hep-th/0306013

Hopf-algebra description of noncommutative-spacetime symmetries

Alessandra AGOSTINI[a], **Giovanni AMELINO-CAMELIA**[b] and **Francesco D'ANDREA**[b]
[a] *Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Università di Napoli "Federico II", Monte S. Angelo, Via Cintia, 80126 Napoli, Italy*
[b] *Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma "La Sapienza" and INFN Sez. Roma1, P.le Moro 2, 00185 Roma, Italy*

In the study of certain noncommutative versions of Minkowski spacetime there is still a large ambiguity concerning the characterization of their symmetries. Adopting as our case study the κ-Minkowski noncommutative space-time, on which a large literature is already available, we propose a line of analysis of noncommutative-spacetime symmetries that relies on the introduction of a Weyl map (connecting a given function in the noncommutative Minkowski with a corresponding function in commutative Minkowski) and of a compatible notion of integration in the noncommutative spacetime. We confirm (and we establish more robustly) previous suggestions that the commutative-spacetime notion of Lie-algebra symmetries must be replaced, in the noncommutative-spacetime context, by the one of Hopf-algebra symmetries. We prove that in κ-Minkowski it is possible to construct an action which is invariant under a Poincaré-like Hopf algebra of symmetries with 10 generators, in which the noncommutativity length scale has the role of relativistic invariant. The approach here adopted does leave one residual ambiguity, which pertains to the description of the translation generators, but our results, independently of this ambiguity, are sufficient to clarify that some recent studies (gr-qc/0212128 and hep-th/0301061), which argued for an operational indistiguishability between theories with and without a length-scale relativistic invariant, implicitly assumed that the underlying spacetime would be classical.

arXiv:hep-th/0306013v2 21 Jun 2003

I. INTRODUCTION

Non-commutative versions of Minkowski spacetime [1,2] are being considered in several quantum-gravity scenarios. In some cases non-commutative spacetimes prove useful at an effective-theory level (for example, in certain string theory pictures [3–5] spacetime noncommutativity provides an effective theory description of the physics of strings in presence of a corresponding external background), while other quantum-gravity approaches [6–9] explore the possibility that a noncommutativity might be needed for the correct fundamental description of spacetime (and a noncommutative version of Minkowski spacetime would be relevant in the flat-spacetime limit).

In recent research on these noncommutative spacetimes much attention has been devoted to the implications of noncommutativity for the classical Poincaré symmetries of Minkowski spacetime. For the simplest noncommutative versions of Minkowski spacetime, the canonical noncommutative spacetimes characterized by coordinate noncommutativity of type ($\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$)

$$[\mathbf{x}_\mu, \mathbf{x}_\nu] = i\theta_{\mu,\nu} \tag{1}$$

with coordinate-independent $\theta_{\mu,\nu}$, a full understanding has been matured, and in particular it has been established that the Lorentz-sector symmetries are broken (see, *e.g.*, Refs. [4,5,10]) by this type of noncommutativity.

Unfortunately, already at the next level of complexity, the one of Lie-algebra noncommutative spacetimes

$$[\mathbf{x}_\mu, \mathbf{x}_\nu] = i\zeta^\sigma_{\mu,\nu}\mathbf{x}_\sigma \ , \tag{2}$$

our present understanding of the fate of Poincaré symmetries is still unsatisfactory. For some of these Lie-algebra spacetimes there has been much discussion in the mathematical literature (see, *e.g.*, Refs. [11,9]) about their "duality", in a certain mathematically-defined sense, to corresponding Hopf-algebra versions of the Poincaré algebra. Moreover, in studies exploring the recent proposal of physical theories with two relativistic invariants [8,9,12] it has been conjectured that Lie-algebra noncommutative spacetimes might play a role in the new class of relativistic theories (see, *e.g.*, Refs. [8,9]). However, a full characterization of the fate of Poincaré symmetries in Lie-algebra noncommutative spacetimes is still missing.

Here we intend to contribute to the understanding of these delicate issues. We focus on the illustrative example of the much studied "κ-Minkowski Lie-algebra noncommutative spacetime" [13,11], whose coordinates satisfy the commutation relations

$$[\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_0] = i\lambda \mathbf{x}_j \ , \quad [\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_k] = 0 \tag{3}$$

where $j, k = 1, 2, 3$ and we denote the noncommutativity parameter by λ (in some other κ-Minkowski studies the reader will encounter the parameter κ, which is related to the λ of (3) by $\lambda = \kappa^{-1}$).

It is puzzling that in the literature it is sometimes stated (see, *e.g.*, Refs. [11,9]) that the symmetries of κ-Minkowski can be described by any one of a large number of κ-Poincaré Hopf algebras. The nature of this claimed symmetry-description degeneracy remains obscure from a physics perspective, since it is only supported by an (equally obscure) "duality" criterion [11,9].

This issue has recently taken central stage also in the mentioned research on the physical proposal [8] of relativistic theories with two invariants, the so-called DSR theories, where κ-Minkowski is being considered as a possible example of spacetime that hosts two relativistic invariants. In that context only the Lorentz sector is considered, but again (since different κ-Poincaré algebras lead to different types of Lorentz transformations) the symmetry-description degeneracy is posing a key challenge [9]. In some related studies [14,15] it was even argued that the presence of two relativistic invariants should be seen as a mathematical/formal artifact, *i.e.* the relativistic theory with two invariants (independently of a possible role for Hopf algebras) could be equivalently described as a relativistic theory with Lie-algebra symmetries and a single invariant. A corollary of our results will prove that the line of analysis advocated in Ref. [14,15] implicitly assumes that the underlying spacetime be classical. In certain quantum spacetimes, *e.g.* in some noncommutative spacetimes, the presence of the length (or energy) scale as relativistic invariant is unavoidable and reflects genuine physical aspects of the theory.

A key point that emerges from the study we report in the following sections is that in certain noncommutative spacetimes (in particular in κ-Minkowski) different physical theories formulated in that same spacetime might enjoy different types of 10-generator Poincaré-like symmetries. Whereas theories in classical (commutative) Minkowski spacetime can only be Poincaré invariant, if they enjoy the maximal number of symmetries, we expect that different theories in κ-Minkowski spacetime can enjoy different types of 10-generators symmetries[1].

In this first study adopting our new approach, the concept of "theory in κ-Minkowski spacetime" is simply identified with the introduction of an action. We emphasize the role that a Weyl map and a compatible notion of integration can play in characterizing the action and its symmetries. We call *symmetry operator* an operator over κ-Minkowski that leaves invariant the action of the theory. We also stress that the symmetries may also depend on the structure of the differential calculus introduced in the noncommutative spacetime (since the differential calculus affects the formulation of the action).

We start by reviewing some of the main properties of κ-Minkowski noncommutative spacetime and of Weyl maps that are naturally considered in the analysis of κ-Minkowski and by reviewing (and providing arguments in favour of) the use of Hopf algebras in the description of the symmetries of a noncommutative spacetime. Then in the second part of the paper we apply these concepts in the analysis of the action for a free scalar field in κ-Minkowski spacetime.

II. κ-Minkowski SPACE-TIME

The elements of κ-Minkowski [13] spacetime are sums and products of the elements $\mathbf{x}_\mu$ (the "noncommutative coordinates") which satisfy the commutation relations $[\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_k] = 0$, $[\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_0] = i\lambda \mathbf{x}_j$, which we already noted in Eq. (3). [κ-Minkowski is the universal enveloping algebra of the Lie algebra (3).] Of course, conventional commuting coordinates are recovered in the limit $\lambda \to 0$, and it is possible to establish a one-to-one correspondence between elements of κ-Minkowski and analytical functions of four commuting variables x_μ. Such a correspondence is called *Weyl map*, and is not unique. Since one of the points we want to emphasize is the possible dependence of the symmetry analysis on the choice of the Weyl map it is convenient for us to focus on two specific choices, which we denote by Ω_R and Ω_S. It is sufficient to specify the Weyl map on the complex exponentials and extend it to the generic function $f(x)$, whose Fourier transform is $\tilde{f}(p) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^4} \int f(x) e^{-ipx} \mathrm{d}^4 p$, by linearity

[1] Of course, both in Minkowski and in κ-Minkowski one can also have theories with less than 10 symmetries, symmetry-breaking theories, but this will not be our focus here.

$$\Omega_{R,S}(f) = \int \tilde{f}(p)\, \Omega_{R,S}(e^{ipx})\, \mathrm{d}^4 p \ .$$

Our first choice of Weyl map is the "time-to-the-right" map, which is most commonly adopted in the κ-Minkowski literature (see, *e.g.*, Ref. [16]):

$$\Omega_R(e^{ipx}) = e^{i\vec{p}\vec{\mathbf{x}}} e^{-ip_0\mathbf{x}_0} \tag{4}$$

and the alternative we also consider is the "time-symmetrized" map [17]

$$\Omega_S(e^{ipx}) = e^{-ip_0\mathbf{x}_0/2} e^{i\vec{p}\vec{\mathbf{x}}} e^{-ip_0\mathbf{x}_0/2} \tag{5}$$

[We are adopting conventions such that $px = \vec{p}\vec{x} - p_0 x_0$, with p_μ four real commuting parameters, and similarly $p\mathbf{x} = \vec{p}\vec{\mathbf{x}} - p_0\mathbf{x}_0$.]

It is straightforward to verify that these Weyl maps are equivalent to corresponding ordering conventions. The Ω_R map associates to each commutative function the element obtained ordering the time x_0 to the right and replacing the x variables with the elements $\mathbf{x}$. For example

$$\Omega_R(x_0 x_j) = \Omega_R(x_j x_0) = \mathbf{x}_j \mathbf{x}_0$$

(and notice that $\mathbf{x}_j\mathbf{x}_0 \neq \mathbf{x}_0\mathbf{x}_j = \mathbf{x}_j(\mathbf{x}_0 - i\lambda) = \Omega_R(x_j x_0 - i\lambda x_j)$). Naturally one can refer to this choice as *time–to–the–right ordering* or *right ordering* convention. The Ω_S map, instead, associates to each commutative function a time-symmetrized element, for example

$$\Omega_S(x_0 x_j) = \Omega_S(x_j x_0) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x}_0\mathbf{x}_j + \mathbf{x}_j\mathbf{x}_0)$$

and could be described as *time-symmetrized ordering* or *symmetric ordering*.

For the benefit of readers more familiar with the use of the star-product in noncommutative spacetimes we stress that the choice of a Weyl map is also equivalent to the choice of a star-product representation of κ-Minkowski. The star-products associated to Ω_R and Ω_S are respectivedly defined by

$$\Omega_R(f \ *_R \ g) = \Omega_R(f) \cdot \Omega_R(g)$$
$$\Omega_S(f \ *_S \ g) = \Omega_S(f) \cdot \Omega_S(g)$$

The space of functions equipped with one of the products $*_R/*_S$ is a noncommutative algebra isomorphic to κ-Minkowski (each star-product is a different representation of the same algebra).

