

Modified 3D Massive Abelian 2-Form Theory with a Single Pseudo-Scalar Field: BRST Approach

S. K. Panja^(a), E. Harikumar^(a), R. P. Malik^(b,c)

^(a) School of Physics, University of Hyderabad,
Central University P. O., Gachibowli, Hyderabad - 500 046, Telangana, India

^(b) *Physics Department, Institute of Science,
Banaras Hindu University (BHU), Varanasi - 221 005, (U.P.), India*

^(c) *DST Centre for Interdisciplinary Mathematical Sciences,
Institute of Science, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi - 221 005, India*
e-mails: sumanpanja19@gmail.com; eharikumar@uohyd.ac.in; rpmalik1995@gmail.com

Abstract: We obtain the off-shell nilpotent Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) and anti-BRST symmetry transformations (corresponding to the infinitesimal classical gauge symmetry transformations) for the Stückelberg-modified massive three $(2 + 1)$ -dimensional (3D) Abelian 2-form gauge theory with a single pseudo-scalar field. The latter field (having the negative kinetic term and a well-defined mass) has already been shown (i) to exist in the modified version of the standard 3D Stückelberg formalism (on solid mathematical grounds), (ii) to be a possible candidate for dark matter, and (iii) to correspond to the “phantom” field of some of the cosmological models of the Universe. A couple of highlights of our present endeavor are (i) the observation that, even though the pseudo-scalar field does *not* transform under the gauge and (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations, it appears in the first-class constraints which annihilate the physical states at the quantum level, and (ii) the Noether conserved (anti-)BRST charges are found to be non-nilpotent. In our present investigation, we derive (i) the coupled (but equivalent) BRST and anti-BRST invariant Lagrangian densities, (ii) the conserved and off-shell nilpotent versions of the (anti-)BRST charges and the conserved ghost charge, (iii) the (anti-)BRST invariant Curci-Ferrari (CF) type restrictions, and (iv) the standard BRST algebra amongst the conserved and nilpotent (anti-)BRST and conserved ghost charges of our theory.

PACS numbers: 11.15. – q, 03.70. + k

Keywords: Stückelberg formalism and its modification; massive 3D Abelian 2-form gauge theory; gauge symmetry transformations; off-shell nilpotent (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations; (pseudo-)scalar fields; negative kinetic term; CF-type restrictions

1 Introduction

The modern developments in the research activities, connected with the ideas behind (super)string theories (see, e.g. [1-5] for details), have brought together a set of very active researchers in the domain of theoretical high energy physics (THEP) as well as in the realm of pure mathematics on an intellectual platform where both sets of researchers have benefited from each-other. As far as the research activities in the realm of quantum field theories are concerned, mention can be made of theoretical works done in the areas of (i) the topological field theories (see, e.g. [6-9] and references therein), (ii) the higher spin gauge theories (see, e.g. [10,11] and references therein), (iii) the supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories (see, e.g. [12,13] and references therein), etc., where there have been convergence of ideas from THEP and pure mathematics. We have devoted time, during the last few years, on the study of the higher p -form ($p = 2, 3, \dots$) gauge theories* which is inspired by the ideas of (super)string theories because the higher p -form ($p = 2, 3, \dots$) basic fields appear in the quantum excitations of the (super)strings. We have been able to establish that the Stückelberg-modified massive and massless Abelian p -form ($p = 1, 2, 3$) gauge theories (in $D = 2p$ dimensions of spacetime) are the field-theoretic examples of Hodge theory (see, e.g. [14-17] and references therein) within the framework of Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) formalism [18-21] where the discrete and continuous symmetries (and corresponding Noether conserved charges) have been able to provide the physical realizations of the de Rham cohomological operators (see, e.g. [22-26] for details) of differential geometry at the algebraic level. It is quite obvious, from the above discussions, that the field-theoretic models for Hodge theory are defined only in the even (i.e. $D = 2p$) dimensions of spacetime.

In our present investigation, we concentrate on the study of a specific massive higher p -form (i.e. $p = 2$) gauge theory in the odd dimension (i.e. $D = 3$) of spacetime. We have obtained a well-defined 3D Lagrangian density [cf. Eq. (1) below] for the modified massive Abelian 2-form gauge theory where we have exploited the modification in the standard Stückelberg technique [27,28] of replacement for the massive Abelian 2-form gauge field. In this modification, in addition to the presence of the standard Stückelberg vector field, we have a single pseudo-scalar field which is incorporated on the basis of solid mathematical arguments (see, e.g. [27-29] for details). The latter field appears in the theory with a negative kinetic term. However, it is endowed with a well-defined rest mass because it obeys the standard Klein-Gordon equation of motion[†]. We have demonstrated the existence of the first-class constraints on this (i.e. Stückelberg-modified) theory. The latter generate the infinitesimal, local and continuous classical gauge symmetry transformations [cf. Eq. (4) below]. We have generalized these classical gauge symmetry transformations to their quantum counterparts as the BRST and anti-BRST symmetry transformations which are

*The most successful theory in THEP is the standard model of particle physics (SMPP) which is based on the interacting non-Abelian 1-form (i.e. $p = 1$) gauge theory where there has been stunning degree of agreements between theory and experiment. However, it is plagued with a large number of adjustable parameters and it does not include the theory of gravity (as far as its theoretical reach and range for the unification scheme is concerned). Moreover, it has been experimentally verified that the weakly interacting neutrinos have masses. This observation nullifies the basic principle on which the SMPP is based.

[†]Such kinds of fields are “exotic” fields and they have become quite popular in the realm of cosmological models of the Universe where they have been christened as the “phantom” or “ghost” fields. These fields (with negative kinetic terms and well defined masses) are also possible candidates for dark matter.

respected by the coupled (but equivalent) Lagrangian densities. The latter owe their origin to the (anti-)BRST invariant Curci-Ferrari (CF) type restrictions (which are the hallmark of a properly BRST-quantized theory) and they also respect the ghost-scale symmetry transformations. We have derived, in our present endeavor, the conserved and off-shell nilpotent versions of the (anti-)BRST charges and the conserved ghost charge and demonstrated that they obey the standard BRST algebra. The (anti-)BRST invariant CF-type restrictions have been derived, in our present endeavor, from different theoretical angles. These derivations happen to be one of the key highlights of our present investigation.

Against the backdrop of the above two paragraphs, it is crystal clear that our present investigation is different from the Stückelberg-modified massive Abelian 2-form (i.e. $p = 2$) gauge theory which has been already established by us as a field-theoretic model for Hodge theory in $D = 4$ dimensions of spacetime (see. e.g. [14, 28] for details) where (i) a pseudo-scalar field, and (ii) an axial-vector field have been shown to possess (a) the negative kinetic terms, and (b) the well-defined masses. In other words, we have been able to establish that there are two “exotic” fields in the above modified massive 4D field-theoretic model for Hodge theory which play very decisive roles in the realm of the cyclic, bouncing and self accelerated cosmological models of the Universe (see, e.g. [30-32]) and they are also a set of possible candidates for dark matter (see, e.g. [33,34] for details). We firmly believe that all the modified massive $2p$ -dimensional Abelian p -form models for Hodge theory, within the framework of our BRST approach, are endowed with a tower of p -number of “exotic” fields and it is not clear whether all of them are the most fundamental “exotic” fields or only some of them. This is not the case with our present investigation where only a single pseudo-scalar field has been shown to be an “exotic” field. It is appropriate, at this juncture, to highlight point-by-point, some of the key differences between our present work and our earlier work on the 4D modified massive Abelian 2-form theory (see, e.g. [14, 28]). First of all, we are dealing with an odd dimensional (i.e. $D = 3$) modified massive Abelian 2-form theory which is not the case with our earlier work [14,28] which is a 4D theory. Second, as pointed out earlier, there is only one “exotic” field in our present theory unlike our previous works [14, 28] where there are two. Finally, in our present endeavor, there is no presence of an axial-vector field as an “exotic” field as is the case in our earlier works.

Our present investigation is essential and important on the following counts. First of all, as pointed out earlier, we have shown the existence of a single pseudo-scalar field which appears in our theory with a negative kinetic term and possesses a well-defined rest mass. Hence, we have a single “exotic” field in our theory. Second, the Noether conserved (anti-)BRST charges $Q_{(a)b}$ turn out to be non-nilpotent (i.e. $Q_{(a)b}^2 \neq 0$). We have been able to obtain the nilpotent (i.e. $Q_{(A)B}^2 = 0$) versions of the (anti-)BRST charges $Q_{(A)B}$ which (i) participate in the standard BRST algebra (cf. Appendix A below for details), and (ii) lead to the derivations of the first-class constraints in their operator form through the requirement of the physicality criteria w.r.t. them (cf. Appendix B below for details). Third, the key signature of a properly BRST-quantized theory is the existence of a set of (non-)trivial CF-type restrictions (see, e.g. [35, 36] for details). The latter for our theory are non-trivial and we have derived them from many theoretical angles. Finally, it appears to us that the pseudo-scalar field (with a negative kinetic term and a well-defined rest mass) is the most fundamental object as far as the existence of the “exotic” fields that provide a

set of possible candidates for dark matter [33,34]. The massless limit of this field (with only a negative kinetic term) is possibly the “phantom” and/or “ghost” field that has become quite popular in the realm of the cyclic, bouncing and self-accelerated cosmological models [30-32] which have been proposed to explain the accelerated expansion of the Universe.

The theoretical materials of our present endeavor are organized as follows. In Sec. 2, we recapitulate the bare essentials of our earlier work on the modified 3D massive Abelian 2-form gauge theory where we (i) show the existence of a pseudo-scalar field in the modification of the standard Stückelberg formalism, (ii) derive the Noether conserved current and charge corresponding to the gauge symmetry transformations, and (iii) establish a connection between the conserved charge and the first-class constraints of the gauge theory. Our Sec. 3 is devoted to the discussions on the BRST symmetry transformations, BRST invariant Lagrangian density and the derivation of the BRST charge. The subject matter of our Sec. 4 is connected with the discussion on the anti-BRST symmetry transformations, anti-BRST invariant Lagrangian density and the derivation of the anti-BRST charge. Our Sec. 5 deals with the importance of the Curci-Ferrari (CF) type restrictions from different theoretical angles. Finally, we make some concluding remarks and point out the future scope and perspective of our present endeavor in our Sec. 6.

In our Appendix A, we derive the standard BRST algebra amongst the conserved and nilpotent versions of the (anti-)BRST charges and the conserved ghost charge. Our Appendix B deals, very briefly, with the physicality criteria w.r.t. the nilpotent BRST charge.

Conventions and Notations: The background 3D flat Minkowskian spacetime is endowed with the metric tensor $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(+1, -1, -1)$ so that the dot product between two non-null vectors U_μ and V_ν is defined as: $U \cdot V = \eta_{\mu\nu} U^\mu V^\nu \equiv U_0 V_0 - U_i V_i$ where the Greek indices $\mu, \nu, \lambda \dots = 0, 1, 2$ correspond to the time and space directions on the 3D Minkowskian spacetime manifold and the Latin indices $i, j, k \dots = 1, 2$ stand for the space directions only. We adopt the convention of (i) the left derivative w.r.t. all the fermionic fields of our theory in the computation of the equations of motion, canonical conjugate momenta, Noether conserved currents, etc., and (ii) the derivative w.r.t. the antisymmetric tensor field $B_{\mu\nu}$ as: $(\partial B_{\rho\sigma} / \partial B_{\mu\nu}) = \frac{1}{2!} (\delta_\rho^\mu \delta_\sigma^\nu - \delta_\sigma^\mu \delta_\rho^\nu)$, etc. The convention for the 3D Levi-Civita tensor is chosen to be such that: $\varepsilon_{012} = +1 = \varepsilon^{012}$ and other relationships are: $\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda} = 3!$, $\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho} = 2! \delta_\rho^\lambda$, etc. We denote the off-shell nilpotent (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations by the symbols $s_{(a)b}$ and corresponding Noether conserved charges carry the symbols $Q_{(a)b}$. Being fermionic in nature, the (anti-)BRST transformation operators $s_{(a)b}$ commute with all the bosonic fields of our theory and they anticommute with the fermionic fields. The notation overdot (i.e. $\dot{\Phi}$) on a generic field Φ of our theory has been used occasionally to denote the partial derivative w.r.t. time (i.e. $\dot{\Phi} = \partial_0 \Phi \equiv \partial \Phi / \partial t$) in the natural units where $\hbar = c = 1$. In other words, ultimately, we have $\partial_0 = (\partial / \partial t)$.

2 Preliminary: Gauge Symmetry Transformations

Our present section is divided into three concise subsections. In Subsec. 2.1, we derive the Noether conserved current and the corresponding conserved charge from the infinitesimal gauge symmetry transformations. Our Subsec. 2.2 is devoted to the discussion on the constraint analysis where we show the existence of the first-class constraints on our theory

in the terminology of Dirac's prescription for the classification scheme of constraints [37-40]. Finally, in Subsec. 2.3, we establish a deep connection between the above conserved Noether charge and the first-class constraints (that exist on our theory).

2.1 Noether Current and Charge: Continuous Symmetry

We begin with the Lagrangian density (\mathcal{L}_0^{MS}) for the three (2 + 1)-dimensional massive Abelian 2-form theory, with the rest mass m for the 2-form field, as follows (see, e.g. [29])

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0^{(MS)} &= \frac{1}{2} (H_{012} + m\tilde{\varphi})^2 - \frac{m^2}{4} B_{\mu\nu} B^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4} \Sigma^{\mu\nu} \Sigma_{\mu\nu} \\ &+ \frac{m}{2} B^{\mu\nu} (\Sigma_{\mu\nu} + \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda} \partial^\lambda \tilde{\varphi}) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \tilde{\varphi} \partial^\mu \tilde{\varphi}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

which has been derived from the original Lagrangian density (\mathcal{L}_0) for the massive Abelian 2-form [$B^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2!} B_{\mu\nu} (dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu)$] field $B_{\mu\nu}$ with (i) the totally antisymmetric field strength tensor $H_{\mu\nu\lambda}$, and (ii) the rest mass m (see, e.g. [29] for details)

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \frac{1}{12} H^{\mu\nu\lambda} H_{\mu\nu\lambda} - \frac{m^2}{4} B^{\mu\nu} B_{\mu\nu}, \quad (2)$$

by using the modified version of the standard Stückelberg technique of replacement in 3D

$$B_{\mu\nu} \longrightarrow B_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{m} \Sigma_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{m} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda} \partial^\lambda \tilde{\varphi}, \quad (3)$$

where $\tilde{\varphi}$ is the pseudo-scalar field and $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda}$ is the totally antisymmetric 3D Levi-Civita tensor where we have assumed that there is no parity violation in our theory. The superscript (MS) on the above Lagrangian density (1) denotes that it has been obtained from (2) by taking into account the modified version of the Stückelberg formalism (3). In the equations (1) and (3), we have the field strength tensor $\Sigma_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \phi_\nu - \partial_\nu \phi_\mu$ for the Stückelberg Lorentz vector field ϕ_μ which is derived from the 2-form [$\Sigma^{(2)} = d\Phi^{(1)} \equiv \frac{1}{2!} \Sigma_{\mu\nu} (dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu)$] where $d = \partial_\mu dx^\mu$ [with $d^2 = \frac{1}{2!} (\partial_\mu \partial_\nu - \partial_\nu \partial_\mu) (dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu) = 0$] is the exterior derivative of differential geometry (see, e.g. [22-26] for details) and the 1-form $\Phi^{(1)} = \phi_\mu dx^\mu$ defines the Stückelberg Lorentz vector field ϕ_μ . It is the peculiarity of the 3D Minkowskian flat spacetime that (i) the field strength tensor $H_{\mu\nu\lambda} = \partial_\mu B_{\nu\lambda} + \partial_\nu B_{\lambda\mu} + \partial_\lambda B_{\mu\nu}$ (derived from the 3-form [$H^{(3)} = dB^{(2)} \equiv \frac{1}{3!} H_{\mu\nu\lambda} (dx^\mu \wedge dx^\nu \wedge dx^\lambda)$]) has only a single independent component which is nothing but H_{012} , (ii) the kinetic term for the gauge field becomes: $\frac{1}{12} H^{\mu\nu\lambda} H_{\mu\nu\lambda} = \frac{1}{2} H^{012} H_{012} \equiv \frac{1}{2} H_{012} H_{012}$, and (iii) the component H_{012} changes under the substitution (3) which, ultimately, leads to the derivation of the first term of the Lagrangian density (1). One of the key observations is the fact that the pseudo-scalar field appears in the theory with the negative kinetic term. However, it is endowed with a well-defined rest mass m as has been shown in our earlier work (see, e.g. [24]). The other crucial observation is the appearance of the higher derivative terms (apart from the usual second order derivative terms) due to the modified version of the replacement (3). However, we have used the simple theoretical trick of on-shell condition[‡] to replace the higher derivative

[‡]We have been able to apply the same trick in the context of 2D modified Proca theory [27] and 4D modified massive Abelian 2-form theory [28] to obtain the well-defined Lagrangian densities. We have

terms in terms of mass term to obtain the well-defined 3D Lagrangian density (1) for the modified 3D massive Abelian 2-form theory without any higher derivative terms [29].

