

Theory of supersymmetry “protected” topological phases of isostatic lattices and highly frustrated magnets

Michael J. Lawler^{1,2}

¹*Department of Physics, Binghamton University, Binghamton, NY, 13902, USA.*

²*Laboratory of Atomic And Solid State Physics, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA.*

(Dated: Sept 17th, 2015)

I generalize the theory of phonon topological band structures of isostatic lattices to highly frustrated antiferromagnets. I achieve this with a discovery of a many-body supersymmetry (SUSY) in the phonon problem of balls and springs which also applies to geometrically frustrated magnets. The Witten index of the SUSY model, when restricted to the single body problem (meaningful for linearized phonons), is then shown to be the Calladine-Kane-Lubensky index of mechanical structures that forms the cornerstone of the phonon topological band structure theory. “Spontaneous supersymmetry breaking” is then identified as the need to gap all modes in the bulk to create the topological state. The many-body SUSY formulation shows that the topology is not restricted to a band structure problem but extends to systems of coupled bosons and fermions that are in principle also realizable in solid state systems. The analogous supersymmetry of the magnon problem turns out to be particularly useful for highly frustrated magnets with the kagome family of antiferromagnets an analog of topological isostatic lattices. Thus, a solid state realization of the theory of phonon topological band structure may be found in highly frustrated magnets. However, our results show that this topology is protected not by any fundamental symmetry of a condensed matter system but instead by the extent to which a material’s behavior is describable by a commonly used toy model such as balls and springs or quadratic spin exchange which have the hidden supersymmetry.

Recently, Kane and Lubensky¹ (KL) identified topological properties of isostatic lattice phonons. They achieved this using a topological index of mechanical structures built on Calladine’s work² and a Dirac-like square-root of the phonon equations of motion, a problem to which they could apply the theory of topological insulators. Remarkably, they showed the existence of lattices with gapped phonons for periodic boundary conditions that must have gapless phonons with open boundary conditions. It is natural to wonder if this striking effect is more general and they conclude their study with “Finally, it will be interesting to explore connections with theories of frustrated magnetism⁴⁸.” where reference 48 is my study³ identifying topological gauge dynamics of the zero modes of classical kagome antiferromagnets. This paper’s goal is to make this connection and use it to generalize KL theory beyond phonons.

The KL theory of isostatic lattices is a different branch of topological phases from the theory of topological band insulators. Following the original discovery of topological insulators, topological properties of boson band structures have been studied for a wide variety of systems including phonons^{4,5}, photons⁶ and magnons^{7,8}. These systems achieve their topological properties in the presence of time reversal symmetry breaking and are built directly from the physics of the integer quantum Hall effect. In contrast, KL’s theory of isostatic phonons is time reversal symmetric and “purely geometric in nature”⁹. A connection to the integer quantum Hall effect is made only after a Dirac-like square-rooting procedure of the equations of motion. It therefore presents a new direction in the theory of topological phases.

Remarkably, though its direct application to solid state phonons is unlikely because they are mechanically stable,

the KL theory has already seen a variety of applications due to its development of the general theory of mechanical collapse. These include jamming and rigidity percolation transitions¹⁰, metamaterials made from beams and pins¹¹, acoustic phononic crystals¹² and, remarkably, origami¹³. So, given the fundamental insight it provides, any extension of KL theory to a new class of systems is likely to reveal new phenomena in those systems.

In this light, frustrated magnets and/or highly frustrated magnets are a prime target for an extension of KL theory. They are magnets not only “on the verge of collapse” but also those that have already “collapsed”. Here collapsing is the analog of destabilizing the magnetic ordered state into a paramagnetic state such as classical or quantum spin liquids, spin glass, spin nematics, valence bond solids, etc. A variety of materials including the organics, kagome family and pyrochlores are heavily studied for this reason¹⁴. In addition, highly geometrically frustrated magnets have a form of accidental degeneracy that results from a special feature of the spin Hamiltonian¹⁵. This frustration is toy-like perhaps in a similar way that balls and springs are toy-like versions of a general theory of phonons and suggests a closer connection between the two systems than may at first appear. So if KL theory were applicable to frustrated magnets, it might apply to many already realized solid state materials.

We show that the key to generalizing KL theory to other systems lies in a remarkable many-body supersymmetric structure that extends the description of balls and springs. The new fermionic degrees of freedom, that I dub “phoninos”, are superpartners to phonons and are governed by the KL theory’s square-rooted equations of motion. For linearized phonons, the two sets of degrees of

freedom are decoupled. The phoninos therefore need not be real degrees of freedom but just reflect the specialness of balls and springs compared to a more general theory of phonons. I then show that the topological index identified in KL theory is the Witten index¹⁶ of supersymmetry restricted to the single body problem, a restriction meaningful for linearized phonons. “Spontaneous supersymmetry breaking” is then identified as the need to gap all modes in the bulk to create the topological state. Finally, the connection with a many-body supersymmetry shows that it is not merely a band-structure effect and can apply to systems of interacting particles.

I then apply the same supersymmetric many-body construction to the case of magnons of both ordinary and highly frustrated magnets. It turns out the supersymmetry is not compatible with linearization of ordinary magnons but is compatible for highly frustrated magnets. Remarkably, kagome magninos are governed by a Hamiltonian which is the Dirac’s “constraint matrix” studied in Ref. 3 and is related to the ordinary kagome magnon problem by supersymmetry. The single-body Witten index in this case is then shown to vanish for periodic boundary conditions but not open boundary conditions demonstrating that kagome magnons are the analog of the isostatic lattice of KL theory. We conclude with a discussion of what protects the topology of isostatic lattices and highly frustrated magnets and how it can be extended to a class of “supersymmetry” protected topological phases in the non-linear regime.

I. PHONON MODEL

There are many ways to describe phonons. Remarkably, the simplest picture, that of vibrations of balls connected to springs (in the classical limit), is endowed with a number of theoretical constructs that shed much light on their behavior. To begin with, this simplicity demands a specific form of their Hamiltonian. If we define the extension of spring labeled by the integer m to be e_m , then the most general form for an ideal balls and springs classical Hamiltonian is

$$H_{\text{phonon}} = \frac{1}{2} p_{i\alpha} m^{i\alpha, j\beta} p_{j\beta} + \frac{1}{2} e_m k^{mn} e_n \quad (1)$$

Here $p_{i\alpha}$ is the $\alpha = \{x, y, \dots\}$ component of the momentum of the ball labeled by i , $m^{i\alpha, j\beta}$ is the matrix inverse of the “mass tensor” $m_{i\alpha, j\beta}$, k^{mn} is the spring constant matrix and repeated indices are summed over. In the simplest setting, $m_{i\alpha, j\beta} = m \delta_{ij} \delta_{\alpha\beta}$ and $k^{mn} = k \delta^{mn}$ are proportional to identity matrices. Here we leave them in the general form to aid our study of the structure of the theory and not its application. The restriction of the Hamiltonian to that of balls and springs therefore introduces two (inverse) metrics k^{mn} and $m^{i\alpha, j\beta}$ in configuration space and momentum space respectively.

