

Unitarity in higher-order Lorentz-invariance violating QED

Carlos M. Reyes*

*Departamento de Ciencias Básicas, Universidad del Bío Bío,
Casilla 447, Chillán, Chile*

The unitarity in Lorentz invariance violating QED consisting of standard fermions and higher-order photons of the Myers-Pospelov theory is studied. We find ghost states associated to the higher-order character of the theory which could render the S -matrix nonunitary. An explicit calculation to check perturbative unitarity in the process of electron-positron scattering is performed and it is found to be possible to preserve unitarity.

PACS numbers: 11.10.Lm, 11.15.-q, 11.30.Cp

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, higher-order operators have become the object of intense study in the search for possible effects of Lorentz-invariance violation. The consideration of Planck-mass-suppressed higher-order operators allows us to go beyond the limits of renormalizable operators, that is, operators with mass dimension of four or less [1, 2].

In general, higher-order operators lead to substantial changes of the theory. A very special modification occurs when the higher-order operators turn into higher-order time derivatives. In this case the theory involves additional degrees of freedom associated to ultra-high-energy modes. Unlike what happens with renormalizable operators and their corresponding high-energy modes, the ultra-high-energy modes are not reduced to the normal ones by setting the dimensionless parameters of the effective terms to zero. These higher-order operators are considered as an effective approach to describe an underlying—yet unknown—fundamental theory. It is expected that the effective approach deviates from the fundamental theory at energies of the order of the Planck-mass scale. However, far below this scale, the theory might be sensitive to these new effects.

Many extensions of the standard model have been proposed in order to include Lorentz invariance violation using higher-order operators. For example, they have been proposed for dimension five [3, 4] and recently for arbitrary dimensions for photons [5] and fermions [6]. They have been studied in loop quantum gravity [7], strings [8] cosmological bounds [9], synchrotron radiation [10], fine-tuning problems [11], radiative corrections [12], anisotropies [13], causality, and stability [14]. Recently, higher-order operators have received special attention in connection with the hierarchy problem in the standard model [15]. Here we are interested in dimension-five operators of the photon sector of the Myers and Pospelov theory [3]. In particular, we focus on the study of unitarity in the higher-order QED with standard fermions and

Myers and Pospelov photons.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In the second section we present the Myers and Pospelov electromagnetic theory and we study its polarization vectors. We obtain the dispersion relations in general backgrounds, giving special attention to those cases in which the theory is a higher time-derivative theory. In the third section we check perturbative unitarity in the electron-positron scattering at tree-level order. Finally, we give the conclusions.

II. THE PHOTON MYERS AND POSPELOV MODEL

The Maxwell-Myers-Pospelov Lagrangian density for photons is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{M.M.P} = -\frac{1}{4}F^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu} - \frac{\xi}{2M_P}n_\mu\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\sigma}A_\nu(n\cdot\partial)^2F_{\lambda\sigma}, \quad (1)$$

where n is a four-vector defining a preferred reference frame, M_P is the Planck mass, and ξ is a dimensionless parameter.

The equations of motion derived from the Lagrangian (1) are

$$\partial_\mu F^{\mu\nu} + g\epsilon^{\nu\alpha\lambda\sigma}n_\alpha(n\cdot\partial)^2F_{\lambda\sigma} = 4\pi j^\nu, \quad (2)$$

where we have introduced a source j^ν and defined $g = \xi/M_P$.

In terms of the physical fields

$$\vec{E} = -\frac{\partial\vec{A}}{\partial t} - \nabla A_0, \quad (3)$$

$$\vec{B} = \nabla \times \vec{A}, \quad (4)$$

we can rewrite Eq.(2) as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \cdot \vec{E} + 2g(n\cdot\partial)^2(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{B}) &= 4\pi\rho, \\ -\frac{\partial\vec{E}}{\partial t} + \nabla \times \vec{B} + 2g(n\cdot\partial)^2(n_0\vec{B} - (\vec{n} \times \vec{E})) &= 4\pi\vec{j}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

together with the usual identities

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \cdot \vec{B} &= 0, \\ \nabla \times \vec{E} + \frac{\partial\vec{B}}{\partial t} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