The Lagrangian density (1) respects the infinitesimal, local and continuous gauge symmetry transformations. These transformations are as follows, namely;

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_g B_{\mu\nu} &= -(\partial_\mu \Lambda_\nu - \partial_\nu \Lambda_\mu), & \delta_g \phi_\mu &= (\partial_\mu \Lambda - m \Lambda_\mu), & \delta_g H_{\mu\nu\lambda} &= 0 \\ \delta_g \Sigma_{\mu\nu} &= -m(\partial_\mu \Lambda_\nu - \partial_\nu \Lambda_\mu), & \delta_g \tilde{\varphi} &= 0, & \delta_g \mathcal{L}_{(0)}^{MS} &= \partial_\mu [-m \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} \Lambda_\nu \partial_\sigma \tilde{\varphi}], \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

which demonstrate that the action integral, corresponding to the Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_{(0)}^{(MS)}$, remains invariant under the above gauge symmetry transformations for the physical fields that vanish off as $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$. According to celebrated Noether's theorem, the above gauge symmetry transformations lead to the derivation of the Noether current J^μ as

$$\begin{aligned} J^\mu &= (\delta_g \tilde{\varphi}) \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{(0)}^{(MS)}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \tilde{\varphi})} + (\delta_g \phi_\rho) \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{(0)}^{(MS)}}{\partial(\partial_\mu \phi_\rho)} + (\delta_g B_{\rho\sigma}) \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{(0)}^{(MS)}}{\partial(\partial_\mu B_{\rho\sigma})} + m \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} \Lambda_\nu \partial_\sigma \tilde{\varphi} \\ &\equiv (m B^{\mu\nu} - \Sigma^{\mu\nu}) (\partial_\nu \Lambda - m \Lambda_\nu) - \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} (\partial_\nu \Lambda_\sigma) (H_{012} + m \tilde{\varphi}) + m \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} \Lambda_\nu \partial_\sigma \tilde{\varphi}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where we have used: $H_{012} = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} \partial_\mu B_{\nu\sigma}$. The conservation law (i.e. $\partial_\mu J^\mu = 0$) can be proven in a straightforward fashion by using the following EL-EoMs that can be readily derived from the Lagrangian density (1) w.r.t. the basic fields $\tilde{\varphi}$, ϕ_μ and $B_{\mu\nu}$, namely;

$$(\square + m^2) \tilde{\varphi} = 0, \quad \partial_\mu (m B^{\mu\nu} - \Sigma^{\mu\nu}) = 0, \quad \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} \partial_\sigma H_{012} = m (\Sigma^{\mu\nu} - m B^{\mu\nu}). \quad (6)$$

According to the basic tenets behind the Noether theorem, we obtain the explicit expression for the conserved charge Q , from the above Noether conserved current (5), as follows

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \int d^2x J^0 \quad \equiv \int d^2x [(m B^{0\nu} - \Sigma^{0\nu}) (\partial_\nu \Lambda - m \Lambda_\nu) \\ &\quad - \varepsilon^{0\nu\sigma} (\partial_\nu \Lambda_\sigma) (H_{012} + m \tilde{\varphi}) + m \varepsilon^{0\nu\sigma} \Lambda_\nu \partial_\sigma \tilde{\varphi}], \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

which turns out to be the generator for the gauge symmetry transformations in (4) if we use the appropriate non-vanishing canonical commutators for our theory. We do this exercise in our Subsect. 2.3 (see below) where a connection between the first-class constraints of our theory and the above conserved charge is established.

2.2 Constraint Analysis: First-Class Constraints

We have a set of gauge symmetry transformations (4) which is respected by the action integral corresponding to the Lagrangian density (1) of our modified 3D massive Abelian 2-form theory. The existence of the local gauge symmetry transformations (in the context of a physical system) owes its origin to the presence of a set of first-class constraints (on that physical system). To corroborate this statement, we perform the constraint analysis of our present modified 3D massive Abelian 2-form theory. Towards this goal in mind, first

established that the higher derivative terms are *not* useless because they lead to the derivations of the correct and appropriate terms of the Lagrangian densities which were incorporated into the Lagrangian densities of our earlier works (on the above 2D and 4D theories [41,14,28]) by trial and error method.

of all, we note that the explicit expressions for the canonical conjugate momenta [derived from the Lagrangian density (1)] w.r.t. the basic fields $\tilde{\varphi}$, ϕ_μ and $B_{\mu\nu}$ are

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_{(\tilde{\varphi})} &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{(0)}^{(MS)}}{\partial (\partial_0 \tilde{\varphi})} = -\dot{\varphi} + \frac{m}{2} \varepsilon^{0ij} B_{ij}, & \Pi_{(\phi)}^\mu &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{(0)}^{(MS)}}{\partial (\partial_0 \phi_\mu)} = mB^{0\mu} - \Sigma^{0\mu}, \\ \Pi_{(B)}^{\mu\nu} &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{(0)}^{(MS)}}{\partial (\partial_0 B_{\mu\nu})} = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{0\mu\nu} (H_{012} + m\tilde{\varphi}),\end{aligned}\quad (8)$$

which demonstrate that we have the following primary constraints on our theory, namely;

$$\Pi_{(\phi)}^0 = mB^{00} - \Sigma^{00} \approx 0, \quad \Pi_{(B)}^{0i} = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{00i} (H_{012} + m\tilde{\varphi}) \approx 0, \quad (9)$$

where we have used Dirac's notation for the weakly zero (i.e. ≈ 0) which implies that we are allowed to take a first-order time derivative on the above primary constraints. The above constraints are nothing but the components (i.e. $\Pi_{(\phi)}^0, \Pi_{(B)}^{0i}$) of the conjugate momenta w.r.t. the Stückelberg vector field ϕ_μ and the massive antisymmetric gauge field $B_{\mu\nu}$, respectively. It is worthwhile to point out that $\Pi_{(B)}^{00} = 0$ is strongly equal to zero and it is not a constraint on our present theory. The subscripts $[(\tilde{\varphi}), (\phi), (B)]$ on the canonical conjugate momenta in (8) denote that these are defined w.r.t. the basic fields $\tilde{\varphi}$, ϕ_μ and $B_{\mu\nu}$ of our theory from the starting Lagrangian density (1), respectively. The requirement of the time-evolution invariance of the above primary constraints (PCs) leads to the secondary constraints on our theory. The most appropriate approach, to obtain the time-evolution invariance of the PCs, is the Hamiltonian formalism. However, for the simple system like our present modified 3D massive Abelian 2-form theory, the EL-EoMs of the theory, derived from the starting Lagrangian density (1), are good enough (see, e.g. [42] for details).

To corroborate the above statement, we focus on the last two entries of the EL-EoMs (6). First of all, we note that, from the second entry of (6), we have the following equation of motion for the choice $\nu = 0$, namely;

$$\partial_0 (mB^{00} - \Sigma^{00}) + \partial_i (mB^{i0} - \Sigma^{i0}) = 0 \quad \implies \quad \partial_0 \Pi_{(\phi)}^0 = \partial_i \Pi_{(\phi)}^i \approx 0, \quad (10)$$

which captures the time-evolution invariance of the primary constraint $\Pi_{(\phi)}^0 \approx 0$ where $\Pi_{(\phi)}^i = mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}$ is the space component of the momenta w.r.t. the Stückelberg vector field ϕ_μ [cf. Eq. (8)]. Thus, we have obtained one of the secondary constraints of our theory as: $\partial_i \Pi_{(\phi)}^i \approx 0$ (w.r.t. the primary constraint $\Pi_{(\phi)}^0 \approx 0$ [cf. Eq. (9)]). It can be readily checked that the primary constraints in (9) commute with this secondary constraint because all are the components of the conjugate momenta [cf. Eq. (8)] and a space derivative on one of them. Now we are in the position to concentrate on the last entry of (6) which has been actually derived from the following EL-EoM w.r.t. the massive gauge field $B_{\mu\nu}$ [from the Lagrangian density (1)], namely;

$$\partial_\lambda \left(\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} [H_{012} + m\tilde{\varphi}] \right) = \frac{m}{2} (\Sigma^{\mu\nu} - mB^{\mu\nu}) + \frac{m}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} \partial_\lambda \tilde{\varphi}. \quad (11)$$

If we make the choice: $\mu = 0, \nu = i$, we obtain the following from the above equation

$$\partial_0 \Pi_{(B)}^{0i} = \frac{m}{2} \Pi_{(\phi)}^i - \partial_j \Pi_{(B)}^{ji} - \frac{m}{2} \varepsilon^{0ij} \partial_j \tilde{\varphi} \approx 0, \quad (12)$$

which is nothing but the requirement of the time-evolution invariance of the primary constraint $\Pi_{(B)}^{0i} \approx 0$ [cf. Eq. (9)]. In other words, we have derived the secondary constraint (w.r.t. the primary constraint $\Pi_{(B)}^{0i} \approx 0$ [cf. Eq. (9)]) on our theory as

$$\frac{m}{2}\Pi_{(\phi)}^i - \partial_j \Pi_{(B)}^{ji} - \frac{m}{2}\varepsilon^{0ij}\partial_j \tilde{\varphi} \approx 0, \quad (13)$$

where the space components of the canonical conjugate momenta are: $\Pi_{(\phi)}^i = mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}$ and $\Pi_{(B)}^{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{0ij}(H_{012} + m\tilde{\varphi})$ [cf. Eq. (8)]. It is straightforward to note that all the primary and secondary constraints of our theory commute among themselves. Hence, they belong to the first-class category of constraints (according to Dirac's prescription for the classification scheme of constraints [37-40]). Ultimately, we have two primary and two secondary constraints on our modified 3D Massive Abelian 2-form theory which are:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{(\phi)}^0 &= mB^{00} - \Sigma^{00} \approx 0, & \Pi_{(B)}^{0i} &= \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{00i}(H_{012} + m\tilde{\varphi}) \approx 0, \\ \partial_i \Pi_{(\phi)}^i &\approx 0, & \frac{m}{2}\Pi_{(\phi)}^i - \partial_j \Pi_{(B)}^{ji} - \frac{m}{2}\varepsilon^{0ij}\partial_j \tilde{\varphi} &\approx 0. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

It is straightforward to check that all the above constraints commute among themselves. Hence, we have a set of four first-class constraints on our theory. We end this subsection with the a couple of final comments. First, there is no primary constraint associated with the canonical conjugate momentum $\Pi_{(\tilde{\varphi})}$ because it is not strongly/weakly equal to zero. Second, to be precise, the the exact number of constraints in (14) are eight (if we take into account the components). However, we shall stick with calling four constraints only.

2.3 Noether Conserved Charge, Gauge Symmetry Transformations and First-Class Constraints: A Deep Relationship

The central purpose of our present subsection is to establish that the conserved Noether charge (7) is the generator for the infinitesimal gauge symmetry transformations (4) of our theory. Since there are four first-class constraints on our theory [cf. Eq. (14)], we have to be careful in expanding the r.h.s of the conserved Noether charge (7) so that the first-class constraints are not strongly set equal to zero. In other words, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \int d^2x [(mB^{00} - \Sigma^{00})(\partial_0\Lambda - m\Lambda_0) + (mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i})(\partial_i\Lambda - m\Lambda_i) + m\varepsilon^{0ij}\Lambda_i\partial_j\tilde{\varphi} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{00i}(\partial_0\Lambda_i - \partial_i\Lambda_0)(H_{012} + m\tilde{\varphi}) - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{0ij}(\partial_i\Lambda_j - \partial_j\Lambda_i)(H_{012} + m\tilde{\varphi})]. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Using the definitions of the canonical conjugate momenta from Eq. (8), we can express the above charge in terms of the precise components of the momenta as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \int d^2x \left[\Pi_{(\phi)}^0 (\partial_0\Lambda - m\Lambda_0) + \Pi_{(\phi)}^i (\partial_i\Lambda - m\Lambda_i) \right] + m\varepsilon^{0ij}\Lambda_i\partial_j\tilde{\varphi} \\ &\quad - \Pi_{(B)}^{0i} (\partial_0\Lambda_i - \partial_i\Lambda_0) - \Pi_{(B)}^{ij} (\partial_i\Lambda_j - \partial_j\Lambda_i). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

At this juncture, we are in the position to define the non-vanishing canonical commutators for our 3D modified massive theory (in the natural units where $\hbar = c = 1$) as

$$\begin{aligned}
[\phi_0(\vec{x}, t), \Pi_{(\phi)}^0(\vec{y}, t)] &= i\delta^{(2)}(\vec{x} - \vec{y}), \\
[\phi_i(\vec{x}, t), \Pi_{(\phi)}^j(\vec{y}, t)] &= i\delta_i^j \delta^{(2)}(\vec{x} - \vec{y}), \\
[B_{0i}(\vec{x}, t), \Pi_{(B)}^{0j}(\vec{y}, t)] &= i\delta_i^j \delta^{(2)}(\vec{x} - \vec{y}), \\
[B_{ij}(\vec{x}, t), \Pi_{(B)}^{kl}(\vec{y}, t)] &= \frac{i}{2!} (\delta_i^k \delta_j^l - \delta_i^l \delta_j^k) \delta^{(2)}(\vec{x} - \vec{y}), \\
[\tilde{\varphi}(\vec{x}, t), \Pi_{(\tilde{\varphi})}(\vec{y}, t)] &= i\delta^{(2)}(\vec{x} - \vec{y}),
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where the above brackets are known as the equal-time canonical commutators. All the rest of the equal-time canonical commutators, as per the rules of the canonical quantization scheme, are equal to zero. Using the non-vanishing canonical commutators (17), we observe that the Noether conserved charge (16) is the generator for the infinitesimal gauge transformations (4) as is evident from the following

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_g \phi_0(\vec{x}, t) &= -i[\phi_0(\vec{x}, t), Q] = (\partial_0 \Lambda - m\Lambda_0), \\
\delta_g \phi_i(\vec{x}, t) &= -i[\phi_i(\vec{x}, t), Q] = (\partial_i \Lambda - m\Lambda_i), \\
\delta_g B_{0i}(\vec{x}, t) &= -i[B_{0i}(\vec{x}, t), Q] = -(\partial_0 \Lambda_i - \partial_i \Lambda_0), \\
\delta_g B_{ij}(\vec{x}, t) &= -i[B_{ij}(\vec{x}, t), Q] = -(\partial_i \Lambda_j - \partial_j \Lambda_i), \\
\delta_g \tilde{\varphi}(\vec{x}, t) &= -i[\tilde{\varphi}(\vec{x}, t), Q] = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where the last entry is correct because we do not have the canonical conjugate momentum $\Pi_{(\tilde{\varphi})}$, corresponding to the pseudo-scalar field $\tilde{\varphi}$, in the expression for the Noether conserved charge Q . In the above equation (18), the covariant form of the gauge symmetry transformations (4), have been expressed in their component forms.