In the linearized phonon limit, there is also a matrix $A_{m, i\alpha}$ and an associated topological invariant. This matrix relates e_m to the displacements of each atom $u^{i\alpha}$

from their equilibrium positions via $e_m = A_{m, i\alpha} u^{i\alpha}$. This matrix also relates the forces $F^{i\alpha}$ to the tensions T^m in each spring via $F^{i\alpha} = A_{i\alpha, m}^T T^m$. The topological invariant associated with this matrix (which we will call the Calladine-Kane-Lubensky index²) is

$$\nu = dN_s - N_b \quad (2)$$

$$= (\text{rank}\mathbf{A} + \text{nullity}\mathbf{A}) - (\text{rank}\mathbf{A}^T + \text{nullity}\mathbf{A}^T) \quad (3)$$

$$= \text{nullity}\mathbf{A} - \text{nullity}\mathbf{A}^T \quad (4)$$

where d is the number of components α , N_s the number of sites, N_b the number of springs (bonds), $\text{nullity}\mathbf{M}$ denotes the dimension of the null space of \mathbf{M} and we have used $\text{rank}\mathbf{A} = \text{rank}\mathbf{A}^T$ by the fundamental theorem of linear algebra. This quantity relates the topology data of the system, d , N_s and N_b to the number of zero modes $N_0 = \text{nullity}\mathbf{A}$ and number of states of self stress $N_{ss} = \text{nullity}\mathbf{A}^T$. Here a zero mode is a vector $u_0^{i\alpha}$ that satisfies $e_m = A_{m, i\alpha} u_0^{i\alpha} = 0$ and a state of self stress is a vector of tensions T_0^m that satisfies $F^{i\alpha} = A_{i\alpha, m}^T T_0^m = 0$. This quantity is also topological in the sense that it doesn’t depend on the metrics $k^{m, n}$ and $m^{i\alpha, j\beta}$. So linearized balls and springs also have a natural topological invariant.

Kane and Lubensky argued that the topology inherent in ν can be understood by studying the Phonon’s Dirac-like square-rooted Hamiltonian matrix to which the theory of topological insulators can be applied. One form of this Hamiltonian is

$$\mathcal{H} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -m^{i\alpha, k\gamma} A_{k\gamma, n}^T \\ k^{m, p} A_{p, j\beta} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

Here I have taken the liberty to add a minus sign to Kane and Lubensky’s matrix and re-inserted $k^{m, n}$ and $m^{i\alpha, j\beta}$ which they set to identity matrices. This is so that squaring this matrix produces

$$\mathcal{H}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} -m^{i\alpha, k\gamma} A_{k\gamma, p}^T k^{p, q} A_{q, j\beta} & 0 \\ 0 & -k^{m, p} A_{p, k\gamma} m^{k\gamma, l\delta} A_{l\delta, n}^T \end{pmatrix} \quad (6)$$

where the upper left block defines the second order differential equation for the displacements

$$\ddot{u}^{i\alpha} = -m^{i\alpha, k\gamma} A_{k\gamma, p}^T k^{p, q} A_{q, j\beta} u^{j\beta} \quad (7)$$

The minus sign can easily be removed by multiplying \mathcal{H} by $\tau^z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ from the right. Since τ^z and \mathcal{H} anticommute, Kane and Lubensky also realized that the eigenvalue problem associated with this matrix is supersymmetric. We will discuss this point in more detail below.

This model helps us understand the importance of the topological index. If, for periodic boundary conditions, $\nu \neq 0$ then there must always be either a zero mode or a self stress mode. In the spectrum of \mathcal{H} there is no gap to the excitations. However, if $\nu = 0$ then we can always find an $A_{m, i\alpha}$ such that the gap disappears. In such a case, if we open the boundary conditions we will invariably find that $\nu \neq 0$ and so edge states must exist.

Finally, there is one more mathematical object useful for the study of phonons. To study the zero modes of this problem directly, we can follow Ref. 3 and view the Hamiltonian as energetically imposing constraints on the degrees of freedom. Here these constraints are simply $p_{i\alpha} = 0$ and $e_m = 0$ for if these conditions are met the Hamiltonian vanishes. In his development of constrained Hamiltonian mechanics, Dirac pointed out that an important object in the study of constraints in phase space is the constraint matrix which here takes the form:

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} \{p_{i\alpha}, p_{j\beta}\} & \{p_{i\alpha}, e_n\} \\ \{e_m, p_{j\beta}\} & \{e_m, e_n\} \end{pmatrix} \quad (8)$$

where $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ is the usual Poisson bracket of classical mechanics. A vector in the null space of this matrix is then either associated with a redundant constraint (when there are more constraint functions than necessary to constrain the variables) or with a zero mode coordinate that has no conjugate variable in the space of zero modes (gauge coordinate). If we expand the spring extensions e_m in terms of the displacements of the atoms from their equilibrium positions $u^{i\alpha}$ as $e_m = A_{m,i\alpha} u^{i\alpha}$ then the constraint matrix takes the form

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -A_{i\alpha,n}^T \\ A_{m,j\beta} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

Remarkably, in this form, \mathbf{C} is similar to the ‘‘square-rooted’’ Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} discussed above. If we work in Kane and Lubensky’s units where $k^{m,n} = \delta^{m,n}$ and $m^{i\alpha,j\beta} = \delta^{ij} \delta^{\alpha\beta}$ they are actually the same. We also see that the redundant constraints are associated with self stress modes living in the null space of $A_{i\alpha,m}^T$ and the gauge coordinates with the zero modes living in the null space of $A_{m,i\alpha}$. So the eigenvalue problem associated with Dirac’s constraint matrix here is closely related to the Dirac-like square-rooted phonon Hamiltonian!

Now the relationship between all of these mathematical objects, the metrics, the Hamiltonians, the $A_{m,i\alpha}$ matrix, and the constraint matrix are not so easily understood. They all clearly derive from the balls and springs construction. But how is the topological index dependent on the metrics? How is the constraint matrix C related to the square-rooted Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} ? In what way is the topology protected? Can these constructions be applied to other systems that are not balls and springs?

II. SUPERSYMMETRIC PHONONS

To address these questions, we will make a leap. We will promote this model to a classical supersymmetric model by extending its phase space to include a set of degrees of freedom γ^m and $\Gamma^{i\alpha}$ that we will call phonino modes. From this vantage point we will then look down on all the mathematical objects discussed previously and see if we can understand their relationships to each other.

To construct a supersymmetric model, we begin by defining the supersymmetric charge

$$Q = \Gamma^{i\alpha} p_{i\alpha} + \gamma^m e_m. \quad (10)$$

and through it a supersymmetric Hamiltonian

$$H_{SUSY} = \frac{1}{2} \{Q, Q\} = \gamma^m \{e_m, p_{i\alpha}\} \Gamma^{i\alpha} + \frac{1}{2} p_{i\alpha} \{\Gamma^{i\alpha}, \Gamma^{j\beta}\} p_{j\beta} + \frac{1}{2} e_m \{\gamma^m, \gamma^n\} e_n \quad (11)$$

where $\{f, g\}$ denotes a Poisson bracket. For this equation to be true, it is necessary for γ^m and $\Gamma^{i\alpha}$ to be Grassmann numbers so that Q is Grassmann odd and $\{Q, Q\}$ does not vanish by the normal antisymmetry of Poisson brackets. We also used $\{\Gamma^{i\alpha}, \gamma^m\} = \{p_{i\alpha}, p_{j\beta}\} = \{e_m, e_n\} = 0$. If we choose the remaining Poisson brackets to be

$$\{\Gamma^{i\alpha}, \Gamma^{j\beta}\} = m^{i\alpha,j\beta}, \quad \{\gamma^m, \gamma^n\} = k^{mn} \quad (12)$$