While in canonical spacetimes, (1), the star-product formulas are characterized by a standard addition of momenta (Fourier paramenters), in Lie-algebra spacetimes the form of the commutators among coordinates imposes a more complicated formulation of the composition of Fourier parameters. In the case of κ-Minkowski, and of our specific choices of Weyl maps, one finds

$$\Omega_R(e^{ipx}) \cdot \Omega_R(e^{iqx}) = \Omega_R(e^{i(\vec{p} + \vec{q}e^{-\lambda p_0})\vec{x} - i(p_0+q_0)x_0})$$
$$\Omega_S(e^{ipx}) \cdot \Omega_S(e^{iqx}) = \Omega_S(e^{i(\vec{p}e^{\frac{\lambda}{2}q_0} + \vec{q}e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}p_0})\vec{x} - i(p_0+q_0)x_0})$$

The exponentials form the *unitary group* of the algebra, and the last equations furnish the multiplication law in two different representations of the group.

In closing this section we also note a relation between the two Weyl maps here considered

$$\Omega_R(e^{ipx}) = \Omega_S(e^{i\vec{p}e^{\frac{\lambda}{2}p_0}\vec{x} - ip_0 x_0}) \tag{6}$$

i.e. it is possible to go from time-to-the-right to time-symmetrized ordering through a four-momenta transformation. This will also play a key role in our analysis.

III. HOPF-ALGEBRA DESCRIPTION OF SYMMETRIES

In this work we consider only *external symmetries*. In the familiar context of theories in commutative spacetimes we describe an external symmetry as a transformation of the coordinates that leaves invariant the action of the theory, and we shall insist on this property in the case of noncommutative spacetimes.

In preparation for our analysis it is useful to consider the simple action $S(\phi) = \int \mathrm{d}^4x\ \phi(\Box - M^2)\phi$ of a free scalar field ϕ in commutative Minkowski spacetime ($\Box = \partial_\mu \partial^\mu$ is the familiar D'Alembert operator). We will briefly review the Lie-algebra description of the symmetries of this action and then show that, upon considering appropriate coalgebraic properties, this can be cast in Hopf-algebra language. However, for theories in commutative spacetime the coalgebra aspects of the symmetry transformations are inevitably trivial, essentially contained already in the statement of the algebra aspects of the symmetry transformations, and it is therefore appropriate to specify the symmetries exclusively in Lie-algebra language, as commonly done. We will then argue that for theories in noncommutative spacetimes the coalgebraic properties are not in general trivial and a full characterization of the symmetries requires the full language of Hopf algebras.

So we start with our free scalar field in commutative Minkowski spacetime, and we observe that the most general infinitesimal transformation that can be considered is $x'_\mu = x_\mu + \epsilon A_\mu(x)$, with A_μ four real functions of the coordinates.

For the scalar field $\phi'(x') = \phi(x)$ and in leading order in ϵ one finds

$$\phi'(x) - \phi(x) = \{\partial^\mu \phi(x)\}(x_\mu - x'_\mu) = -\epsilon A_\mu(x)\partial^\mu \phi(x)$$

In terms of the generator T of the transformation, $T = iA_\mu(x)\partial^\mu$, one obtains $x' = (1 - i\epsilon T)x$ and $\phi' = (1 + i\epsilon T)\phi$. [The action of T over $\mathbf{x}$ is indicated by $T\mathbf{x}$.]

The variation of the action, at the leading order in ϵ is

$$\begin{aligned} S(\phi') - S(\phi) &= i\epsilon \int \mathrm{d}^4x \left(T\{\phi(\Box - M^2)\phi\} + \phi[\Box, T]\phi\right) \\ &= i\epsilon \int \mathrm{d}^4x \left(T\mathcal{L}(x) + \phi[\Box, T]\phi\right) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore the action is invariant under T-generated transformations if and only if

$$\int \mathrm{d}^4x \left(T\mathcal{L}(x) + \phi[\Box, T]\phi\right) = 0\ . \tag{7}$$

Let us pause to briefly comment on the structure of the condition (7). In the case of the illustrative example we are here considering of a free scalar field in commutative Minkowski spacetime there is a well-established form of the (maximally-symmetric) action and one can just verify that condition (7) is satisfied. In cases in which the (possibly noncommutative) spacetime is given and one is looking for a maximally-symmetic form of the action that analysis can naturally progress in two steps: in the first step one can determine the algebra whose elements T satisfy

$$\int \mathrm{d}^4x\ T\,\mathcal{L}(x) = 0 \tag{8}$$

for every[2] scalar function $\mathcal{L}(x)$ and then in the second step one can construct the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}(x)$ of the theory in terms of $\phi(x)$ and of a differential operator $\mathcal{O}$ imposing $[\mathcal{O}, T] = 0$ (in our illustrative example $\mathcal{O} = \Box - M^2$).

This observation will prove useful as we later look for a maximally-symmetric action in κ-Minkowski. For the case of a free scalar field in commutative Minkowski spacetime the choice $\mathcal{O} = \Box - M^2$ is well established and leads to a maximally-symmetric action. The symmetries of this action are described in terms of the classical Poincaré algebra $\mathcal{P}$, generated by the elements

$$P_\mu = -i\partial_\mu \quad M_j = \epsilon_{jkl} x_k P_l \quad N_j = x_j P_0 - x_0 P_j$$

which satisfy the commutation relations

$$\begin{gathered} [P_\mu, P_\nu] = 0 \qquad [M_j, P_0] = 0 \qquad [M_j, P_k] = i\epsilon_{jkl} P_l \\ [M_j, M_k] = i\epsilon_{jkl} M_l \qquad [M_j, N_k] = i\epsilon_{jkl} N_l \\ [N_j, P_0] = iP_j \quad [N_j, P_k] = i\delta_{jk} P_0 \quad [N_j, N_k] = -i\epsilon_{jkl} M_l \end{gathered}$$

The operator $\Box = -P_\mu P^\mu$ is the first casimir of the algebra, and of course satisfies $[\Box, T] = 0$.

---

[2]Indipendently of the form of the differential operator $\mathcal{O}$ contained in $\mathcal{L}(x)$ the condition that $\int \mathrm{d}^4x\ T\{\phi\mathcal{O}\phi)\} = 0$ for a generic ϕ is equivalent to the condition $\int \mathrm{d}^4x\ T\,\mathcal{L}(x) = 0$ for a generic $\mathcal{L}$.

For this case of a maximally-symmetric theory in commutative Minkowski spacetime it is conventional to describe the symmetries fully in terms of the Poincaré Lie algebra. For κ-Minkowski noncommutative spacetime we shall argue that a description in terms of a Hopf algebra is necessary. In order to guide the reader toward this step we want to first show that even in the commutative-Minkowski case there is an underlying Hopf-algebra structure, but the commutativity of functions in Minkowski spacetimes implies that the additional structures present in the Hopf algebra (with respect to the Lie algebra) are all trivial. We will then observe that the noncommutativity of functions in noncommutative κ-Minkowski spacetime leads to a nontrivial Hopf-algebra structure, which cannot be faithfully captured in the simpler language of Lie algebras.

In preparation for this exercise it is convenient to introduce a map ϵ such that

$$\int \mathrm{d}^4x\, U\, \mathcal{L}(x) = \epsilon(U) \int \mathrm{d}^4x\, \mathcal{L}(x) \tag{9}$$

for each element $U \in \mathcal{P}$ and for each function $\mathcal{L}(x)$. It is straightforward to verify that $\epsilon(1) = 1$ (with an abuse of notation, we indicate with 1 the identity transformation) and of course from (8) it follows that $\epsilon(T) = 0$ for each generator T of the algebra. Moreover, from (9) it follows that

$$\int \mathrm{d}^4x\, U(U'\mathcal{L}) = \epsilon(U) \int \mathrm{d}^4x\, U'\mathcal{L} = \epsilon(U)\epsilon(U') \int \mathrm{d}^4x\, \mathcal{L}$$

But the first member is also equal to $\epsilon(UU') \int \mathrm{d}^4x\, \mathcal{L}$, and therefore ϵ is an algebra morphism

$$\epsilon(UU') = \epsilon(U)\epsilon(U')$$

This recursive formula allows us to calculate ϵ for a generic element of the algebra. [Also note that the application of U to a constant function $f = 1$ gives $U{\cdot}1 = \epsilon(U)$.]

For each $U \in \mathcal{P}$ we can also introduce a map $\Delta\colon \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{P}$ such that for every $f(x)$ and $g(x)$

$$U(f{\cdot}g) = (U_{(1)}f)(U_{(2)}g) \tag{10}$$

where $\Delta(U) = \sum_i U^i_{(1)} \otimes U^i_{(2)}$ is written simply as $U_{(1)} \otimes U_{(2)}$ (Sweedler notation). The reader can easily verify that $\Delta(1) = 1 \otimes 1$, and $\Delta(T) = T \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes T$ for each generator of Poincaré algebra. This last property, which plays a key role in allowing a description of the symmetries at the simple Lie-algebra level (without any true need to resort to a full Hopf-algebra description) is actually connected with the commutativity of function in Minkowski spacetime. In fact, from $f{\cdot}g = g{\cdot}f$, one easily finds that Δ is symmetric

$$U_{(1)} \otimes U_{(2)} = U_{(2)} \otimes U_{(1)}$$

for all U or, adopting math gergeon, Δ is *cocommutative* (in a certain sense, Δ is trivial). In general in a noncommutative spacetime Δ is not cocommutative.

Another noteworthy property, the fact that Δ is coassociative, *i.e.* $U_{(1)} \otimes \Delta(U_{(2)}) = \Delta(U_{(1)}) \otimes U_{(2)}$, follows straightforwardly from the associativity of the product of functions. From the property $(UU'){\cdot}(fg) = U(U'{\cdot}fg)$ it follows that Δ is an algebra morphism, *i.e.* $\Delta(UU') = \Delta(U)\Delta(U')$, which allows to calculate Δ recursively. And finally by considering (10) for $g = 1$ one obtains $Uf = U(f{\cdot}1) = (U_{(1)}f)(U_{(2)}1) = (U_{(1)}f)\epsilon(U_{(2)})$ from which it follows that $U_{(1)}\epsilon(U_{(2)}) = U$ (and similarly $\epsilon(U_{(1)})U_{(2)} = U$).

These two maps ϵ and Δ, defined by (9) and (10), make a generic symmetry algebra into a *bialgebra*. ϵ is called *counit* and Δ is called *coproduct*.

Defining $S(1) = 1$, $S(T) = -T$ for each generator and $S(UU') = S(U')S(U)$ we obtain a map satisfying $U_{(1)}S(U_{(2)}) = S(U_{(1)})U_{(2)} = \epsilon(U)$. This makes $\mathcal{P}$ a Hopf algebra [2]. The map S is called antipode and (if it exists, as in this case) it is unique.

