

On the Construction of Zero Energy States in Supersymmetric Matrix Models

Jens Hoppe

Theoretische Physik, ETH Hönggerberg
8093 Zürich, Switzerland

Abstract

For the $SU(N)$ invariant supersymmetric matrix model related to membranes in 4 space-time dimensions, the general solution to the equation(s) $Q^\dagger\Psi = 0$ ($Q\chi = 0$) is determined for N odd. For any such (bosonic) solution of $Q^\dagger\Psi = 0$, a (fermionic) Φ is found that (formally) satisfies $Q^\dagger\Phi = \Psi$.

For the analogous model in 11 dimensions the solution of $Q^\dagger\Psi = 0$ ($Q\Psi = 0$) is outlined.

Previous methods to study the existence of zero energy bound states in $SU(N)$ -invariant supersymmetric matrix models do not lead to actual solutions of $(Q^\dagger Q + QQ^\dagger)\Psi = 0$. It therefore seems valuable to propose a different route. For the model corresponding to 4 space time dimensions, I solve the equation(s) $Q^\dagger\Psi = 0$ ($Q\chi = 0$) and for any such $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_+$ (= the space of bosonic, $SU(N)$ invariant wavefunctions) determine a Φ satisfying $Q^\dagger\Phi = \Psi$. By proving that Φ is normalizable, provided Ψ is, one could (as observed by J. Fröhlich) prove rigorously the absence of a (bosonic) groundstate in this model, for arbitrary (odd) N . In cases when a ground state does exist (as is expected, e.g., for the 11-dimensional model; see [1-9] for some literature), comparing the general solution of $Q^\dagger\Psi = 0$ with the general solution of $Q\chi = 0$ (or proving Φ to be non-normalizable for some normalizable $\Psi = Q^\dagger\Phi$) will yield the explicit construction of the ground state wave-function. For the supersymmetric matrix model corresponding to membranes in 11 space-time dimensions, the calculation is set up in a form where the determination of the expected ground state seems feasible.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= 2\partial_a \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_a} + iq_a \lambda_a \\ Q^\dagger &= -2\bar{\partial}_a \lambda_a - iq_a \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_a} \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\partial_a = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_a}$, $z_a \in \mathbb{C}$, $q_a = \frac{i}{2} f_{abc} z_b \bar{z}_c$ (f_{abc} being totally antisymmetric, real, structure constants of $SU(N)$) and λ_a ($\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_a}$) being fermionic creation (annihilation) operators satisfying $\{\lambda_a, \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_b}\} = \delta_{ab}$, $\{\lambda_a, \lambda_b\} = 0 = \{\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_a}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_b}\}$. The hamiltonian of the model is

$$QQ^\dagger + Q^\dagger Q = -4\partial_a \bar{\partial}_a + q^2 + f_{abc} z_c \lambda_a \lambda_b + f_{abc} \bar{z}_c \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_b} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda_a}. \quad (2)$$

Q and Q^\dagger commute with the operators of $SU(N)$,

$$J_a := -if_{abc}(z_b \partial_c + \bar{z}_b \bar{\partial}_c + \lambda_b \partial_{\lambda_c}) \quad (3)$$

and on the Hilberspace \mathcal{H} of gauge-invariant states, $Q^2 = i\bar{z}_a J_a = 0$. Let

$$\Psi = \sum_{j=0}^{N^2-1} \frac{1}{j!} \psi_{a_1 \cdots a_{2j}} \lambda_{a_1} \cdots \lambda_{a_{2j}} \quad (4)$$

