

Chiral vortical effect: black-hole vs. flat-space derivation

G. Yu. Prokhorov* and O. V. Teryaev†

*Joint Institute for Nuclear Research,
Joliot-Curie str. 6, Dubna 141980, Russia and*

*Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics, NRC Kurchatov Institute,
B. Cheremushkinskaya 25, Moscow 117218, Russia*

V. I. Zakharov‡

*Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics, NRC Kurchatov Institute,
B. Cheremushkinskaya 25, Moscow 117218, Russia and*

School of Biomedicine, Far Eastern Federal University, Vladivostok 690950, Russia

Abstract

The chiral vortical effect (CVE) was derived first for massless fermions, within the framework of thermal quantum field theory. Recently, a dual description of the CVE, as related to the radiation from the horizon of a rotating black hole was suggested. Generalizing the latter approach to the case of photons we encounter a crucial factor of two difference with the predictions based on the thermal field theory. To elucidate the reason for this discrepancy we turn to the limit of large spin S of the massless particles. Within the gravitational approach the CVE grows as S^3 while the flat-space relations result in linear in S dependence. We discuss also briefly an alternative formulation of the presumed duality between the statistical and gravitational approaches.

PACS numbers:

*Electronic address: prokhorov@theor.jinr.ru

†Electronic address: teryaev@jinr.ru

‡Electronic address: vzakharov@itep.ru

I. GRAVITATIONAL CHIRAL ANOMALY AND CVE FOR SPIN-1/2 PARTICLES

The chiral vortical effect (CVE) is the flow of chirality of massless particles in a rotating medium along the vector of the angular velocity $\vec{\Omega}$. For a single right-handed Weyl fermion one finds

$$\vec{j}_{CVE}^N = \left(\frac{\mu^2}{4\pi^2} + \frac{T^2}{12} \right) \vec{\Omega}, \quad (1.1)$$

where \vec{j}^N is the current of number of particles, μ is the chemical potential conjugated to the charge Q^N associated with the current j_μ^N , T is the temperature. In the pioneering paper [1] Eq. (1.1) is derived in the limit of non-interacting fermions by the statistical averaging of the matrix element of the current j_μ^N .

A new era in theory of chiral effects began with the paper in Ref. [2] which developed an approach valid in the strong-coupling limit, or for ideal fluids. The basic idea is to rely only on the hydrodynamic expansion and (anomalous) conservation laws. Remarkably enough, Eq. (1.1) survives the change in the framework. Moreover, the coefficient in front of the $\mu^2 \vec{\Omega}$ term turns to be directly related to the coefficient in the r.h.s. of the chiral anomaly

$$\partial^\alpha j_\alpha^N = -\frac{1}{32\pi^2} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} F_{\alpha\beta} F_{\gamma\delta}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $F_{\alpha\beta}$ is the electromagnetic field strength tensor. The coefficient in front of the T^2 term in Eq. (1.1) remains undefined within the hydrodynamic approach of Ref. [2] but can be fixed within the framework of the thermal field theory [3, 4].

The relation, if any, of the T^2 -term in Eq. (1.1) to anomalies remained a kind of a mystery¹ until there appeared the paper [6]. The main idea here goes back to the Refs. [7–12] which relate the Hawking radiation, to the anomalies of the quantum field theory. In more detail, it is suggested [6] to consider space-time with a boundary imposed by the horizon of a rotating black hole. Then one can check that near the horizon the r.h.s. of the gravitational chiral anomaly

$$\nabla^\alpha j_\alpha^N = \frac{1}{768\pi^2 \sqrt{-g}} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} R_{\alpha\beta\rho\sigma} R_{\gamma\delta}^{\rho\sigma}, \quad (1.3)$$

where $R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ is the Riemann tensor, is not vanishing. Far off from the horizon, where the r.h.s. of Eq. (1.3) vanishes, there is a flow of chirality which can be found by integrating the r.h.s. of Eq. (1.3) [6].

This asymptotic current coincides with the $T^2 \vec{\Omega}$ term in Eq. (1.1) *provided* that the generic temperature T is replaced by the Hawking temperature T_H of the black hole

$$T \rightarrow T_H \equiv \frac{a_H}{2\pi}, \quad (1.4)$$

and one keeps only the first term in the expansion in Ω (which is to be understood now as the angular velocity at the horizon).

