

# Probe Annihilation process on noncommutative space

Chien Yu Chen,<sup>1,\*</sup> Chao Qiang Geng,<sup>1,†</sup> and Xiao Gang He<sup>2,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, National Tsing-Hua University, Hsinchu 300, Taiwan*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, National Taiwan University,  
No.1, Sec.4, Roosevelt Road, Taipei, 10617 Taiwan*

If the twist Poincaré transformation is involved on the non-flat spacetime, then Lorentz invariant will not be a best method to describe the QFT anymore. Recently, noncommutative theory is one of the best candidates to modify this perfect symmetry undoubted before, which gives the concept of spacetime is not commutable. In this paper, we will argue the parity violation under the process of  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  and also take more detail analysis to express the different behavior of each helicity state on the noncommutable spacetime. The effect is result from the spin-magnetic field production, hence the cross section will induce the different energy distribution on the final photon luminosity. Meanwhile, we also check the energy momentum conservation on the each coupling constant. Exploring out that electric field just could induce the different energy distribution, no symmetry violated effect will be produced. Which field will produce the longitudinal state on the final triple photon boson coupling.

PACS numbers: 12.60.Cn, 13.88.+e, 11.30.Er

## I. INTRODUCTION

Lorentz symmetry is a rule constraining the transformation of spacetime by boost and rotation. By researching the history of standard model, Lorentz group dominates to place a limit on the spacetime transformation. Meanwhile, many eminent physicists are struggling to explore about whether this is a permanent symmetry to describe the nature. Following the reason, many portent which standard model could not predict will be revealed in the aspect of Lorentz violation. However, the theory violating Lorentz symmetry had been attracted by physicists to pay attention. Unfortunately, even at the present, we do not have a theoretically complete model for building Lorentz violated theory since we do not really understand the exact source of that.

The main deviation of the paper is more detail to concentrate on the property of effects induced by the background magnetic field, which pertains to discuss the parity symmetry of  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  physics on the theory of Lorentz violation. The numerical results present the parity will be violated, but it still reserves the CP symmetry. Furthermore, CP symmetry takes a constraint on the cross section, the parity violated phenomenon will simultaneously violate the charge conservation. The parity violated effect will induce slight space shift, but the charge violated event will be devoted on the magnitude difference of the cross section. From the viewpoint of quantum gravity, the energy scale is around the scale of Planck mass,  $M_{PL} = 10^{19}\text{GeV}$ , nonetheless such a scale of the Lorentz violation is not very clear in fact. In this paper, we probe the direction of background field how to influence the total cross section(fb). The scale  $\Lambda_C$  and collider energy level have been set on the 1TeV and 800GeV respectively, the shift order is approached to  $69.61 K_{Z\gamma\gamma}$  fb on the visible physical phenomenon.

Comparing with the result of standard model predicted is 5563.65 fb. Moreover, due to background magnetic field will interact with each polarization on the opposite phenomenon, intuitively, the contribution of spin-magnetic interaction,  $\vec{S} \cdot \vec{B}$ , will produce the forward-backward asymmetry which could not be predicted by standard model. Following the calculation, the sensitive phenomenon of total cross section as to the central energy is pertaining to the direction of background magnetic field. On the same time, we could observe that the spin-magnetic interaction effect will be changed by the relation,  $\langle \vec{S} \cdot \vec{B} \rangle = \pm|B| \cos \theta_{B_Z}$ , on the event point. Which the principal frame is along z-axis, the totally energy spectrum will be proportional to the  $\theta_{B_Z}$  angle. By the way, the electric field is the unrealized one anymore by unitarity constraint. Hence, the property of electric field will be ignored in the whole of paper final result analysis.

Almost all of the investigations indicate toward choosing the uniform direction on the isotropic and homogeneous earlier universe, such as adding a non-local four vector term on the Lagrangian[1]. The field along the direction of background field indicated equally indicates a constant direction rearranging the order of spacetime[2], and there are some papers consider the noncommutative scalar field on the fuzzy sphere[3]. However, there a lots theory with consistent concept are to find a preferred direction on the uniformed space. That is apparently to oppose the general assumption of Lorentz symmetry. Noncommutative field theory is one of the theories violating Lorentz symmetry by putting a constant background field term on the Dirac-Born-Infeld action of bosonic string[1]. The field would influence that the position between the particles could not be exchanged on the same consequence.

On the concept of noncommutable spacetime, the commutation relation will be modified by the different kinds of algebra generating the same commutation relation, on the same consequence, which also produces the three kinds of structure[4]: canonical structure, Lie algebra structure, and quantum space structures, those will produce the same results. The structure is dominantly

\*Electronic address: [d9522817@phys.nthu.edu.tw](mailto:d9522817@phys.nthu.edu.tw)

†Electronic address: [geng@phys.nthu.edu.tw](mailto:geng@phys.nthu.edu.tw)

