

# Quantum Field Theory Problems

Ting-Kai Hsu

February 23, 2024

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>T P Symmetries</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Lippmann-Schwinger equation</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Meaning and Function of Potential Operator</b>	<b>2</b>

## 1 T P Symmetries

In S.Weinberg famous textbook about quantum field theory[3] section 2.6, he discusses parity $\mathcal{P}$  and time inversion $\mathcal{T}$ .<sup>1</sup>

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

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

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

---

<sup>1</sup>I 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

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

It seems Weinberg's reason of adding the positive infinitesimal parameter  $\epsilon$  is weird, and it is unclear and unintuitive for giving meaning to operator.

## 3 Meaning and Function of Potential Operator

### References

- [1] J. H. Christenson, J. W. Cronin, V. L. Fitch, and R. Turlay. Evidence for the  $2\pi$  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] Steven Weinberg. *RELATIVISTIC QUANTUM MECHANICS*, page 49–106. Cambridge University Press, 1995.