Generalized soldering of ± 2 helicity states in $D = 2 + 1$

D. Dalmazi[*] and Elias L. Mendonça[†]

*UNESP/Campus de Guaratinguetá-DFQ, Avenida Doutor Ariberto Pereira da Cunha, 333 CEP 12516-410, Guaratinguetá,
São Paulo, Brazil*
(Received 15 May 2009; published 27 July 2009)

The direct sum of a couple of Maxwell-Chern-Simons gauge theories of opposite helicities ± 1 does not lead to a Proca theory in $D = 2 + 1$, although both theories share the same spectrum. However, it is known that by adding an interference term between both helicities we can join the complementary pieces together and obtain the physically expected result. A generalized soldering procedure can be defined to generate the missing interference term. Here, we show that the same procedure can be applied to join together ± 2 helicity states in a full off-shell manner. In particular, by using second-order (in derivatives) self-dual models of helicities ± 2 (spin-2 analogues of Maxwell-Chern-Simmons models) the Fierz-Pauli theory is obtained after soldering. Remarkably, if we replace the second-order models by third-order self-dual models (linearized topologically massive gravity) of opposite helicities, after soldering, we end up exactly with the new massive gravity theory of Bergshoeff, Hohm, and Townsend in its linearized approximation.

I. INTRODUCTION

The direct sum of two chiral fermions in $D = 1 + 1$ gives rise to a full Dirac fermion; however, this is not true for their bosonized versions as noticed in [1] (see also [2]). Likewise, the fermionic determinant of a Dirac fermion interacting with a vector gauge field in $D = 1 + 1$ factorizes into the product of two chiral determinants, but the full bosonic effective action is not the direct sum of the naive chiral effective actions as discussed in [3]. In both cases, it turns out that an interference term between the opposite chirality bosonic actions is necessary to achieve the expected result. Such a term is provided by the so-called soldering procedure.

The same procedure works in $D = 2 + 1$, if we replace chirality by helicity. In particular, the soldering of two Maxwell-Chern-Simons (MCS) [4] theories of opposite helicities ± 1 leads to the Proca theory; see [5]. More generally, the ± 1 helicity modes may have different masses, which leads after soldering to a Maxwell-Chern-Simons-Proca theory. In this case, technical problems [5] regarding a full off-shell soldering can be surmounted by defining a generalized soldering procedure [6]. In Sec. III, we show that such a procedure can be successfully applied to fuse ± 2 helicity states of different masses $m_\pm$ with no need of using equations of motion. After soldering, we obtain the Fierz-Pauli [7] theory plus a first-order Chern-Simons term whose coefficient is proportional to the mass difference $m_+ - m_-$, thus generalizing a previous result [8].

A specific feature of the generalized soldering is the existence of a parameter α with a sign freedom, which plays a role whenever interactions are present. In the

soldering of two chiral Schwinger models such sign ambiguity leads either to an axial ($\alpha = -1$) or to a vector ($\alpha = +1$) Schwinger model which are dual do each other. In the case of the two MCS theories, the two sign choices lead to dual interaction terms. We can have either a derivative coupling or a minimal coupling plus a Thirring term. After integration over the soldering field, the dependence on the sign of α disappears, which proves that they correspond to dual forms of the same interacting theory. In Sec. III, we couple the ± 2 helicity states with a rank-two field $J_{\mu\nu}$ and show that the two signs for α lead after soldering to dual interactions similar to the spin-1 case. Once again, integration over the soldered field leads to the same effective action $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{eff}}(J_{\mu\nu})$ independent of the sign of α.

In $D = 2 + 1$, parity singlets of helicities ± 1 can be described by either the first-order self-dual model of [9] or the second-order MCS theory of [4]. Both models have their spin-2 counterparts, which we call $\mathcal{L}_{\pm 2}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\pm 2}^{(2)}$; see [10,11], respectively. However, in the spin-2 case there is another third-order self-dual model ($\mathcal{L}_{\pm 2}^{(3)}$) with no spin-1 analogue. It is the quadratic truncation of the topologically massive gravity of [4]. Although $\mathcal{L}_{\pm 2}^{(3)}$ is of third order, it is ghost-free. This is a consequence of the nonpropagating nature of the Einstein-Hilbert action in $D = 2 + 1$, which allows this term to be used as a mixing term in the master approach without affecting the particle content of the interpolated theories ($\mathcal{L}_{\pm 2}^{(2)}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\pm 2}^{(3)}$). For the same reason, it is possible to jump from the second-order Fierz-Pauli theory to a fourth-order ghost-free model, as shown in [12], which implies the existence of a new unitary (at tree level[1])

---

[1]The residue at the massless pole generated by the Einstein-Hilbert term vanishes [13] similarly to the massless pole, due to the topological Chern-Simons term in the MCS theory.

[*]dalmazi@feg.unesp.br
[†]elias.fis@gmail.com

massive gravity theory which we call henceforth the Bergshoeff, Hohm, and Townsend (BHT) theory. In Sec. III, we show that the soldering of $\mathcal{L}_{+2}^{(3)}$ with $\mathcal{L}_{-2}^{(3)}$ gives rise exactly to the linearized version of the BHT theory, which is, taking into account previous equivalences of soldered theories, an indication of the existence of a local dual map between the gauge invariant sectors of $\mathcal{L}_{+2}^{(3)} + \mathcal{L}_{-2}^{(3)}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{BHT}}$. In the next section, as an introduction to the forthcoming sections, we discuss the necessity of interference terms between opposite helicity states according to the type of self-dual model employed to describe helicity eigenstates. In Sec. V, we draw some conclusions.