‡Electronic address: [hexg@physics.ntu.edu.tw](mailto:hexg@physics.ntu.edu.tw)

to decide the method of  $\star$  product. The main structures of noncommutative is presented, hence we could not generate the different description of noncommutative gauge transformation by changing different map. However, building on those structures the world of noncommutative theory will be realized. For the model building, unfortunately, the noncommutative model has been restricted by *No-Go Theorem*[5], the gauge group just could be built on the  $U_\star(N)$  ones. Hence, the  $SU(N)$  gauge group could not be worked on noncommutative spacetime. By using the enveloping algebra[4, 6] on the noncommutative gauge theory, the catastrophe will be disappeared. We could use that to expand the original nonabelian gauge theory on the noncommutative spacetime, then the electroweak theory will be worked on this silant geometric. Under the Seiberg-Witten map[1, 7], the original gauge group of standard model,  $SU_C(3) \otimes SU_L(2) \otimes U_Y(1)$ , would be extended by first order  $\theta$  deformation on the noncommutative phase-like translation,

$$f(\hat{x}) \star g(\hat{x}) = f(\hat{x} + \epsilon) \exp\left(\frac{i}{2} \overleftarrow{\partial}_\mu \theta^{\mu\nu} \overrightarrow{\partial}_\nu\right) g(\hat{x} + \epsilon) \Big|_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0},$$

which is two function product on the noncommutative spacetime. Hence the gauge group will be modified as  $SU_C^\star(3) \otimes SU_L^\star(2) \otimes U_Y^\star(1)$ . On the next section, we will briefly introduce the gauge boson action using the enveloping algebra expansion[4]. Hereafter, noncommutative field theory could be used on the non-abelian gauge group, then all of the field theory will be corrected on the expansion of  $\theta$  deformed terms. This comment on physical parameter  $\theta$ , contains the information of early universe background magnetic field and background electric field. Hence, we will also discuss these remnant fields how to influence the present world.

Using the characteristics of space and momentum exchanges on each side of the  $\theta_{\mu\nu}$  under the Moyal space, Lorentz group  $SO(1,3)$  will be replaced by  $O(1,1) \otimes SO(2)$ . This results from the alternative direction of generator is uniquely chosen on the direction of the background field, in which the direction will be contributed on the boost space. The others two dimensions of space will generate the plane violating the boost, and indicate the direction which the background field will induce the rotation symmetry violated effect. Therefore, we could use the Seiberg-Witten map, enveloping algebra[4], to map between the noncommutative spacetime with commutative ones. The common commutation relation on the four vector spacetime is

$$[x, y]_\star = i\theta_{\mu\nu} = i \frac{C_{\mu\nu}}{\Lambda_{NC}^2} \quad (1)$$

where

$$C_{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & E_1 & E_2 & E_3 \\ -E_1 & 0 & -B_3 & B_2 \\ -E_2 & B_3 & 0 & -B_1 \\ -E_3 & -B_2 & B_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

which  $\theta_{\mu\nu}$  contains all the information of background field such as the field strength tensor of electrodynamics. Therefore, the term will generate the infinite order

$\theta$  deformed field theory. Hence, under the odd order  $\theta$  deformed spacetime the cross section will be charge violated. However, the spin of any physical field will interact with the background field by the odd order  $\theta$  deformed one. With the  $\theta$  deformed term certain symmetry violation will be appeared, such as parity and charge violated effects. If we choose a preferred direction on the homogeneous and isotropic spacetime, parity symmetry would not be still symmetrized anymore. Due to each different helicity state of particle will induce the different contribution by coupling the background field, the energy distribution will also be exchanged by the spin-magnetic interaction. Therefore, if the dispersion of each helicity state are equally detected, the total phenomenon of the parity violation will be invisible. On the other hand, each helicity of photon will induce the opposite contribution on forward-backward asymmetry, nonetheless on the unpolarized detector beam the asymmetry will be disappeared because the contribution of right-hand and left-hand photon will be mutually canceled.

## II. BRIEFLY REVIEW NONCOMMUTATIVE THEORY

Under the commutative spacetime we use the Seiberg-Witten map to map the commutative and noncommutative  $\theta^{\mu\nu}$  deformed one. We could get the infinite order of  $\theta$  deformed expansion on the enveloping algebra to expand the non-abelian gauge from  $SU(2) \otimes U(1)$  to  $SU(2)_\star \otimes U(1)_\star$ . Noncommutative standard model is satisfied on the noncommutative gauge transformation under the Hopf algebra[6, 8], which is generated on the Moyal space[9] to coproduct the two fields. We could suppose that  $X$  is an infinitesimal transformation generator with  $\phi \mapsto X \triangleright \phi$ . The action of the field is multiplied by a coproduct  $\Delta$ , denote  $\phi \otimes \psi \mapsto \Delta(X) \triangleright (\phi \otimes \psi)$ .

The translation of coproduction between twist deformed and original one,

$$\Delta_\theta(X) = \mathfrak{F}^{-1} \Delta_0(X) \mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{F}^{-1} (X \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes X) \mathfrak{F}, \quad (3)$$

and the noncommutative momentum boosting representation

$$\mathfrak{F} = \exp\left(-\frac{i}{2} \theta^{ij} p_i \otimes p_j\right), \quad (4)$$

are twisted by abelian gauge transformation. The twist coproduct of Poincaré generators require a consistent deformation of product between fields,  $m_0(\phi \otimes \psi) = \phi \cdot \psi$ , which is also isomorphic to  $m_\theta(\phi \otimes \psi) = \phi \star \psi$ . Therefore, the translation on the gauge symmetry under this sense will be similarly to put Eq.(3) and Eq.(4) into

$$\begin{aligned} X \triangleright m_0(\phi \otimes \psi) &= m_0(\Delta_0(X) \triangleright (\phi \otimes \psi)) \\ \mapsto X \triangleright m_\theta(\phi \otimes \psi) &= m_\theta(\Delta_\theta(X) \triangleright (\phi \otimes \psi)), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

hence, we could use this transformation representation to prove photon polarization will not be changed on the noncommutative spacetime. However, if  $\psi$  and  $\phi$  are substituted for four vector momentum, and Pauli-Ljubanski polarization four vector individually,

$$\mathbb{W}^\mu = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} J_{\nu\alpha} P_\beta, \quad (6)$$

in which  $J_{\nu\alpha}$  is the Lorentz rotation and boosts generator,  $P_\beta$  is the momentum operator.

