

Quantum Field Theory Problems

Ting-Kai Hsu

February 23, 2024

Contents

1	T P Symmetries	1
2	Lippmann-Schwinger equation	2
3	Meaning and Function of Potential Operator V	2

1 T P Symmetries

In S.Weinberg famous textbook about quantum field theory[4] section 2.6, he discusses parity \mathcal{P} and time inversion \mathcal{T} .¹

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}^\mu_\nu &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathcal{T}^\mu_\nu &= \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\end{aligned}\tag{1.0.1}$$

The operators of \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{T} are believed to be

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P} &\equiv U(\mathcal{P}, 0) \\ \mathbf{T} &\equiv U(\mathcal{T}, 0)\end{aligned}\tag{1.0.2}$$

¹I use different notation with Weinberg.

He seems to define a new notation that corresponds to not only Lorentz transformation and translation but also parity and time inversion. The operators of Poincaré algebra would transform according to the following law,

$$\begin{aligned} PU(\Lambda, a)P^{-1} &= U(\mathcal{P}\Lambda\mathcal{P}^{-1}, \mathcal{P}a) \\ TU(\Lambda, a)T^{-1} &= U(\mathcal{T}\Lambda\mathcal{T}^{-1}, \mathcal{T}a) \end{aligned} \quad (1.0.3)$$

I'm confused about what he means,

These transformation rules incorporate most of what is meant when we say that P or T are 'conserved'.

Later, he points out that the above equations of P and T are merely approximation. These are provided by T. D. Lee, C. N. Yang and others works[2][1]. Before reading the references, I think that the problem arises from that equation (1.0.3) that physicists originally define is wrong, or merely an approximation. Still, I would like to know why and why it is regarded as approximation.

2 Lippmann-Schwinger equation

$$\Psi_{\alpha}^{+} = \Phi_{\alpha} + (E(|\mathbf{k}| - H_0 + i\epsilon))^{-1} V \Psi_{\alpha}^{+} \quad (2.0.1)$$

It seems Weinberg's reason[6] of adding the positive infinitesimal parameter ϵ is weird, and it is unclear and unintuitive for giving meaning to operator. Although the sentence of giving meaning to operator is unclear, it is also mentioned in Weinberg's another textbook for quantum field theory[5] that this is because of operator $(E_{\alpha} - H_0)$ isn't invertible, and this is because E_{α} is the eigenvalue of H_0 ; however, restricting the infinitesimal parameter to be positive is still confusing. Possible solution is to re-derive the Lippmann-Schwinger equation[3] in path integral formalism.

3 Meaning and Function of Potential Operator V

When we expand the second term of equation (2.0.1) with free-interaction state Φ_{β} , we get

$$\Psi_{\alpha}^{+} = \Phi_{\alpha} + \int d\beta \frac{(\Phi_{\beta}, V \Psi_{\alpha}^{+})}{(E(|\mathbf{k}|) - E_{\beta} + i\epsilon)} \Phi_{\beta} \quad (3.0.1)$$

and define the T matrix, which later will be seen in S matrix,

$$T_{\beta\alpha}^+ \equiv (\Phi_\beta, V\Psi_\alpha^+) \quad (3.0.2)$$

Now this is weird to me because it is unclear about the inner product between two different vectors from two different Hilbert spaces².

References

- [1] J. H. Christenson, J. W. Cronin, V. L. Fitch, and R. Turlay. Evidence for the 2π decay of the k_2^0 meson. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 13:138–140, Jul 1964.
- [2] T. D. Lee and C. N. Yang. Question of parity conservation in weak interactions. *Phys. Rev.*, 104:254–258, Oct 1956.
- [3] B. A. Lippmann and Julian Schwinger. Variational principles for scattering processes. i. *Phys. Rev.*, 79:469–480, Aug 1950.
- [4] Steven Weinberg. *RELATIVISTIC QUANTUM MECHANICS*, page 49–106. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [5] Steven Weinberg. *SCATTERING THEORY*, page 107–168. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [6] Steven Weinberg. *POTENTIAL SCATTERING*, page 247–281. Cambridge University Press, 2015.

²That is, one is one of the eigenvectors of free-interaction H_0 and the other is one of the eigenvectors of total Hamiltonian H .