Vacuum fluctuations: the source of the permittivity of the vacuum
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Vacuum fluctuations are particle-antiparticle pairs that appear spontaneously in the vacuum as predicted by relativistic quantum field theory and violating conservation of energy to the extent allowed by the Heisenberg uncertainty principle. VFs are created on-mass-shell and are not associated with a Green’s function or perturbation theory.

As will be shown, the VFs that primarily contribute to the permittivity of the vacuum are VFs consisting of charged lepton-antilepton pairs. To conserve angular momentum and minimize the violation of conservation of energy, lepton-antilepton VFs must appear in the vacuum as atoms. The term “dielectric” can then be used in the usual sense: a photon passing through the vacuum is slowed by its interactions with transient atoms, a concept familiar from discussions of a physical dielectric. Accordingly, using a technique similar to that employed for calculating the permittivity of a physical dielectric, an approximate formula for the permittivity of the vacuum can be calculated:

\[ \epsilon_0 \approx \frac{6\mu_0}{\pi} \left( \frac{8\epsilon^2}{\hbar} \right)^2 = 9.10 \times 10^{-12} \frac{C}{V_m}. \] (1)

The experimental value for \( \epsilon_0 \) is 2.8 % less than the calculated value. The calculation of \( \epsilon_0 \) is simplified – and the numerical accuracy is reduced – by including (a) only contributions to lowest order in what turns out to be an expansion in powers of the fine-structure constant \( \alpha \) and (b) only the interactions of photons with bound states of charged lepton-antilepton VFs.

The idea that VFs play a role in determining the permittivity of the vacuum is very old: in 1934 Furry and Oppenheimer wrote that VFs of charged particle-antiparticle pairs would affect the value of the dielectric constant of the vacuum; “Because of the polarizability of the nascent pairs, the dielectric constant of space into which no matter has been introduced differs from that of truly empty space.” In 1936 the idea of treating the vacuum as a medium with electric and magnetic polarizability was discussed by Weisskopf and Pauli.

For VFs to be responsible for the permittivity of the vacuum, it is crucial that they possess an effective spring constant or elasticity. The possibility that a lepton-antilepton pair can form an atomic bound state, which possess precisely this property, was discussed by Ruark. At almost the same time the formation of a lepton-antilepton bound state was elaborated on by Wheeler when he calculated the rate of decay of positronium, the spin-0, ground state of a bound electron and positron, into two photons. The experimental proof that such atoms exist was provided by Deutsch.

In 1957 Dicke wrote about the possibility that the vacuum could be considered as a dielectric medium. Recently the possibility that the properties of the quantum vacuum determine, in the vacuum, the speed of light and the permittivity have been explored by a number of authors.

At this point a word of caution is required: Vacuum bubbles are a class of perturbation effects in quantum field theories that are sometimes confused with VFs because their Feynman diagrams look like bubbles that originate from and terminate in the vacuum. Vacuum bubbles are not VFs and, in fact, do not make a contribution to physical processes.

This article is organized as follows: In §II properties of VFs are discussed, including the energy source for their creation and a proof of their existence. §III discusses how VFs act as harmonic oscillators. In §IV dielectric properties of the vacuum are calculated. Specifically, in §IVA the interaction Hamiltonian describing the interaction of photons with VFs is constructed, in §IVB a quantum calculation of the polarization of VFs is performed, and in §IVC the permittivity \( \epsilon_0 \) of the vacuum is calculated. The calculation is discussed in five subsections: In §IVCf the

\[ \epsilon_0 \approx \frac{6\mu_0}{\pi} \left( \frac{8\epsilon^2}{\hbar} \right)^2 = 9.10 \times 10^{-12} \frac{C}{V_m}. \]
II. VACUUM FLUCTUATIONS OF CHARGED LEPTON-ANTILEPTON PAIRS

The appearance of VFs is a stochastic process: as such, either VFs appear on mass shell or they don’t appear at all. To minimize the transient violation of conservation of energy allowed by the Heisenberg uncertainty principle and to conserve angular momentum, a charged lepton-antilepton VF that results from a fluctuation of the Dirac field will appear in the vacuum as a transient atom in its singlet, ground state, which has zero angular momentum. During the time while such a transient atom exists, it can interact with a photon. The fundamental interaction of a photon with a VF is the capture of the photon by the lepton-antilepton VF. A quantum electrodynamics calculation in Appendix A determines the stochastic decay rate \( \Gamma \) of this quasi-stationary atom. Using \( \Gamma \), the effect of this interaction on the permittivity of the vacuum can be calculated. Coherence between the initial and final state is maintained. As required by conservation of energy and momentum, when the photon-excited, quasi-stationary state annihilates, the energy and momentum that were originally borrowed from the vacuum are returned to the vacuum. An isolated, ordinary atom consisting of a charged lepton-antilepton pair is kinematically forbidden from capturing a photon, annihilating and then emitting a single photon; however, because the kinematics is different for the capture and release of a photon by a VF, the process is kinematically allowed for charged lepton-antilepton VFs.

Field theory provides a simple explanation for the source of the energy available for the creation of a VF and a proof that VFs must exist. The structure of an atom that is a VF does not play a significant role in the discussion of the energy required to produce the VF. (Of course, the structure of the VF, which results from the electromagnetic interaction of the charged lepton-antilepton pair, is important for the calculation of the decay rate of the atom that is a VF.) Thus an atom consisting of a charged lepton and antilepton in its ground state with zero angular momentum can, as far as its creation is concerned, be approximately represented by a free, neutral, spin-0, Klein-Gordon field \( \phi(x) \), as first suggested by Pauli and Weisskopf[6] and elaborated on by Wentzel[17]. Using a field to describe a particle with internal degrees of freedom is discussed in Ref.[3]; representing a particle by a quantum field is essential to understanding the mathematical structure of a VF of a quantum field. Indeed, it is the quanta of a free field that behave as free particles[3].

To write the Hamiltonian of the Klein-Gordon field in the form of a harmonic oscillator[2][17], the Hamiltonian \( H \) is written as a function of the angular wave number \( k = \mathbf{p}/\hbar \) and the angular frequency \( \omega_k = E/\hbar \) where \( \mathbf{p} \) and \( E \) are, respectively, the momentum and energy. Dividing \( k \)-space into cells with volume \( \Delta V_k \), the Hamiltonian can be written as \( H \)

\[
H = \sum_k \hbar \omega_k \left( a_k^\dagger a_k + \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad \omega_k = \sqrt{\frac{c^2 k^2 + M^2 c^4}{\hbar^2}}.
\]

In the above equation \( a_k^\dagger \) and \( a_k \) are, respectively, creation and annihilation operators, and the mass \( M \) is the sum of the mass of the lepton and antilepton minus the binding energy of the lepton-antilepton bound state. The above Hamiltonian has the same form as that of a harmonic oscillator. Since the annihilation operator acting on the vacuum is zero, \( a_k |0\rangle = 0 \), the expectation value of the Hamiltonian in the vacuum is

\[
(0|H|0) = \sum_k (0|\hbar \omega_k \left( a_k^\dagger a_k + \frac{1}{2} \right) |0\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \hbar \omega_k. \quad (3)
\]

The energy available for the creation of VFs is the energy in the vacuum, called the zero-point energy, and appears on the right-hand side of (3). If there is no cutoff in \( k \)-space, the sum over \( k \) is infinite because there is an infinite number of cells in \( k \)-space, implying that the energy in the vacuum is infinite. If there is a cutoff in \( k \)-space, the vacuum energy would be finite, but still large.

