

Comment on the diagonalization of Green functions *

P.A.Henning[†]

Theoretical Physics, Gesellschaft für Schwerionenforschung GSI
P.O.Box 110552, D-64220 Darmstadt, Germany

Real-time thermal field theory is known in the two flavors “closed-time path formalism” and “thermo field dynamics”. With a certain choice of parameters the full two-point functions of these models are identical, hence a scheme to diagonalize the Green function in one model can be applied to the other as well. This allows to compare the diagonalization schemes that have been discussed in the recent literature in order to select the simplest one. Such comparison speaks in favor of a diagonalization method which is motivated from thermo field dynamics.

In real-time quantum field theory for statistical systems, i.e., for thermal as well as for non-equilibrium states, the two-point Green functions acquire a 2×2 matrix structure. Two flavors exist for such a theory: The Schwinger-Keldysh closed-time path formalism (CTP, [1]) and thermo field dynamics (TFD, [2]).

These matrix valued Green functions (propagators) contain spurious information that unnecessarily complicates their use in a perturbative expansion. This unneeded information may be removed by matrix diagonalization. The fact that different diagonalization methods are possible has led to a dispute in the recent literature [3–6]; the present work is aimed at a clarification of this question, thereby uniting the different approaches.

To this end, we concentrate on an interacting scalar quantum field in a thermal equilibrium state and note that similar considerations apply for fermions. The first question to be settled is, whether the Green functions under dispute are different. By definition, the propagator matrix in the CTP formalism is [7]

$$D_{\text{CTP}}^{(ab)}(x, x') = -i \begin{pmatrix} \langle T [\phi_x \phi_{x'}] \rangle & \langle \phi_{x'} \phi_x \rangle \\ \langle \phi_x \phi_{x'} \rangle & \langle \tilde{T} [\phi_x \phi_{x'}] \rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes the statistical average, $T[\cdot]$ the time ordered and $\tilde{T}[\cdot]$ the “anti-time ordered” product, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} T[\phi_x \phi_{x'}] &= \Theta(x^0 - x'^0) \phi_x \phi_{x'} + \Theta(x'^0 - x^0) \phi_{x'} \phi_x \\ \tilde{T}[\phi_x \phi_{x'}] &= \Theta(x'^0 - x^0) \phi_x \phi_{x'} + \Theta(x^0 - x'^0) \phi_{x'} \phi_x. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

In the TFD formalism, the canonical commutation relations have two different commuting representations ϕ_x and $\tilde{\phi}_x$, the matrix valued propagator is

$$D_{\text{TFD}}^{(ab)}(x, x') = -i \begin{pmatrix} \langle T [\phi_x \phi_{x'}] \rangle & \langle T [\phi_x \tilde{\phi}_{x'}] \rangle \\ \langle T [\tilde{\phi}_x \phi_{x'}] \rangle & \langle T [\tilde{\phi}_x \tilde{\phi}_{x'}] \rangle \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

TFD is conceptually different from CTP, in the sense that it contains a Bogoliubov transformation of quantum fields at the operator level. This transformation contains three parameters, for the purpose of the present paper only one aspect is interesting: *For a certain choice of TFD parameters, the two matrices above are identical* [4]. By adopting this special choice ($\alpha = 1$), we will henceforth omit a distinction between D_{CTP} and D_{TFD} , and conclude that they may be diagonalized by the same matrix transformation.

We now turn to the task of isolating the spurious information hidden in these propagators. For convenience, we perform a Fourier transformation to the momentum variable $p = (p_0, \mathbf{p})$, with respect to the difference of the space-time coordinates.

The goal is to formulate a perturbative expansion in terms of the retarded and advanced functions

$$\begin{aligned} D^R(p) &= D^{11}(p) - D^{12}(p) \\ D^A(p) &= D^{11}(p) - D^{21}(p) = (D^R(p))^* , \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

*Work supported by GSI, Preprint No. 95-12 (1995)

[†]Electronic mail: P.Henning@gsi.de, <http://www.gsi.de/~phenning/henning.html>

since they are free of poles on the physical complex energy sheet other than on the real axis. By inspection of (1) and (3) one may easily realize that

$$\begin{aligned} D^{11}(p) + D^{22}(p) &= D^{12}(p) + D^{21}(p) \\ D^{11}(p) &= -(D^{22}(p))^* \\ D^{12}(p) &= -(D^{12}(p))^* \quad , \quad D^{21}(p) = -(D^{21}(p))^* \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where \star denotes complex conjugation. Apart from these trivial relations we also know, that in a thermal equilibrium state the Kubo-Martin-Schwinger boundary condition holds,

$$(1 + n_B(p_0))D^{12}(p) - n_B(p_0)D^{21}(p) = 0 \quad , \quad (6)$$

with the Bose-Einstein function

$$n_B(E) = \frac{1}{\exp(\beta(E - \mu)) - 1} \quad (7)$$

at inverse temperature β and chemical potential μ ($\mu = 0$ for the real scalar field).

