

April, 2023

Nonlinear realisation approach to topologically massive supergravity

Sergei M. Kuzenko and Jake C. Stirling

*Department of Physics M013, The University of Western Australia
35 Stirling Highway, Perth W.A. 6009, Australia*

Email: `sergei.kuzenko@uwa.edu.au`, `jake.stirling@research.uwa.edu.au`

Abstract

We develop a nonlinear realisation approach to topologically massive supergravity in three dimensions, with and without a cosmological term. It is a natural generalisation of a similar construction for $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity in four dimensions, which was recently proposed by one of us. At the heart of both formulations is the nonlinear realisation approach to gravity which was given by Volkov and Soroka fifty years ago in the context of spontaneously broken local supersymmetry. In our setting, the action for cosmological topologically massive supergravity is invariant under two different local supersymmetries. One of them acts on the Goldstino, while the other supersymmetry leaves the Goldstino invariant. The former can be used to gauge away the Goldstino, and then the resulting action coincides with that given in the literature.

Dedicated to the memory of Stanley Deser

arXiv:2304.09506v3 [hep-th] 21 Sep 2023

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The Volkov-Soroka approach in three dimensions	4
3	Second local supersymmetry	8
3.1	Poincaré supergravity	8
3.2	Anti-de Sitter supergravity	11
4	Topologically massive supergravity	13
4.1	Conformal supergravity	13
4.2	Cosmological topologically massive supergravity	16
5	Conclusion	18
A	Nonlinear realisation approach to 4D gravity	19
B	3D notation and conventions	22
C	The first Bianchi identity	25

1 Introduction

The method of nonlinear realisations of groups (also known as the coset construction), which was systematically developed by Coleman, Wess and Zumino [1,2] (see also [3,4]), is the mathematical formalism to construct phenomenological Lagrangians describing the low-energy dynamics of Goldstone fields in theories with spontaneously broken symmetry. This method was extended to spacetime symmetries by Volkov [5] (see also [6]), although the case of spontaneously broken conformal symmetry had been studied earlier [7–10]. In modern applications of the method of nonlinear realisations, an important role is played

by the inverse Higgs mechanism discovered by Ivanov and Ogievetsky [11]. An interesting interpretation of this mechanism was given in [12].

The formalism of nonlinear realisations can also be used to construct gauge theories, including those describing gravity and its matter couplings. The importance of nonlinear realisations for gravity was realised fifty years ago by Volkov and Soroka [13, 14] (for related developments see [15, 16]).¹ These authors gauged the \mathcal{N} -extended super-Poincaré group in four dimensions (4D) and proposed a super-Higgs mechanism by constructing the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity action with nonlinearly realised local supersymmetry (see [22] for a review and [23] for a critical analysis of the Volkov-Soroka construction and modern developments). Restricting their analysis to the $\mathcal{N} = 0$ case results in the nonlinear realisation approach to gravity, which corresponds to the coset space $\text{ISL}(2, \mathbb{C})/\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ in the formulation of [14].² A review of this construction is given in appendix A. The theory is described by a vielbein, an independent Lorentz connection and a vector Goldstone field V^a . There are two types of gauge transformations with vector-like parameters, the general coordinate transformations and the local Poincaré translations. The latter gauge freedom acts on the Goldstone field by the rule $V'^a = V^a + b^a$ and, therefore, it can be fixed by imposing the condition $V^a = 0$. As a result, one arrives at the first-order formulation for gravity [18]. The Goldstone field in this setting is a compensator. In the terminology of [12], V^a is an unphysical Goldstone boson describing purely gauge degrees of freedom.

Within the Volkov-Soroka approach to spontaneously broken local supersymmetry [13, 14], there are two Goldstone fields, the vector field V^a and a spinor field $(\psi^\alpha, \bar{\psi}_\alpha)$. The latter is the Goldstone field for supersymmetry transformations³ [24, 25]. It is called the Goldstino. While V^a is an unphysical Goldstone boson, the Goldstino is in general a genuine Goldstone field for it triggers spontaneous breakdown of the local supersymmetry. In the gauge $\psi^\alpha = 0$, the gravitino becomes massive. A natural question is the following. Is it possible to have a dynamical system such that ψ^α turns into an unphysical Goldstone field? The positive answer was given in [26] where it was shown that, for specially chosen parameters of the theory, the Volkov-Soroka action is invariant under two different local supersymmetries. One of them is present for arbitrary values of the parameters and acts on the Goldstino, while the other supersymmetry emerges only in a special case and leaves

¹Gauge formulations for general relativity have been discussed since the pioneering work by Utiyama [17], Kibble [18] and Sciama [19], see e.g. [20, 21] for reviews.

²The group $\text{ISL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ is isomorphic to the universal covering group, $\widetilde{\text{ISO}}_0(3, 1)$, of the proper orthochronous Poincaré group $\text{ISO}_0(3, 1)$.

³Here we restrict our discussion to the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ case.

the Goldstino invariant. The former can be used to gauge away the Goldstino, and then the resulting action coincides with that proposed by Deser and Zumino for consistent supergravity in the first-order formalism [27].⁴

In this paper we will extend the construction of [26] to the case of 3D $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity [29, 30], with and without a cosmological term, and then the obtained results will be generalised to topologically massive $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity [31] and its cosmological extension [32].

It should be pointed out that the literature on simple supergravity in three dimensions is immense. In particular, superfield approaches to $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity-matter systems were developed, e.g., in [33–38]. The $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric Lorentz Chern-Simons term [31], which is at the heart of (cosmological) topologically massive supergravity [31, 32], has been interpreted as the action for 3D $\mathcal{N} = 1$ conformal supergravity [39].⁵ Superfield formulations for $\mathcal{N} = 1$ conformal supergravity were derived in [41–43] (some-what incomplete results had appeared earlier in [34–36]). The Chern-Simons formulation for $\mathcal{N} = 1$ anti-de Sitter (AdS) supergravity was proposed in [44]. The super-Higgs effect for $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity was first described in [45]. The Hamiltonian form of (topologically) massive $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity was constructed in [46, 47].

This paper is organised as follows. In section 2 we present a 3D analogue of the Volkov-Soroka construction. Using this framework, we demonstrate in section 3 that the action for pure $\mathcal{N} = 1$ Poincaré supergravity (3.1) is invariant under two different local supersymmetries. One of them is present for an arbitrary relative coefficient between the two terms in (3.1) and acts on the Goldstino, while the other supersymmetry emerges only in a special case and leaves the Goldstino invariant. The former can be used to gauge away the Goldstino, and then the resulting action coincides with the standard action for Poincaré supergravity in the first-order formalism. In subsection 3.2 we show that the same formalism of nonlinearly realised local supersymmetry can be used to describe AdS supergravity, however the second local supersymmetry has to be deformed. In section 4 we generalise the analysis of section 3 to topologically massive supergravity and its cosmological extension. The main body of the paper is accompanied by three technical appendices. Appendix A reviews the nonlinear realisation approach to 4D gravity. In appendix B we collect the key formulae of the 3D two-component spinor formalism. Finally, appendix C derives the first Bianchi identity.

⁴The $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity in the second-order formalism [28] is obtained by using the equations of motion for the Lorentz connection to express it in terms of the other fields.

⁵The structure of 3D $\mathcal{N} = 1$ conformal supergravity was also studied in [40].

2 The Volkov-Soroka approach in three dimensions

Let $\mathcal{P}(3|\mathcal{N})$ be the three-dimensional \mathcal{N} -extended super-Poincaré group. Any element $g \in \mathcal{P}(3|\mathcal{N})$ is a $(4|\mathcal{N}) \times (4|\mathcal{N})$ supermatrix of the form⁶

$$g = g(b, \eta, M, \mathcal{R}) = s(b, \eta)h(M, \mathcal{R}) \equiv sh, \quad (2.1a)$$

$$s(b, \eta) := \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} \mathbb{1}_2 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline -\hat{b} + \frac{i}{2}\varepsilon^{-1}\eta^2 & \mathbb{1}_2 & -\sqrt{2}\eta^T \\ \hline i\sqrt{2}\eta & 0 & \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}} \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} \delta_{\alpha\beta} & 0 & 0 \\ \hline -b^{\alpha\beta} + \frac{i}{2}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\eta^2 & \delta_{\alpha\beta} & -\sqrt{2}\eta^{\alpha J} \\ \hline i\sqrt{2}\eta_I{}^\beta & 0 & \delta_{IJ} \end{array} \right), \quad (2.1b)$$

$$h(M, \mathcal{R}) := \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} M & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & (M^{-1})^T & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & \mathcal{R} \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} M_{\alpha\beta} & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & (M^{-1})_{\beta\alpha} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & \mathcal{R}_{IJ} \end{array} \right), \quad (2.1c)$$

where $M \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$, $\mathcal{R} \in \text{SO}(\mathcal{N})$, $\eta = (\eta_I{}^\beta)$, $\eta^2 := \eta_I{}^\alpha \eta_{\alpha I}$, and \hat{b} is defined in (B.3b). The $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ invariant spinor metric $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}) = -(\varepsilon_{\beta\alpha})$ and its inverse $\varepsilon^{-1} = (\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}) = -(\varepsilon^{\beta\alpha})$ are defined in appendix B. The group element $s(b, \eta)$ is labelled by three bosonic real parameters b^a and $2\mathcal{N}$ fermionic real parameters $\eta_I{}^\alpha = \eta^\alpha{}_I \equiv \eta_I^\alpha$.

