

Field Redefinition Invariance and "Extra" Terms

Karyn M. Apfeldorf¹, Carlos Ordóñez^{1,y}

Theory Group, Department of Physics¹

RLM 5.208 University of Texas at Austin

Austin, TEXAS 78712

Department of Physics and Astronomy¹

Box 1807 Station B, Vanderbilt University

Nashville, TN 37235

Abstract

We investigate the issue of coordinate redefinition invariance by carefully performing nonlinear transformations in the discretized in quantum mechanical path integral. By resorting to hamiltonian path integral methods, we provide the first complete derivation of the extra term (beyond the usual jacobian term) which arises in the action when a nonlinear transformation is made. We comment on possible connections with the renormalization group, by showing that these extra terms may emerge from a "blocking" procedure. Finally, by performing field redefinitions before and after dimensional reduction of a two dimensional field theory, we derive an explicit form for an extra term appearing in a quantum field theory.

July 1995
UTTG-29-93

apfel@utpapa.ph.utexas.edu

^ycordonez@utaphy.ph.utexas.edu Current address: University of Texas, Austin

1 Introduction

Perhaps the most primitive of all properties of a physical theory is invariance under redefinition of physical variables. Indeed, experiments yield measurements and these numbers relative to some scale have meaning, but the numbers in no way imply a particular choice of variables. One could go further to argue that in fact although theoretical calculations using an effective physical theory yield viable results, there is no proof that another framework (perhaps not even quantum mechanics or quantum field theory) could not yield similar or equivalent results.

Under coordinate or field redefinitions, physically meaningful quantities must remain unchanged. For example, one expects the poles of renormalized propagators in quantum field theory to remain the same under a field redefinition. On the other hand, quantities related to choice of fields, such as wave function renormalization factors, are physically insignificant and may change.

In the case of quantum mechanics, it has been known for decades [1] that making nonlinear coordinate redefinitions generates "extra" (beyond the usual jacobian) potential terms of $O(\hbar^2)$. From the hamiltonian point of view it is easy to understand why these so-called extra terms are generated, since upon quantization, the classical coordinates become quantum operators, and therefore there are nontrivial issues of operator ordering. Much work has been published discussing the equivalence of the hamiltonian and lagrangian approaches,¹ and one would like also to understand the emergence of these terms from the path integral point of view. Essentially, this phenomenon of generating extra terms is a manifestation of the stochastic nature of the path integral, and may be studied from a discretization of the quantum mechanical path integral. The brownian nature of the paths requires that one take care in evaluating the path integral (naive substitution is insufficient), and one expects extra terms, beyond the usual jacobian term, to be generated if the coordinate transformation is nonlinear.

In contrast to quantum mechanics, the common practice in quantum field theory is to ignore the possibility of any such extra terms, or to sweep them away by appealing, in a hand-waving manner, to renormalization. Motivated

¹ A given prescription for handling the discretized path integral corresponds to a particular operator ordering of the associated hamiltonian. In particular, the midpoint prescription corresponds to Weyl ordering, and in the coordinate representation supports the interpretation of brownian motion. For a nice review of the Feynman path integral in quantum mechanics, see the work of Grosche [3].

by the desire to explain this difference in practice, we revisited the question of operator ordering in the quantum mechanical path integral. Gervais and Jevicki [2] investigated the derivation of extra terms in quantum mechanics by path integral methods, but we contend that there are deficiencies in their derivation. Their derivation of the extra terms is conspicuously missing some key steps in the critical rewriting of the action.

In this paper, first we provide a solid path integral based derivation of the extra terms in the case of quantum mechanics. This is the first complete proof available and thus provides for an extension to quantum field theory [6]. Next, we indirectly investigate extra terms in quantum field theory by connecting to quantum mechanics. More specifically, we examine what transpires as one dimensionally reduces a $1+1$ dimensional field theory where usually no extra terms are considered, to a quantum mechanical theory where the existence of extra terms is well-established. This example allows us to derive an explicit form of an extra term appearing in a quantum field theory and serves as a starting point for a more systematic study of extra terms in quantum field theory. In a forthcoming article [6], we argue that in spite of the path integral's ubiquitous employment, manipulations involving the path integral must be reevaluated, and that interesting physics could be missed.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we revisit the issue of extra terms in quantum mechanics by meticulously deriving the effects of a nonlinear point canonical transformation in the discretized form of the quantum mechanical path integral. Unlike previous treatments [2] of this subject, we give a complete treatment of all steps of the derivation. We are thankful to B. Sakita [5] for showing us an important trick, using the hamiltonian form of the path integral, to evaluate certain expectation values. In section 3, we present a "paradox" where quantum field theory meets quantum mechanics. We consider the dimensional reduction of a free, massless $1+1$ dimensional real scalar quantum field theory to an effectively quantum mechanical theory, and perform field redefinitions both before and after reduction. This example allows us to confirm the existence of, and explicitly derive the form of, the extra term generated in the quantum field theory action upon a nonlinear change of field variables. In section 4, we give conclusions and comment on further research questions.

2 Nonlinear Coordinate Redefinitions in QM

In this section, we meticulously will derive the effects of a nonlinear point canonical transformation in the discretized form of the quantum mechanical path integral.

Although in some ways our derivation will resemble that of Gervais and Jevicki [2], it will be different in at least one main respect. Specifically, we will take a critical look at the method of replacing terms involving difference variables (corresponding to derivative interactions in the continuum limit) which are generated in the action after a coordinate transformation has been performed.

Consider the simple case of an n -dimensional quantum mechanical particle with position $q^a(t)$: The path integral is

$$Z = \int \prod_{a=1}^n dq^a \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_{t_0}^{t_f} dt \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=1}^n (\dot{q}^a)^2 - V_0(q) \right]\right], \quad (2.1)$$

In particular, we will assume that there are no time derivatives in the potential $V_0(q)$. Discretizing the time interval $t_f - t_0$ into N segments of length ϵ such that $t_k = t_0 + k\epsilon$ and $t_f = t_N$; and using the abbreviated notation $q^a(k) = q^a(t_k)$, one arrives at

$$Z = \int \prod_{a=1}^n \prod_{k=1}^{N-1} dq^a(k) \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=1}^n (q^a(k+1) - q^a(k))^2 - \epsilon \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} V_0(q(k)) \right]\right], \quad (2.2)$$

In this expression, the product $N = t_f - t_0 / \epsilon$ is held fixed, while the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$; $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ is implied. A key observation to make is that the one dimensional time differential dt carries a single power of ϵ ; so any terms of $O(\epsilon^2)$ in the exponential will vanish in the small ϵ limit. After a coordinate transformation, the only "extra" terms that need be retained in the path integral action are either $O(\epsilon)$ or possibly divergent.