Thus, in case of massless spin 1/2 particles there are two complementary ways of deriving the CVE, that is, within the statistical approach in flat space and in terms of black-hole

¹ For an earlier attempt to relate the CVE to the gravitational anomaly see [5].

physics. We are considering generalization to the photonic case and discuss the case of arbitrary spin. We obtain a quantitative prediction for the CVE of particles with arbitrary spin. Comparing this prediction with other approaches is a challenge for future research.

II. GRAVITATIONAL CHIRAL ANOMALY AND CVE FOR PHOTONS

As is well known, the chirality of photons is measured by the “charge” $\int d^3x K_0$ where the current K^μ is given by

$$K^\mu = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} A_\nu \partial_\rho A_\sigma, \quad (2.1)$$

where A_μ is the electromagnetic potential. The current (2.1) is normalized in such a way that the corresponding (axial) charge $Q_{photon}^A = \pm 1$ for the right- and left-hand polarized photons, respectively. Note also that the charge Q_{photon}^A is gauge invariant, unlike the current itself.

The current (2.1) is apparently not conserved, since

$$\nabla_\mu K^\mu \equiv \frac{1}{4\sqrt{-g}} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F_{\mu\nu} F_{\rho\sigma}. \quad (2.2)$$

However, one can demonstrate [13] that naively the expectation value of the r.h.s. of Eq. (2.2) for photons propagating in external gravitational field vanishes, and there is analogy with the standard case of charged massless fermions interacting with external electromagnetic field. Moreover, there exists [13–16] the bosonic chiral gravitational anomaly

$$\langle \nabla_\mu K^\mu \rangle = \frac{1}{192\pi^2 \sqrt{-g}} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} R_{\alpha\beta\rho\sigma} R_{\gamma\delta}^{\rho\sigma}. \quad (2.3)$$

Furthermore, Eq. (2.3) suffices to evaluate the chiral vortical effect for photons in terms of the black hole physics following the logic of the paper [6].

Indeed, the chiral gravitational anomalies for spin-1/2 and spin-1 massless particles are proportional to the same $R\tilde{R}$ and the effect of the rotating black hole reduces to a universal geometric factor. We are interested now in the spin dependence of the chiral vortical effect. To elucidate the spin dependence of the CVE it is convenient to compare fermionic and bosonic fields with an equal number of chiral degrees of freedom, that is normalize the photonic case to the case of a Weyl spinor. By comparing Eqs. (1.3) and (2.3) we immediately conclude

$$\frac{(CVE)_{photons}}{(CVE)_{Weyl\ fermions}}|_{black\ hole} = 4. \quad (2.4)$$

The problem is that the flat-space derivation suggests rather that the ratio (2.4) is equal to 2, not 4.

III. EVALUATION OF PHOTONIC CVE IN FLAT SPACE

A. Kubo-type relation

The most common way to evaluate the CVE directly in flat space is to relate it to a retarded, 3d Green’s function using the technique [5] similar to Kubo relations. In more

detail, define the conductivity σ_Ω as

$$\vec{j}_{CVE}^N = \sigma_\Omega \vec{\Omega} . \quad (3.1)$$

Then, σ_Ω is given by the retarded two-point Green's function between the current j_i^N and momentum density T_{0j} at zero frequency ω and small momenta k_i

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} G_R(\omega, k)|_{\omega=0} = i\epsilon_{ijn} k_n \sigma_\Omega . \quad (3.2)$$

Detailed calculations along these lines in case of charged spin-1/2 particles within thermal field theory can be found, in particular, in [3, 4].

Eq. (3.2) can be generalized to the case of photons [3]. The corresponding conductivity, σ_Ω^γ for the current K_μ is expressed now in terms of the correlator between the photonic current K_i and the momentum density T_{0j} . The result of calculations can be summarized as

$$\frac{(CVE)_{photons}}{(CVE)_{Weyl\ spinor}}|_{Kubo\ relation} = 2 . \quad (3.3)$$

Note that (3.3) differs from (2.4) by a factor of 2.

