\partial_\theta^2 = \partial_{\bar{\theta}}^2 = 0$) translational generators $\partial_{\bar{\theta}}$ and ∂_θ on the (anti-)chiral (1, 1)-dimensional super-submanifold. The symmetry invariance of Lagrangian, under s_1 and s_2 , is connected with the translation of some combination

of the composite supervariables (obtained after SUSY invariant restrictions) along θ and $\bar{\theta}$ -directions such that the outcome of this translation is a total time derivative.

We hope to extend our analysis in the context of $\mathcal{N} = 2$ and $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SUSY Yang-Mills gauge theories which are deeply connected with the modern developments in (super)string theories (and extended objects related with it). Furthermore, it would be worthwhile to take some explicit examples of the physically interesting superpotential $W(x)$ [cf. (1)] and discuss, in detail, the phenomenological implications of this analysis. These are some of the problems under consideration and our results would be reported elsewhere [12].

Acknowledgements

Two of us (SK and AS) would like to gratefully acknowledge the financial support from UGC and CSIR, Government of India, New Delhi, under their SRF-schemes.

References

- [1] J. Thierry-Mieg, *J. Math. Phys.* **21**, 2834 (1980)
- [2] M. Quiros, F. J. de Urries, J. Hoyos, M. L. Mazon and E. Rodrigues, *J. Math. Phys.* **22**, 1767 (1981)
- [3] L. Bonora and M. Tonin, *Phys. Lett. B* **98**, 48 (1981)
- [4] R. Delbourgo and P. D. Jarvis, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **15**, 611 (1981)
- [5] R. P. Malik, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **45**, 513 (2006)
- [6] R. P. Malik, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **47**, 227 (2006)
- [7] R. P. Malik, *J. Phys. A* **40**, 4877 (2007)
- [8] S. Krishna, A. Shukla and R. P. Malik, arXiv: 1308.5328 [hep-th]
- [9] R. Kumar and R. P. Malik, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73**, 2514 (2013)
- [10] See, e.g., F. Cooper and B. Freedman *Ann. Phys.* **146**, 262 (1983)
- [11] See, e.g., A. Lahiri, P. K. Roy and B. Bagchi, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **5**, 1383 (1990)
- [12] R. P. Malik, *etal.*, in preparation