

Nonlocal charge of the CP^{n-1} model and its supersymmetric extension to all orders

E. Abdalla, M. C. B. Abdalla, and M. Gomes

Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, C.P. 20516, São Paulo, Brasil

(Received 10 May 1982)

We prove that the conservation of quantum nonlocal charge of the CP^{n-1} model is spoiled by an anomaly calculable to all orders in the $1/n$ expansion, while for its supersymmetric extension it is restored.

I. INTRODUCTION

Two-dimensional nonlinear σ models (chiral models, for short), defined on symmetric spaces, have in recent years aroused considerable interest among field-theoretical physicists. This interest is partly justified by the numerous analogies of the chiral models with four-dimensional Yang-Mills theories,¹ analogies which include "gauge" content, nontrivial topological structure, instantons, and so on. They become even more striking if we go to loop space; there is impressive evidence that Wilson loops can be interpreted as chiral fields in loop space.²

One of the most important properties of these models is their classical integrability, which leads to an infinite number of nonlocal conservation laws³ (there are also local conservation laws, but they will not concern us in this paper). These conservation laws were first discovered in the $O(n)$ nonlinear σ model,⁴ and subsequently generalized to various other models.⁵ They can also be described as Noether currents associated with a nonlocal field transformation leaving the action unchanged.⁶

At the quantum level, the conservation of the nonlocal charges also imposes severe restrictions on the dynamics of the models. This is exemplified by the $O(n)$ σ model, for which it has been shown that they imply the absence of pair production and the factorization equation.⁷ As is well known, these are fundamental blocks for the construction of the exact S matrix.

For all these reasons we think it is very important to study "in extenso" the properties of two-dimensional σ models. In this sense, we have in two recent papers discussed the construction of the quantum nonlocal charges in the CP^{n-1} model⁸ and its supersymmetric extension.⁹

The results obtained can be summarized as follows:

(a) The would-be quantum nonlocal charge of the CP^{n-1} model is not conserved.⁸ Therefore, the exact S -matrix program cannot be completed follow-

ing this thread. Of course, the absence of an S matrix, for the quanta of the basic CP^{n-1} field, is intuitively expected from the confining properties of the model.¹⁰ An examination of the local charges shows a similar result.¹¹

(b) In contrast to (a), quantum nonlocal conserved charges seem to exist if fermions are coupled to the CP^{n-1} field in a minimal or supersymmetric way,⁹ preserving the classical structure of the models.¹² The mechanism by which this happens is the same as the one which is responsible for mass generation in the Schwinger model¹³: vacuum polarization from the coupling fermions. This gives mass to the topological gauge field (thus liberating the basic CP^{n-1} quanta) and also provides an additional, Adler-type anomaly¹⁴ which cancels the one coming from the pure CP^{n-1} model. Similarly to the $O(n)$ σ model,¹⁵ the existence of the quantum conservation laws justifies the construction of exact S matrices for these models.¹⁶

So far, the above results were obtained only in the dominant order of the $1/n$ expansion whereas we would expect them to hold in all orders. In this communication we will show this to indeed be the case. Our result follows from a conjunction of general arguments with a detailed graphical analysis.

The content of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we show the absence of radiative corrections to the anomaly of the pure CP^{n-1} model. In Sec. III we prove the conservation of the quantum nonlocal charge in the supersymmetric case to all orders. In Sec. IV we present some conclusions. Various technical details are relegated to two appendices.

II. ABSENCE OF RADIATIVE CORRECTIONS TO THE ANOMALY OF THE PURE CP^{n-1} MODEL

We begin by listing some basic properties of the CP^{n-1} model (all calculations will be done in Euclidean space). This is the theory of an n -component complex field z_i , described by the Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L} = \overline{D}_\mu z D_\mu z, \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$D_\mu z = \partial_\mu z - A_\mu z \quad (2.1a)$$

with the constraint

$$\bar{z}z = \sum_i \bar{z}_i z_i = \frac{n}{2f}. \quad (2.1b)$$

The Feynman rules for the $1/n$ expansion are found in Ref. 17. They are

$$A_\mu \text{ propagator: } \left[\delta_{\mu\nu} - \frac{p_\mu p_\nu}{p^2} \right] \times \left[(p^2 + 4m^2)A(p) - \frac{1}{\pi} \right]^{-1}, \quad (2.2a)$$

$$Z \text{ propagator: } (p^2 + m^2)^{-1}, \quad (2.2b)$$

$$\alpha \text{ propagator: } [A(p)]^{-1}, \quad (2.2c)$$

with

$$A(p) = \frac{1}{2\pi} [p^2(p^2 + 4m^2)]^{-1/2} \times \ln \frac{(p^2 + 4m^2)^{1/2} + (p^2)^{1/2}}{(p^2 + 4m^2)^{1/2} - (p^2)^{1/2}}, \quad (2.2d)$$

where α is the Lagrange multiplier field which enforces the constraint $\bar{z}z = n/2f$. The mass m is dynamically generated and is given by $m^2 = \mu^2 e^{-n/2f}$, where μ is the renormalization point. Remember that on the quantum level the topological gauge field has acquired the status of an independent field.

The simplest nonlocal charge is classically given by

$$Q^{ij} = \int dy_1 dy_2 \epsilon(y_1 - y_2) J_0^{ik}(t, y_1) J_0^{kj}(t, y_2) - \frac{n}{2f} \int J_1^{ij}(t, y) dy, \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$J_\mu^{ij} = z^i \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_\mu z^j + 2A_\mu z^i \bar{z}^j \quad (2.3a)$$

is the classical (traceless) Noether current generating isospin rotations in the plane ij .

In the quantum case, to give a proper definition of (2.3) we need to consider the singular short-distance behavior of the product of the traceless part of the two currents. To leading order of $1/n$ we showed in Ref. 8 that the following expansion holds:

$$[J_\mu(x + \epsilon), J_\nu(x)]^{ij} = C_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon) J_\rho^{ij}(x) + D_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon) \partial_\sigma J_\rho^{ij}(x) + E_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon) z_i \bar{z}_j F_{\rho\sigma}(x), \quad (2.4a)$$

where

$$C_{\mu\nu}^\rho = \frac{-n}{2\pi} \left[-\frac{\delta_{\mu\nu} \epsilon^\rho}{\epsilon^2} + \frac{\delta_\mu^\rho \epsilon_\nu}{\epsilon^2} + \frac{\delta_\nu^\rho \epsilon_\mu}{\epsilon^2} + 2 \frac{\epsilon_\mu \epsilon_\nu \epsilon^\rho}{\epsilon^2} \right], \quad (2.4b)$$

$$D_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma} = \frac{n}{2\pi} \left[\left[\frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \ln \frac{m^2 \epsilon^2}{4} \right] (\delta_\mu^\sigma \delta_\nu^\rho - \delta_\nu^\sigma \delta_\mu^\rho) + \frac{\delta_\nu^\sigma \epsilon_\mu \epsilon^\rho}{2\epsilon^2} - \frac{\delta_\mu^\sigma \epsilon_\nu \epsilon^\rho}{2\epsilon^2} - \frac{\delta_{\mu\nu} \epsilon^\rho \epsilon^\sigma}{2\epsilon^2} + \frac{\delta_\mu^\rho \epsilon_\nu \epsilon^\sigma}{2\epsilon^2} - \frac{\delta_\nu^\rho \epsilon_\mu \epsilon^\sigma}{2\epsilon^2} + \frac{\epsilon_\mu \epsilon_\nu \epsilon^\sigma \epsilon^\rho}{(\epsilon^2)^2} \right], \quad (2.4c)$$

$$E_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma} = \frac{n}{2\pi} \left[2\delta_\mu^\rho \frac{\epsilon_\nu \epsilon^\sigma}{\epsilon^2} + 2\delta_\nu^\sigma \frac{\epsilon_\mu \epsilon^\rho}{\epsilon^2} \right]. \quad (2.4d)$$