Hence, after transformation we will easily explore out that Lorentz tensor will violate the original boost and rotation on the inhomogeneous space, but the momentum translation on the direction of background field will not to be, if the particle field do not have charge. On the other hand, if the field contains the charge, the momentum translation will be violated on the direction of background electric field. Thus, photon is chargeless the direction of translation will not induce another degrees of freedom to generate the mass. That reflects that non-commutative is translational invariant by Eq.(3)(4)(5) if the particle field is chargeless. Following above discussion,  $m_\theta(P_\mu \otimes P_\nu - P_\nu \otimes P_\mu) = 0$  will take a constraint on the Pauli-Ljubanski polarization to be invariant under the translation. The commutation relation  $m_\theta(\mathbb{W}^\mu \otimes P^\nu - P^\nu \otimes \mathbb{W}^\mu) = 0$ ,  $P^2 = m^2$  and  $\mathbb{W}^2 = m^2 s(s+1)$  still retain the property of Casimir operator, where "m" is the particle mass along the direction of momentum and "s" is the polarization of particle. For the photon case,  $\mathbb{W}^2 = 0$ , and  $m = 0$ , will reflect that photon should not have longitudinal state even after the momentum translation. Therefore, gauge condition  $m_\theta(P^\mu \otimes \mathbb{W}_\mu) = 0$  will be still unchanged. However, the polarization sum should add a phase  $\phi \sim \vec{B} \cdot (\vec{P}_1 \times \vec{P}_2)$ . We do not claim the  $\theta$  deformed term on the polarization production because if photon is just the initial or final state particle, the generated phase will be useless.

The noncommutative gauge theory is very interesting, since the gauge theory have more freedom choosing the different representations of gauge kinetic term under trace technique. The NCSM has infinite way expressing the gauge parameter by this map. On the way, we could use the enveloping algebra to realize the nonabelian group[4], but we just could choose one way most close to the standard model gauge representation  $SU(3)_c \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$ . On the kinetic term, there are two kinds representation at least, first is minimal term and another is non-minimal term. Thus the action of the gauge boson on the noncommutative electroweak model[10] will be regarded as

$$S_{gauge} = S_{gauge}^{minimal} + S_{gauge}^{nm-term}, \quad (7)$$

the minimal term is minimally to expand the original action using the Seiberg-Witten product. The non-minimal term is to choose the non-minimal Seiberg-Witten map on the aspect of using the freedom of gauge boson parameter to expand the gauge boson action,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{gauge}^{minimum} = & \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x \left( \frac{1}{2} A_{\mu\nu} A^{\mu\nu} + Tr B_{\mu\nu} B^{\mu\nu} + Tr G_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu} \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{4} g_s d^{abc} \theta^{\rho\sigma} \int d^4x \left( \frac{1}{4} G_{\rho\sigma}^a G_{\mu\nu}^b - G_{\rho\mu}^a G_{\sigma\nu}^b \right) G^{\mu\nu,c} \\ & + O(\theta^2) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S_{gauge}^{nm-term} = & \\ & + g'^3 k_1 \theta^{\rho\sigma} \int d^4x \left( \frac{a}{4} A_{\rho\sigma} A_{\mu\nu} - A_{\mu\rho} A_{\nu\sigma} \right) A^{\mu\nu} \\ & + g' g^2 k_2 \theta^{\rho\sigma} \int d^4x \left[ \left( \frac{a}{4} A_{\rho\sigma} B_{\mu\nu}^a - A_{\mu\rho} B_{\nu\sigma}^a \right) B^{\mu\nu,a} + c.p. \right] \\ & + g' g^2 k_3 \theta^{\rho\sigma} \int d^4x \left[ \left( \frac{a}{4} A_{\rho\sigma} G_{\mu\nu}^b - A_{\mu\rho} G_{\nu\sigma}^b \right) G^{\mu\nu,b} + c.p. \right] \\ & + O(\theta^2), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

the first one is the original gauge boson kinetic term on noncommutative spacetime. Another is non-minimal term, we can use the freedom of choosing the different trace on kinetic gauge fields to construct non-minimal version of mNCSM by using the different Seiberg-Witten map.

Each triple gauge boson couplings could be derived by the above action. However, the  $\gamma - \gamma - \gamma$  and  $Z - \gamma - \gamma$  couplings will be presented as the following expression,

$$\mathfrak{L}_{\gamma\gamma\gamma} = \frac{e}{4} \sin 2\theta_W K_{\gamma\gamma\gamma} \theta^{\rho\sigma} A^{\mu\nu} (a A_{\mu\nu} A_{\rho\sigma} - 4 A_{\mu\rho} A_{\nu\sigma}) \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{L}_{Z\gamma\gamma} = & \frac{e}{4} \sin 2\theta_W K_{Z\gamma\gamma} \theta^{\rho\sigma} [2Z^{\mu\nu} (2A_{\mu\rho} A_{\nu\sigma} - a A_{\mu\nu} A_{\rho\sigma}) \\ & + 8Z_{\mu\rho} A^{\mu\nu} A_{\nu\sigma} - a Z_{\rho\sigma} A^{\mu\nu} A_{\mu\nu}], \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the couplings  $K_{\gamma\gamma\gamma}$  and  $K_{Z\gamma\gamma}$  contain the gauge parameter,  $g$ ,  $g_s$ , and  $g'$ , and  $k_1$ ,  $k_2$ , and  $k_3$ . [11] plots the range all of these couplings and also takes more detail analysis. Thus the above couplings are composed of the  $g_i$ ,  $i$  goes from 1 to 6. Hence we could easily find that C and P are violated, but which CP symmetry is preserved. C violated effect will induce the different magnitude of cross section, but P violated effect will induce the space will not be symmetrized. These effects generate the shift phenomenon along the direction of boost. However, all of the C and P effects will be shown on the numerical analysis.