In an appropriate sense a Lie algebra is equivalent to a "trivial Hopf algebra", a Hopf algebra with the trivial structure of counit, coproduct and antipode which we just described. For theories in commutative spacetime the symmetries can always be described in terms of a trivial Hopf algebra. In contemplating theories in noncommutative spacetime it is natural to insist on the requirement that the symmetries be described by a Hopf algebra. The Lie-algebra description cannot be maintained, since it would not provide a sufficient set of rules to handle consistently the laws of symmetry transformation of products of (noncommutative) functions. The requirement that symmetries be described in terms of a Hopf algebra actually is a simple statement: the action of symmetry transformations on products of functions should be consistent with the fact that such products are themself functions, and, accordingly, the laws of transformation of products of functions should still only require the appropriate action of the generators of the (Hopf) algebra.

Once the algebra properties are specified (action of symmetry transformations on functions of the noncommutative coordinates) the properties of the counit, coproduct and antipode can always be formally derived, but these will not in general satisfy the Hopf algebra criteria since they may require the introduction of new operators, not included in the algebra sector. If this does not occur (if the counit, coprodut and antipode that one obtains on the basis of the algebra sector can be expressed fully in terms of operators in the algebra) the Hopf-algebra criteria are automatically satisfied.

IV. SYMMETRIES OF A THEORY IN κ-Minkowski SPACETIME

A. General strategy

In this first exploratory study in which our description of symmetries is applied we only consider a free scalar theory in κ-Minkowski spacetime. This is a significant limitation. In fact, our concept of symmetries applies directly to theories and not to the underlying spacetime on which the theories are introduced, so one may expect different results for different theories (even restricting our attention to theories 10-generator Poincaré-like symmetries).

Having specified our objective as the one of describing free scalar fields in κ-Minkowski we have not yet established the form of the action. We will look for an action which realizes our objective of a theory with symmetries described by a 10-generator Hopf algebra.

As announced, our construction of the theory will for convenience make use of Weyl maps, which allow us to keep track a various properties in the familiar context of functions of auxiliary commutative coordinates. We have already introduced the Weyl maps Ω_R and Ω_S which shall be useful to discuss our results. We are therefore ready for the first step in constructing the action for a free scalar particle. Of course we need a rule of integration. In the κ-Minkowski literature there is already substantial work on rules of integration that are naturally expressed using the Ω_R Weyl map

$$\int_R \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\ \Omega_R(f) = \int f(x)\,\mathrm{d}^4x \ . \tag{11}$$

Our alternative choice of Weyl map would naturally invite us to consider the integration rule

$$\int_S \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\ \Omega_S(f) = \int f(x)\,\mathrm{d}^4x \ . \tag{12}$$

Actually these integrals are equivalent, *i.e.* $\int_R \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\ \Phi = \int_S \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\ \Phi$ for each element Φ of κ-Minkowski. This is easily verified by expressing the most general element of κ-Minkowski both in its Ω_R-inspired form and its Ω_S-inspired form

$$\Phi = \int \mathrm{d}^4p\ \tilde{f}(p)\Omega_R(e^{ipx}) = \int \mathrm{d}^4p\ \tilde{f}(p_0, pe^{-\lambda p_0/2})e^{-3\lambda p_0/2}\Omega_S(e^{ipx}) \tag{13}$$

and observing that

$$\int_R \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\ \Phi = \int_S \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\ \Phi = (2\pi)^4\tilde{f}(0) \ .$$

In our search of a maximally-symmetric theory with construction based on Ω_R or Ω_S we therefore have a natural candidate for the integration rules to be used: (11), which can be equivalently reformulated as (12). [Because of the equivalence we will omit indices R or S on the integration symbol.]

We can now also start formulating an educated guess for the general structure of the action we are seeking

$$S(\Phi) = \int \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\ \Phi(\Box_\lambda - M^2)\Phi$$

where Φ is a generic real[3] element of κ-Minkowski, M^2 is (real, dimensionful and) positive and $\Box_\lambda$ is a (differential) operator which is still to be specified (we need more guidance concerning our requirement of obtaining a maximally-symmetric theory) but we know it should reproduce the familiar D'Alembert operator in the $\lambda \to 0$ commutative-spacetime limit. For each real element Φ, the action $S(\Phi)$ is a real number.

[3]Of course, there is no intuitive concept of "reality" for a function of noncommuting coordinates; however, it is natural to state that Φ is a real element of κ-Minkowski if it is obtained from a real commutative function through the Ω-map.

By straightforward generalization of the results reviewed in the previous section, we pose that a transformation T will be a symmetry if (and only if)

$$\int \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\ \left(T\cdot\left\{\Phi\left(\Box_\lambda - M^2\right)\Phi\right\} + \Phi[\Box_\lambda, T]\Phi\right) = 0\ . \tag{14}$$

When several such symmetry generators are available they may or may not combine together to form a Hopf algebra. When they do form a Hopf algebra, denote it generically by $\mathcal{A}$, and we attribute to $\mathcal{A}$ the role of symmetry (Hopf) algebra.

As mentioned in the preceding section, the search of a maximally-symmetric action can be structured in two steps. In the first step one looks for a Hopf algebra (in our case a Hopf algebra which has the Poincaré algebra as classical limit) whose generators T satisfy

$$\int \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\ T\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \tag{15}$$

for each element $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})$ of κ-Minkowski. In the second step one looks for an operator $\Box_\lambda$ that is invariant ($[\Box_\lambda, T] = 0$) under the action of this algebra.

B. Translations

In introducing the concept of translations we of course want to follow as closely as possible the analogy with the well-established concepts that apply in the commutative limit $\lambda \to 0$. Since we have defined functions in κ-Minkowski in terms of the Weyl maps, and since the Weyl maps are fully specified once given on Fourier exponentials (then the map on generic functions simply requires the introduction of standard Fourier transforms), we can, when convenient, confine the discussion to the Fourier exponentials. And an ambiguity, which is deeply connected with noncommutativity, confronts us immediately: in commutative Minkowski the translation generator acts according to

$$P_\mu(e^{ikx}) = k_\mu e^{ikx} \tag{16}$$

but this action of the translation generators cannot be implemented on general functions of the κ-Minkowski coordinates. The root of the ambiguity can be exposed by just considering the same function of κ-Minkowski coordinates written in two ways, the time-to-the-right form and the time-symmetrized form. Let us first write a specific function Φ of the κ-Minkowski coordinates in the way suggested by the time-to-the-right Weyl map:

$$\Phi = \int \mathrm{d}^4p\ \tilde{f}(p)\Omega_R(e^{ipx})\ . \tag{17}$$

On the basis of Eqs. (16) and (17) it would seem natural to define translations in κ-Minkowski as generated by the operators P^R_μ such that

$$P^R_\mu\Omega_R(e^{ikx}) = k_\mu\Omega_R(e^{ikx})\ . \tag{18}$$

But, as already stated through Eq. (13), the same function Φ written in Eq. (17) using time-to-the-right ordering can also be equivalently expressed in time-symmetrized form as

$$\Phi = \int \mathrm{d}^4p\ \tilde{f}(p_0, pe^{-\lambda p_0/2})e^{-3\lambda p_0/2}\Omega_S(e^{ipx}) \tag{19}$$

and on the basis of Eqs. (16) and (19) it would seem natural to define translations in κ-Minkowski as generated by the operators P^S_μ such that

$$P^S_\mu\Omega_S(e^{ikx}) = k_\mu\Omega_S(e^{ikx})\ . \tag{20}$$

We had already encountered an "ordering ambiguity" in introducing a law of integration in κ-Minkowski, but there we eventually realized that there was no ambiguity after all (the two approaches to the law of integration led to identical results). The ordering ambiguity we are facing now in defining translations is certainly more serious. In fact, the two candidates as translation generators P^S_μ and P^R_μ are truly inequivalent, as the careful reader can easily verify by applying P^S_μ and P^R_μ to a few examples of functions in κ-Minkowski; in particular:

$$P^R_\mu(e^{i\vec{k}\vec{\mathbf{x}}}e^{-ik_0\mathbf{x}_0}) = P^R_\mu\Omega_R(e^{ikx}) = k_\mu\Omega_R(e^{ikx}) = k_\mu(e^{i\vec{k}\vec{\mathbf{x}}}e^{-ik_0\mathbf{x}_0}) = k_\mu(e^{-ik_0\mathbf{x}_0/2}e^{ie^{\frac{\lambda}{2}k_0}\vec{k}\vec{\mathbf{x}}}e^{-ik_0\mathbf{x}_0/2})$$
$$\neq e^{\frac{\lambda}{2}k_0}k_\mu(e^{-ik_0\mathbf{x}_0/2}e^{ie^{\frac{\lambda}{2}k_0}\vec{k}\vec{\mathbf{x}}}e^{-ik_0\mathbf{x}_0/2}) = P^S_\mu(e^{i\vec{k}\vec{\mathbf{x}}}e^{-ik_0\mathbf{x}_0}) \ . \tag{21}$$

It is also easy to verify that both P^S_μ and P^R_μ satisfy condition (15):

$$\int \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\ P^{R,S}_\mu\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \tag{22}$$

Moreover the quadruplet of operators P^S_μ and the quadruplet of operators P^R_μ do separately give rise to genuine Hopf algebras of translation-like symmetry transformations. Since, as mentioned, the exponentials $e^{i\vec{k}\vec{\mathbf{x}}}e^{-ik_0\mathbf{x}_0}$ form a basis of κ-Minkowski, the coproduct of the P^R_j operators, ΔP^R_j, is obtained consistently from observing that

$$\begin{aligned}
&P^R_j\Omega_R(e^{ikx})\Omega_R(e^{ipx}) = -i\Omega_R(\partial_j e^{i(k\dot{+}p)x})\\
&= -i\Omega_R((k\dot{+}_R p)_j e^{i(k\dot{+}p)x})\\
&= [P^R_j\Omega_R(e^{ikx})][\Omega_R(e^{ipx})] + [e^{-\lambda P^R_0}\Omega_R(e^{ikx})][P^R_j\Omega_R(e^{ipx})] \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where $p\dot{+}q \equiv (p_0+q_0, p_1+q_1e^{-\lambda p_0}, p_2+q_2e^{-\lambda p_0}, p_3+q_3e^{-\lambda p_0})$, which implies

$$\Delta P^R_j = P^R_j \otimes 1 + e^{-\lambda P^R_0} \otimes P^R_j \tag{24}$$

Following an analogous procedure one can derive

$$\Delta(P^R_0) = P^R_0 \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes P^R_0$$

and the full structure of a four-generator Hopf algebra emerges.

The same goes through, with equal success, for the P^S_μ alternative. The coproducts naturally take a different form,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta P^S_0 &= P^S_0 \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes P^S_0\\
\Delta P^S_j &= P^S_j \otimes e^{\frac{\lambda}{2}P^S_0} + e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}P^S_0} \otimes P^S_j
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

but the full structure of a four-generator Hopf algebra is again straightforwardly obtained.