*Electronic mail: creyes@ubiobio.cl

It can be shown that the conserved energy-momentum tensor is given by

$$T^\alpha_\beta = -G^{\alpha\gamma}F_{\beta\gamma} - \delta^\alpha_\beta \mathcal{L} + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\beta A_\gamma - A_\gamma \partial_\beta)G^{\alpha\gamma}, \quad (7)$$

where

$$G^{\mu\nu} = F^{\mu\nu} + 2g\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}n_\alpha(n \cdot \partial)^2 A_\beta, \quad (8)$$

Now, making an analogy with electrodynamics in macroscopic media, we can define an effective vector displacement field \vec{D} and an effective pseudovector magnetic field \vec{H} [5],

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{D} &\equiv \vec{E} - 2g(n \cdot \partial)^2(\vec{n} \times \vec{A}), \\ \vec{H} &\equiv \vec{B} + 2g(n \cdot \partial)^2(n_0 \vec{A} - \vec{n}A_0), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

such that $D^i = G_{0i}$ and $-\epsilon^{ijk}H^k = G_{ij}$. In terms of these fields, the energy and momentum density are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= \frac{1}{2}(D \cdot E + B \cdot H) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial \vec{A}}{\partial t} \cdot \vec{D} - \vec{A} \cdot \frac{\partial \vec{D}}{\partial t}\right), \\ \vec{S} &= \vec{D} \times \vec{B} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\vec{A} \cdot \nabla \vec{D} - \nabla(\vec{A} \cdot \vec{D})\right), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\mathcal{H} = T^{00}$ and $S^i = T^{0i}$.

A. Polarization vectors and dispersion relations

In this subsection, we cast the Myers-Pospelov model in terms of a basis of four-vectors analogous to the left- and right-handed polarizations of usual electrodynamics. This will allow us to find the dispersion relation in an easier way and to simplify the analysis of unitarity in the next section.

Our first task is to take advantage of the similar Lagrangian structures of the Myers-Pospelov and Chern-Simons theories, recalling that they only differ by the inclusion of the operator $(n \cdot \partial)^2$. Hence, let us start with the tensor

$$e^{\mu\nu} = \eta^{\mu\nu} - \frac{(n \cdot k)}{D}(n^\mu k^\nu + n^\nu k^\mu) + \frac{k^2}{D}n^\mu n^\nu + \frac{n^2}{D}k^\mu k^\nu, \quad (11)$$

and the pseudotensor

$$\epsilon^{\mu\nu} = D^{-1/2}\epsilon^{\mu\alpha\rho\nu}n_\alpha k_\rho, \quad (12)$$

where $D(k, n) = (n \cdot k)^2 - n^2 k^2$, see Refs. [16, 17].

Both quantities $e^{\mu\nu}$ and $\epsilon^{\mu\nu}$ can be considered projectors onto the two-dimensional hyperplane orthogonal to k^μ and n^μ . Indeed, it can be verified that when the preferred four-vector is purely timelike, the tensor $e^{\mu\nu}$ reduces to the transverse delta $\delta_{ij}^T = \delta_{ij} - \frac{k_i k_j}{|k|^2}$. Also, it is straightforward to check that both tensors satisfy the

transverse relations $e^{\mu\nu}n_\nu = e^{\mu\nu}k_\nu = \epsilon^{\mu\nu}n_\nu = \epsilon^{\mu\nu}k_\nu = 0$.

Now, choosing a frame on the two-dimensional hyperplane, we can always select a real basis of four-vectors $e_\mu^{(a)}$ to be orthonormal

$$\eta^{\mu\nu}e_\mu^{(a)}e_\nu^{(b)} = -\delta^{ab}, \quad (13)$$

and to have the properties

$$e_{\mu\nu} = -\sum_{a=1,2} e_\mu^{(a)}e_\nu^{(a)}, \quad (14)$$

$$\epsilon^{\mu\nu} = e^{(1)\mu}e^{(2)\nu} - e^{(2)\mu}e^{(1)\nu}. \quad (15)$$

We can switch to a basis of complex polarization four-vectors defining

$$\varepsilon_\mu^\lambda = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_\mu^{(1)} + i\lambda e_\mu^{(2)}), \quad (16)$$

where $\lambda = \pm$. It can be checked that any four-vector J_μ can be decomposed in this basis as

$$J_\mu^+ = P_{\mu\nu}^+ J^\nu, \quad (17)$$

and

$$J_\mu^- = P_{\mu\nu}^- J^\nu, \quad (18)$$

where the orthogonal projectors $P_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ are defined by

$$P_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \frac{1}{2}(e_{\mu\nu} + i\lambda\epsilon_{\mu\nu}). \quad (19)$$