Note the absence of the normal product of two currents in Eq. (2.4a) as a consequence of our renormalization procedure ($\bar{z}z=0$) discussed in Ref. 8 [after Eq. (3.18)]. This result can be used to verify that the quantum charge

$$Q^{ij} = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} Q_\delta^{ij}, \quad (2.5a)$$

where the cutoff charge

$$Q_\delta^{ij} = \frac{1}{n} \left[\int_{|y_1 - y_2| \geq \delta} dy_1 dy_2 \epsilon(y_1 - y_2) J_0^{ik}(t, y_1) J_0^{kj}(t, y_2) - Z_\delta \int dy J_1^{ij}(t, y) \right] \quad (2.5b)$$

with

$$Z_\delta = \frac{n}{2\pi} \ln \frac{e^{\gamma-1} \mu \delta}{2} \quad (2.5c)$$

is well defined. However, instead of being conserved it satisfies

$$\frac{dQ^{ij}}{dt} = -\frac{2}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} z_i \bar{z}_j F_{10} dy. \quad (2.6)$$

Therefore Lüscher's construction⁷ cannot be applied.

Although derived in the lowest order of the $1/n$ expansion, (2.6) is nevertheless valid to all orders. This result can be stated more precisely as follows.

Let $J_{\mu}^{ij}(x)$ be the current generating isospin rotations in the plane ij , so that the following Ward identity holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\mu}^x \langle 0 | T [J_{\mu}(x), J_{\nu}(y)]^{ij} X | 0 \rangle &= -2n \delta(x-y) \langle 0 | T J_{\nu}^{ij}(y) X | 0 \rangle \\ &\quad - \sum_l \delta(x-x_l) \langle 0 | T [J_{\nu}^{\alpha ij}(y) z^l(x) - J_{\nu}^{ik}(y) \delta^{j\alpha} z^k(x)] X_{\hat{\alpha}_l} | 0 \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum_{m,k} \delta(x-y_m) \langle 0 | T [\delta^{i\beta} z^k(x) J_{\nu}^{kj}(y) - \delta^{k\beta} J_{\nu}^{ik}(y) \bar{z}^j(x)] X_{\hat{\beta}_m} | 0 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Here $X = \prod_{l,m} z_{\alpha_l}(x_l) \bar{z}_{\beta_m}(y_m)$ and $X_{\hat{\alpha}_l} [X_{\hat{\beta}_m}]$ means that $z_{\alpha_l}(x_l) [\bar{z}_{\beta_m}(y_m)]$ is to be deleted.

Furthermore, the current normalization is given by

$$\langle 0 | T J_{\mu}^{ij}(x) z^l(y) X | 0 \rangle = \frac{-1}{2\pi} \frac{(x-y)_{\mu}}{(x-y)^2 + i0} \left\langle 0 \left| \left[\delta^{jl} z^i(y) - \frac{1}{n} \delta^{ij} z^l(y) \right] X \right| 0 \right\rangle + O(\ln(x-y)) \quad (2.8)$$

in accordance with (2.7).

With these assumptions, it follows that (2.4a)–(2.4d) hold in a weak sense (i.e., for time-ordered products and discarding convergent surface terms) in all orders of the $1/n$ expansion.

We would like to remark that the Green's functions of the basic CP^{n-1} field are infrared divergent. Thus in (2.8) and in equations containing non-gauge-invariant operators, we implicitly assume that an infrared regulator for the propagator of the A_{μ} field is used.

The above result is proved in two steps. First, we employ methods completely analogous to those of Ref. 7, namely, we use arguments such as covariance (under Lorenz transformation, charge conjugation, parity, time reversal) and current conservation, to determine the coefficients $C_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}$ and $D_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}$. This is done in Appendix A. Next, to find the remaining coefficients $E_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}$, we argue with more detailed graphical methods.

From (2.4a) and using $C_{\mu\nu}^{\rho} = C_{\nu\mu}^{\rho}$ (see Appendix A) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^2 p e^{-i\epsilon p} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial k_{\alpha}} \langle 0 | T [\tilde{J}_{\mu}(p), J_{\nu}(0)] \tilde{z}_k(q) \tilde{z}_l(r) \tilde{A}_{\lambda}(k) | 0 \rangle^{\text{prop}} \right\}_{q=r=k=0}^{-(\mu \leftrightarrow \nu)} \\ = [D_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon) - D_{\nu\mu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)] \frac{\partial}{\partial k_{\alpha}} \langle 0 | T \partial_{\rho} J_{\sigma}(0) \tilde{z}_k(q) \tilde{z}_l(r) \tilde{A}_{\lambda}(k) | 0 \rangle^{\text{prop}} \Big|_{q=r=k=0} \\ - 4A(\epsilon^2) \frac{\partial}{\partial k_{\alpha}} \langle 0 | T (z_i \bar{z}_j F_{\mu\nu})(0) \tilde{z}_k \tilde{z}_l A_{\lambda}(k) | 0 \rangle^{\text{prop}} \Big|_{q=r=k=0}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

where the tildes indicate Fourier transform and prop means proper. Assuming that our normal products are normalized at zero external momenta, the right-hand side (rhs) of (2.9) turns into

$$-2(D_{\mu\nu}^{\alpha\lambda} - D_{\nu\mu}^{\alpha\lambda}) - 4iA(\epsilon^2)(\delta_{\mu}^{\alpha} \delta_{\nu}^{\lambda} - \delta_{\nu}^{\alpha} \delta_{\mu}^{\lambda}). \quad (2.10)$$

Note that $\delta_{\mu}^{\alpha} \delta_{\nu}^{\lambda} - \delta_{\nu}^{\alpha} \delta_{\mu}^{\lambda} = -\epsilon_{\mu\nu} \epsilon^{\alpha\lambda}$ and therefore

$$E_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma} = A(x^2) \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \epsilon^{\rho\sigma}.$$

Because of current conservation, $A(x^2)$ is a constant

which remains to be determined.

Only the graphs in Fig. 2 contribute to the left-hand side (lhs) of (2.9). To verify this notice that the graphs contributing to $\langle 0 | T [J_{\mu}(\epsilon), J_{\nu}(0)] z_l \bar{z}_k A_{\lambda} | 0 \rangle$ have the general structure shown in Fig. 1. It is easily seen that the analysis for more general diagrams reduces to the one for the simplest diagram shown in Fig. 1. Now if the derivative $\partial/\partial k_{\alpha}$ does not act directly on the momentum factors associated with the current vertex, we obtain a result symmetric under the exchange $\mu \leftrightarrow \nu$. Therefore this type of term [Fig. 1(a)]




FIG. 1. Graphs contributing to the lhs of Eq. (2.9). Dot means derivative with respect to the momentum. In case (a) the derivative acts on all places except in the upper two vertices.

will not contribute to the lhs of (2.9).