Under a coordinate redefinition $q^a(t) = F^a(Q(t))$ from the q^a to the Q^i ($i = 1; \dots; n$), which translates to a point-by-point transformation on the lattice $q^a(k) = F^a(Q(k))$, the path integral becomes

$$Z = \int \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{k=1}^{N-1} dQ^i(k) \det \frac{\partial F^j(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \exp\left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (F^i(Q(k+1)) - F^i(Q(k)))^2 - \epsilon \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} V_0(F(Q(k))) \right]\right], \quad (2.3)$$

To rewrite the action in terms of the new variables, with a "canonical" kinetic term for Q , we must expand the function $F^a(Q(k))$ about some point of its argument. The choice of a discretization procedure in the lagrangian path integral corresponds to a choice of an operator ordering prescription in the hamiltonian. For concreteness, we choose the midpoint prescription, corresponding to Weyl ordering; this is the only discretization scheme to preserve the brownian motion interpretation of a quantum mechanical particle. We will treat the jacobian determinant and the kinetic term as follows. Define the midpoint and difference variables

$$\begin{aligned} Q^i(k) &= \frac{1}{2} (Q^i(k+1) + Q^i(k)) \\ Q^i(k) &= \frac{1}{2} (Q^i(k+1) - Q^i(k)) : \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Invert these equations

$$\begin{aligned} Q^i(k+1) &= Q^i(k) + \frac{1}{2} Q^i(k) \\ Q^i(k) &= Q^i(k) - \frac{1}{2} Q^i(k) \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

and expand the $F^a(Q)$ about the midpoint variables, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} F^a(Q(k)) &= F^a(Q(k)) + \frac{1}{2} Q^i(k) \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \Big|_{Q(k)=Q(k)} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2! 2^2} Q^i(k) Q^j(k) \frac{\partial^2 F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k) \partial Q^j(k)} \Big|_{Q(k)=Q(k)} \\ &+ \frac{1}{3! 2^3} Q^i(k) Q^j(k) Q^l(k) \frac{\partial^3 F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k) \partial Q^j(k) \partial Q^l(k)} \Big|_{Q(k)=Q(k)} + \dots \end{aligned}$$

Note that the transformed variable at a single lattice point k gets rewritten in terms of difference and midpoint variables at both k and $k+1$ lattice sites. The original kinetic term in $q^a(k)$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} (q^a(k))^2 &= (q^a(k+1) - q^a(k))^2 = (F^a(Q(k+1)) - F^a(Q(k)))^2 \\ &= \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \Big|_{Q(k)=Q(k)} \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^j(k)} \Big|_{Q(k)=Q(k)} Q^i(k) Q^j(k) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \Big|_{Q(k)=Q(k)} \frac{\partial^3 F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^j(k) \partial Q^l(k) \partial Q^m(k)} \Big|_{Q(k)=Q(k)} \\ &Q^i(k) Q^j(k) Q^l(k) Q^m(k) + O(Q)^5 : \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

The metric residing in the canonical kinetic term for $Q^i(k)$ is

$$g_{ij}(Q(k)) = \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \dot{Q}^j(k) = Q(k) \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^j(k)} \dot{Q}^j(k) = Q(k) : \quad (2.7)$$

The metric must be a function only of the midpoint variables. This point may be seen especially clearly [4] from the hamiltonian point of view. En route to treating the jacobian term, we evaluate

$$\begin{aligned} & \det \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \\ &= [\det g_m(Q(k))]^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left[\frac{1}{4} Q^i(k) g_m(Q(k)) \frac{\partial}{\partial Q^i(k)} g_m(Q(k)) \right. \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{16} Q^i(k) Q^j(k) g_m(Q(k)) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial Q^i(k) \partial Q^j(k)} g_m(Q(k)) \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{\partial}{\partial Q^i(k)} g_m(Q(k)) \frac{\partial}{\partial Q^j(k)} g_m(Q(k)) + O(Q)^3 \right] : \quad (2.8) \end{aligned}$$

To maintain the symmetry of the action and treat the endpoints correctly, we write for the jacobian

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{k=1}^{N_Y-1} \det \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \quad (2.9) \\ &= \prod_{k=1}^{N_Y-1} \det \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \dot{Q}^j(k) = Q(k) \frac{1}{2} Q(k) \det \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \dot{Q}^j(k) = Q(k-1) + \frac{1}{2} Q(k-1) \\ &= \prod_{k=1}^{N_Y-1} \det \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \dot{Q}^j(k) = Q(k) \frac{1}{2} Q(k) \prod_{k=0}^{N_Y-2} \det \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \dot{Q}^j(k) = Q(k) + \frac{1}{2} Q(k) \\ &= \prod_{k=0}^{N_Y-1} \det \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \dot{Q}^j(k) = Q(k) \frac{1}{2} Q(k) \det \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \dot{Q}^j(k) = Q(k) + \frac{1}{2} Q(k) \\ &= \prod_{k=0}^{N_Y-1} \det \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \dot{Q}^j(k) = Q(k) \frac{1}{2} Q(k) \prod_{k=0}^{N_Y-1} \det \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \dot{Q}^j(k) = Q(k) + \frac{1}{2} Q(k) \\ &= \prod_{k=0}^{N_Y-1} \det g_m(Q(k)) \frac{1}{2} \prod_{k=0}^{N_Y-1} \exp \left[\frac{1}{16} Q^i(k) Q^j(k) G_{ij}(Q(k)) \right] \\ & \quad [\det g_m(Q(0))]^{\frac{1}{4}} [\det g_m(Q(N))]^{\frac{1}{4}} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$G_{ij}(Q(k)) = g^m(Q(k)) \frac{\partial^2 g_m(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k) \partial Q^j(k)} + \frac{\partial g^m(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \frac{\partial g_m(Q(k))}{\partial Q^j(k)} :$$

Collecting the above results, one sees clearly the canonical kinetic term and usual jacobian term plus a series of additional "extra" terms. Explicitly, one finds

$$Z = \int_{i=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{N-1} dQ^i(k) \prod_{k=0}^{N-1} \det g_m(Q(k))^{1/2} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} S[Q(k); Q(k)]} [\det g_m(Q(0))]^{1/4} [\det g_m(Q(N))]^{1/4} \quad (2.10)$$

where

$$S[Q(k); Q(k)] = \frac{1}{2} g_{ij}(Q(k)) Q^i(k) Q^j(k) - V_0(F(Q(k))) - V_{\text{extra}}(Q(k); Q(k))$$

which implies the following "extra" terms beyond the usual jacobian

$$V_{\text{extra}}(Q(k); Q(k)) = \frac{i\hbar}{16} Q^i(k) Q^j(k) G_{ij}(Q(k)) + \frac{1}{24^2} \frac{\partial F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^i(k)} \frac{\partial^3 F^a(Q(k))}{\partial Q^j(k) \partial Q^l(k) \partial Q^m(k)} Q^i(k) Q^j(k) Q^l(k) Q^m(k) + \dots \quad (2.11)$$

In principle, one could stop at this point with a perfectly acceptable action. However, this form of the action is not the most useful. In particular, the corresponding continuum version of the extra potential in the action contains terms with multiple derivatives of the coordinates, and the fact that the series of terms in the difference variables truncates is not as clear. To produce a superior form for the action, we will "integrate out" the difference variables in the extra potential by a perturbation expansion and replace them with functions of the midpoint variables.