Some useful properties are

$$\epsilon^{\mu\nu}e_\nu^{(1)} = e^{(2)\mu}, \quad \epsilon^{\mu\nu}e_\nu^{(2)} = -e^{(1)\mu}, \quad (20)$$

$$\epsilon^{\mu\alpha}\epsilon^\nu_\alpha = e^{\mu\nu}, \quad \epsilon^{\nu\mu} = e^{\nu\alpha}\epsilon^\mu_\alpha, \quad (21)$$

$$P_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = -\varepsilon_\mu^\lambda \varepsilon_\nu^{*\lambda}. \quad (22)$$

Now, consider the gauge field expanded in terms of the new basis as

$$A_\mu(x) = \sum_\lambda \int d^3k \left(\tilde{A}^\lambda(k) \varepsilon_\mu^\lambda(k) e^{-ik \cdot x} + \tilde{A}^{*\lambda}(k) \varepsilon_\mu^{*\lambda}(k) e^{ik \cdot x} \right). \quad (23)$$

Replacing this in the equation of motion (2), we arrive at

$$\begin{pmatrix} (G^+)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (G^-)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A}^+ \\ \tilde{A}^- \end{pmatrix} = 4\pi \begin{pmatrix} j^+ \\ j^- \end{pmatrix}, \quad (24)$$

where $(G^\lambda)^{-1} = (k^2 + 2g\lambda(n \cdot k)^2 \sqrt{D})$. Solving the 2×2 determinant, the dispersion relation reads

$$G = (k^2)^2 - 4g^2(n \cdot k)^4((n \cdot k)^2 - n^2 k^2) = 0, \quad (25)$$

in agreement with the work in [14].

B. Minimal extensions

The Myers-Pospelov theory can be defined in certain backgrounds, where the modifications are perturbative connected to the usual theory. The new physics includes birefringence, anisotropies, and modified dispersion relations, which is proper in the Lorentz symmetry breakdown [18–20]. However, its degrees of freedom are not increased compared to the standard field theory. Moreover, we can always reobtain the usual theory by taking the appropriate low energy-limit. As we will see later, in more general backgrounds the theory allows us to produce additional degrees of freedom associated to ghost states whose frequency solutions diverge when taking the limit $g \rightarrow 0$.

There are two possible ways to define the theory minimally. The first one is to choose a purely timelike background $n = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ for which the positive solutions are found to be

$$\omega_T^\lambda = \frac{|\vec{k}|}{\sqrt{1 + 2g\lambda|\vec{k}|}}, \quad (26)$$

where λ labels the circular polarization vectors introduced earlier. It is clear that the solution ω_T^λ remains real only in the region defined by $|\vec{k}| < 1/(2g)$. For higher momenta the negative mode becomes complex, introducing instabilities in the theory. If one restricts to real solutions then the corresponding Feynman diagrams will depend on a natural cutoff having the possibility to introduce fine-tuning effects [21] and unitarity violation [22]. Some methods have been investigated in order to avoid the fine-tuning problem [11].

The second possibility is to consider a purely spacetime background. In this case the dispersion relations reads

$$\omega_S^\lambda = (k^2 + 2g^2(n \cdot k)^4 + \lambda(n \cdot k)^3(1 + g^2\vec{n}^4(\vec{n} \cdot \vec{k})^2)^{1/2}). \quad (27)$$

By simple inspection one can see that the solutions are always real. The spacelike case has been discussed in relation to anisotropies [13] and microcausality [14].

C. Higher-order sector

The variational formalism for higher-order time derivative theories was developed some time ago by Ostrogradski [23]. Since then, these theories have been studied in different contexts. In quantum field theory, higher-order time derivatives are attractive since they can improve the ultraviolet properties of the theory [24, 25]. Unfortunately, they also introduce negative norm states or ghosts which may destroy the probabilistic interpretation [26].