II. DECOMPOSITION OF PARITY DOUBLETS OF SPINS 1 AND 2 IN $D = 2 + 1$

Before we start the soldering of spin-2 gauge theories in the next sections, it is convenient to recall the description of spin-1 and spin-2 massive particles in $D = 2 + 1$ by means of nongauge theories. In this case, there will be no need to add interference terms between opposite helicity states (parity singlets) in order to build up a parity doublet described by just one field. We start with the spin-1 case. It is known that massive spin-1 particles are described in a covariant way by the Proca theory:

$$\mathcal{L}_P = -\frac{1}{4}F^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu} - \frac{m^2}{2}A^\mu A_\mu. \quad (1)$$

Throughout this work, we use the signature $\eta_{\mu\nu} = (-, +, +)$. From the equations of motion of (1), one derives the transverse condition $\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$ and the Klein-Gordon equation $(\Box - m^2)A^\mu = 0$. So we are left with 2 massive modes corresponding to the helicity states $+1$ and -1, as one can easily check by rewriting the Proca theory in a first-order form with the help of an auxiliary field B_μ,

$$\mathcal{L}_P^{(1)} = -\frac{1}{2}B^\mu B_\mu - \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha}B_\mu\partial_\nu A_\alpha - \frac{m^2}{2}A^\mu A_\mu. \quad (2)$$

After the redefinition $(B_\mu \to m(\tilde{B}_\mu + \tilde{A}_\mu)/\sqrt{2}; \ A_\mu \to (\tilde{A}_\mu - \tilde{B}_\mu)/\sqrt{2})$, we have two decoupled parity singlets:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} &= -\frac{m^2}{2}\tilde{A}_\mu\tilde{A}^\mu - \frac{m}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha}\tilde{A}_\mu\partial_\nu\tilde{A}_\alpha - \frac{m^2}{2}\tilde{B}_\mu\tilde{B}^\mu \\
&\quad + \frac{m}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha}\tilde{B}_\mu\partial_\nu\tilde{B}_\alpha \\
&= \mathcal{L}_{(+1)}^{(1)}[\tilde{A}] + \mathcal{L}_{(-1)}^{(1)}[\tilde{B}]. \quad (3)
\end{aligned}$$

The first-order self-dual models $\mathcal{L}_{(\pm 1)}^{(1)}$ have first appeared in [9] and describe massive eigenstates of the helicity operator $(J \cdot P/\sqrt{P^2})_{\mu\nu} = i\epsilon_{\mu\nu\gamma}\partial^\gamma/\Box$ with eigenvalues ± 1. We conclude that the addition of two first-order self-dual models leads to the parity invariant Proca theory in its first-order form. There is no need to add to the nongauge theory $\mathcal{L}_{(+1)}^{(1)} + \mathcal{L}_{(-1)}^{(1)}$ an interference term between opposite helicity states to arrive at the Proca theory, which has no gauge symmetry as well. On the other hand, each first-order self-dual model is equivalent [14] to a MCS theory (second-order theory), so we expect $\mathcal{L}_P \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{MCS}(+1)} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{MCS}(-1)}$, but since $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{MCS}(\pm 1)}$ are gauge theories, it is clear that the direct sum $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{MCS}(+1)} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{MCS}(-1)}$ will not lead to the Proca theory. As explained in [5,6], a soldering action (W_s) can be defined by the addition of an interference term quadratic in Noether currents, namely, $W_S = W_{\mathrm{MCS}(+1)} + W_{\mathrm{MCS}(-1)} + W_{JJ}$, in a such way that W_S becomes exactly the Proca theory. Or more generally, for helicity states of different masses $m_\pm$, the Maxwell-Chern-Simons-Proca theory is obtained after soldering.

Now let us make a similar analysis of the spin-2 case. The spin-2 analogue of the Proca theory is the Fierz-Pauli model [7], written below in different forms for later convenience:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{FP}} = \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{-g}R)_{hh} + \frac{m^2}{2}(h^2 - h_{\mu\nu}h^{\nu\mu}), \quad (4)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
= \frac{1}{2}\bigg[&-\frac{\partial_\nu h_{\lambda\mu}\partial^\nu(h^{\lambda\mu} + h^{\mu\lambda})}{2} + \partial_\nu h\partial^\nu h - 2\partial_\nu h^{\lambda\nu}\partial_\lambda h \\
&+ \partial_\nu h^{\nu\lambda}\partial^\mu h_{\lambda\mu} + \frac{\partial_\nu h_{\lambda\mu}(\partial^\lambda h^{\nu\mu} + \partial^\mu h^{\lambda\nu})}{2} \\
&+ m^2(h^2 - h_{\mu\nu}h^{\nu\mu}) \bigg], \quad (5)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}T_{\mu\nu}(h)T^{\nu\mu}(h) - \frac{1}{4}T^2(h) + \frac{m^2}{2}(h^2 - h_{\mu\nu}h^{\nu\mu}), \quad (6)$$

where $T_{\mu\nu}(h) = \epsilon_{\mu\alpha\beta}\partial^\alpha h_\nu^\beta$, $h = \eta^{\mu\nu}h_{\mu\nu}$, and $(\sqrt{-g}R)_{hh}$ stands for the Einstein-Hilbert action up to quadratic terms in the dreibein fluctuations: $e_{\mu\alpha} = \eta_{\mu\alpha} + h_{\mu\alpha}$. The field $h_{\mu\nu}$ has no symmetry in its indices. In fact, in this work all rank-two fields have no specific symmetry in their indices. Symmetric and antisymmetric combinations will be denoted, respectively, by $h_{(\alpha\beta)} \equiv (h_{\alpha\beta} + h_{\beta\alpha})/2$ and $h_{[\alpha\beta]} \equiv (h_{\alpha\beta} - h_{\beta\alpha})/2$. From the equations of motion of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{FP}}$, we derive the necessary constraints to describe a massive spin-2 particle, i.e., $h_{[\mu\nu]} = 0$, $\partial^\mu h_{\mu\nu} = 0 = \partial^\nu h_{\mu\nu}$, $h = 0$, and the Klein-Gordon equation $(\Box - m^2)h_{(\mu\nu)} = 0$. The constraints imply that we effectively have $9 - 7 = 2$ massive modes which will correspond to the ± 2 helicity states as follows: We rewrite the quadratic truncation of the Einstein-Hilbert term in first-order form by introducing an auxiliary tensor field $W_{\mu\nu}$ [10]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{FP}}^{(1)} = &\frac{m^2}{2}(W^2 - W_{\mu\nu}W^{\nu\mu}) + mW^{\mu\nu}\epsilon_\mu^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\alpha h_{\beta\nu} \\
&+ \frac{m^2}{2}(h^2 - h_{\mu\nu}h^{\nu\mu}). \quad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