To show that vacuum fluctuations of charged lepton-antilepton pairs must exist, first note that the free field \( \phi(x) \) contains two terms, one proportional to a creation operator and the other proportional to an annihilation operator. The vacuum expectation value of each operator is zero, so the average value of a free field in the vacuum is zero,

\[
(0|\phi(x)|0) = 0. \quad (4)
\]

In contrast, the expectation value of the product of the free field at two different locations \( x \) and \( x' \) is[1][2],

\[
(0|\phi(x)\phi(x')|0) = \int_{k_\mu = \omega_k} \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^32\omega_k} e^{-ik(x-x')} . \quad (5)
\]

The above expression is nonzero because the product \( \phi(x)\phi(x') \) contains a term proportional to \( a_k a_k^\dagger \), that has a nonzero vacuum expectation value. Eq. (5) has the feature that \( (0|\phi^2(x)|0) \) is infinite. However, any
vacuum fluctuation must have a finite size as will become apparent in the next section where the number of vacuum fluctuations per unit volume is discussed. As a consequence, the symbol \((0|\phi(x)\phi(x')|0)\) has no physical meaning unless \(x\) and \(x'\) are averaged over the size associated with the vacuum fluctuation. This point is particularly emphasized by [2] and will result in a finite value for \((0|\phi^2(x)|0)\).

Accordingly, the vacuum expectation of the square of the field \(\phi(x)\) deviates from the square of the vacuum expectation value of the field \(\phi(x)\). This demonstrates that the free field \(\phi(x)\) in the vacuum is nonzero and means that field theory predicts that fluctuations of a free (noninteracting) field occur in the vacuum.

Because the vacuum fluctuations occur for noninteracting fields, the quanta associated with the fields are on mass shell: note from [3] that \(k_0 = \omega_k\) where \(\omega_k\) is defined in [2]. It then immediately follows that

\[ p^2 p_\mu = (\hbar \omega)^2 - (\hbar k)^2 = M^2 c^4. \]

As will be shown in §IVA, once charged lepton-antilepton VFs spontaneously appear, they can interact with physical particles. And if a VF does not interact, the charged pair will simply annihilate, returning the borrowed energy to the vacuum.

III. LEPTON-ANTILEPTON VACUUM FLUCTUATIONS AS HARMONIC OSCILLATORS

As discussed, an important feature of an electron-positron VF is that it appears in the vacuum as parapositronium, a singlet spin state with the lowest energy and zero angular momentum [12, 19, 20]. Here attention is restricted to parapositronium since the corresponding results for muon-anti-muon and tau-anti-tau VFs immediately follow by replacing the electron mass with the muon or tau mass, respectively.

In the center-of-mass rest frame, the relative position of the positron and electron are given by \(\vec{r} = \vec{r}_+ - \vec{r}_-\), where \(\vec{r}_+\) and \(\vec{r}_-\) are, respectively, the positions of the positron and electron. Note that \(\vec{r}\) points in the direction of the electric dipole moment of parapositronium. For the hydrogen atom \(\vec{r}\) usually points from the positive nucleus to the electron. However, the Schrödinger equation for parapositronium, which has a spherically symmetric wave function, is identical to the Schrödinger equation describing states of the hydrogen atom with spherically symmetric wave functions except that the reduced mass \(\mu\) is different: for hydrogen the reduced mass is approximately \(m_e\), where \(m_e\) is the mass of an electron. For parapositronium the reduced mass is \(m_e/2\). The nonrelativistic binding energy for parapositronium, \(E_{p-\nu_s}\), is obtained from the \(n = 1\) binding energy of hydrogen [21] just by changing the reduced mass:

\[ E_{p-\nu_s} = -\frac{(m_e/2)e^4}{2(4\pi\epsilon_0)^2\hbar^2} = -\frac{m_e c^2}{4 \hbar^2}. \]

From both the classical [4, 4] and quantum [22] calculations of the permittivity of physical matter consisting of atoms (or molecules), it follows that for the matter to possess permittivity, the atoms must be able to oscillate when interacting with an electric field (or photons). Taking the electric field to point in the \(x\)-direction, since the atom oscillates along the direction of the electric field, only the oscillatory properties of the atom in the \(x\)-direction are of significance in the interaction. Thus, when calculating the permittivity, the interaction of the electromagnetic field with the atom can be described by a one-dimensional potential.

Similarly to many other systems in physics that can be described by a one-dimensional potential \(U(x)\), the parapositronium atom can be expected to oscillate if the potential has a minimum at \(x_e\) and can be expanded in a Taylor series about that minimum:

\[ U(x) = U(x_e) + \frac{d^2U(x)}{dx^2} |x - x_e|^2 + \ldots \]

In the above formula \(x = x_+ - x_-\). At \(x_e\) there is a relative minimum of the potential so \(d^2U(x)/dx^2\) is zero at \(x_e\). Choosing the origin of the \(x\)-axis at the equilibrium position \(x_e\), so that \(x_e = 0\), [7a] can be rewritten as

\[ U(x) \cong U(x_e = 0) + \frac{1}{2}Kx^2. \]

Eq. [7b] is the equation for a one-dimensional harmonic oscillator potential with a spring constant \(K = d^2U(x)/dx^2|_{x=x_e}\). The constant term \(U(x_e = 0)\) just shifts all energy levels by the same amount.

As pointed out by Feynman [23], when interacting with an electric field, an atom in its ground state interacts with the electric field as if it were a harmonic oscillator with the first two energy levels separated by the binding energy of the atom. Since adjacent harmonic oscillator energy levels are separated by an energy \(\hbar \omega^0\), from the expression [3] for the binding energy \(E_{p-\nu_s}\) of parapositronium,

\[ \omega^0 = \frac{|E_{p-\nu_s}|}{\hbar} = \frac{m_e \alpha^2 c^2}{4 \hbar}. \]

The spring constant \(K\) of the harmonic oscillator corresponding to parapositronium is

\[ K = \mu (\omega^0)^2 = \frac{m_e}{2} \left( \frac{m_e \alpha^2 c^2}{4 \hbar} \right)^2. \]

Using the formula for the energy [21] of a harmonic oscillator in one dimension, \(E = \hbar \omega^0 (n + 1/2)\), \(n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots\), the energy eigenvalues \(E_n^0\) of parapositronium are

\[ E_n^0 = U(x_e = 0) + \hbar \omega^0 (n + 1/2). \]

The harmonic oscillator matrix element that appears in the calculation of the permittivity does not depend on
the constant term $U(x_e = 0)$ in the potential, so there is no need to determine a specific value for $U(x_e = 0)$ in \textcolor{red}{[10]}. In the center of mass rest frame of the parapositronium VF, the parapositronium VF is described by the harmonic oscillator Hamiltonian $H^0$,

$$
H^0 = \frac{1}{2} i \hbar \left( \frac{dx}{dt} \right)^2 + U(x_e = 0) + \frac{1}{2} \mu(\omega^0)^2 x^2 ,
$$

(11)

where $\omega^0$ is defined in \textcolor{red}{[8]}.