Lee and Wick studied an equivalent description to higher-order theories based on indefinite metrics in Hilbert space [22]. In many cases one can find explicitly the equivalence by performing a transformation on the

basic variables of the higher-order theory. The transformation takes the higher-order Lagrangian into a sum of two normal-order Lagrangians but with one having a minus sign in front. It was shown that, in effect, the ghosts that appear can lead to the loss of unitarity. However, by demanding ghost particles to be unstable and thus not be asymptotic states, they were able to show that it was possible to define a unitary S -matrix. Also, Cutkosky used a generalized cutting rule framework to prove that unitarity can be preserved in a general class of diagrams [27]. Both prescriptions, however, were shown to introduce noncausal effects.

To see how the ghosts appear in our model, let us write the propagator as

$$D_{\mu\nu} = \frac{d_{\mu\nu}}{(k^2)^2 - 4g^2(n \cdot k)^4((n \cdot k)^2 - n^2k^2)}, \quad (28)$$

in accordance with the pole structure previously found. Here $d_{\mu\nu}$ is some tensor, which for the moment we can ignore. Let us focus on the denominator,

$$\frac{1}{G} = \frac{1}{(k^2)^2 - 4g^2(n \cdot k)^4((n \cdot k)^2 - n^2k^2)}, \quad (29)$$

which can be rewritten in Euclidean space with $x_0 \rightarrow ix_{0E}$, as

$$\frac{1}{G_E} = \frac{1}{k_E^2} - \frac{4g^2(n_E^2)^3 \cos^4 \theta \sin^2 \theta}{1 + 4g^2k_E^2(n_E^2)^3 \cos^4 \theta \sin^2 \theta}, \quad (30)$$

where θ is the angle between k_E and n_E and the notation is $x_E = (x_{0E}, \vec{x})$.

Now the following is clear:

(i) There is an additional pole in the second term of the right-hand side of Eq. (30) given by the solution of $1 + 4g^2k_E^2(n_E^2)^3 \cos^4 \theta \sin^2 \theta = 0$, besides the usual one in the first term $k_E^2 = 0$.

(ii) This extra pole produces a negative residue contribution, which is interpreted as a negative norm state particle or ghost state [28].

Having identified the ghost contribution, let us analyze with more detail the higher-order sector. We focus on the lightlike case $n^2 = 0$, where the dispersion relation is simplified. Other cases imply solving sixth-order algebraic equations that may be tedious and do not contribute decisively to the discussion.

The dispersion relation in this case is

$$(G^\lambda)^{-1} = \omega^2 - \vec{k}^2 + 2g\lambda(n_0\omega - \vec{n} \cdot \vec{k})^3 = 0. \quad (31)$$

Note that given the form of the above equation we do not have positive and negative energy solutions as in the pure time and space cases. Instead from (31), we have the relation

$$-\omega_{[i]}^\lambda(-\vec{k}) = \omega_{[i]}^{-\lambda}(\vec{k}), \quad (32)$$

where the index runs over $i = 0, 1, 2$ and $[i]$ denotes any of the three solutions for each λ . Without loss of generality we can consider $n = (1, 0, 0, 1)$ in which case the exact solutions are

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega_0^\lambda &= -\frac{1-6g\lambda k_z}{6g\lambda} - \frac{-1+12g\lambda k_z}{3 \times 2^{2/3}g\lambda\Delta^\lambda} + \frac{\Delta^\lambda}{6 \times 2^{1/3}g\lambda}, \\
\omega_1^\lambda &= -\frac{1-6g\lambda k_z}{6g\lambda} + \frac{(1+i\sqrt{3})(-1+12g\lambda k_z)}{6 \times 2^{2/3}g\lambda\Delta^\lambda} - \frac{(1-i\sqrt{3})\Delta^\lambda}{12 \times 2^{1/3}g\lambda}, \\
\omega_2^\lambda &= -\frac{1-6g\lambda k_z}{6g\lambda} + \frac{(1-i\sqrt{3})(-1+12g\lambda k_z)}{6 \times 2^{2/3}g\lambda\Delta^\lambda} - \frac{(1+i\sqrt{3})\Delta^\lambda}{12 \times 2^{1/3}g\lambda},
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where

$$\Delta^\lambda = \left(-2 + 108g^2\vec{k}^2 + 36g\lambda k_z - 108g^2k_z^2 + \sqrt{(-2 + 108g^2\vec{k}^2 + 36g\lambda k_z - 108g^2k_z^2)^2 + 4(-1 + 12g\lambda k_z)^3} \right)^{1/3}. \tag{34}$$