On the Seiberg-Witten map, there are some kinds of coupling will be induced by the connection with  $\theta$ . Following the electroweak model[10], it has considered the change up to the first order  $\theta_{\mu\nu}$  modification using the enveloping algebra to extend the non-abelian gauge group. The interesting coupling  $Z - \gamma - \gamma$  violates the angular momentum distribution[12], hence it is exactly forbidden on the commutative standard model. The branching ratio of  $Z \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  is approximating to  $4 \times 10^{-8}$ , and which the range of coupling strength are  $-0.333 < K_{Z\gamma\gamma} < 0.095$  and  $-0.184 < K_{\gamma\gamma\gamma} < -0.419$ [11]. In this paper, we set  $K_{Z\gamma\gamma} = -0.2$ , and  $K_{\gamma\gamma\gamma} = -0.3$  for convenient.

On the renormalization discussion, the triple coupling tensor  $\Theta^{\mu\nu\rho}$  would be changed by choosing different map[13]. However, the different choice of map will produce the geometric freedom of choosing the constant "a". On the minimal expansion of gauge term,

we could choose the constant  $a=1$ , but it will be non-renormalizable. Following the renormalization condition, we have to choose the  $a=3$ , thus the coupling will be modified as

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_3^{\mu\nu\rho}(a; k_{\mu 1}, k_{\nu 2}, k_{\rho 3}) = & \\ & - (k_1 \theta k_2) [(k_1 - k_2)^\rho g^{\mu\nu} + (k_2 - k_3)^\mu g^{\nu\rho} + (k_3 - k_1)^\nu g^{\rho\mu}] \\ & - \theta^{\mu\nu} [k_1^\rho (k_2 k_3) - k_2^\rho (k_1 k_3)] \\ & - \theta^{\nu\rho} [k_2^\mu (k_3 k_1) - k_3^\mu (k_2 k_1)] \\ & - \theta^{\rho\mu} [k_3^\nu (k_1 k_2) - k_1^\nu (k_3 k_2)] \\ & + (\theta k_2)^\mu [g^{\nu\rho} k_3^2 - k_3^\nu k_3^\rho] + (\theta k_3)^\mu [g^{\nu\rho} k_2^2 - k_2^\nu k_2^\rho] \\ & + (\theta k_3)^\nu [g^{\mu\rho} k_1^2 - k_1^\mu k_1^\rho] + (\theta k_1)^\nu [g^{\mu\rho} k_3^2 - k_3^\mu k_3^\rho] \\ & + (\theta k_1)^\rho [g^{\mu\nu} k_2^2 - k_2^\mu k_2^\nu] + (\theta k_2)^\rho [g^{\mu\nu} k_1^2 - k_1^\mu k_1^\nu] \\ & + \theta^{\mu\alpha} (a k_1 + k_2 + k_3)_\alpha [g^{\nu\rho} (k_3 k_2) - k_3^\nu k_2^\rho] \\ & + \theta^{\nu\alpha} (k_1 + a k_2 + k_3)_\alpha [g^{\mu\rho} (k_3 k_1) - k_3^\mu k_1^\rho] \\ & + \theta^{\rho\alpha} (k_1 + k_2 + a k_3)_\alpha [g^{\mu\nu} (k_2 k_1) - k_2^\mu k_1^\nu] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\theta^{\mu\nu\rho} = \theta^{\mu\nu} \gamma^\rho + \theta^{\nu\rho} \gamma^\mu + \theta^{\rho\mu} \gamma^\nu.$$

The energy momentum conservation will constrain the unitarity has to be satisfied[14]. The coupling of gauge boson to matter field will preserve the gauge condition for the conservation of the energy momentum. Therefore, under the production of each photon energy momentum  $k_1^\mu$  and  $k_2^\nu$  on the above coupling, we could find out that energy momentum is conserved under producing the  $k_3^\rho$ . Momentum conservation is preserved on the coupling if we choose the central mass frame, but the energy will be corrected. Induced exotic energy by this coupling will be proportional to the coupling constant multiplying the central energy. The coupling constant is well-known proportional to  $\sin(2\theta_W) K_{Z\gamma\gamma}$ , however, the electric field will devote on the modification of energy spectrum. Therefore, which could have the ability to generate the longitudinal state.

Following the discussion of triple gauge boson coupling, there are the longitudinal states will be produced, if the process contains the triple gauge boson coupling generated by the charged matter field. The electric field will give energy under the interaction. Final triple gauge boson coupling will have sufficient exotic energy transferring under the gauge boson propagator to generate the non-physical state on the final gauge boson luminosity. Hence, that should contain the ghost particle to cancel out that distribution or assume which electric field is not physical field. Whatsoever, the electric field will not contribute on this process and no symmetry violated effect could be discussed.

