

Rapid Communications

The Rapid Communications section is intended for the accelerated publication of important new results. Since manuscripts submitted to this section are given priority treatment both in the editorial office and in production, authors should explain in their submittal letter why the work justifies this special handling. A Rapid Communication in Physical Review D should be no longer than five printed pages and must be accompanied by an abstract. Page proofs are sent to authors, but because of the accelerated schedule, publication is not delayed for receipt of corrections unless requested by the author or noted by the editor.

Dynamical parity violation and the Chern-Simons term

M. Gomes, V. O. Rivelles, and A. J. da Silva

Departamento de Física Matemática, Instituto de Física da Universidade de São Paulo,
Caixa Postal 20516 São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

(Received 28 July 1989)

We consider a three-dimensional model of two-component spinors with a quadrilinear self-interaction. In the $1/N$ expansion the model turns out to be renormalizable and a mass term is generated, violating parity. This allows for the generation of a Chern-Simons term if the spinor is coupled to an external gauge field. Parity violation and the associated induction of the topological term cease at a computable critical temperature.

Quantum field theory in three space-time dimensions has recently attracted considerable interest, particularly due to its possible relevance to the quantized Hall effect¹ and high- T_c superconductivity.² Indeed, there is a class of three-dimensional theories exhibiting interesting and impressive features such as exotic statistics, fractional spin,^{3,4} and massive gauge fields.^{5,6} It has been pointed out that these peculiarities are of a topological nature and they can be produced via the addition of a Chern-Simons term to the Lagrangian describing the system under consideration.^{7,8} It is therefore important to understand the mechanism by which a topological term of the Chern-Simons type can be generated. Being a pseudoscalar density this term is odd under parity. Parity violation is a prerequisite to generate the Chern-Simons term. This breakdown of parity can be accomplished by coupling the gauge field to massive, two-component spinors. In fact, it is well known that a fermionic mass term is odd under parity. Here we would like to indicate another route to parity violation, namely, the parity symmetry breakdown through radiative corrections. This dynamical violation of parity will be explicitly verified in the context of a model with a four-fermion interaction. Although perturbatively nonrenormalizable the model has a well-defined $1/N$ expansion. Formally, it is described by the Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L} = i\bar{\psi}\partial\psi - \frac{g}{2N}(\bar{\psi}\psi)^2. \quad (1)$$

The dimension of ψ is one so that the quadrilinear term has dimension four, signaling a (perturbatively) nonrenormalizable theory.

There are two inequivalent two-dimensional representations of the Dirac algebra. One of these has

$$\gamma^0 = \sigma^3, \quad \gamma^1 = i\sigma^1, \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma^2 = i\sigma^2 \quad (2)$$

as a typical explicit realization; the other inequivalent representation has a typical representative which differs from the above just by the sign of one of the γ matrices. For definiteness, we use representation (2) whenever convenient.

The parity transformation, corresponding to the inversion of one of the axes x_1 , let us say, leaves the action corresponding to (1) invariant if

$$\psi(x^0, x^1, x^2) \rightarrow \gamma^1 \psi(x^0, -x^1, x^2). \quad (3)$$

Note, however, that a mass term $\bar{\psi}\psi$ would change sign under such transformation.⁶

The most efficient way to derive the $1/N$ expansion for this model is to use the equivalent Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = i\bar{\psi}\partial\psi - \sigma(\bar{\psi}\psi) + \frac{N}{2g}\sigma^2, \quad (4)$$

where σ plays the role of an auxiliary field [classically, $\sigma = (g/N)\bar{\psi}\psi$]. As in two dimensions,⁹ there is the possibility for σ to acquire a nonzero vacuum expectation value, $\langle 0|\sigma|0\rangle = \sigma_0$, at the quantum level. Making the replacement $\sigma \rightarrow \sigma' = \sigma + \sigma_0$ the Lagrangian density in Eq. (4) becomes

$$\mathcal{L} = i\bar{\psi}\partial\psi - \sigma_0(\bar{\psi}\psi) - \sigma(\bar{\psi}\psi) + \frac{N}{2g}\sigma_0^2 + \frac{N}{2g}\sigma^2 + \frac{N}{g}\sigma_0\sigma. \quad (5)$$