On the other hand, if the derivative acts on the momentum factors at the current vertex, the only graphs which contribute are those of Fig. 2. For the graphs of Fig. 1(b) and 1(c) this happens because the insertion of a zero-momentum external wavy line will produce a result proportional to the derivative with respect to the loop momentum p . [The graph of Fig. 1(d) is trivially zero.] Thus after integration we will get zero except for the graphs of Fig. 2, in which case there will be nonvanishing surface terms. But these terms have already been computed in Ref. 8, so that the result (2.4a) holds in every finite order of the $1/n$ expansion.

III. CONSERVATION OF THE SUPERSYMMETRIC QUANTUM NONLOCAL CHARGE TO ALL ORDERS

The formal Lagrangian density that couples the CP^{n-1} model supersymmetrically to fermions is

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{D}_\mu z D_\mu z + \bar{\psi}(\partial - \gamma_\mu \bar{z} \partial_\mu z)\psi + \frac{f}{2n} [(\bar{\psi}\psi)^2 + (\bar{\psi}\gamma_5\psi)^2 - (\bar{\psi}\gamma_\mu\psi)^2], \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$D_\mu z = \partial_\mu z - \frac{2f}{n} (\bar{z} \partial_\mu z) z, \quad (3.1a)$$

$$\bar{z} z = \frac{n}{2f}, \quad (3.1b)$$

$$\bar{\psi} z = \bar{z} \psi = 0. \quad (3.1c)$$

The $1/n$ expansion as well as the Feynman rules were derived in Ref. 10. We follow the graphical notation of Ref. 9 to which the reader is also referred for details. To enforce the constraints (3.1b) and (3.1c), one introduces the α and c fields, respectively. The quadrilinear interactions are reduced to bilinear ones by introducing the auxiliary fields π, ϕ, λ_μ .

Our strategy will be the same as for the pure CP^{n-1} case but the technical details are more complicated.

The model has a classical nonlocal charge specified by¹⁸

$$Q^{ij} = \int dy_1 dy_2 \epsilon(y - y_2) J_0^{ik}(t, y_1) J_0^{kj}(t, y_2) - \int dy (j_1 + 2i_1)^{ij}(t, y) + i \int dy [z_i \bar{z}_j (\bar{\psi} \gamma_1 \psi)](t, y), \quad (3.2)$$

where




FIG. 2. Nonvanishing lowest-order graphs of Fig. 1.

$$J_\mu^{ij} = z^i \overleftrightarrow{D}_\mu z^j + \bar{\psi}^j \gamma_\mu \psi^i = (j_\mu + i_\mu)^{ij}, \quad (3.2a)$$

$$D_\mu z = \partial_\mu z - A_\mu z. \quad (3.2b)$$

To give a correct quantum definition of (3.2) we have, as before, to examine the short-distance behavior of the product of two currents.

A priori there will be a huge number of local operators, of dimension equal to or less than two, which appear in this Wilson expansion. (As in Luscher's case we argue that asymptotic freedom restricts the dimension of the local operators to be ≤ 2 .) However, as shown in Appendix B, *PT*, charge conjugation, charge conservation, and general graphical arguments strongly restrict the number of allowed candidates and we are left with

$$\begin{aligned} [J_\mu(x+\epsilon), J_\nu(x)] = & C_{\mu\nu}^\rho j_\rho + 2\hat{C}_{\mu\nu}^\rho i_\rho \\ & + D_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma\rho} \partial_\sigma j_\rho + 2\hat{D}_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma\rho} \partial_\sigma i_\rho \\ & + E_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma} z_i \bar{z}_j F_{\rho\sigma} + N[J_\mu, J_\nu], \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where j_ρ is the pure CP^{n-1} current and $i_\rho = \bar{\psi}_j \gamma_\rho \psi_i$

$$Q_8^{ij} = \frac{1}{n} \int_{|y_1 - y_2| \geq \delta} dy_1 dy_2 \epsilon(y_1 - y_2) J_0^{ik}(t, y_1) J_0^{kj}(t, y_2) - \frac{z_\delta}{n} \int dy [j_1(t, y) + 2i_1(t, y)]^{ij} + \frac{i}{n} \int dy (z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_1 \psi)(y, t) \quad (3.5)$$

is conserved to all orders of $1/n$.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have proved that to all orders in the $1/n$ expansion, conservation of the nonlocal charge in the pure CP^{n-1} model is spoiled by an anomaly with a calculable coefficient while for its supersymmetric extension it is restored. In this last case, this means that the quantum S matrix can be calculated, using standard procedures such as factorization equations, justified by the nonlocal charge conservation. It is worth mentioning that although the pure CP^{n-1} model has an anomaly canceled by another one coming from the coupling with fermions, the pure fermionic model is anomaly free.¹⁹ This is a consequence of the fact that the anomaly roots in the interactions between fermions and bosons and not in the fermions self-coupling itself.

The case of the pure CP^{n-1} model is more involved. Here, the existence of the anomaly is in accord with the confining¹⁷ properties of the model. The next question concerns the scattering of bound states. We conjecture that the anomaly will not contribute (with the same implications as above) if the relevant asymptotic states are constructed from the vacuum by application of operators which commute with the anomaly.

is the fermionic current as specified in (3.2a).

Now using the same arguments as in the pure CP^{n-1} case we see that only the lowest-order graphs contribute. The coefficients $C_{\mu\nu}^\rho$ and $D_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma\rho}$ are the same as those of Sec. II, while for $\hat{C}_{\mu\nu}^\rho$ and $\hat{D}_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma\rho}$ we have the result in Ref. 9, $E_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}$ being zero in all orders. Explicitly,

$$\hat{C}_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon) = \frac{n}{2\pi} \left[-\frac{\delta_{\mu\nu}\epsilon^\rho}{\epsilon^2} + \frac{\delta_\mu^\rho \epsilon_\nu}{\epsilon^2} + \frac{\delta_\nu^\rho \epsilon_\mu}{\epsilon^2} \right], \quad (3.4a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{D}_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon) = & \frac{1}{2} \hat{C}_{\mu\nu}^\rho \epsilon^\sigma + \hat{D}_1 \epsilon^\rho (\epsilon_\mu \delta_\nu^\sigma - \epsilon_\nu \delta_\mu^\sigma) \\ & + \hat{D}_2 \epsilon^\sigma (\epsilon_\mu \delta_\nu^\rho + \epsilon_\nu \delta_\mu^\rho), \end{aligned} \quad (3.4b)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon^2} (\epsilon^2 \hat{D}_1) &= -\frac{n}{8\pi} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon^2} (\epsilon^2 \hat{D}_2) &= +\frac{n}{8\pi} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4c)$$

It follows that the quantum-nonlocal charge

We remark also that our results are valid to all orders of the $1/n$ expansion but neglect nonperturbative aspects such as θ vacuums and pseudoparticles. The existence of an anomaly in the pure CP^{n-1} model and its absence in the $O(n)$ σ model puts forward the following question: What are the fundamental properties determining the possibilities of anomalies in quantum nonlocal charges?

As already shown,²⁰ the absence of an anomaly in the purely bosonic nonlinear σ models, defined on symmetric spaces G/H , can be traced back to the fact that H is simple.

Finally, we would like to remark that CP^1 is anomaly free: the would-be anomaly is a total derivative which can be absorbed into a redefinition of the charge.²¹

APPENDIX A

In this appendix we determine the coefficients $C_{\mu\nu}^\rho$ and $D_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma\rho}$ of Eq. (2.4b) using general properties such as parity, time reversal, and current conservation. This will give us nonperturbative information also about the coefficient $E_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}$ of the Wilson expansion.

