

COMMENTS

Comments are short papers which criticize or correct papers of other authors previously published in the **Physical Review**. Each Comment should state clearly to which paper it refers and must be accompanied by a brief abstract. The same publication schedule as for regular articles is followed, and page proofs are sent to authors.

Comment on “Statistics transmutation in Maxwell-Chern-Simons theories”

C. R. Hagen

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627

(Received 3 December 1990)

It is shown that transmutation of statistics fails in Maxwell-Chern-Simons field theory for precisely the same reasons it fails in Chern-Simons field theory.

The idea of fractional statistics had its origins in general considerations of quantum mechanics in two spatial dimensions [1]. The possibility that it could be extended to the domain of quantum field theory has received much consideration of late. In particular, Semenoff [2] claimed to have achieved this goal, though this was subsequently shown [3] to be incorrect. Recently, Matsuyama [4] has sought to revive such claims by extending Semenoff's construction to the full Maxwell-Chern-Simons theory.

It is not difficult to show that the results of Ref. [4] are untenable since they are subject to the same criticism as Ref. [2]. In particular, it can be seen that the result depends crucially upon the alleged identity

$$\nabla_i \Omega(\mathbf{x}) = -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ij} \nabla_j \ln x^2, \tag{1}$$

where $\epsilon_{ij} = -\epsilon_{ji}$ ($\epsilon_{12} = +1$) and

$$\Omega(\mathbf{x}) = \arctan y/x.$$

The validity of (1) would allow one to write, for example,

$$\begin{aligned} -\nabla_i \int \Omega(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}') j^0(\mathbf{x}') d^2x' \\ = \epsilon_{ij} \nabla_j \int \ln |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'| j^0(\mathbf{x}') d^2x', \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

which is crucial to the manipulations carried out in Ref. [4].

This issue was, however, resolved in Ref. [3] by the demonstration in an explicit calculation for a *c*-number charge density $j^0(x)$ that Eq. (2) implied a contradiction. In particular, the choice

$$j^0(x) = \begin{cases} 1/\pi R^2, & r < R, \\ 0, & r > R, \end{cases}$$

gave the results

$$-\epsilon_{ij} \nabla_j \int \ln |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'| j^0(\mathbf{x}') d^2x' = (\epsilon_\phi)_i \times \begin{cases} 1/r, & r > R, \\ r/R^2, & r < R, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_i \int \Omega(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}') j^0(\mathbf{x}') d^2x' \\ = \begin{cases} (\epsilon_\phi)_i (1/r), & r > R, \\ (\epsilon_\phi)_i r/R^2 + \left[\frac{2r}{R^2} \right] \phi(\epsilon_r)_i, & r < R, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where ϵ_ϕ and ϵ_r are the usual unit vectors in the plane. Evidently, the integration over the inverse tangent gives an unusual multivalued contribution in the radial direction for $r > R$, thereby disproving relation (2).

It is not difficult to establish why this consistency must occur in general. Relation (2) is easily seen to be correct for $r \neq 0$ by direct differentiation, but it *cannot* be generally true as a simple argument shows. Since

$$\nabla^2 \ln x^2 = 4\pi \delta(\mathbf{x}),$$

insertion of (1) requires that

$$\nabla \times \nabla \Omega = 2\pi \delta(\mathbf{x}), \tag{3}$$

a result which is recognized in Ref. [4]. As pointed out there, such an equation must be interpreted as a distribution. To this end one multiplies (3) by a function $f(r)$, which is well behaved at $r = \infty$ (e^{-r^2} is a possible choice) and integrates the product of this function with Eq. (3). This yields, upon integration by parts and use of the fact that one can choose $f(r)$ such that

$$\nabla \times \nabla f = 0,$$

the contradiction

$$2\pi f(0) = 0.$$

In other words, the functions Ω which satisfy (3) in the context distribution theory do not exist.

One concludes that the transmutation claimed in Ref. [4] fails in the same way as does that of Semenoff. Finally, the author wishes to emphasize that the support of transmutation attributed to him in Ref. [4] is without basis. The publication cited [5] established the possibility of fractional charge, but no transmutation, exotic statis-

tics, or spin and statistics connection was either suggested or claimed in that work.

This work was supported in part by U.S. Department of Energy Contract No. DE-AC02-76ER13065.

[1] F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1144 (1982); **49**, 957 (1982).

[2] G. W. Semenoff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 517 (1988).

[3] C. R. Hagen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 1025 (1989).

[4] T. Matsuyama, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 3469 (1990).

[5] C. R. Hagen, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **157**, 342 (1984).