The requirement that the shifted field σ now has a zero vacuum expectation value implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{g}\sigma_0 &= - \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \text{Tr} \frac{i}{\not{k} - \sigma_0} \\ &= -2i\sigma_0 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{k^2 - \sigma_0^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where in the (logarithmically divergent) integral an appropriate ultraviolet cutoff is understood. This relation fixes g as a function of the generated mass. In particular, if a Pauli-Villars regulator is employed, we get

$$\frac{1}{g(\Lambda)} + \frac{1}{2\pi}(\Lambda - |\sigma_0|) = 0, \tag{7}$$

so that, introducing a renormalized coupling constant g_R through

$$\frac{1}{g_R} = \frac{1}{g(\Lambda)} + \frac{1}{2\pi}(\Lambda - \mu) \tag{8}$$

we obtain

$$\frac{1}{g_R} = \frac{|\sigma_0| - \mu}{2\pi}, \tag{9}$$

where the massive parameter μ plays the role of the renormalization spot. Different renormalization prescriptions will introduce the mass parameter in different ways, but they can be related through a renormalization-group transformation.¹⁰

Let us look now to the propagator for the σ field. In the dominant order of the $1/N$ expansion it is given by the inverse of

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_\sigma = & i\frac{N}{g} + N \text{Tr} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{i}{\not{k} - \sigma_0} \frac{i}{(\not{k} + \not{p}) - \sigma_0} \\ & - iN \left[\frac{1}{g} + 2i \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{k \cdot (k+p) + \sigma_0^2}{(k^2 - \sigma_0^2)[(k+p)^2 - \sigma_0^2]} \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Now, if one replaces (6) in the above equation, we get a finite result

$$\Gamma_\sigma = N(p^2 - 4\sigma_0^2) \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{(k^2 - \sigma_0^2)[(k+p)^2 - \sigma_0^2]}, \tag{11}$$

which exhibits a bound-state pole for the propagator $\Delta_\sigma = (\Gamma_\sigma)^{-1}$ at $p^2 = 4\sigma_0^2$.

In conclusion, in the large- N limit there is a broken parity symmetry phase in which the ψ field becomes massive. Moreover, the absence of tachyonic excitations [see (11)] tell us that this phase is stable. To this same result one would arrive by an analysis of the effective potential. The calculation is straightforward and shows that the broken phase is actually energetically preferred.

For large p^2 , the sigma's propagator behaves like

$$\Delta_\sigma(p) \underset{p \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p^2}}. \tag{12}$$

This expression illustrates the fact that, by summing an infinite chain of one-loop diagrams as the $1/N$ expansion does, one may improve the ultraviolet behavior of field theories. Here each fermionic loop at high momenta has gained additional decaying factors corresponding to the sigma lines in it.

Higher-order contributions to the $1/N$ expansion can

now be systematically constructed. They must use a

fermion propagator $i/(\not{p} - \sigma_0)$,

a sigma propagator Δ_σ given above,

and a trilinear vertex

$$\text{associated to the term } -\sigma(\bar{\psi}\psi). \tag{13}$$

Graphs containing as subgraphs either the one-loop contribution to the σ propagator or the one-loop contribution to the tadpole should be omitted since they have been explicitly taken into consideration. Similarly to the four-component spinor case,¹¹ with these rules we obtain that the degree of superficial divergence associated to a proper graph γ is given by

$$d(\gamma) = 3 - N_F - N_\sigma, \tag{14}$$

where N_F and N_σ are the number of external fermion and sigma lines, respectively. From this we see that the $1/N$ expansion defines a renormalizable theory. Graphs having $N_\sigma = 2$ and $N_F = 0$ are linearly divergent but, due to Lorentz covariance, only a counterterm proportional to σ^2 is actually needed to absorb this divergence; the counterterm corresponds to coupling-constant renormalization. Differently, in four dimensions the same type of diagram is quadratically divergent and needs a counterterm of the type $(\partial_\mu \sigma)^2$ making the $1/N$ expansion unrenormalizable.

A Chern-Simons term can be generated by coupling a gauge field A_μ to ψ through the interaction

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} = \frac{e}{\sqrt{N}} \bar{\psi} \gamma_\mu \psi A^\mu \tag{15}$$

so that, in the dominant order of $1/N$, the polarization tensor $\pi_{\mu\nu}$ is given by

$$\pi^{\mu\nu}(p) = e^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \text{Tr} \left[\gamma^\mu \frac{i}{\not{k} - \sigma_0} \gamma^\nu \frac{i}{\not{k} + \not{p} - \sigma_0} \right]. \tag{16}$$

Taking into account that $\text{Tr}(\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma^\rho) = -2i\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}$, we obtain

$$\pi^{\mu\nu}(p) = 2ie^2 \sigma_0 \epsilon^{\mu\rho\nu} p_\rho F(p^2) + \text{other terms}, \tag{17}$$

where $F(p^2)$ is the same integral found in the calculation of the sigma propagator, i.e.,

$$F(p^2) = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{(k^2 - \sigma_0^2)[(k+p)^2 - \sigma_0^2]}. \tag{18}$$

For very low momenta this expression reduces itself to $(e^2/4\pi)(\text{sgn}\sigma_0)\epsilon^{\mu\rho\nu}p_\rho$. It corresponds to an induced Chern-Simons term

$$\frac{e^2}{8\pi} (\text{sgn}\sigma_0) \epsilon^{\mu\rho\nu} A_\mu \partial_\rho A_\nu \tag{19}$$

in the effective Lagrangian density. We arrive thus to the conclusion that the Chern-Simons term can be generated via a dynamical violation of the parity symmetry.