The results obtained in this way are listed below.

(i) *PT*:

$$C_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(-\epsilon) = -C_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(\epsilon), \quad (\text{A1a})$$

$$D_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon) = D_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon), \quad (\text{A1b})$$

$$E_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon) = E_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon). \quad (\text{A1c})$$

(ii) *Charge conjugation*

$$C_{\nu\mu}^{\rho}(\epsilon) = -C_{\nu\mu}^{\rho}(-\epsilon), \quad (\text{A2a})$$

$$D_{\nu\mu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon) = -D_{\nu\mu}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon) - [C_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma}(-\epsilon)\epsilon^{\rho} - \frac{1}{2}\delta^{\rho\sigma}C_{\nu\mu}^{\lambda}(-\epsilon)\epsilon_{\lambda}], \quad (\text{A2b})$$

$$E_{\nu\mu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon) = -E_{\nu\mu}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon). \quad (\text{A2c})$$

(iii) *Current conservation*. Using (2.4a) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\epsilon}^{\mu} \langle 0 | T[J_{\mu}(x+\epsilon), J_{\nu}(x)]^{ij} X | 0 \rangle &= \partial_{\epsilon}^{\mu} C_{\mu\nu}^{\rho} \langle 0 | T J_{\rho}^{ij}(x) X | 0 \rangle + \partial^{\mu} D_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon) \langle 0 | T \partial_{\sigma} J_{\rho}^{ij}(x) X | 0 \rangle \\ &+ \partial^{\mu} E_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon) \langle 0 | T z^i \bar{z}^j F_{\rho\sigma}(x) X | 0 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

As a consequence of (2.7), the term containing $\delta(\epsilon)$ on the lhs is given by

$$-2n\delta(\epsilon) \langle 0 | J_{ij}^{\nu}(x) X | 0 \rangle. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Thus we require that

$$\partial^{\mu} C_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(\epsilon) = -2n\delta(\epsilon)\delta_{\nu}^{\rho}, \quad (\text{A5a})$$

$$\partial^{\mu} D_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon) = \partial^{\mu} E_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma} = 0. \quad (\text{A5b})$$

Now, we use that the above coefficients have the following tensorial decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(\epsilon) &= C_1(\epsilon^2)g_{\mu\nu}\epsilon^{\rho} + C_2(\epsilon^2)(\epsilon_{\mu}\delta_{\nu}^{\rho} + \epsilon_{\nu}\delta_{\mu}^{\rho}) \\ &+ C_3(\epsilon^2)\epsilon_{\mu}\epsilon_{\nu}\epsilon^{\rho}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6a})$$

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon) &= D_1\epsilon^{\sigma}(\epsilon_{\mu}\delta_{\nu}^{\rho} - \epsilon_{\nu}\delta_{\mu}^{\rho}) \\ &+ D_2\epsilon^{\rho}(\epsilon_{\mu}\delta_{\nu}^{\sigma} - \epsilon_{\nu}\delta_{\mu}^{\sigma}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}(C_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma}\epsilon^{\rho} - \frac{1}{2}g^{\rho\sigma}C_{\mu\nu}^{\lambda}\epsilon_{\lambda}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6b})$$

$$E_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon) = A(\epsilon^2)\epsilon_{\mu\nu}\epsilon^{\rho\sigma}. \quad (\text{A6c})$$

We obtain, for $\epsilon \neq 0$ (prime denotes derivation with respect to ϵ^2),

$$C_1 + 2x^2C_2' + 3C_2 = 0, \quad (\text{A7a})$$

$$C_1' + C_2' + x^2C_3' + 2C_3 = 0, \quad (\text{A7b})$$

$$2x^2D_1' + 2D_1 + \frac{1}{2}C_1 = 0, \quad (\text{A7c})$$

$$-2D_1' - 2D_2' + \frac{1}{2}C_3 = 0, \quad (\text{A7d})$$

$$-D_1 - D_2 - \frac{C_2}{4} - \frac{1}{4}C_1 - \frac{1}{4}C_3x^2 = 0, \quad (\text{A7e})$$

$$2x^2D_2' + 2D_2 + \frac{1}{2}C_2 = 0, \quad (\text{A7f})$$

$$A' = 0. \quad (\text{A7g})$$

The above equations are not enough to fix the C 's and D 's. To get more information we proceed as follows.

From (2.4a) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x^{\nu} \langle 0 | T[J_{\mu}(y), J_{\nu}(x)]^{ij} z^l(x') X | 0 \rangle &= \partial_x^{\nu} C_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(-x+y) \langle 0 | T J_{\rho}^{ij}(x) z^l(x') X | 0 \rangle \\ &+ C_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(y-x) \partial_x^{\nu} \langle 0 | T J_{\rho}^{ij}(x) z^l(x') X | 0 \rangle \\ &+ \partial_x^{\nu} D_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(y-x) \langle 0 | T \partial_{\sigma} J_{\rho}^{ij} z^l(x') X | 0 \rangle \\ &+ \partial_x^{\nu} E_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(y-x) \langle 0 | T(z_i \bar{z}_j F_{\rho\sigma})(x) z^l(x') X | 0 \rangle \\ &+ O(\ln(x-y)^2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

In computing the lhs of (A8) we will retain only terms involving δ functions of $(y-x)$ or $(x-x')$. Using (A5a) and (A5b) we get, for $\mu=1$ (at $x^0=y^0$),

$$\begin{aligned} -\delta(x-x') \langle 0 | T[J_1^{ik}(y)\delta^{lj} z^k(x^1) - \delta^{lk} z^i(x^1) J_1^{kj}(y)] | 0 \rangle \\ = [C_{1\nu}^{\rho} \partial^{\nu} \langle 0 | T J_{\rho}^{ij}(x) z^l(x') X | 0 \rangle + \partial^{\nu} D_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma} \partial_{\sigma} \langle 0 | T J_{\rho}^{ij}(x) z^l(x') X | 0 \rangle] \Big|_{\substack{y^0=x^0 \\ y'-x'=\epsilon'}} \\ = C_2(\epsilon^2)\epsilon_1 \partial^{\nu} \langle 0 | T J_{\nu}^{ij}(x) z^l(x') X | 0 \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A9})$$

so that

$$\langle 0 | T [J_1^{ik}(y)z^k(x)\delta^{lj} - J_1^{lj}(y)z^i(x)]X | 0 \rangle = C_2(\epsilon^2)\epsilon_1 \delta^{jl} \left\langle 0 \left| T \left[\delta^{jl}z^i(x) - \frac{1}{n}\delta^{ij}z^l(x) \right] X \right| 0 \right\rangle. \quad (\text{A10})$$

From (A10) and (2.8) we obtained, finally,

$$C_2(x^2) = \frac{-n}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}. \quad (\text{A11})$$

Having found C_2 , C_1 is evaluated with the help of (A7a);

$$C_1(\epsilon^2) = + \frac{n}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}, \quad (\text{A12})$$

and from (A7b) we find

$$C_3(\epsilon^2) = \frac{\lambda}{(\epsilon^2)^2}. \quad (\text{A13})$$

The value of λ above is fixed by imposing (A5a), which gives

$$C_3(\epsilon^2) = \frac{-n}{\pi} \frac{1}{(\epsilon^2)^2}. \quad (\text{A14})$$

Using the equations (A7c)–(A7f) we find D_1 and D_2 ,

$$D_1 = \frac{-n}{8\pi\epsilon^2} \ln\mu^2\epsilon^2, \quad (\text{A15})$$

$$D_2 = \frac{+n}{8\pi\epsilon^2} \ln\mu^2\epsilon^2 + \frac{n}{4\pi} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}. \quad (\text{A16})$$

TABLE I. Allowed operators in the Wilson expansion for the commutator of two currents. Listed are the behaviors of the coefficients under PT and charge conjugation.