If we choose the central mass frame, the phenomenon of the collider should not be changed on this frame even Lorentz is violated. Hereafter, the following calculation of the process we choose the  $\theta^{0i} = 0$ , and the observer is stand on the event point. However, under the assumption of  $\theta^{0i} = 0$ , the  $k_\mu^1 \theta^{\mu\nu} k_\nu^2$  term will be disappeared for convenient. Therefore, in the numerical section we will introduce the first order  $\theta$  deformed term how to influence our result via background magnetic field,  $B^i = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{ijk} \theta_{jk}$ , coupling to photon polarization. Hence, the

forward-backward asymmetry effect will be induced under the spin and magnetic field coupling, which is purely contributed by the noncommutative effect.

### III. $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ PHYSICS

Briefly review the  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  experiment process on U(1) noncommutative model[15]. The U(1) NCQED is the complete order  $\theta$  deformed field theory containing the even order  $\theta$  perturbative expansion. However, on the U(1) tree level process we could find that the event number is like as the sinusously function, which means that the parity is reserved, in spite of triple photon coupling is contributed.

We know that noncommutative geometry, the complete  $\theta$  deformed theory, is most likely as phase transition on the spacetime coordinates. Nevertheless, for the first  $\theta$  expansion, the commutation relation Eq.(1) will be dominantly to influence the spacetime non-flat effect. This dramatic phenomenon is the complete background field effect. However, we could see that this unusually commutation relation will induce the triple gauge boson coupling on the electroweak model. Such couplings,  $\gamma - \gamma - \gamma$  and  $Z - \gamma - \gamma$ , will violate the charge conservation because  $C(\gamma) = C(Z) = -1$ , but preserves the CP symmetry. However, the well-know knowledge U(1) could not produce the parity violated effect, no helicity violation will be generated on this group. Therefore, the event process will be still even order contributed on the each final result. For the first term expansion, the gauge field will be modified as

$$\hat{A}_\mu = A_\mu - \frac{1}{2} \theta^{\alpha\beta} A_\alpha (\partial_\beta A_\mu + F_{\beta\mu}), \quad (12)$$

and the field strength field

$$\hat{F}_{\mu\nu} = F_{\mu\nu} - \theta^{\alpha\beta} (A_\alpha \partial_\beta F_{\mu\nu} + F_{\mu\alpha} F_{\beta\nu}), \quad (13)$$

which is the first order  $\theta$  expansion, where the  $\theta^{\mu\nu}$  is denoted by Eq.(1) and (2). The polarization sum will be changed to be the phase transition form,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_s \epsilon_\mu^{*s}(k) \star \epsilon_\nu^s(k) \\ & = -e^{-i\frac{k\theta k}{2}} \left( g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{n_\mu k_\nu + n_\nu k_\mu}{2} + \frac{n^2 k_\mu k_\nu}{2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

even though the phase term will give us more information about the coherent effect between the photon polarization, but the induced  $\theta$  phase transition is useless on the collider physics process. In fact, although U(1) model do not have the source of parity violation, but on the loop process of CP violation the  $\theta$  deformed term will be contributed, such as magnetic dipole moment and electric dipole moment[16]. In physically speaking, the background magnetic field will induce the spin-magnetic effect, the term of charge violated coupling will simultaneously violate parity symmetry. Even on the U(1) model, the  $\theta$  deformation will correct all parity violated event on the odd order  $\theta$  deformed term, but on the non-parity violated process just only even

order  $\theta$  deformation could be contributed on the magnitude of cross section. Therefore, we could easily find out that the process of  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  will be no parity phenomenon, which is only modified by the order of  $s \times \Lambda_C^{-2}$  series expansion.

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dzd\phi} = \frac{\alpha^2}{4s} \left[ \frac{u}{t} + \frac{t}{u} - 4 \frac{u^2 + t^2}{s^2} \sin^2\left(\frac{k_1\theta k_2}{2}\right) \right] \quad (15)$$

which is the same as the Compton process by exchanging  $p_2$  and  $k_1$ , where  $u = (p_1 - k_2)^2$ ,  $t = (p_1 - k_1)^2$ , and  $s = (p_1 + p_2)^2$ . These processes are only contributed by the background electric field, this implies the final state photon will not interact with the background magnetic field, thus only the charge of electron could interact with background electric field on the event point.

We can explore out that the electric field interact with the  $e^+$  and  $e^-$  on the opposite influence, but if we choose the direction of the background electric field on the orientation perpendicular to the incoming incident, the event number will be maximum distribution. Expectedly, the case  $\alpha_E = 0$  will not have the  $\phi$  dependent effect because the preferred direction is parallel to the incident axis. On the noncommutative electroweak model, due to the unitarity condition on the triple gauge boson coupling, we have to take the background electric field go to zero automatically. However, on the U(1) case, the total cross section is proportional to the  $\theta^2$  order term. There are no symmetry property could be found, if there are no theta odd order term. Nonetheless, on noncommutative electroweak model we could find that this term will be retained on the final result. Intuitively, the process will generate the parity asymmetry effect. Following the diagrams we could write down