We must therefore live with this ambiguity. As we look for an example of maximally-symmetric theory in κ-Minkowski both the option P^R_μ and the option P^S_μ must be considered[4], *i.e.* we can look for 10-generator extensions of either.

C. Rotations

Next we attempt to obtain a 7-generator Hopf algebra, describing four translation-like operators and three rotation-like generators. Since, as just mentioned, our analysis of translations alone led us to two alternatives, we are in principle prepared for at least two alternative version of the 7-generator Hopf-algebra for translations and rotations: (P^R, M^R) and (P^S, M^S), with M^R and M^S to be determined.

For what concerns the translations we have found that an acceptable Hopf-algebra description was obtained by straightforward "quantization" of the classical translations: the P^R_μ translations where just obtained from the

[4]Of course, it is reasonable to contemplate even more options in addition to these two; however, for our purposes it is convenient to focus on these two examples. This will be sufficient in order to illustrate the differences and the common features of the two choices (similar differences and analogous common features should be expected of other possibilities which might be considered). We also stress that the two options we consider, the one inspired by time-to-the-right ordering and the one inspired by time-symmetrized ordering, can be viewed as the most natural ones. In fact, the time coordinate has a privileged role in the κ-Minkowski commutation relations and it is natural to think first of all to three options: time-symmetrized, time-to-the-right and time-to-the-left. We are actually considering also the time-to-the-left option; in fact, as the careful reader can easily verify, the implications of time-to-the-left ordering are indistinguishable from the ones of the time-to-the-right ordering (identical Hopf-algebra structures...just a few trivial formal differences).

commutative-spacetime translations through the Ω_R Weyl map and the P^S_μ translations where just obtained from the commutative-spacetime translations through the Ω_S Weyl map.

Also noticing that the κ-Minkowski commutation relations are structured in a way that appears to be very respectful of classical rotations, it is natural to explore the possibility of describing also the rotations by straightforward "quantization"

$$M^R_j \cdot \Omega_R(f) = \Omega_R(M_j f) = \Omega_R(-i\epsilon_{jkl} x_k \partial_l f) \tag{26}$$

$$M^S_j \cdot \Omega_S(f) = \Omega_S(M_j f) = \Omega_S(-i\epsilon_{jkl} x_k \partial_l f) \tag{27}$$

where again in defining these rotation generators we used the fact that any element of κ-Minkowski (any "function in κ-Minkowski spacetime") can be obtained through the action of a Weyl map from some commutative function $f(x)$.

This is actually another instance in which an ordering ambiguity is only apparent. In fact, M^S_j and M^R_j act exactly in the same way, as one can verify through the observation that

$$\begin{aligned} M^S_j \Omega_R(e^{ikx}) &= M^S_j \Omega_S(e^{ik'x})_{k'=(k_0, k_i e^{\lambda k_0/2})} \\ = -i\epsilon_{jkl}\Omega_S(x_k \partial_l e^{ik'x}) &= \epsilon_{jkl}\Omega_S(x_k e^{\lambda k_0/2} k_l e^{ik'x}) \\ = -i\epsilon_{jkl} k_l \Omega_S(\partial_{k_k} e^{ik'x}) &= -i\epsilon_{jkl} k_l \partial_{k_k} \Omega_S(e^{ik'x}) \\ = -i\epsilon_{jkl} k_l \partial_{k_k} \Omega_R(e^{ikx}) &= \epsilon_{jkl} k_l \Omega_R(-i\partial_{k_k} e^{ikx}) \\ = -i\epsilon_{jkl}\Omega_R(x_k \partial_l e^{ikx}) &= M^R_j \Omega_R(e^{ikx}) \end{aligned}$$

We will therefore remove the indices R/S on the rotation generator, and denote simply by M_j.

One easily verifies that the operators M_j, as defined by (26) (and equivalently defined by (27)), are good candidates for the construction of (Hopf) algebras of symmetries of a theory in κ-Minkowski spacetime; in fact:

$$\int \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\; M_j \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}) = 0\ . \tag{28}$$

It is also straightforward to verify that

$$[M_j, M_k] = i\varepsilon_{jkl} M_l \tag{29}$$

and, following a line of analysis analogous to the one of Eq. (23), that a trivial coproduct must be adopted for these candidate rotation operators:

$$\Delta M_j = M_j \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes M_j \tag{30}$$

Therefore the triplet M_j forms a 3-generator Hopf algebra that is completely undeformed (classical) both in the algebra and in the coalgebra sectors. (Using the intuitive description introduced earlier this is a trivial rotation Hopf algebras, whose structure could be equally well captured by the standard Lie algebra of rotations.)

There is therefore a difference between the translations sector and the rotations sector. Both translations and rotations can be realized as straightforward (up to ordering) quantization of their classical actions, but while for rotations even the coalgebraic properties are classical (trivial coalgebra) for the translations we found a nontrivial coalgebra sector (24) (or alternatively (25)).

Up to this point we have two candidates, P^S_μ and P^S_μ, for a 4-generator Hopf algebra of translation symmetries and a candidate, M_j, for a 3-generator Hopf algebra of rotation symmetries. These can actually be put together straightforwardly to obtain two candidates for 7-generator translations-rotations symmetries (P^R_μ, M_j) and (P^S_μ, M_j). It is sufficient to observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &[M_j, P^{R,S}_\mu] \cdot \Omega(e^{ikx}) = \varepsilon_{jkl}\Omega([-x_k\partial_\mu + \partial_\mu x_k]\partial_l e^{ikx}) \\ &= \delta_{\mu k}\varepsilon_{jkl}\Omega(\partial_l e^{ikx}) \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

from which it follows that

$$[M_i, P^{R,S}_j] = i\varepsilon_{ijk} P^{R,S}_k,\ \ [M_i, P^{R,S}_0] = 0 \tag{32}$$

i.e. the action of rotations on energy-momentum is undeformed. Accordingly, the generators M_j can be represented as differential operators over energy-momentum space in the familiar way, $M_j = -i\varepsilon_{jkl} P_k \partial_{P_l}$. [This also provides another opportunity to verify (29).]

D. Failure of classical Boosts

In the analysis of translations and boosts we have already encountered two different situations: rotations in κ-Minkowski spacetime are essentially classical in all respects, while translations have a "classical" action (straightforward Ω-map "quantization" of the corresponding classical action) but have nontrivial coalgebraic properties. As we now intend to include also boosts, and obtain 10-generator symmetry algebras, we encounter another possibility: for boosts not only the coalgebra sector is nontrivial but even the action on functions in κ-Minkowski cannot be obtained by "quantization" of the classical action.

Because of its profound implications for our analysis, we devote this subsection to the analysis of classical boosts, showing that they do not lead to acceptable symmetries. For simplicity we only look for boosts N_j^R that could combine with the translations P_μ^R and rotations M_j to give us a 10-generator symmetry algebra. The assumption that the action of these boosts could be "classical" means

$$N_j^R \Omega_R(f) = \Omega_R(N_j f) = \Omega_R(i[x_0\partial_j - x_j\partial_0]f]) \ . \tag{33}$$

It is easy to see (and it is obvious) that these boosts combine with the rotations M_j to close a healthy undeformed Lorentz algebra, and that adding also the translations P_μ^R one obtains the undeformed Poincaré algebra. However, these algebras cannot be extended (by introducing a suitable coalgebra sector) to obtain a (Hopf) algebra of symmetries of theories in our noncommutative κ-Minkowski spacetime. In particular, we find an inconsistency in the coproduct of these boosts N_j^R, which signals an obstruction originating from an inadequacy in the description of the action of boosts on (noncommutative) products of κ-Minkowski functions.

The coproduct of the boosts N_j^R can be inferred from observing that

$$\begin{aligned}
&N_j^R \Omega_R(e^{ikx})\Omega_R(e^{ipx}) = \Omega_R(N_j e^{i(k\dot{+}p)x}) \\
&= -\Omega_R[(x_0(k\dot{+}p)_j - x_j(k+p)_0)e^{i(k\dot{+}p)x}] \\
&= -[\Omega_R([k_j x_0 - k_0 x_j]e^{ikx})\Omega_R(e^{ipx}) \\
&+\Omega_R(e^{-\lambda k_0}e^{ikx})\Omega_R([p_j x_0 - p_0 x_j]e^{ipx}) \\
&-\lambda\Omega_R(k_j e^{ikx})\Omega_R(p_l x_l e^{ipx}) + 2\Omega_R(\sinh(\lambda k_0)e^{ikx})\Omega_R(p_0 x_j e^{ipx})]
\end{aligned}$$

where we also used the relations

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_R(x_0 e^{i(k\dot{+}p)x}) &= \Omega_R(e^{i(k\dot{+}p)x})\mathbf{x}_0 \\
= \Omega_R(e^{ikx})\mathbf{x}_0\Omega_R(e^{ipx}) &- \lambda p\Omega_R(e^{ikx})\mathbf{x}\Omega_R(e^{ipx}) \\
= \Omega_R(x_0 e^{ikx})\Omega_R(e^{ipx}) &- \lambda\Omega_R(e^{ikx})\Omega_R(p_l x_l e^{ipx}) \\
\Omega_R(x_j e^{i(k\dot{+}p)\mathbf{x}}) &= \mathbf{x}_j\Omega_R(e^{i(k\dot{+}p)x}) \\
= e^{\lambda k_0}\Omega_R(e^{ikx})\mathbf{x}_j\Omega_R(e^{ipx}) &= e^{\lambda k_0}\Omega_R(e^{ikx})\Omega_R(x_j e^{ipx})
\end{aligned}$$

From this one concludes that the coproduct is

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta(N_j^R) = N_j^R \otimes 1 + e^{-\lambda P_0^R} \otimes N_j^R &+ \\
+2\sinh\lambda P_0^R \otimes \mathbf{x}_j P_0^R - \lambda P_j^R \otimes \vec{\mathbf{x}}\vec{P}_R &
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

The problem is that $\Delta(N_j^R)$ is not an element of the algebraic tensor product, *i.e.* it is not a function only of the elements M, N, P. It would be necessary to introduce new elements to close the Hopf algebra; for example, the well known *dilatation operator* $\mathcal{D} = \vec{\mathbf{x}}\vec{P}_R$, which is independent from the other generators. Therefore, as anticipated, the "classical" choice N_j^R cannot be combined with M^R and P_μ^R to obtain a 10-generator symmetry algebra. From (34) one might immagine that perhaps an 11-generator symmetry algebra, including the dilatation operator $\mathcal{D}$, could be contemplated but this is also not possible since one can easily verify that $\mathcal{D}$ does not satisfy condition (15),

$$\int \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\ \mathcal{D}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0 \ . \tag{35}$$

$\mathcal{D}$ cannot be a symmetry of a scalar action in κ-Minkowski.

Since the "classical" choice N_j^R is inadequate we are left with two possible outcomes: either there is no 10-generator symmetry-algebra extension of the 7-generator symmetry algebra (P_μ^R,M_j) or the 10-generator symmetry-algebra extension exists but requires nonclassical boosts. In the next Subsection we show that the latter is true.