Coefficient No.	Operator	Coefficient	PT	Charge conjugation
1	j_ρ	$C_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$	$-C_{\mu\nu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$	$-C_{\nu\mu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$
2	i_ρ	$C_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(\epsilon)$	$-C_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$-C_{\nu\mu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$
3	$\partial_\sigma j_\rho$	$D_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma\rho}(\epsilon)$	$+D_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$-D_{\nu\mu}^{\sigma\rho}(-\epsilon) - C_{\nu\mu}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon)\epsilon^\sigma$
4	$\partial_\sigma i_\rho$	$D_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\sigma\rho}(\epsilon)$	$+D_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\sigma\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$-D_{\nu\mu}^{\prime\sigma\rho}(-\epsilon) - C_{\nu\mu}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon)\epsilon^\sigma$
5	$z_i \bar{z}_j F_{\sigma\rho}$	$E_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma\rho}(\epsilon)$	$+E_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$-E_{\nu\mu}^{\sigma\rho}(-\epsilon)$
6	$z_i \bar{z}_j \pi$	$E'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+E'_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$-E'_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
7	$z_i \bar{z}_j \phi$	$F_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+F_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$+F_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
8	$z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_5 \psi$	$F'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+F'_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$-F'_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
9	$z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_\rho \psi$	$G_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$	$-G_{\mu\nu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$	$-G_{\nu\mu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$
10	$z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \psi$	$G'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+G'_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$+G'_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
11	$\bar{\psi}_j \psi_i$	$H_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+H_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$+H_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
12	$\bar{\psi}_j \gamma_5 \psi_i$	$H'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+H'_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$-H'_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
13	$z_i \bar{\psi}_j c$	$I_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+I_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$I_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon) = L_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$
14	$z_i \bar{\psi}_j \gamma_5 c$	$I'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+I'_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$I_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon) = -L'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$
15	$\partial_\rho(z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_5 \psi)$	$J_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$	$-J_{\mu\nu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$	$-J_{\nu\mu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$
16	$\partial_\rho(z_i \bar{z}_j \pi)$	$J'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$-J'_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$-J'_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
17	$\partial_\rho(z_i \bar{z}_j \phi)$	$K_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$	$-K_{\mu\nu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$	$K_{\nu\mu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$
18	$\partial_\rho(z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_0 \psi)$	$K'_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$	$+K'_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon)$	$-K'_{\nu\mu}{}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon)$
19	$\bar{z}_j \bar{c} \psi_i$	$L_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+L_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$L_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon) = I_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$
20	$\bar{z}_j \bar{c} \gamma_5 \psi_i$	$L'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+L'_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$L'_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon) = I'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$
21	$\partial_\rho(z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \psi)$	$M_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$	$-M_{\mu\nu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$	$+M_{\nu\mu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$
22	$z_i \bar{z}_j \partial_\rho \pi$	$M'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$-M'_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$-M'_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
23	$z_i \partial_\rho \bar{z}_j \pi$	$N_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$	$-N_{\mu\nu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$	$N_{\nu\mu}^\rho(-\epsilon) = -N'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$
24	$\partial_\rho z_i \bar{z}_j \pi$	$N'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$-N'_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$N'_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon) = -N_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$
25	$z_i \bar{z}_j \partial_\rho(\bar{\psi} \gamma_5 \psi)$	$O_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$	$+O_{\mu\nu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$	$-O_{\nu\mu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$
26	$z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_3 \partial_\rho \psi$	$O'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$-O'_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$+O'_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
27	$\partial_\rho z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_5 \psi$	$P_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$	$-P_{\mu\nu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$	$P_{\nu\mu}^\rho(-\epsilon) = -P'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$
28	$z_i \partial_\rho \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_5 \psi$	$P'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$-P'_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$P'_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon) = -P_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$
29	$z_i \bar{z}_j \partial_\rho \phi$	$Q_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$	$-Q_{\mu\nu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$	$+Q_{\nu\mu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$
30	$z_i \partial_\rho \bar{z}_j \phi$	$Q'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$-Q'_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$Q'_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon) = R_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$
31	$\partial_\rho z_i \bar{z}_j \phi$	$R_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$	$-R_{\mu\nu}^\rho(-\epsilon)$	$R_{\nu\mu}^\rho(-\epsilon) = Q'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$
32	$z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_\rho \partial_\sigma \rho$	$R_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$	$+R_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon)$	$+R_{\nu\mu}{}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon)$
33	$z_i \bar{z}_j \partial_\rho(\bar{\psi} \gamma_\sigma \psi)$	$S_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$	$+S_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon)$	$-S_{\nu\mu}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon)$
34	$\partial_\rho z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_\sigma \psi$	$S'_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$	$+S'_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon)$	$S'_{\nu\mu}{}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon) = -T_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$

APPENDIX B

In this appendix we show that the short-distance expansion for the product of two currents of the CP^{n-1} supersymmetric model is given by (3.3). To prove this we note that the local operators contributing to the commutator $[J_\mu(x+\epsilon), J_\nu(x)]^{ij}$ have at most dimension 2. Therefore the allowed candidates are those listed in Table I, which shows also the behavior of the coefficients under PT and charge conjugation.

Using Table I we analyze whether each of the coefficients contribute to the Wilson expansion or not. Since the first five will survive we begin the

discussion with the coefficient number 6.

Coefficient number 6 $[E'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)]$. By PT and charge conjugation (CC) we conclude that

$$E'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon) = -E'_{\nu\mu}(\epsilon) \quad (B1)$$

so that

$$E'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon) = \epsilon_{\mu\nu} f(\epsilon^2). \quad (B2)$$

Because of current conservation $f(\epsilon^2)$ is a constant f . The normalization condition gives (our normal products are always normalized at zero external momenta)

$$f\epsilon_{\mu\nu} = \langle 0 | Tz_i(p)\bar{z}_j(q)\pi(r)[J_\mu(\epsilon), J_\nu(0)] | 0 \rangle \Big|_{p=q=r=0}. \quad (B3)$$

The graphs contributing to the rhs of (B3) have the structure shown in Fig. 3. Thus we have

TABLE I. (Continued.)