We would like to say, at this stage, a few words about the connection between the Noether conserved charge Q [cf. Eq. (16)] and the first-class constraints (14) that exist on our theory. It is straightforward to note that we can throw away the total space derivative terms from the expression for Q in (16) by exploiting the mathematical potential and physical arguments of Gauss's divergence theorem. In other words, we take into account the following inputs due to the above celebrated theorem, namely;

$$\begin{aligned}
\int d^2x \Pi_{(\phi)}^i (\partial_i \Lambda) &= - \int d^2x (\partial_i \Pi_{(\phi)}^i) \Lambda, \\
- \int d^2x \Pi_{(B)}^{ij} (\partial_i \Lambda_j - \partial_j \Lambda_i) &= + \int d^2x \left[\left(\partial_i \Pi_{(B)}^{ij} \right) \Lambda_j + \left(\partial_j \Pi_{(B)}^{ji} \right) \Lambda_i \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

in addition to the simple mathematical tricks of re-writing the expressions

$$\begin{aligned}
-m\Pi_{(\phi)}^i \Lambda_i &= -\frac{m}{2} \Pi_{(\phi)}^i \Lambda_i - \frac{m}{2} \Pi_{(\phi)}^j \Lambda_j, \\
+m\varepsilon^{0ij} \Lambda_i \partial_j \tilde{\varphi} &= +\frac{m}{2} \varepsilon^{0ij} \Lambda_i \partial_j \tilde{\varphi} + \frac{m}{2} \varepsilon^{0ji} \Lambda_j \partial_i \tilde{\varphi},
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

to re-express the charge Q in (16) as follows:

$$Q = \int d^2x \left[\Pi_{(\phi)}^0 (\partial_0 \Lambda - m \Lambda_0) - (\partial_i \Pi_{(\phi)}^i) \Lambda - \Pi_{(B)}^{0i} (\partial_0 \Lambda_i - \partial_i \Lambda_0) \right. \\ \left. - \left(\frac{m}{2} \Pi_{(\phi)}^i - \partial_j \Pi_{(B)}^{ji} - \frac{m}{2} \varepsilon^{0ij} \partial_j \tilde{\varphi} \right) \Lambda_i - \left(\frac{m}{2} \Pi_{(\phi)}^j - \partial_i \Pi_{(B)}^{ij} - \frac{m}{2} \varepsilon^{0ji} \partial_i \tilde{\varphi} \right) \Lambda_j \right]. \quad (21)$$

In the above, we have also used the antisymmetric (i.e. $\Pi_{(B)}^{\mu\nu} = -\Pi_{(B)}^{\nu\mu}$) property of the conjugate momenta (i.e. $\Pi_{(B)}^{0i} = -\Pi_{(B)}^{i0}$, $\Pi_{(B)}^{ij} = -\Pi_{(B)}^{ji}$) w.r.t. the antisymmetric tensor gauge field $B_{\mu\nu}$. A close look at the expression for the gauge symmetry generator Q in (21) demonstrates that we have been able to express it in terms of the primary and secondary constraints that have been listed in (14). In more sophisticated language, the infinitesimal gauge symmetry transformations (4) are generated by the first-class constraints [cf. Eq. (14)] in the terminology of Dirac's prescription for the classification scheme of constraints [37-40]. These constraints are present in the generator Q [cf. Eq. (21)]. Finally, we would like to add that the above expression for the conserved Noether charge matches with the standard formula for the generator of the classical gauge symmetry transformations that has been obtained [43] in terms of the first-class constraints.

3 BRST Transformations: Lagrangian Density and Nilpotency Property of the BRST Charge

The theoretical contents of this section are divided into two parts. In Subsec. 3.1, we derive the Noether conserved charge Q_b (from the conserved Noether current) and show that (i) it is the generator for the nilpotent BRST symmetry transformations (26), and (ii) it is not nilpotent (i.e. $Q_b^2 \neq 0$) of order two. Our Subsec. 3.2 is devoted to the derivation of the nilpotent ($Q_B^2 = 0$) version of the BRST charge Q_B from the Noether charge Q_b .

3.1 Noether Conserved Charge: BRST Symmetries

In this subsection, first of all, we focus on the derivation of the BRST-invariant Lagrangian density which is a generalization of the classical Stückelberg-modified classical Lagrangian density (1) to its counterpart quantum version that incorporates (i) the gauge-fixing terms, and (ii) the Faddeev-Popov (FP) ghost terms. In this connection, we would like to mention that the properly gauge-fixed Lagrangian density[§] for our present system of the modified massive 3D Abelian 2-form gauge theory has been written in our earlier work [29]

$$\mathcal{L}_{(0)}^{(MS)} + \mathcal{L}_{(gf)}^{(B)} = \frac{1}{2} (H_{012} + m\tilde{\varphi})^2 - \frac{m^2}{4} B^{\mu\nu} B_{\mu\nu} + \frac{m}{2} B^{\mu\nu} [\Sigma_{\mu\nu} + \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\sigma} \partial^\sigma \tilde{\varphi}] - \frac{1}{4} \Sigma^{\mu\nu} \Sigma_{\mu\nu} \\ - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \tilde{\varphi} \partial^\mu \tilde{\varphi} - \frac{1}{2} (\partial \cdot \phi + m\phi)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\partial^\nu B_{\nu\mu} - \partial_\mu \phi + m\phi_\mu)^2, \quad (22)$$

[§]This gauge-fixed Lagrangian density (22) is such that the scalar and pseudo-scalar fields obey the Klein-Gordon equations of motion [i.e. $(\square + m^2)\phi = 0$, $(\square + m^2)\tilde{\varphi} = 0$] despite the fact that they are endowed with the kinetic terms that carry opposite signs.

where $\mathcal{L}_{(gf)}^{(B)}$ is the gauge-fixing part of the Lagrangian density of our theory. In this term, the appropriate mass dimensions (in the natural units) have been taken into account as far as the proper gauge-fixing terms for the Stückelberg vector field ϕ_μ and the massive gauge field $B_{\mu\nu}$ are concerned. The gauge-fixing term for the vector field ϕ_μ corresponds to the famous 't Hooft gauge that has been invoked in the context of the quantizations of the Abelian Higgs model and modified massive Abelian 1-form theories (see, e.g. [44] for details). The superscript (B) on the Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_{(gf)}^{(B)}$ denotes that we are dealing with the modified massive Abelian 2-form gauge theory where the basic field is the antisymmetric tensor massive gauge field $B_{\mu\nu}$.

All the quadratic terms, in the above gauge-fixed Lagrangian density (22), can be linearized by invoking the Nakanishi-Lautrup type auxiliary fields[¶] as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{(b)} = & \mathcal{B} \left(\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} \partial_\mu B_{\nu\sigma} + m\tilde{\varphi} \right) - \frac{\mathcal{B}^2}{2} - \frac{m^2}{4} B^{\mu\nu} B_{\mu\nu} + \frac{m}{2} B^{\mu\nu} (\Sigma_{\mu\nu} + \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\sigma} \partial^\sigma \tilde{\varphi}) + \frac{B^2}{2} \\ & - B(\partial \cdot \phi + m\phi) - \frac{1}{4} \Sigma^{\mu\nu} \Sigma_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \tilde{\varphi} \partial^\mu \tilde{\varphi} + B^\mu (\partial^\nu B_{\nu\mu} - \partial_\mu \phi + m\phi_\mu) - \frac{B^\mu B_\mu}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

In the above, we have utilized the auxiliary field \mathcal{B} to linearize the kinetic term where we have taken into account the covariant form of H_{012} as: $H_{012} = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda} \partial_\mu B_{\nu\sigma}$. Similarly, the auxiliary fields B and B_μ have been invoked to linearize the quadratic gauge-fixing terms for the Stückelberg vector field ϕ_μ and gauge field $B_{\mu\nu}$, respectively. It is worth pointing out that we have a scalar field, too, in our theory which is due to the reducibility property of the massive gauge field $B_{\mu\nu}$. The FP-ghost part of the BRST-invariant Lagrangian density for our massive Abelian 2-form theory is as follows^{||} (see, e.g. [45] for details)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{(FP)} = & \partial_\mu \bar{\beta} \partial^\mu \beta - m^2 \bar{\beta} \beta + (\partial_\mu \bar{C}_\nu - \partial_\nu \bar{C}_\mu) (\partial^\mu C^\nu) - (\partial_\mu \bar{C} - m\bar{C}_\mu) (\partial^\mu C - mC^\mu) \\ & + (\partial \cdot \bar{C} + \rho + m\bar{C}) \lambda + (\partial \cdot C - \lambda + mC) \rho, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where $(\bar{C}_\mu) C_\mu$ are the fermionic (i.e. $C_\mu^2 = \bar{C}_\mu^2 = 0, C_\mu \bar{C}_\nu + \bar{C}_\nu C_\mu = 0, C_\mu C_\nu + C_\nu C_\mu = 0, \bar{C}_\mu \bar{C}_\nu + \bar{C}_\nu \bar{C}_\mu = 0$) (anti-)ghost fields with ghost numbers $(-1) + 1$ and $(\bar{\beta})\beta$ are the bosonic (anti-)ghost fields with ghost numbers $(-2) + 2$, respectively. The pair $(\bar{C})C$ are the additional set of (anti-)ghost fermionic (i.e. $C^2 = \bar{C}^2 = 0, C\bar{C} + \bar{C}C = 0$) fields with ghost numbers $(-1) + 1$. On the other hand, we have $(\rho)\lambda$ as the auxiliary (anti-)ghost fields with ghost numbers $(-1) + 1$, respectively, because we note that: $\rho = -\frac{1}{2}(\partial \cdot \bar{C} + m\bar{C})$ and $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}(\partial \cdot C + mC)$. These (anti-)ghost fields are required in the theory to maintain the sacrosanct property of unitarity at any arbitrary order of perturbative computations for a given physical process that is allowed by our BRST quantized theory (see, e.g. [46-48]).

[¶]It will be noted that our present choices of the signs for the Nakanishi-Lautrup type auxiliary fields, in the linearization processes of the gauge-fixing terms, are different from our earlier work. These differences can be seen in our equations (23) and (48) and the corresponding equations in our earlier work [45].

^{||}The systematic derivation of the gauge-fixing and FP-ghost terms for the modified massive Abelian 2-form theory has been performed in our earlier work (see, e.g. [14] for details) where this theory has been proven to be a model for Hodge theory. In our present endeavor, we have taken into account the simplest form of the FP-ghost Lagrangian density which has been considered in our another earlier work (see, e.g. [45]) where the proof of this theory to be an example of Hodge theory has not been given any importance.

The total Lagrangian density [i.e. $\mathcal{L}_B = \mathcal{L}_{(b)} + \mathcal{L}_{(FP)} \equiv \mathcal{L}_{(0)}^{(MS)} + \mathcal{L}_{(gf)}^{(B)} + \mathcal{L}_{(FP)}$], which is the sum of equations (23) and (24), transforms to the total spacetime derivative

$$s_b \mathcal{L}_B = -\partial_\mu \{ (\partial^\mu C^\nu - \partial^\nu C^\mu) B_\nu + m \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} C_\nu \partial_\sigma \tilde{\varphi} + \lambda B^\mu + \rho \partial^\mu \beta + (\partial^\mu C - m C^\mu) B \}, \quad (25)$$

under the following infinitesimal, continuous and off-shell nilpotent (i.e. $s_b^2 = 0$) BRST symmetry transformations $((s_b)$, namely;

$$\begin{aligned} s_b B_{\mu\nu} &= -(\partial_\mu C_\nu - \partial_\nu C_\mu), & s_b C_\mu &= -\partial_\mu \beta, & s_b \bar{C}_\mu &= -B_\mu, \\ s_b \phi_\mu &= (\partial_\mu C - m C_\mu), & s_b \bar{C} &= B, & s_b C &= -m\beta, \\ s_b \bar{\beta} &= -\rho, & s_b \phi &= +\lambda, & s_b \Sigma_{\mu\nu} &= -m(\partial_\mu C_\nu - \partial_\nu C_\mu), \\ s_b [\tilde{\varphi}, \rho, \lambda, \beta, B_\mu, B, \mathcal{B}, H_{\mu\nu\lambda}] &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

As a consequence, the action integral $S = \int d^3x \mathcal{L}_B$, corresponding to the Lagrangian density \mathcal{L}_B , remains BRST invariant (i.e. $s_b S = 0$) for the physical fields that vanish off as $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$ due to Gauss's divergence theorem. Three crucial observations, at this stage, are worth pointing out. First of all, we note that the field-strength tensor $H_{\mu\nu\lambda}$ (owing its origin to the exterior derivative) remains invariant under the BRST symmetry transformations. Second, the exotic pseudo-scalar field does not participate in the classical gauge as well as in the BRST symmetry transformations. In other words, it remains inert (i.e. $\delta_g \tilde{\varphi} = 0, s_b \tilde{\varphi} = 0$) to the classical gauge as well as quantum BRST symmetry transformations [cf. Eqs. (4),(26)]. However, this pseudo-scalar field participates in the (anti)-co-BRST symmetry transformations that have been shown in our earlier works [14-17]. Finally, the above nilpotent BRST symmetry transformations (26) are the generalization of the gauge symmetry transformations (4). The observation in (25) implies that we can compute the BRST Noether conserved current following the similar kind of formula that is given in (5). We have to take into account the total BRST invariant Lagrangian density which is the sum of (23) and (24) in the application of the analogue of (5). In fact, we obtain the following expression for the BRST current $[J_{(b)}^\mu]$, namely;

$$\begin{aligned} J_{(b)}^\mu &= m \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} C_\nu \partial_\sigma \tilde{\varphi} + (\partial^\mu \bar{C}^\nu - \partial^\nu \bar{C}^\mu) \partial_\nu \beta - \lambda B^\mu - (\partial^\mu C - m C^\mu) B \\ &- m (\partial^\mu \bar{C} - m \bar{C}^\mu) \beta + (m B^{\mu\nu} - \Sigma^{\mu\nu}) (\partial_\nu C - m C_\nu) - \rho \partial^\mu \beta \\ &- \frac{1}{2} [\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} \mathcal{B} + (\eta^{\mu\nu} B^\sigma - \eta^{\mu\sigma} B^\nu)] (\partial_\nu C_\sigma - \partial_\sigma C_\nu). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

The conservation law (i.e. $\partial_\mu J_{(b)}^\mu = 0$) can be readily proven by using the following EL-EoMs that are derived from the total BRST invariant Lagrangian density, namely;

$$\begin{aligned} (\square + m^2) \beta &= 0, & \partial_\mu (\partial^\mu \bar{C}^\nu - \partial^\nu \bar{C}^\mu) &= \partial^\nu \rho + m (\partial^\nu \bar{C} - m \bar{C}^\nu), \\ \partial_\mu (\partial^\mu \bar{C} - m \bar{C}^\mu) &= +m\rho, & \partial_\mu (\partial^\mu C - m C^\mu) &= -m\lambda, \\ \square C_\mu - \partial_\mu (\partial \cdot C) + \partial_\mu \lambda &= +m (\partial_\mu C - m C_\mu), & (\square + m^2) \bar{\beta} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

In addition to the above EL-EoMs (that emerge out from the ghost-sector of the total BRST invariant Lagrangian density), we have to use the following EL-EoMs that emerge

out from the non-ghost sector of our theory, namely;

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\mu (mB^{\mu\nu} - \Sigma^{\mu\nu}) &= mB^\nu + \partial^\nu B, & \partial_\mu B^\mu &= mB, \\ \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} \partial_\mu \mathcal{B} + (\partial^\nu B^\sigma - \partial^\sigma B^\nu) &= -m(mB^{\nu\sigma} - \Sigma^{\nu\sigma}) + m\varepsilon^{\nu\sigma\eta} \partial_\eta \tilde{\varphi}.\end{aligned}\quad (29)$$

Following the basic tenets of the Noether theorem, we can derive the BRST charge $Q_b = \int d^2x J_{(b)}^0$ which will also be conserved because it is derived from the conserved Noether BRST current (27). In what follows, we shall comment on its nilpotency property.