Redefining $W_{\mu\nu} \to (\tilde{W}_{\mu\nu} - \tilde{h}_{\mu\nu})/\sqrt{2}$ and $h_{\mu\nu} \to (\tilde{h}_{\mu\nu} + \tilde{W}_{\mu\nu})/\sqrt{2}$ one obtains two decoupled first-order self-dual models,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{FP}}^{(1)} = \frac{m^2}{2}(\tilde{W}^2 - \tilde{W}_{\mu\nu}\tilde{W}^{\nu\mu}) + \frac{m}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta}\tilde{W}_{\mu\nu}\partial_\alpha\tilde{W}^\nu_\beta$$

$$+ \frac{m^2}{2}(\tilde{h}^2 - \tilde{h}_{\mu\nu}\tilde{h}^{\nu\mu}) - \frac{m}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta}\tilde{h}_{\mu\nu}\partial_\alpha\tilde{h}^\nu_\beta$$

$$= \mathcal{L}_{+2}^{(1)} + \mathcal{L}_{-2}^{(1)}. \tag{8}$$

Each of the models $\mathcal{L}_{\pm 2}^{(1)}$, first found in [10], describes an eigenstate of a spin-2 helicity operator with eigenvalues ± 2; see e.g. [10,15]. Concluding, in both spin-1 and spin-2 cases a couple of first-order nongauge theories of opposite helicities can be simply added up to yield a parity invariant nongauge model containing two helicity modes. Once again, there is no need to add any extra interference term between the opposite helicity states. However, this is not true for the second- and third-order gauge invariant actions below, which also represent ± 2 helicity eigenstates:

$$W_{\pm 2}^{(2)} = \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{2}T_{\mu\nu}(A)T^{\nu\mu}(A) - \frac{1}{4}T^2(A)\right.$$
$$\left. \mp \frac{m}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta}A_{\mu\nu}\partial_\alpha A^\nu_\beta\right], \tag{9}$$

$$W_{\pm 2}^{(3)} = \int d^3x \left[-\frac{1}{2}T_{\mu\nu}(A)T^{\nu\mu}(A) + \frac{1}{4}T^2(A)\right.$$
$$\left. \mp \frac{1}{2m}A_{\alpha\mu}(\Box\theta^{\alpha\gamma}E^{\beta\mu} - \Box\theta^{\alpha\mu}E^{\beta\gamma})A_{\gamma\beta}\right], \tag{10}$$

where $T_{\mu\nu}(A) = \epsilon_\mu^{\gamma\delta}\partial_\gamma A_{\delta\nu}$ and

$$E_{\mu\nu} = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\gamma}\partial^\gamma; \qquad \Box\theta^{\mu\nu} = \eta^{\mu\nu}\Box - \partial^\mu\partial^\nu. \tag{11}$$

The second-order model $W_{\pm 2}^{(2)}$, which appeared before in [10,11], is the spin-2 analogue of the MCS theory. It is invariant under the local transformations $\delta A_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\xi_\nu$. The quadratic truncation of the topologically massive gravity of [4], $W_{\pm 2}^{(3)}$, is invariant under the more general local transformations $\delta A_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\xi_\nu + \epsilon_{\mu\nu\gamma}\Lambda^\gamma$. The Einstein-Hilbert term appears with the correct sign in $W_{\pm 2}^{(2)}$ in contrast to $W_{\pm 2}^{(3)}$. Both models are unitary and can be deduced from $W_{\pm 2}^{(1)} = \int d^3x \mathcal{L}_{\pm 2}^{(1)}$ via master action [16]. There is a local dual map connecting correlation functions in $W_{\pm 2}^{(1)}$ with correlation functions of gauge invariant objects in $W_{\pm 2}^{(2)}$ and $W_{\pm 2}^{(3)}$ up to contact terms [16]. In the next section, we solder $W_{+2}^{(2)}$ and $W_{-2}^{(2)}$; the case of $W_{\pm 2}^{(3)}$ will be treated in Sec. IV.

III. SOLDERING OF $W_{+2}^{(2)}$ AND $W_{-2}^{(2)}$

We start with the second-order opposite helicity models:

$$W_{+2}^{(2)}[A] = \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{2}T_{\mu\nu}(A)T^{\nu\mu}(A) - \frac{1}{4}T^2(A)\right.$$
$$\left. + \frac{m_+}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\gamma\rho}A_{\mu\nu}\partial_\gamma A^\nu_\rho + \gamma_+\epsilon^{\mu\gamma\rho}J_{\mu\nu}\partial_\gamma A^\nu_\rho\right], \tag{12}$$

$$W_{-2}^{(2)}[B] = \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{2}T_{\mu\nu}(B)T^{\nu\mu}(B) - \frac{1}{4}T^2(B)\right.$$
$$\left. - \frac{m_-}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\gamma\rho}B_{\mu\nu}\partial_\gamma B^\nu_\rho + \gamma_-\epsilon^{\mu\gamma\rho}J_{\mu\nu}\partial_\gamma B^\nu_\rho\right]. \tag{13}$$