Let us introduce Goldstone fields $Z^A(x) = (X^a(x), \Theta_I^\alpha(x))$ for spacetime translations (X^a) and supersymmetry transformations (Θ_I^α). They parametrise the homogeneous space (\mathcal{N} -extended Minkowski superspace)

$$\mathbb{M}^{3|2\mathcal{N}} = \frac{\mathcal{P}(3|\mathcal{N})}{\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \text{SO}(\mathcal{N})} \quad (2.2)$$

according to the rule:

$$\mathfrak{S}(Z) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} \mathbb{1}_2 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline -\hat{X} + \frac{i}{2}\varepsilon^{-1}\Theta^2 & \mathbb{1}_2 & -\sqrt{2}\Theta^T \\ \hline i\sqrt{2}\Theta & 0 & \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}} \end{array} \right) \implies \mathfrak{S}^{-1}(Z) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} \mathbb{1}_2 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \hat{X} + \frac{i}{2}\varepsilon^{-1}\Theta^2 & \mathbb{1}_2 & \sqrt{2}\Theta^T \\ \hline -i\sqrt{2}\Theta & 0 & \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{N}} \end{array} \right). \quad (2.3)$$

A gauge super-Poincaré transformation acts as

$$g(x) : Z(x) \rightarrow Z'(x), \quad g\mathfrak{S}(Z) = \mathfrak{S}(Z')h, \quad (2.4)$$

with $g = sh$. This is equivalent to the following transformations of the Goldstone fields:

$$s(b, \eta) : \quad \hat{X}' = \hat{X} + \hat{b} + i(\eta^T \Theta - \Theta^T \eta), \quad (2.5a)$$

⁶Our parametrisation of the elements of $\mathcal{P}(3|\mathcal{N})$ follows [48].

$$\Theta' = \Theta + \eta , \quad (2.5b)$$

and

$$h(M, \mathcal{R}) : \quad \hat{X}' = (M^{-1})^T \hat{X} M^{-1} , \quad (2.6a)$$

$$\Theta' = \mathcal{R} \Theta M^{-1} . \quad (2.6b)$$

Introduce a connection $\mathfrak{A} = dx^m \mathfrak{A}_m$ taking its values in the super-Poincaré algebra,

$$\mathfrak{A} := \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} \frac{1}{2}\Omega & 0 & 0 \\ \hline -\hat{e} & -\frac{1}{2}\Omega^T & -\sqrt{2}\psi^T \\ \hline i\sqrt{2}\psi & 0 & r \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} \frac{1}{2}\Omega_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} & 0 & 0 \\ \hline -e^{\alpha\beta} & -\frac{1}{2}\Omega^{\alpha}{}_{\beta} & -\sqrt{2}\psi^{\alpha}{}_J \\ \hline i\sqrt{2}\psi_{I\beta} & 0 & r_{IJ} \end{array} \right) , \quad (2.7)$$

and possessing the gauge transformation law

$$\mathfrak{A}' = g\mathfrak{A}g^{-1} + gdg^{-1}. \quad (2.8)$$

Here the one-form $\Omega_{\alpha}{}^{\beta}$ is related to the Lorentz connection $\Omega^{ab} = dx^m \Omega_m{}^{ab} = -\Omega^{ba}$ as

$$\Omega_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{abc}(\gamma^a)_{\alpha}{}^{\beta}\Omega^{bc}. \quad (2.9)$$

As in the first-order formalism to gravity, the Lorentz connection is an independent field and may be expressed in terms of the other fields by requiring it to be on-shell. The one-form $e^{\alpha\beta}$ is the spinor counterpart of the dreibein $e^a = dx^m e_m{}^a$. The fermionic one-forms $\psi_I{}^{\beta}$ describe \mathcal{N} gravitini. Finally, the one-form $r_{IJ} = -r_{JI}$ is the $\text{SO}(\mathcal{N})$ gauge field.

It should be pointed out that our parametrisation of the super-Poincaré algebra follows [43] and differs from [48]. Under an infinitesimal Lorentz transformation

$$\delta x^a = \lambda^a{}_b x^b = \varepsilon^{abc} \lambda_b x_c , \quad \lambda_{ab} = -\lambda_{ba} \quad (2.10a)$$

a two-component spinor ψ_{α} transforms as

$$\delta \psi_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} \psi_{\beta} , \quad \lambda_{\alpha\beta} = \lambda_{\beta\alpha} , \quad (2.10b)$$

where the Lorentz parameters λ_{ab} , λ_a and $\lambda_{\alpha\beta}$ are related to each other according to the rules (B.14), (B.15) and (B.16).

Associated with \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{A} is the different connection

$$\mathbb{A} := \mathfrak{S}^{-1} \mathfrak{A} \mathfrak{S} + \mathfrak{S}^{-1} d\mathfrak{S} , \quad (2.11)$$

with gauge transformation law

$$\mathbb{A}' = h\mathbb{A}h^{-1} + hdh^{-1} , \quad (2.12)$$

for an arbitrary gauge parameter $g = sh$. This connection is the main object in the Volkov-Soroka construction. Direct calculations give the explicit form of \mathbb{A}

$$\mathbb{A} := \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} \frac{1}{2}\Omega & 0 & 0 \\ \hline -\hat{E} & -\frac{1}{2}\Omega^T & -\sqrt{2}\Psi^T \\ \hline i\sqrt{2}\Psi & 0 & r \end{array} \right) , \quad (2.13)$$

where we have defined

$$\hat{E} := \hat{e} + \mathcal{D}\hat{X} + i(\mathcal{D}\Theta^T\Theta - \Theta^T\mathcal{D}\Theta) + 2i(\psi^T\Theta - \Theta^T\psi) , \quad (2.14a)$$

$$\Psi := \psi + \mathcal{D}\Theta , \quad \Psi^T = \psi^T + \mathcal{D}\Theta^T , \quad (2.14b)$$

and \mathcal{D} denotes the covariant derivative,

$$\mathcal{D}\hat{X} = d\hat{X} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{X}\Omega - \frac{1}{2}\Omega^T\hat{X} , \quad (2.15a)$$

$$\mathcal{D}\Theta = d\Theta - \frac{1}{2}\Theta\Omega + r\Theta , \quad \mathcal{D}\Theta^T = d\Theta^T - \frac{1}{2}\Omega^T\Theta^T - \Theta^T r . \quad (2.15b)$$

Equation (2.12) is equivalent to the following gauge transformation laws:

$$\Omega' = M\Omega M^{-1} + M dM^{-1} , \quad (2.16a)$$

$$r' = \mathcal{R}r\mathcal{R}^{-1} + \mathcal{R}d\mathcal{R}^{-1} \quad (2.16b)$$

and

$$\hat{E}' = (M^{-1})^T \hat{E} M^{-1} , \quad (2.17a)$$

$$\Psi' = \mathcal{R}\Psi M^{-1} . \quad (2.17b)$$

It is worth pointing out that the supersymmetric one-forms E^a and Ψ_I^β transform as tensors with respect to the Lorentz and $\text{SO}(\mathcal{N})$ gauge groups.

Under a supersymmetry transformation, $g = s(0, \eta)$, one can use the Goldstone field transformations (2.5a) and (2.5b) to deduce the local supersymmetry transformation laws of the gravitini and the dreibein

$$\psi' = \psi - \mathcal{D}\eta , \quad (2.18a)$$

$$\hat{e}' = \hat{e} + 2i(\eta^T\psi - \psi^T\eta) + i(\mathcal{D}\eta^T\eta - \eta^T\mathcal{D}\eta) . \quad (2.18b)$$

In the infinitesimal case, these supersymmetry transformation laws take the form

$$\delta_\eta \psi = -\mathcal{D}\eta , \quad \delta_\eta e^a = 2i \operatorname{tr}(\eta \gamma^a \psi^\mathbb{T}) . \quad (2.19a)$$

These should be accompanied by the supersymmetry transformations of the Goldstone fields

$$\delta_\eta X^a = -i \operatorname{tr}(\Theta \gamma^a \eta^\mathbb{T}) , \quad \delta_\eta \Theta = \eta . \quad (2.19b)$$

A local Poincaré translation is given by $g = s(b, 0)$. It acts on the Goldstone vector field X^a and the dreibein e^a as follows

$$X'^a = X^a + b^a , \quad e'^a = e^a - \mathcal{D}b^a , \quad (2.20)$$

while leaving the Goldstini and gravitini inert.

The curvature tensor is found through

$$\mathbb{R} = d\mathbb{A} - \mathbb{A} \wedge \mathbb{A} , \quad \mathbb{R}' = h\mathbb{R}h^{-1} . \quad (2.21)$$

Direct calculations give

$$\mathbb{R} := \left(\begin{array}{c|c|c} \frac{1}{2}R & 0 & 0 \\ \hline -\hat{\mathbb{T}} & -\frac{1}{2}R^\mathbb{T} & -\sqrt{2}\mathcal{D}\Psi^\mathbb{T} \\ \hline i\sqrt{2}\mathcal{D}\Psi & 0 & F \end{array} \right) , \quad (2.22)$$

where $R = (R_\alpha^\beta)$ is the Lorentz curvature, $F = (F_{IJ})$ is the Yang-Mills field strength,

$$\mathcal{D}\Psi = d\Psi - \frac{1}{2}\Psi \wedge \Omega - r \wedge \Psi , \quad \mathcal{D}\Psi^\mathbb{T} = d\Psi^\mathbb{T} + \frac{1}{2}\Omega^\mathbb{T} \wedge \Psi^\mathbb{T} - \Psi^\mathbb{T} \wedge r \quad (2.23)$$

are the gravitino field strengths, and

$$\hat{\mathbb{T}} = d\hat{E} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{E} \wedge \Omega + \frac{1}{2}\Omega^\mathbb{T} \wedge \hat{E} - 2i\Psi^\mathbb{T} \wedge \Psi = \mathcal{D}\hat{E} - 2i\Psi^\mathbb{T} \wedge \Psi \quad (2.24)$$

is the supersymmetric torsion tensor. In vector notation, the torsion tensor reads

$$\mathbb{T}^a = \mathcal{D}E^a - i\Psi \wedge \gamma^a \Psi^\mathbb{T} . \quad (2.25)$$

The Lorentz curvature tensor with spinor (R_α^β) and vector (R^a_b) indices has the form

$$R_\alpha^\beta = d\Omega_\alpha^\beta - \frac{1}{2}\Omega_\alpha^\gamma \wedge \Omega_\gamma^\beta , \quad R^a_b = d\Omega^a_b - \Omega^a_c \wedge \Omega^c_b . \quad (2.26)$$

Using the above results, one can construct a locally supersymmetric action. With the notation $E = \det(E_m^a)$, gauge-invariant functionals include the following:

- The Einstein-Hilbert action

$$S_{\text{EH}} = \frac{1}{2} \int \varepsilon_{abc} E^a \wedge R^{bc} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x E R ; \quad (2.27)$$

- The Rarita-Schwinger action

$$S_{\text{RS}} = \text{i} \int \Psi_I^\alpha \wedge \mathcal{D}\Psi_{\alpha I} = \text{i} \int d^3x E \varepsilon^{mnp} \Psi_{mI}^\alpha \mathcal{D}_p \Psi_{n\alpha I} ; \quad (2.28)$$

- The cosmological term

$$S_{\text{cosm}} = -\frac{1}{6} \int \varepsilon_{abc} E^a \wedge E^b \wedge E^c = \int d^3x E ; \quad (2.29)$$

- The mass term

$$S_{\text{mass}} = \int \Psi_I \wedge E^a \gamma_a \wedge \Psi_I = \int d^3x E \varepsilon^{mnp} \Psi_{mI} \gamma_n \Psi_{pI} . \quad (2.30)$$

In contrast to the 4D case, the mass term is invariant under the entire R -symmetry group $\text{SO}(\mathcal{N})$. Making use of the $\text{SO}(\mathcal{N})$ connection r and the corresponding field strength F , we can construct standard Chern-Simons and Yang-Mills actions. We will not use them. In the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ case, a linear combination of the above functionals gives an action for spontaneously broken supergravity.

3 Second local supersymmetry

In the remainder of this paper our discussion is restricted to the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ case for simplicity. If $\mathcal{N} > 1$, it is necessary to take into account the $\text{SO}(\mathcal{N})$ connection. An extension of our approach to the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ case will be studied elsewhere.