Previous authors [2], seeking to recast the extra terms in the action into a non-derivative form, have stated that one should employ the following integrals (wherein $g = \det g_{ij}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{a=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{N-1} dx^a e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \frac{1}{2} g_{ij} x^i x^j} x^l x^m &= (2i\hbar)^{n=2} g^{1/2} (i\hbar)^n g^m \quad (2.12) \\ \int_{a=1}^N \prod_{k=1}^{N-1} dx^a e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \frac{1}{2} g_{ij} x^i x^j} x^l x^m x^p x^q &= (2i\hbar)^{n=2} g^{1/2} (i\hbar)^2 (g^m g^{pq} + g^p g^{mq} + g^q g^{mp}) \end{aligned}$$

to replace the difference variables by functions of the midpoint variables. The implication, of course, is that for each k , $Q(k)$ is substituted in place of x . Note that the above integrals may be simply derived from the "normalization" integral

$$\int_{a=1}^Z \int_{Y^n} dx^a e^{\frac{i}{n} \frac{1}{2} g_{ij} x^i x^j} = (2\pi\hbar)^{n=2} g^{-\frac{1}{2}} : \quad (2.13)$$

While Gervais and Jevicki [2] quote these integrals in reference to this application, and Sakita [4] gives a brief argument for use of these integrals, any sort of proof or even a detailed accounting of the procedure of replacing the difference variables with functions of the midpoint variables is conspicuously lacking. The critical issue is that the above prescription implies that to integrate over the difference variables $Q(k)$ for each k , we must have an integration factor $dQ(k)$ for each k . However, this is not a straightforward procedure, as Sakita indeed remarks in his book.

To understand the complication in applying the above formulas, consider the base integral we must evaluate in order to derive the integrals of powers of difference variables (dropping $V_0(Q(k))$ since it has no consequence)

$$\begin{aligned} Z_0 &= \int_{i=1}^Z \int_{Y^{N-1}} \int_{k=1}^{N-1} dQ^i(k) \int_{k=0}^{N-1} \det g_m(Q(k))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_{k=0}^{N-1} e^{\frac{i}{n} \frac{1}{2} g_{ij}(Q(k)) Q^i(k) Q^j(k)} \\ &\quad [\det g_m(Q(0))]^{\frac{1}{4}} [\det g_m(Q(N))]^{\frac{1}{4}} : \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

The problem is that this integral is not analogous to the "normalization" integral listed in the left hand side of equation 2.13. To correctly apply those integrals above, we must rewrite the $dQ(k)$ differentials in terms of the $dQ(k)$ differentials. Applying the expressions in equation 2.5 for $Q(k)$ and $Q(k+1)$ in terms of the midpoint and difference variables to the differentials of two neighboring coordinates $Q(k)$ and $Q(k+1)$, we find

$$dQ(k)dQ(k+1) = dQ(k)dQ(k) : \quad (2.15)$$

Note that if we just apply this along the chain of differentials, we get

$$dQ(1)dQ(2)dQ(3)dQ(4) ::= dQ(1)dQ(1)dQ(3)dQ(3) :::; \quad (2.16)$$

or in other terms, taking an even number of lattice points, we find

$$\int_{i=1}^{2M} dQ(i) = \int_{i=1}^M dQ(2i-1)dQ(2i-1) : \quad (2.17)$$

Note that we get differentials of midpoint and difference variables labeled with every other point. In particular, we do not get a differential of a difference variable at each point. We believe that this feature, which is reminiscent of the "blocking" of a lattice, may be the root of a connection between old definitions and the renormalization group. This matter is currently being investigated by the authors [6].

Instead of working with the lagrangian form of the path integral, we will turn to the hamiltonian form of the path integral to evaluate the necessary integrals. We are grateful to B. Sakita [5] for pointing out to us the utility of the phase space method in this case. Consider the phase space version of the path integral given in equation 2.14, with action given by

$$S = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} P_i(k) \dot{Q}^i(k) - \frac{h}{2} g^{ij}(Q(k)) P_i(k) P_j(k) : \quad (2.18)$$

Dropping irrelevant normalization factors and using the abbreviation $[dQ][dP] = \prod_{k=1}^{N-1} dQ(k) \prod_{k=0}^{N-1} dP(k)$, we use the following relation

$$\begin{aligned} & \int [dQ][dP] e^{\frac{i}{2h} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} g^{ij}(Q(k)) P_i(k) P_j(k)} \frac{h}{i\partial P_i(k)} \frac{h}{i\partial P_m(k)} e^{\frac{i}{h} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} P_n(k) \dot{Q}^n(k)} \\ &= \int [dQ][dP] e^{\frac{i}{h} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} P_n(k) \dot{Q}^n(k)} \frac{h}{i\partial P_i(k)} \frac{h}{i\partial P_m(k)} e^{\frac{i}{2h} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} g^{ij}(Q(k)) P_i(k) P_j(k)} \end{aligned}$$

to derive the exact relation

$$h \dot{Q}^i(k) \dot{Q}^m(k) i_{\text{phase}} = i h g^{im}(Q(k)) i_{\text{phase}} + \frac{h^2}{2} g^{ik}(Q(k)) g^{mj}(Q(k)) P_i(k) P_j(k) i_{\text{phase}} : \quad (2.19)$$

Our plan is to prove that the second term on the right-hand side is $O(\hbar^2)$; i.e. the term inside the brackets is of $O(\hbar)$. If this is true, then the second term may be dropped, since only terms of $O(\hbar)$ survive in the action. Toward this end, we will employ phase space path integral perturbation expansion techniques. Following loosely the notation of Sakita's book [4], the generating functional is

$$Z[J;K] = \lim_{\substack{t_f \rightarrow 1 \\ t_i \rightarrow -1}} \int \int dQ_f dQ_i \psi_0(Q_f; t_f) K(Q_f; t_f; Q_i; t_i) \psi_0(Q_i; t_i) \quad (2.20)$$

where $K(Q_f; t_f; Q_i; t_i)$ is the Feynman kernel and $\psi_0(Q; t)$ is the asymptotic ground state wave function of the free hamiltonian. Explicitly, the Feynman

kernel is

$$K = \prod_{k=1}^{N_Y-1} dQ(k) \prod_{k=0}^{N_Y-1} \frac{dP(k)}{2} \exp iS[J;K] \quad (2.21)$$

where $S[J;K]$ is the phase space action with sources J and K for Q and P respectively

$$S[J;K] = \sum_{n=0}^{N_X-1} P(n)Q(n) - H_n + \sum_{n=0}^{N_X-1} J(n)Q(n) + \sum_{n=0}^{N_X-1} K(n)P(n) :$$

Writing the hamiltonian as

$$H_n = H_0(n) + H_1 - P(n); \frac{Q(n) + Q(n-1)}{2} ;$$

and taking the free hamiltonian to be

$$H_0 = \frac{P^2 + \frac{1}{2}Q^2}{2}$$

the asymptotic ground state wave function may be calculated to be

$$\psi_0 = \left(\frac{1}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}Q^2 - \frac{i}{2}Pt} :$$

To develop a perturbation expansion, we write

$$Z[J;K] = e^{R_1} \exp \left[\int_0^1 dt H_1 \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{Q}{t}, \frac{1}{2} \frac{P}{t} \right] \right] Z_0[J;K] ; \quad (2.22)$$

and subsequently calculate the generating functional $Z_0[J;K]$ to be

$$Z_0[J;K] = \lim_{\hbar \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{\frac{N}{2}} i e^{i! (t_f - t_i) N} \frac{1}{2} \quad (2.23)$$

$$e^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n,m=1}^N P(n) K(m+1) - \sum_{n,m=1}^N [J(n) K(m+1)] - \sum_{n,m=1}^N [J(m) K(n+1)] + \frac{i}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N P(n) K^2(n)}$$