**IV. CALCULATION OF DIELECTRIC PROPERTIES OF THE VACUUM**

**A. Interaction Hamiltonian for photons with vacuum fluctuations**

Based on Feynman’s assertion\textcolor{red}{[23]} that the parapositronium atom can be described mathematically as the ground state of a harmonic oscillator, and that that ground state is characterized by a frequency $\omega^0$, it is possible to describe the interaction of a photon with a parapositronium atom. The calculation that follows provides a quantum-mechanical derivation of the significance of $\omega^0$ that was stated by Feynman in \textcolor{red}{[23]}.

The dipole moment (operator) $p_x$ of an atom in the presence an electromagnetic wave with its electric field in the $x$-direction is $p_x = e(x_+ - x_-) = ex$, where $e$ is the magnitude of the charge on an an electron. The Hamiltonian $H^1$ describing the interaction of the electric dipole of the atom with the electromagnetic wave is

$$
H^1 = -p \cdot E(t) = -exE_0 \cos \omega t .
$$

(12)

The two Hamiltonian equations for the Hamiltonian $H^0 + H^1$ can be combined to yield

$$
-Kx + eE_0 \cos \omega t = \mu \frac{d^2 x(t)}{dt^2} ,
$$

(13)

which is just the equation “force equals mass $\times$ acceleration”. The classical calculation of the permittivity of ordinary matter is based on \textcolor{red}{[19]} with one exception: for ordinary matter there is also a phenomenological term proportional to velocity that describes damping that results from radiation and collisions. For gases damping is often very small and can be neglected. While neglecting damping is an approximation for physical particles in a dielectric, it is exactly true for VFs. VFs can neither radiate energy nor lose energy in collisions with other quanta. If they did, after they vanished they would permanently leave behind energy, violating the principle of conservation of energy.

To describe the interaction of VFs with an electric field, one change has to be made to $H^1$. If an atom is continually interacting with photons from an electric field $E_0 \cos \omega t \hat{x}$, then the interaction $H^1$ of the atom with the field is given by \textcolor{red}{[12]}. As will be discussed in §IVC, even in an intense laser beam the number density of photons is much less than the number density of VFs. Thus the probability that at a given time a VF interacts with more than one photon is very small. That is, if a VF interacts with an electromagnetic wave, it almost always does so one photon at a time.

If a VF absorbs a photon at time $t_i$, the photon and associated electric field vanish at that instant. The electric field at the moment of interaction is $E(t_i) = E_0 \cos \omega t_i \equiv E_0$, implying that the VF interacts with the electric field $E_0 \hat{x}$. For VFs \textcolor{red}{[12]} becomes

$$
H^{1\text{VF}} = -exE_0 \cos \omega t_i \equiv -exE_0 .
$$

(14)

As a part of the capture process, a parapositronium atom will, to some extent, be excited by $E_0$ to resonate at its characteristic frequency $\omega^0$, as discussed in the following section.

**B. Quantum calculation of the polarization of vacuum fluctuations**

Because photons interact with atoms that are VFs somewhat similarly to the the way that they interact with ordinary atoms, it is possible to calculate the permittivity $\varepsilon_0$ of the vacuum using techniques similar to those employed for calculating the permittivity $\varepsilon$ of a physical dielectric. In the vacuum the interactions that primarily contribute to the value of $\varepsilon_0$ are photon capture by lepton-antilepton VFs bound into the lowest energy state that has zero angular momentum. The lepton-antilepton pair quickly annihilate, emitting a photon identical to the incident, captured photon.

The quantum calculation of polarization presented here is based on a discussion of dispersion theory in the text by Sokolov et al.\textcolor{red}{[22]}. Let $\psi_n^0(x,t)$ be solutions to the unperturbed Schrödinger equation,

$$
i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi_n^0(x,t)}{\partial t} = H^0 \psi_n^0(x,t) = E_n^0 \psi_n^0(x,t) ,
$$

(15)

where $E_n^0$ and $H^0$ are given in \textcolor{red}{[10]} and \textcolor{red}{[11]}, respectively. The “exact” wave function $\psi_n(x,t)$ satisfies the Schrödinger equation,

$$
i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi_n(x,t)}{\partial t} = (H^0 + H^{1\text{VF}}) \psi_n(x,t) .
$$

(16)

Perturbation theory is now used to calculate $\psi_n(x,t)$ to first order in the perturbation $H^{1\text{VF}}$. Writing the “exact” wave function $\psi_n(x,t)$ as

$$
\psi_n(x,t) = \psi_n^0(x,t) + \psi_n^1(x,t) ,
$$

(17)

and substituting \textcolor{red}{[17]} into \textcolor{red}{[16]},

$$
i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} [\psi_n^0(x,t) + \psi_n^1(x,t)] = (H^0 + H^{1\text{VF}})[\psi_n^0(x,t) + \psi_n^1(x,t)] ,
$$

(18)
The zeroth-order equation in the perturbation is \(15\), and the first-order equation is

\[ i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi_n^1(x,t)}{\partial t} = H_0\psi_n^1(x,t) + H^{1\nu}\psi_n^1(x,t). \]  

(19)

Eq. (19) is solved by seeking a solution of the form

\[ \psi_n^1(x,t) = \psi_n^1(x)e^{-iE_n^0t/\hbar}, \]  

(20)

and expressing \(\psi_n^1(x)\) in terms of the unperturbed eigenfunctions \(\psi_n^0(x)\),

\[ \psi_n^1(x) = \sum_{n'} c_{n'n'}\psi_{n'}^0(x). \]  

(21)

Substituting (21) into (19) and defining

\[ \omega_{n,n'}^0 \equiv \frac{1}{\hbar}(E_n^0 - E_{n'}^0), \]  

(22)

it follows that

\[ \hbar \sum_{n'} c_{n'n'}\psi_{n',n'}^0(x) = -e\hbar E_0 \psi_n^0(x). \]  

(23)

Multiplying (23) by \(\psi_{n'}^0(x)\), integrating over \(x\), and using the fact that the unperturbed wave functions \(\psi_{n'}^0(x)\) are orthonormal, the following formula for \(c_{n'}\) is obtained:

\[ c_{n'} = \frac{\hbar \omega_{n,n'}^0}{eE_0} < x >_{n',n} \]  

(24)

where

\[ < x >_{n',n} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \psi_{n'}^0(x) x \psi_n^0(x). \]  

(25)

Substituting (24) into (21)

\[ \psi_n^1(x) = \frac{eE_0}{\hbar} \sum_{n' \neq n} \frac{< x >_{n',n}}{\omega_{n',n}^0} \psi_{n'}^0(x). \]  

(26)

The “exact” wave function \(\psi_n(x,t)\) is obtained to first order in the perturbation \(H^{1\nu}\) from (17), (20), and (26),

\[ \psi_n(x,t) = e^{-iE_n^0t/\hbar}[\psi_n^0(x) + \frac{eE_0}{\hbar} \sum_{n' \neq n} \frac{< x >_{n',n}}{\omega_{n',n}^0} \psi_{n'}^0(x)]. \]  