3.1 Poincaré supergravity

Each of the functionals (2.27)–(2.30) is invariant under the local supersymmetry transformation (2.19). We are going to show that a special linear combination of the actions (2.27) and (2.28) possesses a second local supersymmetry described by the parameter $\epsilon = (\epsilon^\alpha)$. This combination is

$$S_{\text{SG}} = S_{\text{EH}} - 2S_{\text{RS}} = \frac{1}{2} \int \varepsilon_{abc} E^a \wedge R^{bc} - 2\text{i} \int \Psi \wedge \mathcal{D}\Psi . \quad (3.1)$$

Making use of the first supersymmetry transformation (2.19) and the local Poincaré translation (2.20) allows us to impose the unitary gauge

$$X^a = 0, \quad \Theta^\alpha = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

Then (3.1) turns into the action for pure $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity without a cosmological term [29].

Under the second supersymmetry, the composite fields E^a and Ψ^α are postulated to transform as

$$\delta_\epsilon \Psi^\alpha = -\mathcal{D}\epsilon^\alpha, \quad \delta_\epsilon E^a = 2i\epsilon\gamma^a\Psi. \quad (3.3a)$$

The Goldstone fields are required to be inert under this transformation,

$$\delta_\epsilon X^a = 0, \quad \delta_\epsilon \Theta^\alpha = 0. \quad (3.3b)$$

The elementary fields ψ^α and e^a transform as follows:

$$\delta_\epsilon \psi^\alpha = -\mathcal{D}\epsilon^\alpha + \frac{1}{2}(\Theta\delta_\epsilon\Omega)^\alpha, \quad (3.3c)$$

$$\delta_\epsilon e^a = -\delta_\epsilon\Omega^a{}_b X^b + 2i\epsilon\gamma^a\Psi + 2i\mathcal{D}\epsilon\gamma^a\Theta - \frac{i}{4}\varepsilon^{abc}\delta_\epsilon\Omega_{bc}\Theta^2. \quad (3.3d)$$

The dependence on $\delta_\epsilon\Omega$ in (3.3c) and (3.3d) is such that the composite fields Ψ^α and E^a remain unchanged when the connection gets the displacement $\Omega \rightarrow \Omega + \delta_\epsilon\Omega$. As will be shown, the transformation law of Ω will be determined by demanding the action (3.1) to be invariant under this new local supersymmetry (3.3).

We now compute variations of the two terms in the action (3.1). Denote $\delta_\epsilon^{(1)}$ for variations with respect to the transformations (3.3a) and $\delta_\epsilon^{(2)}$ for variations with respect to the Lorentz connection. Computing the $\delta_\epsilon^{(1)}$ variation of the Einstein-Hilbert action (2.27) gives

$$\delta_\epsilon^{(1)} S_{\text{EH}} = i \int \varepsilon_{abc} R^{ab} \wedge \epsilon\gamma^c\Psi. \quad (3.4)$$

Computing the $\delta_\epsilon^{(1)}$ variation of the Rarita-Schwinger action (2.28) gives

$$\delta_\epsilon^{(1)} S_{\text{RS}} = \frac{i}{2} \int \varepsilon_{abc} R^{ab} \wedge \epsilon\gamma^c\Psi, \quad (3.5)$$

where we have used the relations

$$\mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}\Psi = -\frac{1}{2}\Psi \wedge R, \quad \mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}\epsilon = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon R. \quad (3.6)$$

As a result, computing the $\delta_\epsilon^{(1)}$ variation of the action (3.1), we observe that the curvature contributions (3.4) and (3.5) precisely cancel each other,

$$\delta_\epsilon^{(1)} S_{\text{SG}} = \delta_\epsilon^{(1)} (S_{\text{EH}} - 2S_{\text{RS}}) = \delta_\epsilon^{(1)} S_{\text{EH}} - 2\delta_\epsilon^{(1)} S_{\text{RS}} = 0 . \quad (3.7)$$

Next, we vary the action (3.1) with respect to the Lorentz connection Ω^{ab} . We give the Lorentz connection a small disturbance $\Omega \rightarrow \Omega + \delta_\epsilon \Omega$, with $\delta_\epsilon \Omega$ to be determined below, and assume that the elementary fields ψ^α and e^a also acquire $\delta_\epsilon \Omega$ -dependent variations given in (3.3c) and (3.3d). For the Einstein-Hilbert action we get the variation

$$\delta_\epsilon^{(2)} S_{\text{EH}} = \frac{1}{2} \int \varepsilon_{abc} \mathcal{D}E^a \wedge \delta_\epsilon \Omega^{bc} . \quad (3.8)$$

The Rarita-Schwinger action variation is

$$\delta_\epsilon^{(2)} S_{\text{RS}} = \frac{i}{4} \int \varepsilon_{abc} \Psi \wedge \gamma^a \Psi \wedge \delta_\epsilon \Omega^{bc} . \quad (3.9)$$

Hence, the variation of the total action (3.1) with respect to the Lorentz connection is

$$\delta_\epsilon^{(2)} S_{\text{SG}} = \frac{1}{2} \int \mathbb{T}^a \wedge \varepsilon_{abc} \delta_\epsilon \Omega^{bc} . \quad (3.10)$$

Combining the results (3.7) and (3.10), we end up with

$$\delta_\epsilon S_{\text{SG}} = \frac{1}{2} \int \mathbb{T}^a \wedge \varepsilon_{abc} \delta_\epsilon \Omega^{bc} . \quad (3.11)$$

This variation vanishes if $\delta_\epsilon \Omega^{bc} = 0$, which differs from the case of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity in four dimensions considered in [26].

Alternatively, we can work with a composite connection obtained by imposing the constraint

$$\mathbb{T}^a = \mathcal{D}E^a - i\Psi \wedge \gamma^a \Psi = dE^a + E^b \wedge \Omega^a{}_b - i\Psi \wedge \gamma^a \Psi = 0 . \quad (3.12)$$

In the case of vanishing Goldstone fields, $X^a = 0$ and $\Theta^\alpha = 0$, one can uniquely solve (3.12) for the connection giving its well-known expression in terms of the dreibein and gravitino, $\Omega = \Omega(e, \psi)$.

It is a simple observation that (3.12) is the equation of motion for the Lorentz connection Ω . If this equation holds, the explicit form of the variation $\delta_\epsilon \Omega$ is irrelevant when computing $\delta_\epsilon S_{\text{SG}}$. Thus the Volkov-Soroka approach allows one to naturally arrive at the 1.5 formalism [49, 50].

3.2 Anti-de Sitter supergravity

In order to describe a supersymmetric extension of gravity with a cosmological term

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x e (R - 2\Lambda) , \quad (3.13)$$

the second supersymmetry transformation (3.3) has to be deformed.

Let us alter the Ψ^α transformation (3.3a) in the following way

$$\delta_\epsilon \Psi^\alpha = -\mathcal{D}\epsilon^\alpha - \frac{m}{2}(\epsilon\gamma_a)^\alpha E^a \equiv \delta_\epsilon^{(1)}\Psi^\alpha + \delta_\epsilon^{(m)}\Psi^\alpha , \quad (3.14)$$

while keeping the E^a and Goldstone field transformations the same, as given by the equations (3.3a) and (3.3b). Here m is a constant real parameter. The elementary fields ψ^α and e^a pick up an additional term proportional to m :

$$\delta_\epsilon \psi^\alpha = -\mathcal{D}\epsilon^\alpha + \frac{1}{2}(\Theta\delta_\epsilon\Omega)^\alpha - \frac{m}{2}(\epsilon\gamma_a)^\alpha E^a , \quad (3.15a)$$

$$\delta_\epsilon e^a = -\delta_\epsilon \Omega^{ab} X_b + 2i\epsilon\gamma^a\Psi + 2i\mathcal{D}\epsilon\gamma^a\Theta - \frac{i}{4}\varepsilon^{abc}\delta_\epsilon\Omega_{bc}\Theta^2 + im(\epsilon\gamma_b\gamma^a\Theta)E^b . \quad (3.15b)$$

Let us now add to the action (3.1) a supersymmetric cosmological term

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{super-cosm}} &= m^2 S_{\text{cosm}} - im S_{\text{mass}} \\ &= -\frac{1}{6}m^2 \int \varepsilon_{abc} E^a \wedge E^b \wedge E^c - im \int \Psi \wedge E^a \wedge \gamma_a \Psi . \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

We will show that the resulting additional variation for the action (3.1) due to the term proportional to m in (3.14) combined with the total variation of the action (3.16) does not contribute to the already established variation (3.11) if we require certain conditions.

First we compute the additional variation of the action (3.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\epsilon^{(m)} S_{\text{SG}} &= -2\delta_\epsilon^{(m)} S_{\text{RS}} \\ &= -2im \int \left(\mathcal{D}\epsilon^\beta (\gamma_a)_\beta{}^\alpha \wedge E^a \wedge \Psi_\alpha - (\epsilon\gamma_a)^\alpha \mathcal{D}E^a \wedge \Psi_\alpha \right) , \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

where we have denoted $\delta_\epsilon^{(m)}$ for the variation due to the additional term $-\frac{1}{2}m(\epsilon\gamma_a)^\alpha E^a$ appearing in (3.14). The total variation of the action (3.16) under the transformations (3.3a) and (3.14) respectively reads⁷

$$\delta_\epsilon S_{\text{super-cosm}} = 2im \int \mathcal{D}\epsilon^\beta (\gamma_a)_\beta{}^\alpha \wedge E^a \wedge \Psi_\alpha . \quad (3.18)$$

⁷There is no connection variation contribution from this action.

Combining all variations (3.11), (3.17) and (3.18), we end up with

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_\epsilon S_{\text{AdS}} &= \frac{1}{2} \int \mathbb{T}^a \wedge \varepsilon_{abc} \delta_\epsilon \Omega^{bc} + 2im \int \mathcal{D}E^a \wedge \epsilon \gamma_a \Psi \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int \mathbb{T}^a \wedge \varepsilon_{abc} \delta_\epsilon \Omega^{bc} + 2im \int (\mathbb{T}^a + i\Psi \wedge \gamma^a \Psi) \wedge \epsilon \gamma_a \Psi \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int \mathbb{T}^a \wedge (\varepsilon_{abc} \delta_\epsilon \Omega^{bc} + 4im\epsilon \gamma_a \Psi) ,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

where we have denoted

$$S_{\text{AdS}} = S_{\text{SG}} + S_{\text{super-cosm}} . \tag{3.20}$$

This action is invariant under the deformed local supersymmetry transformations (3.3a), (3.3b), (3.14), (3.15a) and (3.15b), provided

$$\delta_\epsilon \Omega^{bc} = 2im\varepsilon^{abc} \epsilon \gamma_a \Psi . \tag{3.21}$$

In the unitary gauge (3.2), the action (3.20) coincides with that proposed by Howe and Tucker to describe AdS supergravity [29].