$(K(n+1) = \frac{K(n+1) - K(n)}{2})$ where

$$= \frac{8}{4 + \frac{1}{2}t^2} = \frac{2}{t} \sin$$

and

$$\tan \frac{\pi}{2} = \frac{1}{2} :$$

The lattice propagator is

$$F(n;m) = \frac{1}{2!} [(n-m-1)e^{i(n-m)} + n\delta_m + (m-n-1)e^{i(m-n)}] \quad (2.24)$$

where δ is the discrete version of the theta function, i.e. $\delta = 1$ if $\cdot \geq 0$ and $\delta = 0$ if $\cdot < 0$. Some useful relations for the following discussion are

$$\begin{aligned} F(m;m) &= \frac{1}{2!} \quad 8m \\ F(m;m-1) &= F(m-1;m) = \frac{1}{2!} e^{i \quad 8m} : \end{aligned}$$

Using the above, one may evaluate the phase space propagators

$$hQ(n)Q(m)i_{\text{phase}} = \frac{1}{(i)^2} \frac{Z_0[J;K]}{J(n)J(m)} \Big|_{J=0, K=0} = F(n;m) = F(m;n) \quad (2.25)$$

$$hQ(n)P(m)i_{\text{phase}} = \frac{1}{(i)^2} \frac{Z_0[J;K]}{J(n)K(m)} \Big|_{J=0, K=0} = \frac{1}{i} [F(n;m) - F(n;m-1)] \quad (2.26)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} hP(n)P(m)i_{\text{phase}} &= \frac{1}{(i)^2} \frac{Z_0[J;K]}{K(n)K(m)} \Big|_{J=0, K=0} \\ &= \frac{1}{i} n\delta_m + \frac{1}{2} [F(n;m) + F(n-1;m-1) \\ &\quad - F(n-1;m) - F(n;m-1)] : \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

Determining the order in \hbar of the second term of equation 2.19 requires that we calculate $hQ(k)Q(k)i_{\text{phase}}$, $hQ(k)P(k)i_{\text{phase}}$, and $hP(k)P(k)i_{\text{phase}}$. Firstly, note that a consequence of using the midpoint coordinate $Q(m)$, as opposed to $Q(m)$, gives

$$\begin{aligned} hQ(m)P(m)i_{\text{phase}} &= \frac{1}{2} hQ(m)P(m)i_{\text{phase}} + \frac{1}{2} hQ(m-1)P(m)i_{\text{phase}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} [F(m;m) - F(m;m-1) + F(m-1;m) - F(m-1;m-1)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} [(F(m;m) - F(m-1;m-1)) + (F(m-1;m) - F(m;m-1))] \\ &= 0 : \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

Secondly, since the two-point function of two $Q(m)$'s is independent of \hbar , so must be the two-point function of two $Q(m)$'s since the $Q(m)$'s are linear combinations of the $Q(m)$'s. Finally, one may calculate the two-point function of two $P(m)$'s taken at the same point

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P(m)P(m) \rangle_{\text{phase}} &= \frac{i}{2} + \frac{1}{2} [\langle m;m \rangle + \langle m-1;m-1 \rangle - \langle m-1;m \rangle - \langle m;m-1 \rangle] \\ &= \frac{i}{2} + \frac{1}{2!} (1 - e^{-1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{6} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (2.29)$$

Together with Wick's theorem, these expectation integrals show that the second term on the right hand side of equation 2.19 is order $O(\hbar^2)$ and thus is of no consequence. Since the second term may be neglected, and the remaining terms do not contain averages over $P(m)$'s, we may implicitly integrate over the $P(m)$'s in the phase space expectation values, to arrive at a lagrangian formula valid in the same small \hbar limit

$$\langle Q^i(k) Q^m(k) \rangle = i \hbar g^m(Q(k)) \delta^i_m \quad (2.30)$$

In the same way, one may prove that

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle Q^i(k) Q^j(k) Q^m(k) Q^n(k) \rangle \\ &= (i \hbar)^2 g^{ij}(Q(k)) g^{mn}(Q(k)) + g^{in}(Q(k)) g^{jm}(Q(k)) + g^{im}(Q(k)) g^{jn}(Q(k)) \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

Finally, by using the preceding two relations to replace the difference variables with functions of the midpoint variables, we arrive at a contribution (at midpoint site Q_i)

$$S_{\text{extra}}[Q_i] = \hbar^2 \sum_{k; \vec{p} \in 2Z} \frac{1}{8} g^{nn}(Q_i) k_p(Q_i) p_{nk}(Q_i) \quad (2.32)$$

which is written compactly here in terms of the metric and connection of the coordinate transformation. In the continuum limit, this amounts to an extra potential term

$$S_{\text{extra}}[Q] = \hbar^2 \int dt \sum_{k; \vec{p} \in 2Z} \frac{1}{8} g^{nn}(Q) k_p(Q) p_{nk}(Q) \quad (2.33)$$

This contribution only occurs for nonlinear transformations, since while the metric involves only one derivative of the transformation, the connection

involves two derivatives. This form for the extra term agrees with the previously obtained result of Gervais and Jevicki [2].

The important point of this analysis in the quantum mechanical case lies not so much in this final form for the extra term generated by a nonlinear coordinate redefinition, but in our derivation and its consequences. We have provided a solid path integral proof for the extra term, and have supplied conspicuously missing steps in the derivation. In the process, we have uncovered a possible connection between field redefinitions and renormalization group transformations, by way of "blocking" the lattice. Perhaps most importantly, the successful path integral approach will allow a similar analysis in the quantum field theory case.

In the following section, we indirectly explore nonlinear field redefinitions in quantum field theory by bridging the gap between quantum mechanics and quantum field theory via dimensional reduction. This serves as a concrete example for the generation of extra terms in quantum field theory and as motivation for our future paper in which we give a direct, complete analysis using discretization of the quantum field theory path integral [6].

3 Kaluza-Klein "Paradox"

In contrast to the case of quantum mechanics, the standard lore in quantum field theory dictates that under a field redefinition, the action changes by direct substitution of the change of variables in the action together with inclusion of the jacobian determinant of the transformation. Furthermore, when dimensional regularization is employed, the jacobian determinant does not contribute since upon exponentiation the formally infinite spacetime delta function $\delta^{(d)}(0)$ generated by the trace is set equal to zero. Similarly, there is also a standard argument that any extra terms generated in the path integral, since they are manifestations of operator ordering (i.e. from $[\phi(x); \phi(x)] = i\hbar \delta^{(d-1)}(0)$), would involve delta functions at zero argument and therefore would vanish by dimensional regularization. Even if the validity of dimensional regularization is not questioned, a solid justification for setting infinite quantities equal to zero is lacking. Certainly from the lattice point of view, the jacobian term, as well as any extra term, is very real and does not vanish since the spacetime delta function at zero argument is just a power of the inverse lattice spacing i.e., $\delta^{(d)}(0) \sim a^{-d}$: Dimensional regularization does in fact fail in cases where the action has some feature depending on the dimensionality of spacetime.