The explicit form of the BRST charge Q_b , derived from (27), is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}Q_b &= \int d^2x \left[m\varepsilon^{0ij} C_i \partial_j \tilde{\varphi} + (\partial^0 \bar{C}^i - \partial^i \bar{C}^0) \partial_i \beta - (\partial^0 C - mC^0) B \right. \\ &\quad - m(\partial^0 \bar{C} - m\bar{C}^0) \beta + (mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}) (\partial_i C - mC_i) - \rho \partial^0 \beta - \lambda B^0 \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{0ij} \mathcal{B} (\partial_i C_j - \partial_j C_i) - B^i (\partial_0 C_i - \partial_i C_0) \right].\end{aligned}\quad (30)$$

The above BRST charge is the generator for the BRST symmetry transformations in (26). For this purpose, we have to compute the conjugate momenta corresponding to all the basic fields of our theory and check that the following is true, namely;

$$s_b \Phi(\vec{x}, t) = -i [\Phi(\vec{x}, t), Q_b]_{(\pm)}, \quad (31)$$

where the (\pm) signs, as the subscripts on the square bracket, stand for the bracket to be an (anti)commutator for the generic field Φ of our theory being fermionic/bosonic in nature. It is worthwhile to point out that the relationship between the continuous symmetry and the Noether conserved charge is sacrosanct and it is true for any kind of fermionic/bosonic field operator (chosen for the generic field Φ). In this connection, it very interesting to note that we have the sanctity of the following relationship

$$s_b Q_b = -i \{Q_b, Q_b\} \equiv -2i Q_b^2, \quad (32)$$

that exist between the BRST symmetry transformation operator s_b and the corresponding conserved Noether BRST charge Q_b . In the above, we have taken into account the fermionic nature of Q_b which is evident from its explicit expression in (30). A close look at (32) shows that we can talk about the nilpotency property of the Noether BRST charge Q_b if we can compute explicitly the l.h.s. of (32) by taking into account the BRST symmetry transformations (26) and the explicit expression for the BRST charge Q_b [cf. Eq. (30)]. In fact, the explicit computation of the l.h.s. of (32) yields the following:

$$s_b Q_b = \int d^2x [(\partial^0 B^i - \partial^i B^0) \partial_i \beta - m(\partial^0 B - mB^0) \beta] \neq 0. \quad (33)$$

A close look at (32) and (33) establishes the fact that the BRST charge Q_b is not nilpotent (i.e. $Q_b^2 \neq 0$) of order two. In the next subsection, we derive the nilpotent version where the emphasis is laid on the precise computation of the l.h.s. of (32) without spoiling the conservation law of the Noether BRST charge.

3.2 Conserved BRST Charge: Nilpotent Version

The central purpose of this subsection is to derive the nilpotent version of the BRST charge from the non-nilpotent Noether BRST charge. We have proposed a theoretical framework (see, e.g. [45] for details) which allows the derivation of the conserved and nilpotent version of the BRST charge Q_B from the non-nilpotent Noether conserved charge Q_b . In fact, for this purpose, we have exploited the interplay of (i) the Gauss divergence theorem, (ii) the appropriate EL-EoMs, and (iii) the application of the BRST symmetry transformations at appropriate places. For instance, let us focus on the last but one term of the Noether conserved BRST charge Q_b [cf. Eq. (30)] which can be re-written as

$$- \int d^2x \varepsilon^{0ij} \mathcal{B} (\partial_i C_j) = \int d^2x (\varepsilon^{0ij} \partial_i \mathcal{B}) C_j, \quad (34)$$

where we have exploited the theoretical potential of the Gauss divergence theorem. At this stage, we can use the last entry of the equation of motion (29) that has been derived from the BRST invariant Lagrangian density w.r.t. the massive gauge field $B_{\mu\nu}$. The following input coming out from the above equation of motion, namely;

$$(\varepsilon^{0ij} \partial_i \mathcal{B}) C_j = m (mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}) C_i - m\varepsilon^{0ij} C_i \partial_j \tilde{\varphi} + (\partial^0 B^i - \partial^i B^0) C_i, \quad (35)$$

leads to following form of the r.h.s. of (34), namely;

$$\int d^2x [m (mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}) C_i - m\varepsilon^{0ij} C_i \partial_j \tilde{\varphi} + (\partial^0 B^i - \partial^i B^0) C_i]. \quad (36)$$

It is worthwhile to point out that, in the derivation of (35), we have used the explicit form of the last entry of (29) as: $\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} \partial_\mu \mathcal{B} + (\partial^\nu B^\sigma - \partial^\sigma B^\nu) = -m (mB^{\nu\sigma} - \Sigma^{\nu\sigma}) + m\varepsilon^{\nu\sigma\eta} \partial_\eta \tilde{\varphi}$ and taken the choice $\nu = 0, \sigma = j$. We have also used the standard rules of the summation convention to express the r.h.s. of (35) in a compact and nice looking form. A close look at the r.h.s. of the above equation (36) and the expression for the Noether BRST charge [cf. Eq. (30)] demonstrates that the first two terms of the above equation will cancel out with (i) the first term of Q_b [cf. Eq. (30)], and (ii) the second term of the r.h.s. of

$$(mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}) (\partial_i C - mC_i) = (mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}) \partial_i C - m (mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}) C_i, \quad (37)$$

which is nothing but the expanded form the fifth term of the Noether conserved charge Q_b [cf. Eq. (30)]. It is crystal clear, from the above exercise, that the first term, fifth term and the last but one term of the Noether conserved charge Q_b [cf. Eq. (30)] lead to the existence of only the last term of (36) and the first term of (37) which will be present in the nilpotent (i.e. $Q_B^2 = 0$) version of Q_B (which we derive from Q_b).

At this juncture, let us focus on the first term of (37) which is present inside the integration. Once again, we apply the Gauss divergence theorem to obtain the following:

$$\int d^2x (mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}) \partial_i C \equiv - \int d^2x \partial_i (mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}) C. \quad (38)$$

We use, in (38), the first entry of the equations of motion in (29) to obtain the following

$$\int d^2x (mB^0 + \partial^0 B) C, \quad (39)$$

which will be present in the nilpotent version of the BRST charge Q_B . To sum up, we have two very important and useful terms of the nilpotent version of the BRST charge Q_B as

$$\int d^2x [(mB^0 + \partial^0 B) C + (\partial^0 B^i - \partial^i B^0) C_i]. \quad (40)$$

As per the rules illustrated in our earlier work [45], we have to apply the BRST symmetry transformations on the above two terms and re-arrange some of the relevant terms of Q_b so that there are perfect cancellations. For instance, we note that the application of the BRST symmetry transformations on the above two terms yield:

$$- \int d^2x [(\partial^0 B^i - \partial^i B^0) \partial_i \beta + m (mB^0 + \partial^0 B) \beta]. \quad (41)$$

For the cancellation of the above two terms, we have to modify the second and fourth terms of the Noether BRST charge Q_b [cf. Eq. (30)] as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^2x (\partial^0 \bar{C}^i - \partial^i \bar{C}^0) \partial_i \beta &= 2 \int d^2x (\partial^0 \bar{C}^i - \partial^i \bar{C}^0) \partial_i \beta - \int d^2x (\partial^0 \bar{C}^i - \partial^i \bar{C}^0) \partial_i \beta, \\ -m \int d^2x (\partial^0 \bar{C} - m\bar{C}^0) \beta &= -2m \int d^2x (\partial^0 \bar{C} - m\bar{C}^0) \beta \\ +m \int d^2x (\partial^0 \bar{C} - m\bar{C}^0) \beta. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

It is straightforward to note that the application of the BRST symmetry transformations on the second entries on the r.h.s. of the above top as well as bottom equations leads to the perfect cancellation of (41). Thus, in addition to the two terms of (40), the above second entries on the r.h.s. of the top and bottom equations of (42) will also be present in the nilpotent version of the BRST charge Q_B . Let us now concentrate on the first entry that is present on the r.h.s. of the top equation of (42), namely;

$$2 \int d^2x (\partial^0 \bar{C}^i - \partial^i \bar{C}^0) \partial_i \beta \equiv +2 \int d^2x \partial_i (\partial^i \bar{C}^0 - \partial^0 \bar{C}^i) \beta, \quad (43)$$

where we have used the Gauss divergence theorem to throw away the total space derivative term. Using the equation of motion: $\partial_\mu (\partial^\mu \bar{C}^\nu - \partial^\nu \bar{C}^\mu) = \partial^\nu \rho + m (\partial^\nu \bar{C} - m\bar{C}^\nu)$ for the choice $\nu = 0$, we obtain the following expression from the r.h.s. of (43), namely;

$$+ \int d^2x [2\dot{\rho}\beta + 2m (\partial^0 \bar{C} - m\bar{C}^0) \beta]. \quad (44)$$

It can be readily checked that the second term on the r.h.s. of the above equation cancels out with the first term of the r.h.s. of (42). It is interesting to point out that the first term of the above equation (44) is a BRST invariant quantity [i.e. $s_b(2\dot{\rho}\beta) = 0$]. Thus, finally, the most important, useful and non-trivial five existing terms of the nilpotent (i.e. $Q_B^2 = 0$) version of the BRST charge Q_B are as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \int d^2x [(mB^0 + \partial^0 B) C + (\partial^0 B^i - \partial^i B^0) C_i \\ +m (\partial^0 \bar{C} - m\bar{C}^0) \beta - (\partial^0 \bar{C}^i - \partial^i \bar{C}^0) \partial_i \beta + 2\dot{\rho}\beta], \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

which are the sum of terms in (40), second terms of the r.h.s. of the bottom and top equations of (42) and the first term of (44). It is crystal clear that if we apply the BRST symmetry transformations s_b on the above terms, it turns out to be zero.

We have obtained the non-trivial and very useful BRST invariant five terms of (45) by focusing on the first, second, fourth, fifth and eighth terms of the total nine terms that are present in the conserved (but non-nilpotent) Noether conserved charge Q_b [cf. Eq. (30)]. It is interesting to point out that all the rest of the terms in Q_b are BRST invariant quantities. Hence, finally, the explicit expression for the nilpotent (i.e. $Q_B^2 = 0$) version of the BRST charge Q_B (derived from the non-nilpotent Noether conserved charge Q_b) is:

$$Q_b \rightarrow Q_B = \int d^2x [(\partial^0 B^i - \partial^i B^0) C_i + (mB^0 + \partial^0 B) C + m(\partial^0 \bar{C} - m\bar{C}^0) \beta - (\partial^0 \bar{C}^i - \partial^i \bar{C}^0) \partial_i \beta + 2\dot{\rho}\beta - \rho\dot{\beta} - \lambda B^0 - B^i (\partial_0 C_i - \partial_i C_0) - (\partial^0 C - mC^0) B] \quad (46)$$

It is straightforward to note that if we apply the BRST symmetry transformations s_b on the above expression, we obtain zero. In other words, we find that: $s_b Q_B = -i \{Q_B, Q_B\} = 0$. This implies that the BRST charge Q_B (that has been systematically derived from the non-nilpotent Noether conserved charge Q_b) is indeed nilpotent (i.e. $Q_B^2 = 0$) of order two.

We end this subsection with the following remarks. First of all, the existence of the conserved (but non-nilpotent) version of the Noether charge is a clear indication that there are non-trivial CF-type restrictions on our theory (see, e.g. [45] for details). Second, to obtain the nilpotent version of the BRST charge Q_B (from the non-nilpotent version of the Noether charge Q_b), we have exploited only the appropriate EL-EoMs and Gauss's divergence theorem. Thus, the nilpotent version of the BRST charge Q_B is conserved (just like the Noether conserved charge Q_b). Third, we know that our BRST-quantized theory is endowed with the non-trivial CF-type restrictions. We shall derive these very important (anti-)BRST invariant CF-type restrictions, from different theoretical angles, in our Sec. 5 (see below). Finally, the nilpotency property is very important because (i) the BRST cohomology crucially depends on this property, and (ii) the operator forms of the first-class constraints of our theory appear in the physicality criteria (i.e. $Q_{(A)B} |phys\rangle = 0$) w.r.t. only the nilpotent (i.e. $Q_{(A)B}^2 = 0$) versions of the (anti-)BRST charges $Q_{(A)B}$ where they annihilate the physical states (i.e. $|phys\rangle$). The latter observation is important because it is consistent with the Dirac-quantization conditions for systems that are endowed with any kinds of constraints (in the terminology of Dirac's classification scheme).

4 Anti-BRST Transformations: Lagrangian Density and Nilpotency Property of the Anti-BRST Charge

Our present section contains two subsections. In Subsec. 4.1, we derive the conserved Noether anti-BRST current and corresponding charge Q_{ab} and show that the latter is non-nilpotent (i.e. $Q_{ab}^2 \neq 0$) of order two. We briefly comment that the Noether conserved antiBRST charge Q_{ab} is the generator for the infinitesimal, continuous and off-shell nilpotent anti-BRST symmetry transformations [cf. Eq. (49) below]. Our Subsec. 4.2 deals with the derivation of the nilpotent (i.e. $Q_{AB}^2 = 0$) version of the anti-BRST charge Q_{AB}

from its non-nilpotent counterpart Noether anti-BRST charge Q_{ab} . We also provide a few simple arguments to establish that the nilpotent version of the anti-BRST charge Q_{AB} is also conserved (just like the Noether conserved anti-BRST charge Q_{ab}).