(27)

The expectation value \(<p^{VF}>_{n,n}\) of the dipole moment in the state characterized by \(\psi_n(x,t)\) is

\[ <p^{VF}>_{n,n} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx <\psi_n^*(x,t) e\hbar \sum_{n' \neq n} \frac{< x >_{n',n}}{\omega_{n',n}^0} \psi_{n'}^0(x)>, \]  

(28)

Introducing the oscillator strength [24, 26],

\[ f_{n',n} = \frac{2\mu}{\hbar} \omega_{n',n}^0 < x >_{n',n}^2, \]  

(29)

\[ <p^{VF}>_{n,n} = \frac{\hbar e^2 E_0}{\omega_{n,n}^0} \sum_{n' \neq n} f_{n',n}. \]  

(30)

In his book *Introduction to Quantum Electrodynamics* [27], Sokolov used Bethe’s concept of the oscillator strength [25] to construct an important Theorem, initiated in his earlier book [28] that contained as a second half, *Introduction to the theory of Elementary Particles* by D. D. Ivanenko. This Theorem pointed out that, in the case of the harmonic oscillator, the selection rules for electric dipole transitions between the ground state and any excited state allow only for an excitation to the state \(n = 1\). There are two consequences of this assertion. The first is that electric dipole ionization of a ground state of a system represented by a harmonic oscillator can only be accomplished by representing the ionized state by the \(n = 1\) state of that oscillator. The second assertion then follows immediately: the resonant frequency \(\omega^0\) of the oscillator can be represented only by the binding energy of the system under consideration. This statement substantiates the earlier reference by Feynman [28]. Reference to Sokolov’s theorem can also be found in [29] and [22].

Since the atom is initially in its ground state \(\psi_{n=0}^0\), the only allowed transition is to the state \(\psi_{n=1}^0\). For this transition

\[ < x >_{1,0} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2\mu \omega^0}}. \]  

(31)

As a consequence \(\omega_{1,0} = \omega^0\) and \(f_{1,0} = 1\). The expectation value of the dipole moment (30) is then

\[ < p^{VF}>_{0,0} = \frac{(e^2/\mu) E_0}{(\omega^0)^2}. \]  

(32)

Describing an oscillator as a harmonic oscillator, the quantum formula for the expectation value of the electric dipole of a VF agrees with the classical formula for the electric dipole of an atom of ordinary matter with two exceptions that have already been discussed: (1) Since VFs can neither radiate energy nor loose energy in a collision, there is no damping term. (2) Because VFs essentially always only interact with a single photon, only the value of the electric field at the instant of interaction is relevant so there is no dependence on the angular frequency \(\omega\) of the incident photon.

To allow for the possibility that there is more than one type of atom made from particle-antiparticle VFs, an index \(j\) is added to the charge, \(e \rightarrow q_j\), the reduced mass, \(\mu \rightarrow \mu_j\), and resonant frequency \(\omega^0 \rightarrow \omega^j\).

\[ < p_{j}^{VF}>_{0,0} = \frac{(q_j^2/\mu_j) E_0}{(\omega^j)^2}. \]  

(33)
C. Calculation of the permittivity of the vacuum

1. General formula for the permittivity $\varepsilon_0$ of the vacuum

In a dielectric, the electric displacement $D(t)$ satisfies

$$D(t) = \varepsilon E(t) = \varepsilon_0 E(t) + P(t),$$

where

$$P(t) = \sum_j N_j p_j(t).$$

In these equations, $\varepsilon$ is the permittivity of the dielectric, $P(t)$ is the polarization density, and $N_j$ is the number of oscillators per unit volume of the $j$th variety that are available to interact.

In a uniform, classical electric field, the electric field is everywhere $E_0 \cos \omega t$. Since the polarization density is proportional to the electric field, the electric field cancels out of

$$\varepsilon E(t) = P^{VF}(t),$$

The polarization density $P(t)$ is responsible for the increase from $\varepsilon_0 E(t)$ to $\varepsilon E(t)$ because of photons interacting with oscillators in the dielectric and results entirely from polarization of the atoms, molecules or both in the dielectric. It then follows that in the vacuum $\varepsilon_0 E(t)$ must result entirely from the polarization density $P^{VF}(t)$ of atoms, molecules, or both that are VFs. Thus,

$$\varepsilon_0 E(t) = P^{VF}(t),$$

or

$$\varepsilon_0 = \frac{P^{VF}(t)}{E(t)}.$$

The measurement of the permittivity $\varepsilon_0$ of the vacuum occurs over a time interval $\Delta t$. For any time $t_i$ in the interval $\Delta t$ for which a photon-VF interaction occurs, the electric field at that instant is $E(t_i) = E_0 \cos \omega t_i \equiv E_0$. As shown in (34), the polarization density is proportional to $E_0$, implying that the instantaneous value of the electric field cancels out in (36).

From (36b), (35), and (34),

$$\varepsilon_0 = \sum_j N_j^{VF} \frac{p_j^{VF}(t_i)}{E_0},$$

$$= \sum_j N_j^{VF} \frac{p_j^{VF} > 0.0}{E_0},$$

$$= \sum_j N_j^{VF} \frac{(q_j^2 / \mu_j)}{\omega_j^2}.$$ (37)

The three types of VFs considered first are atomic, bound states of a charged lepton and antilepton, namely, parapositronium, muon-antimuon bound states, and tau-antitau bound states. Quark-antiquark states will be discussed later. Initially attention is restricted to parapositronium that is a VF.

2. Number density of charged lepton-antilepton and quark-antiquark vacuum fluctuations

For parapositronium that is a VF, the Heisenberg uncertainty principle is

$$\Delta E_{p-\text{Ps}} \Delta t_{p-\text{Ps}} \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}.$$ (38)

Denoting the mass of an electron (or positron) by $m_e$, $\Delta E_{p-\text{Ps}}$ is the energy $2m_e c^2$ for the production of parapositronium that is a VF (39). The minimum time $\Delta t$ is the average lifetime $\Delta t_{p-\text{Ps}}$ for the existence of parapositronium that is a VF. Then (38) yields

$$\Delta t_{p-\text{Ps}} = \frac{\hbar}{4m_e c^2}.$$ (39)

During the time $\Delta t_{p-\text{Ps}}$, a beam of light travels a distance $L_{p-\text{Ps}}$ given by

$$L_{p-\text{Ps}} = c \Delta t_{p-\text{Ps}} = \frac{\hbar}{4m_e c}.$$ (40)

Since a parapositronium VF appears from the vacuum at essentially a single location and since nothing can travel faster than the speed of light, while they exist the maximum distance between the electron and positron in parapositronium is $L_{p-\text{Ps}}$. Having already borrowed energy $2m_e c^2$ from a volume $L_{p-\text{Ps}}^3$, the vacuum is reasonable to assume that another parapositronium VF is unlikely to form in the same volume, suggesting the ansatz that the number of VF parapositronium atoms per unit volume is $1/L_{p-\text{Ps}}^3$, a result that can immediately be generalized to other charged lepton-antilepton VFs and quark-antiquark VFs.