As mentioned the careful reader can easily verify that all these points we made about the "classical" N_j^R and the (P_μ^R,M_j,N_j^R) algebra also apply to the "classical" N_j^S and the (P_μ^S,M_j,N_j^S) algebra.

E. Deformed boosts succeed

We now show that there is a nonclassical choice of boosts $\mathcal{N}_j^R$ that leads to a satisfactory $(P_\mu^R, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j^R)$ symmetry (Hopf) algebra. On the basis of the problem encountered in the previous subsection it is clear that our key task is to find an operator $\mathcal{N}_j^R$ such that $\Delta(\mathcal{N}_j^R)$ is an element of $\mathcal{A}\otimes\mathcal{A}$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is the algebra generated by $(P_\mu^R, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j^R)$. We will show that this is possible, and that our $\mathcal{N}_j^R$ has the correct classical limit and even the classical Lorentz-subalgebra relations can be preserved (the commutation relations involving $M_j, \mathcal{N}_j^R$ are undeformed[5], *i.e.* λ-independent, and therefore exactly as in the commutative Minkowski spacetime case).

Let us start by observing that, as one can easily verify, by imposing that the deformed boost generator $\mathcal{N}_j$ (although possibly having a nonclassical action) transforms as a vector under rotation one finds

$$\mathcal{N}_j\Omega(\phi(x)) = \Omega\{[ix_0A(-i\partial_x)\partial_j + \lambda^{-1}x_jB(-i\partial_x) - \lambda x_lC(-i\partial_x)\partial_l\partial_j - i\epsilon_{jkl}x_kD(-i\partial_x)\partial_l]\phi(x)\} \tag{36}$$

where A, B, C, D are unknown functions of P_μ^R (in the classical limit $A = i, D = 0$; moreover, as $\lambda \to 0$ one obtains the classical limit if $\lambda C \to 0$ and $B \to \lambda P_0$).

Imposing

$$\mathcal{N}_j^R[\Omega(e^{ikx})\Omega(e^{ipx})] = [\mathcal{N}_{(1),j}^R\Omega(e^{ikx})][\mathcal{N}_{(2),j}^R\Omega(e^{ikp})] \tag{37}$$

one clearly obtains some constraints on the functions A, B, C, D that must be satisfied in order to obtain the desired result that the operator $\mathcal{N}_j^R$ is such that $\Delta(\mathcal{N}_j^R)$ is an element of $\mathcal{A}\otimes\mathcal{A}$. These constraints are discussed and analyzed in the Appendix. The final result is

$$\mathcal{N}_j^R\Omega_R(f) = \Omega_R([ix_0\partial_j + x_j(\frac{1-e^{2i\lambda\partial_0}}{2\lambda} - \frac{\lambda}{2}\nabla^2) - \lambda x_l\partial_l\partial_j]f) \tag{38}$$

It is easy to verify that the Hopf algebra $(P_\mu^R, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j^R)$ satisfies all the requirements for a candidate symmetry-algebra for theories in κ-Minkowski spacetime.

Analogously on finds that the deformed boost generators

$$\mathcal{N}_j^S\Omega_S(f) = \Omega_S([ix_0\partial_j - x_j(\frac{\sinh(i\lambda\partial_0)}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{2}\nabla^2) + \frac{\lambda}{2}x_l\partial_l\partial_j]e^{i\frac{\lambda}{2}\partial_0}f) \tag{39}$$

combine with the translations P_μ^S and the rotations M_j to give a genuine symmetry Hopf algebra $(P_\mu^R, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j^S)$.

Although introduced following different formulations (respectively the action on right-ordered functions and the action on symmetrically-ordered functions) $\mathcal{N}_j^R$ and $\mathcal{N}_j^S$ are actually identical. This is easily seen by observing that

$$\mathcal{N}_j^S\Omega_R(f) = \Omega_R([ix_0\partial_j + x_j(\frac{1-e^{2i\lambda\partial_0}}{2\lambda} - \frac{\lambda}{2}\nabla^2) - \lambda x_l\partial_l\partial_j]f) \tag{40}$$

and comparing with (38). We therefore remove the indices R/S and use the unified notation $\mathcal{N}_j$.

In summary we have two candidate Hopf algebras of 10-generator Poincaré-like symmetries for κ-Minkowski: $(P_\mu^R, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$ and $(P_\mu^S, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$.

F. An action for the free scalar field in κ-Minkowski

We have completed what we had announced as "step 1" of our analysis: we have constructed explicitly candidates (actually not one but two candidates) of 10-generator symmetry Hopf algebras for theories in κ-Minkowski spacetime, whose generators, generically denoted by T, satisfy

[5]The fact that the Lorentz-subalgebra relations are undeformed is actually not surprising. It is easy to see, just on the basis of dimensional considerations, that the Lorentz algebra cannot be deformed by a length parameter λ. In order to deform the Lorentz-sector commutation relations one should renounce to the property that the Lorentz-sector generators form a subalgebra (the Lorentz-sector commutators can only be deformed if energy-momentum generators are allowed to enter the commutation relations). Fortunately we find that this is not required.

$$\int \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\, T\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \tag{41}$$

for every element $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})$ of κ-Minkowski (*i.e.* for every function $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})$ of the κ-Minkowski coordinates).

We are finally ready for the second step: introducing a differential operator $\Box_\lambda$, whose classical $\lambda \to 0$ limit is the familiar D'Alembert operator, and such that the action

$$S(\Phi) = \int \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\, \Phi(\Box_\lambda - M^2)\Phi \tag{42}$$

is invariant under one of the Hopf algebras we have constructed $(P^R_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$ and $(P^S_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$. We therefore must verify that, for some choice of $\Box_\lambda$, $[\Box_\lambda, T] = 0$ for every T in the Hopf algebra.

For the $(P^R_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$ case, guided by the intuition that $\Box_\lambda$ should be a scalar with respect to $(P^R_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$ transformations, one is led to the proposal

$$\Box_\lambda = \left(\frac{2}{\lambda}\sinh\frac{\lambda P^R_0}{2}\right)^2 - e^{\lambda P^2_0} P^2_R \tag{43}$$

In fact, it is easy to verify that with this choice of $\Box_\lambda$ the action (42) is invariant under the $(P^R_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$ transformations. Therefore, we have finally managed to construct an action describing free scalar fields in κ-Minkowski that enjoyes 10-generator (Hopf-algebra) symmetries $(P^R_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$.

It may surprise the reader that this same choice of differential operator $\Box_\lambda$ is also acceptable from the perspective of the alternative $(P^S_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$ symmetries. It turns out that the $\Box_\lambda$ given in (43) is also a scalar with respect to the $(P^S_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$ transformations ($[\Box_\lambda, T] = 0$ for every T in $(P^S_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$) and the action (42) with $\Box_\lambda$ given in (43) is invariant also under the $(P^S_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$ transformations.

We will provide some additional remarks on this ambiguity in the next Section, but let us first clarify what we found. The action (42) with $\Box_\lambda$ given in (43) is invariant both under $(P^R_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$ transformations and under $(P^S_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$ transformations. It is of course not proper to state that it is invariant under 14-generator $(P^R_\mu, P^S_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$ transformations (this 14-generator algebra is not a Hopf algebra and its generators are not truly independent), but rather we have an ambiguity in the description of the symmetries of the action we have constructed for a free scalar field in κ-Minkowski. As discussed we are here formulating the ambiguity in terms of two Hopf algebras, (P^R_μ, M_j, N_j) and (P^S_μ, M_j, N_j), which are profoundly connected with two different choices of ordering in κ-Minkowski (in the sense codified in the Weyl maps Ω_R and Ω). We anticipate that the ambiguity should actually be between more than two options: if one considered other types of ordering conventions (ignoring the fact that these other alternatives might not be "natural") for functions in κ-Minkowski one would find other candidates P^*_μ as translation generators and, correspondingly, other candidate 10-generator Hopf algebras of Poincaré-like symmetries for κ-Minkowski of the type $(P^*_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$.

V. REDUCING THE AMBIGUITY TO THE CHOICE OF TRANSLATION GENERATORS

The observation reported in the previous Section clearly confronts us with an important aspect of the noncommutative geometries we are considering. One could consider assuming that the two Hopf algebras (P^R_μ, M_j, N_j) and (P^S_μ, M_j, N_j) are actually equivalent dscriptions of the symmetries of the theory, but this would only postpone the question at the level of describing energy-momentum in our theory. We are used to associate energy-momentum with the translation generators and it is not conceivable that a given operative definition of energy-momentum could be equivalently described in the context of the (P^R_μ, M_j, N_j) and (P^S_μ, M_j, N_j) Hopf algebras. If the properties of P^R_μ describe the properties of a certain operative definition of energy-momentum then for that same operative definition of energy-momentum a description in terms of P^S_μ will turn out to be unacceptable. The difference would be easily established by using, for example, the different dispersion relations that P^R_μ and P^S_μ satisfy (a meaningful physical property, which could, in particular, have observable consequences in astrophysics [18] and in cosmology [19,20]).

There are clearly several paths one could follow in exploring this issue. One hypothesis that deserves investigation in future studies is the one that perhaps the theory we considered does not have enough structure to give proper physical significance to energy-momentum. In the study of gauge theories in canonical noncommutative spacetime it has emerged that gauge transformations and spacetime transformations are deeply connected. It therefore seems important to aim for the construction of gauge theories in κ-Minkowski spacetime, which might have a deep role in clarifying the status of the energy-momentum observables.

While clearly our analysis leaves this question unanswered, we have reduced and clarifed the ambiguity that one finds in previous κ-Minkowski literature concerning the description of symmetries. As mentioned in the Introduction, in the literature there has been discussion (see, *e.g.*, Refs. [11,9]) of a large class of Hopf algebras as candidates for the description of the symmetries of κ-Minkowski. These candidates were identified using a Hopf-algebra-duality criterion. The commutation relations that characterize these different Hopf algebras fulfilling the duality condition take a very different form in the different algebras, just like very different commutation relations characterize our algebras (P_μ^R, M_j, N_j) and (P_μ^S, M_j, N_j). In the previous literature the differences between the algebras were perceived in very general terms, so much so that, in terms of our notation, our two algebras would have been distinguished as (P_μ^R, M_j^R, N_j^R) and (P_μ^S, M_j^S, N_j^S). Instead our two algebras involve the same generators for rotations and boosts. These generators have different commutation rules with translations, but only because the translations P_μ^R are genuinely different from the translations P_μ^S. When acting on the same entity (in particular when acting on functions of the κ-Minkowski coordinates) the generators for rotations and boosts of the two algebras act in exactly the same way, they are identical operators.

We have therefore clarified that the difference between alternative 10-generator algebras of symmetries merely reflect a different concept of translations. As discussed in Subsection IV.B the type of spacetime noncommutativity we are considering does naturally invite one to consider alternative descriptions of translations.