then we obtain the simple relation $H_{SUSY} = H_{phonino} + H_{phonon}$ where $H_{phonino}$ is the first term and the second and third terms make up H_{phonon} of Eq. 1. This defines the Poisson bracket to be¹⁷⁻¹⁹

$$\{f, g\} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial u^{i\alpha}} \frac{\partial g}{\partial p_{i\alpha}} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_{i\alpha}} \frac{\partial g}{\partial u^{i\alpha}} + f \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial \Gamma^{i\alpha}} m^{i\alpha,j\beta} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \Gamma^{j\beta}} + f \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial \gamma^m} k^{mn} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \gamma^n} \quad (13)$$

which is symmetric if f and g are both grassmann odd and antisymmetric otherwise. Finally, we see that $\{Q, H_{SUSY}\} = 0$ so the two observables form a closed superalgebra. So we can promote the phonon problem to a supersymmetric problem of bosonic phonons and fermionic phoninos where the phoninos satisfy a Clifford algebra with metrics k^{mn} and $m^{i\alpha,j\beta}$ and the phonino Hamiltonian is determined by the constraint matrix

$$H_{phonino} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma^{i\alpha} & \gamma_m \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{C} \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma^{j\beta} \\ \gamma_n \end{pmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

In the linearized limit the two Hamiltonians become

$$H_{phonon} = \frac{1}{2} p_{i\alpha} m^{i\alpha,j\beta} p_{j\beta} + \frac{1}{2} u^{i\alpha} A_{i\alpha,m}^T k^{mm'} A_{m',j\beta} u^{j\beta} \quad (15)$$

and

$$H_{phonino} = \gamma^m A_{m,i\alpha} \Gamma^{i\alpha} \quad (16)$$

where we used $\{p_{i\alpha}, u^{j\beta}\} = \delta_i^j \delta_\alpha^\beta$. In this limit then, the phonons and the phoninos are decoupled and the Hamiltonians are quadratic. We therefore have a model we can apply to real systems since it contains the correct phonon eigenvalue problem. It is less obvious, however, what connections we have made by introducing the phoninos.

III. THE SUSY EIGENVALUE PROBLEM

It remains then to solve the eigenvalue problems of H_{SUSY} and seek any implications it may have for the original phonon problem. To this end, we need to solve the corresponding equations of motion. The first order in time differential equations are, for the phonons:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{u}^{i\alpha} \\ \dot{p}_{i\alpha} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m^{i\alpha,j\beta} \\ -A_{i\alpha,m}^T k^{m,n} A_{n,j\beta} & \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u^{j\beta} \\ p_{j\beta} \end{pmatrix} \quad (17)$$

and the phoninos:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\Gamma}^{i\alpha} \\ \dot{\gamma}^m \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -m^{i\alpha,k\gamma} A_{k\gamma,n}^T \\ k^{m,p} A_{p,j\beta} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma^{j\beta} \\ \gamma^n \end{pmatrix} \quad (18)$$

So phonino equations of motion are given by square-rooted hamiltonian matrix \mathcal{H} . The constraint matrix \mathbf{C} and \mathcal{H} are therefore related in the supersymmetric model by one entering the Hamiltonian quadratic form and the other by the corresponding equations of motion.

We will also find it useful work with the second derivative in time equations of motion:

$$\ddot{u}^{i\alpha} = -m^{i\alpha,j\beta} A_{j\beta,m}^T k^{m,n} A_{n,k\gamma} u^{k\gamma} \quad (19)$$

$$\ddot{p}_{i\alpha} = -A_{i\alpha,m}^T k^{m,n} A_{n,j\beta} m^{j\beta,k\gamma} p_{k\gamma} \quad (20)$$

$$\ddot{\Gamma}^{i\alpha} = -m^{i\alpha,j\beta} A_{j\beta,m}^T k^{m,n} A_{n,k\gamma} \Gamma^{k\gamma} \quad (21)$$

$$\ddot{\gamma}^m = -k^{m,n} A_{n,i\alpha} m^{i\alpha,j\beta} A_{j\beta,p}^T \gamma^p \quad (22)$$

From these, we see that, $u^{i\alpha}$, $v^{i\alpha} = m^{i\alpha,j\beta} p_{j\beta}$ and $\Gamma^{i\alpha}$ all obey the same equations of motion. γ^m obeys a distinctly different equation. We also can determine that each equation has two types of eigenmodes. For the $u^{i\alpha}$ -type equations, all modes either have zero eigenvalue and are in the null space of $A_{m,i\alpha}$ or they have finite eigenvalues. There are no modes with zero eigenvalue that satisfy $A_{m,i\alpha} u^{i\alpha} \neq 0$. This is because such a mode would satisfy $g_m k^{m,n} g_n = 0$ with $g_m = A_{m,i\alpha} u^{i\alpha} \neq 0$ and violate the assumption that $k^{m,n}$ is a positive definite matrix. For a similar reason, the γ^m equation has two modes types, those with zero eigenvalue in the nullspace of $A_{i\alpha,m}^T$ and those with finite eigenvalues.

We can of course proceed by solving these equations separately, but this would not give us any insight into how the phoninos can help us understand the phonons. Instead, lets proceed by studying supersymmetry transformations and reduce the problem to solving only the parts not related by supersymmetry.

The supersymmetric charge provides us with a map between the phase space observables with an even number of phonino coordinates (Grassmann even) and those with an odd number (Grassmann odd). The single particle phonon modes which are linear combinations of $u^{i\alpha}$ and $p_{i\alpha}$ are in the even group while the single particle phonino modes which are linear combinations of $\Gamma^{i\alpha}$ and γ^m are in the odd group. The map $\{\cdot, Q\}$ we can construct from Q sends an observable from the even sector to the odd sector or vice versa by inserting it into the location of the \cdot . This map has a special relationship with

the equations of motion: time evolution of the mapped observable is the same as the unmapped observable. For example, $\{u^{i\alpha}, Q\}$ is a phonino observable that obeys the equations of motion

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \{u^{i\alpha}, Q\} = -m^{i\alpha,j\beta} A_{j\beta,m}^T k^{m,n} A_{n,k\gamma} \{u_{k\gamma}, Q\} \quad (23)$$

which is the equations of motion for $u^{i\alpha}$. Similarly, the phonon observables $\{p_{i\alpha}, Q\}$, $\{\Gamma^{i\alpha}, Q\}$, $\{\gamma^m, Q\}$ obey the $p_{i\alpha}$, $\Gamma^{i\alpha}$ and γ^m equations respectively. Computing these Poisson brackets explicitly, we see that they are

$$\{u^{i\alpha}, Q\} = \Gamma^{i\alpha}, \quad \{p_{i\alpha}, Q\} = A_{i\alpha,m}^T \gamma^m \quad (24)$$

$$\{\Gamma^{i\alpha}, Q\} = m^{i\alpha,j\beta} p_{j\beta}, \quad \{\gamma^m, Q\} = k^{m,n} A_{n,i\alpha} u^{i\alpha} \quad (25)$$

So it would seem that supersymmetry is too powerful a symmetry, that the phonon problem is equivalent to the phonon problem (and therefore uninteresting).