The number density of lepton-antilepton VFs ranges from $1.12 \times 10^{39}/m^3$ for electron-positron VFs to $4.70 \times 10^{49}/m^3$ for tau-anti-tau VFs. In a 6,000 W, CO$_2$ cutting laser with a beam diameter of 0.32 mm, the number density of photons is on the order of $10^{22}$ photons/m$^3$. Even in such an intense laser beam, the number density of lepton-antilepton VFs is is much greater than the number density of photons. Thus if a lepton-antilepton VF interacts with a photon at all, it essentially always interacts with only one photon, justifying (14).

The number density of atoms or molecules of an ideal gas at STP is $2.68 \times 10^{25}/m^3$. It is possible for the number density of VFs to be many orders of magnitude greater that the number density of atoms or molecules of an ideal gas because a VF cannot exert a force. Consider first the electromagnetic force: if a VF has not already absorbed radiation, it cannot spontaneously emit radiation. If it did, the radiated photons would exist after the VF has disappeared back into the vacuum, permanently violating conservation of energy. If a VF has interacted with a photon, when the VF vanishes back into the vacuum, the VF must emit a photon identical to the incident photon in order to conserve energy, momentum, and angular momentum. Since a VF cannot “permanently” exchange
a photon with either a VF or a physical quantum, it cannot exert a force on either. Similar arguments verify that VFs cannot exert a force of any type.

In addition to absorbing and emitting photons, VFs can also interact through the annihilation of a particle and antiparticle. For example, a physical electron can annihilate with a positron VF. The electron that was part of the VF then becomes a physical electron with a location different from that of the original, physical electron, giving rise to Zitterbewegung.[1]

3. Contribution to $\epsilon_0$ from charged lepton-antilepton vacuum fluctuations

The progress of a photon traveling through the vacuum is slowed when it interacts with and has a polarizing effect on a VF consisting of a charged lepton and antilepton bound into an atom in its ground state. From Appendix A, after reinstating appropriate factors of $\hbar$ and $c$, the electromagnetic decay rate $\Gamma_{p-\text{Ps}}$ for a VF parapositronium atom after it has interacted with the incident photon to form a quasi-stationary state is

$$\Gamma_{p-\text{Ps}} = \frac{\alpha^2 m_e c^2}{\hbar}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (41)

The above rate is twice the decay rate of ordinary parapositronium into two photons[11][32].

The probability that an excited VF parapositronium atom has not decayed during a time $t$ is $e^{-\Gamma_{p-\text{Ps}} t}$, and the probability that it has decayed electromagnetically is $1 - e^{-\Gamma_{p-\text{Ps}} t}$. The quantity $N_{j_{\text{Vf}}}^{PM}$ in (37) for a parapositronium VF is the number of VF parapositronium atoms per unit volume with which a photon actually interacts. At equilibrium the average rate at which a parapositronium VF absorbs a photon equals the average rate for VF parapositronium to annihilate and emit a photon. As a consequence, the average probability that parapositronium absorbs a photon during a time $\Delta t_{p-\text{Ps}}$ is $1 - e^{-\Gamma_{p-\text{Ps}} \Delta t_{p-\text{Ps}}}$. For VF parapositronium the quantity $N_{j_{\text{Vf}}}^{PM}$, denoted by $N_{p-\text{Ps}}$, is the number density of VF parapositronium atoms multiplied by the probability that a VF parapositronium atom will absorb an incoming photon:

$$N_{p-\text{Ps}} \cong \frac{1}{L_{p-\text{Ps}}^3} \times (1 - e^{\Gamma_{p-\text{Ps}} \Delta t_{p-\text{Ps}}}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (42)

Since $\Gamma_{p-\text{Ps}} \Delta t_{p-\text{Ps}} \ll 1$, the term $1 - e^{\Gamma_{p-\text{Ps}} \Delta t_{p-\text{Ps}}}$ is very nearly equal to $\Gamma_{p-\text{Ps}} \Delta t_{p-\text{Ps}}$. Thus

$$N_{p-\text{Ps}} \cong \frac{1}{L_{p-\text{Ps}}^3} \times \Gamma_{p-\text{Ps}} \Delta t_{p-\text{Ps}} = \frac{\alpha^2 m_e c}{4 \hbar^2}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (43)

For a particular atom (or molecule), let $N$ be the number of atoms per unit volume, $\Gamma$ be the decay rate of a photon-excited atom into the atom in its ground state plus a photon, and $t$ be the average time that the atom itself exists. For ordinary matter $N_j$ is $N$, but for a vacuum fluctuation it is $N \Gamma t$ as given in (33). How does this difference arise? Making no assumptions about the magnitude of $\Gamma t$ and using the logic that led to (12), $N_j = N(1 - e^{-\Gamma t})$. If the atom is stable, $\Gamma t$ is infinite, and $N_j = N$ as expected. On the other hand, if $\Gamma t \ll 1$, as is the case for a parapositronium VF, $N_{j_{\text{Vf}}}^{PM} \cong N \Gamma t$ as indicated in (43).[33]

Substituting (43) and (43) into (37),

$$\epsilon_0 \cong \sum_j \frac{3 \alpha e^2}{\hbar c}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (44)

Note that the mass of the electron has cancelled from the expression for $\epsilon_0$, implying that bound muon-antimuon and tau-antitau VFs each contribute the same amount to the value of $\epsilon_0$ as parapositronium VFs. Including the contributions from the three types of charged, bound lepton-antilepton VFs yields

$$\epsilon_0 \cong 3 \frac{3 \alpha e^2}{\hbar c} + \text{any contribution from quark-antiquark VFs}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (45)

4. Contribution to $\epsilon_0$ from quark-antiquark vacuum fluctuations

The contribution to $\epsilon_0$ from quark-antiquark VFs is substantially reduced in comparison with the contribution from lepton-antilepton VFs. First consider the heavy quarks $Q = c, b, or t$ where it is appropriate to think in terms of static quark potentials for $Q\bar{Q}$ bound states. The least massive $c\bar{c}$ bound state $\eta_c(1S)$ has $J = 0$ and has positive charge conjugation parity.[34]

To obtain an order-of-magnitude estimate of the maximum contribution that an $\eta_c(1S)$ VF could make to $\epsilon_0$, the calculation is essentially the same as that of a parapositronium VF’s contribution to $\epsilon_0$ with two exceptions: (a) As previously noted, the decay rate of a photon-excited parapositronium VF into a photon is twice the decay rate of ordinary parapositronium into two photons. Thus the decay rate $\Gamma_{\eta_c(1S)}$ of a photon-excited $\eta_c(1S)$ VF into a photon is approximated by twice the experimental decay rate of $\eta_c(1S)$ into two photons: $\Gamma_{\eta_c(1S)} \sim 2 \times 7.69 \times 10^{15}/s = 1.54 \times 10^{19}/s$.[34]. (b) It is not obvious which energy should be used to calculate the angular frequency $\omega_0$ in (37), but the minimum possible energy $E_{\text{min}}$ yields a minimum possible value for $\omega_0$ and a maximum possible value for the contribution of an $\eta_c(1S)$ VF to $\epsilon_0$. $E_{\text{min}}$ is the difference between the mass $m_{\eta_c(1S)}$ of $\eta_c(1S)$ and the masses $m_c$ of the charm and anti-charm quarks when they are weakly bound: $E_{\text{min}} = m_{\eta_c(1S)} - 2m_c \sim 2.98 \text{ GeV} - 2 \times 1.27 \text{ GeV} = 0.44 \text{ GeV}$.[34]. The maximum contribution to $\epsilon_0$ from $\eta_c(1S)$ VFs is then calculated to be about $10^{-4}$ times smaller than the contribution from the three lepton-antilepton VFs.