VI. ASIDE ON THE NEW κ-Poincaré HOPF ALGEBRA THAT EMERGED FROM THE ANALYSIS

While the work here reported has as primary objective the one of contributing to the understanding of physical theories in certain types of noncommutative spacetimes, we should at least mention in passing that in the analysis reported in the previous Section we have stumbled upon an interesting new example of the so-called κ-Poincaré Hopf algebras. The reader familiar with the subject will recognize that the Hopf algebra (P_μ^R, M_j, N_j), to which we were led by our time-to-the-right ordering convention, turns out to be a well known example of κ-Poincaré Hopf algebra, the Majid-Ruegg algebra first discussed in Refs. [13,11]. Instead the (P_μ^S, M_j, N_j) algebra, which we ended up considering starting from the time-symmetrized ordering convention, is actually a new example of κ-Poincaré Hopf algebra, which had not previously emerged in the literature.

While for a mathematical discussion of the properties of the Majid-Ruegg (P_μ^R, M_j, N_j) algebra we refer the reader to the literature [13,11], it seems appropriate to note here some of the key characteristics of our (P_μ^S, M_j, N_j) Hopf algebra. The algebra sector of (P_μ^S, M_j, N_j) is characterized by commutation relations

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left[P_\mu^S, P_\nu^S\right] = 0 \\
&[M_j, M_k] = i\varepsilon_{jkl} M_l \quad [\mathcal{N}_j, M_k] = i\varepsilon_{jkl}\mathcal{N}_l \quad [\mathcal{N}_j, \mathcal{N}_k] = -i\varepsilon_{jkl} M_l \\
&\left[M_j, P_0^S\right] = 0 \quad [M_j, P_k^S] = i\epsilon_{jkl} P_l^S \\
&\left[\mathcal{N}_j, P_0^S\right] = i e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}P_0^S} P_i^S \\
&\left[\mathcal{N}_j, P_k^S\right] = i e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}P_0^S}\left[\left(\frac{\sin(\lambda P_0^S)}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{2}\vec{P^S}^2\right)\delta_{jk} - \frac{\lambda}{2}P_j^S P_k^S\right] ,
\end{aligned}$$

with "mass" Casimir

$$C(P^S) = \cosh(\lambda P_0^S) - \frac{\lambda^2}{2}\vec{P^S}^2 , \tag{44}$$

while the co-algebra sector is characterized by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta(P_0^S) = P_0^S \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes P_0^S \quad \Delta(P_i^S) = P_i^S \otimes e^{\frac{\lambda}{2}P_0^S} + e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}P_0^S} \otimes P_j^S \\
&\Delta(M_i) = M_i \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes M_i \\
&\Delta(\mathcal{N}_j) = \mathcal{N}_j \otimes 1 + e^{-\lambda P_0^S} \otimes \mathcal{N}_j + \lambda\epsilon_{jkl} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}P_0^S} P_j \otimes M_k
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Just like the Majid-Ruegg (P_μ^R, M_j, N_j) algebra, also (P_μ^S, M_j, N_j) is a bicrossproduct Hopf algebra [13,11]. Since the Majid-Ruegg (P_μ^R, M_j, N_j) algebra is often referred to as the "bicrossproduct basis", it may be natural to call "type-2 bicrossproduct basis" our (P_μ^S, M_j, N_j) Hopf algebra.

The reader familiar with the relevant literature will recognize that $\Delta(P_0^S)$, $\Delta(P_i^S)$ and $C(P^S)$ for the Hopf algebra (P_μ^S, M_j, N_j) are identical to the ones of the so-called κ-Poincaré "standard basis" Hopf algebra [21]. However, other characteristics of (P_μ^S, M_j, N_j) are different from the ones of the "standard basis", which in particular is not of bicrossproduct type.

VII. MORE ON THE DESCRIPTION OF TRANSLATIONS

The results reported in the previous Sections were based on the concept of symmetry codified in (14). This is a natural symmetry requirement, which however deserves a few more comments, which will also lead us to a noteworthy characterization of translations. Our discussion of this point will be more easily followed as we consider a specific action. Let us focus on the simple example

$$S(\phi) = \int \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\ \phi^2\ . \tag{46}$$

It is natural to describe infinitesimal translations in terms of

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} \to \mathbf{x}' &= \mathbf{x} - \alpha\epsilon \\ \phi(\mathbf{x}) \to \phi'(\mathbf{x}) &= \phi(\mathbf{x}) + i\alpha T\phi(\mathbf{x}) + O(\alpha^2) \end{aligned}$$

where $T = -i\epsilon^\mu\partial_\mu$ is the generator of translations and $\alpha \in R$ is an expansion parameter.

On the basis of an analogy with corresponding analyses in commutative spacetimes there are actually two possible starting points for a description of T as a symmetry of the action:

$$\delta_I S(\phi) = i\int \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\ T\cdot\phi^2 = 0 \tag{47}$$

and

$$\delta_{II} S(\phi) = S(\phi') - S(\phi) = 0 \tag{48}$$

In the context of theories in commutative spacetimes the conditions (47) and (48) are easily shown to be equivalent. But in a noncommutative space-time this is not necessarily the case. Let us start by considering the simplest possibility, the case of commutative transformation parameters ϵ. In this case by expanding (47) and (48) to first order one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{II} S(\phi) = S(\phi + i\alpha\epsilon P\phi) - S(\phi) &= i\alpha\int \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\Big\{(\epsilon P\phi)\phi + \phi(\epsilon P\phi) + i\alpha(\epsilon P\phi)(\epsilon P\phi)\Big\} = \\ &= i\alpha\int \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\Big\{(\epsilon P\phi)\phi + \phi(\epsilon P\phi)\Big\} + o(\alpha) \\ \delta_I S(\phi) = \int \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x} i\alpha\epsilon P\phi^2 &= i\alpha\int \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\Big\{\epsilon_\mu(P^\mu\phi)\phi + \epsilon_0\phi(P^0\phi) + \epsilon_j(e^{-\lambda P_0}\phi)(P^j\phi)\Big\}\ , \end{aligned}$$

which clearly indicates that the condition $\delta_I S(\phi) = 0$ does not imply $\delta_{II} S(\phi) = 0$ and *vice versa*. If we want to preserve the double description (47) and (48) of symmetry under translation transformations we must therefore introduce noncommuative transformation parameters. In fact, it is easy to verify that assuming

$$[\epsilon_0, x_\mu] = 0\ , \quad \Phi\epsilon_j = \epsilon_j(e^{-\lambda P_0}\Phi)\ ,$$

which follow from

$$[\epsilon_j, \mathbf{x}_0] = i\lambda\epsilon_j\ , \quad [\epsilon_j, \mathbf{x}_k] = 0\ ,$$

one finds that the conditions (47) and (48) are equivalent. Interestingly this choice of noncommutativity of the transformation parameters allows to describe them as differential forms[6], $\epsilon_\mu = \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}_\mu$, and therefore the condition for invariance of the action under translation transformations can be cast in the form

$$S(\Phi + i\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}P\Phi) - S(\Phi) = i\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}_\mu\int \mathrm{d}^4\mathbf{x}\ P^\mu\Phi^2$$

It appears plausible that other choices of noncommutative transformation parameters would preserve the double description (47) and (48) of symmetry under translation transformations. But it appears likely that this connection

[6]Note that this is one of the two differential calculi introduced in Ref. [22].

with differential forms has some deep meaning: in order to preserve the possibility to describe translation symmetries according to (48) (having already verified that these symmetries satisfied the first criterion (47)) we ended up adopting the following description of translations

$$\mathbf{x}_\mu \to \mathbf{x}'_\mu = \mathbf{x}_\mu + \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}_\mu$$
$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) \to \phi'(\mathbf{x}) = \phi(\mathbf{x}) + i\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}_\mu P^\mu \Phi$$

where the $\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}_\mu$ describe the proper concept, as previously established [22], of differential forms for our noncommutative spacetime and the P^μ act as previously described ($P_\mu \Omega_R(f) = \Omega_R(-i\partial_\mu f)$). This is rather satisfactory from a conceptual perspective, since even in commutative spacetime an infinitesimal translation is most properly described as "addition" of a differential form.

The differentials satisfy nontrivial commutation relations [22]

$$[\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_\mu] = 0 \quad [\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_k] = 0 \quad [\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_0] = i\lambda \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}_j$$

as required for our translations to preserve the κ-Minkowski commutation relations (again with $\mathbf{x}'_\mu = \mathbf{x}_\mu + \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}_\mu$)

$$[\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_k] = 0 \to [\mathbf{x}'_j, \mathbf{x}'_k] = 0 \ , \qquad [\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{x}_0] = i\lambda \mathbf{x}_j \to [\mathbf{x}'_j, \mathbf{x}'_0] = i\lambda \mathbf{x}'_j$$

An infinitesimal translation $\Phi \to \Phi' \equiv \Phi + \mathrm{d}\Phi$ associates to each element of κ-Minkowski (which we here denote by M_κ) an element of the algebra $M_\kappa \oplus \Gamma$ defined over a vector space that is direct sum of κ-Minkowski and the bimodule [22], Γ, over M_κ, with product rule

$$(\Phi + \mathrm{d}\Phi)(\Psi + \mathrm{d}\Psi) = \Phi\Psi + \Phi\cdot\mathrm{d}\Psi + \mathrm{d}\Phi\cdot\Psi = \Phi\Psi + \mathrm{d}(\Phi\Psi) \tag{49}$$

This algebra is isomorphic to κ-Minkowski through the map $1 + \mathrm{d}$, which is an algebra-isomorphism. Then an infinitesimal translation transforms an element of κ-Minkowski in an element of a "second copy" of κ-Minkowski. It is a transformation internal to the same <u>abstract</u> algebra. This abstract algebra <u>is</u> our "space of functions of the spacetime coordinates".

The careful reader can easily verify that the equivalence of (47) and (48) emerged as a result of the fact that, while for our translation generators P_μ the Leibniz rule clearly does not hold, for the infinitesimal translation "d" the Leibniz rule holds:

$$\mathrm{d}(\Phi\Psi) = (\Phi\Psi)' - \Phi\Psi = \mathrm{d}\Phi\,\Psi + \Phi\,\mathrm{d}\Psi$$

(where again $\Phi' \equiv \Phi + \mathrm{d}\Phi$ and we used the product rule (49)).

This network of results and interpretations provides the conceptual ground for a description of translational symmetry in κ-Minkowski spacetime. Simply by inspection of the κ-Minkowski commutation relations one already concludes that classical translations cannot be a symmetry of this spacetime. The question then is whether translations are a lost/broken symmetry of this spacetime or instead they are simply deformed by the κ-Minkowski noncommutativity. We have shown that one can construct theories in κ-Minkowski spacetime that enjoy a deformed/quantum (Hopf-algebra) translational symmetry.

Again by inspection of the κ-Minkowski commutation relations one can see that instead classical rotations can be implemented as a symmetry. But for boosts something analogous to what happens for translations occurs: classical boosts are not a symmetry of κ-Minkowski, but, as we showed, there is a quantum/deformed version of boosts that are symmetries.