FIG. 1: The  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  diagrams

the square amplitude and photon polarization on the first order  $\theta$  deformed term. We use the each photon polarization

$$\epsilon_{1\mu} = (0, 1, bi, 0) \quad \epsilon_{2\mu} = (0, 1, -bi, 0) \quad (16)$$

to discuss the parity asymmetry phenomenon, in which  $b$  is  $+$  or  $-$  corresponding to right hand and left hand respectively. That could be more conveniently to analysis the contribution of each different helicity. Therefore on the following calculation, we just consider,  $\theta^{ij}$ , space-space noncommutative deformed spacetime. However we could probe the spin and magnetic field how to interact with each other. Hence, the total amplitude could

be splitted by the zero term and first order  $\theta$  deformed term

$$\sigma_{tot} = \sigma_0 + \sigma_\theta \text{(theta first order term)},$$

the first part is the original commutative one and the second term is the first order  $\theta$  deformed one. Which contributes to the total cross section containing the free map parameter "a" and helicity constant "b". By the way, the renormalization condition requires the parameter "a" has to be 3, therefore, we choose the  $a = 3$  on the following calculation. The cross section of zero term and first order term could be written as

$$\sigma_0 = \frac{\alpha^2}{4s} \left( \frac{t}{u} + \frac{u}{t} \right) \quad (17)$$

$$\sigma_\theta = \frac{\alpha^2}{4s} \Re[\sigma_1 + (a+1)\sigma_2] \quad (18)$$

where

$$\sigma_1 = \frac{i}{2} (\epsilon_1 \theta \epsilon_2) \left[ \frac{s^2 b \Delta}{2} - sz(s\Box - 1) \right] \quad (19)$$

$$\sigma_2 = \frac{i}{2} s^{\frac{3}{2}} \Delta \sqrt{\frac{1-z^2}{2}} \left[ \frac{(\epsilon_1 \theta k_1)(b \cos \phi - i \sin \phi)}{z+1} + \frac{(\epsilon_2 \theta k_1)(b \cos \phi + i \sin \phi)}{z-1} \right] \quad (20)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= \frac{2K_{Z\gamma\gamma} C_A}{s - m_Z^2} \\ \Box &= -\frac{2K_{\gamma\gamma\gamma} \sin 2\theta_W}{s} - \frac{2C_V K_{Z\gamma\gamma}}{s - m_Z^2} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_{V,f_L} &= T_{3,f_L} - 2Q_f \sin^2 \theta_w \\ C_{A,f_L} &= T_{3,f_L}, \end{aligned}$$

which is the total cross section of the process. By the way, the total decay rate is contributed by complete  $\theta$  second order term. There are no asymmetry phenomenon could be generated. Hence, under the rotation of the direction of background magnetic field, total decay rate will be symmetrically changed. Recently, there are many articles arguing this forbidden decay[11]. Which will violate the angular momentum and bosonic distribution. But under noncommutative spacetime the angular momentum will be connected by the  $\theta$  deformed term, however this unusual distribution could be presented.

#### IV. NUMERICAL RESULT

On the numerical analysis, the total cross section and differential cross section of each helicity state are dominantly influenced by the direction of background field. However, intuitively, each photon helicity will interact with the background magnetic field on the opposite phenomenon, which asymmetry effects of photon mediator

on the final helicity state will be mutually canceled on the unpolarized cross section. Moreover, concentrating on the result of the  $\theta$  deformed term, we could find that the parity asymmetry on the very high energy level, the  $Z^0$  gauge boson process will be almost completely violated. On the contrast, the contribution of the massless gauge boson on the each helicity state will not be changed by rapid. Which cross section is minutely varied, but, its behavior is more dramatically changed on the scattering process. Because the Z gauge boson is a non-abelian gauge couples to the helicity current by different distribution and its mass is approaching to 0.1 TeV.




FIG. 2: The coupling constant  $K_{Z\gamma\gamma} = -0.2$ , where  $E_{CE} = 800$  GeV,  $\Lambda_C = 1$ TeV. As the result from  $Z^0$  gauge boson will couple to the matter current by the different contribution, therefore it will contribute on the unpolarized cross section. However, if  $K_{Z\gamma\gamma} = 0$  the number of event will be approaching to 442.74. Actually, that is the QED result.

On the Fig.(2), the contribution of  $Z^0$  gauge boson process plays a crucial point to dominate the role controlling the total cross section of helicity, and which the results will compare with the unpolarized beam by setting  $K_{Z\gamma\gamma} = -0.2$ . The  $Z^0$  gauge boson one will produce slight shift, but that will not be influenced by photon sector. On the  $SU_L(2) \otimes U_Y(1)$  model, photon is the gauge boson coupling to each helicity current by the same phenomenon, but  $Z^0$  gauge boson will induce the different distribution of left-hand current and right-hand current. Therefore, under the Left-Right symmetry model,  $SU_C(3) \otimes SU_R(2) \otimes SU_L(2) \otimes U_Y(1)$ , the unpolarized  $Z^0$  sector asymmetry effects will not wish to be produced. However, the total cross section could not be corrected by setting  $K_{\gamma\gamma\gamma} = 0$ , Fig.(3), because photon is the complete U(1) gauge boson. Under the very high energy collider physics the main distribution will be presented along z-axis. As to the  $\phi$ -axis, the influence of spin-magnetic interaction will be very tiny influenced. Visibly, the diagram, Fig.(3), has a perfect symmetry on the limit point  $\alpha = \pi$ . That is result from if there are two the observers standing on the different side of the event point by each other, they could not get the same result by detecting the total cross section of each photon helicity. The order of different quality is




FIG. 3: The coupling constant  $K_{Z\gamma\gamma} = 0$  and  $-0.2$ , and the central energy  $E_{CM} = 800$  GeV,  $\Lambda_C = 1$ TeV. As the  $K_{Z\gamma\gamma} = 0$ , that will be as same as QED result, 3.561. On the polarized helicity state, the contribution of  $b = 1$ , and  $b = -1$  on the different direction of background field along the z-axis are the same consequence.