The least massive $b\bar{b}$ bound state $\eta_b(1S)$ has $J = 0$ and has positive charge conjugation parity.[34]. Its mass
is known experimentally, but the decay rate into two photons is not\cite{34}. However, there are theoretical calculations of the decay rate that range from 0.22 keV to 0.45 keV\cite{23,38}. To determine the maximum possible contribution to $\epsilon_0$ from oscillations of $\eta_b(1S)$ VFs, the maximum value for the decay rate and the minimum value of energy associated with the state are used: $E_{\text{min}}$ is the difference between the mass $m_{\gamma_b(1S)}$ of $\eta_b(1S)$ and the masses $m_b$ of the bottom and anti-bottom quarks when they are weakly bound: $E_{\text{min}} = m_{\eta_b(1S)} - 2m_b \sim 9.40 \text{ GeV} - 2 \times 4.3 \text{ GeV} = 0.8 \text{ GeV}\cite{34}$. The maximum contribution to $\epsilon_0$ from oscillations of $\eta_b(1S)$ VFs is then calculated to be about $10^{-10}$ times smaller than the contribution from the three lepton-antilepton VFs.

For the heavy quarks $c$ and $b$, as the mass increased from $m_c$ to $m_b$, the minimum possible angular frequency increased, and the decay rate of the photon-excited Q\bar{Q} VF decreased. Both effects decrease the maximum possible contribution to $\epsilon_0$. Although there is no experimental information about $\eta_b(1S)\bar{\eta}_b(1S)$, from the above discussion the contribution of $\eta_b(1S)$ VFs to $\epsilon_0$ is expected to be even smaller than those from $\eta_b(1S)$ VFs.

For the light quarks $q = u, d, or s$, the $\pi^0, \eta$, and $\eta'$ are the least massive $J = 0$ combinations of $q\bar{q}$ bound states that decay into two photons. Here, however, the comparison with an oscillator is less appropriate; a Bethe-Saltpeter approach to $q\bar{q}$ bound states fails completely\cite{39}. As discussed in Ref.\cite{10}, a completely relativistic approach is required, an approach that shows no indication that a $q\bar{q}$ pair can be characterized by an oscillator potential energy. Moreover, since the strong interactions are primarily responsible for the binding of these relativistic states, the $q\bar{q}$ bound state VFs would have much higher natural frequencies than the electromagnetically bound lepton-antilepton bound state VFs that are much more weakly bound. Accordingly $q\bar{q}$ bound state VFs contribute little to $\epsilon_0$ and to lowest order need not be considered.

5. Calculation of $\epsilon_0$

Ignoring the small contributions to $\epsilon_0$ from quark-antiquark VFs, an approximate formula for $\epsilon_0$ is immediately obtained from \cite{15} using the defining formula $\alpha = e^2/(4\pi\epsilon_0\hbar c)$ to eliminate $\alpha$ and then using $c = 1/\sqrt{\mu_0\epsilon_0}$:

$$\epsilon_0 \cong \frac{6\mu_0}{\pi} \left(\frac{8e^2}{\hbar}\right)^2 = 9.10 \times 10^{-12} \frac{\text{C}}{\text{Vm}}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (46)

The experimental value for $\epsilon_0$ is $\epsilon_0 = 8.85 \times 10^{-12} \frac{\text{C}}{\text{Vm}}$, which is 2.8% less than the calculated value.

Only the lowest-order terms in $\alpha$ have been retained in calculating $\epsilon_0$. The binding energy of parapositronium was neglected when calculating $\Delta t_{p-\bar{p}s}$ in \cite{39}, and only the leading term was retained when calculating $\omega_j^0$. Moreover, only the leading term in the formula for $\Gamma_{p-\bar{p}s}$ is calculated in Appendix A.

Appendix A: Calculation of the decay rate of a photon-excited, parapositronium vacuum fluctuation

Here the decay rate is calculated for a photon-excited, VF of parapositronium. Single-photon decay is kinematically forbidden for a photon-excited, quasi-stationary state of ordinary parapositronium but is allowed for a photon-excited, quasi-stationary state of parapositronium that is a VF since its energy and momentum are transitory and thus do not enter into overall energy-momentum conservation. The formula for the decay rate immediately generalizes to yield decay rates for VFs of muon-antimuon and tau-antitau that are bound into atoms in their singlet, ground states.

Labeling the initial (incident) and final (emitted) photons, respectively, by $\gamma_i$ and $\gamma_f$, to lowest order the two Feynman diagrams that contribute to the process $\gamma_i \rightarrow \gamma_f$ are shown in Fig. 1. The diagrams $p-, p+, k_i$, and $k_f$ are, respectively, the four-momenta of the electron, positron, initial photon, and final photon.

As already mentioned, for ordinary positronium the

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{fig1.png}
\caption{(a) Photon $\gamma_i$ interacts with a positron that then annihilates with an electron, emitting photon $\gamma_f$. (b) Photon $\gamma_i$ interacts with an electron that then annihilates with a positron, emitting photon $\gamma_f$.}
\end{figure}

process is kinematically forbidden. In the center-of-mass rest frame of positronium, $p_- + p_+ = 0$. Therefore, in this frame,

$$p_- = (E_-, p_-) = \sqrt{m_e^2 + p_-^2}, \quad p_+ = (E_+, p_+) = \sqrt{m_e^2 + p_+^2}, \quad (A.1a)$$

$$p_- = (E_-, p_-) = \sqrt{m_e^2 + p_-^2}, \quad p_+ = (E_+, p_+) = \sqrt{m_e^2 + p_+^2} \tag{A.1b}$$

$$k_i = (\omega_i, k_i) = (|k_i|, k_i), \quad (A.1c)$$

$$k_f = (\omega_f, k_f) = (|k_f|, k_f), \quad (A.1d)$$

where $m_e$ is the mass of an electron. Conservation of energy and momentum requires $p_+ + p_- + k_i = k_f$. Squaring both sides of the above equation yields

$$E_+^2 + E_- \omega_i = 0. \quad (A.2)$$

Eq. (A.2) cannot be satisfied for ordinary positronium since both terms on the left-hand side are positive. However, after a photon excites positronium that is a VF, a photon can be emitted, but only when the positronium vanishes into the vacuum because only then does $E_- \rightarrow 0$, allowing (A.2) to be satisfied.