Coefficient No.	Operator	Coefficient	PT	Charge conjugation
35	$z_i \partial_\rho \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_\sigma \psi$	$T_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$	$+T_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon)$	$T_{\nu\mu}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon) = -S_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$
36	$z_i \bar{z}_j \partial_\rho (\bar{\psi} \psi)$	$T_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(\epsilon)$	$-T_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$+T_{\nu\mu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$
37	$z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \partial_\rho \psi$	$U_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(\epsilon)$	$-U_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$-U_{\nu\mu}^{\rho}(-\epsilon)$
38	$z_i \partial_\rho \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \psi$	$U_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(\epsilon)$	$-U_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$U_{\nu\mu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon) = V_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(\epsilon)$
39	$\partial_\rho z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \psi$	$V_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(\epsilon)$	$-V_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$V_{\nu\mu}^{\rho}(-\epsilon) = U_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(\epsilon)$
40	$\partial_\rho (\bar{\psi}_j \psi_i)$	$V_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(\epsilon)$	$-V_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$+V_{\nu\mu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$
41	$\bar{\psi}_j \partial_\rho \psi_i$	$X_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(\epsilon)$	$-X_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$-X_{\nu\mu}^{\rho}(-\epsilon)$
42	$\partial_\rho (\bar{\psi}_j \gamma_s \psi_i)$	$X_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(\epsilon)$	$-X_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$-X_{\nu\mu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$
43	$\bar{\psi}_j \gamma_s \partial_\rho \psi_i$	$Z_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(\epsilon)$	$+Z_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$+Z_{\nu\mu}^{\rho}(-\epsilon)$
44	$z_i \bar{z}_j \pi \phi$	$Z_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(\epsilon)$	$+Z_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$-Z_{\nu\mu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$
45	$z_i \bar{z}_j \pi \bar{\psi} \gamma_s \psi$	$W_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+W_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$+W_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
46	$z_i \bar{z}_j \pi \bar{\psi} \gamma_\rho \psi$	$W_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(\epsilon)$	$-W_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$+W_{\nu\mu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$
47	$z_i \bar{z}_j \pi \bar{\psi} \psi$	$Y_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+Y_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$-Y_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
48	$z_i \bar{z}_j \phi \bar{\psi} \gamma_s \psi$	$Y_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(\epsilon)$	$+Y_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$-Y_{\nu\mu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$
49	$z_i \bar{z}_j \phi \bar{\psi} \gamma_\rho \psi$	$a_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(\epsilon)$	$-a_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$-a_{\nu\mu}^{\rho}(-\epsilon)$
50	$z_i \bar{z}_j \phi \bar{\psi} \psi$	$a_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+a_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$+a_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
51	$z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_s \psi \bar{\psi}_\rho \psi$	$b_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(\epsilon)$	$-b_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$+b_{\nu\mu}^{\rho}(-\epsilon)$
52	$z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_s \psi \psi \bar{\psi}$	$b_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+b_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$-b_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
53	$z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_\rho \psi \bar{\psi} \psi$	$c_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(\epsilon)$	$-c_{\mu\nu}^{\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$-c_{\nu\mu}^{\rho}(-\epsilon)$
54	$\pi \bar{\psi}_j \gamma_s \psi_i$	$c_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+c_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$+c_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
55	$\pi \bar{\psi}_j \gamma_i \psi$	$d_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+d_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$-d_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
56	$\phi \bar{\psi}_j \gamma_s \psi_i$	$d_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(\epsilon)$	$+d_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$-d_{\nu\mu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$
57	$\phi \bar{\psi}_j \psi_i$	$f_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+f_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$+f_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
58	$\bar{\psi} \gamma_s \psi \bar{\psi}_j \gamma_s \psi_i$	$f_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(\epsilon)$	$+f_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$+f_{\nu\mu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$
59	$\bar{\psi} \gamma_s \psi \bar{\psi}_j \psi_i$	$g_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+g_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$-g_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
60	$\bar{\psi} \gamma_\rho \psi \bar{\psi}_j \gamma_s \psi_i$	$g_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(\epsilon)$	$-g_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$+g_{\nu\mu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$
61	$\bar{\psi} \gamma_\rho \psi \bar{\psi}_j \psi_i$	$h_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$-h_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$-h_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
62	$\bar{\psi} \psi \bar{\psi}_j \gamma_s \psi_i$	$h_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(\epsilon)$	$+h_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$-h_{\nu\mu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$
63	$\bar{\psi} \psi \bar{\psi}_j \psi_i$	$i_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+i_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$+i_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
64	$z_i \bar{z}_j \pi \pi$	$i_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(\epsilon)$	$+i_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$+i_{\nu\mu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$
65	$z_i \bar{z}_j \phi \phi$	$j_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$	$+j_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon)$	$+j_{\nu\mu}(-\epsilon)$
66	$z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_s \psi \bar{\psi} \gamma_s \psi$	$j_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(\epsilon)$	$+j_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$	$+j_{\nu\mu}^{\prime\rho}(-\epsilon)$
67	$\bar{\psi} \gamma_\rho \psi \bar{\psi} \gamma_\sigma \psi$	$k_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$	$+k_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon)$	$+k_{\nu\mu}^{\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon)$
68	$z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \psi \bar{\psi} \psi$	$k_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$	$+k_{\mu\nu}^{\prime\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon)$	$+k_{\nu\mu}^{\prime\rho\sigma}(-\epsilon)$

$$\text{Fig. 3} = \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} e^{ik\epsilon} (k+2p)_\mu \Delta(k,p,r) (k+p+r+q)_\nu \Big|_{p=q=r=0}, \quad (\text{B4})$$

where the $\Delta(k,p,r)$ factor can be made explicit using the Feynman rules. The equation (B4) is symmetric under the interchange $\mu \leftrightarrow \nu$, and we conclude, therefore, that $E'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon) = 0$. The same arguments can be applied to show that the coefficients numbers 8, 12, 14, 20, 44, 47, 48, 52, 55, 56, 59, and 62 also vanish.

Coefficient number 7 [$F_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$]. Taking the adjoint of the Wilson expansion one readily sees that $F_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$ must be purely imaginary. On the other hand,

$$F_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon) = \langle 0 | T z_i \bar{z}_j \phi [J_\mu(\epsilon), J_\nu(0)] | 0 \rangle = \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} e^{ik\epsilon} g_{\mu\nu}(k), \quad (\text{B5})$$

where by inspection $g_{\mu\nu}(k)$ is real. (Although the fermion propagators have both imaginary and real parts, only products of an even number of imaginary parts contribute.) It follows that

$$F_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon) = F_{\mu\nu}^*(\epsilon) = -F_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon). \quad (\text{B6})$$

By *PT*,

$$F_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon) = F_{\mu\nu}(-\epsilon), \quad (\text{B7})$$

and we conclude that $F_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon) = 0$. An identical argument can be used for the coefficients numbers 10 and 11.

Coefficients numbers 9 and 18 [$G_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$ and $K_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$]. First of all, due to *PT*, *CC*, and current conservation,

$$G_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon) = g_1 \frac{g_{\mu\nu}\epsilon^\rho}{\epsilon^2} + g_2 \frac{\epsilon_\mu g_\nu^\rho + \epsilon_\nu g_\mu^\rho}{\epsilon^2} + g_3 \frac{\epsilon_\mu \epsilon_\nu \epsilon^\rho}{(\epsilon^2)^2}, \quad (\text{B8})$$

where g_1 , g_2 , and g_3 are constants.