As we have just seen, the induced Chern-Simons term is ultraviolet finite, the divergent part of $\pi_{\mu\nu}$ being on what we have called "other terms" in (17). The imposition of transversality of the remaining piece suffices to make it

finite. Therefore any regularization scheme preserving transversality is physically acceptable and we are free to employ our preferred one (Pauli-Villars, dimensional, etc.).¹²

The Chern-Simons term produces a rotational anomaly as follows. First, notice that the equation of motion for the A_0 component of the gauge field is

$$\frac{e}{\sqrt{N}} \bar{\psi} \gamma^0 \psi + \frac{e^2}{4\pi} (\text{sgn} \sigma_0) \epsilon_{ij} \partial_i A_j = 0 \quad (20)$$

implying that the "magnetic" field $\epsilon_{ij} \partial^i A^j$ creates a charge. In Dirac's Hamiltonian formalism for constrained systems this is a secondary constraint induced by the primary constraint $\pi_0 = 0$ (π_0 is the canonical momentum conjugate to A_0). Choosing the gauge $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = 0$, $A_0 = 0$ permits one to integrate Eq. (20) to

$$A_i(x) = \frac{2(\text{sgn} \sigma_0)}{e^2} \epsilon_{ij} \int d^2y \frac{x_j - y_j}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|^2} j_0(y), \quad (21)$$

where $j_0 = (e/\sqrt{N}) \bar{\psi} \gamma_0 \psi$ is the charge density. Now, the symmetric gauge-invariant energy-momentum tensor is given by

$$T^{\mu\nu} = \frac{i}{4} (\bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu D^\nu \psi + \bar{\psi} \gamma^\nu D^\mu \psi - D^\nu \bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu \psi - D^\mu \bar{\psi} \gamma^\nu \psi) - g^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{L}, \quad (22)$$

where $D^\mu \psi = [\partial^\mu - i(e/\sqrt{N})A^\mu] \psi$ is the covariant derivative. In particular, the component T^{0i} has the form

$$T^{0i} = \frac{i}{4} [3\bar{\psi} \gamma^0 \partial^i \psi - \partial^i \bar{\psi} \gamma^0 \psi - \partial^k (\bar{\psi} \gamma^k \gamma^0 \gamma^i \psi)] + \frac{e}{\sqrt{N}} \bar{\psi} \gamma^0 \psi A^i \quad (23)$$

so that the generator of rotations

$$L = \int d^2x (x_j \epsilon_{ji} T_{0i}) \quad (24)$$

turns out to be equal to

$$L = \int d^2x i \left[\epsilon_{ji} x_j \bar{\psi} \gamma_0 \partial_i \psi - \frac{\epsilon_{ik}}{4} \bar{\psi} \gamma^0 \gamma^k \gamma^i \psi + \frac{e}{\sqrt{N}} \epsilon_{ij} x_i \bar{\psi} \gamma_0 \psi A_j \right]. \quad (25)$$

The last term in this expression, which can be rewritten as $[(\text{sgn} \sigma_0)/e^2] Q^2$, where Q is the charge operator, is responsible for the fractional spin.

As we shall see now, these facts are temperature dependent and we shall determine a critical temperature beyond which no parity violation occurs and, consequently, no Chern-Simons term is induced.

At finite temperature, Eq. (6) changes to

$$\frac{1}{g} - \frac{2}{\beta} \sum_n \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{k^2 - \sigma_T^2} = 0, \quad (26)$$

where the sum is over k_0 equal to odd integer multiples of πiT ; β is the inverse of the temperature. The sum can be transformed into an integral, giving

$$\frac{1}{g} + \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{\omega_k} \left[1 - \frac{2}{e^{\beta\omega_k} + 1} \right] = 0, \quad (27)$$

where $\omega_k = \sqrt{k^2 + \sigma_T^2}$. This equation shows that σ_T decreases monotonically from σ_0 at $T=0$ until zero at the critical temperature $T_c = (1/4 \ln 2) \sigma_0 \approx 0.3607 \sigma_0$. We should remark that a similar result holds in two dimensions where there is also a critical temperature at the leading $1/N$ order, associated to a chiral-symmetry violation.¹³

At $T = T_c$ parity ceases to be violated and there is no induced Chern-Simons term. In fact, one rapidly finds that the finite-temperature analog of the first term in Eq. (17) contains a factor σ_T which takes the would-be Chern-Simons term to zero for all values of $p \neq 0$. The isolated singularity at $p = 0$ is integrable so that the Chern-Simons term really tends to zero in a distributional sense.

