Referee Report

"Scalar fields, impurities and supersymmetry"

arXiv:2607.09406

Summary of the paper

The manuscript develops a rigid $\mathcal{N} = (1,1)$ superspace description of N real scalar multiplets coupled to prescribed, spatially varying backgrounds represented by N real spurion multiplets. Starting from the superspace action in equation (1), the authors eliminate the matter auxiliary fields through equation (10). Requiring each static bosonic spurion background to be invariant under a common nonzero supersymmetry parameter gives $G_i = \eta\sigma_i'$ and the projector $\varepsilon^- = \eta\varepsilon^+$ in equations (16) and (17). Applying the same projector to the matter multiplets gives the coupled first-order system

$$\phi_i' = \eta(W_{\phi_i} + \sigma_l \mathcal{F}_{l\phi_i})$$

in equation (22). The static energy density in equation (30) is then written as a sum of squares plus the derivative of

$$U(\phi, \sigma) = W(\phi) + \sigma_l \mathcal{F}_l(\phi, \sigma) + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_l\sigma_l,$$

leading, for localized impurities, to the boundary expression in equation (36).

The second half of the manuscript illustrates this construction. In the one-field sector the authors derive conditions for an impurity to preserve a chosen impurity-free kink as a non-BPS solution of the second-order equation, including the two formal solutions (47) and (49). They then give several ϕ^4 examples, some numerical and some analytic. A factorized choice $\mathcal{F} = W\Gamma$ maps the first-order equation to the impurity-free equation after composition with a function $\xi(x)$. The same idea is extended to the BNRT model through $\zeta(x)$ and to a three-field model through $\tau(x)$. These examples exhibit non-monotone field profiles and locally negative values of the displayed energy density while retaining the same boundary contribution to the total energy.

There is useful material here. In particular, the requirement that all nontrivial spurions select the same sign η is important, the algebraic completion from equation (30) to equation (33) is correct, and the analytic reductions in the factorized examples are convenient. I also checked the derivations of equations (47) and (49), the BNRT composition in equations (81)–(83), and the three-field seed solution subject to $rs^2 = 1$; these calculations are internally consistent within their stated branches.

Recommendation

Major revision. The classical construction is potentially publishable, but the present version does not yet meet the standard expected for a high-energy theory journal. Most importantly, the asserted absolute BPS bound following equation (36) is not a consequence of the displayed completion for a fixed spurion background and admits a simple counterexample. The manuscript also needs a genuine residual-superalgebra derivation, a well-defined prescription for the local energy density, and a sharper account of novelty relative to the authors' Ref. [24] and the earlier impurity literature. The examples would be considerably more significant if the omitted BPS modulus and fluctuation problem were treated. These are substantive issues rather than matters of presentation, but they appear addressable without abandoning the basic framework.

Major comments

1. **The sign of the bound and the residual supersymmetry algebra must be corrected.**

   For a fixed half-BPS background, equation (33) establishes the one-sided inequality

   $$E \geq \eta\,[U(+\infty) - U(-\infty)].$$

   When the impurities vanish asymptotically this becomes $E \geq \eta\Delta W$. It does not by itself imply $E \geq |\Delta W|$. In the present construction η is fixed by the background relation $G_i = \eta\sigma_i'$ in equation (16). Changing η therefore changes the auxiliary spurion background that enters the component action; it is not merely a choice of the opposite topological orientation within one fixed theory.

   The statement after equation (36) that a compatible flow necessarily obeys $\eta\Delta W \geq 0$ is in fact false for the general class allowed by the paper. A counterexample already exists in the one-field specialization $\mathcal{F} = \phi$ discussed before equation (23). Take

   $$W(\phi) = \phi - \frac{1}{3}\phi^3, \qquad \eta = +1, \qquad \sigma(x) = -2\,\operatorname{sech}^2 x,$$

   with $G = \sigma'$, and consider $\phi(x) = -\tanh x$. Since

   $$W_\phi = \operatorname{sech}^2 x, \qquad W_\phi + \sigma = -\operatorname{sech}^2 x = \phi',$$

   this configuration satisfies equation (22) exactly and the impurity satisfies all stated localization conditions. Nevertheless,

   $$\Delta W = W(-1) - W(+1) = -\frac{4}{3},$$

   so the saturated value furnished by equations (33) and (36) is $E = -4/3$, not $|\Delta W| = 4/3$. This example exposes a real choice that the manuscript currently leaves unresolved: either the energy in an external spurion background is normalized so that such negative values are allowed and the correct statement is only the one-sided bound, or the admissible backgrounds/sectors must be restricted by an additional condition that enforces positivity.

   The authors should derive the conserved Noether supercharge of the frozen half-BPS background and compute its anticommutator, including all boundary terms. This would establish whether the relevant algebra contains $\eta\Delta U$, how the Hamiltonian is normalized in the presence of the external multiplet, and precisely which inequality follows from positivity. A brief appeal to the standard Witten–Olive argument is not sufficient because spatial translations and half of the original supersymmetry are explicitly broken by the prescribed background. The revised paper should also distinguish clearly between formal superspace covariance before the spurion is frozen and the actual symmetry of a specified component background.