4.1 Anti-BRST Symmetries: Noether Conserved Charge

Against the backdrop of our elaborate discussions in the previous section, we shall be brief in our present subsection where we start with the analogue of the gauge-fixed Lagrangian density (22) for our modified massive 3D Abelian 2-form theory as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{(0)}^{(MS)} + \mathcal{L}_{(gf)}^{(B)} &= \frac{1}{2} (H_{012} + m\tilde{\varphi})^2 - \frac{m^2}{4} B^{\mu\nu} B_{\mu\nu} + \frac{m}{2} B^{\mu\nu} [\Sigma_{\mu\nu} + \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\sigma} \partial^\sigma \tilde{\varphi}] - \frac{1}{4} \Sigma^{\mu\nu} \Sigma_{\mu\nu} \\ &- \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \tilde{\varphi} \partial^\mu \tilde{\varphi} - \frac{1}{2} (\partial \cdot \phi - m\phi)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\partial^\nu B_{\nu\mu} + \partial_\mu \phi + m\phi_\mu)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where it is worthwhile to mention that (i) we have taken into account $\phi \rightarrow -\phi$ for the scalar field so that it differs from the gauge-fixed-Lagrangian density of (22) and provides more generality to the 't Hooft gauge, and (ii) we still have the validity of the on-shell condition $(\square + m^2)\phi = 0$ that is also true for the Lagrangian density (22). As we have pointed out in our earlier work [24], it is very interesting to mention that the scalar and pseudo-scalar fields of our theory satisfy the Klein-Gordon equations despite the fact that they carry the kinetic terms that are endowed with opposite signs. The above quadratic gauge-fixed Lagrangian density (with the quadratic kinetic term for the massive gauge field) can be linearized by invoking another set of Nakanishi-Lautrup auxiliary fields (e.g. $\mathcal{B}, \bar{B}, \bar{B}_\mu$) as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{(\bar{b})} &= \mathcal{B} \left(\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} \partial_\mu B_{\nu\sigma} + m\tilde{\varphi} \right) - \frac{\mathcal{B}^2}{2} - \frac{m^2}{4} B^{\mu\nu} B_{\mu\nu} + \frac{m}{2} B^{\mu\nu} (\Sigma_{\mu\nu} + \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\sigma} \partial^\sigma \tilde{\varphi}) + \frac{\bar{B}^2}{2} \\ &+ \bar{B} (\partial \cdot \phi - m\phi) - \frac{1}{4} \Sigma^{\mu\nu} \Sigma_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \tilde{\varphi} \partial^\mu \tilde{\varphi} + \bar{B}^\mu (\partial^\nu B_{\nu\mu} + \partial_\mu \phi + m\phi_\mu) - \frac{\bar{B}^\mu \bar{B}_\mu}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

It will be worthwhile to mention here that the quadratic kinetic term for the massive gauge field [i.e. the first term in (47)] remains the same as nothing can be altered in it. Hence, the auxiliary field \mathcal{B} remains the same as in (23). The subscript (\bar{b}) on the above Lagrangian density denotes that it is different from (23) and is meant for our discussion on the nilpotent anti-BRST symmetries where the FP-ghost terms remain the same as in (24). Thus, the total anti-BRST invariant Lagrangian density \mathcal{L}_B is the sum of (48) and (24) [i.e. $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}} = \mathcal{L}_{(\bar{b})} + \mathcal{L}_{(FP)}$]. Under the following infinitesimal, continuous and off-shell nilpotent (i.e. $s_{ab}^2 = 0$) anti-BRST symmetry transformations s_{ab}

$$\begin{aligned} s_{ab} B_{\mu\nu} &= -(\partial_\mu \bar{C}_\nu - \partial_\nu \bar{C}_\mu), \quad s_{ab} \bar{C}_\mu = -\partial_\mu \bar{\beta}, \quad s_{ab} C_\mu = \bar{B}_\mu, \\ s_{ab} \phi_\mu &= (\partial_\mu \bar{C} - m\bar{C}_\mu), \quad s_{ab} \bar{C} = -m\bar{\beta}, \quad s_{ab} C = \bar{B}, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

$$\begin{aligned} s_{ab} \beta &= -\lambda, \quad s_{ab} \phi + \rho, \quad s_{ab} \Sigma_{\mu\nu} = -m(\partial_\mu \bar{C}_\nu - \partial_\nu \bar{C}_\mu), \\ s_{ab} [\tilde{\varphi}, \rho, \lambda, \bar{\beta}, \bar{B}_\mu, \bar{B}, \mathcal{B}, H_{\mu\nu\lambda}] &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

the total Lagrangian density ($\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$) transforms to the total spacetime derivative as

$$s_{ab} \mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}} = \partial_\mu \{ \rho \bar{B}^\mu - \lambda \partial^\mu \bar{\beta} + (\partial^\mu \bar{C} - m\bar{C}^\mu) \bar{B} - m\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} \bar{C}_\nu \partial_\sigma \tilde{\varphi} - (\partial^\mu \bar{C}^\nu - \partial^\nu \bar{C}^\mu) \bar{B}_\nu \}, \quad (51)$$

which establishes that the action integral $S = \int d^3x \mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$ remains invariant (i.e. $s_{ab}S = 0$) under the continuous, off-shell nilpotent and infinitesimal anti-BRST symmetry transformations (49) because the physically well-defined fields vanish off as $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$.

According to Noether's theorem, the invariance of the action integral under a set of infinitesimal continuous symmetry transformations leads to the derivation of the conserved Noether current. Following the analogue of (5), we obtain the following explicit expression for the Noether anti-BRST current $\left(J_{(ab)}^\mu\right)$:

$$\begin{aligned} J_{(ab)}^\mu &= m\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} \bar{C}_\nu \partial_\sigma \tilde{\varphi} + m(\partial^\mu C - mC^\mu) \bar{\beta} - \lambda \partial^\mu \bar{\beta} - (\partial^\mu C^\nu - \partial^\nu C^\mu) \partial_\nu \bar{\beta} \\ &+ (mB^{\mu\nu} - \Sigma^{\mu\nu}) (\partial_\nu \bar{C} - m\bar{C}_\nu) + \rho \bar{B}^\mu + (\partial^\mu \bar{C} - m\bar{C}^\mu) \bar{B} \\ &- \frac{1}{2} [\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} \mathcal{B} + (\eta^{\mu\nu} \bar{B}^\sigma - \eta^{\mu\sigma} \bar{B}^\nu)] (\partial_\nu \bar{C}_\sigma - \partial_\sigma \bar{C}_\nu). \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

The above current is conserved (i.e. $\partial_\mu J_{(ab)}^\mu = 0$) provided we use the equations of motion (28) that emerge out from the ghost-sector [i.e. $\mathcal{L}_{(FP)}$] of the total Lagrangian density and the following EL-EoMs that are derived from the non-ghost sector [i.e. $\mathcal{L}_{(\bar{b})}$], namely;

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma} \partial_\mu \mathcal{B} + (\partial^\nu \bar{B}^\sigma - \partial^\sigma \bar{B}^\nu) &= -m(mB^{\nu\sigma} - \Sigma^{\nu\sigma}) + m\varepsilon^{\nu\sigma\eta} \partial_\eta \tilde{\varphi}, \\ \partial_\mu (mB^{\mu\nu} - \Sigma^{\mu\nu}) &= m\bar{B}^\nu - \partial^\nu \bar{B}, \quad \partial_\mu \bar{B}^\mu = -m\bar{B}. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

w.r.t. the massive antisymmetric (i.e. $B_{\mu\nu} = -B_{\nu\mu}$) tensor gauge field $B_{\mu\nu}$, vector field ϕ_μ and the scalar field ϕ , respectively. From the conserved Noether anti-BRST current (51), we can derive the conserved anti-BRST charge (i.c. $Q_{ab} = \int d^2x J_{(ab)}^0$) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{ab} &= \int d^2x \left[\rho \bar{B}^0 - \lambda \dot{\bar{\beta}} + (\partial^0 \bar{C} - m\bar{C}^0) \bar{B} + m(\partial^0 C - mC^0) \bar{\beta} + m\varepsilon^{0ij} \bar{C}_i \partial_j \tilde{\varphi} \right. \\ &+ (mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}) (\partial_i \bar{C} - m\bar{C}_i) - (\partial^0 C^i - \partial^i C^0) \partial_i \bar{\beta} - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{0ij} \mathcal{B} (\partial_i \bar{C}_j - \partial_j \bar{C}_i) \\ &\left. - \bar{B}^i (\partial_0 \bar{C}_i - \partial_i \bar{C}_0) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

The above charge is the generator for the infinitesimal, continuous and off-shell nilpotent anti-BRST symmetry transformations (49) provided we compute the conjugate momentum corresponding to the generic field Φ of our theory and use the equation (31) with the replacements: $s_b \rightarrow s_{ab}$, $Q_b \rightarrow Q_{ab}$. However, it is very interesting to point out that the above Noether conserved anti-BRST charge Q_{ab} is found to be non-nilpotent (i.c. $Q_{ab}^2 \neq 0$) of order two because we observe that the following is true, namely;

$$s_{ab} Q_{ab} = -i \{Q_{ab}, Q_{ab}\} \equiv -2i Q_{ab}^2 \neq 0. \quad (55)$$

To corroborate the above statement, we have to compute explicitly the l.h.s. of (54) by using (49) and the explicit expression for Q_{ab} [cf. Eq. (53)]. To be precise, we note that the following is true as far as the computation of the l.h.s. of (54) is concerned, namely;

$$s_{ab} Q_{ab} = \int d^2x \left[m(\partial^0 \bar{B} - m\bar{B}^0) \bar{\beta} - (\partial^0 \bar{B}^i - \partial^i \bar{B}^0) \partial_i \bar{\beta} \right] \neq 0. \quad (56)$$

In other words, we find that the Noether anti-BRST charge is conserved and it is the generator for the infinitesimal, continuous and off-shell nilpotent anti-BRST symmetry transformations (49). However, it is not nilpotent of order two (i.e. $Q_{ab}^2 \neq 0$).

4.2 Conserved Anti-BRST Charge: Nilpotent Version

With the background of our elaborate discussions in Subsec. 3.2, we shall be brief in our present subsection where we shall derive the nilpotent (i.e. $Q_{AB}^2 = 0$) version of the anti-BRST charge Q_{AB} from the Noether anti-BRST charge Q_{ab} [c.f. Eq. (53)]. In this context, first of all, we focus on the last but one term of (53) which can be re-expressed as

$$- \int d^2x \varepsilon^{0ij} \mathcal{B} (\partial_i \bar{C}_j) = \int d^2x (\varepsilon^{0ij} \partial_i \mathcal{B}) \bar{C}_j, \quad (57)$$

where we have dropped a total space derivative term due to Gauss's divergence theorem. Using the EL-EoMs (52), the r.h.s. of the above equation can be re-written as:

$$\int d^2x [m (mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}) \bar{C}_i - m\varepsilon^{0ij} \bar{C}_i \partial_j \tilde{\varphi} + (\partial^0 B^i - \partial^i B^0) \bar{C}_i]. \quad (58)$$

To be precise, we have exploited the beauty of the top entry in (52) which is nothing but the EL-EoM w.r.t. the massive gauge field $B_{\mu\nu}$. Furthermore, the sixth term of the Noether anti-BRST charge (53) can be expanded as:

$$(mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}) (\partial_i \bar{C} - m\bar{C}_i) = (mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}) \partial_i \bar{C} - m (mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}) \bar{C}_i. \quad (59)$$

A close and careful look at the equations (53), (57) and (58) demonstrate that the first two terms of (57) would cancel out with the second term of (58) and the last entry in the top line of (53). Hence, only the last term will survive in (57) and it will be present in the nilpotent version (i.e. $Q_{AB}^2 = 0$) of the anti-BRST charge Q_{AB} . Now we concentrate on the first term of (58) which is present inside the integral. Using the Gauss divergence theorem, it can be re-written and re-expressed, using the appropriate EL-EoM from (52), as:

$$- \int d^2x \partial_i (mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}) \bar{C} = + \int d^2x (m\bar{B}^0 - \partial^0 \bar{B}) \bar{C}. \quad (60)$$

This term will be also a part of the nilpotent version (i.e. $Q_{AB}^2 = 0$) of the anti-BRST charge Q_{AB} . Thus, the last term of (57) and the above term are a part of Q_{AB} which can be re-expressed in the following manner:

$$\int d^2x [(\partial^0 \bar{B}^i - \partial^i \bar{B}^0) \bar{C}_i - (\partial^0 \bar{B} - m\bar{B}^0) \bar{C}]. \quad (61)$$

At this juncture, we apply the anti-BRST symmetry transformations (49) on the above expression and re-arrange some of the appropriate terms of the Noether anti-BRST charge (53) so that there are perfect cancellations. For instance, the application of the anti-BRST symmetry transformations on the above terms of (60) leads to the following:

$$\int d^2x [m (\partial^0 \bar{B} - m\bar{B}^0) \bar{\beta} - (\partial^0 \bar{B}^i - \partial^i \bar{B}^0) \partial_i \bar{\beta}]. \quad (62)$$

Now the stage is suitable set to modify some of the appropriate terms of (53) so that when the anti-BRST symmetry transformations are applied on a part of them, there are perfect

cancellations between them and (61). Towards this goal in mind, we re-express a couple of appropriate terms of (53) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
m \int d^2x (\partial^0 C - mC^0) \bar{\beta} &= 2m \int d^2x (\partial^0 C - mC^0) \bar{\beta} - m \int d^2x (\partial^0 C - mC^0) \bar{\beta}, \\
- \int d^2x (\partial^0 C^i - \partial^i \bar{C}^0) \partial_i \bar{\beta} &= -2 \int d^2x (\partial^0 C^i - \partial^i \bar{C}^0) \partial_i \bar{\beta} \\
+ \int d^2x (\partial^0 C^i - \partial^i \bar{C}^0) \partial_i \bar{\beta}, & \tag{63}
\end{aligned}$$

which are nothing but the third and seventh terms of the Noether charge Q_{ab} . It is straightforward to note that if apply the anti-BRST symmetry transformations (49) on the second terms on the r.h.s. of the top and bottom equations, the resulting expressions cancel out with both the terms of (61). Thus, in addition to (61), the second terms on the r.h.s. of the above equation (62) would also be present in Q_{AB} .

To obtain the final form of the nilpotent (i.e. $Q_{AB}^2 = 0$) version of the anti-BRST charge Q_{AB} , we concentrate on the first integral on the r.h.s. of the bottom equation of (62). The latter can be re-expressed, using the Gauss divergence theorem, as

$$+2 \int d^2x \partial_i (\partial^0 C^i - \partial^i \bar{C}^0) \bar{\beta} \equiv -2 \int d^2x \partial_i (\partial^i C^0 - \partial^0 C^i) \bar{\beta}. \tag{64}$$

It is obvious that if we use the EL-EoM: $\partial_\mu (\partial^\mu C^\nu - \partial^\nu C^\mu) = -\partial^\nu \lambda + m (\partial^\nu C - mC^\nu)$ for the choice: $\nu = 0$, the r.h.s. of the above equation (63) can be re-written as

$$\int d^2x \left[+2\dot{\lambda}\bar{\beta} - 2m (\partial^0 C - mC^0) \bar{\beta} \right]. \tag{65}$$

A straightforward observation of (62) and (64) shows that the last entry of the latter will cancel out with the first entry on the r.h.s. of the top equation of the former. Thus, ultimately, we have obtained five crucial terms of Q_{AB} as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\int d^2x \left[(\partial^0 \bar{B}^i - \partial^i \bar{B}^0) \bar{C}_i - (\partial^0 \bar{B} - m\bar{B}^0) \bar{C} - m (\partial^0 C - mC^0) \bar{\beta} \right. \\
\left. + (\partial^0 C^i - \partial^i \bar{C}^0) \partial_i \bar{\beta} + 2\dot{\lambda}\bar{\beta} \right], & \tag{66}
\end{aligned}$$

which are nothing but the sum of (61), second terms on the r.h.s. of top and bottom equations of (62) and the first entry in (65). It is pretty clear that the latter entry is an anti-BRST invariant [i.e. $s_{ab}(2\dot{\lambda}\bar{\beta}) = 0$] quantity. Thus, we have taken into account all the non-trivial terms of the Noether conserved (but non-nilpotent) charge Q_{ab} . The rest of the terms of Q_{ab} are trivially anti-BRST invariant. Hence, the final form of the conserved and nilpotent version of the anti-BRST charge Q_{AB} is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{AB} = \int d^2x \left[(\partial^0 \bar{B}^i - \partial^i \bar{B}^0) \bar{C}^i - (\partial^0 \bar{B} - m\bar{B}^0) \bar{C} - m (\partial^0 C - mC^0) \bar{\beta} \right. \\
\left. + (\partial^0 C^i - \partial^i \bar{C}^0) \partial_i \bar{\beta} + 2\dot{\lambda}\bar{\beta} - \lambda\dot{\beta} + \rho\bar{B}^0 + (\partial^0 \bar{C} - m\bar{C}^0) \bar{B} - \bar{B}^i (\partial_0 \bar{C}_i - \partial_i \bar{C}_0) \right]. & \tag{67}
\end{aligned}$$

The above is nothing but the sum of (65) and the rest of the BRST-invariant terms of Q_{ab} [cf. Eq. (53)]. It is straightforward to check that we have the validity of $s_{ab}Q_{AB} = -i \{Q_{AB}, Q_{AB}\} = 0 \Rightarrow Q_{AB}^2 = 0$ which proves the off-shell nilpotency of Q_{AB} .