When performing an electrodynamics calculation, if a factor $\exp(\pm(ip \cdot x))$ is associated with a particle that is part of a WF when it appears in its initial state, a factor $\exp(\mp(ip \cdot x))$ is associated with a particle that is part of a WF when it vanishes into the vacuum. This just eliminates the contribution of the particle that is part of a WF to overall energy-momentum conservation. When progressing along an energy-momentum line in a Feynman diagram, the energy-momentum associated with a particle that is part of a WF is not further used after the particle vanishes. Since the parapositronium atom is a WF, it is on mass shell. That is, as is the case for physical parapositronium, the electron and positron are on mass shell and they are bound by 6.8 eV, the binding energy of parapositronium. Using the notation of Ref. 12, the S-matrix for the transition photon + positronium that is a WF → photon is 13

$$S_{ii} = \frac{\epsilon_i^2}{V^2} \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{E_+}} \left[ \frac{1}{E_- - \sqrt{2m_e \omega_i}} \right] \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m_r}} (2\pi)^4 \delta(k_i - k_f) \times$$

$$\left( -i \frac{\epsilon_i}{p_- + \epsilon_i - m_e} \right) \left( i \frac{\epsilon_f}{p_+ + \epsilon_f} \right) u(p_-, s_-). \quad (A.3)$$

In (A.3) the fermion wave functions are normalized to unit probability in a box of volume $V$. The equality $\gamma/(p \pm m_e) = (p + m_e)/(p^2 - m_e^2)$ is used to rewrite the above two propagators. From the identity $\{\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu\} = 2g^{\mu\nu}I$, the equation

$$\gamma \vec{p} = -\vec{p} + 2a \cdot b I \quad (A.4)$$

immediately follows where $a$ and $b$ are four-vectors and $I$ is the identity matrix. Using (A.4) $\gamma_i \gamma_+ = -\gamma_+ \gamma_i + 2p_+ \cdot e_i I$ and $\gamma_- \gamma_+ = -\gamma_+ \gamma_- + 2p_- \cdot e_i I$. Also $\bar{v}(p_+, s_+) \gamma_+ = -\bar{v}(p_+, s_+) m_e$ and $\bar{u}(p_-, s_-) = m_e u(p_, s_-)$, with the result that (A.3) can be rewritten as

$$S_{ii} = -i \frac{\epsilon_i^2}{V^2} \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{E_+}} \left[ \frac{1}{E_- - \sqrt{2m_e \omega_i}} \right] \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m_r}} (2\pi)^4 \delta(k_i - k_f) \times$$

$$\left( -i \frac{\epsilon_i}{p_- + \epsilon_i - m_e} \right) \left( i \frac{\epsilon_f}{p_+ + \epsilon_f} \right) u(p_-, s_-). \quad (A.5)$$

To obtain the decay rate to lowest order, in $S_{ii}$ the respective velocities $v_-$ and $v_+$ of the electron and positron can be neglected. Thus

$$E_- \rightarrow m_e, \quad E_+ \rightarrow m_e, \quad (A.6a)$$

$$p_\pm \rightarrow (m_e, 0). \quad (A.6b)$$

The respective polarization vectors $\epsilon_i$ and $\epsilon_f$ of the initial and final photons are chosen to be space-like: $\epsilon_i = (0, \epsilon_i), \quad \epsilon_f = (0, \epsilon_f)$ where

$$k_i \cdot \epsilon_i = -k_i \cdot \epsilon_i = 0, \quad (A.7a)$$

$$k_f \cdot \epsilon_f = -k_f \cdot \epsilon_f = 0. \quad (A.7b)$$

Using (A.6), (A.7), and $k_i \cdot k_f = 0$, utions

$$(p_\pm + k_i)^2 - m_e^2 = 2m_e \omega_i, \quad (A.8a)$$

$$\epsilon_i \cdot p_\pm = 0. \quad (A.8b)$$

With the aid of (A.3), (A.5) becomes

$$S_{ii} = -i \frac{\epsilon_i^2}{V^2} \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{E_+}} \left[ \frac{1}{E_- - \sqrt{2m_e \omega_i}} \right] \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m_r}} (2\pi)^4 \delta(k_i - k_f) \times$$

$$\left( -i \frac{\epsilon_i}{p_- + \epsilon_i - m_e} \right) \left( i \frac{\epsilon_f}{p_+ + \epsilon_f} \right) u(p_-, s_-). \quad (A.9)$$

Since $k_i = k_f$, it follows from (A.4) and (A.7) that $k_i$ anti-commutes with both $\gamma_i$ and $\gamma_f$, allowing (A.9) to be rewritten as

$$S_{ii} = -i \frac{\epsilon_i^2}{V^2} \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{E_+}} \left[ \frac{1}{E_- - \sqrt{2m_e \omega_i}} \right] \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m_r}} (2\pi)^4 \delta(k_i - k_f) \times$$

$$\left( -i \frac{\epsilon_i}{p_- + \epsilon_i - m_e} \right) \left( i \frac{\epsilon_f}{p_+ + \epsilon_f} \right) u(p_-, s_-). \quad (A.10)$$

Then,

$$|S_{ii}|^2 = \frac{\epsilon_i^4}{V^4} \frac{1}{2 \omega_f} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m_r}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m_e \omega_i}} (2\pi)^4 \delta(k_i - k_f) \times$$

$$\left( -i \frac{\epsilon_i}{p_- + \epsilon_i - m_e} \right) \left( i \frac{\epsilon_f}{p_+ + \epsilon_f} \right) \bar{u}(p_-, s_-) \gamma_i \gamma_f \bar{u}(p_+, s_+). \quad (A.11)$$

In (A.11) the interaction is assumed to occur in the time interval $-T/2 < t < T/2$. 
Summing over the electron and positron spins, which converts \(|S_{\|}\)^2 into a trace denoted by \(Tr\),

\[
\sum_{s_{\pm}} |S_{\|}\|^2 = \frac{e^4}{V^4} \frac{1}{2\omega_i} \frac{1}{2\omega_f} \frac{1}{16m_e^2\omega_i} VT \left(2\pi\right)^4 \delta^4(k_i - k_f) \times
\]

\[Tr[(\mathbf{p}_+ - m_e)(\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}_f)(\mathbf{k}_1(\mathbf{p}_+ + m_e)\mathbf{k}_1(\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}_f - \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}_f)]].
\]  

(A.12)

Using (A.4) to reverse the order of \(\mathbf{k}_1\) and \(\mathbf{p}_+\) and using \(\mathbf{k}_1 = k_i \cdot k_i I = 0\), the following term that appears in the second line above can be simplified:

\[
\mathbf{k}_1(\mathbf{p}_+ + m_e)\mathbf{k}_1 = 2m_e\omega_i \mathbf{k}_1.
\]  

(A.13)

As mentioned previously, \(\mathbf{k}_1\) anti-commutes with both \(\mathbf{e}_i\) and \(\mathbf{e}_f\), with the result that (A.12) becomes

\[
\sum_{s_{\pm}} |S_{\|}\|^2 = \frac{e^4}{V^4} \frac{1}{2\omega_i} \frac{1}{2\omega_f} \frac{1}{8m_e^2\omega_i} VT \left(2\pi\right)^4 \delta^4(k_i - k_f) \times
\]

\[Tr[(\mathbf{p}_+ - m_e)(\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}_f)(\mathbf{k}_1(\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}_f - \mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}_f)]].
\]  

(A.14)