VIII. REPLACING THE CLASSICAL POINCARÉ ALGEBRA

One other point which must be stressed within our analysis is that both the algebra $(P^R_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$ and the algebra $(P^S_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$ involve underformed Lorentz sector, meaning that the commutators in the rotation/boost sector are unmodified. However, the action of boosts on momenta is modified in a nonlinear way. The action of boosts on momenta represents a nonlinear realization of the Lorentz group. These are the ingredients of the most popular realizations of the "DSR" (or "Doubly Special Relativity") framework [8,9,12]. The DSR nonlinearities are the way in which a second relativistic invariant (in addition to speed-of-light scale) becomes manifest. The second invariant is, in the notation here adopted, the length scale λ, which can be naturally identified with the Planck length.

The fact that the Lorentz group is still present, but is nonlinearly realized in some DSR proposals, has led some authors [14,15] to argue that essentially the nonlinearity might be a formal artifact, that one should unravel the

nonlinearity by performing some nonlinear redefinition of the energy-momentum variables, and that "true" translations would still have to satisfy linear commutation relations with boosts.

The analysis we are reporting exposes a hidden assumption of the arguments advocated in Refs. [14,15]: the authors are clearly assuming that the underlying spacetime be classical (or at least commutative). We showed explicitly that in some examples of spacetime noncommutativity translations are inevitably a nontrivial concept. In both our examples, the algebra $(P^R_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$ and the algebra $(P^S_\mu, M_j, \mathcal{N}_j)$, boosts act nonlinearly on the one-particle sector (which is faithfully described by the algebra sector) and on the multi-particle sector (which in these noncommutative spacetimes is described through the coalgebra sector of the Hopf algebra of symmetries). We have only constructed two illustrative examples of symmetry algebras, but the careful reader can easily verify that no change of ordering convention for functions of the κ-Minkowski coordinates can fully remove the nonlinearity. Some form of nonlinearity will inevitably survive[7], since this is the natural energy-momentum manifestation of the fact that the κ-Minkowski commutation relations, with their length scale λ, are being introduced as a fundamental feature of spacetime. In κ-Minkowski the description of translations, as shown here, necessarily requires some new structures, as most elementarily seen by looking at the product of plane waves in κ-Minkowski noncommutative spacetime which we already discussed above: $[e^{-ikx}e^{iEt}]\cdot[e^{-iqx}e^{i\omega t}] = [e^{-i(k+e^{\lambda E}q)x}e^{i(E+\omega)t}]$. Clearly the spacetime noncommutativity is leading to a law of composition of energy momentum $((k,E),(q,\omega)) \to ((k+e^{\lambda E}q),(E+\omega))$ which is not covariant under ordinary boosts and involves a clear nonlinearity. In this type of contexts a nonlinear realization of the Lorentz group is the only way to save the equivalence of inertial frames (the "Relativity Principle").

And there starts to be growing evidence [24] that noncommutativity is not the only realization of the idea of "spacetime quantization" that leads to DSR-type implementation of the Relativity Principle. In particular, in Ref. [24] it was recently shown that in a large class of quantum-gravity theories a quantum (Hopf-algebra), rather than classical, symmetry is realized when the cosmological constant is nonzero. And the symmetries are still quantum rather than classical in the limit of vanishing cosmological constant (the limit in which these quantum symmetries, of course, are Poincaré-like). Again the nonlinearities of the boost action turn out to be unavoidable: one appears to have some freedom to transfer some of the nonlinearity form the one-particle to the two- (multi-)particle sector or viceversa, but the presence of some nonlinearity is unavoidable.

The DSR framework was introduced [8] as a contribution to quantum-gravity research and therefore it implicitly assumes that spacetime has strikingly nonclassical features, such as noncommutativity. By focusing, as essentially done in Ref. [14,15], on the inadequacy of the DSR framework for theories in a classical spacetime one is basically missing the key objective of the DSR proposal. DSR was never intended to apply in a classical spacetime. And actually the point should be properly phrased in reverse: the DSR frameworks which we are here considering, the ones with nonlinear realization of the Lorentz group on energy-momentum space, take energy-momentum space as primitive entity (in the sense of operative definitions) and spacetime as a derived entity[8], and therefore one should not ask in which way can the nonlinearity in energy-momentum space be unravelled (there will always be a trivial answer: it can be unravelled by assuming it refers to a classical spacetime) but rather one should look for a spacetime picture in which the nonlinearity plays a natural role. The type of noncommutative spacetimes here considered is an example of natural application of the DSR concepts.

IX. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

The analysis we reported in the previous Sections has provided insight on some questions, and raised new questions, for the study of physical theories in certain types of noncommutative spacetimes. We have introduced a concept of

[7] At the cost of an awkward nonlinear redefinition of energy-momentum [23] (which would not correspond to a workable ordering conventions in κ-Minkowski and would not have a natural associated differential calculus), one can even remove λ completely from the algebra sector and could be misled into believing that the scale λ would have been "redefined away". But instead the same redefinition of energy-momentum that trivializes the algebra sector requires, in order to define coherently the action of these new tiem-space translations generators on products of functions, that the coproduct be λ-dependent in a highly nontrivial way. For this awkward setup the action of boosts on one-particle states would still be linear, but only at the cost of a highly nonlinear action on two-particle states.

[8] Thinking in these terms may be challenging at first (or at least it was at first challenging for us), since our present world view implicitly assumes that spacetime entities are primary. For example, we describe energy-momentum through the concept of translations in spacetime. It is hardly ever stressed that spacetime coordinates may be similarly described through translations in energy-momentum space.

noncommutative-spacetime symmetry, which follows very closely the one adopted in commutative spacetimes, and actually is analyzed most naturally in terms of a Weyl map, *i.e.* with the support of familiar properties of commutative functions in an auxiliary commutative spacetime. We argued that the symmetries of a theory in such a noncommutative spacetime may depend rather strikingly on the specific form of the action that characterizes the theory. While theories in classical Minkowski spacetime are always Poincaré invariant, if invariant under a 10-generator algebra, it appears plausible that different theories in κ-Minkowski spacetime might enjoy different 10-generator symmetries (different Hopf-algebra versions of the Poincaré symmetries).

We found that for a specific simple theory, a theory describing a free scalar field in κ-Minkowski, it was impossible to find a formulation that would admit invariance under ordinary (classical) Poincaré transformations. This, in particular, allowed us (Section VIII) to clarify a concern about DSR theories which had been raised in Ref. [14,15], by showing that those studies had implicitly relied on the assumption that the spacetime would be commutative and essentially classical. More importantly for the key objectives of our analysis, we did find (Section IV) 10-generators symmetries of our description of a free scalar field in κ-Minkowski, and these symmetries admitted formulation in terms of Hopf-algebra (quantum) versions of the classical Poincaré symmetries.

Although our analysis allowed us to reduce the amount of ambiguity in the description of the symmetries of theories in these noncommutative spacetimes, we are left with a choice between different realizations of the concept of translations in the noncommutative spacetime. We have clarified that such an ambiguity might have to be expected on the basis of the type of coordinate noncommutativity here considered, but it remains to be seen whether by appropriate choice of the action of the theory one can remove the ambiguity, *i.e.* construct a theory which is invariant under one specific type of translations and not under any other type. This appears to be the most urgent open issue that emerges from our study, and, as argued in Section V, one natural context in which to explore this issue might be provided by attempting to construct gauge theories in κ-Minkowski spacetime following the approach here advocated.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful for conversations G. Mandanici during the preparation of this manuscript. We also thank J. Kowalski-Glikman and E. Witten: conversations with them provided encouragement for us to rewrite more pedagogically Section VII (which offered fewer details in an earlier version of the manuscript).

APPENDIX A: DEFORMED BOOST GENERATORS

As announced in Subsection IV.E, in this appendix we report some aspects of the analysis necessary in order to construct the boost generators $\mathcal{N}^R$. Analogous techniques can be used for $\mathcal{N}^S$, but here we focus on $\mathcal{N}^R$, and, since we therefore always refer to the "right-ordered" Ω_R map, the label R is omitted.

The starting point for the analysis reported in Subsection IV.E was the 7-generator Hopf algebra with P_μ and M_j generators, which we note again here for convenience:

$$\begin{aligned} [P_\mu, P_\nu] = 0 \ , \qquad [M_j, P_0] = 0, \ \ , \qquad & [M_j, P_l] = i\varepsilon_{jlm} P_m \\ P_\mu \Omega(e^{ikx}) = \Omega(-i\partial_\mu e^{ikx}) \ \ , \qquad & \Delta P_\mu = P_\mu \otimes 1 + e^{\lambda P_0 (\delta_{\mu 0} - 1)} \otimes P_\mu \\ M_j \Omega(e^{ikx}) = \Omega(-i\epsilon_{jkl} x_k \partial_l e^{ikx}) \ \ , \qquad & \Delta M_j = M_j \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes M_j \end{aligned}$$

As showed in Subsection IV.D, one cannot extend this 7-generator algebra to a 10-generator algebra by adding ordinary (classical) boost generators. But one can obtain a 10-generator Hopf algebra by introducing deformed boost generators $\mathcal{N}$, and in particular it is possible to do so while leaving the Lorentz-sector commutation relations unmodified

$$\begin{aligned} &[M_j, M_k] = i\varepsilon_{jkl} M_l \\ &[\mathcal{N}_j, M_k] = i\varepsilon_{jkl} \mathcal{N}_l \\ &[\mathcal{N}_j, \mathcal{N}_k] = -i\varepsilon_{jkl} M_l \ . \end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

We intend to show this explicitly here.

Let us start observing that the most general form in which the commutation relations among $\mathcal{N}_j$ and P_l can be deformed (consistently with the underlying space-rotation symmetries) is

$$\begin{aligned} &[\mathcal{N}_j, P_0] = iA(P) P_j \\ &[\mathcal{N}_j, P_l] = i\lambda^{-1} B(P) \delta_{jl} + i\lambda C(P) P_j P_l + iD(P) \varepsilon_{jlm} P_m \end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

where A, B, C, D are unknown adimensional functions of λP_0 and $\lambda^2 \vec{P}^2$. In the classical limit $A(P) = 1$, $\lambda^{-1} B(P) = P_0$, $D = 0$ and C can take any form, as long as it is finite, since $\lambda C(P)$ must vanish in the classical $\lambda \to 0$ limit.

From these relations it is easy to find that $\mathcal{N}_j$ can be represented as differential operators inside the Ω map,

$$\mathcal{N}_j \Omega(\phi(x)) = \Omega\{[ix_0 A(-i\partial_x)\partial_j + \lambda^{-1} x_j B(-i\partial_x) - \lambda x_l C(-i\partial_x)\partial_l \partial_j - i\epsilon_{jkl} x_k D(-i\partial_x)\partial_l]\phi(x)\} \ ,$$

and using $\Omega_R(x_0 f) = [\mathbf{x}_0 - \lambda \vec{\mathbf{x}} \vec{P}]\Omega_R(f)$ on can rewrite $\mathcal{N}_j$ as

$$\mathcal{N}_j = \Big(\lambda^{-1} \mathbf{x}_j Z(P_0, P^2) - \mathbf{x}_0 P_j\Big) A(P_0, P^2) - \lambda C(P_0, P^2) \epsilon_{jkl} P_k M_l + D(P_0, P^2) M_j$$

where $Z \equiv B - \lambda^2 \vec{P}^2 C$.