We wrap-up this subsection with the following two crucial remarks. First of all, as is well-known from Noether's theorem, the expression for the Noether conserved charge can be re-caste into any other form by exploiting the beauty and strength of EL-EoMs for a given theory. This is what exactly we have followed in the derivation of Q_{AB} from Q_{ab} along with the standard definition of the physical fields that vanish off as $x \rightarrow \pm\infty$. The *latter* requirement has been taken care of by Gauss's divergence theorem which we have utilized at various places. Hence, if Q_{ab} is conserved, the alternative expression Q_{AB} (that is derived by using (i) the EL-EoMS, and (ii) the Gauss divergence theorem) will also be conserved. Second, the nilpotency property of the (anti-)BRST charges is very essential from the point of view of (i) the standard BRST algebra (cf. Appendix A below), (ii) the BRST cohomology (see, e.g. [42q]), and (iii) the Dirac quantization conditions where the operator form of the constraints of the classical theory must annihilate the physical states (of the total quantum Hilbert space of states) at the quantum level (cf. Appendix B below).

5 Curci-Ferrari Type Restrictions: Importance

The existence of the (non-)trivial CF-type restriction(s) on a BRST-quantized theory is as fundamental as the existence of the first-class constraints for the definition of a classical gauge theory. In the case of our present theory, the (anti-)BRST invariant CF-type restrictions are responsible for (i) the absolute anticommutativity of the BRST and anti-BRST symmetry transformations which encodes the linear independence of the BRST and anti-BRST symmetries, and (ii) the existence of the coupled (but equivalent) (anti-)BRST invariant Lagrangian densities which respect both BRST and anti-BRST symmetry transformations (provided we take into account the sanctity of the CF-type restrictions). Our present section contains three parts. In Subsec. 5.1, we derive the CF-type restrictions by demanding the direct equality of the BRST and anti-BRST invariant Lagrangian densities. Our Subsec. 5.2 deals with the proof that the (anti-)BRST invariant Lagrangian densities are equivalent w.r.t. the BRST and anti-BRST symmetry transformations in the sense that both the Lagrangian densities respect both the nilpotent symmetries (provided the validity of CF-type restrictions is invoked). Finally, in our Subsec. 5.3, we establish the importance of the CF-type restrictions in the proof of the absolute anticommutativity between the BRST and anti-BRST symmetry transformations.

5.1 Direct Equality of the Lagrangian Densities

As pointed out earlier, the CF -type restrictions are responsible for the equivalence of the (anti-)BRST invariant Lagrangian densities modulo some total spacetime derivatives. The latter, as we know, do not play any significant role in the description of the dynamics of the theory within the framework of the Lagrangian formulation. To be precise, we wish to prove that the difference between the BRST invariant Lagrangian density \mathcal{L}_B and anti-BRST invariant Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$ is equal to the total spacetime derivative provided we take into account the sanctity of the CF-type restrictions. We know that the FP-ghost part of the Lagrangian density (24) is common in the Lagrangian densities \mathcal{L}_B and $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$. Hence, in the difference $\mathcal{L}_B - \mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$, it will cancel out. Ultimately, this difference reduces to

$\mathcal{L}_{(b)} - \mathcal{L}_{(\bar{b})}$ [cf. Eqs. (23),(48)] which leads to the following expression, namely;

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2}(B + \bar{B})(B - \bar{B}) - (B + \bar{B})(\partial \cdot \phi) - m(B - \bar{B})\phi - \frac{1}{2}(B^\mu - \bar{B}^\mu)(B_\mu + \bar{B}_\mu) \\ & + m(B^\mu - \bar{B}^\mu)\phi_\mu - (B^\mu + \bar{B}^\mu)\partial_\mu\phi + (B^\mu - \bar{B}^\mu)(\partial^\nu B_{\nu\mu}), \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

where we have used the simple algebraic trick of factorization of the difference between two square terms [e.g. $B^2 - \bar{B}^2 = (B + \bar{B})(B - \bar{B})$, etc.]. Re-arrangement of the above equation leads to the following form of the ensuing equation:

$$\begin{aligned} & (B^\mu - \bar{B}^\mu + 2\partial^\mu\phi) \left[(\partial^\nu B_{\nu\mu}) + m\phi_\mu - \frac{1}{2}(B_\mu + \bar{B}_\mu) \right] \\ & + (B + \bar{B} - 2m\phi) \left[\frac{1}{2}(B - \bar{B}) - (\partial \cdot \phi) \right] + \partial_\mu [-2m\phi^\mu\phi]. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

It is pretty obvious that if we impose the restrictions: $B + \bar{B} - 2m\phi = 0$ and $B_\mu - \bar{B}_\mu + 2\partial_\mu\phi = 0$ on our theory, we observe that \mathcal{L}_B and $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$ differ from each-other by a total spacetime derivative term: $\partial_\mu [-2m\phi^\mu\phi]$. Hence, they are equivalent. The above two relationships among the Nakanishi-Lautrup auxiliary fields (e.g. $B, \bar{B}, B_\mu, \bar{B}_\mu$) and the scalar field ϕ are known as the CF-type restrictions which are, as is clear, responsible for the equivalence of the BRST and anti-BRST invariant Lagrangian densities.

The CF-type restrictions exist at the quantum level within the framework of the BRST formalism. They are physical restrictions on our theory and, therefore, they should be (anti-)BRST invariant quantities. This requirement leads to the following off-shell nilpotent (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations for the Nakanishi-Lautrup auxiliary fields

$$s_{ab}B_\mu = -2\partial_\mu\rho, \quad s_{ab}B = 2m\rho, \quad s_b\bar{B}_\mu = 2\partial_\mu\lambda, \quad s_b\bar{B} = 2m\lambda, \quad (70)$$

which are *not* present in the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations that have been listed in (49) and (26), respectively. As a side remark, we would like to mention that the above physically important and (anti-)BRST invariant non-trivial CF-type restrictions (i.e. $B_\mu - \bar{B}_\mu + 2\partial_\mu\phi = 0$, $B + \bar{B} - 2m\phi = 0$) can be derived from the following EL-EoMs

$$\begin{aligned} B_\mu &= \partial^\nu B_{\nu\mu} - \partial_\mu\phi + m\phi_\mu, & B &= (\partial \cdot \phi) + m\phi, \\ \bar{B}_\mu &= \partial^\nu B_{\nu\mu} + \partial_\mu\phi + m\phi_\mu, & \bar{B} &= -(\partial \cdot \phi) + m\phi, \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

which are derived from the Lagrangian densities \mathcal{L}_B and $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$ w.r.t. the Nakanishi-Lautrup auxiliary fields ($B_\mu, B, \bar{B}_\mu, \bar{B}$). Hence, there is consistency between our observations in (68) and (70) as far as the derivations of the CF-type resections are concerned.

We wrap-up this subsection with the remarks that (i) the (non-)trivial CF-type restrictions are inevitable part of a properly BRST-quantized theory as they are physical in the sense that they are (anti-)BRST invariant, (ii) the direct equality of the BRST and anti-BRST invariant coupled (but equivalent) Lagrangian densities leads to their derivation, and (iii) the EL-EoMs from these (anti-)BRST invariant Lagrangian densities also give a glimpse of their existence on a properly BRST-quantized theory.

5.2 Equivalent Lagrangian Densities: Symmetry Considerations

We have already seen that, under the BRST symmetry transformations (26), the Lagrangian density \mathcal{L}_B transforms to the total spacetime derivative [cf. Eq. (25)]. In exactly similar fashion, we have noted that $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$ transforms to the total spacetime derivative [cf. Eq. (50)] under the anti-BRST symmetry transformations (49). The purpose of this subsection is to show that (i) the perfectly BRST invariant Lagrangian density \mathcal{L}_B also respects the anti-BRST symmetry transformations (49), and (ii) the perfectly anti-BRST invariant Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$ also respects the BRST symmetry transformations (26), provided we take into account the sanctity of the CF-type restrictions (i.e. $B + \bar{B} - 2m\phi = 0$, $B_\mu - \bar{B}_\mu + 2\partial_\mu\phi = 0$). In other words, when we apply the BRST symmetry transformations (s_b) on $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$ and anti-BRST symmetry transformations (s_{ab}) on \mathcal{L}_B , we obtain the total spacetime derivative terms plus the terms that contain the above CF-type restrictions. To corroborate this statement, first of all, we focus on the computation of $s_b\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$ which leads to the following explicit expression

$$\begin{aligned}
s_b\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}} &= \partial_\mu \left[2(\partial_\nu B^{\nu\mu})\lambda - (\partial^\mu C^\nu - \partial^\nu C^\mu)\bar{B}_\nu + (\partial^\mu C - mC^\mu)\bar{B} - \rho\partial^\mu\beta + 2m\lambda\phi^\mu \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \lambda B^\mu - m\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma}C_\nu\partial_\sigma\tilde{\varphi} \right] - (\partial^\mu C^\nu - \partial^\nu C^\mu)\partial_\mu \left[B_\nu - \bar{B}_\nu + 2\partial_\nu\phi \right] \\
&\quad - m(\partial^\mu C - mC^\mu)(B_\mu - \bar{B}_\mu + 2\partial_\mu\phi) + m\lambda(B + \bar{B} - 2m\phi) \\
&\quad - (\partial^\mu C - mC^\mu)\partial_\mu \left[B + \bar{B} - 2m\phi \right] + (B^\mu - \bar{B}^\mu + 2\partial^\mu\phi)\partial_\mu\lambda, \tag{72}
\end{aligned}$$

which clearly demonstrates that, on the r.h.s, we have the total spacetime derivative terms and the terms that contain the CF-type restrictions on our theory. In exactly similar fashion, when we apply s_{ab} on \mathcal{L}_B , we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{ab}\mathcal{L}_B &= \partial_\mu \left[\rho\bar{B}^\mu - (\partial^\mu\bar{C}^\nu - \partial^\nu\bar{C}^\mu)B_\nu - 2(\partial_\nu B^{\nu\mu})\rho - 2m\rho\phi^\mu - (\partial^\mu\bar{C} - m\bar{C}^\mu)B \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \lambda\partial^\mu\bar{\beta} - m\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma}\bar{C}_\nu\partial_\sigma\tilde{\varphi} \right] + (\partial^\mu\bar{C}^\nu - \partial^\nu\bar{C}^\mu)\partial_\mu \left(B_\nu - \bar{B}_\nu + 2\partial_\nu\phi \right) \\
&\quad + m(\partial^\mu\bar{C} - m\bar{C}^\mu)(B_\mu - \bar{B}_\mu + 2\partial_\mu\phi) + m\rho(B + \bar{B} - 2m\phi) \\
&\quad + (\partial^\mu\bar{C} - m\bar{C}^\mu)\partial_\mu \left(B + \bar{B} - 2m\phi \right) + (B^\mu - \bar{B}^\mu + 2\partial^\mu\phi)\partial_\mu\rho. \tag{73}
\end{aligned}$$

The r.h.s. of the above equation also shows that we have the total spacetime derivative terms plus terms that explicitly incorporate the CF-type restrictions. Thus, it is crystal clear that, if we invoke the validity of the CF-type restrictions (i.e. $B + \bar{B} - 2m\phi = 0$, $B_\mu - \bar{B}_\mu + 2\partial_\mu\phi = 0$), we observe that \mathcal{L}_B and $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$ both respect both (i.e. BRST and anti-BRST) symmetry transformations on the submanifold of fields which is defined by the the equations corresponding to the CF-type restrictions.

We end this subsection with the following concluding remarks. First, we observe that, as far as the RRST and anti-BRST symmetries are concerned, the Lagrangian densities \mathcal{L}_B and $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}}$ are equivalent provided we take into account the validity of CF-type restrictions. Second, these Lagrangian densities are *coupled* because they are connected to each-other by the CF-type restrictions (modulo a total spacetime derivative term). Finally, we note that the existence of the non-trivial CF type restrictions *always* implies the existence of

the coupled (but equivalent) Lagrangian densities that respect both (i.e. BRST and anti-BRST) symmetries *together*.

5.3 Absolute Anticommutativity Property: Significance

For a given gauge theory with the local, continuous and infinitesimal gauge symmetry transformations, there exist two nilpotent symmetry transformations (within the framework of the BRST formalism) which are known as the BRST and anti-BRST symmetry transformations. The impotency property encodes the *fermionic* nature of these symmetries which implies that, under these symmetry transformations, the fermionic fields of the BRST-quantized theory transform to the bosonic fields and vice-versa. However, these symmetries are *not* like the $\mathcal{N} = 2$ SUSY symmetry transformations because (i) the SUSY transformations do *not* absolutely anticommute with each-other, and (ii) the BRST and anti-BRST symmetry transformations anticommute with each-other due to the existence of the (non-)trivial CF-type restrictions on the BRST quantized theory. In fact, the absolute anticommutativity property of the (anti-)BRST symmetries is one of the sacrosanct properties of the BRST formalism. Physically, this property encodes the linear independence of the BRST and anti-BRST symmetry transformations. For instance, in the case of our present BRST-quantized theory, we observe the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ s_b, s_{ab} \right\} B_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu(B_\nu - \bar{B}_\nu) - \partial_\nu(B_\mu - \bar{B}_\mu), \\ \left\{ s_b, s_{ab} \right\} \phi_\mu &= \partial_\mu(B + \bar{B}) + m(B_\mu - \bar{B}_\mu), \\ \left\{ s_b, s_{ab} \right\} \Phi &= 0, \quad \Phi = \bar{C}_\mu, C_\mu, \beta, \bar{\beta}, C, \bar{C}, \phi, \bar{\varphi}, B_\mu, \bar{B}_\mu, B, \bar{B}. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

The above equation demonstrates that the absolute anticommutativity property (i.e. $\{s_b, s_{ab}\} = 0$) of the BRST and anti-BRST symmetry transformation operators [cf. Eqs. (26),(49),(69)] is satisfied for all the fields of our theory provided we take into account the validity of the CF-type restrictions (i.e. $B + \bar{B} - 2m\phi = 0$, $B_\mu - \bar{B}_\mu + 2\partial_\mu\phi = 0$).