Using that (up to logarithmically divergent terms)

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x^\nu \langle 0 | T [J_\mu(y), J_\nu(x)]_{ij} \psi_\alpha^k(x') X | 0 \rangle &= \partial_x^\nu G_{\mu\nu}^\rho(y-x) \langle 0 | T (z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_\rho \psi)(x) \psi_\alpha^k(x') X | 0 \rangle \\ &+ G_{\mu\nu}^\rho(y-x) \partial_x^\nu \langle 0 | T (z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_\rho \psi)(x) \psi_\alpha^k(x') X | 0 \rangle \\ &+ \partial_x^\nu K_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(y-x) \langle 0 | T \partial_\sigma (z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_\rho \psi)(x) \psi_\alpha^k(x') X | 0 \rangle + \text{other terms} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B9})$$

we see that the lhs provides terms linear in the J_μ , ψ , and X fields (X denotes a products of the Z 's, ψ 's, and their adjoints), but no term proportional to $z_i \bar{z}_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_\rho \psi$. These linear contributions cancel those coming from $C_{\mu\nu}^\rho$ on the rhs, but no contributions arise which are able to cancel $G_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$. So we conclude that $G_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$ is equal to zero.

It is straightforward to see that this implies $K_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon) = 0$.

Coefficients numbers 13 and 19 [$I_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$ and $L_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$]. Taking the symmetric and antisymmetric parts of the coefficients (which have definite transformation properties under charge conjugation), we see that both parts are zero, using the arguments of the cases numbers 1 and 2.

Coefficient number 15 [$J_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$]. By *PT*, *CC*, and *P* we get, for this coefficient,

$$J_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon) = j_1(\epsilon^2) \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \epsilon^\rho + j_2(\epsilon^2) (\epsilon_\mu^\rho \epsilon_\nu - \epsilon_\nu^\rho \epsilon_\mu). \quad (\text{B10})$$

However, current conservation implies

$$J_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon) = j(\epsilon_{\mu\nu} \epsilon^\rho - \epsilon_\mu^\rho \epsilon_\nu + \epsilon_\nu^\rho \epsilon_\mu) \quad (\text{B11})$$

which tends to zero as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. The situation is analogous for the coefficients numbers 16, 22, 25, 26, 43, 46, 51, and 60.

Coefficient number 17 [$K_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$]. *PT* and *CC* enforce

$$K_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon) = k(\epsilon^2) (\epsilon_\mu g_\nu^\rho - \epsilon_\nu g_\mu^\rho) \quad (\text{B12})$$

and this is consistent with current conservation only if $K_{\mu\nu}^\rho = 0$. The same argument holds for coefficients numbers 21, 29, 36, and 40.

Coefficients numbers 23 and 24 [$N_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$ and $N'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$]. First we take the symmetric and antisymmetric parts which have definite transformation properties under charge conjugation. Combining the arguments used in the last two cases we get that these parts are zero. For the pair (27 and 28) one can use the same argument.

Coefficients numbers 30 and 31 [$Q_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$ and $R_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$]. For this pair we use a combination of the arguments of the second [$F_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$] and the sixth case [$K_{\mu\nu}^\rho(\epsilon)$].

Coefficient number 32 [$R_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$]. The graphical contribution is shown in Fig. 4. We have




FIG. 3. Graph corresponding to the coefficient number 6 [Eq. (B4)].




FIG. 4. Graph corresponding to the coefficient number 32 [Eq. (B15)].

$$\begin{aligned}
 R'_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}(\epsilon) &= \gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{\rho} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial r_{\sigma}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial s_{\sigma}} \right] \langle 0 | T z_i(p) z_j(q) \bar{\psi}_{k_{\alpha}}(r) \psi_{k_{\beta}}(s) [J_{\mu}(\epsilon), J_{\nu}(0)] | \rangle \Big|_{p=q=r=s=0} \\
 &= \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} k_{\mu}(k+p+q+r+s)_{\nu} \gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{\rho} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial r_{\sigma}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial s_{\sigma}} \right] f_{\alpha\beta}(p, k, s, r) e^{ik\epsilon} \Big|_{p=q=r=s=0} - \left[\begin{array}{c} \mu \leftrightarrow \nu \\ \epsilon \leftrightarrow -\epsilon \end{array} \right] \\
 &= \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} k_{\mu} k_{\nu} \gamma^{\rho} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial r_{\sigma}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial s_{\sigma}} \right] f_{\alpha\beta}(p, k, r, s) (e^{ik\epsilon} - e^{-ik\epsilon}) \quad (B13)
 \end{aligned}$$

which is antisymmetric under the interchange $\epsilon \leftrightarrow -\epsilon$. But this is forbidden by *PT*. The same holds for the coefficient number 37.

Coefficient number 33 [$S_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$]. By *PT*, *CC*, and current conservation,

$$S_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon) = s \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \epsilon^{\rho\sigma}. \quad (B14)$$

On the other hand,

$$S_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon) = \text{tr} \gamma^2 \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial r_{\rho}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial s_{\rho}} \right] \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} k_{\mu}(k+r+s+p+q)_{\nu} f(p, k, r, s) e^{ik\epsilon} - \left[\begin{array}{c} \mu \leftrightarrow \nu \\ \epsilon \leftrightarrow -\epsilon \end{array} \right]. \quad (B15)$$

In view of Eq. (B14), only the antisymmetric part survives and the derivatives act only on the $k_{\mu}(k+r+s+p+q)_{\nu}$ factor. After multiplying $\epsilon^{\mu\nu} \epsilon_{\rho\sigma}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 s &= \text{tr} \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} (k_{\mu} g_{\nu}^{\rho} e^{ik\epsilon} \\
 &\quad - k_{\nu} g_{\mu}^{\rho} e^{-ik\epsilon}) \epsilon^{\mu\nu} \gamma_{\rho} \gamma_{\sigma} f(k) \quad (B16)
 \end{aligned}$$

which is antisymmetric under $\epsilon \leftrightarrow -\epsilon$, violating *PT*.

Coefficients numbers 34 and 35 [$S'_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$ and $T^{\rho\sigma}_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$]. For the symmetric part of this pair we use the same argument as in the case of $R'_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$ (number 32). The antisymmetric part of the argument is the same as in the case of $S_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma}(\epsilon)$ (number 33).

Coefficients numbers 38 and 39 [$U'_{\mu\nu}{}^{\rho}(\epsilon)$ and $V^{\rho}_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$]. Taking the antisymmetric part of this pair we use the sixth argument. For the symmetric part we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
 U'_{\{\mu\nu\}}{}^{\rho}(\epsilon) &= \text{tr} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial q_{\rho}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial p_{\rho}} \right] \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} (k+2p)_{\mu}(k+p+r+s+q)_{\nu} f e^{ik\epsilon} \Big|_{p=q=r=s=0} - \left[\begin{array}{c} \mu \leftrightarrow \nu \\ \epsilon \leftrightarrow -\epsilon \end{array} \right] \\
 &= \text{tr} \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} k_{\mu} k_{\nu} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial q_{\rho}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial p_{\rho}} \right] f (e^{ik\epsilon} - e^{-ik\epsilon}) + \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} 2(g_{\mu}^{\rho} k_{\nu} e^{ik\epsilon} - g_{\nu}^{\rho} k_{\mu} e^{-ik\epsilon}) f. \quad (B17)
 \end{aligned}$$

The first integral is convergent, whereas the second one yields

$$U'_{\{\mu\nu\}}{}^{\rho}(\epsilon) = u(\epsilon^2)(g_{\mu}^{\rho} \epsilon_{\nu} + g_{\nu}^{\rho} \epsilon_{\mu}). \quad (B18)$$

At this point current conservation is enough to imply $U'_{\{\mu\nu\}}(\epsilon)=0$.