Alternatively, we can deal with a composite connection obtained by imposing the constraint (3.12), which makes the variation (3.19) vanish. In the remainder of this paper, we will work with the condition (3.12), which will be necessary for our consideration of (cosmological) topologically massive supergravity theories in section 4. Requiring the constraint (3.12) to be invariant under the transformations

$$\delta_\epsilon \Psi^\alpha = -\mathcal{D}\epsilon^\alpha - \frac{m}{2} (\epsilon \gamma_a)^\alpha E^a , \tag{3.22a}$$

$$\delta_\epsilon E^a = 2i\epsilon \gamma^a \Psi , \tag{3.22b}$$

we can determine a non-trivial variation of the connection. In particular, one finds

$$E^b \wedge \delta_\epsilon \Omega^a{}_b = -2i\epsilon \gamma^a \mathcal{D}\Psi - im\epsilon E^b \wedge \gamma_b \gamma^a \Psi , \tag{3.23}$$

which has the unique solution for the dual connection $\Omega_{ma} := \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{abc} \Omega_m{}^{bc}$,

$$\delta_\epsilon \Omega_{ma} = -2i\epsilon \left(\gamma_m \mathfrak{F}_a - \frac{1}{2} E_{ma} \gamma_b \mathfrak{F}^b \right) + im\epsilon (\varepsilon_{abc} E_m{}^b \Psi^c - \gamma_a \Psi_m) , \tag{3.24}$$

where

$$\star \mathcal{D}\Psi = dx^m \mathfrak{F}_m , \quad \mathfrak{F}_m := \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{mnp} \mathfrak{F}^{np} \tag{3.25}$$

is the Hodge dual of the gravitino field strength

$$\mathcal{D}\Psi = \frac{1}{2} dx^m \wedge dx^n \mathfrak{F}_{nm} , \quad \mathfrak{F}_{nm} := \mathcal{D}_n \Psi_m - \mathcal{D}_m \Psi_n = -\mathfrak{F}_{mn} . \tag{3.26}$$

When $m = 0$, this transformation law is compatible with $\delta_\epsilon \Omega_{ma} = 0$ since this variation vanishes when Ψ is on-shell, $\mathcal{D}\Psi = 0$ [31].

4 Topologically massive supergravity

A unique feature of three dimensions is the existence of Chern-Simons terms that can be used to define topologically massive couplings [51–55].

4.1 Conformal supergravity

Here we study a generalisation of the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric Lorentz Chern-Simons action [31] which involves the Goldstone fields X^a and Θ^α . We consider the action

$$S_{\text{CSG}} = S_{\text{LCS}} + S_{\text{FCS}} , \quad (4.1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{LCS}} &= \frac{1}{2} \int \text{Tr} \left(\Omega \wedge d\Omega - \frac{1}{3} \Omega \wedge \Omega \wedge \Omega \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \int d^3x E \varepsilon^{mnp} \left(\Omega_m{}^{ab} R_{npab} + \frac{2}{3} \Omega_m{}^a{}_b \Omega_n{}^b{}_c \Omega_p{}^c{}_a \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

is the Lorentz Chern-Simons term, and

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{FCS}} &= 2i \int \left(\mathcal{D}\Psi^\alpha \wedge \star \mathcal{D}\Psi_\alpha + \star \mathcal{D}\Psi^\alpha \wedge E_{\alpha\beta} \wedge \star \mathcal{D}\Psi^\beta \right) \\ &= -2i \int d^3x E \mathfrak{F}^a \mathfrak{F}_a \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

the fermionic Chern-Simons term. The latter involves the gravitino field strength (3.26) and its Hodge dual (3.25). In the unitary gauge (3.2), the functional (4.1) coincides with the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric Lorentz Chern-Simons action [31] which is also known as the action for $\mathcal{N} = 1$ conformal supergravity [39].

We endeavour to demonstrate that the action (4.1) is invariant under the local supersymmetry transformations (3.22a), (3.22b) and (3.24). The elementary fields ψ^α and e^a transform according to (3.15a) and (3.15b). As before, it is assumed that the $\delta_\epsilon \Omega$ -dependence in these transformation laws is such that the composite fields Ψ^α and E^a remain unchanged when the connection is perturbed $\Omega \rightarrow \Omega + \delta_\epsilon \Omega$.

Once this has been achieved, we can couple the action (4.1) to the AdS supergravity action (3.20) giving a generalisation of cosmological topologically massive supergravity proposed in [32]. However, we first consider topologically massive supergravity without a cosmological term [31] by restricting to the case $m = 0$.

Let us compute variations of the action (4.1) in parts, beginning with the variation of the Lorentz Chern-Simons term (4.2),

$$\delta S_{\text{LCS}} = i \int d^3x E R(\epsilon\gamma_a \mathfrak{F}^a) + 4i \int d^3x E G^{ab}(\epsilon\gamma_b \mathfrak{F}_a) , \quad (4.4)$$

where $G_{ab} = R_{ab} - \frac{1}{2}\eta_{ab}R$ is the Einstein tensor, $R_{ab} = R^c{}_{acb}$ is the Ricci tensor and $R = -2\eta^{ab}G_{ab} = \eta^{ab}R_{ab}$ is the Ricci scalar. Varying the fermionic Chern-Simons term (4.3) with respect to Ψ gives

$$\delta_\Psi S_{\text{FCS}} = -2i \int d^3x E \left(G^{ab}(\epsilon\gamma_a \mathfrak{F}_b) + \varepsilon^{abc} G_{ba}(\epsilon\mathfrak{F}_c) + G^{ab}(\epsilon\gamma_b \mathfrak{F}_a) + \frac{1}{2}R(\epsilon\gamma_a \mathfrak{F}^a) \right) , \quad (4.5)$$

where we have used the second relation in (3.6). Combining the variations (4.4) and (4.5) results in the cancellation of the Ricci scalar curvature terms leaving

$$\delta S_{\text{LCS}} + \delta_\Psi S_{\text{FCS}} = 2i \int d^3x E \{ G^{ab}(\epsilon\gamma_b \mathfrak{F}_a) - G^{ab}(\epsilon\gamma_a \mathfrak{F}_b) - \varepsilon^{abc} G_{ba}(\epsilon\mathfrak{F}_c) \} . \quad (4.6)$$

Let us introduce the Hodge dual of the antisymmetric part $R_{[ab]}$ of the Ricci tensor

$$\star R^a = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{abc} R_{bc} , \quad (4.7)$$

so that the combined variation (4.6) takes the form

$$\delta S_{\text{LCS}} + \delta_\Psi S_{\text{FCS}} = 2i \int d^3x E \{ G^{ab}(\epsilon\gamma_b \mathfrak{F}_a) - G^{ab}(\epsilon\gamma_a \mathfrak{F}_b) + 2\star R^a(\epsilon\mathfrak{F}_a) \} . \quad (4.8)$$

With some algebraic manipulations, this combination can be brought to the simplified form of a single term involving (4.7)

$$\delta S_{\text{LCS}} + \delta_\Psi S_{\text{FCS}} = 4i \int d^3x E \star R^a(\epsilon\gamma_b \gamma_a \mathfrak{F}^b) , \quad (4.9)$$

which upon inserting the relation (C.5) and substituting the identity (B.7a) becomes

$$\delta S_{\text{LCS}} + \delta_\Psi S_{\text{FCS}} = 2 \int d^3x E \{ 2(\mathfrak{F}^b \gamma^a \Psi_b)(\epsilon\mathfrak{F}_a) + 2\varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}_d \gamma_b \Psi^d)(\epsilon\gamma_c \mathfrak{F}_a) \} . \quad (4.10)$$

Next we vary the action (4.3) with respect to the composite field E^a . This variation reads

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_E S_{\text{FCS}} = 2 \int d^3x E \{ & -2(\mathfrak{F}^a \mathfrak{F}_a)(\epsilon\gamma^b \Psi_b) - 2\varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}_b \gamma_c \mathfrak{F}_a)(\epsilon\gamma_d \Psi^d) \\ & + 4(\mathfrak{F}^a \mathfrak{F}_b)(\epsilon\gamma^b \Psi_a) + 4\varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}^d \gamma_c \mathfrak{F}_a)(\epsilon\gamma_b \Psi_d) \} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

The final variation to be computed is the variation of S_{FCS} (4.3) with respect to the Lorentz connection. Direct calculations give

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\Omega} S_{\text{FCS}} = 2 \int d^3x E \{ & 2\varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}^d \gamma_d \Psi_c)(\epsilon \gamma_b \mathfrak{F}_a) - 2\varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}_a \gamma_d \Psi_c)(\epsilon \gamma_b \mathfrak{F}^d) \\ & - 2\varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}^d \gamma_a \Psi_c)(\epsilon \gamma_b \mathfrak{F}_d) + 2(\mathfrak{F}^a \Psi_b)(\epsilon \gamma_a \mathfrak{F}^b) \} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

In order to show that the total variation of the action (4.1) vanishes, we will need to perform systematic Fierz rearrangements on the individual terms contained within the variations of (4.10) and (4.12) such that all terms have products of the form $(\mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{F})(\epsilon\Psi)$, potentially with gamma matrices wedged between the fields. Note that the variation (4.11) is already in the desired form and so will not require a Fierz rearrangement of its terms. After a series of tedious calculations guided by the use of the Fierz rearrangement rule for two-component spinors (B.11), we achieve the desired forms of the variations (4.10) and (4.12):

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S_{\text{LCS}} + \delta_{\Psi} S_{\text{FCS}} = 2 \int d^3x E \{ & -3(\mathfrak{F}^a \mathfrak{F}^b)(\epsilon \gamma_b \Psi_a) + (\mathfrak{F}_b \gamma^a \mathfrak{F}_a)(\epsilon \Psi^b) \\ & - \varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}^d \gamma_c \mathfrak{F}_a)(\epsilon \gamma_b \Psi_d) \} , \end{aligned} \quad (4.13a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\Omega} S_{\text{FCS}} = 2 \int d^3x E \{ & (\mathfrak{F}^a \gamma_a \mathfrak{F}^b)(\epsilon \Psi_b) - (\mathfrak{F}^a \mathfrak{F}^b)(\epsilon \gamma_a \Psi_b) + 2(\mathfrak{F}^a \mathfrak{F}_a)(\epsilon \gamma^b \Psi_b) \\ & + 2\varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}_a \gamma_b \mathfrak{F}^d)(\epsilon \gamma_d \Psi_c) + 2\varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}_b \gamma_d \mathfrak{F}_a)(\epsilon \gamma^d \Psi_c) \\ & + 2\varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}_a \gamma_d \mathfrak{F}^d)(\epsilon \gamma_b \Psi_c) - \varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}_b \gamma_c \mathfrak{F}^d)(\epsilon \gamma_a \Psi_d) \} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.13b)$$