Gauge invariance of the results obtained remains a subtle point since the current K_μ is not explicitly gauge invariant. Gauge invariance could be imposed explicitly by introducing non-locality. In particular, for photons on mass-shell the gauge-invariant current reads as:

$$\kappa_\mu = (const) \frac{q_\mu}{q^2} F_{\alpha\beta} \tilde{F}^{\alpha\beta} , \quad (3.4)$$

where q_μ is the 4-momentum brought in by the current. Note, however, that in the two cases most interesting for applications the current κ_μ reduces in fact to K_μ . Namely, evaluation of the charge $\int d^3x K_0(x)$ assumes taking the limit $q_i = 0$, $\omega \rightarrow 0$ in the language of the Fourier transform. In this limit

$$\lim_{q_i=0, \omega \rightarrow 0} \kappa_0 = K_0 , \quad (3.5)$$

and the charge density K_0 understood as the component of the Fourier transform with $q_i \equiv 0$, $q_0 \rightarrow 0$ turns gauge invariant.

Similarly, in case of the definition (3.2), one considers the limit $\omega = 0$, $q_3 \rightarrow 0$. In this limit the non-local current κ_μ reduces to the component K_3

$$\lim_{\omega=0, q_3 \rightarrow 0} \kappa_3 = K_3 . \quad (3.6)$$

In other words, the component of the Fourier transform of the current defined by the Eq. (3.2) is gauge invariant and the conductivity σ_Ω is a physical observable.

B. CVE from the Sommerfeld expansion

There is another approach to evaluate the CVE by statistical averaging the matrix element of the corresponding current. One finds first energy levels as function of the momentum of the particles and of the angular velocity of the medium and evaluates then the matrix element of the current for each mode.

The latter technique was tried first [1], with the following result for a Weyl fermion

$$J_{CVE}^N = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \epsilon^2 d\epsilon \cdot \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{\beta(\epsilon - (\mu + \Omega/2))}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{\beta(\epsilon - (\mu - \Omega/2))}} \right) = \frac{\mu^2 \Omega}{4\pi^2} + \frac{\Omega^3}{48\pi^2} + \frac{T^2 \Omega}{12}. \quad (3.7)$$

Note that there is no direct proof that the Kubo relation and the statistical averaging of the matrix element of the current result in the same final expression. But the explicit calculations demonstrate consistency of the two approaches to evaluate the CVE for spin-1/2 particles.

As is emphasized recently [6], the polynomiality in thermodynamic parameters of the Sommerfeld integrals (3.7) can be viewed as an analogy to the field theoretic anomalies which are polynomial in the fields. Moreover, in case of the $\mu^2 \Omega$ term in the CVE current (3.7) the analogy can be traced algebraically on the level of Feynman graphs.

Recently, the statistically averaged matrix element of the photonic current \vec{K} was evaluated in Ref. [17]. A complete set of solutions of the Maxwell equation satisfying the proper boundary conditions was found as well as the energy levels. The final result is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{J}_{CVE}^N &= \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_{\Omega^+}^{\infty} d\omega \int_{-\omega}^{\omega} dk (\omega + k^2/\omega) \\ &\left(\frac{1}{e^{(\omega - \Omega)/T} - 1} - \frac{1}{e^{(\omega + \Omega)/T} - 1} \right) = \frac{2}{9} T^2 \Omega + \mathcal{O}(\Omega^2), \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where $\Omega^+ = \Omega$ naively but more realistically Ω^+ satisfies the condition $\Omega^+ > \Omega$. In more detail, to avoid having velocity of rotation larger than the speed of light, one introduces a finite radius R of the rotating cylinder and $\Omega^+ \rightarrow \Omega$ in the limit $R \rightarrow \infty$. In this case, despite the fact that the Bose distribution in (3.8) turns out to be singular in the limit $\Omega^+ \rightarrow \Omega$, the integral (3.8) is finite in this limit.

Note that the final answer (3.8) differs from (3.3) by a factor of 4/3. The reason for that is not well understood. We add some comments in the next subsection, for further discussion see also [17, 18].

To summarize, various approaches to evaluate the photonic chiral vortical effect result in conflicting numerical values. This could be related to the subtleties of the infrared regularization. We will discuss some aspects of this problem next.

C. Sensitivity to the infrared

Taken at face value Eqs. (3.7), (3.8) imply existence of negative modes at $\epsilon \lesssim \Omega$. However, Eqs. (3.7), (3.8) themselves are derived under the assumption that one can expand in Ω and this assumption is apparently not true at $p \lesssim \Omega$. In other words, the contribution of the region of small energies ϵ is to be considered more carefully.