FIG. 4: The forward-backward asymmetry is dominantly affected by the cube vertex diagram, the  $Z^0$  mediator gauge boson contributed effect actually is very small. The coupling constants  $K_{Z\gamma\gamma} = -0.2$  and  $K_{\gamma\gamma\gamma} = -0.3$ , where central energy  $E_{CM} = 800$  GeV, and  $\Lambda_C = 1$ TeV.

associated with the square inverse of the  $\Lambda_c$  parameter. By the way, throughout the F-B asymmetry discussion, we set the parameter  $\Lambda_c$  up to 1000 GeV, and the central energy is assumed by 800 GeV.

The main idea of the parity violation, Fig.(4)(5), on this process is spin-magnetic field interaction, which could be contributed by the different energy distribution on the opposite side as the event point. If the spin orientation is parallel to the background magnetic field, the energy will be maximally contributed. On the contrary, the energy will be diminished if the direction between spin and background magnetic field is opposed. That is the reason why we could get the parity violation phenomenon, therefore, the term of  $\vec{S} \times \vec{B}$  will give us




FIG. 5: The coupling constant  $K_{Z\gamma\gamma} = -0.2$  and  $0$ , the  $\alpha = \frac{\pi}{3}$  and  $E_{CE} = 800\text{GeV}$  and  $\Lambda_C = 1\text{TeV}$ , and the black Dashline is original QED predicted.




FIG. 6: The coupling  $K_{Z\gamma\gamma} = -0.2, 0$  and  $K_{\gamma\gamma\gamma} = -0.3, 0$ , where the  $\alpha = \frac{\pi}{3}$  and  $E_{CE} = 800\text{GeV}$ ,  $\Lambda_C = 1\text{TeV}$ . Comparing with the QED result, the coupling  $K_{\gamma\gamma\gamma}$  will be dominant to influence the slight shift effects.

the different physical viewpoint to investigate the process. The term is very clearly to describe the spin could not be perpendicular to the background magnetic field, otherwise the effect of the term induced will be useless for the cross section. However, the phenomenon will be produced, and it also will generate the incident on the direction perpendicular to the background magnetic field since the distribution of this direction will be maximum to be contributed.

Finally, the result about the behavior of photon or  $Z^0$  gauge boson mediator is as similar as the non-theta deformed theory, but only one difference is the order of parity a little bit asymmetry associated with the strength of background magnetic field, and the spin of the gauge boson will also interact with it.

The other evidences could also be observed is the quantity of event number as to the  $z$  variable,  $z = \cos \theta$ .




FIG. 7: The Unpolarized cross section, we set the coupling constant  $K_{Z\gamma\gamma} = -0.2$ , where the  $\Lambda_C$  is set to  $5000\text{ GeV}$ . The energy spectrum is increased by the spin-magnetic production effect, gauge boson polarization couples to the background magnetic field on the event point will rearrange the distribution of production energy.

On the Fig.(6), we could easily understand the helicity process could be contributed by the parity asymmetry on the final result. We just plot out the only one kind of helicity state  $b = 1$ , and however we could find that the another helicity state,  $b = -1$ , will be shifted on the opposite side. If we choose the  $K_{\gamma\gamma\gamma}$  coupling goes to zero then the signal will be similarly unchanged because  $Z^0$  is more heavier than photon, the mediator photon gauge boson contributing to the final result will be more perceivable than  $Z^0$  one. The dubious shift is contributed by the spin of photon interacted with background magnetic field, and the shifting axis is perpendicular to the direction of magnetic field. The different distribution about this shifting distribution is perpendicular to the axis of the direction of magnetic field because the effective term of  $\vec{S} \times \vec{B}$  generates the partial vector paralleling to the plane crossing the magnetic field with the direction of incoming particle.

On the energy spectrum, Fig.(7), the  $\theta$  expansion term will play the important role on the very high energy spectrum, the  $\alpha = 0$  will generate the more distribution on the high energy level because the polarization of total cross section on the event point is parallel to the beam axis. However, we have mentioned if the polarization is parallel to the magnetic field we will get the maximum energy distribution. Such as the concept of quantum mechanics, the energy spectrum is decided by the eigenvalues of the global system. Therefore,  $\alpha = 0$ , on the event point, photon will gain the maximum energy distribution on the collision process. On the experiment detector the photon luminosity will have tiny difference as to the movement of earth.

## V. CONCLUSION

We have briefly introduced the background magnetic field how to influence the final result of the electron an-

nihilation to two photons process, and the strong dramatic magnetic field induces the interesting effect under the exotic mediator massive gauge boson  $Z^0$  and massless photon. However, parity violation should be observed on the further high energy level, but CP symmetry is still conserved on the triple photon and  $Z^0$  gauge boson coupling, because these couplings will violate the charge symmetry. On the same time, it will also violate the parity conservation, thus the exotic term on the action deformed by  $\theta$  expansion could not induce the CPV effect. However, under the energy spectrum, due to the spin will product with magnetic field to generate the different energy distribution on the opposite

side around the event point, the energy distribution will dominantly to induce the parity violation on the observer stage. Therefore, the process will be usefully and precisely contributed on the further more high energy linear collider experiment.

### Acknowledgments

We will thank J. N. Ng, D. V. Zhuridov and Hisaki Hatanaka for useful discussions.