An effective laboratory in which to learn about nonlinear point canonical transformations in quantum field theory is that of a 1+1 dimensional real scalar field on a Minkowskian cylinder. By integrating out the angular coordinate one arrives at an effectively quantum mechanical problem, and then the well-established results for nonlinear point canonical transformations in quantum mechanics may be employed. On the other hand, one may use the standard lore to make a nonlinear field redefinition directly in the 1+1 dimensional quantum field theory, and then afterwards integrate out the angular coordinate to arrive again to a quantum mechanics action. One expects that the two approaches should give the same result, so if it is true that no new terms appear in the latter scenario when one performs a field redefinition in the quantum field theory, one must be able to explain what happens to the extra terms that arise along the way in the former scenario. In the following we consider a real massless scalar field $\phi(x;t)$ in a flat 1+1 Minkowskian spacetime with a periodic spatial coordinate

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^Z dx \left(\dot{\phi}^2 - \phi'^2 \right) \quad (3.1)$$

where $\dot{\phi} = \partial_t \phi$; $\phi' = \partial_x \phi$ and $x = x + 2\pi R$:

3.1 Method 1

Using an angular coordinate $\theta = x/R$; the action is

$$S = R \int_0^Z dt \left(\frac{1}{2} \dot{\phi}^2 - \frac{1}{2R^2} (\phi')^2 \right) \quad (3.2)$$

One may convert this quantum field theory into an effectively quantum mechanical problem by expanding the scalar field in a Kaluza-Klein-like decomposition

$$\phi(x;t) = \sum_{p \in 2\pi Z} a^{(p)}(t) e^{ipx} \quad (3.3)$$

and integrating out the x dependence in the action. The resulting action is that of a sum of an infinite number of quantum mechanical complex oscillators $a^{(m)}(t)$ with frequencies $\omega_m = \frac{m}{R}$ dependent on mode number m and radius R of the internal dimension. Explicitly,

$$S_0[a] = \sum_{p \in 2\pi Z} \int_0^Z dt \sum_{m \in 2\pi Z} \left(\frac{1}{2} g_{mp} \dot{a}^{(m)} \dot{a}^{(p)} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{p^2}{R^2} g_{mp} a^{(m)} a^{(p)} \right) \quad (3.4)$$

where the metric

$$g_{mp}[a] = 2 \sum_{m,p} R_{m,p} = 2 \sum_{m+p=0} R_{m,p}$$

is an infinite-dimensional unit matrix multiplied by $2 \sum R$. We may consider a "cutoff" version of this theory, wherein only modes with $|n_j| \leq N_{max}$ are included. In this case, $g_{mp}[a]$ is an ordinary $(2N_{max} + 1) \times (2N_{max} + 1)$ metric defining a Euclidean space of oscillators $a(t)$:

Let us perform a change of variables in this quantum mechanical model. In particular, we wish to make the change of variables corresponding to

$$a = F[a'] + a'^N; \quad (3.5)$$

We expand the new field $a'(\tau; t)$ in modes

$$a'(\tau; t) = \sum_{p \in 2\mathbb{Z}} b^{(p)}(t) e^{ip\tau}; \quad (3.6)$$

and define the following useful objects

$$E_L^{(\lambda)}[b] = \sum_{p_1 \in 2\mathbb{Z}} \cdots \sum_{p_L \in 2\mathbb{Z}} b^{(p_1)} \cdots b^{(p_L)} \delta_{\sum_{i=1}^L p_i = \lambda} \quad (3.7)$$

$$B_L[b] = E_L^{(0)}[b] = \frac{d}{2} a'(\tau; t)^L; \quad (3.8)$$

where $\delta = 0$ is one when $\lambda = 0$ and is zero if $\lambda \neq 0$: Note $E_L^{(\lambda)}[b]$ involves the product of L b 's whose mode numbers add up to λ ; and $B_L[b]$ involves L b 's whose overall sum of mode numbers vanishes. A number of identities, the simplest being

$$\sum_{p \in 2\mathbb{Z}} E_M^{(\lambda+p)}[b] E_L^{(p+m)}[b] = E_{M+L}^{(\lambda+m)}[b] \quad (3.9)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial b^{(m)}} E_M^{(\lambda)}[b] = M E_{M-1}^{(\lambda-m)}[b] \quad (3.10)$$

greatly facilitate subsequent calculations. Appendix A contains useful identities and their proofs. The transformation of the modes corresponding to the field redefinition above in equation 3.5 is

$$a^{(p)} = f^{(p)}[b] = b^{(p)} + E_N^{(p)}[b]; \quad (3.11)$$

To implement this change of coordinates in the quantum mechanical path integral, we must include not only the naive substitution of change of variables

in the action and the jacobian determinant, but also the extra term due to the stochastic nature of the path integral. Specifically, after exponentiating the usual jacobian factor, the action becomes

$$S[b] = S_0[b] + S_{\text{jacobian}}[b] + S_{\text{extra}}[b] \quad (3.12)$$

where $S_0[b]$ is the action obtained by direct substitution into the original free action given in equation 3.4, and where, as derived in equation 2.33, the extra term of $O(\hbar^2)$ is

$$S_{\text{extra}}[b] = \hbar^2 \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \sum_{k,p,m \geq 2} \frac{1}{8} g^{(n)}_{k,p} [b] \tilde{b}^{(k)}_p [b] \tilde{b}^{(p)}_{nk} [b]; \quad (3.13)$$

It is possible to compute all three contributions to the action $S[b]$ exactly to all orders in the parameter \hbar . The metric in the new coordinates is given by

$$g_{mn}[b] = 2R \delta_{m+n=0} + 2N E_{N-1}^{(m,n)} [b] + N^2 E_{2N-2}^{(m,n)} [b]; \quad (3.14)$$

and the inverse metric, which may be obtained via a recursion equation (see appendix B), is given by

$$g^{km}[b] = \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{j=0}^k (-N)^j (j+1) E_{j(N-1)}^{(k+m)} [b]; \quad (3.15)$$

In terms of this metric, direct substitution of the nonlinear change of variables into the original action yields

$$S_0[b] = \sum_{p \geq 2} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m \geq 2} g_{mp}[b] \tilde{b}^{(m)}_p [b] - \frac{1}{2R^2} \sum_{p \geq 2} f^{(p)} [b] \tilde{b}^{(p)} [b]; \quad (3.16)$$

where $f^{(p)}[b]$ was given in equation 3.11. The jacobian factor may be evaluated (see appendix B) to give a contribution to the action of

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{jacobian}}[b] &= \frac{i\hbar}{2} \text{Tr} \ln g_{mn}[b] (t - t_0) \\ &= i\hbar \sum_{k \geq 2} \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{(-N)^j}{j} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt B_{j(N-1)}; \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

where we have dropped an infinite constant $ih \int_0^T dt \ln [2R] \prod_{k=2}^P \frac{1}{2}$. Finally, the extra term arising from the stochastic nature of the path integral may be evaluated (see appendix B) to give a contribution to the action of

$$S_{\text{extra}}[b] = \frac{h^2}{8} \frac{(N-1)^2}{2R} \sum_{k=2}^P \sum_{X=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{15} \frac{1}{5} \frac{1}{3} (N)^{X+2} \frac{X+3}{3} \int_0^T dt B_X (N-1)+2(N-2) [b]; \quad (3.18)$$

Note the presence of the infinite sum over modes in equation 3.17 and the same sum squared in equation 3.18.