Summing all variations (4.13a), (4.13b) and (4.11) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S_{\text{CSG}} = \delta S_{\text{LCS}} + \delta_{\Psi} S_{\text{FCS}} + \delta_E S_{\text{FCS}} + \delta_{\Omega} S_{\text{FCS}} \\ = 4 \int d^3x E \{ & \varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}^d \gamma_c \mathfrak{F}_a)(\epsilon \gamma_b \Psi_d) - \varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}_b \gamma_c \mathfrak{F}_a)(\epsilon \gamma_d \Psi^d) \\ & + \varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}_a \gamma_d \mathfrak{F}^d)(\epsilon \gamma_b \Psi_c) + \varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}_b \gamma_d \mathfrak{F}_a)(\epsilon \gamma^d \Psi_c) \\ & + \varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}_a \gamma_b \mathfrak{F}^d)(\epsilon \gamma_d \Psi_c) \} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

The combination in curly brackets can be rewritten in the equivalent form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}(\epsilon \gamma_b \Psi_d) \left[\varepsilon^{bac} \{ & (\mathfrak{F}_a \gamma_c \mathfrak{F}^d) + (\mathfrak{F}^d \gamma_a \mathfrak{F}_c) + (\mathfrak{F}_c \gamma^d \mathfrak{F}_a) \} \right. \\ & \left. + \varepsilon^{dac} \{ (\mathfrak{F}_a \gamma_c \mathfrak{F}^b) + (\mathfrak{F}^b \gamma_a \mathfrak{F}_c) + (\mathfrak{F}_c \gamma^b \mathfrak{F}_a) \} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\varepsilon_{abc}(\varepsilon\gamma_d\Psi^d)(\mathfrak{F}^b\gamma^c\mathfrak{F}^a) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{bac}(\varepsilon\gamma_b\Psi_d)(\mathfrak{F}_a\gamma_c\mathfrak{F}^d) - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{bac}(\varepsilon\gamma_b\Psi_d)(\mathfrak{F}^d\gamma_a\mathfrak{F}_c) \\
& -\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{cad}(\varepsilon\gamma^b\Psi^d)(\mathfrak{F}^c\gamma_b\mathfrak{F}^a) - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{bac}(\varepsilon\gamma_b\Psi_d)(\mathfrak{F}_c\gamma^d\mathfrak{F}_a) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{dac}(\varepsilon\gamma_b\Psi_d)(\mathfrak{F}_a\gamma_c\mathfrak{F}^b) \\
& -\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{dac}(\varepsilon\gamma_b\Psi_d)(\mathfrak{F}^b\gamma_a\mathfrak{F}_c) - \varepsilon_{abd}(\varepsilon\gamma^b\Psi^d)(\mathfrak{F}^c\gamma_c\mathfrak{F}^a) .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Now if we consider the first cycled combination in curly brackets

$$\mathfrak{F}_a\gamma_c\mathfrak{F}_d + \mathfrak{F}_d\gamma_a\mathfrak{F}_c + \mathfrak{F}_c\gamma_d\mathfrak{F}_a \equiv \mathcal{X}_{acd} , \tag{4.16}$$

we notice that \mathcal{X}_{acd} is totally antisymmetric in its indices and therefore

$$\mathcal{X}_{acd} = k\varepsilon_{acd} = -\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{bef}(\mathfrak{F}_b\gamma_e\mathfrak{F}_f)\varepsilon_{acd} . \tag{4.17}$$

Similarly, applying the same trick for the second cycled term in curly brackets leads to the same result. As a consequence of these observations, we cancel the term in (4.15) proportional to $(\varepsilon\gamma_d\Psi^d)$. After additional cancellations within the combination (4.15), it reduces to three remaining terms,

$$-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{cad}(\mathfrak{F}^c\gamma_b\mathfrak{F}^a)(\varepsilon\gamma^b\Psi^d) - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{bac}(\mathfrak{F}^c\gamma^d\mathfrak{F}^a)(\varepsilon\gamma^b\Psi_d) - \varepsilon_{abd}(\mathfrak{F}^c\gamma_c\mathfrak{F}^a)(\varepsilon\gamma^b\Psi^d) . \tag{4.18}$$

This combination may be shown to be identically zero.

As a result, we have demonstrated that the conformal supergravity action (4.1) is invariant under the local supersymmetry transformations (3.22a), (3.22b) and (3.24). This implies that the action

$$S_{\text{TMSG}} = \frac{1}{\kappa}S_{\text{SG}} + \frac{1}{\mu}S_{\text{CSG}} \tag{4.19}$$

is also invariant under the second local supersymmetry, with κ and μ being coupling constants. In the unitary gauge (3.2), the functional (4.19) turns into the action for $\mathcal{N} = 1$ topologically massive supergravity originally constructed in [31].

4.2 Cosmological topologically massive supergravity

We now incorporate the supersymmetric cosmological term (3.16) by demonstrating that the additional variations of the action (4.1) arising from the m -dependent transformation terms in (3.22a) and (3.24) keep the action stationary. The first contribution comes from varying the Lorentz Chern-Simons action (4.2),

$$\delta^{(m)}S_{\text{LCS}} = 2im \int d^3x E G^{ab}(\varepsilon\gamma_a\Psi_b) + 4m \int d^3x E (\Psi_a\gamma_b\mathfrak{F}^a)(\varepsilon\Psi^b) . \tag{4.20}$$

The variation of the fermionic Chern-Simons action (4.3) resulting from the m -dependent transformation term for the field Ψ reads

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\Psi}^{(m)} S_{\text{FCS}} = & 2m \int d^3x E \{ 2(\epsilon \mathfrak{F}^a)(\Psi_a \gamma^b \Psi_b) - \varepsilon^{abc}(\epsilon \gamma_a \mathfrak{F}^d)(\Psi_c \gamma_d \Psi_b) \\ & + \varepsilon^{abc}(\epsilon \gamma_d \mathfrak{F}^d)(\Psi_c \gamma_a \Psi_b) - \varepsilon^{abc}(\epsilon \gamma_d \mathfrak{F}_a)(\Psi_c \gamma^d \Psi_b) \\ & - iG^{ab}(\epsilon \gamma_a \Psi_b) \} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

Combining these two variations results in the cancellation of the terms proportional to G^{ab} leaving

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{(m)} S_{\text{LCS}} + \delta_{\Psi}^{(m)} S_{\text{FCS}} = & 2m \int d^3x E \{ (\Psi_a \gamma^b \Psi_b)(\epsilon \mathfrak{F}^a) - (\Psi_a \Psi_b)(\epsilon \gamma^b \mathfrak{F}^a) \\ & - \varepsilon^{abc}(\epsilon \gamma_b \mathfrak{F}^d)(\Psi_d \gamma_c \Psi_a) - \varepsilon^{abc}(\epsilon \gamma_a \mathfrak{F}^d)(\Psi_c \gamma_d \Psi_b) \\ & + \varepsilon^{abc}(\epsilon \gamma_d \mathfrak{F}^d)(\Psi_c \gamma_a \Psi_b) - \varepsilon^{abc}(\epsilon \gamma_d \mathfrak{F}_a)(\Psi_c \gamma^d \Psi_b) \} , \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

where the additional terms have arisen from a Fierz rearrangement of the second term in (4.20). Finally, the m -dependent transformation term for the Lorentz connection gives us the contribution

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\Omega}^{(m)} S_{\text{FCS}} = & 2m \int d^3x E \{ (\mathfrak{F}_a \gamma^b \Psi_b)(\epsilon \Psi^a) + (\mathfrak{F}^a \gamma_b \Psi_a)(\epsilon \Psi^b) - (\mathfrak{F}^a \Psi_a)(\epsilon \gamma^b \Psi_b) \\ & + (\mathfrak{F}^a \Psi_b)(\epsilon \gamma^b \Psi_a) - \varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}_b \Psi_a)(\epsilon \Psi_c) - \varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}_a \gamma_d \Psi_c)(\epsilon \gamma^d \Psi_b) \\ & + \varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}^d \gamma_d \Psi_c)(\epsilon \gamma_a \Psi_b) - \varepsilon^{abc}(\mathfrak{F}^d \gamma_a \Psi_c)(\epsilon \gamma_d \Psi_b) \} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

Following the strategy used in the $m = 0$ case, we perform systematic Fierz rearrangements on the individual terms contained within the variation (4.23) such that all terms have products of the form $(\epsilon \mathfrak{F})(\Psi \Psi)$, potentially with gamma matrices wedged between the fields. After applying the Fierz rearrangement rule (B.11) on all terms, we arrive at the desired form of the variation (4.23),

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\Omega}^{(m)} S_{\text{FCS}} = & 2m \int d^3x E \{ (\epsilon \gamma^b \mathfrak{F}^a)(\Psi_a \Psi_b) - (\epsilon \mathfrak{F}^b)(\Psi_b \gamma^a \Psi_a) \\ & - \varepsilon^{abc}(\epsilon \gamma^d \mathfrak{F}_b)(\Psi_c \gamma_d \Psi_a) - \varepsilon^{abc}(\epsilon \gamma_c \mathfrak{F}^d)(\Psi_d \gamma_a \Psi_b) \} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Summing the variations (4.22) and (4.24) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{(m)} S_{\text{CSG}} = & \delta^{(m)} S_{\text{LCS}} + \delta_{\Psi}^{(m)} S_{\text{FCS}} + \delta_{\Omega}^{(m)} S_{\text{FCS}} \\ = & 2m \int d^3x E \left\{ \varepsilon^{abc}(\epsilon \gamma_d \mathfrak{F}^d)(\Psi_c \gamma_a \Psi_b) - \varepsilon^{abc}(\epsilon \gamma_a \mathfrak{F}^d)(\Psi_c \gamma_d \Psi_b) \right. \\ & \left. - 2\varepsilon^{abc}(\epsilon \gamma_b \mathfrak{F}^d)(\Psi_d \gamma_c \Psi_a) \right\} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

The combination of these three terms may be shown to be identically zero, and therefore

$$\delta^{(m)} S_{\text{CSG}} = \delta^{(m)} S_{\text{LCS}} + \delta_{\Psi}^{(m)} S_{\text{FCS}} + \delta_{\Omega}^{(m)} S_{\text{FCS}} = 0 . \quad (4.26)$$

Finally we arrive at

$$\delta S_{\text{CSG}} = \delta S_{\text{LCS}} + \delta_{\Psi} S_{\text{FCS}} + \delta_E S_{\text{FCS}} + \delta_{\Omega} S_{\text{FCS}} = 0 . \quad (4.27)$$

We have demonstrated that the action

$$S_{\text{CTMSG}} = \frac{1}{\kappa} \left(S_{\text{SG}} + S_{\text{super-cosm}} \right) + \frac{1}{\mu} S_{\text{CSG}} \quad (4.28)$$

is invariant under the second local supersymmetry given by (3.22a), (3.22b) and (3.24), with κ and μ coupling constants. In the unitary gauge (3.2), the functional (4.28) turns into the action for $\mathcal{N} = 1$ cosmological topologically massive supergravity originally constructed in [32].