We end this subsection with the following comments. First of all, we note that the absolute anticommutativity property (i.e. $\{s_b, s_{ab}\} = 0$) automatically satisfied for the generic field $\Phi = \bar{C}_\mu, C_\mu, \beta, \bar{\beta}, C, \bar{C}, \phi, \bar{\varphi}, B_\mu, \bar{B}_\mu, B, \bar{B}$. However, for the gauge field and Stückelberg vector field, we have to invoke the sanctity of the CF-type restrictions. This happens because the gauge field $B_{\mu\nu}$ and the Stückelberg vector field ϕ_μ are the most basic fields of our theory. Rest of the fields appear in the theory because of the BRST quantization of the Stückelberg-modified massive gauge theory. Second, the (non-)trivial CF-type restrictions are essential in the BRST-quantized theory because the independent identity of the BRST and anti-BRST symmetries (and corresponding conserved charges) crucially depends on them. Furthermore, we have established in our earlier works [35,36] that the CF-type restrictions are connected with the geometrical objects called gerbes. Finally, the independent nature of the BRST and anti-BRST charges becomes crystal clear in the field-theoretic models for Hodge theory (see. e.g. [14] for details) where we observe that there is two-to-one mapping between the conserved charges of the theory and the de Rham cohomological operators of differential geometry.

6 Conclusions

In our present endeavor, we have shown that under the local, continuous and infinitesimal (i) classical gauge symmetry transformations (4), and (ii) quantum (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations [cf. Eqs. (49),(26)], the kinetic terms of the 3D massive Abelian 2-form gauge field and the pseudo-scalar field remain invariant. The classical gauge symmetry transformations (4) are generated by a set of *four* first-class constraints [cf. Eq. (14)] that have shown to exist on our theory. The (anti-)BRST invariance exists in our present theory because the gauge-fixing terms (for the massive Abelian 2-form field $B_{\mu\nu}$ as well as Stückelberg's vector field ϕ_μ) along with the FP-ghost terms transform in such a manner that the total (anti-)BRST invariant Lagrangian densities transform to the total spacetime derivatives [cf. Eqs.(50),(25)]. As a consequence, the action integrals, corresponding to the above (anti-)BRST invariant Lagrangian densities, respect the (anti-)BRST symmetry transformations. We have performed this exercise, for the first-time, in the case of an odd-dimensional (i.e. $D = 3$) modified massive Abelian 2-form gauge theory.

One of the highlights of our present investigation is the observation that the pseudoscalar field (i.e. $\tilde{\varphi}$) of our theory remains inert (i.e. $\delta_g \tilde{\varphi} = 0, s_{(a)b} \tilde{\varphi} = 0$) as far as the classical gauge symmetry transformations (4) and the quantum BRST and anti-BRST symmetry transformations (26) and (49), respectively, are concerned. However, its presence in the *two* of the total four first-class constraints [cf. Eq. (14)] is an undeniable fact. According to Dirac's quantization conditions, the operator forms of the constraints must annihilate the physical states (in the total quantum Hilbert space of states) at the quantum level (see, e.g. [38] for details). We have been able to establish this fact, very briefly (cf. Appendix B below), where we have demanded that the physical states (in the total quantum Hilbert space of states) are those that are annihilated (i.e. $Q_B |phys\rangle = 0$) by the conserved and nilpotent version of the BRST charge Q_B . It is worthwhile to point out, in the context of our present discussions, that the pseudo-scalar field (i.e. $\tilde{\varphi}$) does transform under the (anti-)co-BRST symmetry transformations which have been shown to exist, within the framework of BRST formalism, in the contexts of (i) the modified 2D massive Abelian 1-form (i.e. Proca) theory (see, e.g. [41]), and (ii) the modified massive 4D Abelian 2-form theory (see, e.g. [14,28]). These models, as mentioned earlier, are the field-theoretic examples for Hodge theory which provide the physical realizations of the set of three de Rham cohomological operators of differential geometry at the algebraic level.

Against the backdrop of the discussions in the above paragraph, we would like to lay emphasis on the fact that the pseudo-scalar field (with the negative kinetic term and a well-defined mass) is very important field in our theory because (i) it turns out to be one of the possible candidates of dark matter, and (ii) it plays a crucial role in the realm of cyclic, bouncing and self-accelerated cosmological models of the Universe. Its massless limit (when it would be endowed with only a negative kinetic term), we speculate, will be a possible candidate of dark energy because it would automatically lead to the existence of negative pressure in the theory. The *latter* is one of the characteristic features of dark energy which is responsible for the modern observations of the accelerated expansion of the Universe (see, e.g. [49-51]). We further speculate that the pseudo-scalar field (with the negative kinetic term) will be one of the most fundamental fields that would correspond to the "phantom" and/or "ghost" fields of the cosmological models.

The existence of the (anti-)BRST invariant CF-type restriction(s) is the hallmark of a properly BRST-quantized theory. In this context, it is pertinent to point out that the *trivial* CF-type restriction** exists in the simple cases of the BRST approach to the Abelian 1-form gauge theory, a system of rigid rotor, etc., which are described by a *single* (anti-)BRST invariant Lagrangian density/Lagrangian that respects BRST as well as anti-BRST symmetry transformations and the property of the absolute anticommutativity is satisfied automatically. As far as our 3D modified massive Abelian 2-form theory is concerned, we have shown the existence of the non-trivial CF-type restrictions which are responsible for the existence of the coupled (but equivalent) BRST and anti-BRST invariant Lagrangian densities. Furthermore, in the proof of the absolute anticommutativity property of the BRST and anti-BRST transformations, we have been compelled to invoke the sanctity of the non-trivial CF-type resections. All these aspects have been discussed in our Sec. 5 and we have been able to derive the CF-type restrictions from different theoretical angles.

One of the very promising future endeavor for us would be look into the possibility of the existence of the nilpotent (i.e. $s_{(a)d}^2 = 0$) (anti-)co-BRST/(anti-)dual-BRST symmetry transformations $s_{(a)d}$ for our 3D modified massive Abelian 2-form theory. It is expected that, under these symmetry transformations, the total gauge-fixing terms for the massive gauge field as well as Stückelberg's vector field would remain invariant. In other words, we shall have the following kinds of (anti-)dual-BRST transformations (see, e.g. [14,9,28]):

$$\begin{aligned} s_{ad}B_{\mu\nu} &= -\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\sigma}\partial^\sigma C, & s_{ad}C &= 0, & s_{ad}\phi_\mu &= 0, & s_{ad}\phi &= 0, & s_{ad}(\partial^\nu B_{\nu\mu}) &= 0, \\ s_d B_{\mu\nu} &= -\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\sigma}\partial^\sigma \bar{C}, & s_d \bar{C} &= 0, & s_d \phi_\mu &= 0, & s_d \phi &= 0, & s_d(\partial^\nu B_{\nu\mu}) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

On top of these symmetry transformations, we have to find out the appropriate transformations for the (anti-)ghost fields as well as for the pseudo-scalar field so that the total transformations on (i) the kinetic terms for the gauge field as well as the pseudo-scalar field, and (ii) the ghost-sector of the total (anti-)BRST invariant Lagrangian densities sum up to the total spacetime derivatives. Thus, in our future endeavor, we wish to prove that our present odd dimensional (i.e. $D = 3$) modified massive Abelian 2-form theory is *also* a field-theoretic model for Hodge theory. This will be a completely new result. Another direction that can be followed by us is the constraint analysis of this theory, in an elaborate manner, within the framework of BRST formalism. We have, very concisely, discussed a bit of this aspect of our theory in our Appendix B to show that the existence of the pseudo-scalar field in our theory is important because it is present in the operator form of the *two* constraints which annihilate the physical states (i.e. $|phys\rangle$) of our theory at the quantum level (cf. Appendix B). We are currently very much involved with the above cited problems and our results will be reported in our future publications [53].

Acknowledgments

Our present work was initiated when one of us (RPM) visited the School of Physics, University of Hyderabad (UoH). He is immensely grateful to the IoE-UoH- IPDF (EH) scheme of

**The *trivial* CF-type condition, in the context of the BRST approach to any arbitrary dimensional Abelian 1-form gauge theory, turns out to the limiting case of the celebrated CF-condition [52] that exists in the context of the BRST approach to any arbitrary dimensional non-Abelian 1-form gauge theory which is responsible for the existence of the coupled (but equivalent) (anti-)BRST invariant Lagrangian densities.

UoH for enabling this visit. SKP is thankful to the UGC, Government of India, for financial support under its JRF scheme (id.191620059604). All the authors gratefully acknowledge a crucial technical help, provided by Dr. A. K. Rao, in the preparation of this manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability

No data were used to support this study.

Appendix A: On the Standard BRST Algebra

In addition to the infinitesimal, continuous and off-shell nilpotent (i.e. fermionic) BRST and anti-BRST symmetry transformations that have been discussed in Secs. 3 and 4, respectively, we also have a set of ghost-scale symmetry transformations in our theory which are found to be bosonic in nature, namely;

$$\begin{aligned}
C_\mu &\rightarrow e^{+\Sigma} C_\mu, & \bar{C}_\mu &\rightarrow e^{-\Sigma} \bar{C}_\mu, & \beta &\rightarrow e^{+2\Sigma} \beta, & \bar{\beta} &\rightarrow e^{-2\Sigma} \bar{\beta}, \\
C &\rightarrow e^{+\Sigma} C, & \bar{C} &\rightarrow e^{-\Sigma} \bar{C}, & \lambda &\rightarrow e^{+\Sigma} \lambda, & \rho &\rightarrow e^{-\Sigma} \rho, \\
\Phi &\rightarrow e^0 \Phi \quad (\Phi = B_{\mu\nu}, B_\mu, \mathcal{B}, B, \bar{B}_\mu, \bar{B}, \phi_\mu, \phi, \tilde{\varphi}),
\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

where Σ is a spacetime-independent (i.e. global) scale transformation parameter and the numerals in the exponents correspond to the ghost numbers for the fields. It is clear that all the fields of the non-ghost sector (i.e. $B_{\mu\nu}, B_\mu, \mathcal{B}, B, \bar{B}_\mu, \bar{B}, \phi_\mu, \phi, \tilde{\varphi}$) carry the ghost number equal to zero. Hence, in the exponent, corresponding to the ghost-scale symmetry transformation on the generic field Φ , we have zero as the numeral. For the sake of brevity, we take into account $\Sigma = 1$ so that the infinitesimal version (s_g) of the above ghost-scale symmetry transformations becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
s_g C_\mu &= +C_\mu, & s_g \bar{C}_\mu &= -\bar{C}_\mu, & s_g \beta &= +2\beta, & s_g \bar{\beta} &= -2\bar{\beta}, \\
s_g C &= +C, & s_g \bar{C} &= -\bar{C}, & s_g \lambda &= +\lambda, & s_g \rho &= -\rho, & s_g \Phi &= 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

where it can be readily checked that s_g is bosonic (i.e. $s_g^2 \neq 0$) in nature. Under these infinitesimal transformations, the (anti-)BRST invariant Lagrangian densities remain invariant (i.e. $s_g \mathcal{L}_B = 0, s_g \mathcal{L}_{\bar{B}} = 0$). As a consequence, according to Noether theorem, we have the following expression for the ghost current $J_{(g)}^\mu$, namely;

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{(g)}^\mu &= 2\beta \partial^\mu \bar{\beta} - 2\bar{\beta} \partial^\mu \beta + (\partial^\mu C^\nu - \partial^\nu C^\mu) \bar{C}_\nu + \lambda \bar{C}^\mu + (\partial^\mu \bar{C}^\nu - \partial^\nu \bar{C}^\mu) C_\nu - \rho C^\mu \\
&\quad - (\partial^\mu \bar{C} - m \bar{C}^\mu) C - (\partial^\mu C - m C^\mu) \bar{C}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

The conservation law ($\partial_\mu J_{(g)}^\mu = 0$) can be proven readily by using the EL-EoMs (28) that have been derived from the ghost-sector of the (anti-)BRST invariant Lagrangian densities. The expression for the conserved ghost charge $Q_g = \int d^2x J_{(g)}^0$ is as follows:

$$Q_g = \int d^2x \left[2\beta\dot{\bar{\beta}} - 2\bar{\beta}\dot{\beta} + (\partial^0 C^i - \partial^i C^0) \bar{C}_i + \lambda \bar{C}^0 - \rho C^0 + (\partial^0 \bar{C}^i - \partial^i \bar{C}^0) C_i - (\partial^0 \bar{C} - m \bar{C}^0) C - (\partial^0 C - m C^0) \bar{C} \right]. \quad (A.4)$$

The above charge is the generator for the infinitesimal ghost transformations (A.2) if we express the ghost charge in terms of the canonical conjugate momenta w.r.t. the basic (anti-)ghost fields of our theory and use the general equation (31) with the replacements: $s_b \rightarrow s_g, Q_b \rightarrow Q_g$ and use only the commutator (i.e. $[\cdot, \cdot]_{(-)}$) on the r.h.s. of (31).

Taking into account the property of the ghost charge Q_g as the generator for the infinitesimal ghost-scale transformations s_g , we further note that the following relationships between the ghost charge and the non-nilpotent version (i.e. $Q_{(a)b}^2 \neq 0$) and nilpotent version (i.e. $Q_{(A)B}^2 = 0$) of the (anti-)BRST charges [i.e. $Q_{(a)b}, Q_{(A)B}$] are true, namely;

$$\begin{aligned} s_g Q_b &= -i [Q_b, Q_g] = +Q_b \Rightarrow i [Q_g, Q_b] = +Q_b, \\ s_g Q_{ab} &= -i [Q_{ab}, Q_g] = -Q_{ab} \Rightarrow i [Q_g, Q_{ab}] = -Q_{ab}, \\ s_g Q_B &= -i [Q_B, Q_g] = +Q_B \Rightarrow i [Q_g, Q_B] = +Q_B, \\ s_g Q_{AB} &= -i [Q_{AB}, Q_g] = -Q_{AB} \Rightarrow i [Q_g, Q_{AB}] = -Q_{AB}, \end{aligned} \quad (A.5)$$

which demonstrate that the Noether non-nilpotent (anti-)BRST charges $Q_{(a)b}$ and the nilpotent versions of the (anti-)BRST charges $Q_{(A)B}$ obey the same kinds of algebras with the conserved ghost charge Q_g . However, we know that the off-shell nilpotency property of the (anti-)BRST charges is very important from the point of view of (i) the BRST cohomology, and (ii) the physicality criteria and their consistency with the Dirac-quantization conditions for the systems with constraints. Thus, the standard BRST algebra is obeyed amongst the nilpotent versions (i.e. $Q_{(A)B}^2 = 0$) of the (anti-)BRST charges $Q_{(A)B}$ and the conserved ghost charge Q_g . This well-known and beautiful algebra is as follows:

$$Q_B^2 = 0, \quad Q_{AB}^2 = 0, \quad i [Q_g, Q_B] = +Q_B, \quad i [Q_g, Q_{AB}] = -Q_{AB}. \quad (A.6)$$

The above algebra encodes the fact that the ghost numbers of the (anti-)BRST charges are $(-1) + 1$, respectively. In other words, the BRST transformation increases the ghost number of a field by one [cf. Eq. (26)]. On the other hand, the ghost number decreases by one [cf. Eq. (49)] for a field on which the anti-BRST transformation operates.