Eq. (A.4) is used as necessary to reverse the order of \(\mathbf{e}_i\) and \(\mathbf{e}_f\) so as to obtain terms of the form \(\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}_f = \epsilon_i \cdot \epsilon_f I = -\epsilon_i \cdot \epsilon_f I = -I\) and \(\mathbf{e}_i \cdot \mathbf{e}_f = -I\). All nonzero traces in (A.14) are then either of the form \(Tr(\Delta \mathbf{b})\) or \(Tr(\Delta \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{d})\) that are easily simplified, yielding the result

\[
\sum_{s_{\pm}} |S_{\|}\|^2 = \frac{2}{m^2_+ V^4} \frac{1}{2\omega_i} \frac{1}{2\omega_f} \frac{1}{8m_e^2\omega_i} VT \left(2\pi\right)^4 \delta^4(k_i - k_f) \times
\]

\[\left[1 - (\epsilon_i \cdot \epsilon_f)^2\right].
\]  

(A.15)

Choosing the z-axis to point in the direction of \(\mathbf{k}_1\), the unit polarization vectors for the initial photon \(\epsilon_i^a\) and \(\epsilon_i^b\) are chosen in the x- and y-direction, respectively. Because the delta function in (A.17) imposes the condition \(k_f = k_i\), the unit polarization vectors for the final photon \(\epsilon_f^a\) and \(\epsilon_f^b\) can also be chosen in the x- and y-direction, respectively. The sum over polarizations in (A.10) is now easily performed:

\[
\sum_{\epsilon_i} \sum_{\epsilon_f} 1 = 4,
\]  

(A.18a)

\[
\sum_{\epsilon_i} \sum_{\epsilon_f} (\epsilon_i \cdot \epsilon_f)^2 =
\]

\[\epsilon_i^a \cdot \epsilon_f^a + (\epsilon_i^b \cdot \epsilon_f^b)^2 + (\epsilon_i^a \cdot \epsilon_f^b)^2 + (\epsilon_i^b \cdot \epsilon_f^a)^2 =
\]

\[(-1)^2 + 0 + 0 + (-1)^2 = 2.
\]  

(A.18b)

Using (A.1d) and the identity [21],

\[
\delta(\omega^2 - a^2) = \frac{1}{2a^2} [\delta(\omega - a) + \delta(\omega + a)], a > 0,
\]  

(A.19)

it is straightforward to show that

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d^3k_j}{2\omega_i} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d^4k_i}{2\omega_i} \delta(k_i^2) \theta(k_{i0}).
\]  

(A.20)

The theta function \(\theta(k_{i0}) = 0\) if \(k_{i0} < 0\) and \(\theta(k_{i0}) = 1\) if \(k_{i0} > 0\). With the aid of (A.20), the second line in (A.17) can be rewritten as

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d^3k_j}{2\omega_f} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d^3k_i}{2\omega_i} \delta(k_i^2) \theta(k_{i0}) =
\]

\[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d^3k_j}{2\omega_f} \delta(k_j^2) \theta(k_{j0}).
\]  

(A.21)

Factoring \(k_j^2 = k_{j0} - |k_j|^2\) in the above \(\delta\)-function, using (A.19), rewriting \(d^3k_j\) as \(d\Omega_j |k_j|^2 d|k_j|\), performing the angular integration over \(d\Omega_j\), which yields a factor of 4\(\pi\), and then integrating over \(|k_j|\),

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d^3k_j}{2\omega_f} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d^3k_i}{2\omega_i} \delta(k_i^2 - k_f^2) = \pi.
\]  

(A.22)

Substituting (A.18) and (A.22) into (A.17) yields the formula for the cross section for the annihilation into a photon of photon-excited positronium that is a VF,

\[
\sigma = \frac{2\pi a^2}{m_e^2} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{v}_+ - \mathbf{v}_-|}.
\]  

(A.23)

From the formula for the cross section, a formula for the decay rate is readily obtained. The logic is the same as that used to calculate the decay rate for para-positronium decaying into two photons[11, 32]: para-positronium, orthopositronium, and a photon have respective charge conjugation parities of +1, -1, and -1.
Thus photon-excited parapositronium has charge conjugation parity of -1 while photon-excited orthopositronium has charge conjugation parity of +1. Since electromagnetic interactions are invariant under charge conjugation, photon-excited parapositronium, but not photon-excited orthopositronium, can decay into a single photon.

In obtaining (A.23) the electron and positron spins were averaged over all four spins, resulting in the sum being divided by four. But the annihilating state is parapositronium, the singlet state. Orthopositronium, the triplet state, does not contribute. Since only one of the four spin states contributes to the cross section, the formula for the cross section should not have been divided by four, it should have been divided by the number one. Thus the formula for $\sigma$ in (A.23) should be multiplied by a factor of four to obtain the cross section, abbreviated $\sigma_{p-\bar{p}s}$, for the annihilation into a photon of photon-excited parapositronium that is a VF,

$$\sigma_{p-\bar{p}s} = \frac{8\pi\alpha^2}{m_e^2} \frac{1}{|v_+ - v_-|}. \quad (A.24)$$

For the annihilation of photon-excited parapositronium that is a VF into a photon, the electromagnetic decay rate $\Gamma_{p-\bar{p}s}$ is calculated using the mechanism for the quantum electrodynamic decay of V. Weisskopf, Kgl. Danske Videnskab. Selskabs Mat.-Fys. Medd. 10, 934 (1954).

In the above formula $x$ is the magnitude of the vector $x = x_e - x_p$ where $x_e$ and $x_p$ are, respectively, the positions of the electron and the positron.

The decay rate $\Gamma_{p-\bar{p}s}$ is the product of $\sigma_{p-\bar{p}s}$ and the flux of a parapositronium atom, which is the relative velocity of approach of the electron and positron in parapositronium multiplied by $|\psi(0)|^2$, the probability density that the electron and positron collide and annihilate.

$$\Gamma_{p-\bar{p}s} = \sigma_{p-\bar{p}s} |v_+ - v_-| |\psi(0)|^2,$$

$$= \frac{8\pi\alpha^2}{m_e^2} \frac{1}{|v_+ - v_-|} |v_+ - v_-| \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{(\alpha m_e)^3}{2},$$

$$= \alpha^5 m_e. \quad (A.26)$$

The above decay rate is twice that of ordinary parapositronium into two photons [11, 32].

It immediately follows that the corresponding decay rates for photon-excited, muon-antimuon or tau-antitau VFs bound into a singlet, ground state are obtained by replacing the electron mass in (A.26) with the muon or tau mass, respectively. As photons travel through the vacuum, these three decay rates characterize how photons interact with charged lepton-antilepton VFs.


[31] The binding energy of parapositronium, which is small in comparison with $2m_e c^2$, is being neglected.


[33] As pointed out by A. Bohm[27], a physical state prepared in a scattering experiment contains background information about the reaction in which it was created. The above description of a single photon interacting with a VF clearly depicts such a circumstance despite the fact that the details of the discussion involve a decay rate $\Gamma$. Usually, a decay rate such as $\Gamma_{p^- p_s}$ calculated in Appendix A is associated only with a stochastic process. In each individual interaction of a photon with a VF, the coherence of the final photon with the initial photon is assured, as promised at the beginning of §II.


[41] Theorists’ units are used in this Appendix, implying that $\hbar$ and $c$ are each replaced by 1.


[43] The cross section is calculated for positronium that is a VF, and the restriction to parapositronium is not made until the decay rate is calculated.