(an analogous discussion could be applied to states in \mathcal{H}_- , i.e. states containing only odd numbers of λ 's). The equations $Q\chi = 0, Q^\dagger\Psi = 0$ then read

$$i(2k-1) q[a_1 \chi_{a_2 \cdots a_{2k-1}}] = 2\partial_a \chi_{a_1 \cdots a_{2k-1} a} \quad (5)$$

$$(2k-1)2\bar{\partial}[a_1 \psi_{a_2 \cdots a_{2k-1}}] = iq_a \psi_{a_1 \cdots a_{2k-1} a} \quad (6)$$

where $k = 1, \dots, K := \frac{N^2-1}{2}$. Think of (5) as equations for $\chi^{(2k-2)} = \{\chi_{a_1 \cdots a_{2k-2}}\}$, provided $\chi^{(2k)} = \{\chi_{a_2 \cdots a_{2k}}\}$ is known; it is not difficult to verify that

$$\chi_{a_1}^{[in]} \cdots_{a_{2k-2}} := \frac{-2i}{q^2} q_{a_{2k-1}} \partial_{a_{2k}} \chi_{a_1 \cdots a_{2k}} \quad (7)$$

solves (5). At each stage of the interaction (eventually leaving only one single free function, $\chi_{a_1 \cdots a_{2k}} = \epsilon_{a_1 \cdots a_{2k}} \tilde{\chi}$) a solution of the homogeneous equation, i.e.

$$q[a \chi_{a_1}^{[h]} \cdots_{a_{2k-2}}] \equiv 0 \quad (8)$$

may be added. Similarly, one may verify that

$$\psi_{a_1}^{(in)} \cdots_{a_{2k}} := \frac{(2k)(2k-1)}{q^2} 2i q [_{a_1} \bar{\partial}_{a_2} \psi_{a_3} \cdots_{a_{2k}}] \quad (9)$$

(determining $\psi^{(2k)}$ in terms of $\psi^{(2k-2)}$) solves (6), so that the *general* solution of (6) is given by

$$\Psi = \Psi^{(in)} \oplus \Psi^{(h)}, \quad (10)$$

with

$$q_{a_{2k}} \psi_{a_1}^{(h)} \cdots_{a_{2k}} \equiv 0. \quad (11)$$

With the direct sum property indicated in (10) ($\int \psi_{a_1}^{(h)*} \cdots_{a_{2k}} \psi_{a_1}^{(in)} \cdots_{a_{2k}} = 0 = \int \psi_{a_1}^{[in]*} \cdots_{a_{2k}} \psi_{a_1}^{[h]} \cdots_{a_{2k}}$) the choice of the particular solution(s) of the inhomogenous equation(s) is canonical. Note that

$$(q\partial)\psi_{a_1} \cdots_{a_n} + n\psi_{a[a_2} \cdots_{a_n} \partial_{a_1]} q_a = 0 \quad (12)$$

when $J_a \Psi = 0$. Now define

$$\Phi = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{(2k-1)!} \phi_{a_1} \cdots_{a_{2k-1}}, \lambda_{a_1} \cdots_{a_{2k-1}}$$

by

$$\phi_{a_1} \cdots_{a_{2k-1}} := \frac{-i}{q^2} (2k-1)q [_{a_1} (\psi_{a_2} \cdots_{a_{2k-1}}) - 2(2k-2) \bar{\partial}_{a_2} \phi_{a_3} \cdots_{a_{2k-1}}] \quad (13)$$

. Then $-Q^\dagger \Phi = \Psi$, i.e.

$$iq_a \phi_a = \psi$$

$$iq_c \phi_{abc} + 4 \bar{\partial}_{[a} \phi_{b]} = \psi_{ab} \quad (14)$$

⋮

$$iq_{a_{2k+1}} \phi_{a_1} \cdots_{a_{2k+1}} + (2k)2\bar{\partial}_{[a_1} \phi_{a_2} \cdots_{a_{2k}}] = \psi_{a_1} \cdots_{a_{2k}}$$

⋮

$$\psi_{a_1} \cdots_{a_{2k}} = (2K)2\bar{\partial}_{[a_1} \phi_{a_2} \cdots_{a_{2k}}].$$