Under the transformation (32) we note that

$$\omega_0^+ \rightarrow \omega_0^-, \quad \omega_1^+ \rightarrow \omega_2^-, \quad \omega_2^+ \rightarrow \omega_1^-. \tag{35}$$

The approximations for small g are

$$\omega_0^\lambda \approx -\frac{1}{2g\lambda} + 3k_z + 2g\lambda(\vec{k}^2 + 3k_z^2), \tag{36}$$

$$\omega_1^\lambda \approx |\vec{k}| - \frac{g\lambda(|\vec{k}| - k_z)^3}{|\vec{k}|}, \tag{37}$$

$$\omega_2^\lambda \approx -|\vec{k}| - \frac{g\lambda(|\vec{k}| + k_z)^3}{|\vec{k}|}. \tag{38}$$

We see that the first solution or the ghost mode goes to infinity in the limit $g \rightarrow 0$, while the other two behave as perturbative corrections in the same limit.

III. PERTURBATIVE UNITARITY

In this section we study the unitarity in the QED theory consisting of higher-order photons of Myers-Pospelov minimally coupled to standard fermions. We verify perturbative unitarity checking the optical theorem in the process of electron-positron scattering at tree-level order.

A. The optical theorem

The mathematical statement of conservation of the total probability, for an arbitrary final state to arise from some initial state in a scattering process, gives the unitarity property of the S matrix

$$S^\dagger S = 1. \tag{39}$$

The optical theorem relates the imaginary part of the forward scattering amplitude to the total cross section and follows from this conservation of probability. To see how the optical theorem appears, let us consider the S -matrix in the form,

$$S = 1 + iT. \tag{40}$$

Substitution in Eq. (39) implies the equation

$$-i(T - T^\dagger) = T^\dagger T. \tag{41}$$

Taking the matrix elements between initial $|i\rangle$ and final $\langle f|$ states, we have

$$\langle f|T|i\rangle - \langle f|T^\dagger|i\rangle = i\langle f|T^\dagger T|i\rangle. \tag{42}$$

Now, inserting a complete set of intermediate states $\langle m|$, we rewrite the above equation as

$$\langle f|T|i\rangle - \langle f|T^\dagger|i\rangle = i \sum_m \int d\Pi_m \langle f|T^\dagger|m\rangle \langle m|T|i\rangle. \tag{43}$$

By defining

$$\langle f|T|i\rangle = \mathcal{M}_{fi}(2\pi)^4 \delta^4(P_f - P_i), \tag{44}$$

$$\langle f|T^\dagger|i\rangle = \mathcal{M}_{if}^*(2\pi)^4 \delta^4(P_f - P_i), \tag{45}$$

we write

$$\mathcal{M}_{fi} - \mathcal{M}_{if}^* = i \sum_m \int d\Pi_m \mathcal{M}_{fm} \mathcal{M}_{im}^*, \tag{46}$$

and in the special case of forward scattering $f = i$, we arrive at the unitarity condition

$$2 \text{Im} \mathcal{M}_{ii} = \sum_m \int d\Pi_m |\mathcal{M}_{im}|^2, \tag{47}$$

where the sum runs over all intermediate states that are allowed by the conservation of total energy and momentum. Any violation of unitarity due to Lee-Wick ghost fields is expected to show up as a contradiction of this unitarity condition constraint equation (47). The generalization of the optical theorem for Feynman diagrams has been proven by Cutkosky using a set of cutting rules [29].

B. The modified QED

Let us consider the QED Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} &= \bar{\psi}(i\not{\partial} - m)\psi - \frac{1}{4}F^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu} \\
&\quad - \frac{g}{2}n_\mu \epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\sigma} A_\nu (n \cdot \partial)^2 F_{\lambda\sigma} + \mathcal{L}_{int},
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$




FIG. 1: Direct and exchange graphs contributing to the scattering amplitude $\mathcal{M}(e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-)$.

where the interaction term \mathcal{L}_{int} in principle, can receive contributions from the dimension-five operators. These additional terms proportional to $(n \cdot A)^2$ coming from the minimal substitution can introduce additional vertices that may have to be included in the analysis. In the transverse gauge, however, we have simply

$$\mathcal{L}_{int} = -e\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu A_\mu\psi. \quad (49)$$

