

IP/BBSR/96-34

hep-th/9605163

# On the Fractional Electric Charge of a Magnetic Monopole at Nonzero Temperature

Alfred Goldhaber<sup>a</sup>, Rajesh Parwani<sup>a</sup> and Harvendra Singh<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Institute for Theoretical Physics,  
State University of New York,  
Stony Brook, NY 11794,  
U.S.A.

<sup>b</sup> Institute of Physics  
Sachivalaya Marg, Bhubaneswar-751 005,  
INDIA

May 1996, Revised June 1996

## Abstract

We extend recent discussions about the effect of nonzero temperature on the induced electric charge, due to CP violation, of a Dirac or an 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole. In particular, we determine the fractional electric charge of a very small 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole coupled to light fermions at nonzero temperature. If dyons with fractional electric charge exist in the Weinberg-Salam model, as recently suggested in the literature, then their charge too should be temperature dependent.

---

email : goldhab@insti.physics.sunysb.edu; parwani@iopb.ernet.in ; hsingh@iopb.ernet.in

Recently two papers [1, 2] analyzed the temperature ( $T$ ) dependence of the fractionalelectric charge induced respectively on (i) a Dirac monopole with CP violating boundary conditions on the fermions, and (ii) an 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole (in the absence of fermions) under the influence of a CP-odd  $\theta$ -term in the Lagrangian. Some comments in Ref.[2] appear to contradict those in Ref.[1]. Our purpose here is to resolve this apparent discrepancy and to extend the study of Ref.[2] by including light fermions. We also note that the result of Ref.[1] may be simply modified to accommodate a chiral angle for the fermion masses.

As shown by Schwinger and Zwanziger, Dirac's quantization condition for monopoles [3] must be generalized in the case of dyons to [4]

$$e_1 g_2 - e_2 g_1 = \frac{1}{2} \text{ integer} \quad (1)$$

where  $(e_i, g_i); 1 \leq i \leq 2$ , are the electric and magnetic charges of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  dyon. From the existence of electrons of charge  $(e; 0)$ , one deduces from (1) that the difference in the electric charge  $(q - q')$  of two dyons, carrying minimum magnetic charge  $g = 1/2e$ , is an integral multiple of  $e$ ,

$$q - q' = ne; \quad n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (2)$$

However in the absence of CP conservation, there is no further restriction on  $q$  or  $q'$  so that, in general, they may be irrational. Witten [5] considered CP violation due to a vacuum angle term

$$L = \frac{e^2}{32\pi^2} F^a F^a \quad (3)$$

in the Lagrangian of a spontaneously broken gauge theory containing 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles [6]. By canonical methods it was shown in [5] that at zero temperature the monopole acquires a fractionalelectric charge

$$Q = \frac{e}{2}; \quad (4)$$

and that this result is exact.

In Ref.[2] the 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole was quantized by the method of collective coordinates to leading order in temperature  $T$ . Since fluctuations of fields were ignored in [2], their calculation is at tree level in the fields. At that order they obtained again Eq.(4). We believe the result may be understood as follows. As is

well known, the partition function may be represented by an Euclidean path integral with periodic boundary conditions in the time direction for the bosons. The action is

$$S = \int_0^Z \frac{1}{kT} \int d^3x (L + L) ; \quad (5)$$

where  $L$  is the CP even part and  $L$  is given by (3). Therefore the CP-odd part of the static, effective Lagrangian obtained from (5) is to leading order (when field fluctuations are ignored), the same as (3) and hence the charge must be given by the same expression (4) at nonzero temperature. More physically, fluctuations may be ignored if the temperature is much below the scale for creation of free charge carriers, or in this case the mass of a charged vector boson. Thus the conclusion of Ref.[2] appears to be essentially the result of an implicit zero temperature analysis.

In order to study the change in the result of Ref.[2] when light fermions<sup>y</sup> are coupled to the monopole we first recall the situation at zero temperature : Though the net charge is still given by Eq.(4) when fermions are coupled in a CP-invariant way to an 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole, the distribution of charge changes significantly. As noted by Callan and others [7, 8, 9] it is energetically preferable for the charge to reside with the light fermions rather than in the small monopole core. Computationally one sees the problem as a breakdown of the loop expansion in the limit of a small monopole. In Ref.[9] a variational calculation, which included the Coulomb energy of the dyon, showed that in the limit of a point monopole the energy of the system was minimized when the effective boundary conditions for the fermions violated CP. The effective boundary conditions become labeled by the vacuum angle which appeared originally as a coupling constant in the Lagrangian. It is these effective CP violating boundary conditions which allow the dyon charge to be carried by the light fermions.