The masses $m_\pm$ can take arbitrary positive values. As in the spin-1 case, we have added linear couplings with a rank-two tensor $J_{\mu\nu}$. The interaction terms are such that the global shifts ($\delta A_{\mu\nu} = \omega_{\mu\nu}$; $\delta B_{\mu\nu} = \tilde{\omega}_{\mu\nu}$) and the local transformations ($\delta A_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\xi_\nu$; $\delta B_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\tilde{\xi}_\nu$), which are symmetries of the first two terms of (12) and (13), are preserved. Furthermore, those are the natural interaction terms when $W_{\pm 2}^{(2)}$ are deduced from $W_{\pm 2}^{(1)}$ via master action [16]. The coupling constants $\gamma_\pm$ are in principle arbitrary, but special cases will be treated later on. Both $W_{\pm 2}^{(2)}$ are also invariant under $\delta_\phi J_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\phi_\nu$.

The basic idea of the soldering procedure is to lift the global shift symmetry to a local symmetry and tie the fields $A_{\mu\nu}$ and $B_{\mu\nu}$ together by assuring that their transformations are proportional to each other:

$$\delta A_{\mu\nu} = \omega_{\mu\nu}; \qquad \delta B_{\mu\nu} = \alpha\omega_{\mu\nu}, \tag{14}$$

where α is so far an arbitrary constant. From (12) and (13) we derive

$$\delta(W_{+2}^{(2)}[A] + W_{-2}^{(2)}[B]) = \int d^3x J^{\mu\nu\lambda}\partial_\nu\omega_{\lambda\mu}, \tag{15}$$

with

$$J^{\mu\nu\lambda} = C_{\rho\beta\gamma}^{\mu\nu\lambda}\partial^\beta g^{\gamma\rho} + \epsilon_\gamma^{\nu\lambda}f^{\gamma\mu}, \tag{16}$$

and

$$C_{\rho\beta\gamma}^{\mu\nu\lambda} = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda}\epsilon_{\rho\beta\gamma} + \epsilon_\rho^{\nu\lambda}\epsilon_{\beta\gamma}^\mu, \tag{17}$$

$$g_{\mu\nu} = A_{\mu\nu} + \alpha B_{\mu\nu}, \tag{18}$$

$$f_{\mu\nu} = m_+ A_{\mu\nu} - \alpha m_- B_{\mu\nu} + (\gamma_+ + \alpha\gamma_-)J_{\mu\nu}. \tag{19}$$

In a first step Noether procedure we cancel the variation (15) introducing auxiliary fields $H_{\mu\nu\lambda}$ such that

$$\delta H_{\mu\nu\lambda} = -\partial_\nu\omega_{\lambda\mu}. \tag{20}$$

Therefore

$$\delta\left(W_{+2}^{(2)}[A] + W_{-2}^{(2)}[B] + \int d^3x J^{\mu\nu\lambda}H_{\mu\nu\lambda}\right)$$
$$= \int d^3x \delta J^{\mu\nu\lambda}H_{\mu\nu\lambda}. \tag{21}$$

Since $\delta J^{\mu\nu\lambda} = (1 + \alpha^2)C_{\rho\beta\gamma}^{\mu\nu\lambda}\partial^\beta\omega^{\gamma\rho} + \epsilon^{\gamma\nu\lambda}(m_+ - \alpha^2 m_-)\omega_\gamma^\mu$, if we choose

$$\alpha = \pm\sqrt{\frac{m_+}{m_-}}, \qquad (22)$$

then we have

$$\delta J^{\mu\nu\lambda} = (1 + \alpha^2)C^{\mu\nu\lambda}_{\rho\beta\gamma}\partial^\beta\omega^{\gamma\rho}, \qquad (23)$$

$$= -(1 + \alpha^2)C^{\mu\nu\lambda}_{\rho\beta\gamma}\delta H^{\rho\beta\gamma}. \qquad (24)$$

From (21) and (24) we deduce $\delta W_S^{(2)} = 0$ where the soldered action is given by

$$W_S^{(2)} = W_{+2}^{(2)}[A] + W_{-2}^{(2)}[B] + \int d^3x\bigg[J^{\mu\nu\lambda}H_{\mu\nu\lambda}$$
$$+ \frac{(1 + \alpha^2)}{2}C^{\mu\nu\lambda}_{\rho\beta\gamma}H^{\rho\beta\gamma}H_{\mu\nu\lambda}\bigg]. \qquad (25)$$

After the elimination of the auxiliary fields through their algebraic equations of motion, we end up with

$$W_S^{(2)} = W_{+2}^{(2)}[A] + W_{-2}^{(2)}[B] - \int d^3x\frac{[J^*_{\mu\nu}J^{*\nu\mu} - (J^*)^2]}{8(1 + \alpha^2)}, \qquad (26)$$

where $J^* = \eta^{\mu\nu}J^*_{\mu\nu}$ with

$$J^*_{\mu\nu} = \epsilon^{\gamma\lambda}_\mu J_{\nu\gamma\lambda} = 2T_{\mu\nu}(g) - \eta_{\mu\nu}T(g) - 2f_{\mu\nu}. \quad (27)$$

The reader can check that (26) is invariant under (14) by using (15) and (23) where α is given in (22). After some algebra, we can rewrite $W_S^{(2)}$ in a more explicit form:

$$W_S^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2(1 + \alpha^2)}\int d^3x[\sqrt{-g}R|_{hh}$$
$$+ (m_+ - m_-)\epsilon^{\mu\gamma\rho}h_{\mu\nu}\partial_\gamma h^\nu_\rho$$
$$+ m_+m_-(\tilde{h}^2 - \tilde{h}_{\mu\nu}\tilde{h}^{\nu\mu})$$
$$+ (\alpha\gamma_+ - \gamma_-)\epsilon^{\mu\gamma\rho}J_{\mu\nu}\partial_\gamma h^\nu_\rho]. \qquad (28)$$