In preparation for the rest of the analysis, we note here that

$$\mathbf{x}_j \Omega_R(f) = \Omega_R(x_j f) = \Big(e^{\lambda P_0} \Omega_R(f)\Big) \mathbf{x}_j$$

and we introduce the useful notations $g_p = e^{ip_1 \mathbf{x}_1} e^{-ip_0 \mathbf{x}_0}$ and $p \dot{+} q = (p_0 + q_0, p_1 + q_1 e^{-\lambda p_0}, 0, 0)$, so that $g_p g_q = g_{(p \dot{+} q)}$. For a generic scalar function it will be implictly assumed that it depends on the operators P_0 and P^2 (so for example, with A we will denote $A(P_0, P^2)$). A notation of type $A(q_0, q^2)$ will be reserved to functions which depend on a real four-vector q.

Since

$$M_1 g_p = P_2 g_p = P_3 g_p = 0$$

it is easy to verify that

$$\mathcal{N}_1 \, g_{(p \dot{+} q)} = A(p \dot{+} q) \Big(\lambda^{-1} Z(p \dot{+} q) \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_0 (p_1 + q_1 e^{-\lambda p_0})\Big) \, g_{(p \dot{+} q)}$$

and we can remove $\mathbf{x}_0$ from the previous expression using the identity

$$\mathbf{x}_0 P_1 \, g_p = (\lambda^{-1} \mathbf{x}_1 Z - \mathcal{N}_1 \, A^{-1}) g_p$$

obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_1 \, g_{(p \dot{+} q)} = {} & (\mathcal{N}_1 A^{-1} A_{(1)} g_p)(A_{(2)} g_q) + (e^{-\lambda P_0} A_{(1)} g_p)(\mathcal{N}_1 A^{-1} A_{(2)} g_q) + \\ & + \lambda^{-1} \mathbf{x}_1 A g_p g_q \left\{ Z(p \dot{+} q) - Z(p) - e^{-2\lambda p_0} Z(q) - \lambda^2 e^{-\lambda p_0} p_1 q_1 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

We notice that it is impossible to eliminate $\mathbf{x}_1$ from this expression without reintroducing $\mathbf{x}_0$, and therefore, if we want the second member to be function only of $\mathcal{N}_j$ (and of P_0, P_1 and operators with null action on g_p), the factor which multiplies $\mathbf{x}_1$ must vanish identically. For this, it is necessary and sufficient that

$$Z\Big(p_0 + q_0, (p_1 + q_1 e^{-\lambda p_0})^2\Big) = Z(p_0, p_1^2) + e^{-2\lambda p_0} Z(q_0, q_1^2) + \lambda^2 e^{-\lambda p_0} p_1 q_1 \tag{A3}$$

for each p and q.

We must now find a solution of (A3). Applying $\partial_{p_1} \partial_{q_1}$ to (A3) we obtain

$$\partial_{p_1} \partial_{q_1} Z\Big(p_0 + q_0, (p_1 + q_1 e^{-\lambda p_0})^2\Big) = \lambda^2 e^{-\lambda p_0}$$

In the first member we can substitute ∂_{q_1} with $e^{-\lambda p_0} \partial_{p_1}$, and calculate the resulting expression in $q_0 = q_1 = 0$, leading us to

$$\partial_{p_1}^2 Z(p_0, p_1^2) = \lambda^2$$

This can be integrated to

$$Z(p_0, p_1^2) = W(\lambda p_0) + \beta \lambda p_1 + \lambda^2 p_1^2 / 2$$

with β and W arbitrary.

Since Z is function only of p_0 and p_1^2, β must be zero. Substituting in (A3) we get the condition

$$W(\lambda p_0 + \lambda q_0) = W(p_0) + e^{-2\lambda p_0} W(\lambda q_0)$$

For $p_0 = q_0 = 0$ we have $W(0) = 2W(0)$, that is $W(0) = 0$.

Applying $\partial_{\lambda q_0}$, using the identity $\partial_{\lambda q_0} W(\lambda p_0 + \lambda q_0) = \partial_{\lambda p_0} W(\lambda p_0 + \lambda q_0)$ and calculating in $q_0 = 0$ we obtain

$$\partial_{\lambda p_0} W(\lambda p_0) = e^{-2\lambda p_0} \partial_{\lambda q_0} W(\lambda q_0)\big|_{q_0=0}$$

which integrated, with the condition $W(0) = 0$, gives

$$W(\lambda p_0) = \frac{1 - e^{-2\lambda p_0}}{2} \partial_{\lambda p_0} W(\lambda p_0)\big|_{p_0=0} \ .$$

From the request that $\mathcal{N}_1$ has the correct classical limit, we derive $\partial_{\lambda p_0} W(0) = 1$, and this allows us to write

$$Z(p_0, p_1^2) = \frac{1 - e^{-2\lambda p_0}}{2} + \frac{\lambda^2}{2} p_1^2 \ .$$

Since Z is a scalar, the knowledge of $Z(p_0, p_1^2)$ is equivalent to the knowledge of $Z(p_0, p^2)$ for a generic $\vec{p}$ (just renaming $p_1^2 \to p^2$). We have therefore established that

$$\mathcal{N}_j = \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_j A - i\lambda C \epsilon_{jkl} P_k M_l + D M_j$$

where A, C, D are arbitrary adimensional scalar function of P_μ and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_j = \mathbf{x}_j \left\{ \frac{1 - e^{-2\lambda P_0}}{2\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{2} P^2 \right\} - \mathbf{x}_0 P_j$$

It is straightforward to verify that the 10 generators $(\mathcal{N}, M, P)$ close a Hopf algebra, for any choice of the triplet (A, C, D). In fact, the coproduct of $\mathcal{N}_j$ is

$$\Delta \mathcal{N}_j = \left(\mathcal{N}_j \otimes 1 + e^{-\lambda P_0} \otimes \mathcal{N}_j + \lambda \epsilon_{jkl} P_k \otimes M_l \right) \Delta A + \lambda \epsilon_{jkl} (\Delta C)(\Delta P_k)(\Delta M_l) + \Delta D \cdot \Delta M_j$$

where $(\Delta A, \Delta C, \Delta D)$ are known tensors, for each choice of (A, C, D).

The request of a classical Lorentz subalgebra $(M_j, \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_j)$ leads to the conditions

$$D = 0 \qquad [\lambda A \partial_0 - 2(C + \lambda^2 P^2 D)\partial_{\vec{P}^2} + \lambda^2 D] C = -\lambda^2 \tag{A4}$$

The deformed boost operators considered in Subsection IV.D correspond to the $A = 1, C = D = 0$ solution of (A4) (*i.e.* correspond to $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_j$) and take the form

$$\mathcal{N}_j \Omega_R(f) = \Omega_R \left(\left[i x_0 \partial_j + x_j \left(\frac{1 - e^{2i\lambda\partial_0}}{2\lambda} - \frac{\lambda}{2} \nabla^2 \right) + \lambda x_l \partial_l \partial_j \right] f \right) \ .$$

[1] A. Connes, *Noncommutative Geometry*, (Academic Press, 1994); G. Landi, *An introduction to noncommutative spaces and their geometry*, (Springer, 1998), J. Madore, *An Introduction to Noncommutative Differential Geometry and Physical Applications*, (Cambridge Univerisity Press, 1998).

[2] S. Majid, *Foundations of quantum group theory*, (Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[3] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, JHEP 9909 (1999) 032 [arXiv:hep-th/9908142].

[4] A. Matusis, L. Susskind and N. Toumbas, JHEP 0012 (2000) 002 [hep-th/0002075].

[5] M.R. Douglas and N.A. Nekrasov, Rev. Mod. Phys. 73 (2001) 977 [hep-th/0106048].

[6] H. S. Snyder, Phys. Rev. 71 (1947) 38.

[7] S. Doplicher, K. Fredenhagen and J. E. Roberts, Commun. Math. Phys. 172 (1995) 187; Phys. Lett. B331 (1994) 39.

[8] G. Amelino-Camelia, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D11 (2002) 35 [arXiv: gr-qc/0012051]; Phys.Lett.B510 (2001) 255 [arXiv: hep-th/0012238]; Nature 418 (2002) 34 [arXiv: gr-qc/0207049].
[9] J Kowalski-Glikman and S Nowak, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D12 (2003) 299 [arXiv: hep-th/0204245].
[10] G. Amelino-Camelia, L. Doplicher, S. Nam, Y.-S. Seo, Phys. Rev. D67 (2003) 085008 [arXiv:hep-th/0109191].
[11] J. Lukierski, A. Nowicki and H. Ruegg, Ann. Phys. 243 (1995) 90.
[12] J. Magueijo and L. Smolin, Phys. Rev. D67 (2003) 044017 [arXiv: gr-qc/0207085].
[13] S. Majid and H. Ruegg, Phys. Lett. B334 (1994) 348 [arXiv: hep-th/9405107].
[14] D.V. Ahluwalia, M. Kirchbach and N. Dadhich, gr-qc/0212128.
[15] D. Grumiller, W. Kummer and D.V. Vassilevich, hep-th/0301061.
[16] G. Amelino-Camelia and S. Majid, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A15 (2000) 4301 [arXiv:hep-th/9907110].
[17] A. Agostini, F. Lizzi and A. Zampini, Mod. Phys. Lett. A17 (2002) 2105 [arXiv: hep-th/0209174].
[18] G. Amelino-Camelia, J. Ellis, N.E. Mavromatos, D.V. Nanopoulos and S. Sarkar, Nature 393 (1998) 763 [arXiv: astro-ph/9712103]; G. Amelino-Camelia and T. Piran, Phys. Rev. D64 (2001) 036005 [arXiv: astro-ph/0008107]; G. Amelino-Camelia, F. D'Andrea, G. Mandanici, hep-th/0211022.
[19] J. Kowalski-Glikman, Phys. Lett. B499 (2001) 1.
[20] S. Alexander, R. Brandenberger and J. Magueijo, Phys.Rev. D67 (2003) 081301.
[21] J. Lukierski, H. Ruegg, A. Nowicki and V.N. Tolstoi, Phys. Lett. B264 (1991) 331; J. Lukierski, A. Nowicki and H. Ruegg, Phys. Lett. B293 (1992) 344.
[22] R. Oeckl, J. Math. Phys. 40 (1999) 3588.
[23] S. Judes and M. Visser, gr-qc/0205067.
[24] G. Amelino-Camelia, L. Smolin and A. Starodubtsev, hep-th/0306134.