The lowest levels in the rotating system can be found by using the well-known analogy between the magnetic field \vec{H} and “field of rotation” $\vec{\Omega}$. For massless charged fermions of spin 1/2 the Landau levels are given by

$$E_n = \pm \sqrt{2H(n + 1/2) + P_3^2 + H\sigma_3}, \quad (3.9)$$

where P_3 is the momentum along the magnetic field and $\sigma_3 = \pm 1$ is the sign of the spin projection onto the direction of the magnetic field. The lowest level $n = 0$, $P_3 = 0$, $\sigma_3 = -1$

is the famous zero model responsible for the chiral magnetic effect. In case of the rotation, however, there is no zero mode for spin-1/2

$$E_n > 0, \quad \text{spin } 1/2, \quad \text{gravity}, \quad (3.10)$$

since in the gravitational case the gyromagnetic ratio is two times smaller than in case of the electromagnetic interaction.

For spin-1 particle in rotating medium we would expect that the zero mode comes back

$$E_{min} = 0, \quad \text{spin } 1, \quad \text{gravity}. \quad (3.11)$$

Indeed, the spin is doubled and compensates for the just mentioned loss of the factor of two. These expectations can be confronted with explicit evaluation of the CVE effect for photons in the rotating medium, see Eq. (3.8). Clearly, Eq. (3.8) exhibits the zero mode which we are discussing. Keeping the radius R of the rotating cylinder finite regularizes the expression for the current (3.8) and eliminates the zero mode.

For higher spins, $S \geq 3/2$, the lowest energy level is to be negative

$$E_{min} < 0, \quad S \geq 3/2, \quad \text{gravity}, \quad (3.12)$$

and the perturbative vacuum is apparently unstable.

A careful analysis reveals further sources of infrared sensitivity. In particular, it turns out that the chiral vortical current is model independent only as far as it is evaluated on the axis of the rotation, or at the radial coordinate $\rho = 0$. On the other hand, as we discussed above, see Eq. (3.2), evaluation of the CVE assumes that the momentum tends to zero, $q_i \rightarrow 0$. And it is only in this limit that we have gauge invariance granted. The conditions $\rho = 0$ and $q_i \rightarrow 0$ are at least formally in conflict with each other. In principle, this could be a source of discrepancy between results of various evaluations of the photonic CVE.

Another typical example of an infrared problem is described in Ref. [19]. One introduces a massless, spin-3/2 charged field ψ_ν . To avoid the infinite radiation, one adds a massless spin-1/2 field, λ , along with interaction which generates mass

$$S_m = m \int d^4x (\bar{\lambda} \gamma^\nu \psi_\nu - \bar{\psi}_\nu \gamma^\nu \lambda). \quad (3.13)$$

This solves the infrared problem but modifies also the chiral anomaly [19] because of the introduction of an extra particle λ .

To summarize, there are various sources of sensitivity of the global picture to details of the dynamics in the infrared. However, the high temperature contribution to the CVE might well be protected against these infrared sensitive effects. Indeed, there is no reason to expect that the two regions, infrared-sensitive and high-temperature ones, give parametrically similar results.

Under this assumption, we proceed to consider the higher-spin case.

D. Limit of large spin of massless particles

The coefficient in front of the gravitational anomaly grows with spin S of the massless chiral particles as S^3 for large S [20–22]

$$\nabla_\mu K_S^\mu = \frac{(-1)^{2S} (2S^3 - S)}{192\pi^2 \sqrt{-g}} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} R_{\mu\nu\kappa\lambda} R_{\rho\sigma}{}^{\kappa\lambda}, \quad (3.14)$$

where K_S^μ is the chiral current for massless particles of spin S , an analog of the current K^μ in the photonic case. The current K_S^μ can explicitly be constructed in terms of the Pauli-Lubanski pseudovector [22]. Basing on the general formula (3.14) and following [6], we predict the T^2 term in the vortical current

$$\vec{K}_S = \frac{(-1)^{2S}(2S^3 - S)}{3} T^2 \vec{\Omega}, \quad (\textit{gravitational anomaly}). \quad (3.15)$$

A striking feature of the prediction (3.15) for the CVE of particles with large spin S is its S^3 dependence. This spin dependence is not reproduced within thermal field theory in flat space. Indeed, within the thermal field theory the only source of the growth of the vortical current with spin S is the effective coupling $\vec{S} \cdot \vec{\Omega}$, specific for the equilibrium. Thus, the term linear in Ω grows also linearly in spin S . These expectations are confirmed by explicit calculations, see, in particular [23] and references therein. According to [23] the flow of chirality J_χ carried by the spin- S massless particles is given by

$$\vec{J}_\chi = \frac{S \cdot \vec{\Omega}}{\pi^2} \sum_{\pm} \int_0^\infty f_{\pm}(p) p dp, \quad (3.16)$$

where the summation is over the chiral states with projection on the momentum equal to $\pm S$, $f_{\pm}(p)$ are the Bose or Fermi distributions, whichever relevant, and one reserves for non-vanishing chemical potentials μ_{\pm} .