The conclusion of Ref.[9] should hold also for temperatures  $T \ll M_W$ , (where is the gauge coupling) so that the thermal properties of a very small 't Hooft Polyakov monopole coupled to light fermions may be deduced from those of the Dirac monopole studied in Ref.[1]. We therefore review the main features of the Dirac problem : It was discovered long ago [10, 11] that unless particular boundary conditions at the Dirac monopole are imposed on the wavefunctions of the electron Hamiltonian, the problem

---

<sup>y</sup>We shall discuss only massive fermions here to avoid subtleties involved with the massless case (see [7, 8, 9, 12] for a discussion at zero temperature). More specially we shall restrict ourselves to the regime  $M_W \gg T$  and  $M_W \gg M$ , with  $M_W$  the W-boson mass and  $M$  the fermion mass. The monopole size is  $1/M_W$  and the temperature is well below the symmetry restoration scale.

is ill defined. Assuming a conventional fermion mass, equivalent to that obtained by Yukawa coupling to a scalar field, the most general boundary conditions are labeled by an angular parameter [11] with CP invariance holding only for  $\theta = 0$  or  $\pi$ . In [12] it was found that at zero temperature, at one-loop, the Dirac monopole acquired an electric charge

$$Q_D(T=0) = \frac{e}{2}; \quad \theta < \pi \quad (6)$$

due to vacuum polarization. The generalization of (6) to nonzero temperature was obtained, at one-loop, in Ref.[1],

$$Q_D(T) = \frac{ex}{2} \sin \frac{x^2}{2} \frac{1}{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2n+1)^2 + x^2 + x \cos \frac{\theta}{2}}} \quad (7)$$

where  $x = M(T)$ . In particular at high temperature,

$$Q_D(T \rightarrow M) = \frac{eM}{T} \frac{\sin \frac{\theta}{2}}{8} + O\left(\frac{M}{T}\right)^2 \quad (8)$$

Amazingly, the angular nature of  $\theta$  is not manifest at zero temperature but becomes so at nonzero temperature. Also at nonzero temperature,  $Q_D$  vanishes smoothly for the CP even values  $\theta = 0$  or  $\pi$ .

Returning to the 'tHooft-Polyakov problem, if the fermion is an isodoublet then, in the point limit of the monopole, two angles [9]  $\theta_1 = \frac{\theta}{2}$  and  $\theta_2 = \frac{\theta}{2} + \pi$  are required to label the boundary conditions. These angles correspond respectively to the two states of charge  $e=2$  represented in the fermion and are the analog of the angle  $\theta$  in the Dirac monopole-electron problem. Combining the results of Refs.[1] and [9] we determine the charge  $Q_{HP}(\theta; T)$ , at nonzero temperature, of the point 'tHooft-Polyakov monopole-fermion system to be

$$Q_{HP}(\theta; T) = \frac{1}{2} [Q_D(\theta_1; T) - Q_D(\theta_2; T)]; \quad (9)$$

$$= \frac{ex^2}{2} \sin 2 \frac{x^2}{2} \frac{1}{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{[(2n+1)^2 + x^2]^{\frac{3}{2}}}} \frac{1}{x^2 \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2}} \frac{1}{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2n+1)^2 + x^2}}; \quad (10)$$

where  $Q_D$  is given by Eq.(7). Notice that the charge vanishes at  $\theta = \pi$  which correspond to the CP invariant values of  $\theta$  for  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  above. Also, because of the cancellation in (9) between the two oppositely charged states, the leading term

at high-temperature is of order  $\frac{M}{T}^2 \sin^2$  compared to  $\frac{M}{T} \sin$  for the Dirac case in (8). At zero temperature, (10) may be evaluated as described in [1] to give

$$Q_{HP}(\theta; T=0) = \frac{e}{2} \quad (11)$$

in agreement with Ref.[9] and Witten's formula (4).

In summary, Witten's formula (4) changes at nonzero temperature. An explicit computation has been possible in the limit of an infinitely massive monopole coupled to light fermions. The vacuum angle of the theory then becomes the parameter labelling the effective CP violating boundary conditions at the location of the monopole. While the result (9) above applies in the point limit, we expect most of the features discussed to be qualitatively the same slightly away from this limit. However, for monopoles of sufficiently large radius the above analysis is sure to break down. Corrections may become appreciable already when the temperature  $T$  is within an order of magnitude of the vector boson mass  $M_W$ . Even though the magnetic pole strength still is well defined at this point, the appearance of charged boson pairs begins to be noticeable.