To study these relationships in more detail, lets now take linear combinations of phase space observables. If $v^{i\alpha} p_{i\alpha}$ is an eigenmode of the $p_{i\alpha}$ equation then it obeys

$$v^{i\alpha} A_{i\alpha,m}^T k^{m,n} A_{n,j\beta} m^{j\beta,k\gamma} = \omega^2 v^{k\gamma} \quad (26)$$

Now if $v^{i\alpha} A_{i\alpha,m}^T = 0$ so the $v^{i\alpha}$ is in the (left) nullspace of $A_{i\alpha,m}^T$, then it is an eigenvector with frequency $\omega = 0$. If this is not the case, it is an eigenvector with a finite frequency as discussed above. Now lets map this to a linear combination of γ^m 's using Q :

$$\{v^{i\alpha} p_{i\alpha}, Q\} = v^{i\alpha} A_{i\alpha,m}^T \gamma^m \quad (27)$$

If $v^{i\alpha}$ therefore corresponds to a zero mode, it gets annihilated by this map. Only the finite frequency modes therefore actually pass from the $p_{i\alpha}$ eigenmode problem to the γ^m eigenmode problem. However, for the finite mode case, notice that the mapped observable is a linear combination whose coefficients obey

$$v^{i\alpha} A_{i\alpha,m}^T k^{m,n} A_{n,j\beta} m^{j\beta,k\gamma} A_{k\gamma,p}^T = \omega^2 v^{i\alpha} A_{i\alpha,p}^T \quad (28)$$

So it is a (left) eigenvector of the γ^m differential equation with the same eigenvalue it had in the $p_{i\alpha}$ differential equation before it was mapped. Mapped observables therefore carry their eigenvalue with them.

Extending this study to each of the four differential equations and breaking their set of eigenvectors into two groups, the finite and the zero eigenvalue modes, we have constructed Fig. 1 graphically depicting all the different relationships. In it an arrow actually represents a function for the set of eigenmodes at its tail to the set of eigenmodes at its head. If two different paths exist between any two sets, one going from one set to the other and the other going the reverse direction, then the two sets are isomorphic and in particular have the same number of eigenmodes. In this way, we see that the number of finite energy eigenmodes are the same for all differential equations, just their zero modes are different.




FIG. 1. Graphical display of eigenmode relationships. Here two types of arrows are drawn: one called “is” results from the identical form of the two differential equations and one called “Q” is the supersymmetry map. Notice Q does not map zero mode eigenstates from $p_{i\alpha}$ to γ^m and from γ^m to $u^{i\alpha}$. Since all arrows represent maps of unique elements to unique elements, if a path of arrows exists from one set of modes to another and another path exists from that set of modes back to the first then the two sets of modes are isomorphic. For finite modes, any two sets of eigenstates have such paths relating them so they are all isomorphic to each other. For zero modes, only the $u^{i\alpha}$, $\Gamma^{i\alpha}$ and $p_{i\alpha}$ sets of eigenstates are isomorphic. The γ^m set is different and hence the phonino problem has a different set of zero modes from the phonon problem.

Now, with the above analysis of the eigenmodes, we are in a position to understand the topological index associated with a supersymmetric theory. As pointed out by Witten (and often called the “Witten index”) the total number of boson modes minus the total number of fermion modes ($Tr(-1)^F$ where $F = 0$ for a boson mode, and $F = 1$ for a fermion mode) is a topological invariant. Applying this to the single particle sector we have

$$\nu = Tr(-1)^F = 2dN_s - dN_s - N_b = dN_s - N_b \quad (29)$$

But if we break down the count of zero modes into the four groups of two types of modes, we have

$$\nu = \underbrace{(N_{>} + N_0)}_{u^{i\alpha} \text{ modes}} + \underbrace{(N_{>} + N_0)}_{p_{i\alpha} \text{ modes}} - \underbrace{(N_{>} + N_0)}_{\Gamma^{i\alpha} \text{ modes}} - \underbrace{(N_{>} + N_{ss})}_{\gamma^m \text{ modes}} \quad (30)$$

$$= N_0 - N_{ss} \quad (31)$$

where we used Fig. 1 to establish that the number of finite modes $N_{>}$ is the same between all modes types while N_0 is the same only between $u^{i\alpha}$, $\Gamma^{i\alpha}$ and $p_{i\alpha}$ and is in general different from the number of γ^m zero modes, N_{ss} . Finally, we also used that the number of zero modes not mapped N_0 and N_{ss} is given by $\text{nullity}\mathbf{A}$ and $\text{nullity}\mathbf{A}^T$ respectively. To derive these results, we heavily relied on the positive definiteness of $m^{i\alpha,j\beta}$ and $k^{m,n}$ for if this were not the case, more modes would fail to be mapped by Q. So the Witten index of supersymmetry, when applied to the single particle sector valid for the linearized theory, is identical to the Calladine-Kane-Lubensky index but its derivation is directly built on eigenvalue problems.

The Witten index is useful in a supersymmetric theory because it dictates whether there must be a zero mode. If $\nu > 0$ there must be ν bosonic (phonon) zero modes. If $\nu < 0$ there must be $|\nu|$ fermionic (phonino) zero modes which here must be self stress modes. So long as $\nu \neq 0$ then, supersymmetry can exist in the “ground state” for there is then a zero mode that satisfies $\hat{Q}|0\rangle = 0$ (in the quantum language). However, if $\nu = 0$ then without explicitly breaking supersymmetry one can remove all zero modes. Then there are no states satisfying $\hat{Q}|0\rangle = 0$ and supersymmetry is spontaneously broken in the ground state. Remarkably, for a topological insulator-like phase to exist, we must have $\nu = 0$ for periodic boundary conditions and to have gapped out all zero modes. So a topological insulator-like phase (here an isostatic lattice) arises in the supersymmetry language when supersymmetry is “spontaneously broken”.

Finally, there remains the question of how the above supersymmetry is related to the quantum mechanics-like supersymmetry of the square rooted equations of motion (Eq. 18) pointed out by Kane and Lubensky. This symmetry is a supersymmetry between $\Gamma^{i\alpha}$ modes and γ^m modes (both of which are fermionic here) and has an associated topological index which is the same index as the single particle Witten index discussed above. So the phonon problem appears to have two different supersymmetries, one at the full phase space level that we discuss above and the other at the level of the equations of motion of the linearized fermions. Both of these supersymmetries identify a specialness of balls and springs over a more general theory of phonons whose potential cannot be directly related to springs.

So the supersymmetry model has brought all mathematical objects mentioned so far under one umbrella. The supersymmetric theory has the phonon Hamiltonian, the two metrics $m^{i\alpha,j\beta}$ and $k^{m,n}$ play a central role as they determine the commutation relations of the fermions, the phonino hamiltonian is determined by the constraint matrix \mathbf{C} and its corresponding equations of motion is the square-rooted Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} . Finally, the topological index is determined by the supersymmetry relations between the various eigenmodes. Lastly, it suggests that the specialness of the balls and springs description is the requirement that it is supersymmetric.

If we break this specialness, if we explicitly break the supersymmetry, then most of the mathematical objects contained in the theory lose their meaning. In this way, I argue that the topological structure of isostatic lattice phonon band structure is supersymmetry protected (i.e. protected by the extent to which a toy model describes a real system, where “toy” refers to a simplification in the definition of the model not demanded by a fundamental symmetry).ntext).

IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR MAGNONS

Now the simplest magnon (spin wave) model is quadratic in the spin vectors

$$H_{magnon} = \frac{1}{2} S_{i\alpha} J^{i\alpha, j\beta} S_{j\beta} \quad (32)$$

where $J^{i\alpha, j\beta}$ is the matrix of exchange constants and $S_{i\alpha}$ is here taken to be a classical spin vector obeying Poisson bracket relations

$$\{S_{i\alpha}, S_{j\beta}\} = f_{i\alpha, j\beta}^{k\gamma} S_{k\gamma} \quad (33)$$

with $f_{i\alpha, j\beta}^{k\gamma} = \delta_{ij}^k \epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma$, $\delta_{ij}^k = 1$ if $i = j = k$ and zero otherwise and $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^\gamma$ is the 3 dimensional Levi-Civita tensor.

This model is special, like that of balls and springs, in that there is no fundamental reason to keep just the quadratic in $S_{i\alpha}$ order in the Hamiltonian. It is easy to show, using our study of phonons, that indeed this special structure can be exploited to define a supersymmetric magnon problem. We can define a supersymmetric charge

$$Q = \gamma^{i\alpha} S_{i\alpha} \quad (34)$$

and compute the SUSY Hamiltonian

$$H_{SUSY} = \frac{1}{2} \{Q, Q\} \quad (35)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{i\alpha} \{S_{i\alpha}, S_{j\beta}\} \gamma^{j\beta} + \frac{1}{2} S_{i\alpha} \{\gamma^{i\alpha}, \gamma^{j\beta}\} S_{j\beta} \quad (36)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{i\alpha} \gamma^{j\beta} f_{i\alpha, j\beta}^{k\gamma} S_{k\gamma} + \frac{1}{2} S_{i\alpha} J^{i\alpha, j\beta} S_{j\beta} \quad (37)$$

where I choose $\{\gamma^{i\alpha}, \gamma^{j\beta}\} = J^{i\alpha, j\beta}$ so that the first term is just H_{magnon} . In general, $J^{i\alpha, j\beta}$ is a non-singular matrix with positive and negative eigenvalues. It therefore defines a pseudo-Riemannian metric like that of Minkowski space and the magninos $\gamma^{i\alpha}$ are well defined by a Clifford algebra. So it is a strait-forward extension of our supersymmetric phonon approach to create a supersymmetric magnon model.

It remains to linearize. We can do this by expanding $S_{i\alpha} = S_{i\alpha}^0 + B_{i\alpha, j\mu} x^{j\mu} + C_{i\alpha, j\mu, k\nu} x^{j\mu} x^{k\nu} + \dots$ to quadratic order about an ordering spin pattern $S_{i\alpha}^0$. It is necessary to keep to this order because both $B_{i\alpha, j\mu}$ and $C_{i\alpha, j\mu, k\nu}$

will enter the quadratic magnon Hamiltonian

$$H_{magnon}^{quadratic} \approx = \frac{1}{2} S_{i\alpha}^0 J^{i\alpha, j\beta} S_{j\beta}^0 + \frac{1}{2} x^{i\mu} B_{i\mu, j\alpha}^T J^{j\alpha, k\beta} B_{k\beta, l\nu} x^{l\nu} + S_{i\alpha}^0 J^{i\alpha, j\beta} C_{j\beta, k\mu, l\nu} x^{k\mu} x^{l\nu} \quad (38)$$

However, the supersymmetric charge is then

$$Q = \gamma^{i\alpha} (S_{i\alpha}^0 + B_{i\alpha, j\mu} x^{j\mu} + C_{i\alpha, j\mu, k\nu} x^{j\mu} x^{k\nu}) \quad (39)$$

and H_{SUSY} will not just be the quadratic magnon Hamiltonian but also include non-quadratic terms. So the linearization breaks supersymmetry!

These results imply that a supersymmetric model of magnons (or more generally spins) coupled to fermionic magninos exists but only at the non-linear level. This failure to linearize is related to a leading non-zero constant contribution to $S_{i\alpha}$ when expanded in powers of $x^{i\mu}$. This constant term exists because $S_{i\alpha}$ is not a constraint that vanishes in the ground state. The phonon problem, however, has a Hamiltonian that is a sum of soft constraints and the ground states (zero modes) obey $p_{i\alpha} = 0$ and $e_m = 0$. So the failure to extend the linearized supersymmetric phonon results appears to be directly related to the form of the magnon model: that it is not a sum of soft constraints on the motion of the spins.

V. FRUSTRATED MAGNONS

The quadratic magnon Hamiltonian is not the only special model for magnons. Another important model is that of highly geometrically frustrated magnets^{20,21}

$$H_{FrustratedMagnons} = \frac{1}{2} S_{\Delta\alpha} J^{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta} S_{\Delta'\beta} \quad (40)$$

where $S_{\Delta\alpha} = S_{i\alpha} + S_{j\alpha} + \dots$ is the total spin on a simplex (a triangle or tetrahedron). For the case, $J^{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta} = J \delta^{\Delta, \Delta'} \delta_{\alpha\beta}$, this model reduces to the nearest neighbor Heisenberg model on a lattice of corner sharing simplexes such as the kagome lattice, hyperkagome lattice and pyrochlore lattice. We will therefore assume $J^{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta}$ has positive definite eigenvalues and defines a metric.

This model has a feature absent from the more general magnon model we studied previously: the ground states all satisfy the local condition $S_{\Delta\alpha} = 0$. It is a sum of soft constraints on the motion of the spins. We can therefore follow Ref. 3 and study its zero modes by taking these ground state conditions as constraints and computing the eigenmodes of Dirac’s constraint matrix $C_{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta} = \{S_{\Delta\alpha}, S_{\Delta'\beta}\}$. This reveals the existence of two types of zero modes: gauge zero modes like those we (briefly) encountered in the phonon problem and “self-field” modes which correspond to local magnetic fields $h^{\Delta\alpha}$ that would contribute no energy to a Zeeman term:

$$H_{Zeeman} = -h^{\Delta\alpha} S_{\Delta\alpha} \quad (41)$$

Self-field modes were not directly discussed in Ref. 3 because they correspond to redundant constraints (i.e. if a sufficiently large subset of $S_{\Delta\alpha} = 0$ then they all vanish) and can be dropped from a study of the constrained subspace. In the presence of such redundancy, the number of gauge modes is the number of zero modes of $C_{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta}$ that are not self-field modes. This is one of Dirac's discoveries of generalized (constrained) Hamiltonian mechanics. So this model has a useful constraint matrix that provides information about the zero modes in addition to those obtained directly from the Hamiltonian.

To see if the rest of the structure we outlined for the phonon problem exists here, let's proceed by deriving its supersymmetric counter part. We can again write down a supersymmetric charge

$$Q = \gamma^{\Delta\alpha} S_{\Delta\alpha} \quad (42)$$

and compute the corresponding supersymmetric Hamiltonian

$$H_{SUSY} = \frac{1}{2} S_{\Delta\alpha} \{ \gamma^{\Delta\alpha}, \gamma^{\Delta'\beta} \} S_{\Delta'\beta} + \frac{1}{2} \gamma^{\Delta\alpha} C_{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta} \gamma^{\Delta'\beta} \quad (43)$$

So we need to choose $\{ \gamma^{\Delta\alpha}, \gamma^{\Delta'\beta} \} = J^{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta}$ to make the first term $H_{FrustratedMagnons}$. Thus the magnino Hamiltonian here is determined by the constraint matrix just like the phonino Hamiltonian in the supersymmetric phonon problem. The equations of motion of these magninos, however, does not give us the "square-rooted" Hamiltonian for it is

$$\dot{\gamma}^{\Delta\alpha} = J^{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta} C_{\Delta'\beta, \Delta''\gamma} \gamma^{\Delta''\gamma} \quad (44)$$

So the structure of the square-rooted Hamiltonian and its associated quantum mechanics-like supersymmetry doesn't apply here. The supersymmetry defined by Q is therefore not related to the square-rooted Hamiltonian in general.