While for the verification of the first $(K-1)$ equations, in (14), it is sufficient to only use (6) (and (12)) the last equality requires knowledge of how $\psi_{a_1} \cdots_{a_{2k}}$ is solved in terms of $\psi_{a_1} \cdots_{a_{2k-2}}$, i.e. $(9)_{k=K}$. While the square integrability of Ψ presumably implies $\|q\Phi\| < \infty$ (via (13)), the discussion of whether $Q^\dagger \Psi = 0$ actually implies $\|\Phi\| < \infty$ (when Φ is defined via (13)) will be more complicated (but could perhaps roughly go as follows: $Q^\dagger \Psi = 0$, resp. $Q\Psi = 0$, implies that the first derivatives of the $\Psi^{(n)}$, divided by q , are square-integrable, which is in conflict with the normalizability of Ψ , unless $\Psi(q=0) = 0$ – which probably improves the behavior of Φ at $q=0$ such that $\|\Phi\| < \infty$, when $\|q\Phi\| < \infty$).

If $\Psi = Q^\dagger \Phi$, with $\|\Phi\| < \infty$, Ψ can not be annihilated by Q , due to the direct sum decomposition of \mathcal{H}_+ into $Q\mathcal{H}_-$, $Q^\dagger \mathcal{H}_-$, and states annihilated by both Q and Q^\dagger (I am grateful to J. Fröhlich for pointing out to me this simple but important fact, which suggested to check whether the solutions (7)-(11) arise as images of Q , resp. Q^\dagger).

Consider now the general case,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\beta &= D_a^{(\beta)} \partial_{\lambda_a} + M_a^{(\beta)} \lambda_a \\ Q_\beta^\dagger &= D_a^{(\beta)\dagger} \lambda_a + M_a^{(\beta)\dagger} \partial_{\lambda_a} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

In $D = 11$ ($\Gamma^j = \Gamma^{j\dagger} = -\Gamma^{jtr}$, $j = 1 \dots 7$) or $D = 4$ ($\Gamma^j \rightarrow 0$, $x_j \rightarrow 0$):

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\alpha A}^{(\beta)} &= \delta_{\alpha\beta} 2\partial_A - i f_{ABC} x_{jB} \bar{z}_C \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^j \\ M_{\alpha A}^{(\beta)} &= \delta_{\alpha\beta} i q_A + i \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^j \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{jA}} - \frac{1}{2} f_{ABC} x_{jB} x_{kc} \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{jk}, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $A = 1 \dots N^2 - 1$, $\alpha\beta = 1 \dots 8$ ($D = 11$) $\Gamma^{jk} = \frac{1}{2} [\Gamma_j, \Gamma_k]$. They satisfy [7]

$$\{Q_\beta, Q_{\beta'}\} = 2i \delta_{\beta\beta'} \bar{z}_E J_E \quad \{Q_\beta, Q_{\beta'}^\dagger\} = \delta_{\beta\beta'} H + 2\Gamma_{\beta\beta'}^j x_{jE} J_E \quad (17)$$

with

$$J_E = -i f_{EAA'} (x_{jA} \partial_{x_{jA'}} + z_A \partial_{A'} + \bar{z}_A \bar{\partial}_{A'} + \lambda_{\alpha A} \partial_{\lambda_{\alpha A'}}) = L_E + S_E \quad (18)$$

and

$$H = (-\Delta + V) - 2i f_{EAA'} x_{jE} \Gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}^j \lambda_{\alpha A} \partial_{\lambda_{\alpha A'}} + f_{EAA'} z_E \lambda_{\alpha A} \lambda_{\alpha A'} + f_{EAA'} z_E \partial_{\lambda_{\alpha A'}} \partial_{\lambda_{\alpha A}} \quad (19)$$

where $\Delta = 4\partial_A \bar{\partial}_A + \partial_{jA} \partial_{jA}$ and $V = q^2 + \tilde{V}$ being twice $V(x, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}Z, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\bar{Z})$ given in e.g. (4.11) of [7]. The superalgebra (15) alone (!) implies the following (commutation) relations ($(\beta\beta')$ denoting symmetrisation ($\frac{1}{2}\beta\beta' + \frac{1}{2}\beta'\beta$):