As in the Dirac case studied in [1], we caution that at nonzero temperature the charge of the monopole is a thermal expectation value rather than an eigenvalue. Furthermore the charge, which is localised within the fermion's thermal Compton wavelength, is Debye screened at large distances. Clearly then it makes sense to talk of the charge only if the fermion thermal Compton wavelength is much smaller than the Debye length. This last condition is satisfied, for example, at high temperature when  $T \gg eT \gg M$ : so that the Debye length  $\lambda_D = eT$  is much larger than the fermion's thermal Compton wavelength  $\lambda_F = T$ .

So far we have considered CP violation in the form of a vacuum angle or through fermionic boundary conditions (in the point limit above these were seen to be linked). One can also consider CP violation in the form of chiral angles in the fermion masses. For example, if the electron mass  $M$  is replaced by  $M e^{i\theta}$  then, as remarked in Ref.[12], the result (6) for the charge of a Dirac monopole is modified by the replacement  $\theta \rightarrow \theta + \theta$ . We have verified that this replacement holds more generally for the nonzero temperature result (7).

At zero temperature, instead of the local or Gauss's law charge discussed up till now, one can define also an Aharonov-Bohm (AB) or Lorentz-force charge, as measured in an AB diffraction experiment. A gauge invariance argument of Wilczek [8], elaborated by Goldhaber, et. al. [13], showed that at zero temperature the fractional AB charge of a dyon is exactly equal to its vacuum angle contribution. In vacuum at zero temperature the AB and local charges are identical. Thus a nonzero vacuum angle is a necessary as well as a sufficient condition for fractional dyon charge. Since the vacuum angle may be removed from the Lagrangian by a chiral rotation of the fermions, this helps to justify the resemblance of Eq.(6) to Eq.(4). At nonzero temperature, as discussed above, the local charge is subject to thermal fluctuations and leakage, and also is screened at large distances. What happens to the AB charge is less clear to us, but it looks quite likely that it also is diminished and subject to fluctuations because random collisions with the quasiparticles in the plasma would dephase contributions from different spacetime paths.

Finally, we note that the Weinberg-Salam model of electroweak interactions appears to have some peculiar magnetic monopole solutions [14, 15, 16]. So far their properties have been studied in the absence of fermions. Since fermions in this model are a source of CP violation, it has been suggested [15] that these monopoles may become dyons carrying irrational electric charges. It would be fascinating if such dyons turn out to be phenomenologically relevant. From our discussion here we anticipate the electric charge of such an electroweak dyon to be much smaller at high temperature than at zero temperature.

This work was supported in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation.

## References

- [1] C. Coriano and R. Parwani, Phys. Lett. B 363 (1995) 75.
- [2] J. C. Le Guillou and F. A. Schaposnik, preprint ENSLAPP-A-584/96 (hep-th/9603102).
- [3] P. A. M. Dirac, Proc. Roy. Soc. A 133 (1931) 60.
- [4] J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. 144 (1966) 1087; 173 (1968) 1536;  
D. Zwanziger, Phys. Rev. 176 (1968) 1480, 1489.
- [5] E. Witten, Phys. Lett. B 86 (1979) 283.
- [6] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B 79 (1974) 276;  
A. M. Polyakov, JETP Lett. 20 (1974) 194;  
B. Julia and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. D 11 (1974) 2227.
- [7] C. G. Callan, Jr., Phys. Rev. D 26 (1982) 2058.
- [8] F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48 (1982) 1146.
- [9] H. Yamagishi, Phys. Rev. D 28 (1983) 977; D 32 (1985) 1576.  
H. Panagopoulos and H. Yamagishi, Phys. Rev. D 32 (1985) 2113.
- [10] Y. Kazama, C. N. Yang and A. S. Goldhaber, Phys. Rev. D 15 (1977) 2287.
- [11] A. S. Goldhaber, Phys. Rev. D 16 (1977) 1815.
- [12] H. Yamagishi, Phys. Rev. D 27 (1983) 2383;  
B. Grossman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 50 (1983) 464; 51 (1983) 959.
- [13] A. S. Goldhaber, R. M. Ackennie, and F. Wilczek, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 4 (1989) 21.
- [14] Y. Nambu, Nucl. Phys. B 130 (1977) 505.
- [15] T. Vachaspati, Nucl. Phys. B 439 (1995) 79.
- [16] Y. M. Cho and D. M. Aison, preprint SNU-TP 95-99 (hep-th/9601028).