To summarize, consideration of higher spins elevates the mismatch between the two ways of evaluating the CVE to a qualitative effect.

E. Spin dependence of vortical current within the gravitational approach

The predictions (3.15) and (3.16) differ qualitatively. The origin of the disagreement is that in flat space the effect is controlled primarily by the number of degrees of freedom which for massless particles does not grow with their spin S . The strong S dependence in case of the gravitational anomaly is apparently due to a specific gravitational interaction with spin.

As is noticed in Refs. [20, 21], the S^3 dependence of the gravitational anomaly goes back to the coupling of the Riemann tensor to the spin of the particles

$$X = \Sigma^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu}{}^{ab} \Sigma_{ab}, \quad (3.17)$$

where $\Sigma^{\mu\nu}$ is the spin operator. Physically, this coupling corresponds to the interaction of the gravitational wave with the quadrupole moment of the particle ².

In the next section we describe briefly another formulation of the statistical approach which provides us with another derivation of the S^3 dependence.

² We are grateful to A.I. Vainshtein for this remark.

IV. TEMPERATURE-ACCELERATION, $T \leftrightarrow \frac{a}{2\pi}$, DUALITY?

A. Derivation of the Unruh temperature within statistical approach

Discovery of the Unruh temperature, or temperature seen by an accelerated observer

$$T_U = \frac{a}{2\pi}, \quad (4.1)$$

established for the first time a kind of equivalence, or duality between acceleration a and the temperature T . The next step was made in Refs. [7–12]. Here, the basic idea is that at the horizon of the black hole there is an intrinsic right-left asymmetry since the particles are emitted outwards of the horizon and absorbed inwards. The precise measure of the particle production is provided by the quantum anomalies in terms of the gravitational field, or acceleration on the horizon, a_H . By matching the flow of the particles far off from the horizon to the radiation from a black body one is rederiving the Hawking temperature T_H

$$T_H = \frac{a_H}{2\pi}. \quad (4.2)$$

Finally, Ref. [6] suggested a similar construction to relate the chiral vortical effect in flat space to the radiation from a rotating black brane.

In all these cases one and the same phenomenon is described either in terms of the statistical theory as a process in equilibrium, or in terms of quantum field theory, as a manifestation of an anomaly in external gravitational field.

There exists another systematic way to relate physics in the equilibrium in flat space to the physics in external gravitational field and vice versa, for introduction and further references see [24]. On the statistical side, the crucial point is the introduction of the following density operator $\hat{\rho}$

$$\hat{\rho} = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left(-\beta_\mu \hat{P}^\mu + \frac{1}{2} \varpi_{\mu\nu} \hat{J}^{\mu\nu} + \xi \hat{Q} \right), \quad (4.3)$$

where $\xi = \mu/T$, \hat{P}_μ is the 4-momentum, $\hat{J}^{\mu\nu}$ are generators of the Lorentz transformations and \hat{Q} is a conserved charge. Moreover, $\varpi_{\mu\nu} = 1/2(\partial_\nu \beta_\mu - \partial_\mu \beta_\nu)$ is the tensor of the thermal vorticity, and $\beta_\mu = u_\mu/T$. The operator $\hat{J}^{\mu\nu}$ in Eq. (4.3) can be rewritten as

$$\hat{J}^{\mu\nu} = u^\mu \hat{K}^\nu - u^\nu \hat{K}^\mu - \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} u_\rho \hat{J}_\sigma, \quad (4.4)$$

where \hat{K}^μ is the boost operator and \hat{J}_ν is the operator of angular momentum. Furthermore, it is useful to introduce 4-vectors α_μ, w_μ

$$\alpha_\mu = \varpi_{\mu\nu} u^\nu, \quad w_\mu = (1/2) \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} u^\nu \varpi^{\alpha\beta}. \quad (4.5)$$

In the rest frame $T \cdot \alpha^i$ and $T \cdot w^i$ coincide with the standard 3-vectors of acceleration \vec{a} and of the angular velocity $\vec{\Omega}$, respectively.