We have introduced the combinations

$$h_{\mu\nu} = \alpha A_{\mu\nu} - B_{\mu\nu}, \qquad (29)$$

$$\tilde{h}_{\mu\nu} = h_{\mu\nu} + \frac{(\gamma_+ + \alpha\gamma_-)}{\alpha m_-}J_{\mu\nu}. \qquad (30)$$

The invariance under (14) has forced the action $W_S^{(2)}$ to depend only upon the combination $h_{\mu\nu} = \alpha A_{\mu\nu} - B_{\mu\nu}$, invariant under (14), which is called the soldering field. In particular, if $m_+ = m_-$, then the soldered action corresponds exactly to the Fierz-Pauli theory [7], which is known to describe massive spin-2 particles in arbitrary D-dimensional spaces. It is remarkable that the nontrivial Fierz-Pauli mass term has been generated out of mass terms of Chern-Simons–type appearing in $W_{\pm2}^{(2)}$. If we drop the interactions ($J_{\mu\nu} = 0$) and set $h = 0 = h_{[\mu\nu]}$, which certainly hold on shell, at action level we recover

the soldered action of [8] obtained for $m_+ = m_-$. The mass split $m_+ - m_- \neq 0$ is responsible for the parity breaking Chern-Simons term in (28) analogously to the spin-1 case [6].

Regarding the interactions, besides the derivative coupling [last term in (28)] already present in $W_{\pm2}^{(2)}$ before soldering, there appears now a linear coupling through the combination $\tilde{h}_{\mu\nu}$ such that the symmetry $\delta_\phi J_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\phi_\nu$ of $W_{\pm2}^{(2)}$ is maintained, if we transform the soldering field accordingly. Namely, $\delta_\phi W_S^{(2)} = 0$ under

$$\delta_\phi J_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\phi_\nu; \qquad \delta_\phi h_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{(\gamma_+ + \alpha\gamma_-)}{\alpha m_-}\partial_\mu\phi_\nu. \qquad (31)$$

The soldered action $W_S^{(2)}$ depends explicitly on its interaction terms on the sign choice of α defined in (22). In order to check if we do really have any physical consequence of the sign freedom, we proceed as in [6] and integrate over the soldering field $h_{\mu\nu}$ in the path integral and derive an effective action $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}[J_{\mu\nu}]$. Although the integral is Gaussian, the fact that $h_{\mu\nu}$ has no symmetry in its indices makes its propagator quite complicated. Our final result contains even and odd parity terms:

$$(-2)\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}[J_{\mu\nu}] = J^{\mu\nu}\bigg[\Box(P_{\text{even}}^{(2)})^{\delta\epsilon}_{\mu\nu}\bigg(\frac{\gamma_+^2}{\Box - m_+^2} + \frac{\gamma_-^2}{\Box - m_-^2}\bigg)$$
$$+ \sqrt{\Box}(P_{\text{odd}}^{(2)})^{\delta\epsilon}_{\mu\nu}\bigg(\frac{m_+\gamma_+^2}{\Box - m_+^2} - \frac{m_-\gamma_-^2}{\Box - m_-^2}\bigg)$$
$$+ \bigg(\frac{\gamma_+^2}{m_+^2} + \frac{\gamma_-^2}{m_-^2}\bigg)\frac{\Box\theta_{\mu\nu}\theta^{\delta\epsilon}}{2}$$
$$+ \bigg(\frac{\gamma_+^2}{m_+} - \frac{\gamma_-^2}{m_-}\bigg)\bigg(\theta_{\mu\nu}E^{\epsilon\delta} - \frac{\partial_\nu\partial^\epsilon}{\Box}E^\delta_\mu\bigg)\bigg]J_{\delta\epsilon}. \qquad (32)$$

The spin-2 projection operators are given by

$$(P_{\text{even}}^{(2)})^{\delta\epsilon}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}(\theta^\delta_\mu\theta^\epsilon_\nu + \theta^\epsilon_\mu\theta^\delta_\nu - \theta_{\mu\nu}\theta^{\delta\epsilon}), \qquad (33)$$

$$(P_{\text{odd}}^{(2)})^{\delta\epsilon}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{4\sqrt{\Box}}(E^\delta_\mu\theta^\epsilon_\nu + E^\epsilon_\mu\theta^\delta_\nu + E^\epsilon_\nu\theta^\delta_\mu + E^\delta_\nu\theta^\epsilon_\mu). \qquad (34)$$

A detailed comparison with the spin-1 case (see the second reference of [6]) reveals that the first two terms of (32) are remarkably similar to their spin-1 counterparts that have a Maxwell-Chern-Simons structure. Namely, the differential operator which appears in the Chern-Simons term is the square root of the differential operator in the Maxwell term ($E_{\mu\nu}E^{\nu\gamma} = \Box\theta^\gamma_\mu$), which is similar to $(P_{\text{odd}}^{(2)})^{\delta\epsilon}_{\mu\nu}(P_{\text{odd}}^{(2)})^{\gamma\rho}_{\delta\epsilon} = (P_{\text{even}}^{(2)})^{\gamma\rho}_{\mu\nu}$.