We will consider the tree-order amplitude of the Bhabha scattering $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-$ shown in Fig. 1. Let us start with the left-hand side of the unitarity condition (47). The amplitudes that contribute to the S matrix are the direct graph

$$\mathcal{M}^{\text{dir}} = (-ie)^2 \int d^4k \delta^4(p_1 - p'_1 - k) \hat{U}^\mu U^\nu G_{\mu\nu}(k), \quad (50)$$

and the exchange graph

$$\mathcal{M}^{\text{ex}} = (-ie)^2 \int d^4k \delta^4(p_1 + p_2 - k) \hat{V}^\mu V^\nu G_{\mu\nu}(k), \quad (51)$$

where $\hat{U}^\mu = N_{p_2} N_{p'_2} \bar{v}(p_2) \gamma^\mu v(p'_2)$, $U^\nu = N_{p'_1} N_{p_1} \bar{u}(p'_1) \gamma^\nu u(p_1)$ and $\hat{V}^\mu = N_{p'_1} N_{p'_2} \bar{u}(p'_1) \gamma^\mu v(p'_2)$, $V^\nu = N_{p_2} N_{p_1} \bar{v}(p_2) \gamma^\nu u(p_1)$, and where $N_p = \sqrt{\frac{m}{E_p}}$ are the usual fermionic normalization constants.

It is not difficult to see that the photon propagator is $G_{\mu\nu}(k) = -\sum_\lambda P_{\mu\nu}^\lambda G^\lambda$, where the projector is given in (19). To simplify we will consider the lightlike case where we have a ghost state with frequencies ω_0^\pm and two photons with frequencies $\omega_{1,2}^\lambda$ given in (33). The propagator in the lightlike case is

$$G_{\mu\nu}(k) = -\sum_\lambda \frac{P_{\mu\nu}^\lambda(k)}{k^2 + 2g\lambda(n \cdot k)^3 + i\epsilon}, \quad (52)$$

where and we have included the $i\epsilon$ prescription.

We are interested in the imaginary part of the forward-scattering amplitude; therefore, let us set $p'_1 \rightarrow p_1$ and $p'_2 \rightarrow p_2$. Moreover, we can see that the direct process does not contribute since the virtual photon can never be on shell for nonzero external momenta, hence $\text{Im}[\mathcal{M}^{\text{dir}}] =$

0. Let us find the contribution of the exchange process and substitute the propagator (52) in (51),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^{\text{ex}} &= e^2 \int \frac{dk^0}{(2\pi)} \int \frac{d^3\vec{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \delta^4(p_1 + p_2 - k) V^\mu V^{*\nu} \\ &\times \sum_\lambda \frac{P_{\mu\nu}^\lambda(k)}{k^2 + 2g\lambda(n \cdot k)^3 + i\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Since only the poles can contribute to the imaginary part, it is convenient to rewrite the propagator as

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{k^2 + 2g\lambda(n \cdot k)^3 + i\epsilon} \\ &= \frac{k^2 + 2g\lambda(n \cdot k)^3}{(k^2 + 2g\lambda(n \cdot k)^3)^2 + \epsilon^2} - \frac{i\pi\delta(k_0 - \omega_1^\lambda)}{2g\lambda(k_0 - \omega_0^\lambda)(k_0 - \omega_2^\lambda)}, \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where we have used the identity $\pi\delta(x) = \frac{\epsilon}{x^2 + \epsilon^2}$, $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$.

Because of energy conservation encoded in $\delta^4(p_1 + p_2 - k)$, we have that only the positive poles of the virtual photon have a chance to contribute. We can discard the ghost contribution since its energy $|\omega_0^\lambda| \sim 1/2g$ lies beyond the region of validity of the effective theory. That is, the external fermions will always fulfill the condition $p_{01} + p_{02} < |\omega_0^\lambda|$.