3.2 Method 2

Alternatively, we may choose to perform the field redefinition in the original quantum field theory, and then afterwards expand in the Kaluza Klein modes. Upon direct substitution, the field redefinition of equation 3.5 introduces derivative interaction terms into the action

$$S_0[\varphi] = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T dt d^2x (1 + 2N \varphi' N^{-1} + N^2 \varphi'^2 N^{-1}) @' (x) @' (x); \quad (3.19)$$

The exponentiated jacobian determinant gives a contribution to the action

$$S_{\text{jacobian}}[\varphi] = ih \int_0^T dt d^2x \ln [1 + N \varphi' N^{-1}]; \quad (3.20)$$

Assuming the conventional arguments hold would imply that the total action is given by $S_0[\varphi] + S_{\text{jacobian}}[\varphi]$. We now convert this action to an effectively quantum mechanical one by integrating out the angular coordinate. The terms in the action for the modes obtained from method 2 will be written with tildes to distinguish them from those of method 1. Upon integrating out the dependence, $S_0[\varphi]$ becomes

$$\tilde{S}_0[b] = \int_0^T dt \sum_{m=2}^P \sum_{p=2}^P \frac{1}{2} g_{mp}^{(b)} b^{(m)} b^{(p)} + \frac{mp}{2R^2} g_{mp} b^{(m)} b^{(p)} \quad (3.21)$$

where $g_{mp}^{(b)}$ is exactly the metric appearing in the previous section. Similarly, expanding the logarithm and using equation 3.8, one obtains the expression for the jacobian

$$\tilde{S}_{\text{jacobian}}[b] = 2R ih \int_0^T dt \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(N)^j}{j} \int_0^T dt B_{j(N-1)}; \quad (3.22)$$

3.3 Comparison of Methods

If the standard lore holds true, one would expect to find that the two actions for the effective quantum mechanics theory are equivalent, i.e.

$$S_0[b] + S_{\text{jacobian}}[b] + S_{\text{extra}}[b] = S_0[b] + S_{\text{jacobian}}[b]: \quad (3.23)$$

Firstly, we note that using identity A.7 from appendix A allows one to prove the equality of the kinetic term s , i.e. $S_0[b] = S_0[b]$ (see equations 3.16 and 3.21).

Secondly, comparison of the jacobian factors (equations 3.17 and 3.22) indicates that the following correspondence must hold

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{k^2} = \frac{2}{R} \delta(0) \quad (3.24)$$

where the delta function at zero argument on the right hand side of this equation is a delta function in the coordinate x , i.e. $\delta(0) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \delta(x)$. If we express the delta function in terms of the angular coordinate $x = R\theta$, the R dependence in the above equation drops out. With this identification, we find $S_{\text{jacobian}}[b] = S_{\text{jacobian}}[b]$ up to the infinite constant that we dropped.

Finally, we turn our attention to the most interesting term, namely $S_{\text{extra}}[\varphi]$: In the second method where we performed the nonlinear field redefinition in the quantum field theory using the standard arguments, we did not pick up any such term. Taking the pragmatic point of view that this term can not be rationalized to vanish, we ask the following question "could this term arise as an extra term generated upon nonlinear field redefinition in the original quantum field theory?" Remarkably, it is possible (see appendix B) to perform the resummation of the infinite series in equation 3.18. The resulting term is

$$S_{\text{extra}}[\varphi] = \frac{\hbar^2}{8} \frac{[\int_{k^2} 1]^2}{(2R)^2} \frac{2N^2(N-1)^2}{d^2x} \frac{e^{2N-4}}{(1 + N e^{N-1})^4}: \quad (3.25)$$

We still must contend with the peculiar infinite summations to relate this potential to the two dimensional field theory. Using the result of the comparison of the jacobian terms, i.e. equation 3.24, we conclude that the extra term becomes

$$S_{\text{extra}}[\varphi] = \frac{\hbar^2}{8} (\delta(0))^2 \frac{2N^2(N-1)^2}{d^2x} \frac{e^{2N-4}}{(1 + N e^{N-1})^4}: \quad (3.26)$$

Interestingly, note that this term diverges as the square of the $\phi(0)$ in the spatial coordinate, and not like the two-dimensional delta function at zero argument. This feature (which persists in d -dimensional quantum field theory where an extra term containing $(\phi(0))^{d-2}$ appears) occurs for an important reason which becomes evident when one evaluates Feynman diagrams.

We could have elected to present the material in the intermediate step of Method 2 of this exercise in a different, more complete manner. That is, after the field redefinition, we should add to the action an infinite series of counterterms with unspecified coefficients c_i ; i.e.

$$S[\phi] = \frac{1}{2} \int d^2x \left((1 + 2N \phi^{N-1} + N^2 \phi^{2(N-1)}) \partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi \right) \\ + i\hbar^{(2)}(0) \int d^2x \ln[1 + N \phi^{N-1}] + \int d^2x \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} c_i \phi^i(\mathbf{x})$$

With this action, one would have to determine the infinite series of unknown coefficients, the c_i 's, by calculating physically significant quantities and matching with the original free theory. On the other hand, our exercise has enabled us to pin down the precise counterterm without having to resort to evaluating Feynman diagrams, i.e. the series in c_i is replaced by the simple expression in equation 3.26.

To conclude this section, we have given concrete evidence for a single² extra term to be generated upon making a nonlinear field redefinition in this $1+1$ dimensional quantum field theory on a Minkowskian cylinder. With this result as motivation, we are poised to tackle this subject directly in a subsequent paper [6], by discretizing the quantum field theory path integral.

4 Conclusion

We have provided the first solid path integral based derivation of the extra potential term, beyond the usual jacobian term, which arises when one makes nonlinear coordinate redefinitions in quantum mechanics. By carefully performing nonlinear transformations in the discretized version of the quantum mechanical path integral, and then resorting to hamiltonian path integral methods, we succeeded in filling in missing steps from previous discussions. Along the way, we uncovered a possible connection between coor-

²The fact that only a single extra term appears in this example is related to the particular spacetime topology in the problem. Our future works will treat quantum field theories in generic spacetimes.

dinate transformations and renormalization group transformations, and we are currently investigating the possible interpretation that the extra terms may emerge from a "blocking" procedure [6]. A main virtue of our path integral based proof is that it provides for an extension to quantum field theory. As a precursor to carrying out the discretization in the quantum field theory case, we indirectly investigated extra terms in quantum field theory by examining what transpires as one dimensionally reduces a $1+1$ dimensional field theory where usually no extra terms are considered, to a quantum mechanical theory where the existence of extra terms is well-established. We performed field redefinitions both before and after reduction, and were able to derive an explicit form of an extra term appearing in the quantum field theory. In a forthcoming article [6], we will argue that in spite of the path integral's ubiquitous employment, manipulations involving the path integral must be reevaluated, and that interesting physics could be missed. Applications are numerous since nonlinear field redefinitions are commonplace. Exciting possibilities include higher order $O(\hbar^n)$ $n \geq 2$ anomalies in theories with nonlinear symmetries, corrections to quantities computed using collective coordinate techniques, and corrections to duality transformations (such as the higher order dilaton corrections associated with the R-symmetry in string theory). These issues are currently under investigation by the authors [6].