- 
- [1] Nathan Seiberg and Edward Witten, JHEP 09, 032 (1999), [arXiv:hep-th/9908142](#); Nathan Seiberg, Leonard Susskind, N. Toumbas, JHEP 06, 021 (2000), [arXiv:hep-th/0005040](#); A. Abouelsaood, C. G. Callan, C. R. Nappi and S. A. Yost, Nucl. Phys. **B280**, 599 (1987)
- [2] Shiraz Minwalla, Mark Van Raamsdonk, and Nathan Seiberg, JHEP 02, 020 (2000), [arXiv:hep-th/9912072](#); Andrei Micu and M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari, JHEP 0101, 025 (2001), [arXiv:hep-th/0008057](#); I. Ya. Aref'eva, D. M. Belov, A. S. Koshelev and O. A. Rytchkov, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 102, 11 (2001), [hep-th/0003176](#); Luca Griguolo, Massimo Pietroni, JHEP 05, 032 (2001), [arXiv:hep-th/0104217](#); Daniel Robbins and Savdeep Sethi, JHEP 07, 034 (2003); T. R. Govindarajan, Seçkin Kürkçüoğlu and Marco Panerob, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A21**, 1851 (2006), [arXiv:hep-th/0604061](#);
- [3] Marco Panero, JHEP 0705, 082 (2007), [arXiv:hep-th/0608202](#);
- [4] Branislav Jurco, Stefan Schraml, Peter Schupp, Julius Wess, Eur. Phys. J. **C17**, 521 (2000), [arXiv:hep-th/0006246](#); John Madore, Stefan Schraml, Peter Schupp, Julius Wess, Eur. Phys. J. **C16**, 161 (2000), [arXiv:hep-th/0001203](#); L. Bonora, M. Schnabl, M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari, A. Tomasiello, Nucl. Phys. **B589**, 461 (2000), [arXiv:hep-th/0006091](#); Keizo Matsubara, Phys. Lett. **B482**, 417 (2000), [arXiv:hep-th/0003294](#)
- [5] M. Chaichian, P. Prešnajder, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, A. Tureanu, Phys. Lett. **B526**, 132 (2002), [arXiv:hep-th/0107037](#)
- [6] Raimar Wulkenhaar, Lect. Notes Phys. 596 313 (2002), [arXiv:hep-th/9912221](#); Peter Schupp, [arXiv:hep-th/0111038](#)
- [7] C.P. Martin, Nucl. Phys. **B652**, 72 (2003), [arXiv:hep-th/0211164](#)
- [8] Jochen Zahn, Phys. Rew. **D73**, 105005 (2006), [arXiv:hep-th/0603231](#); M. Chaichian, P. Kulish, K. Nishijima, A. Tureanu, Phys. Lett. **B604** 98, (2004), [arXiv:hep-th/0408069](#)
- [9] Jean-Christophe Wallet, [arXiv:hep-th/0708.2471](#)
- [10] X. Calmet, B. Jurco, P. Schupp, J. Wess, M. Wohlgenannt, Eur. Phys. J. **C23**, 363 (2002), [arXiv:hep-ph/0111115](#); B. Melic, K. Passek-Kumericki, J. Trampetic, P. Schupp, M. Wohlgenannt, Eur. Phys. J. **C42**, 483 (2005), [arXiv:hep-th/0502249](#)
- [11] Goran Duplancic, Peter Schupp, Josip Trampetic, Eur. Phys. J. **C32**, 141 (2003), [arXiv:hep-ph/0309138](#); Josip Trampetic, [arXiv:hep-th/0704.0559](#); M. Buric, D.Latas, V.Radovanovic, J.Trampetic, [arXiv:hep-ph/0711.0887](#); A. P. Balachandran, S. G. Jo, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A22**, 6133 (2007), [arXiv:hep-th/0704.0921](#); W. Behr, N.G. Deshpande, G. Duplancic, P. Schupp, J. Trampetic, J. Wess, Eur. Phys. J. **C29** 441 (2003), [arXiv:hep-ph/0202121](#)
- [12] Hartland S. Snyder, Phys. Rev. 71, 38 (1947)
- [13] P. P. Kulish, [arXiv:hep-th/0606056](#); Vincent Rivasseau, [arXiv:hep-th/0705.0705](#); Richard J. Szabo, [arXiv:hep-th/0701224](#)
- [14] Thorsten Ohl, Reinhold Rückl, Jörg Zeiner, Nucl. Phys. **B676**, 229 (2004), [arXiv:hep-th/0309021](#); Jaume Gomis, Thomas Mehen, Nucl. Phys. **B591**, 265 (2000), [arXiv:hep-th/0005129](#); M. Chaichian, A. Demichev, P. Presnajder, A. Tureanu, Eur. Phys. J. **C20**, 767 (2001), [arXiv:hep-th/0007156](#)
- [15] Seungwon Baek, Dilip Kumar Ghosh, Xiao-Gang He, W-Y. P. Hwang, Phys. Rew. **D64**, 056001 (2001), [arXiv:hep-ph/0103068](#); J. L. Hewett, F. J. Petriello, T. G. Rizzo, Phys. Rew. **D64**, 075012 (2001), [arXiv:hep-ph/0010354](#); Prakash Mathews, Phys. Rew. **D63**, 075007 (2001), [arXiv:hep-ph/0011332](#); Thomas G. Rizzo, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A18**, 2797 (2003), [arXiv:hep-ph/0203240](#)
- [16] I.F. Riad, M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari, JHEP 008 045 (2000), [arXiv:hep-th/0008132](#); I. Hinchliffe, N. Kersting, Phys. Lett. **B527**, 115 (2002), [arXiv:hep-ph/0109224](#)