Let's now linearize by setting $S_{\Delta\alpha} = A_{\Delta\alpha, i\mu} x^{i\mu}$ with $x^{i\mu} \rightarrow (q^i, p_i)$ the phase space coordinates and study the single particle Witten index. It is

$$\nu = 2N_s - dN_\Delta = \text{nullity} \mathbf{A} - \text{nullity} \mathbf{A}^T = N_G + 2N_c - N_{sf} \quad (45)$$

where N_Δ is the number of simplices (triangles, tetrahedrons, etc.), again $d = 3$ is the number of spin vector components, $2N_s$ is the number of coordinates $x^{i\mu}$ and dN_Δ the number of coordinates $\gamma^{i\alpha}$. We obtain the second equality here using $2N_s = \text{rank} \mathbf{A} + \text{nullity} \mathbf{A}$, $dN_\Delta = \text{rank} \mathbf{A}^T + \text{nullity} \mathbf{A}^T$ and $\text{rank} \mathbf{A} = \text{rank} \mathbf{A}^T$. The third equality was obtained using $\text{nullity} \mathbf{A}^T = N_{sf}$ where N_{sf} is the number of self-field modes and $\text{nullity} \mathbf{A}^T = N_G + 2N_c$ is the dimension of the "constraint" surface in phase space that satisfies $S_{\Delta\alpha} = A_{\Delta\alpha, i\mu} x^{i\mu} = 0$. Here N_G is the number of gauge coordinates that have no conjugate on the constraint surface and N_c the number of pairs of conjugate coordinates on the constraint surface. So, the single particle Witten index takes the same form as it did for phonons just now the matrix $A_{\Delta\alpha, i\mu}$ has a different interpretation.

The above derivation of the single particle Witten index did not rely on the equations of motion directly, just the mathematical properties of the matrix $A_{\Delta\alpha, i\mu}$. To see that it is indeed connected to the equations of motion, we need to work out the supersymmetry relations between eigenmodes. These modes satisfy the equations of motion

$$\dot{x}^{i\mu} = \sigma^{i\mu, j\nu} A_{j\nu, \Delta\alpha}^T J^{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta} A_{\Delta'\beta, k\lambda} x^{k\lambda} \quad (46)$$

$$\dot{\gamma}^{\Delta\alpha} = J^{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta} A_{\Delta'\beta, i\mu} \sigma^{i\mu, j\nu} A_{j\nu, \Delta''\gamma}^T \gamma^{\Delta''\gamma} \quad (47)$$

where $\sigma^{i\mu, j\nu} = \{ x^{i\mu}, x^{j\nu} \} = \delta^{ij} \epsilon^{\mu\nu}$ is the Poisson bracket tensor with $\epsilon^{\mu\nu}$ the two dimensional Levi-Civita tensor and we expanded the constraint matrix using $C_{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta} = A_{\Delta\alpha, i\mu} \sigma^{i\mu, j\nu} A_{j\nu, \Delta'\beta}^T$.

For the $x^{i\mu}$ equations of motion, we can break up the set of eigenmodes $v_{i\mu} \dot{x}^{i\mu}$ into:

- finite frequency modes obeying $v_{i\mu} \sigma^{i\mu, j\nu} A_{j\nu, \Delta\alpha}^T J^{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta} A_{\Delta'\beta, k\lambda} = i\omega v_{k\lambda}$ with $\omega > 0$;
- gauge modes obeying $A_{\Delta\alpha, i\mu} \sigma^{i\mu, j\nu} v_{j\nu} = 0$ but $\{ v_{i\mu} \dot{x}^{i\mu}, w_{i\mu} x^{i\mu} = 0$ where $w_{i\mu}$ is any vector satisfying $A_{\Delta\alpha, i\mu} \sigma^{i\mu, j\nu} w_{j\nu} = 0$;
- canonical zero modes obeying $A_{\Delta\alpha, i\mu} \sigma^{i\mu, j\nu} v_{j\nu} = 0$ but are not a gauge mode;
- conjugate gauge modes that do not satisfy $A_{\Delta\alpha, i\mu} \sigma^{i\mu, j\nu} v_{j\nu} = 0$ but are also not finite frequency modes.

The conjugate gauge modes arise because the eigenvalue problem here is not that of a symmetric or Hermitian matrix. It need not have a complete set of eigenmodes. The missing vectors arise in this case when there are gauge modes present and correspond to their conjugate modes. The conjugate gauge modes are still zero frequency modes but do not satisfy $A_{\Delta\alpha, i\mu} \sigma^{i\mu, j\nu} v_{j\nu} = 0$ which seems like an impossibility since any mode with $A_{\Delta\alpha, i\mu} \sigma^{i\mu, j\nu} v_{j\nu} \neq 0$ has $v_{i\mu} \sigma^{i\mu, j\nu} A_{j\nu, \Delta\alpha}^T J^{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta} A_{\Delta'\beta, k\lambda} \neq 0$. The solution to this impossibility is that they are modes that are not eigenvectors.

For the $\gamma^{\Delta\alpha}$ equations of motion, we can break up the set of eigenmodes $g_{\Delta\alpha} \dot{\gamma}^{\Delta\alpha}$ into:

- finite frequency modes obeying $g_{\Delta\alpha} J^{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta} A_{\Delta'\beta, i\mu} \sigma^{i\mu, j\nu} A_{j\nu, \Delta''\gamma}^T = i\omega g_{\Delta''\gamma}$;
- self field modes obeying $A_{i\mu, \Delta\alpha}^T J^{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta} g_{\Delta'\beta} = 0$;
- magnino gauge modes that do not satisfy $A_{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta} J^{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta} g_{\Delta''\gamma} = 0$ but are eigenmodes with $\omega = 0$.

The "magnino gauge modes" are not gauge modes in the sense of zero modes whose conjugate is not a zero mode. Their name comes from their use in counting

gauge modes: Dirac found there is a gauge mode for every eigenvector in the nullspace of the constraint matrix that does not correspond to a redundant constraint (the self field modes).

Now with all these modes identified, we can pass them through the supersymmetry map $\{\cdot, Q\}$ and see how they are related by supersymmetry. The result is presented in Fig. 2. Since no two eigenmodes mapped by $\{\cdot, Q\}$ maps to the same eigenmode, we must have:

- the number of finite frequency phonon modes $N_{>}$ is equal to the number of finite frequency phonino modes;
- the number of magnon gauge modes N_G is equal to the number of magnino “gauge” modes

So the supersymmetry map gives us an explanation of Dirac mode counting: magnino gauge modes map to gauge modes under supersymmetry and conjugate gauge modes map to magnino gauge modes. This defines an isomorphism between magnon and magnino gauge modes and so the number of each must be the same. The supersymmetry map also explains the single particle Witten index for the above conditions on the number of modes in each set implies the difference between the number of magnon and magnino modes is

$$\nu = \underbrace{(N_{>} + 2N_G + 2N_c)}_{x^{i\mu} \text{ modes}} - \underbrace{(N_{>} + N_G + N_{sf})}_{\gamma^m \text{ modes}} \quad (48)$$

where N_c is half the number of modes zero modes with a conjugate pair that is also a zero mode and N_{sf} is the number of self field modes. This index reduces to the result we had from the mathematical properties of the $A_{\Delta\alpha, i\mu}$ alone (Eq. 45).