$$[D_a^{(\beta)}, D_{a'}^{(\beta')}] = 0 \quad (20)$$

$$[M_a^{(\beta)}, M_{a'}^{(\beta')}] = 0 \quad (21)$$

$$D_a^{(\beta)} M_a^{(\beta')} = i \delta_{\beta\beta'} \bar{z}_E L_E \quad (22)$$

$$[M_{\alpha A}^{(\beta)}, D_{\alpha' A'}^{(\beta')}] = \delta_{\alpha\alpha'} \delta_{\beta\beta'} \bar{z}_E f_{EAA'} \quad (23)$$

and, using also the specific form of H , (19),

$$[M_{[\alpha A}^\beta, D_{\alpha' A'}^{\dagger\beta'}]] = \delta_{\alpha\alpha'} \delta_{\beta\beta'} z_E f_{EAA'} \quad (24)$$

$$D_a^\beta D_a^{\beta'\dagger} + M_a^{\dagger\beta'} M_a^\beta = \delta_{\beta\beta'} (-\Delta + V) + 2\Gamma_{\beta\beta'}^j x_{jE} L_E \quad (25)$$

$$[M_{\alpha A}^\beta, M_{\alpha' A'}^{\beta'\dagger}] + [D_{\alpha A}^{\beta'\dagger}, D_{\alpha' A'}^\beta] = -2i x_{jE} f_{EAA'} (\delta_{\beta\beta'} \Gamma_{\alpha\alpha'}^j + \delta_{\alpha\alpha'} \Gamma_{\beta\beta'}^j). \quad (26)$$

The equations $Q^{(\beta)}\Psi = 0, Q^{(\beta)\dagger}\Psi = 0$, read:

$$\begin{aligned} (2k-1) M_{[a_1}^{(\beta)} \psi_{a_2 \dots a_{2k-1}}] &= D_{a_{2k}}^{(\beta)} \psi_{a_1 \dots a_{2k}} \\ k &= 1, \dots, K \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

$$(2k-1) D_{[a_1}^{(\beta)\dagger} \psi_{a_2 \dots a_{2k-1}}] = M_{a_{2k}}^{(\beta)\dagger} \psi_{a_1 \dots a_{2k}}. \quad (28)$$

Due to the non-commutativity of M with M^\dagger they are slightly more difficult to solve (but also less singular, as $\tilde{M}^\dagger \tilde{M} > 0$). The solution of the first equations, $M_a \psi = D_b \psi_{ab}, D_a^\dagger \psi = M_b^\dagger \psi_{ab}$, are $\psi = (M^\dagger M)^{-1} M_a^\dagger D_b \psi_{ab}$ and (with ψ_{abc} , totally antisymmetric, arbitrary)

$$\psi_{ab} = 2D_{[a}^\dagger M_{b]} (M^\dagger M)^{-1} \psi + M_c^\dagger \psi_{abc}. \quad (29)$$

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank G. Felder, J. Fröhlich, G.-M. Graf, H. Nicolai and R. Suter for valuable discussion, the Albert Einstein Institute, Potsdam, and the Institute for Theoretical Physics, Zürich, for hospitality, and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for financial support.

References

- [1] M. Porrati, A. Rozenberg; hep-th/9708119.
- [2] S. Sethi, M. Stern; hep-th/9705046.
- [3] P. Yi; hep-th/9704098.
- [4] J. Fröhlich, J. Hoppe; hep-th/9701119.
- [5] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S.H. Shenker, L. Susskind; hep-th/9610043.
- [6] B. de Wit, M. Lüscher, H. Nicolai; Nuclear Physics B320 (1989) 135.
- [7] B. de Wit, J. Hoppe, H. Nicolai; Nuclear Physics B305 (1988) 545.
- [8] R. Flume; Annals of Physics 164 (1985) 189.
M. Claudson, M. Halpern; Nuclear Physics B 250 (1985) 689.
M. Baake, P. Reinicke, V. Rittenberg; Journal of Math. Physics 26 (1985) 1070.
- [9] J. Hoppe; “Quantum Theory of a Massless Relativistic Surface”,
MIT Ph.D. Thesis 1982.
J. Goldstone; unpublished.