As expected, the effective action is invariant under the original symmetry $\delta_\phi J_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \phi_\nu$ of $W^{(2)}_{\pm 2}$, since $E^\nu_\mu \partial_\nu \phi = \theta^\nu_\mu \partial_\nu \phi$. Moreover, in the special case where the couplings satisfy

$$\gamma^2_+ = \frac{m_+}{m_-} \gamma^2_- = \alpha^2 \gamma^2_-, \qquad (35)$$

the effective theory depends only upon $J_{(\mu\nu)}$, and consequently it is invariant under any antisymmetric local shift $\delta_\Lambda J_{\mu\nu} = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\gamma} \Lambda^\gamma$. Indeed, we have checked that if $\gamma_+ = \pm \alpha \gamma_-$ it follows that $\delta_\Lambda W^{(2)}_S = 0$ under, respectively,

$$\delta_\Lambda J_{\mu\nu} = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\gamma} \Lambda^\gamma, \qquad (36)$$

$$\delta_\Lambda h_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{\gamma_-}{m_-}\left[(1 \pm 1)\epsilon_{\mu\nu\gamma}\Lambda^\gamma + \frac{m_+ \mp m_-}{m_+ m_-}\partial_\mu \Lambda_\nu\right]. \qquad (37)$$

We also have the discrete symmetry $(m_+, m_-, \gamma_+, \gamma_-) \rightarrow (-m_-, -m_+, \gamma_-, \gamma_+)$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{eff}}[J]$, which amounts, before soldering, to interchange $W^{(2)}_{\pm 2} \rightleftharpoons W^{(2)}_{\mp 2}$.

As in the previous soldering cases [6], the dependence on the sign of α disappears completely after integration over the soldering field $h_{\mu\nu}$. In particular,[2] if $\gamma_- = -\gamma_+ \equiv \gamma$ and $m_+ = m_-$, the two choices $\alpha = \pm 1$ lead to $\mathcal{L}^{\alpha=+1}_S(j) = \mathcal{L}_S(0) - 2\gamma J^{\mu\nu}\epsilon_{\nu\gamma\rho}\partial^\nu h^{\gamma\rho}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{\alpha=-1}_S(j) = \mathcal{L}_S(0) + 4m\gamma(Jh - J_{\mu\nu}h^{\nu\mu}) + 4\gamma^2(J^2 - J_{\mu\nu}J^{\nu\mu})$. Thus, the sign freedom of α gives rise to dual theories as in the spin-1 case in $D = 2 + 1$ and in the soldering of two Chiral-Schwinger models in $D = 1 + 1$.

Finally, we mention that in the second part of [16] the equivalence of (28) and the gauge invariant sector of $W^{(2)}_{+2} + W^{(2)}_{-2}$ has been proved at quantum level; see also [17,18]. So, the soldering procedure has led once more to a physically equivalent (dual) theory.

IV. SOLDERING OF $W^{(3)}_{+2}$ AND $W^{(3)}_{-2}$

For sake of simplicity, we drop interactions in this section and begin with the following third-order self-dual models of helicities ± 2, which correspond to quadratic truncations of topologically massive gravity [see (10)]:

$$W^{(3)}_{+2}[A] = \int d^3x\left[-\frac{1}{2}T_{\mu\nu}(A)T^{\nu\mu}(A) + \frac{1}{4}T^2(A)\right.$$
$$\left. -\frac{1}{2m_+}A_{\alpha\mu}(\Box\theta^{\alpha\gamma}E^{\beta\mu} - \Box\theta^{\alpha\mu}E^{\beta\gamma})A_{\gamma\beta}\right], \qquad (38)$$

[2]The case where opposite helicity states have opposite derivative couplings ($\gamma_+ = -\gamma_-$) naturally appears when we obtain $W^{(2)}_{\pm 2}$ from $W^{(1)}_{\pm 2}$ via master action [16].

$$W^{(3)}_{-2}[B] = \int d^3x\left[-\frac{1}{2}T_{\mu\nu}(B)T^{\nu\mu}(B) + \frac{1}{4}T^2(B)\right.$$
$$\left. +\frac{1}{2m_-}B_{\alpha\mu}(\Box\theta^{\alpha\gamma}E^{\beta\mu} - \Box\theta^{\alpha\mu}E^{\beta\gamma})B_{\gamma\beta}\right]. \qquad (39)$$

Now, we follow basically the same steps which have led us from (12) and (13) to (26). We require the soldered theory to be invariant under $\delta A_{\mu\nu} = \omega_{\mu\nu}$; $\delta B_{\mu\nu} = \tilde{\alpha}\omega_{\mu\nu}$ with $\tilde{\alpha}$ a constant to be determined. So we derive

$$\delta(W^{(3)}_{+2}[A] + W^{(3)}_{-2}[B]) = \int d^3x J^{\mu\nu\lambda}\partial_\nu\omega_{\lambda\mu}, \qquad (40)$$

where now, compare with (16), the Noether current contains first and second derivatives terms, i.e.,

$$J^{\mu\nu\lambda} = -C^{\mu\nu\lambda}_{\rho\beta\gamma}\partial^\beta\tilde{g}^{\gamma\rho} - \frac{1}{2}D^{\nu\lambda\mu\gamma\rho}\tilde{f}_{\gamma\rho}, \qquad (41)$$

where $C^{\mu\nu\lambda}_{\rho\beta\gamma}$ is defined as in (17) while

$$\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} = A_{\mu\nu} + \tilde{\alpha}B_{\mu\nu}, \qquad (42)$$

$$\tilde{f}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{A_{\mu\nu}}{m_+} - \tilde{\alpha}\frac{B_{\mu\nu}}{m_-}, \qquad (43)$$

$$D^{\nu\lambda\mu\gamma\rho} = \epsilon^{\beta\lambda\nu}(2E^\gamma_\beta E^{\rho\mu} - E^\mu_\beta E^{\rho\gamma} - \Box\theta^{\gamma\rho}\eta^\mu_\beta). \qquad (44)$$