Convinced of the existence of the single particle Witten index for the linearized magnon problem, we are now in a position to understand some of its implications. If $\nu > 0$ we must have magnon zero modes ($N_G + 2N_c > 0$). If $\nu < 0$, we must have magnino zero modes ($N_{sf} > 0$). If $\nu = 0$ then it is possible to remove all zero modes without violating supersymmetry by a suitable choice of $A_{\Delta\alpha, i\mu}$. This can happen for periodic boundary conditions if $2n_s - 3n_\Delta = 0$ where $n_s = N_s/N_u$ is the number of sites in each unit cell and $n_\Delta = N_\Delta/N_u$ is the number of simplices per unit cell. Examples of this situation include the kagome lattice with $n_s = 3$ and $n_\Delta = 2$ and the three dimensional hyperkagome lattice of $\text{Na}_4\text{Ir}_3\text{O}_8$ with $n_s = 12$ and $n_\Delta = 8$. But it does not happen for the pyrochlore lattice with $n_s = 4$ and $n_\Delta = 2$ where $\nu = 2N_u > 0$ demands that $N_G + 2N_c > 0$.

Given that $\nu = 0$ for the kagome family of lattices with periodic boundary conditions, we can see if the Witten index demands gapless edge states for various open boundary conditions. For the two finite kagome clusters shown in Fig. 3, we have $\nu = 12$ and $\nu = 6$. So either type of boundary condition will have $\nu > 0$ and demand




FIG. 2. A graphical depiction of the relationships between eigenmodes of the magnon-magnino supersymmetric model. The magnon modes are broken down into four groups due to the canonical structure of the zero modes: some zero modes have a canonical conjugate (canonical zero frequency mode) and others do not (gauge zero frequency mode). Since each arrow maps a unique eigenmode to a unique eigenmode, the finite frequency magnon and magnino modes are isomorphic. Also the magnon gauge zero frequency modes are isomorphic to the magnino “gauge” zero frequency modes which explains Dirac’s use of the constraint matrix to count gauge modes purely from supersymmetry.




FIG. 3. Two examples of open boundary conditions for the kagome lattice. Each of these cases has $\nu = 2N_s - 3N_\Delta > 0$. a) has dangling triangles and $\nu = 2(33) - 3(18) = 12$, b) has no dangling triangles and $\nu = 2(21) - 3(12) = 6$. It appears that $\nu > 0$ for any open boundary conditions and only reaches zero for periodic boundary conditions. Thus we can always gap out all bulk modes with a suitable choice of the matrix \mathbf{A} but not so at the edge. A magnon gauge or canonical zero mode must exist on the edge so long as the magnon Hamiltonian is of the form Eq. 40.

edge zero modes. Presumably, this holds for any boundary condition that still allows us to write the Hamiltonian in the general form of Eq. 40.

The above results show that indeed we can extend the supersymmetry of the linearized phonon problem to highly frustrated magnons (unlike the more general magnon case). In addition, we find that the kagome family is an analog of “Maxwell lattices”¹⁰. It has $\nu = 0$ for periodic boundary conditions and $\nu > 0$ for open boundary conditions. If we gap out all modes, with super-

symmetry allowed perturbations, we would then have a magnetic analog of an isostatic lattice (a Maxwell lattice with no zero modes).

VI. TOPOLOGICAL PROTECTION

The previous results show that special toy models of phonons and magnons a topological property tied to their equations of motion by a supersymmetric relationship with phoninos and magninos. Here we discuss the question of to what extent this topological property is robust.

A. Robustness to quantum fluctuations

For the most part, we worked in the classical limit where phonons are actually lattice vibrations and magnons are actually spin waves. Consider the magnon case. If we quantize it, then we demand $[\hat{x}^{i\mu}, \hat{x}^{j\mu}] = i\sigma^{i\mu, j\nu}$, $\{\hat{\gamma}^{\Delta\alpha}, \hat{\gamma}^{\Delta'\beta}\} = J^{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta}$ and $[\hat{x}^{i\mu}, \hat{\gamma}^{\Delta\alpha}] = 0$, where we replace antisymmetric Poisson bracket relationships with commutators (and multiplied by i) and symmetric Poisson bracket relationships with anticommutators. Quantizing the supersymmetric charge to $\hat{Q} = \hat{\gamma}^{\Delta\alpha} A_{\Delta\alpha, i\mu} \hat{x}^{i\mu}$ then gives the supersymmetric Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_{SUSY} = \frac{1}{2} \{\hat{Q}, \hat{Q}\} &= \frac{1}{2} \hat{x}^{i\mu} A_{i\mu, \Delta\alpha}^T J^{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta} A_{\Delta'\beta, j\nu} \hat{x}^{j\nu} \\ &+ \frac{i}{2} \hat{\gamma}^{\Delta\alpha} A_{\Delta\alpha, i\mu} \sigma^{i\mu, j\nu} A_{j\nu, \Delta'\beta} \hat{\gamma}^{\Delta'\beta} \quad (49) \end{aligned}$$

A similar correspondence between the non-linear forms of the classical and quantum model also holds. The same correspondence between quantum and classical models for the lattice vibrations and phonons case also holds. So the main results of this paper hold in both the classical and quantum forms and are not restricted to semi-classical or classical regimes.

B. What do metric distortions do?

Since the metrics $k^{m,n}$ and $m^{i\alpha, j\beta}$ entering the phonon problem and $J^{\Delta\alpha, \Delta'\beta}$ entering the frustrated magnon problem are not present in the respective topological indices, the topological protection holds if these undergo a distortion so long as they remain positive definite matrices.

For example, consider single ion anisotropy. It is a distortion of the spin exchange constants $J^{i\alpha, j\beta}$ of the magnon problem (a $j^{iz, jz}$ term). For frustrated magnons, we can break this symmetry with

$$\frac{K}{2} \sum_{\Delta} \left(\sum_{i \in \Delta} S_{iz} \right)^2 = K \sum_i S_{iz}^2 + K \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} S_{iz} S_{jz}. \quad (50)$$

which is a $J^{\Delta z, \Delta' z}$ term. So in general, single ion anisotropy will break supersymmetry (and relieve frustration) but if it is of this form, it will not violate the supersymmetry of H_{SUSY} .

1. What happens in the non-linear phonon and magnon cases?

Let us first address this question for the non-linear supersymmetry models before returning to the full problem of non-linear phonons and magnons.

In the presence of non-linearities, the eigenmodes of the system are no longer linear combinations of single particle observables. Instead, they become a linear combination of all multiparticle observables. As a result, the Witten index restricted to the single particle sector loses its meaning but the full index

$$\begin{aligned} \nu &= Tr(-1)^F \quad (51) \\ &= \# \text{ of bosonic observables} - \# \text{ of fermionic observables} \quad (52) \end{aligned}$$

still holds because Q still maps multiparticle bosonic observables to a multiparticle fermionic observables. To get a sense of this full set of observables, we have considered the two-particle sector with $2N_s(2N_s + 1)/2$ bosonic observables of type $x^{i\mu} x^{j\nu}$, $2N_s(3N_{\Delta})$ fermionic observables of type $x^{i\mu} \gamma^{\Delta\alpha}$ and $3N_{\Delta}(3N_{\Delta} - 1)/2$ bosonic observables of type $\gamma^{\Delta\alpha} \gamma^{\Delta'\beta}$. The two particle sector then has an index

$$\nu^2 \text{ particle} = 2N_s(2N_s+1)/2 + 3N_{\Delta}(3N_{\Delta}-1)/2 - 2N_s(3N_{\Delta}) \quad (53)$$

If $3N_{\Delta} = 2N_s$ as it does for the kagome lattice with periodic boundary conditions, this also vanishes. Since the index for the one-particle and two-particle sectors vanishes for highly frustrated magnons on the kagome, likely the total sum over all sectors relevant for the many body non-linear problem also vanishes. So the topological protection remains in effect for the full non-linear supersymmetric problem.