From these relations follows that there exists a nonsingular 2×2 matrix $V(p_0)$ such that

$$V(p_0) D(p) V(p_0) = \begin{pmatrix} D^F(p) & 0 \\ 0 & -(D^F(p))^* \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad (8)$$

where

$$D^F(p) = \Theta(p_0) D^R(p) + \Theta(-p_0) D^A(p) \quad . \quad (9)$$

(this ‘‘Feynman’’-like propagator is not causal in a state with nonzero $n_B(p_0)$).

This matrix transformation *diagonalizes* the full boson propagator. The transformation matrix is well known for some time (see e.g. [7, eq. (2.4.31)]), here we adopt the notation of ref. [3]:

$$V(p_0) = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh(\theta) & -\exp[\beta(p_0 - \mu)/2] \sinh(\theta) \\ -\exp[-\beta(p_0 - \mu)/2] \sinh(\theta) & \cosh(\theta) \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad (10)$$

with hyperbolic functions

$$\begin{aligned} \cosh(\theta) &= \sqrt{\Theta(p_0)[1 + n_B(p_0)] - \Theta(-p_0)n_B(p_0)} \\ \sinh(\theta) &= \sqrt{\Theta(p_0)n_B(p_0) - \Theta(-p_0)[1 + n_B(p_0)]} \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Thus, after diagonalization the only temperature dependence is located in the matrices V – and we may absorb them into the interaction vertices of a theory, which are then linked by retarded or advanced propagators. The goal of isolating the spurious information hidden in the propagator from its field theoretical content has been reached. However, three questions are unanswered yet:

1. Does the matrix (10) represent the simplest possible choice ?
2. What is the physical meaning of this diagonalization procedure ?
3. How does one handle the diagonalization task in non-equilibrium states ?

To answer the first question, we reconsider the relations (5) and (6). Apart from the diagonalization procedure outlined above, they also guarantee a different way to reach our goal: There exists at least one nonsingular 2×2 matrix \mathcal{B} such that

$$\mathcal{B}[n_B(p_0)] D(p) \tau_3 \left(\mathcal{B}[n_B(p_0)] \right)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} D^A(p) & 0 \\ 0 & D^R(p) \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad (12)$$

where $\tau_3 = \text{diag}(1, -1)$. Hence, also this matrix transformation *diagonalizes* the full boson propagator [4,8,9].

In fact, more than one such matrix \mathcal{B} exists, but one may chose a particularly simple form linear in the Bose-Einstein function $n(p_0)$

$$\mathcal{B}[n] = \begin{pmatrix} (1+n) & n \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

From the continuum of possible diagonalization methods of the full propagator, the above choice clearly is one of the simplest – whereas the matrix V in (10) is a highly nonlinear function of $n(p_0)$.

To answer the second question, we consider a simple harmonic oscillator with hamiltonian $H = \omega a^\dagger a$, immersed in a heat bath of inverse temperature β . It is well known, that one may describe this oscillator equally well in terms of particle states or hole states, i.e., the Liouville operator governing the time evolution of the statistical system has a symplectic symmetry. Without elaboration at this point we note that its symmetry group is the two-dimensional symplectic group $\text{Sp}(2)$ (see [10,9] for a more complete discussion).

In a thermal equilibrium state, we also know the statistical operator to be $W = \exp(-\beta H)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + n_B(\omega)) a W - n_B(\omega) W a &= 0 \\ (1 + n_B(\omega)) W a^\dagger - n_B(\omega) a^\dagger W &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

which is nothing but the Kubo-Martin-Schwinger condition for this oscillator. Thus, although the creation and annihilation operators of this simple system do not commute with the statistical operator, we find that a certain *linear combination* of right-acting and left-acting operators (well defined in Liouville space [10]) annihilates the density matrix.

The corresponding orthogonal linear combination creates an excitation of the system. It is a linear combination of particle and hole state, which propagates through the system without “feeling” the thermal background. Thus, by introducing these “thermal quasi-particles” the statistical information has been separated from the time evolution problem.