5 Conclusion

In this paper we have developed a nonlinear realisation approach to (cosmological) topologically massive $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity in three dimensions. In addition to the supergravity multiplet, the action involves the Goldstone fields X^a and Θ^α which are purely gauge degrees of freedom with respect to the local super-Poincaré translations generated by the parameters (b^a, η^α) . The action is invariant under two different local supersymmetries. One of them acts on the Goldstino, while the other supersymmetry leaves the Goldstino invariant. The former can be used to gauge away the Goldstino, and then the resulting action coincides with that given in the literature [32].

There is a remarkable feature of uniqueness in the proposed approach to $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity. The explicit structure of the first local supersymmetry (2.19) is uniquely determined by the coset construction under consideration. In the case of topologically massive supergravity (4.19), the structure of the second local supersymmetry (3.3) is modelled on the first one, eq. (2.19). In the case of cosmological topologically massive supergravity, the second supersymmetry is deformed by m -dependent contributions.

The action for cosmological topologically massive supergravity, eq. (4.28), involves two different functionals, which are separately invariant under the two local supersymmetry transformations. The first functional $S_{\text{AdS}} = S_{\text{SG}} + S_{\text{super-cosm}}$ is a combination of four

terms with fixed relative coefficients. The second functional S_{CSG} is a combination of two terms with fixed relative coefficients. Changing at least one of the relative coefficients breaks explicitly the second local supersymmetry, and then the resulting action describes a model for spontaneously broken $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity.

In principle, our construction, which is a natural application of the ideas pioneered by Volkov and Soroka [13, 14], may be generalised to include more general models for massive $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity constructed in [58, 59] and recast in the superspace setting of [60]. That would require a further deformation of the second local supersymmetry transformation. Of course, the massive supergravity theories of [58–60] were constructed using off-shell supergravity techniques, and our nonlinear realisation approach to supergravity is not a competitor to the off-shell methods, simply due to the fact that the second local supersymmetry is on-shell. It is still quite remarkable that the structure of $\mathcal{N} = 1$ Poincaré supergravity is uniquely determined by applying the formalism of nonlinear realisations.

The Volkov-Soroka approach was also inspirational for a recent work [61] in which the minimal massive gravity theory of [62] was shown to be a particular case of a more general ‘minimal massive gravity’ arising upon spontaneous breaking of a local symmetry in a Chern-Simons gravity based on a Hietarinta or Maxwell algebra. It would be interesting to extend the construction of [61] to the supersymmetric case.

Acknowledgements:

We are grateful to Ian McArthur and Dmitri Sorokin for discussions and suggestions. The work of SMK is supported in part by the Australian Research Council, projects DP200101944 and DP230101629. The work of JS is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship.

A Nonlinear realisation approach to 4D gravity

In this appendix we review the nonlinear realisation approach to gravity proposed by Volkov and Soroka [13, 14]. It can be formulated in d spacetime dimensions by identifying the proper orthochronous Poincaré group $\text{ISO}_0(d-1, 1)$ with the set of all $(d+1) \times (d+1)$ matrices of the form

$$D(\Lambda, b) = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda^a_b & b^a \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Lambda = (\Lambda^a_b) \in \text{SO}_0(d-1, 1), \quad b = (b^a) \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

However, we prefer to fix $d = 4$ and work with $\text{ISL}(2, \mathbb{C})$, the universal covering group of the proper orthochronous Poincaré group $\text{ISO}_0(3, 1)$. Any element $g = (M, b) \in \text{ISL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ is a 4×4 matrix of the form

$$g = S(\mathbb{1}_2, b) h(M, 0) \equiv Sh, \quad (\text{A.2a})$$

$$S(\mathbb{1}_2, b) := \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbb{1}_2 & 0 \\ \hline -i\tilde{b} & \mathbb{1}_2 \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \delta_{\alpha\beta} & 0 \\ \hline -i b^{\dot{\alpha}\beta} & \delta^{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} \end{array} \right), \quad (\text{A.2b})$$

$$h(M, 0) := \left(\begin{array}{c|c} M & 0 \\ \hline 0 & (M^{-1})^\dagger \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} M_{\alpha\beta} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & (\bar{M}^{-1})_{\dot{\beta}\dot{\alpha}} \end{array} \right), \quad (\text{A.2c})$$

where $b^{\dot{\alpha}\beta} = b^a (\tilde{\sigma}_a)^{\dot{\alpha}\beta}$, $M = (M_{\alpha\beta}) \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$. The tilde notation in (A.2b) reflects the fact that there are two types of relativistic Pauli matrices, $\sigma_a = ((\sigma_a)_{\alpha\dot{\beta}})$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_a = ((\tilde{\sigma}_a)^{\dot{\alpha}\beta})$, see [56]. The group element $S(\mathbb{1}_2, b)$ is parametrised by a real 4-vector b^a .

Introduce a Goldstone vector field $V^a(x)$ for spacetime translations. It takes its values in the homogeneous space $\mathbb{M}^4 = \text{ISL}(2, \mathbb{C})/\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ (Minkowski space) according to the rule:

$$\mathfrak{S}(V) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbb{1}_2 & 0 \\ \hline -i\tilde{V} & \mathbb{1}_2 \end{array} \right). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We define gauge Poincaré transformations by

$$g(x) : V(x) \rightarrow V'(x), \quad g\mathfrak{S}(V) = \mathfrak{S}(V')h, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

with $g = Sh$. This is equivalent to the following transformations of the Goldstone field:

$$S(\mathbb{1}_2, b) : \quad \tilde{V}' = \tilde{V} + \tilde{b}, \quad (\text{A.5a})$$

$$h(M, 0) : \quad \tilde{V}' = (M^\dagger)^{-1} \tilde{V} M^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.5b})$$

Introduce a connection $\mathfrak{A} = dx^m \mathfrak{A}_m$ taking its values in the Poincaré algebra,

$$\mathfrak{A} := \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \Omega & 0 \\ \hline -i\tilde{e} & -\Omega^\dagger \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \Omega_{\alpha\beta} & 0 \\ \hline -i e^{\dot{\alpha}\beta} & -\bar{\Omega}^{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} \end{array} \right), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

and possessing the gauge transformation law

$$\mathfrak{A}' = g\mathfrak{A}g^{-1} + g\text{d}g^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Here the one-forms $\Omega_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\bar{\Omega}^{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}}$ are the spinor counterparts of the Lorentz connection $\Omega^{ab} = dx^m \Omega_m^{ab} = -\Omega^{ba}$ such that

$$\Omega_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_{ab})_{\alpha\beta} \Omega^{ab}, \quad \bar{\Omega}^{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} = -\frac{1}{2} (\tilde{\sigma}_{ab})^{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} \Omega^{ab}, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

and the matrices σ_{ab} and $\tilde{\sigma}_{ab}$ are defined as $\sigma_{ab} = -\frac{1}{4}(\sigma_a\tilde{\sigma}_b - \sigma_b\tilde{\sigma}_a)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_{ab} = -\frac{1}{4}(\tilde{\sigma}_a\sigma_b - \tilde{\sigma}_b\sigma_a)$.⁸ The Lorentz connection is an independent field.

Associated with \mathfrak{S} and \mathfrak{A} is the following connection

$$\mathbb{A} := \mathfrak{S}^{-1}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{S} + \mathfrak{S}^{-1}d\mathfrak{S} , \quad (\text{A.9})$$

which is characterised by the gauge transformation law

$$\mathbb{A}' = h\mathbb{A}h^{-1} + h dh^{-1} , \quad (\text{A.10})$$

for an arbitrary gauge parameter $g = Sh$. This transformation law tells us that \mathbb{A} is invariant under all gauge transformations of the form $g = S(\mathbb{1}_2, b)$ which describe local spacetime translations. The connection \mathbb{A} is the main object of the Volkov-Soroka construction. It has the form

$$\mathbb{A} := \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \Omega & 0 \\ \hline -i\tilde{E} & -\Omega^\dagger \end{array} \right) , \quad \tilde{E} := \tilde{e} + \mathcal{D}\tilde{V} , \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where \mathcal{D} denotes the covariant derivative,

$$\mathcal{D}\tilde{V} = d\tilde{V} - \Omega^\dagger\tilde{V} - \tilde{V}\Omega . \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Equation (A.10) is equivalent to the following gauge transformation laws:

$$\Omega' = M\Omega M^{-1} + M dM^{-1} , \quad (\text{A.13a})$$

$$\tilde{E}' = (M^\dagger)^{-1}\tilde{E}M^{-1} . \quad (\text{A.13b})$$

We see that the one-form E^a transforms as a four-vector under the gauge Lorentz group.

Let us consider a local Poincaré translation, $S(\mathbb{1}_2, b)$. It only acts on the Goldstone vector field V^a and the vierbein e^a ,

$$V'^a = V^a + b^a , \quad e'^a = e^a - \mathcal{D}b^a . \quad (\text{A.14})$$

We have two types of gauge transformations with vector parameters, the general coordinate transformations and the local Poincaré translations. The latter gauge freedom can be fixed by imposing the condition $V^a = 0$, and then we stay only with the general coordinate invariance. However, we prefer to keep V^a intact.

The curvature tensor is given by

$$\mathbb{R} = d\mathbb{A} - \mathbb{A} \wedge \mathbb{A} , \quad \mathbb{R}' = h\mathbb{R}h^{-1} . \quad (\text{A.15})$$

⁸This definition agrees with [57] and differs by sign from [56].

Its explicit form is

$$\mathbb{R} := \left(\begin{array}{c|c} R & 0 \\ \hline -i\tilde{\mathbb{T}} & -R^\dagger \end{array} \right), \quad (\text{A.16})$$

where $R = (R_\alpha^\beta)$ and $R^\dagger = (\bar{R}^{\dot{\alpha}}_{\dot{\beta}})$ form the Lorentz curvature, and

$$\tilde{\mathbb{T}} = d\tilde{E} - \tilde{E} \wedge \Omega + \Omega^\dagger \wedge \tilde{E} = \mathcal{D}\tilde{E} \iff \mathbb{T}^a = \mathcal{D}E^a \quad (\text{A.17})$$

is the torsion tensor.

Using the transformation laws (A.13b) and (A.15), one can immediately engineer gauge-invariant functionals, including the Einstein-Hilbert action

$$S_{\text{EH}} = \frac{1}{4} \int \varepsilon_{abcd} E^a \wedge E^b \wedge R^{cd} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x E R \quad (\text{A.18})$$

and the cosmological term

$$S_{\text{cosm}} = \frac{1}{24} \int \varepsilon_{abcd} E^a \wedge E^b \wedge E^c \wedge E^d = - \int d^4x E. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

In this formulation, the action for gravity with a cosmological term is

$$S = \frac{1}{\kappa^2} (S_{\text{EH}} + \Lambda S_{\text{cosm}}) = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int d^4x E (R - 2\Lambda), \quad (\text{A.20})$$

with Λ the cosmological constant. Varying this action with respect to the connection leads to the equation of motion $\mathbb{T}^a = 0$.