With this technical extension, we see that the non-linear models are also topological. Since they consist now of majorana fermions coupled to phonons and magnons, they could in principle be realized in a well engineered superconductor. In practice, however, they may prove to be more useful as a means of gaining theoretical insight into ‘‘symmetry protected topological order’’ in the presence of fermions.

Unfortunately, the salient feature of the non-linear problem is that the phonons are now coupled to the phoninos and the magnons are coupled to the magninos. We can no longer think about the added fermionic degrees of freedom as a device to construct a topological index. So, if the fermions are absent the supersymmetry is lost and with it the topological protection.

These statements, however, are all about the microscopic physics. It may very well be that the full non-

linear phonon or magnon problem has the same long distance physics as the corresponding supersymmetric non-linear phonon or magnon problem. In which case, the topological protection may emerge in this limit.

C. What happens if the supersymmetry is broken?

The models discussed in this paper are all “toy” models in that they correspond to useful simplifications of the actual phonon or magnon microscopic physics but in any real system, there will be perturbations that are not of the simple form. For example, the general linearized phonon potential

$$V_{\text{phonon}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} u^{i\alpha} V_{i\alpha,j\beta} u^{j\beta} \quad (54)$$

is not that of balls and springs. The supersymmetry can therefore be thought of as a symmetry emerging from the ‘toy-ness’ of the model. The extent to which the toy model captures the full physics of a real material is the extent to which the supersymmetry will be obeyed. In particular, we can expect that if supersymmetry demands gapless phonon edge modes in a system with gapped bulk phonon modes, these edge modes would be gapped by perturbations violating the toy-like property of balls and springs and the size of the gap is likely related to the strength of these non-toy-like perturbations.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper I set out to address the question of how Dirac degree of freedom counting of zero modes of a bosonic Hamiltonian that can be viewed as imposing a set of soft constraints on the bosons is related to a topological index associated with the same zero modes. The relationship turns out to be that the topological index is implied by a supersymmetry between fermions governed by Dirac’s constraint matrix and the original bosonic Hamiltonian.

Remarkably, this supersymmetry brings together a number of additional mathematical quantities. In one supersymmetric model of phonons, we have shown that:

- the Dirac-like square-rooted phonon equations of motion obeyed by phoninos are related to the original phonon equations of motion by supersymmetry;

- that the Calladine-Kane-Lubensky topological index is the Witten index of the supersymmetry model restricted to the single particle sector;
- that the phoninos obey a Clifford algebra with a metric determined by the spring constants and mass tensors of the phonon Hamiltonian.

I further extended this supersymmetry to magnons for the full non-linear regime, but could only study the linearized regime for highly frustrated magnons. In the linearized highly frustrated case, again fermions governed by Dirac’s constraint matrix are related to magnon modes by supersymmetry. These magnons have many of the same additional objects as the phonon case:

- a (topological) single particle Witten index;
- the magninos obey a Clifford algebra with a metric determined by the spin exchange constants

They also have an analog of the isostatic phonon case: the kagome family of antiferromagnets. Notably, the magnino Hamiltonian does not have the square-rooted structure and corresponding quantum mechanics-like supersymmetry so the many-body supersymmetry employed in this paper appears to be different from the single-body supersymmetry discovered by Kane and Lubensky. The magnon model also reveals an alternative explanation of Dirac’s counting of gauge degrees of freedom such as carried out in Ref. 3 by using the constraint matrix results from an isomorphism between fermionic zero modes and bosonic zero modes implied by supersymmetry.

The topological index has a direct importance for highly frustrated magnets: it applies not only to a larger class of models than merely the nearest neighbor model but also to the full manifold of ground states (i.e. remains unchanged if we were to continuously deform the ground state from one ground state to another). It even has interesting implications beyond finding a topological phase: the case of demanding the existence of zero modes. For example, if the supersymmetry is obeyed, a pyrochlore antiferromagnet must have a macroscopic degeneracy of its ground states. So, it gives a more precise meaning to the specialness of a highly frustrated magnet over other more generic magnets.

It is remarkable that supersymmetry can be used in condensed matter physics with out any additional fine tuning than those we commonly employ. But it is even more remarkable that in doing so, it can unify a number of special features present in our toy models under one theory while at the same time connect directly with the current intense focus on topological phases.

Acknowledgements— We would like to thank Tom Lubensky, Charlie Kane, Tom Hartman for useful discussions.

-
- ¹ C. L. Kane and T. C. Lubensky, *Nat Phys*, **10**, 39 (2014).
² C. Calladine, *Int. J. Solids Struct.*, **14**, 161 (1978).
³ M. J. Lawler, *New J. Phys.*, **15**, 043043 (2013).
⁴ E. Prodan and C. Prodan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **103**, 248101 (2009).
⁵ V. Peano, C. Brendel, M. Schmidt, and F. Marquardt, *Phys. Rev. X*, **5**, 031011 (2015).
⁶ L. Lu, J. D. Joannopoulos, and M. Soljacic, *Nat Phot.*, **8**, 821 (2014).
⁷ L. Zhang, J. Ren, J.-S. Wang, and B. Li, *Phys. Rev. B*, **87**, 144101 (2013).
⁸ A. Mook, J. Henk, and I. Mertig, *Phys. Rev. B*, **89**, 134409 (2014).
⁹ T. Witten, *Nat. Phys.*, **11**, 95 (2015).
¹⁰ T. C. Lubensky, C. L. Kane, X. Mao, a. Souslov, and K. Sun(2015). See arXiv:1503.01324.
¹¹ B. G.-g. Chen, N. Upadhyaya, and V. Vitelli, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **111**, 13004 (2014).
¹² M. Xiao, G. Ma, Z. Yang, P. Sheng, Z. Q. Zhang, and C. T. Chan, *Nat. Phys.*, **11**, 240 (2015).
¹³ A. a. Evans, J. L. Silverberg, and C. D. Santangelo, *Phys. Rev. E*, **92**, 013205 (2015).
¹⁴ L. Balents, *Nature*, **464**, 199 (2010), ISSN 1476-4687.
¹⁵ R. Moessner, *Can. J. Phys.*, **79**, 1283 (2001).
¹⁶ E. Witten, *J. Differ. Geom.*, **17**, 661 (1982).
¹⁷ R. Casalbuoni, *Nuovo Cim. A Ser. 11*, **33**, 389 (1976).
¹⁸ F. Berezin and M. Marinov, *Ann. Phys. (N. Y.)*, **104**, 336 (1977).
¹⁹ Y. Nakano, *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, **63**, 599 (1980).
²⁰ R. Moessner and J. T. Chalker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **80**, 2929 (1997).
²¹ R. Moessner and J. Chalker, *Phys. Rev. B*, **58**, 12049 (1998).