Coefficient number 42 [$X'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$]. We have

$$X'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)=\text{tr} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial p_\rho} - \frac{\partial}{\partial q_\rho} \right] \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \gamma_\mu \Gamma(p,q) \gamma_\nu e^{ik\epsilon} \Big|_{p=q=0} - \left[\begin{array}{c} \mu \leftrightarrow \nu \\ \epsilon \leftrightarrow -\epsilon \end{array} \right], \quad (\text{B19})$$

where, in general,

$$\Gamma(p,q)=b(p,q)+c(p,q)\gamma_5+a_\eta(p,q)\gamma^\eta, \quad (\text{B20})$$

giving us three terms:

$$\text{tr}(\gamma_\mu \gamma^\eta \gamma_\nu e^{ik\epsilon} - \gamma_\nu \gamma^\eta \gamma_\mu e^{-ik\epsilon}) f(k), \quad (\text{B21a})$$

which is zero because $\text{tr} \gamma_\mu \gamma^\eta \gamma_\nu = 0$;

$$\text{tr} \gamma_5 (\gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu e^{ik\epsilon} - \gamma_\nu \gamma_\mu e^{-ik\epsilon}) f(k), \quad (\text{B21b})$$

which is proportional to $\epsilon_{\mu\nu}$, which is forbidden by P ;

$$\text{tr}(\gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu e^{ik\epsilon} - \gamma_\nu \gamma_\mu e^{-ik\epsilon}) f(k). \quad (\text{B21c})$$

This has the tensor structure

$$X'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)=x(\epsilon^2)g_{\mu\nu}\epsilon^\rho, \quad (\text{B22})$$

and, again, current conservation requires $X'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)=0$.

This argument can be used for the coefficients numbers 54, 57, and 58.

Coefficient number 42 [$X'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$]. By PT , P , and charge conjugation,

$$X'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)=x(\epsilon^2)(\epsilon^\rho_\mu \epsilon_\nu + \epsilon^\rho_\nu \epsilon_\mu) \quad (\text{B23})$$

and current conservation implies $X'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)=0$.

Coefficient number 45 [$W_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$]. PT and CC imply

$$W_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)=\omega_1(\epsilon^2)g_{\mu\nu}+\omega_2(\epsilon^2)\epsilon_\mu \epsilon_\nu. \quad (\text{B24})$$

On the other hand,

$$W_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)=\int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} k_\mu k_\nu f(k) e^{ik\epsilon} - \left[\begin{array}{c} \mu \leftrightarrow \nu \\ \epsilon \leftrightarrow -\epsilon \end{array} \right] \quad (\text{B25})$$

which is antisymmetric under $\epsilon \leftrightarrow -\epsilon$, violating P . The same argument holds for coefficients numbers 50, 64, 65, 66, and 68.

Coefficient number 49 [$a'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$]. We have

$$a'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)=\int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} k_\mu k_\nu f(k) (e^{ik\epsilon} - e^{-ik\epsilon}). \quad (\text{B26})$$

Each of the terms above is logarithmically divergent so that their difference is finite. This argument can also be applied to coefficient number 53.

Coefficient number 61 [$h'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$]. We have

$$h'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)=\text{tr} \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} [\gamma_\mu f(k) \gamma_\nu e^{ik\epsilon} - \gamma_\nu f(k) \gamma_\mu e^{-ik\epsilon}], \quad (\text{B27})$$

and using the cyclicity of the trace,

$$h'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)=\int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} (\gamma_\nu \gamma_\mu e^{ik\epsilon} - \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu e^{-ik\epsilon}) f(k). \quad (\text{B28})$$

But

$$\gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu = g_{\mu\nu} + \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \gamma_5, \quad (\text{B29})$$

where the last term does not contribute due to P and for the first term we use the same argument as for coefficient number 49 [$a'_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$]. The same holds for coefficient number 63.

Coefficient number 67 [$k^{\rho\sigma}_{\mu\nu}(\epsilon)$]. Here we have a product of two traces but the procedure is similar to the preceding cases.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is our pleasure to thank M. Forger for reading the manuscript. The work of M. C. B. Abdalla was supported by Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP), whereas the work of M. Gomes and E. Abdalla was partially supported by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq).

¹M. Forger, Ph.D. thesis, F. U. Berlin, 1980 (unpublished); E. Brezin, S. Hikami, and J. Zinn-Justin, Nucl. Phys. **B165**, 528 (1980).

²A. M. Polyakov, Nucl. Phys. **B164**, 171 (1980).

³H. Eichenherr and M. Forger, Nucl. Phys. **B115**, 381

(1979); **B164**, 528 (1980).

⁴K. Pohlmeyer, Commun. Math. Phys. **46**, 207 (1976); M. Lüscher and K. Pohlmeyer, Nucl. Phys. **B137**, 46 (1978).

⁵E. Brezin, C. Itzykson, J. Zinn-Justin, and J. B. Zuber,

- Phys. Lett. **82B**, 442 (1979); H. Eichenherr, Nucl. Phys. **B146**, 223 (1978); **B155**, 544 (1979); V. E. Zakharov and A. V. Mikhailov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **74**, 1953 (1978) [Sov. Phys.—JETP **47**, 1017 (1978)].
- ⁶L. Dolan and A. Roos, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 2018 (1980); Hou Bo-yu, Ge Mo-lin, and Wu Yong-shi, *ibid.* **24**, 2238 (1981).
- ⁷M. Lüscher, Nucl. Phys. **B135**, 1 (1978).
- ⁸E. Abdalla, M. C. B. Abdalla, and M. Gomes, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 1800 (1981).
- ⁹E. Abdalla, M. C. B. Abdalla, and M. Gomes, Phys. Rev. D **25**, 452 (1982).
- ¹⁰A. D'Adda, P. Di Vecchia, and M. Lüscher, Nucl. Phys. **B152**, 125 (1979).
- ¹¹Y. Y. Goldschmidt and E. Witten, Phys. Lett. **91B**, 392 (1980).
- ¹²P. di Vecchia and S. Ferrara, Nucl. Phys. **B130**, 93 (1977); E. Witten, Phys. Rev. D **16**, 2991 (1977).
- ¹³J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **128**, 2425 (1962); J. Lowenstein and A. Swieca, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **68**, 172 (1971).
- ¹⁴S. L. Adler, in *Lectures on Elementary Particles and Quantum Field Theory*, 1970 Brandeis Summer Institute in Theoretical Physics, edited by S. Deser, M. Grisaru, and H. Pendleton (MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1970).
- ¹⁵R. Shankar and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B141**, 349 (1978); Phys. Rev. D **17**, 2134 (1978).
- ¹⁶R. Köberle and V. Kurak, Report No. IFUSP-200 (unpublished).
- ¹⁷A. D'Adda, P. Di Vecchia, and M. Luscher, Nucl. Phys. **B146**, 63 (1978).
- ¹⁸T. L. Curtright and C. K. Zachos, Phys. Rev. D **21**, 411 (1980).
- ¹⁹N. Andrei and J. Lowenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 1698 (1979); Phys. Lett. **90B**, 106 (1980); A. A. Belavin, Phys. Lett. **87B**, 117 (1979); E. Abdalla, B. Berg, and P. Weisz, Nucl. Phys. **B157**, 387 (1979).
- ²⁰E. Abdalla, M. Forger, and M. Gomes, Nucl. Phys. **B210**, 181 (1982).
- ²¹M. C. B. Abdalla and A. Lima Santos, Report No. IFUSP-360 (unpublished).