We could have considered a more general Lagrangian with four-fermion interactions. However, because of the identities

$$\left[1 + \frac{2}{N} \right] (\bar{\psi} \psi)^2 = -(\bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu \psi)(\bar{\psi} \gamma_\mu \psi) - (\bar{\psi} \lambda^a \psi)(\bar{\psi} \lambda^a \psi), \quad (28)$$

$$2 \left[2 + \frac{1}{N} \right] (\bar{\psi} \psi)^2 + \frac{2}{N} (\bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu \psi)(\bar{\psi} \gamma_\mu \psi) + (\bar{\psi} \lambda^a \psi)(\bar{\psi} \lambda^a \psi) + (\bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu \lambda^a \psi)(\bar{\psi} \gamma_\mu \lambda^a \psi) = 0, \quad (29)$$

where λ^a , $a = 1, \dots, N$, indicate the $SU(N)$ generators, there are only two linearly independent, $U(N)$ -invariant, quadrilinear interactions. These could be $(\bar{\psi} \psi)^2$ and $(\bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu \psi)(\bar{\psi} \gamma_\mu \psi)$. If we incorporate this last interaction the treatment is very similar to what we have already described. In addition to the σ field, one introduces an auxiliary vector field W^μ through the combination $NW^2/\bar{g} - W^\mu \bar{\psi} \gamma_\mu \psi$, where \bar{g} is another coupling constant, associated to the new interaction. Because of $\text{Tr} \gamma^\mu = 0$, the tadpole equation, Eq. (6), remains the same. The W^μ propagator turns out to have a transversal part which decays for large momentum as $1/\sqrt{p^2}$. The longitudinal piece, nonetheless, behaves like a constant. This bad behavior will still be under control if the regularization procedure keeps the current $\bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu \psi$ conserved.

On the other hand, if the only interaction is $(\bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu \psi)(\bar{\psi} \gamma_\mu \psi)$, the induced mass will possibly be generated at higher orders of $1/N$. This is presently under investigation.

This work was partially supported by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico.

- ¹S. M. Girvin and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 1252 (1987).
- ²B. Wiegman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 821 (1988); I. Dzyaloshinskii, A. M. Polyakov, and P. W. Wiegmann, Phys. Lett. A **127**, 112 (1988).
- ³J. M. Leinaas and J. Myrheim, Nuovo Cimento **37B**, 1 (1977).
- ⁴F. Wilczek and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 2250 (1983); T. H. Hansson, M. Rocek, I. Zahed, and S. C. Zhang, Phys. Lett. B **214**, 475 (1988); L. Huerta and M. Ruiz-Altaba, *ibid.* **216**, 371 (1989); R. Mackenzie and F. Wilczek, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **3**, 2827 (1988).
- ⁵J. F. Schonfeld, Nucl. Phys. **B185**, 157 (1981).
- ⁶S. Deser, R. Jackiw, and S. Templeton, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 975 (1982); Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **140**, 372 (1982).
- ⁷A. N. Redlich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 18 (1984); Phys. Rev. D **29**, 2366 (1984); S. Deser and A. N. Redlich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 1541 (1988).
- ⁸A. Niemi and G. W. Semenoff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 2077 (1983); G. W. Semenoff, *ibid.* **61**, 517 (1988).
- ⁹D. J. Gross and A. Neveu, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 3235 (1974).
- ¹⁰For a discussion of this question in two dimensions, see H. Fleming, K. Furuya, and J. L. de Lyra, Nuovo Cimento **53A**, 405 (1979).
- ¹¹B. Rosenstein, B. J. Warr, and S. H. Park, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 1433 (1989).
- ¹²For primitively divergent amplitudes whose degree of divergence is odd, dimensional regularization is already a renormalization, selecting in a specific way the renormalization conditions of the theory. If one prefers other renormalization conditions one can always add finite counterterms to change them.
- ¹³R. F. Dashen, S-k Ma, and R. Rajaraman, Phys. Rev. D **11**, 1499 (1975).