Appendix B: On the Physicality Criteria w.r.t. Q_B

The purpose of our present Appendix is to discuss briefly the consequences of the physicality criteria w.r.t. the nilpotent version of the BRST charge Q_B and to establish its superiority over the non-nilpotent version of the Noether BRST charge Q_b . To be precise, we show

that all the primary as well as the secondary constraints of our theory annihilate the physical states when we demand that the physical states (i.e. $|phys\rangle$) are those (in the total quantum Hilbert space of states) that are annihilated (i.e. $Q_B|phys\rangle = 0$) by the conserved and nilpotent version of the BRST charge Q_B operator. Before we shall do this exercise, we would like to point out that there are no explicit primary constraints for the BRST invariant Lagrangian density (23). Rather, they have been traded with the Nakanishi-Lautrup type auxiliary fields because we observe the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_{(B)}^{\mu\nu} &= \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_B}{\partial(\partial_0 B_{\mu\nu})} = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{0\mu\nu}\mathcal{B} + \frac{1}{2}(\eta^{0\mu}B^\nu - \eta^{0\nu}B^\mu), \\ \Pi_{(\phi)}^\mu &= \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}_B}{\partial(\partial_0\phi_\mu)} = mB^{0\mu} - \Sigma^{0\mu} - \eta^{0\mu}B.\end{aligned}\tag{B.1}$$

The expressions in (B.1) demonstrate that we have the following:

$$\Pi_{(B)}^{0i} = \frac{1}{2}B^i, \quad \Pi_{(B)}^{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{0ij}\mathcal{B}, \quad \Pi_{(\phi)}^0 = -B, \quad \Pi_{(\phi)}^i = mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}.\tag{B.2}$$

These observations corroborate our statement that the primary constraints $\Pi_{(B)}^{0i} \approx 0$ and $\Pi_{(\phi)}^0 \approx 0$ [cf. Eq. (9)] of our starting Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_{(0)}^{MS}$ have been traded with the Nakanishi-Lautrup auxiliary fields B^i and B , respectively [cf. Eq. (B.2)].

A close and careful look at the (anti-)BRST invariant Lagrangian densities reveals that the (anti-)ghost fields are decoupled, right from the beginning, from the *rest* of the theory as there is no interaction between the bosonic ($B_{\mu\nu}, \phi_\mu, \phi, \tilde{\varphi}$) fields (with the ghost number zero) of our theory and the (anti-)ghost fields (which carry non-zero ghost numbers). Hence the quantum Hilbert space of states of our theory is a direct product (see, e.g. [54] for details) of the physical states (i.e. $|phys\rangle$) and the ghost states (i.e. $|ghost\rangle$). When we demand the physicality criteria on the quantum Hilbert space of states w.r.t. the nilpotent version of the BRST charge [cf. Eq. (46)], the ghost fields act only on the ghost states (i.e. $|ghost\rangle$) and produce the non-zero results. Hence, to satisfy the condition $Q_B|phys\rangle = 0$, all the fields and/or the specific combination of them (with the zero ghost number) that are (i) present in the expression for Q_B , and (ii) are associated with the basic (anti-)ghost fields, must annihilate the physical states (i.e. $|phys\rangle$). As a consequence, the following explicit operator conditions emerge out on the physical states from the requirement: $Q_B|phys\rangle = 0$, namely;

$$\begin{aligned}B | phys \rangle = 0, \quad B^i | phys \rangle = 0, \quad (\partial^0 B + mB^0) | phys \rangle = 0, \\ (\partial^0 B^i - \partial^i B^0) | phys \rangle = 0.\end{aligned}\tag{B.3}$$

It is pretty obvious, from (B.2), that $B | phys \rangle = 0, B_i | phys \rangle = 0$ imply that the operator forms of the primary constraints annihilate (i.e. $\Pi_{(\phi)}^0 | phys \rangle = 0, \Pi_{(B)}^{0i} | phys \rangle = 0$) the physical states of our theory. Let us now concentrate on the last two entries of (B.3) and prove that they imply that the secondary constraints of our theory annihilate the physical states. For this purpose, we have to take into account the following EL-EoMs that emerge out from the non-ghost sector of the BRST-invariant Lagrangian density, namely;

$$\partial_\mu (mB^{\mu\nu} - \Sigma^{\mu\nu}) = mB^\nu + \partial^\nu B,$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma}\partial_\mu\mathcal{B} + \frac{1}{2}(\partial^\nu B^\sigma - \partial^\sigma B^\nu) = -\frac{m}{2}(mB^{\nu\sigma} - \Sigma^{\nu\sigma}) + \frac{m}{2}\varepsilon^{\nu\sigma\eta}\partial_\eta\tilde{\varphi}. \quad (B.4)$$

Taking the choice $\nu = 0$ in the top entry of the above equation and the choosing $\nu = 0, \sigma = i$ in the bottom entry, we obtain the following very useful relationships:

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial^0 B + mB^0) &= -\partial_i(mB^{0i} - \Sigma^{0i}) \equiv -\partial_i\Pi_{(\phi)}^i, \\ (\partial^0 B^i - \partial^i B^0) &= 2\left(\partial_j\Pi_{(\phi)}^{ji} - \frac{m}{2}\Pi_{(\phi)}^i + \frac{m}{2}\varepsilon^{0ij}\partial_j\tilde{\varphi}\right) \\ &\equiv -2\left(\frac{m}{2}\Pi_{(\phi)}^i - \partial_j\Pi_{(\phi)}^{ji} - \frac{m}{2}\varepsilon^{0ij}\partial_j\tilde{\varphi}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (B.5)$$

The above beautiful relationships establish that the third and fourth conditions on the physical states (i.e. $|phys\rangle$) in (B.3) are nothing but the conditions that the operator forms of the secondary constraints [cf. Eqs. (10),(12)] of our classical theory annihilate the physical states that exist in the total quantum Hilbert space of states.

We end this Appendix with the following closing remarks. First of all, we note that the physicality criteria [cf. Eq. (B.3)] and ensuing conditions on the physical states w.r.t. the nilpotent version of the BRST charge are consistent with the Dirac quantization conditions (on the correct way of quantization of systems that are endowed with constraints. Second, we have not taken into account the condition: $B^0 |phys\rangle = 0$ from the physicality criteria w.r.t.the BRST charge Q_B because the auxiliary field component B^0 is associated with the auxiliary ghost field λ which is not a basic ghost field. Moreover, it (i.e. B^0) is the conjugate momentum corresponding to the scalar field ϕ which is non-zero and, therefore, it is not a constraint on our theory. Third, even though the pseudo-scalar field does not transform under the classical gauge transformations [cf. Eq. (4)] and nilpotent (anti-)BRST transformations [cf. Eqs.(49),(26)] at the quantum level, its presence and importance in the constraints at the classical level [cf. Eq. (14)] as well as at the quantum level [cf. Eqs. (B.5),(B.3)] can *not* be denied. Fourth, it can be explicitly checked that the physicality criteria (i.e. $Q_b|phys\rangle = 0$) w.r.t. the non-nilpotent (i.e. $Q_b^2 \neq 0$) Noether conserved charge Q_b [cf. Eq. (30)] leads to the annihilation of the physical states only by the operator forms of the primary constraints [cf. Eq. (9)] of our classical theory. However, it does not lead to the annihilation of the physical states by the operator forms of the secondary constraints [cf. Eqs. (10),(12)] that are present on our classical theory. Finally, we would like to mention, in passing, that one can take into account the nilpotent version of the anti-BRST charge Q_{AB} in the discussion of the physicality criteria. However, the results will be same as what we have achieved in the case of our present discussions w.r.t. the nilpotent version of the BRST charge Q_B (modulo some signs and symbols).

References

- [1] M. B. Green, J. H. Schwarz, E. Witten, Superstring Theory (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987)
- [2] J. Polchinski, String Theory (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998)
- [3] D. Lust, S. Theisen, Lectures in String Theory (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989)

- [4] K. Becker, M. Becker, J.H. Schwarz, *String Theory and M-Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007)
- [5] D. Rickles, *A Brief History of String Theory From Dual Models to M-Theory* (Springer, Germany, 2014)
- [6] E. Witten, Supersymmetric quantum mechanics on the lattice: I. Loop formulation. *Nucl. Phys. B* 202, 253 (1982)
- [7] A. S. Schwarz, On quantum fluctuations of instantons. *Lett. Math. Phys.* 2, 217 (1978)
- [8] D. Birmingham, Matthias Blau, Mark Rakowski, George Thompson, Topological field theory. *Physics Reports* 209, 129 (1991)
- [9] R. P. Malik, New topological field theories in two dimensions. *J. Phys. A Math. Gen.* 34, 4167 (2001)
- [10] M. A. Vasiliev, Higher spin gauge theories in any dimension. *Comptes Rendus Physique* 5, 1101 (2004)
- [11] C. Sleight, M. Taronna, Higher-spin gauge theories and bulk locality. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 121, 171604 (2018)
- [12] Eric D'Hoker, D. H. Phong, *Lectures on Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory and Integrable Systems*, arXiv: 9912271 [hep-th]
- [13] Lars Brink, John H. Schwarz, J. Scherk, Supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories. *Nucl. Phys. B* 121, 77 (1977)
- [14] S. Krishna, R. Kumar, R. P. Malik, A massive field-theoretic model for Hodge theory. *Ann. Phys.* 414, 168087 (2020)
- [15] S. Gupta, R.P. Malik, A field-theoretic model for hodge theory. *Eur. Phys. J. C* 58, 517 (2008)
- [16] R. Kumar, S. Krishna, A. Shukla, R. P. Malik, Abelian p-Form ($p = 1, 2, 3$) Gauge theories as the field theoretic models for the Hodge theory. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* 29, 1450135 (2014)
- [17] E. Harikumar, R. P. Malik, M. Sivakumar, Hodge decomposition theorem for Abelian two-form gauge theory. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 33, 7149 (2000)
- [18] C. Becchi, A. Rouet, R. Stora, The Abelian Higgs-Kibble model: unitarity of the S-operator. *Phys. Lett. B* 52, 344 (1974)
- [19] C. Becchi, A. Rouet, R. Stora, Renormalization of the Abelian Higgs-Kibble model. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 42, 127 (1975)
- [20] C. Becchi, A. Rouet, R. Stora, Renormalization of gauge theories. *Ann. Phys. (N. Y.)* 98, 287 (1976)

- [21] I. V. Tyutin, Gauge invariance in field theory and statistical physics in operator formalism, in Lebedev Institute Preprint, Report Number: FIAN-39 (1975) (unpublished), arXiv:0812.0580 [hep-th]
- [22] T. Eguchi, P. B. Gilkey, A. Hanson, Gravitation, Gauge theories and differential geometry. Phys. Rep. 66, 213 (1980)
- [23] S. Mukhi, N. Mukunda, Introduction to Topology Differential Geometry and Group Theory for Physicists. (Wiley Eastern Private Limited, New Delhi, 1990)
- [24] M. Goeckeler, T. Schucker, Differential Geometry Gauge Theories and Gravity. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987)
- [25] J. W. van Holten, The BRST complex and the cohomology of compact lie algebras. Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 2863 (1990)
- [26] K. Nishijima, The Casimir operator in the representations of BRS algebra. Prog. Theor. Phys. 80, 897 (1988)
- [27] A. K. Rao, R. P. Malik, Modified Proca theory in arbitrary and two dimensions. Euro. Phys. Lett. 135, 21001 (2021)
- [28] A. K. Rao, R. P. Malik, Modified Stückelberg formalism: free massive Abelian 2-form theory in 4D. Universe 9, 191 (2023)
- [29] E. Harikumar, R. P. Malik, Modified massive Abelian p-form (p=1,2,3) gauge theories: existence of the pseudo-scalar field and its implications, arXiv:2402.11598 [hep-th]
- [30] P. J. Steinhardt, N. Turok, A cyclic model of the universe. Science 296, 1436 (2002)
- [31] Y. F. Cai, A. Marcian, D.-G. Wang, E. Wilson-Ewing, Bouncing cosmologies with dark matter and dark energy. Universe 3, 1 (2017)
- [32] K. Koyama, Ghost in self-accelerating universe. Class. Quantum Gravity 24, R231 (2007)
- [33] V.M. Zhuravlev, D.A. Kornilov, E.P. Savelova, The scalar fields with negative kinetic energy, dark matter and dark energy. Gen. Relat. Gravity 36, 1736 (2004)
- [34] Y. Aharonov, S. Popescu, D. Rohrlich, L. Vaidman, Measurements, errors, and negative kinetic energy. Phys. Rev. A 48, 4084 (1993)
- [35] L. Bonora, R.P. Malik, BRST, anti-BRST and gerbes. Phys. Lett. B 655, 75 (2007)
- [36] L. Bonora, R.P. Malik, BRST, anti-BRST and their geometry. J. Phys. A Math. Theor. 43, 375403 (2010)
- [37] P.A.M. Dirac, Lectures on Quantum Mechanics (Belfer Graduate School of Science). (Yeshiva University Press, New York, 1964)

- [38] K. Sundermeyer, Constraint Dynamics, Lecture Notes in Physics. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1982)
- [39] E.C.G. Sudarshan, N. Mukunda, Classical Dynamics: A Modern Perspective (Wiley, New York, 1972)
- [40] D.M. Gitman, I.V. Tyutin, Quantization of Fields with Constraints (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1990)
- [41] B. Chauhan, S. Kumar, A. Tripathi, R. P. Malik, Modified 2D Proca theory: revisited under BRST and (Anti-)chiral superfield formalisms. Adv. High Energy Phys. 2020, 3495168 (2020)
- [42] S. Weinberg, The Quantum Theory of Fields: Modern Applications, vol. 2 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996)
- [43] P. Mitra, R. Rajaraman, Gauge-invariant reformulation of theories with second-class constraints. Ann. Phys. 203, 157 (1990)
- [44] H. Ruegg, M. Ruiz-Altab, The Stueckelberg field. Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 19, 3265 (2004)
- [45] A. K. Rao, A. Tripathi, B. Chauhan, R. P. Malik, Noether theorem and nilpotency property of the (Anti-)BRST charges in the BRST formalism: a brief review. Universe 8, 566 (2022)
- [46] K. Nishijima, B.R.S. Invariance, Asymptotic Freedom and Color Confinement. Czechoslov. J. Phys. 46, 140 (1996)
- [47] M. Henneaux, C. Teitelboim, Quantization of Gauge Systems (Princeton University, New Jersey, 1992)
- [48] N. Nakanishi, I. Ojima, Covariant Operator Formalism of Gauge Theories and Quantum Gravity (World Scientific, Singapore, 1996)
- [49] B. P. Schmidt, Nobel Lecture: Accelerating expansion of the Universe through observations of distant supernovae. Rev. Mod. Phys. 84, 1151 (2012)
- [50] P. Astier, R. Pain, Observational evidence of the accelerated expansion of the Universe, arXiv: 1204.5493 [astro-ph.CO]
- [51] Y. Gong, A. Wang, Energy conditions and current acceleration of the Universe. Phys. Lett. B 652, 63 (2007)
- [52] G. Curci, R. Ferrari, Slavnov transformations and supersymmetry. Phys. Lett. B 63, 91 (1976)
- [53] R. P. Malik, *etal*, in preparation
- [54] T. Kugo, I. Ojima, Local covariant operator formalism of non-Abelian gauge theories and quark confinement problem. Prog. Theo. Phys. (Suppl) 66, 1 (1979)