The relation between ordinary creation/annihilation operators and these unusual linear combinations is mediated by the matrices $\mathcal{B}[n(\omega)]$ from eq. (13). Hence we may identify the diagonalization according to eq. (12) *physically* as the transformation to a linear combination of particle and hole state that have retarded/advanced boundary conditions in time.

It remains to answer the third question, i.e., what one does for non-equilibrium states. In this case, the Fourier transform with respect to coordinate differences leaves us with an additional dependence on $X = (x + x')/2$. In this mixed representation, the relations (5) between the matrix elements of the two-point functions still prevail, but the KMS boundary condition (6) is *not* valid.

We label the non-equilibrium propagators by a \sim -sign, i.e. $\tilde{D}^{ab} \equiv \tilde{D}^{ab}(X, p)$, and use the easily established fact that for *arbitrary* parameter $N \equiv N(X, p)$ the matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}[N]$ according to (13) leads to

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}[N] \tilde{D}(X, p) \tau_3 \left(\tilde{\mathcal{B}}[N] \right)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{D}^A & (N \tilde{D}^{12} - (1 + N) \tilde{D}^{21}) \\ 0 & \tilde{D}^R \end{pmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

Hence, this procedure transforms the full Green function to triangular form. One might then ask, whether there exists a special choice for $N \equiv N(X, p)$ such that the off-diagonal element of this matrix also vanishes, i.e. such that

$$N(X, p) \tilde{D}^{12}(X, p) - (1 + N(X, p)) \tilde{D}^{21}(X, p) = 0. \quad (16)$$

This can be answered by inserting the propagator into the full Schwinger-Dyson equation, the result is a differential equation for $N(X, p)$. On close inspection it is identified with a *transport equation*, i.e., a close relative of the Boltzmann equation for the quantity $N(X, p)$ [9,11].

Naturally, transport equations are also obtainable using a different diagonalization scheme. However, the differential equations then are *much* more complicated and thus their relation to the Boltzmann equation or any other *known* transport equation is not easily established.

To conclude the present paper: As already stated in ref. [4], a diagonalization of two-point functions is easily possible in the closed-time path formalism as well as in thermo field dynamics – which is a trivial fact since the propagators can be made identical.

As pointed out in ref. [3] as well as in [4], the diagonalization matrices that occur *naturally* are V from (10) in CTP, but \mathcal{B} from (13) in TFD. For simplicity one should therefore make the obvious choice of the diagonalization scheme according to eq. (12) *also in the CTP formalism*. Especially for non-equilibrium states such simplicity is *required* to obtain a meaningful interpretation of the diagonalization condition – independently of the reader’s preference for one of the two flavors of real-time statistical quantum field theory.

The situation described here bears a close analogy to the fixing of a gauge: In equilibrium states, the choice of diagonalization matrices does not influence physical quantities – but the *calculational effort* greatly depends on

this choice. It has been shown, that this is indeed more than an analogy, i.e., that choosing a special form of the transformation matrices indeed corresponds to a gauge fixing [9].

- [1] J.Schwinger, J.Math.Phys. **2** (1961) 407;
L.V.Keldysh, Zh.Exsp.Teor.Fiz. **47** (1964) 1515 and JETP **20** (1965) 1018
- [2] T.Arimitsu and H.Umezawa, Prog.Theor.Phys. **77** (1987) 32 and 53;
H.Umezawa, *Advanced Field Theory: Micro, Macro and Thermal Physics*
(American Institute of Physics, 1993)
- [3] H.Xu, Phys.Lett.**B342** (1995) 219
- [4] P.A.Henning and H.Umezawa,
Nucl.Phys. **B417** (1994) 463 and Phys.Lett. **B303** (1993) 209
- [5] P.Aurenche and T.Becherawy, Nucl.Phys. **B379** (1992) 259
- [6] M.A.van Eijck and Ch.G. van Weert, Phys.Lett. **B278** (1992) 305
- [7] N.P.Landsman and Ch.G.van Weert, Phys.Rep. **145** (1987) 141
- [8] H.Umezawa and Y.Yamanaka, Mod.Phys.Lett. **A7** (1992) 305
- [9] P.A.Henning,
TFD for quantum fields with continuous mass spectrum,
Physics Report (to appear in February 1995)
- [10] M.Hirokawa, Ann.Phys. **223** (1993) 1
- [11] P.A.Henning, Nucl.Phys. **A582** (1995) 633