B 3D notation and conventions

In this appendix we collect key formulae of the 3D two-component spinor formalism that is described in [48]. The starting point for setting up this 3D spinor formalism is the 4D relativistic Pauli matrices⁹

$$(\sigma_{\underline{a}})_{\alpha\dot{\beta}} := (\mathbb{1}_2, \vec{\sigma}), \quad (\tilde{\sigma}_{\underline{a}})^{\dot{\alpha}\beta} := (\mathbb{1}_2, -\vec{\sigma}), \quad \underline{a} = 0, 1, 2, 3, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where $\vec{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)$ are the Pauli matrices. We remove the matrices with space index $\underline{a} = 2$ and obtain the 3D gamma-matrices

$$(\sigma_{\underline{a}})_{\alpha\dot{\beta}} \longrightarrow (\gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta} = (\gamma_a)_{\beta\alpha} = (\mathbb{1}_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_3), \quad (\text{B.2a})$$

⁹In contrast to the 4D notation used in the previous appendix, here it is useful to denote 4D vector indices by underlined Latin letters.

$$(\tilde{\sigma}_a)^{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} \longrightarrow (\gamma_a)^{\alpha\beta} = (\gamma_a)^{\beta\alpha} = \varepsilon^{\alpha\gamma}\varepsilon^{\beta\delta}(\gamma_a)_{\gamma\delta}, \quad a = 0, 1, 2. \quad (\text{B.2b})$$

The $(\gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta}$ and $(\gamma_a)^{\alpha\beta}$ are invariant tensors of the Lorentz group $\text{SO}_0(2, 1)$. They can be used to convert any three-vector V^a into symmetric second-rank spinors

$$\check{V} = (V_{\alpha\beta}), \quad V_{\alpha\beta} = V^a(\gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta}; \quad (\text{B.3a})$$

$$\hat{V} = (V^{\alpha\beta}), \quad V^{\alpha\beta} = V^a(\gamma_a)^{\alpha\beta}. \quad (\text{B.3b})$$

As is known, the invariance properties of $(\gamma_a)_{\alpha\beta}$ and $(\gamma_a)^{\alpha\beta}$ follow from the isomorphism $\text{SO}_0(2, 1) \cong \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})/\mathbb{Z}_2$ which is defined by associating with a group element $M \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ the linear transformation on the vector space of symmetric real 2×2 matrices \check{V}

$$\check{V} \rightarrow M\check{V}M^T. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

In the 3D case, the spinor indices are lowered and raised using the $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ invariant spinor metric $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}) = -(\varepsilon_{\beta\alpha})$ and its inverse $\varepsilon^{-1} = (\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}) = -(\varepsilon^{\beta\alpha})$, which are normalised by $\varepsilon^{12} = -\varepsilon_{12} = 1$. The rules for lowering and raising the spinor indices are:

$$\psi_\alpha = \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}\psi^\beta, \quad \psi^\alpha = \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\psi_\beta. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

By construction, the γ -matrices (B.2a) and (B.2b) are real and symmetric.

Properties of the 4D relativistic Pauli matrices imply analogous properties of the 3D γ -matrices. In particular, for the Dirac matrices

$$\gamma_a := ((\gamma_a)_\alpha^\beta) = \varepsilon^{\beta\gamma}(\gamma_a)_{\alpha\gamma} = (-i\sigma_2, \sigma_3, -\sigma_1) \quad (\text{B.6})$$

we have the following identities

$$\gamma_a\gamma_b = \eta_{ab}\mathbb{1}_2 + \varepsilon_{abc}\gamma^c \implies \{\gamma_a, \gamma_b\} = 2\eta_{ab}\mathbb{1}_2, \quad (\text{B.7a})$$

$$\gamma_a\gamma_b\gamma_c = \eta_{ab}\gamma_c - \eta_{ac}\gamma_b + \eta_{bc}\gamma_a + \varepsilon_{abc}\mathbb{1}_2, \quad (\text{B.7b})$$

$$(\gamma^a)^{\alpha\beta}(\gamma_a)^{\gamma\delta} = \varepsilon^{\alpha\gamma}\varepsilon^{\delta\beta} + \varepsilon^{\alpha\delta}\varepsilon^{\gamma\beta}, \quad (\text{B.7c})$$

where the 3D Minkowski metric is $\eta_{ab} = \eta^{ab} = \text{diag}(-1, +1, +1)$, and the Levi-Civita tensors ε_{abc} and ε^{abc} are normalised by $\varepsilon_{012} = -\varepsilon^{012} = -1$.

Throughout this paper, contractions of spinor indices are defined as follows:

$$\phi\chi := \phi^\alpha\chi_\alpha = \chi\phi, \quad \phi^2 := \phi\phi, \quad (\text{B.8a})$$

$$\phi\gamma_a\chi := \phi^\alpha(\gamma_a)_\alpha^\beta\chi_\beta = -\chi\gamma_a\phi. \quad (\text{B.8b})$$

Here ϕ_α and χ_α are arbitrary anti-commuting spinors.

The Dirac matrices (B.6) along with the unit matrix, $\Gamma_A := \{\mathbb{1}_2, \gamma_a\}$, form a basis in the linear space of 2×2 matrices. If we define the corresponding set with upper indices, $\Gamma^A := \{\mathbb{1}_2, \gamma^a\}$, we have the identity

$$\text{tr}(\Gamma_A \Gamma^B) = 2\delta_A^B . \quad (\text{B.9})$$

In accordance with this identity, if $M = (M_\alpha^\beta)$ and $N = (N_\alpha^\beta)$ are 2×2 matrices, then

$$M_\alpha^\beta N_\gamma^\delta = \sum_A (C^A)_\alpha^\delta (\Gamma_A)_\gamma^\beta , \quad (\text{B.10a})$$

$$(C^A)_\alpha^\delta = \frac{1}{2} M_\alpha^\beta (\Gamma^A)_\beta^\gamma N_\gamma^\delta . \quad (\text{B.10b})$$

Now let $\psi_1^\alpha, \psi_2^\alpha, \psi_3^\alpha$ and ψ_4^α be arbitrary two-component spinors. Using the equations (B.10a) and (B.10b) one can show that

$$(\psi_1 M \psi_2)(\psi_3 N \psi_4) = -\frac{1}{2} (\psi_1 M \Gamma^A N \psi_4)(\psi_3 \Gamma_A \psi_2) , \quad (\text{B.11})$$

which is the Fierz rearrangement rule for two-component spinors.

The Levi-Civita tensor with lower curved-space indices, ε_{mnp} , is defined by

$$\varepsilon_{mnp} = E \epsilon_{mnp} = E_m^a E_n^b E_p^c \varepsilon_{abc} , \quad (\text{B.12})$$

where $E := \det(E_m^a)$ and ϵ_{mnp} is the Levi-Civita symbol. Its counterpart with upper curved-space indices ε^{mnp} is

$$\varepsilon^{mnp} = E^{-1} \epsilon^{mnp} = E_a^m E_b^n E_c^p \varepsilon^{abc} . \quad (\text{B.13})$$

In three dimensions, any vector F^a can be equivalently realised as a symmetric second-rank spinor $F_{\alpha\beta} = F_{\beta\alpha}$ or as an antisymmetric second-rank tensor $F_{ab} = -F_{ba}$. The former realisation is obtained using the gamma-matrices:

$$F_{\alpha\beta} := (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} F_a = F_{\beta\alpha} , \quad F^a = -\frac{1}{2} (\gamma^a)^{\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\beta} . \quad (\text{B.14})$$

The antisymmetric tensor F_{ab} is the Hodge-dual of F_a ,

$$F_{ab} = -\varepsilon_{abc} F^c , \quad F_a = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{abc} F^{bc} . \quad (\text{B.15})$$

The symmetric spinor $F_{\alpha\beta}$ is defined in terms of F_{ab} as follows

$$F_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2} (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_{abc} F^{bc} . \quad (\text{B.16})$$

We emphasise that the three algebraic objects F_a , F_{ab} and $F_{\alpha\beta}$ are equivalent to each other. The corresponding inner products are related to each other as follows:

$$-F^a G_a = \frac{1}{2} F^{ab} G_{ab} = \frac{1}{2} F^{\alpha\beta} G_{\alpha\beta} . \quad (\text{B.17})$$

More details can be found in [38].

C The first Bianchi identity

The first Bianchi identity is given by

$$\mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}E^a = E^b \wedge R^a{}_b . \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Requiring the supersymmetric torsion to vanish gives

$$\mathbb{T}^a = \mathcal{D}E^a - i\Psi \wedge \gamma^a \Psi = 0 \quad \implies \quad \mathcal{D}\mathcal{D}E^a = 2i\Psi \wedge \gamma^a \mathcal{D}\Psi . \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Therefore,

$$E^b \wedge R^a{}_b = 2i\Psi \wedge \gamma^a \mathcal{D}\Psi . \quad (\text{C.3})$$

By expanding this expression into its components and contracting with ε^{mpn} we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{mpn} R_{mpn}{}^a &= -4i\varepsilon^{mpn} (\Psi_m \gamma^a \mathcal{D}_p \Psi_n) = -2i\varepsilon^{mpn} (\Psi_m \gamma^a (\mathcal{D}_p \Psi_n - \mathcal{D}_n \Psi_p)) \\ &= -2i\varepsilon^{mpn} (\Psi_m \gamma^a \mathfrak{F}_{pn}) = -4i(\Psi_m \gamma^a \mathfrak{F}^m) . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

The relation (C.4) implies that the dual of the antisymmetric part $R_{[ab]}$ of the Ricci tensor, eq. (4.7), can be expressed in terms of the fermionic fields:

$$\star R^a = i\Psi_b \gamma^a \mathfrak{F}^b . \quad (\text{C.5})$$

References

- [1] S. R. Coleman, J. Wess and B. Zumino, “Structure of phenomenological Lagrangians. 1,” *Phys. Rev.* **177**, 2239 (1969).
- [2] C. G. Callan Jr., S. R. Coleman, J. Wess and B. Zumino, “Structure of phenomenological Lagrangians. 2,” *Phys. Rev.* **177**, 2247 (1969).
- [3] C. J. Isham, “A group-theoretic approach to chiral transformations,” *Nuovo Cim. A* **59**, 356 (1969).
- [4] A. Salam and J. A. Strathdee, “Nonlinear realizations. 1. The Role of Goldstone bosons,” *Phys. Rev.* **184**, 1750 (1969).