Introducing auxiliary fields which transform as $\delta H_{\mu\nu\lambda} = -\partial_\mu\omega_{\nu\lambda}$, we deduce

$$\delta\left(W^{(3)}_{+2}[A] + W^{(3)}_{-2}[B] + \int d^3x J^{\mu\nu\lambda}H_{\mu\nu\lambda}\right)$$
$$= \int d^3x \delta J^{\mu\nu\lambda}H_{\mu\nu\lambda}. \qquad (45)$$

However, we have now

$$\delta J^{\mu\nu\lambda} = (1 + \tilde{\alpha}^2)C^{\mu\nu\lambda}_{\rho\beta\gamma}\partial^\beta\omega^{\gamma\rho}$$
$$- \frac{1}{2}D^{\nu\lambda\mu\gamma\rho}\left(\frac{1}{m_+} - \frac{\tilde{\alpha}^2}{m_-}\right)\omega_{\gamma\rho}. \qquad (46)$$

As in the last section, we suppress the last term above by fixing $\tilde{\alpha}$ up to a sign

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \pm\sqrt{\frac{m_-}{m_+}}. \qquad (47)$$

Consequently,

$$\delta J^{\mu\nu\lambda} = -(1 + \tilde{\alpha}^2)C^{\mu\nu\lambda}_{\rho\beta\gamma}\partial^\beta\omega^{\gamma\rho}, \qquad (48)$$

$$= (1 + \tilde{\alpha}^2)C^{\mu\nu\lambda}_{\rho\beta\gamma}\delta H^{\rho\beta\gamma}. \qquad (49)$$

Note the sign difference to (23) and (24). This is due to the "wrong" sign of the Einstein-Hilbert term in (38) and (39). Thus, after elimination of the auxiliary fields we have, compare with (26),

$$W_S^{(4)} = W_{+2}^{(3)}[A] + W_{-2}^{(3)}[B] + \int d^3x \frac{[J_{\mu\nu}^* J^{*\nu\mu} - (J^*)^2]}{8(1 + \tilde{\alpha}^2)},$$
(50)

where now

$$J_{\mu\nu}^* = \epsilon_\mu^{\gamma\lambda} J_{\nu\gamma\lambda} = 2T_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{g}) - \eta_{\mu\nu} T(\tilde{g}) - V_{\mu\nu}, \quad (51)$$

with

$$V^{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{\gamma\rho}^\mu D^{\gamma\rho\nu\epsilon\delta} \tilde{f}_{\epsilon\delta}, \quad (52)$$

$$= (2E^{\mu\epsilon}E^{\delta\nu} + E^{\mu\nu}E^{\epsilon\delta} - \Box\eta^{\mu\nu}\theta^{\epsilon\delta})\tilde{f}_{\epsilon\delta}. \quad (53)$$

Rewriting the fields in term of the soldering invariant combination $h_{\mu\nu} = \tilde{\alpha}A_{\mu\nu} - B_{\mu\nu}$,

$$\tilde{f}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{A_{\mu\nu}}{m_+} - \tilde{\alpha}\frac{B_{\mu\nu}}{m_-} = \frac{\tilde{\alpha}}{m_-} h_{\mu\nu}, \quad (54)$$

$$g_{\mu\nu} = A_{\mu\nu} + \tilde{\alpha}B_{\mu\nu} = \tilde{\alpha}A_{\mu\nu} - h_{\mu\nu}. \quad (55)$$

It turns out that $W_S^{(4)}$ depends only on $h_{\mu\nu}$. In particular, all the fourth-order terms in $W_S^{(4)}$ stem from the combination:

$$\int \frac{d^3x}{8(1 + \tilde{\alpha}^2)} (V_{\mu\nu}V^{\nu\mu} - V^2)$$

$$= \int \frac{d^3x}{4(1 + \tilde{\alpha}^2)} h_{(\mu\nu)} \left(\frac{2\theta^{\mu\epsilon}\theta^{\nu\delta} - \theta^{\mu\nu}\theta^{\epsilon\delta}}{m_+ m_-} \right) \Box^2 h_{(\epsilon\delta)}.$$
(56)

In deriving (56) from (53) we have used integration by parts, the identities $E_{\mu\gamma}E_\nu^\gamma = \Box\theta_{\mu\nu}$, $E_{\mu\nu}\theta^{\nu\gamma} = E_\mu^\gamma$, $\theta_{\mu\nu}\theta^{\nu\gamma} = \theta_\mu^\gamma$, Eq. (54), and $(\tilde{\alpha}/m_-)^2 = 1/m_+ m_-$. After collecting all terms in (50) we can write the corresponding soldered Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_S^{(4)}$ as

$$\mathcal{L}_S^{(4)} = \frac{1}{2(1 + \tilde{\alpha}^2)} h_{(\mu\nu)} \left[E^{\epsilon\mu}E^{\nu\delta} \right.$$

$$+ \frac{4(m_+ - m_-)}{m_+ m_-} E^{\mu\delta}\Box\theta^{\nu\delta}$$

$$\left. + \frac{(2\theta^{\mu\epsilon}\theta^{\nu\delta} - \theta^{\mu\nu}\theta^{\epsilon\delta})\Box^2}{2m_+ m_-} \right] h_{(\epsilon\delta)}. \quad (57)$$