A special case of the operator $\hat{\rho}$ is better known, when it describes a medium with a finite constant angular velocity $\vec{\Omega}$ [24, 25]

$$\hat{\rho} = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left(-\hat{H}/T_0 + \Omega \hat{J}_z/T_0 + \mu_0 \hat{Q}/T_0 \right), \quad (4.6)$$

where the indices 0 indicate that the quantities are measured in a stationary reference frame.

Note that the boost operators \hat{K}^i , although conserved, do not commute with the Hamiltonian \hat{H}

$$i\frac{d\hat{K}^i}{dt} = 0, \quad [\hat{K}^i, \hat{H}] = -i\hat{P}^i, \quad (4.7)$$

and the equations (4.7) are consistent with each other because of an explicit dependence of \hat{K}^i on time [24]. For this reason actual calculations based on the density operator (4.3) in case of $\vec{a} \neq 0$ are highly non-trivial and the corresponding technique has been worked out only recently [24].

Applications of this technique have turned successful. In particular, the Unruh temperature can be defined now [24] in terms of the energy density T_{00} as a function of acceleration a and of the temperature, $T_{00}(a, T)$

$$T_{00}(a, T)|_{T=T_U} = 0. \quad (4.8)$$

It was demonstrated [26] that in case of massless spin-1/2 and spin-0 particles the condition (4.8) allows to determine the Unruh temperature without introducing any parameter or subtractions.

Note that within the approach (4.3) acceleration and temperature are treated as independent variables. To match this freedom on the gravitational side one considers [26] the Rindler space with a conical singularity and defines the acceleration and temperature geometrically. The duality works perfectly well [26]. One can say that the case $\Omega = 0$, $(a, T) \neq 0$ is fully understood in terms of the duality between gravitational and statistical approaches. Here we are considering both a and Ω non-vanishing and it is a generic feature that the formalism is becoming much more complicated, see in particular [27].

B. Coupling of acceleration and vorticity to the spin

The density operator (4.3) which we are exploiting, introduces the following effective interaction, specific for the physics of equilibrium

$$\delta\hat{H} = -\vec{\Omega} \cdot \vec{J} - \vec{a} \cdot \vec{K}, \quad (4.9)$$

In the nonrelativistic limit the part with boost leads to energy of a particle in a constant gravitational field a [24]

$$\hat{H} - a\hat{K}_z = mc^2 + \hat{p}^2/2m - ma\hat{z}. \quad (4.10)$$

More generally, the terms with boost and angular momentum provide that the evolution operator generates a transition between instantaneous inertial rest frames at different time moments, since these transformations in the presence of acceleration are not reduced only to time translations, and also include Lorentz transformations [28].

We consider the case of the vectors $\vec{\Omega}$ and \vec{a} parallel to each other, $\vec{\Omega} \parallel \vec{a}$. Then it is straightforward to evaluate the correction to the energy of a chiral state of spin-1/2 polarized along the vector $\vec{\Omega}$, \vec{a}

$$\delta E = -(\Omega_z - ia_z)\sigma_z/2. \quad (4.11)$$

The only non-trivial point here is the emergence of an “imaginary energy” $\delta E \sim ia/2$. The reason for that is the lack of a unitary representation for the boosts operator in case of a chiral

multiplet. As a result, one uses an anti-unitary realization of the boost operator, $K^i \sim i\sigma^i$ which, however, respects commutation relations between the operators. Thermodynamically, this imaginary energy does not make any trouble since the odd powers of a are canceled out between contributions of particles and anti-particles, while even powers of a survive.

Now, the generalization to the case of massless particles of higher spin S is trivial

$$\sigma_z/2 \rightarrow S_z, \quad \delta E \rightarrow (\vec{\Omega} - i\vec{a}) \cdot \vec{S}. \quad (4.12)$$

Estimates of spin dependences of other observables is also straightforward. Namely, each power of a or Ω is accompanied by a factor of S , while the temperature is “unaware” of the spin since there are two degrees of freedom for any massless particle with $S \neq 0$.

Consider as an example the chiral vortical effect. On the dimensional grounds

$$J_{CVE} \sim c_1 T^2 \Omega + c_2 a^2 \Omega, \quad (4.13)$$

where the coefficients c_1 and c_2 are to be calculated. Following the logic outlined above, we come to the estimates

$$c_1 \sim S, \quad c_2 \sim S^3. \quad (4.14)$$

The S^3 dependence of c_2 matches perfectly the prediction (3.15) based on the gravitational anomaly.