Considering (54), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\text{Im}[\mathcal{M}^{\text{ex}}] &= -e^2 \int dk^0 \int \frac{d^3\vec{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \delta^4(p_1 + p_2 - k) V^\mu V^{*\nu} \\ &\times \sum_\lambda \frac{P_{\mu\nu}^\lambda \delta(k_0 - \omega_1^\lambda)}{2g\lambda(k_0 - \omega_0^\lambda)(k_0 - \omega_2^\lambda)}, \\ &= -e^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \delta^4(p_1 + p_2 - k) V^\mu V^{*\nu} \\ &\times \sum_\lambda \frac{P_{\mu\nu}^\lambda}{2g\lambda(\omega_1^\lambda - \omega_0^\lambda)(\omega_1^\lambda - \omega_2^\lambda)}, \\ &= e^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \delta^4(p_1 + p_2 - k) V^\mu V^{*\nu} \\ &\times \sum_\lambda \frac{\varepsilon_\mu^\lambda \varepsilon_\nu^{*\lambda}}{2g\lambda(\omega_1^\lambda - \omega_0^\lambda)(\omega_1^\lambda - \omega_2^\lambda)}, \\ &= \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \delta^2(p_1 + p_2 - k) \sum_\lambda |\mathcal{M}_\lambda|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$




FIG. 2: Physical graph contributing to $\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}(e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma)$.

where we have used the notation $\mathcal{M}_\lambda = (-ie)N_{k,\lambda}V^\mu\varepsilon_\mu^\lambda$ for the physical process $\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}(e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma)$ shown in Fig. 2, and again we have introduced the normalization constant $N_{k,\lambda} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2g\lambda(\omega_1^\lambda - \omega_0^\lambda)(\omega_1^\lambda - \omega_2^\lambda)}}$. The constant $N_{k,\lambda}$ can be understood in the following way: in the field expansion for usual photons, the normalization constant $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega_k}}$ comes from the delta $\delta^4(k^2)$ in four-momenta representation. In our case the normalization constant is exactly the one coming from $\delta^4(k^2 + 2g\lambda(n \cdot k)^3)$, and it can be verified that it has the correct limit when $g \rightarrow 0$, that is to say $N_{k,\lambda} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega_k}}$. Finally, we have

$$2\text{Im}[\mathcal{M}] = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \delta^2(p_1 + p_2 - k) |\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}|^2, \quad (56)$$

and therefore the unitarity condition is satisfied in this scattering process.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we have studied whether perturbative unitarity in a modified Lorentz-invariance violating QED theory with ghost states associated to higher-order time derivatives can be preserved. For this, we have focused on

higher-order photons of the Myers and Pospelov model minimally coupled to standard fermions.

To summarize, we have identified two realizations of Lorentz symmetry breakdown in the Myers-Pospelov model where the dimension-five operators lead to minimal modifications. These occur when the breakdown is produced with a preferred four-vector in the timelike and spacelike directions. For any other form of Lorentz invariance violation, these dimension-five operators turn into higher-order time derivatives leading to ghost states that may produce the loss of unitarity of the S matrix, thus undermining the probability interpretation of the theory. With an explicit calculation we have verified that the unitarity condition in the process of electron-positron scattering at tree-level order is satisfied. We have introduced a simplification by restricting only to physical degrees of freedom in the QED theory. In this way we have bypassed the possible contribution of the usual ghost and longitudinal modes of standard electrodynamics. The only ghosts we had to deal with were the ghosts coming from the higher-order time derivatives of the theory.

The establishment of unitarity in our modified QED to order e^2 will require us to analyze more diagrams [30]. Some of them contain loops where the ghosts can appear off-shell, thus, introducing an extra difficulty. Checking the unitarity condition to these orders will give us robust support in order to make physical predictions in the theory.

Acknowledgments

I want to thank Markos Maniatis and Luis Urrutia for reading the manuscript and for valuable comments on this work. This work was partially supported by the Dirección de Investigación de la Universidad del Bío-Bío (DIUBB) Grant No. 123809 3/R.