Acknowledgements

K.A. dedicates this paper to her beloved father Dr. Max Apfeldorf, who died January 18, 1995, and C.O. dedicates this paper to his brother Jorge Ricardo Odonez Montenegro who died March 13, 1995. We thank Steven Weinberg and Jacques Distler for useful discussions of the integrating out procedure and the renormalization group. This research was supported in part by Robert A. Welch Foundation, NSF Grant PHY 9009850 (UT Austin) and Department of Education grant DE-FG 05-87ER 40367 (Vanderbilt).

Useful identities involving modes

In this appendix, we prove some identities used in obtaining results in this paper. Consider the expansion in modes of a function $f(x;t)$ with a periodic

coordinate

$$\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{r}; t) = \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^N} \mathbf{b}^{(\mathbf{p})}(\mathbf{r}) e^{i\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r}} : \quad (\text{A } 1)$$

We call \mathbf{p} the mode number. Define the following object which is multilinear in N modes and where the sum of the mode numbers is 0

$$E_N^{(\mathbf{p})}[\mathbf{b}] = \sum_{\mathbf{p}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^N} \cdots \sum_{\mathbf{p}_N \in \mathbb{Z}^N} \mathbf{b}^{(\mathbf{p}_1)} \cdots \mathbf{b}^{(\mathbf{p}_N)} : \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{p}_i = 0 : \quad (\text{A } 2)$$

Note the special case when the sum of the mode numbers is zero

$$E_N^{(0)}[\mathbf{b}] = \frac{d}{d\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{r}; t)^N B_N[\mathbf{b}] : \quad (\text{A } 3)$$

One may straightforwardly relate the sum over a product of two E 's to a single E in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^N} E_M^{(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{p})}[\mathbf{b}] E_N^{(\mathbf{p})}[\mathbf{b}] \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{p}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^N} \cdots \sum_{\mathbf{p}_M \in \mathbb{Z}^N} \mathbf{b}^{(\mathbf{p}_1)} \cdots \mathbf{b}^{(\mathbf{p}_M)} \mathbf{b}^{(\mathbf{p}_1)} \cdots \mathbf{b}^{(\mathbf{p}_N)} : \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{p}_i = 0 \quad \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{p}_j = 0 \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{p}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^N} \cdots \sum_{\mathbf{p}_M \in \mathbb{Z}^N} \mathbf{b}^{(\mathbf{p}_1)} \cdots \mathbf{b}^{(\mathbf{p}_M)} \mathbf{b}^{(\mathbf{p}_1)} \cdots \mathbf{b}^{(\mathbf{p}_N)} : \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbf{p}_i = 0 \quad \sum_{j=1}^{M+N} \mathbf{p}_j = 0 \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{p}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^N} \cdots \sum_{\mathbf{p}_{M+N} \in \mathbb{Z}^N} \mathbf{b}^{(\mathbf{p}_1)} \cdots \mathbf{b}^{(\mathbf{p}_{M+N})} : \sum_{j=1}^{M+N} \mathbf{p}_j = 0 \\ &= E_{M+N}^{(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{p})}[\mathbf{b}] : \quad (\text{A } 4) \end{aligned}$$

Consider three E 's where the number of modes may be different and where the sum of all mode numbers is zero

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^N} E_L^{(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{n})}[\mathbf{b}] E_M^{(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{p})}[\mathbf{b}] E_N^{(\mathbf{p})}[\mathbf{b}] \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{p}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^N} \cdots \sum_{\mathbf{p}_{L+M} \in \mathbb{Z}^N} E_{L+M}^{(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{p})}[\mathbf{b}] E_N^{(\mathbf{p})}[\mathbf{b}] \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{p}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^N} \cdots \sum_{\mathbf{p}_{L+M+N} \in \mathbb{Z}^N} E_{L+M+N}^{(\mathbf{p})}[\mathbf{b}] \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^N} B_{L+M+N}[\mathbf{b}] : \quad (\text{A } 5) \end{aligned}$$

Finally consider the following trace of $j E_M$'s where the sum of all mode numbers is zero (summation convention assumed)

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{tr}(E_M^j) &= E_M^{(n_j+n_1)} [b] E_M^{(n_1+n_2)} [b] \dots E_M^{(n_{j-1}+n_j)} [b] \\
&= E_M^{(n_j+n_2)} [b] E_M^{(n_2+n_3)} [b] \dots E_M^{(n_{j-1}+n_j)} [b] \\
&= \sum_{n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{n_2} B_{j(N-1)} [b] :
\end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

This identity is useful when evaluating the jacobian determinant in section 3.1 of this paper.

A final identity which is useful in section 3.3 where we compare the kinetic terms in the two methods is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} p^2 E_N^{(p)} E_1^{(-p)} \\
&= \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N p^2 b^{(i)} b^{(j)} E_N^{(p)} E_1^{(-p)} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} p^2 b^{(i)} b^{(j)} E_N^{(p)} E_1^{(-p)} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} p^2 b^{(i)} b^{(j)} E_N^{(p)} E_1^{(-p)} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} p^2 b^{(i)} b^{(j)} E_N^{(p)} E_1^{(-p)} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} p^2 b^{(i)} b^{(j)} E_N^{(p)} E_1^{(-p)} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} p^2 b^{(i)} b^{(j)} E_N^{(p)} E_1^{(-p)} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} p^2 b^{(i)} b^{(j)} E_N^{(p)} E_1^{(-p)} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} p^2 b^{(i)} b^{(j)} E_N^{(p)} E_1^{(-p)} :
\end{aligned} \tag{A.7}$$

B Details of Kaluza Klein calculation

The metric in terms of the $b^{(m)}$ modes in the Kaluza Klein calculation is

$$\begin{aligned} g_{mn}[b] &= 2R (1_{m+n=0} + 2N E_{N-1}^{(m-n)}[b] + N^2 E_{2N-2}^{(m-n)}[b]) \\ &= 2R (1 + N E_{N-1}[b])_{m+n}^2; \end{aligned}$$

where 1_{m+n} is shorthand for $1_{m+n=0}$; $(E_M)_{m+n}$ is shorthand for $E_M^{(m-n)}$, and $(E_M^2)_{m+n}$ is shorthand for $E_M^{(m-p)} E_M^{(p-n)}$. Subtracting out an infinite constant due to the $2R$; we compute the jacobian contribution

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} \ln \left[\frac{g_{mn}[b]}{2R} \right] (t-t^0) &= 2 \text{Tr} \ln (1 + N E_{N-1}[b])_{m+n} (t-t^0) \\ &= 2 \text{Tr} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-N)^j}{j} (E_{N-1}^j[b])_{m+n} (t-t^0) \\ &= 2(0) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-N)^j}{j} \int_{t^0}^t dt E_{N-1}^{(m+n-1)}[b] E_{N-1}^{(n-1+m)}[b] \\ &= 2(0) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-N)^j}{j} \int_{t^0}^t dt B_{j(N-1)}[b]; \quad (B.1) \end{aligned}$$