To summarize, straightforward estimates within the statistical approach based on the density operator (4.3) immediately result in a S^3 dependence of the chiral vortical effect for higher-spin particles.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Two approaches have been tried to evaluate the chiral vortical effect (CVE) for massless spin-1/2 particles, with identical results obtained. The first approach is based on statistical averaging of the matrix elements of the axial current. The other one relates the CVE to the chiral gravitational anomaly. The latter approach can immediately be generalized to the case of arbitrary spin of particles interacting with external gravitational field.

The prediction for the photonic CVE obtained in this way can be compared with the results obtained within the statistical approach. In particular, application of the Kubo-type relation to evaluate the photonic CVE gives an answer [3, 4] which differs by a factor of two from the gravitational approach. However, there is no consensus yet in the literature concerning the value of the vortical conductivity σ_Ω^γ . The source of uncertainty is apparently dependence on the regularization procedure in the infrared. Thus, it is not ruled out that the final result for photons would agree with the prediction of the gravitational approach.

To have a clearer case we turn to consideration of the limit of large spin S of the constituents. In this case the predictions for the vortical conductivity differ qualitatively

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_\Omega &\sim S^3 \quad (\text{gravitational anomaly}), \\ \sigma_\Omega &\sim S \quad (\text{thermal field theory}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

We also try an alternative statistical approach based on the use of the density operator (4.3). This version of the statistical approach does reproduce the S^3 dependence of the vortical effect in accelerated medium. The basic element of the derivation is demonstration of

existence of coupling of acceleration to spin, $\delta L \sim \vec{a} \cdot \vec{S}$, specific for physics of the equilibrium³. On the other hand, linear in the acceleration terms drop off thermodynamically, and there is no contradiction with the equivalence principle for this reason.

There are many questions left open. The main reservation concerning the status of the results obtained is that theories involving massless particle with large spin S have intrinsic problems and difficulties.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are thankful to P. G. Mitkin, A. V. Sadofyev, A. I. Vainshtein and A. I. Vasiliev for valuable discussions and to J. Erdmenger and R. Banerjee for communications. The work was supported by the RFBR grant No. 18-02-40056.

-
- [1] A. Vilenkin, “*Quantum Field Theory At Finite Temperature In A Rotating System*”, Phys.Rev. D21 (1980) 2260-2269.
 - [2] D. T. Son and P. Surowka, “*Hydrodynamics with Triangle Anomalies*”, Phys.Rev.Lett. 103 (2009) 191601, [arXiv: 0906.5044 [hep-th]].
 - [3] S. Golkar and D. T. Son, “*(Non)-renormalization of the chiral vortical effect coefficient*”, JHEP 1502 (2015) 169, [arXiv: 1207.5806 [hep-th]].
 - [4] De-Fu Hou, Hui Liu, and Hai-cang Ren, “*A Possible Higher Order Correction to the Vortical Conductivity in a Gauge Field Plasma*”, Phys.Rev. D86 (2012) 121703, [arXiv: 1210.0969 [hep-th]].
 - [5] K. Landsteiner, Eu. Megias, and F. Pena-Benitez, “*Gravitational Anomaly and Transport*”, Phys. Rev. Lett. 107 (2011) 021601, [arXiv:1103.5006 [hep-ph]].
 - [6] M. Stone and J. Kim, “*Mixed Anomalies: Chiral Vortical Effect and the Sommerfeld Expansion*”, Phys.Rev. D98 (2018) no.2, 025012, [arXiv:1804.08668 [cond-mat.mes-hall]].
 - [7] S. P. Robinson and F. Wilczek, “*Relationship between Hawking Radiation and Gravitational Anomalies*”, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 011303 (2005).
 - [8] S. Iso, H. Umetsu, and F. Wilczek, “*Hawking Radiation from Charged Black Holes via Gauge and Gravitational Anomalies*”, Phys. Rev. Lett.96, 151302 (2006).
 - [9] S. Iso, H. Umetsu, and F. Wilczek, “*Anomalies, Hawking Radiations and Regularity in Rotating Black Holes*”, Phys. Rev.D74, 044017 (2006).
 - [10] R. Banerjee and S. Kulkarni, “*Hawking radiation and covariant anomalies*”, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 024018 (2008), [arXiv:0707.2449 [hep-th]].
 - [11] R. Banerjee and S. Kulkarni, “*Hawking radiation, effective actions and covariant boundary conditions*”, Phys. Lett. B **659**, 827-831 (2008), [arXiv:0709.3916 [hep-th]].
 - [12] R. Banerjee and S. Kulkarni, “*Hawking Radiation, Covariant Boundary Conditions and Vacuum States*”, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 084035 (2009), [arXiv:0810.5683 [hep-th]].