Thus, as in the last section, the requirement of invariance under local shifts proportional to each other effectively solders the fields $A_{\mu\nu}$ and $B_{\mu\nu}$ into one combination $h_{\mu\nu} = \tilde{\alpha}A_{\mu\nu} - B_{\mu\nu}$. By using $\tilde{\alpha} = \pm\sqrt{m_-/m_+}$, it is easy to

check that each of the terms of (57) is invariant under the discrete symmetry $(m_+, m_-, \gamma_+, \gamma_-) \to (-m_-, -m_+, \gamma_-, \gamma_+)$ which interchanges $W_{\pm 2}^{(3)} \rightleftharpoons W_{\mp 2}^{(3)}$. Furthermore, the action (57) is invariant under the local symmetries $\delta h_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu\xi_\nu + \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda}\Lambda^\lambda$ inherited from $W_\pm^{(3)}$. The three terms in (57) correspond exactly to the quadratic truncation of the new massive gravity of [12] up to an overall constant:

$$2(1 + \tilde{\alpha}^2)\mathcal{L}_S^{(4)} = \left[-\sqrt{-g}R + \frac{m_+ - m_-}{m_+ m_-} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}\Gamma_{\mu\gamma}^\epsilon\partial_\nu\Gamma_{\epsilon\rho}^\gamma \right.$$

$$\left. + \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{m_+ m_-} \left(R_{\mu\nu}R^{\nu\mu} - \frac{3}{8}R^2 \right) \right]_{hh}. \quad (58)$$

In identifying (57) with (58) we have used $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + 2h_{(\mu\nu)}$ (or $e_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}$). The second term in (58) is the quadratic truncation of the the third order Chern-Simons term of [4]: $\mathcal{L}_{CS3} = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}\Gamma_{\mu\gamma}^\epsilon[\partial_\nu\Gamma_{\epsilon\rho}^\gamma + (2/3)\Gamma_{\nu\delta}^\gamma\Gamma_{\rho\epsilon}^\delta]$.

V. CONCLUSION

In both cases of spin-1 and spin-2 theories in $D = 2 + 1$, we have shown that the simple addition of two first-order self-dual models (parity singlets) of opposite helicities leads us to a parity invariant theory (for equal masses), which describes a parity doublet by means of a single field. Those are the well-known Proca and Fierz-Pauli theories, respectively. On the other hand, the addition of self-dual models with gauge symmetry demands extra interference terms between the opposite helicity states in order to produce the desired result. We have shown here that the generalized soldering furnishes those required terms in a systematic way also for spin-2 particles in a complete off-shell procedure. In particular, the Fierz-Pauli theory with its nontrivial mass term is automatically produced, Sec. III, out of two second-order self-dual models of opposite helicities which are the spin-2 analogues of the Maxwell-Chern-Simon theories.

In Sec. III, we have shown that if we start with two spin-2 self-dual models of third order (quadratic truncation of topologically massive gravity), we end up, after soldering, exactly with the new massive gravity theory of [12]. Since in previous examples [6] the theories related via soldering turn out to be equivalent (up to contact terms in the correlation functions), our results suggest that there might be a local dual map between the gauge invariant sectors of $W_{+2}^{(3)} + W_{-2}^{(3)}$ and the new massive gravity theory [12] at the linearized level. In particular, both theories have the same $m \to \infty$ limit (pure Einstein-Hilbert) contrary to the Fierz-Pauli theory (see discussion in [19]).

Extensions of the soldering formalism beyond the linear level in $D = 2 + 1$ as well as the introduction of interactions in the soldering of the third-order self-dual models are currently under investigation in both in the soldering

and master action approaches. Moreover, it would be interesting to investigate (see also [20,21]) higher spin ($s \geq 3$) generalizations of the soldering procedure in $D = 2 + 1$ and their possible relationships with massless higher spin theories in $D = 3 + 1$.

[1] M. Stone, Illinois Report No. ILL-(TH)-89-23, 1989; Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 731 (1989); Nucl. Phys. **B327**, 399 (1989).

[2] R. Amorim, A. Das, and C. Wotzasek, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 5810 (1996).

[3] E. M. C. Abreu, R. Banerjee, and C. Wotzasek, Nucl. Phys. **B509**, 519 (1998).

[4] S. Deser, R. Jackiw, and S. Templeton, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **140**, 372 (1982).

[5] R. Banerjee and S. Kumar, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 085005 (1999).

[6] D. Dalmazi, A. de Souza Dutra, and E. M. C. Abreu, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 025015 (2006); **79**, 109902 (2009).

[7] M. Fierz, Helv. Phys. Acta **22**, 3 (1939); M. Fierz and W. Pauli, Proc. R. Soc. A **173**, 211 (1939).

[8] A. Ilha and C. Wotzasek, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 105013 (2001).

[9] P. K. Townsend, K. Pilch, and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Lett. **136B**, 38 (1984).

[10] C. Aragone and A. Khoudeir, Phys. Lett. B **173**, 141 (1986).

[11] S. Deser and J. McCarthy, Phys. Lett. B **246**, 441 (1990).

[12] E. Bergshoeff, O. Hohm, and P. K. Townsend, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 201301 (2009).

[13] M. Nakazone and I. Oda, arXiv:0902.3531.

[14] S. Deser and R. Jackiw, Phys. Lett. **139B**, 371 (1984).

[15] R. Gaitan, Ph.D. thesis, Universidad Central de Venezuela, 2005 (in Spanish), arXiv:0711.2498.

[16] D. Dalmazi and E. L. Mendonça, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 045025 (2009).

[17] C. Aragone, P. J. Arias, and A. Khoudeir, Nuovo Cimento Soc. Ital. Fis., B **109**, 303 (1994).

[18] T. Scaria, Ph.D. thesis, Jadavpur University, 2003, arXiv:hep-th/0407022.

[19] S. Deser, arXiv:gr-qc/9211010.

[20] T. Damour and S. Deser, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincare Phys. Theor. **47**, 277 (1987).

[21] C. Aragone and A. Khoudeir, in *Proceedings of the 8th Latin American Symposium on Relativity and Gravitation (SILARG), São Paulo, Brazil, 1993* (SILARG, São Paulo, 1993), pp. 0529–533.