-
- [1] D. Colladay and V. A. Kostelecky, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 6760 (1997); D. Colladay and V. A. Kostelecky, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 116002 (1998).
 - [2] V. A. Kostelecky and N. Russell, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 11 (2011).
 - [3] R. C. Myers and M. Pospelov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** (2003) 211601.
 - [4] P. A. Bolokhov and M. Pospelov, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 025022 (2008).
 - [5] V. A. Kostelecky and M. Mewes, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 015020 (2009).
 - [6] V. A. Kostelecky and M. Mewes, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 096005 (2012).
 - [7] R. Gambini and J. Pullin, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 124021 (1999); J. Alfaro, H. A. Morales-Tecotl and L. F. Urrutia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2318 (2000); H. Sahlmann and T. Thiemann, Class. Quant. Grav. **23**, 909 (2006).
 - [8] N. Moeller and B. Zwiebach, JHEP **0210**, 034 (2002).
 - [9] L. Maccione, S. Liberati, A. Celotti and J. G. Kirk, JCAP **0710**, (2007) 013; L. Maccione and S. Liberati, JCAP **0808**, (2008) 027.
 - [10] R. Montemayor and L. F. Urrutia, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 045018 (2005); R. Montemayor and L. F. Urrutia, Phys. Lett. B **606** (2005) 86.
 - [11] C. M. Reyes, L. F. Urrutia, J. D. Vergara, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 125011 (2008); C. M. Reyes, L. F. Urrutia and J. D. Vergara, Phys. Lett. B **675**, 336 (2009).
 - [12] T. Mariz, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 045018 (2011); T. Mariz, J. R. Nascimento and A. Y. Petrov, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 125003 (2012); R. Casana, M. M. Ferreira, R. V. Maluf and F. E. P. d. Santos, arXiv:1302.2375 [hep-th].
 - [13] G. Gubitosi, G. Genovese, G. Amelino-Camelia and A. Melchiorri, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 024013 (2010).
 - [14] C. M. Reyes, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 125036 (2010).
 - [15] J. R. Espinosa, B. Grinstein, D. O'Connell, M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 085002 (2008); B. Grinstein,

- D. O'Connell, M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. **D77**, 025012 (2008).
- [16] S. M. Carroll, G. B. Field and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 1231 (1990); C. Adam and F. R. Klinkhamer, Nucl. Phys. B **607** (2001) 247.
- [17] A. A. Andrianov, P. Giacconi and R. Soldati, JHEP **0202**, 030 (2002); A. A. Andrianov, P. Giacconi and R. Soldati, JHEP **0202** (2002) 030; J. Alfaro, A. A. Andrianov, M. Cambiaso, P. Giacconi and R. Soldati, Phys. Lett. B **639**, 586 (2006).
- [18] V. A. Kostelevy and S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. D **39**, 683 (1989); V. A. Kostelevy and S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 1886 (1989).
- [19] V. A. Kostelevy and R. Potting, Nucl. Phys. B **359**, 545 (1991); V. A. Kostelevy and R. Potting, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 3923 (1995).
- [20] V. A. Kostelevy and R. Lehnert, Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001) 065008; R. Lehnert, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 085003 (2003); J. -P. Bocquet, D. Moricciani, V. Bellini, M. Beretta, L. Casano, A. D'Angelo, R. Di Salvo, A. Fantini *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 241601 (2010); B. Altschul, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 056012 (2011).
- [21] J. Collins, A. Perez, D. Sudarsky, L. Urrutia and H. Vucetich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 191301 (2004).
- [22] T. D. Lee and G. C. Wick, Nucl. Phys. B **9**, 209 (1969); T. D. Lee, G. C. Wick, Phys. Rev. **D2**, 1033-1048 (1970).
- [23] M. Ostrogradski, Mem. Acad. St. -Pétersbourg **VI**, 385 (1850).
- [24] B. Podolsky, Phys. Rev. **62**, 68 (1942); B. Podolsky and C. Kikuchi, Phys. Rev. **65**, 228 (1944).
- [25] I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas and D. M. Ghilencea, Nucl. Phys. B **767**, 29 (2007); D. Anselmi, Eur. Phys. J. C **65**, 523 (2010).
- [26] A. Pais and G. E. Uhlenbeck, Phys. Rev. **79**, 145 (1950).
- [27] R. E. Cutkosky, P. V. Landshoff, D. I. Olive, J. C. Polkinghorne, Nucl. Phys. **B12**, 281-300 (1969).
- [28] C. M. Bender and P. D. Mannheim, J. Phys. **41**, 304018 (2008); C. M. Bender and P. D. Mannheim, arXiv:0804.4190 [hep-th].
- [29] R. E. Cutkosky, J. Math. Phys. **1**, 429 (1960).
- [30] R. Jackiw and V. A. Kostelevy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 3572 (1999); M. Perez-Victoria, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2518 (1999); B. Altschul, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 101701 (2004).