We now illustrate how the inverse metric is obtained to all orders in ϵ via a recursion equation. We write

$$g^{km}[b] = \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{Q=0}^{\infty} f_Q(\epsilon) E_Q^{(k+m)}[b]; \quad (B.2)$$

and compute $g^{km}[b]g_{mn}[b] = \delta_{m+n=0}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{m+n=0} &= \sum_{Q=0}^{\infty} f_Q(\epsilon) E_Q^{(k-n)}[b] + 2N \sum_{Q=0}^{\infty} f_Q(\epsilon) E_Q^{(k+m)}[b] E_{N-1}^{(m-n)}[b] \\ &\quad + N^2 \sum_{Q=0}^{\infty} f_Q(\epsilon) E_Q^{(k+m)}[b] E_{N-2}^{(m-n)}[b] \\ &= \sum_{Q=0}^{\infty} f_Q(\epsilon) E_Q^{(k-n)}[b] + 2N \sum_{Q=0}^{\infty} f_Q(\epsilon) E_{Q+N-1}^{(k-n)}[b] \\ &\quad + N^2 \sum_{Q=0}^{\infty} f_Q(\epsilon) E_{Q+2N-2}^{(k-n)}[b] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{Q=0}^{N-2} f_Q(\cdot) E_Q^{(k,n)}[\mathbf{b}] + \sum_{Q=0}^{N-2} (f_{Q+N-1}(\cdot) + 2^{-N} f_Q(\cdot)) E_{Q+N-1}^{(k,n)}[\mathbf{b}] \\
&\quad + \sum_{Q=0}^{N-2} f_{Q+2N-2}(\cdot) + 2^{-N} f_{Q+N-1}(\cdot) + 2^{-2N} f_Q(\cdot) E_{Q+2N-2}^{(k,n)}[\mathbf{b}]:
\end{aligned}$$

The first sum on the righthand side after the last equal sign must be a Kronecker delta function, and the other two sums must vanish. From the first sum, one finds $f_0(\cdot) = 1$ and $f_1(\cdot) = \dots = f_{N-1}(\cdot) = 0$: From the second sum, one finds $f_{N-1}(\cdot) = 2^{-N}$ and $f_N(\cdot) = \dots = f_{2N-1}(\cdot) = 0$: From the third sum, it is clear that $f_Q(\cdot) = 0$ if Q is not divisible by $N-1$: Furthermore, making the ansatz

$$f_{(N-1)q}(\cdot) = (\cdot - N)^q C_q;$$

we may determine the unknown function C_q by plugging into the third sum. Explicitly, the condition that the third sum vanishes is

$$f_{(N-1)(2+q)}(\cdot) = 2^{-N} f_{(N-1)(1+q)}(\cdot) - 2^{-2N} f_{(N-1)q}(\cdot);$$

and taking into account the boundary condition $C_0 = 1$; this leads to the solution

$$f_{(N-1)q}(\cdot) = (\cdot - N)^q (q+1):$$

Thus, we obtain the inverse metric to all orders in the parameter

$$g^{km}[\mathbf{b}] = \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (\cdot - N)^j (j+1) E_{j(N-1)}^{(k+m)}[\mathbf{b}]: \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Using this expression, the connection coefficients are computed to be

$$\gamma_p^k[\mathbf{b}] = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (\cdot - N)^{j+1} (N-1) E_{j(N-1)+N-2}^{(k,p)}[\mathbf{b}]: \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Note that $\gamma_p^k[\mathbf{b}]$ is dependent only on the total mode number $k+p$, so it will prove useful to write $\gamma_p^k[\mathbf{b}] = \gamma_{k+p}^k[\mathbf{b}]$. The metric and inverse metric also depend only on the sum of their indices. Using these expressions, the extra term may be found by computing

$$\sum_{k,p,n} \frac{1}{8} g^{kn}[\mathbf{b}] \gamma_p^k[\mathbf{b}] \gamma_{nk}^p[\mathbf{b}]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k=0}^X \frac{1}{8} g^k [b]^{N-k} [p]^{p-N+k} [b] \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^X \frac{1}{8} g^k [b]^{N-k} [p]^{p-N+k} [b] \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^X \frac{1}{8} \frac{(N-k)^2}{2} \sum_{L=0}^k \sum_{M=0}^L \sum_{J=0}^M (N-k)^{L+M+J+2} (L+1) E_{(M+J+L)(N-1)+2(N-2)}^{(0)} [b] \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^X \frac{1}{8} \frac{(N-k)^2}{2} \sum_{L=0}^k \sum_{M=0}^L \sum_{J=0}^M (N-k)^{L+M+J+2} \frac{L+M+J}{3} + 1 \\
&\quad B_{(M+J+L)(N-1)+2(N-2)} [b] \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^X \frac{1}{8} \frac{(N-k)^2}{2} \sum_{L=0}^k \sum_{M=0}^L \sum_{J=0}^M (N-k)^{L+M+J+2} \frac{X}{3} + 1 B_{X(N-1)+2(N-2)} [b] \\
&= \frac{(N-1)^2}{8} \sum_{k=0}^X \frac{1}{2} \sum_{L=0}^k \sum_{M=0}^L \sum_{J=0}^M (N-k)^{L+M+J+2} \frac{X+3}{3} B_{X(N-1)+2(N-2)} [b]: \quad (B.5)
\end{aligned}$$

We have used the fact that $P_3(X) = \frac{1}{2}(X+1)(X+2)$ is the number of ways to write X as the sum of 3 non-negative integers. To rewrite this expression in terms of $'$, we use equation A.3

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{(N-1)^2}{48} \sum_{k=0}^X \frac{1}{2} \sum_{L=0}^k \sum_{M=0}^L \sum_{J=0}^M (N-k)^{L+M+J+2} (X+1)(X+2)(X+3) \\
&\quad \frac{d}{2} [b]^{X(N-1)+2(N-2)} \\
&= \frac{(N-1)^2}{48} \sum_{k=0}^X \frac{1}{2} \sum_{L=0}^k \sum_{M=0}^L \sum_{J=0}^M \frac{d}{2} \frac{1}{(N-k)^{L+M+J+2}} \frac{d^3}{d(N-k)^3} (N-k)^{L+M+J+2} \\
&= \frac{(N-1)^2}{48} \sum_{k=0}^X \frac{1}{2} \sum_{L=0}^k \sum_{M=0}^L \sum_{J=0}^M \frac{d}{2} \frac{1}{(N-k)^{L+M+J+2}} \frac{d^3}{d(N-k)^3} \frac{(N-k)^{L+M+J+2}}{1+(N-k)^{L+M+J+2}} \\
&= \frac{1}{8} \frac{2N^2(N-1)^2}{2} \sum_{k=0}^X \frac{1}{2} \sum_{L=0}^k \sum_{M=0}^L \sum_{J=0}^M \frac{d}{2} \frac{(N-k)^2}{(1+(N-k)^{L+M+J+2})^4}: \quad (B.6)
\end{aligned}$$

References

- [1] S.F. Edwards, Y.V. Gulyaev *Proc. Roy. Soc. A* 279 (1964) 229
- [2] J.-L. Gervais, A. Jevicki *Nucl. Phys. B* 110 (1976) 93 Point canonical transformations in the path integral
- [3] C. Grosche NTZ-29-92 (hep-th@xxx.lanl.gov - 9302097) An introduction into the Feynman path integral.
- [4] B. Sakita *Quantum Theory of Many-Variable Systems and Fields* World Scientific Lecture Notes in Physics Vol. 1 1985 pp. 67-68.
- [5] B. Sakita, Private communication.
- [6] K.M. Apfeldorf and C. Ordóñez, Work in progress.