³ Similar coupling appears in the case of the Coriolis force, which is associated with a term in the Lagrangian of the form $\delta L = m\vec{v} \cdot \vec{\Omega} \times \vec{r} = \vec{\Omega} \cdot \vec{J}$, while the interchange of spin and orbital momenta is justified by equivalence principle.

- [13] A.I. Vainshtein, A.D. Dolgov, V. I. Zakharov, and I.B. Khriplovich, “*Chiral Photon Current And Its Anomaly In A Gravitational Field*”, Sov. Phys. JETP 67 (1988) 1326, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 94 (1988) 54.
- [14] I. Agullo, A. del Rio, and J. Navarro-Salas, “*Electromagnetic duality anomaly in curved spacetimes*”, Phys.Rev.Lett. 118 (2017) no.11, 111301, [arXiv:1607.08879 [gr-qc]].
- [15] A. Avkhadiev and A. V. Sadofyev, “*Chiral Vortical Effect for Bosons*”, Phys.Rev. D96 (2017) no.4, 045015, [arXiv:1702.07340 [hep-th]].
- [16] J. Erdmenger, “*Gravitational axial anomaly for four-dimensional conformal field theories*”, Nucl. Phys. B **562**, 315-329 (1999), [arXiv:hep-th/9905176 [hep-th]].
- [17] M.N. Chernodub, A. Cortijo, and K. Landsteiner, “*Zilch vortical effect*”, Phys.Rev. D98 (2018) no.6, 065016, [arXiv: 1807.10705 [hep-th]].
- [18] Xu-Guang Huang, Pavel Mitkin, Andrey V. Sadofyev, and Enrico Speranza, “*Zilch Vortical Effect, Berry Phase, and Kinetic Theory*”, [arXiv: 2006.03591 [hep-th]].
- [19] S. L. Adler, “*Recent Path Crossings with Roman and Anomalies*”, [arXiv: 1910.04089 [hep-th]].
- [20] S. M. Christensen and M. J. Duff, “*New Gravitational Index Theorems and Supertheorems*”, Nucl. Phys. B154, 301 (1979).
- [21] M. J. Duff, Supergravity 81, Proc. of 1st School on Supergravity, Ed. by S. Ferrara and J. G. Taylor, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1982, preprint Ref.TH.3232-CERN.
- [22] A.D. Dolgov, I.B. Khriplovich, A.I. Vainshtein, and V. I. Zakharov, “*Photonic Chiral Current and Its Anomaly in a Gravitational Field*”, Nucl.Phys. B315 (1989) 138.
- [23] X. G. Huang and A. V. Sadofyev, “*Chiral Vortical Effect For An Arbitrary Spin*”, JHEP **03**, 084 (2019), [arXiv:1805.08779 [hep-th]].
- [24] F. Becattini, “*Thermodynamic equilibrium with acceleration and the Unruh effect*”, Phys. Rev. D 97, 085013, [arXiv: 1712.08031 [gr-qc]].
- [25] V. E. Ambrus, “*Helical massive fermions under rotation*”, JHEP **08**, 016 (2020), [arXiv: 1912.09977 [nucl-th]].
- [26] G.Y. Prokhorov, O.V Teryaev, and V.I. Zakharov, “*Unruh effect universality: emergent conical geometry from density operator*”, J. High Energ. Phys. 2020, 137 (2020), [arXiv: 1911.04545 [hep-th]].
- [27] J.D. Brown, E. A. Martinez, and J. W. York, Jr. , *Complex Kerr-Newman geometry and black hole thermodynamics*, Phys.Rev.Lett. 66 (1991) 2281-2284 .
- [28] J. I. Korsbakken and J. M. Leinaas, “*The Fulling-Unruh effect in general stationary accelerated frames*”, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 084016 (2004), [arXiv:hep-th/0406080 [hep-th]].