2. **The local energy density, and hence the claims about negative-energy regions, require a definite stress-tensor prescription.**

   Equation (29) is not obtained pointwise by simply taking $\rho = -\mathcal{L}_{\text{off}}|_{\text{static}}$ in equation (28). The latter contains $\frac{1}{2}\phi_i\Box\phi_i$, so in a static configuration its contribution to $-\mathcal{L}$ is $-\frac{1}{2}\phi_i\phi_i''$. Replacing this by $+\frac{1}{2}(\phi_i')^2$ discards

   $$-\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dx}(\phi_i\phi_i').$$

   That is harmless for the integrated energy under the stated boundary conditions, but it changes the pointwise density. The manuscript subsequently retains other total derivatives and assigns physical importance to the resulting local profile. These choices must be made consistently.

There is a related ambiguity intrinsic to a nondynamical background. A background-only superspace term $H(\Sigma)$ does not alter the matter equation, while on a half-BPS static profile its bosonic contribution shifts the displayed density by a derivative proportional to $\eta\, dH(\sigma)/dx$. For a localized impurity it leaves the total energy unchanged but can move or create negative regions locally. More ordinary improvement terms lead to the same concern. Thus the shapes shown in Figs. 3, 6, 10, and 12 are properties of a chosen energy-density convention, not automatically invariant observables.

The authors should derive T_{00} from a specified first-derivative action, or by a metric/vielbein variation that consistently treats the external spurion, and state which improvement has been chosen. It would also be useful to separate matter energy from the work or energy assigned to the external source. The total boundary energy can remain an important invariant result, but claims about local negativity and internal energy structure must be qualified or replaced by quantities that do not depend on an arbitrary total derivative.

3. **The scope of the multifield generalization and the relation to the full equations of motion need to be stated more precisely.**

   The field-space vector in equation (22) is necessarily a gradient:

$$A_i(\phi, x) = W_{\phi_i} + \sigma_l \mathcal{F}_{l\phi_i} = \frac{\partial U}{\partial \phi_i}.$$

   Consequently it obeys the integrability condition $\partial A_i/\partial\phi_j = \partial A_j/\partial\phi_i$. Moreover, the action depends on the functions $\mathcal{F}_i$ through the contraction $\sigma_i\mathcal{F}_i$ (and derivatives of this same contraction), so their decomposition is redundant. The decision to introduce exactly as many spurions as matter fields is also not required by the algebra; in general one could have M backgrounds and N matter fields.

   These observations do not invalidate the construction, but they substantially delimit its generality and should be made explicit. The authors should formulate the M-spurion/N-matter case, or explain a physical reason for imposing $M = N$, and identify which multifield impurity forces can and cannot be represented. They should also show explicitly, for general N and general $\mathcal{F}_i(\phi, \sigma)$, that a solution of equation (22) satisfies all coupled second-order matter equations. Only the one-field equation (39) is displayed. This implication should follow from a careful variation of the completed energy, but it is central enough to demonstrate rather than leave implicit.

   Finally, at least one genuinely nonfactorizable multifield example would be valuable. The choices in equations (74) and (85) multiply every component of the impurity-free gradient flow by the same scalar function of x. They therefore preserve the known target-space orbit and change only its parametrization. Such examples illustrate the notation, but they do not probe the more interesting coupled possibilities advertised by the general formalism.

4. **The novelty and physical significance relative to the cited literature are presently too modest.**

   The single-field spurion action, background projector, first-order equation, and exact square completion were already developed by the same authors in Ref. [24]. The bosonic specialization $\mathcal{F}_i = \Phi_i$ overlaps with the multifield impurity system in Ref. [23], while the coordinate-composition idea is explicitly described as related to Ref. [40]. The extension from one index to N indices is natural, but much of Section II is an index promotion of Ref. [24], and the two- and three-field examples in Section III use known BNRT and three-field trajectories with a common reparametrization.

   The revised manuscript should give a direct, technically specific comparison with Refs. [18], [19], [23], [24], and [40], separating results already known in the one-field spurion theory from the genuinely new statements. The kink-preserving construction leading to equations (47) and (49) appears to be one of the more distinctive parts and deserves a clearer explanation of what it adds to Ref. [19]. For publication at the level envisaged here, the paper would be stronger if it used the supersymmetric completion to obtain new physics that is not visible in the bosonic square alone–for example, the fermionic zero modes, pairing of fluctuation spectra, a nonfactorizable multifield orbit, or a dynamical consequence for the spectral-wall motivation emphasized in the Introduction.

5. **The factorized models contain a physical BPS modulus that has been omitted.**

   For equation (65), the general composed solution is not only $\phi(x) = \phi_0(\xi(x))$. It is

   $$\phi_a(x) = \phi_0(\xi(x) - a),$$

   with an integration constant a. Because the impurity fixes the origin of x, this constant cannot in general be removed by translating the spatial coordinate. For every finite a, ϕ_a has the same asymptotic vacua and the same boundary energy. The two- and three-field analogues are

   $$(\phi_a, \chi_a)(x) = (\phi_0, \chi_0)(\zeta(x) - a),$$

   and similarly for the three fields composed with $\tau(x) - a$. The derivative with respect to a is the natural generalized-translation zero mode. The constants set to zero below equations (69), (81), and (91) therefore label physically inequivalent solutions rather than disposable coordinate conventions.