- [5] D. V. Volkov, “Phenomenological Lagrangians,” *Sov. J. Particles Nucl.* **4**, 1 (1973).
- [6] V. I. Ogievetsky, “Nonlinear realizations of internal and space-time symmetries,” in *Proceeding of 10th Karpacz Winter School of Theoretical Physics, Vol. 1*, Wroslaw, 1974, pp. 117–132.
- [7] A. Salam and J. A. Strathdee, “Nonlinear realizations. 2. Conformal symmetry,” *Phys. Rev.* **184**, 1760 (1969).
- [8] C. J. Isham, A. Salam and J. A. Strathdee, “Spontaneous breakdown of conformal symmetry,” *Phys. Lett. B* **31**, 300 (1970).
- [9] C. J. Isham, A. Salam and J. A. Strathdee, “Nonlinear realizations of space-time symmetries. Scalar and tensor gravity,” *Annals Phys.* **62**, 98 (1971).
- [10] B. Zumino, “Effective Lagrangians and broken symmetries,” in *Lectures on Elementary Particles and Quantum Field Theory, Vol. 2*, S. Deser, M. Grisaru and H. Pendleton (Eds.), Cambridge, Mass. 1970, pp. 437-500.
- [11] E. A. Ivanov and V. I. Ogievetsky, “The inverse Higgs phenomenon in nonlinear realizations,” *Theor. Math. Phys.* **25**, 1050 (1975) [*Teor. Mat. Fiz.* **25**, 164 (1975)].
- [12] I. N. McArthur, “Nonlinear realizations of symmetries and unphysical Goldstone bosons,” *JHEP* **11**, 140 (2010) [arXiv:1009.3696 [hep-th]].
- [13] D. V. Volkov and V. A. Soroka, “Higgs effect for Goldstone particles with spin 1/2,” *JETP Lett.* **18**, 312 (1973) [*Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **18**, 529 (1973)].
- [14] D. V. Volkov and V. A. Soroka, “Gauge fields for symmetry group with spinor parameters,” *Theor. Math. Phys.* **20**, 829 (1974) [*Teor. Mat. Fiz.* **20**, 291(1974)].
- [15] K. S. Stelle and P. C. West, “Spontaneously broken de Sitter symmetry and the gravitational holonomy group,” *Phys. Rev. D* **21**, 1466 (1980).
- [16] E. A. Ivanov and J. Niederle, “Gauge formulation of gravitation theories. 1. The Poincaré, de Sitter and conformal cases,” *Phys. Rev. D* **25**, 976 (1982).
- [17] R. Utiyama, “Invariant theoretical interpretation of interaction,” *Phys. Rev.* **101**, 1597 (1956).
- [18] T. W. B. Kibble, “Lorentz invariance and the gravitational field,” *J. Math. Phys.* **2**, 212 (1961).
- [19] D. W. Sciama, “The analogy between charge and spin in general relativity,” in *Recent Developments in General Relativity*, Pergamon, Oxford, 1962, pp. 415–438. (Reprinted in [21].)
- [20] F. W. Hehl, P. Von Der Heyde, G. D. Kerlick and J. M. Nester, “General relativity with spin and torsion: Foundations and prospects,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **48**, 393 (1976).
- [21] M. Blagojević and F. W. Hehl, *Gauge Theories of Gravitation: A Reader with Commentaries*, Imperial College Press, London, 2013.
- [22] D. V. Volkov, “Supergravity before 1976,” in: *History of Original Ideas and Basic Discoveries in Particle Physics*, H. B. Newman and T. Ypsilantis (Eds.), Plenum Press, New York (1996), pp. 663-675 [arXiv:hep-th/9410024 [hep-th]].

- [23] I. Bandos, L. Martucci, D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, “Brane induced supersymmetry breaking and de Sitter supergravity,” JHEP **1602**, 080 (2016) [arXiv:1511.03024 [hep-th]].
- [24] D. V. Volkov and V. P. Akulov, “Possible universal neutrino interaction,” JETP Lett. **16**, 438 (1972) [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **16**, 621 (1972)]; “Is the neutrino a Goldstone particle?,” Phys. Lett. B **46**, 109 (1973).
- [25] V. P. Akulov and D. V. Volkov, “Goldstone fields with spin 1/2,” Theor. Math. Phys. **18**, 28 (1974) 28 [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **18**, 39 (1974)].
- [26] S. M. Kuzenko, “Local supersymmetry: Variations on a theme by Volkov and Soroka,” Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **479**, 20230022 (2023) [arXiv:2110.12835 [hep-th]].
- [27] S. Deser and B. Zumino, “Consistent supergravity,” Phys. Lett. B **62**, 335 (1976).
- [28] D. Z. Freedman, P. van Nieuwenhuizen and S. Ferrara, “Progress toward a theory of supergravity,” Phys. Rev. D **13**, 3214 (1976).
- [29] P. S. Howe and R. W. Tucker, “Local supersymmetry in (2+1) dimensions. 1. Supergravity and differential forms,” J. Math. Phys. **19**, 869 (1978).
- [30] P. S. Howe and R. W. Tucker, “A locally supersymmetric and reparametrization invariant action for a spinning membrane,” J. Phys. A **10**, L155 (1977); “Local supersymmetry in (2+1) dimensions. 2. An action for a spinning membrane,” J. Math. Phys. **19**, 981 (1978).
- [31] S. Deser and J. H. Kay “Topologically massive supergravity,” Phys. Lett. B **120**, 97 (1983).
- [32] S. Deser, “Cosmological topological supergravity,” in *Quantum Theory Of Gravity*, S. M. Christensen (Ed.), Adam Hilger, Bristol, 1984, pp. 374-381.
- [33] M. Brown and S. J. Gates Jr., “Superspace Bianchi identities and the supercovariant derivative,” Annals Phys. **122**, 443 (1979).
- [34] S. J. Gates Jr., M. T. Grisaru, M. Rocek and W. Siegel, *Superspace, or One Thousand and One Lessons in Supersymmetry*, Front. Phys. **58**, 1 (1983) [arXiv:hep-th/0108200].
- [35] B. M. Zupnik and D. G. Pak, “Superfield formulation of the simplest three-dimensional gauge theories and conformal supergravities,” Theor. Math. Phys. **77** (1988) 1070 [Teor. Mat. Fiz. **77** (1988) 97].
- [36] B. M. Zupnik and D. G. Pak, “Differential and integral forms in supergauge theories and supergravity,” Class. Quant. Grav. **6**, 723 (1989).
- [37] U. Lindström and M. Roček, “Superconformal gravity in three dimensions as a gauge theory,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 2905 (1989).
- [38] S. M. Kuzenko, U. Lindström and G. Tartaglino-Mazzucchelli, “Off-shell supergravity-matter couplings in three dimensions,” JHEP **1103**, 120 (2011) [arXiv:1101.4013 [hep-th]].
- [39] P. van Nieuwenhuizen, “D = 3 conformal supergravity and Chern-Simons terms,” Phys. Rev. D **32**, 872 (1985).

- [40] T. Uematsu, “Structure of N=1 conformal and Poincare supergravity in (1+1)-dimensions and (2+1)-dimensions,” *Z. Phys. C* **29**, 143 (1985); “Constraints and actions in two-dimensional and three-dimensional N=1 conformal supergravity,” *Z. Phys. C* **32**, 33 (1986).
- [41] S. M. Kuzenko and G. Tartaglino-Mazzucchelli, “Conformal supergravities as Chern-Simons theories revisited,” *JHEP* **1303**, 113 (2013) [arXiv:1212.6852 [hep-th]].
- [42] D. Butter, S. M. Kuzenko, J. Novak and G. Tartaglino-Mazzucchelli, “Conformal supergravity in three dimensions: New off-shell formulation,” *JHEP* **1309**, 072 (2013) [arXiv:1305.3132 [hep-th]].
- [43] D. Butter, S. M. Kuzenko, J. Novak and G. Tartaglino-Mazzucchelli, “Conformal supergravity in three dimensions: Off-shell actions,” *JHEP* **1310**, 073 (2013) [arXiv:1306.1205 [hep-th]].
- [44] A. Achúcarro and P. K. Townsend, “A Chern-Simons action for three-dimensional anti-de Sitter supergravity theories,” *Phys. Lett. B* **180**, 89 (1986).
- [45] T. Dereli and S. Deser, “Fermionic Goldstone-Higgs effect in (2+1)-dimensional supergravity,” *J. Phys. A* **11**, L27 (1978).
- [46] O. Hohm, A. Routh, P. K. Townsend and B. Zhang, “On the Hamiltonian form of 3D massive gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 084035 (2012) [arXiv:1208.0038 [hep-th]].
- [47] A. Routh, “Hamiltonian form of topologically massive supergravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, no.2, 024022 (2013) [arXiv:1301.7671 [hep-th]].
- [48] S. M. Kuzenko, J. Park, G. Tartaglino-Mazzucchelli and R. von Unge “Off-shell superconformal nonlinear sigma-models in three dimensions,” *JHEP* **1101**, 146 (2010) [arXiv:hep-th/1011.5727].
- [49] P. K. Townsend and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, “Geometrical interpretation of extended supergravity,” *Phys. Lett. B* **67**, 439 (1977).
- [50] A. H. Chamseddine and P. C. West, “Supergravity as a gauge theory of supersymmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **129**, 39 (1977).
- [51] W. Siegel, “Unextended superfields in extended supersymmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **156**, 135 (1979).
- [52] R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, “How super-renormalizable interactions cure their infrared divergences,” *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 2291 (1981).
- [53] J. F. Schonfeld, “A mass term for three-dimensional gauge fields,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **185**, 157 (1981).
- [54] S. Deser, R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, “Three-dimensional massive gauge theories,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **48**, 975 (1982).
- [55] S. Deser, R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, “Topologically massive gauge theories,” *Annals Phys.* **140**, 372 (1982) [Erratum-ibid. **185**, 406 (1988)].
- [56] J. Wess and J. Bagger, *Supersymmetry and Supergravity*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1992.
- [57] I. L. Buchbinder and S. M. Kuzenko, *Ideas and Methods of Supersymmetry and Supergravity or a Walk Through Superspace*, IOP, Bristol, 1998.

- [58] R. Andringa, E. A. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo, O. Hohm, E. Sezgin and P. K. Townsend, “Massive 3D supergravity,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **27**, 025010 (2010) [arXiv:0907.4658 [hep-th]].
- [59] E. A. Bergshoeff, O. Hohm, J. Rosseel, E. Sezgin and P. K. Townsend, “More on massive 3D supergravity,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **28**, 015002 (2011) [arXiv:1005.3952 [hep-th]].
- [60] S. M. Kuzenko, J. Novak and G. Tartaglino-Mazzucchelli, “Higher derivative couplings and massive supergravity in three dimensions,” *JHEP* **09**, 081 (2015) [arXiv:1506.09063 [hep-th]].
- [61] D. Chernyavsky, N. S. Deger and D. Sorokin, “Spontaneously broken 3d Hietarinta/Maxwell Chern–Simons theory and minimal massive gravity,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, no.6, 556 (2020) [arXiv:2002.07592 [hep-th]].
- [62] E. Bergshoeff, O. Hohm, W. Merbis, A. J. Routh and P. K. Townsend, “Minimal massive 3D gravity,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **31**, 145008 (2014) [arXiv:1404.2867 [hep-th]].