   This moduli family is especially relevant to BPS impurity physics and to the spectral-wall motivation cited in the paper. The authors should restore it, determine its range and normalizability, compute the induced moduli-space metric, and relate the bosonic zero mode to the residual supersymmetry. For the numerical equations (57), (60), and (64), imposing $\phi(0) = 0$ likewise selects a particular solution. The paper should determine whether a continuous family with the same endpoints exists in those nonfactorized examples and, if so, how its profiles and spectra depend on the modulus. At a minimum, linear stability and the expected supersymmetric pairing should be discussed.

6. **The fractional-power one-field example is not a smooth field theory at the stated vacua, and the numerical evidence is not reproducible.**

   Equations (54) and (55) use

   $$\mathcal{F}_\phi = (1 - \phi^2)^{1/3}.$$

   Although a real cube-root branch can be chosen, $\mathcal{F}_{\phi\phi}$ diverges at $\phi = \pm 1$. This derivative appears explicitly in the component action (9), in the static equation (39), and in the kink-preserving condition (43). The hypergeometric representation in equation (54) also requires an explicit continuation once $|\phi| > 1$; the principal hypergeometric branch is not simply the real antiderivative there. Since the solutions approach $\phi = \pm 1$ and the paper is a supersymmetric field-theory construction rather than only a formal first-order ODE, regularity of the Yukawa couplings and of the fluctuation operator is essential.

   The authors should specify the real branch, analyze the asymptotic products involving $\sigma\mathcal{F}_{\phi\phi}$, and show that the quadratic bosonic and fermionic fluctuation operators are finite and self-adjoint on the proposed backgrounds. They should also verify that every numerical profile remains in the domain on which the chosen superfunction is defined. If a satisfactory fluctuation theory cannot be given, the cleanest solution would be to replace this example by a smooth coupling with the same qualitative behavior.

   For all numerical solutions of equations (57), (60), and (64), the revision should report the solver, domain, tolerances, asymptotic boundary values, and residuals in both the BPS and second-order equations. A numerical check that the integrated chosen density equals the claimed 4/3 for each displayed parameter value is particularly important. The figures currently encode many parameter values only through a color gradient; representative values or a color bar should be supplied.

Minor comments

1. Equations (60) and (64) have $\eta = -1$. Their solutions approach $+1$ as $x \to -\infty$ and -1 as $x \to +\infty$, as is also visible in Figs. 5 and 8. They are antikinks, not kinks, and the text and captions should be corrected.

2. The statement after equation (89) that there are six isolated minima for all $-1 < s < 1$ is false at $s = 0$. At that value, $\phi = 0$ and $r(\chi^2 + \psi^2) = 1$ form a continuous circle of vacua. The later analytic solution already requires $rs^2 = 1$, hence $s \neq 0$ and $r > 1$ within the stated range; these restrictions should be given explicitly.

3. At $r = 0$ in the three-field potential, the result is a ϕ^4 sector together with two free flat scalar directions, not literally a single-field model. This distinction matters in a supersymmetric theory because it changes the massless spectrum.

4. The seed solution in equations (90a)–(90c) solves the displayed impurity-free first-order equations with the $\eta = +1$ orientation (subject to $rs^2 = 1$). The discussion following equation (91) should state the corresponding sign; the $\eta = -1$ branch requires the reversed solution.

5. Engineering dimensions and any rescalings should be stated. In particular, the terms $\Sigma_i \mathcal{F}_i$ and Σ_i^2 in equation (1), and special choices such as $\mathcal{F}_i = \Phi_i$ or $\mathcal{F}_i = W\Gamma_i$, require dimensionful coefficients unless all variables have first been rescaled. This is easy to fix but important for interpreting the claimed general action.

6. It would be clearer to describe ψ_{i+} and ψ_{i-} (and likewise the spurion fermions) as the chiral components of a Majorana fermion. Calling each full fermion "Majorana–Weyl" in $1+1$ dimensions can obscure which reality and chirality conditions are being imposed.

7. The presentation would benefit from a compact table listing, for every example, the choices of η, σ_i, $\mathcal{F}_i$, endpoint vacua, total boundary energy, and whether the solution is analytic or numerical. This would also prevent the orientation errors noted above.

Conclusion

The manuscript contains a coherent classical square-completion framework and a useful collection of impurity-deformed profiles. The common supersymmetry projector and several of the analytic examples are convincing. However, the claimed absolute bound, the physical definition of local energy, and the status of the residual supersymmetry are central to the paper and must be resolved before its correctness can be established. A revision that derives the actual superalgebra, treats the BPS modulus and fluctuations, and sharpens the novelty beyond the earlier single-field construction could make the work a worthwhile contribution. In its present form, I recommend major revision.