

# QED Conformal Anomaly in External Fields

Lance Labun and Johann Rafelski

*Department of Physics, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, 85721 USA, and  
Department für Physik der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München und  
Maier-Leibniz-Laboratory, Am Coulombwall 1, 85748 Garching, Germany*

(Dated: October 3, 2008)

We study the properties of the trace anomaly of the QED energy-momentum tensor in presence of quasi-constant external electromagnetic fields. These vacuum fluctuations act like the dark energy.

PACS numbers: 12.20.Ds, 11.15.Tk

Effective nonlinear electromagnetic theory arises naturally from quantum electrodynamics via the Euler-Heisenberg (EH) effective action [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. This classic result applies when the spatial and temporal variation of the field strength is negligible on the length scale of the electron-positron fluctuations in the vacuum, i.e. the electron Compton wavelength  $\lambda_c = \hbar c/m_e$ . More generally, Maxwell's theory could be the limiting case of a nonlinear electromagnetic theory, which was the original motivation for the Born-Infeld (BI) approach [9, 10, 11, 12].

A common feature of any form of nonlinear electromagnetism is the presence of dimensioned field scale  $E_c = m^2/e$  which we express using a mass scale  $m$ , where  $m$  can be as large as a string theory scale [12] or as small as the mass of the electron [1, 2, 10], in which case  $E_c = m_e^2/e = 1.3 \times 10^{18} \text{ V/m} = 4.4 \times 10^9 \text{ T}$  is often referred to as the critical field strength of QED. This field corresponds to a potential difference of  $\Delta eV = m_e c^2$  over the distance  $\lambda_c$ .

Our study of QED in external fields differs from the more challenging issues surrounding the nonlinearities of quantum chromodynamics, see e.g. [13]. In our case, the physical observables and thus the effective action induced by quasi-constant external electromagnetic fields are well defined, because QED is an infrared-stable theory.

We write the (nonlinear) effective electromagnetic action in the form

$$\overline{V}_{\text{eff}} \equiv m^4 \overline{V}_{\text{eff}} \left( \frac{\mathcal{S}}{m^4}, \frac{\mathcal{P}}{m^4} \right) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} -\mathcal{S} \quad (1)$$

presented here as a function of the (Lorentz) scalar  $\mathcal{S} := \frac{1}{4} F_{\kappa\lambda} F^{\kappa\lambda} = \frac{1}{2} (B^2 - E^2)$  and the pseudo scalar  $\mathcal{P} := \frac{1}{4} F_{\kappa\lambda}^* F^{\kappa\lambda} = E \cdot B$ . The format of Eq. (1) is not the most general because there can be a linear term, e.g.  $\mathcal{S} \ln m/\mu$  where  $\mu$  is another scale and when such is included we omit the bar in  $\overline{V}_{\text{eff}}$ . The barred  $\overline{V}_{\text{eff}}$  comprises the Maxwell term shown as the small field limit (measured in units of  $E_c$ ) as is noted in Eq. (1), but excludes any other term linear in  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Given an effective action we evaluate energy momentum tensor

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\delta}{\delta g_{\mu\nu}} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} V_{\text{eff}} \quad (2)$$

where  $g$  is the determinant of the metric tensor  $g^{\mu\nu}$ . The explicit form may be written (see e.g. Eq. (4.17) in [14] and Eq. (A3) in [15]):

$$T_{\mu\nu} = (F_{\mu\lambda} F_{\nu}{}^{\lambda} - g_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{S}) \frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial \mathcal{S}} - g_{\mu\nu} \left( V_{\text{eff}} - \mathcal{S} \frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial \mathcal{S}} - \mathcal{P} \frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial \mathcal{P}} \right) \quad (3)$$

The first term in Eq. (3) is traceless, and using Eq. (1) the second term can be rewritten

$$T_{\mu}^{\mu} \equiv \mathcal{T} = -4 \left( V_{\text{eff}} - \mathcal{S} \frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial \mathcal{S}} - \mathcal{P} \frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial \mathcal{P}} \right) = -m \frac{\partial \overline{V}_{\text{eff}}}{\partial m}, \quad (4)$$

A term linear in the invariant  $\mathcal{S}$  cannot contribute to the right side of Eq. (4) since it cancels explicitly in the middle parenthesis, allowing us to omit the bar there.

While we could evaluate directly the value of the EH anomaly in external fields, a better understanding of the situation is obtained by connecting the trace anomaly (4) to the Dirac field (electron-positron) condensate induced in the vacuum by an applied external field [16]. We recall the elementary form of Wick's decomposition theorem

$$T(\psi(x') \bar{\psi}(x)) =: \psi(x') \bar{\psi}(x) : + \langle 0 | T(\psi(x') \bar{\psi}(x)) | 0 \rangle,$$

where the normal ordering is with respect to the 'no-field' vacuum. Taking the expectation value of this relation in the 'with-field' vacuum  $| \rangle$  we find

$$\langle : \psi \bar{\psi} : \rangle = \langle | T(\psi(x) \bar{\psi}(x)) | \rangle - \langle 0 | T(\psi(x) \bar{\psi}(x)) | 0 \rangle \quad (5) \\ = i S_F(x, x) - i S_F^0(x, x)$$

where the coincidence limit

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \text{tr} [S_F(x + \epsilon, x - \epsilon, m)]$$

is implied for equal propagator arguments, with  $\epsilon$  a time-like vector. The trace over spinor indices is implied when the  $\bar{\psi}$  field is placed to the left of  $\psi$  and the requisite exchange of Fermi-operators introduces an additional minus sign. In this case, the normal ordering symbols are also omitted and we have the well-known relation which can be read-off from Schwinger's proper time formulation for the Feynman Green's function [2]:

$$-m \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle = im \text{tr} (S_F - S_F^0) = m \frac{dV_{\text{eff}}}{dm} \quad (6)$$

The condensate therefore derives from the difference of normal ordering of operators in the no-field (also called perturbative) vacuum and the new, with-field vacuum. The subtraction in Eq. (5) is seen to be a consequence of this definition, and is not result of renormalization or ad-hoc removal. The proper time representation of the trace anomaly can then be stated in several ways (we use Schwinger's expressions and units, in which  $\alpha = e^2/4\pi$  [2])

$$\mathcal{T} = \frac{2\alpha}{3\pi}\mathcal{S} + m\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle \quad (7)$$

$$= \frac{2\alpha}{3\pi}\mathcal{S} - \frac{m^2}{4\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{ds e^{-m^2 s}}{s^2} (eEs \cot(eEs) \times \quad (8)$$

$$eBs \coth(eBs) - 1)$$

$$= -\frac{m^2}{4\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{ds e^{-m^2 s}}{s^2} (eEs \cot(eEs) \times \quad (9)$$

$$eBs \coth(eBs) - 1 - \frac{2e^2}{3}s^2\mathcal{S})$$

When both  $E, B \neq 0$  these expressions are generalized by the substitutions

$$B^2 \rightarrow b^2 = \sqrt{\mathcal{S}^2 + \mathcal{P}^2} + \mathcal{S}, \quad E^2 \rightarrow a^2 = \sqrt{\mathcal{S}^2 + \mathcal{P}^2} - \mathcal{S}.$$

Our expression for the trace anomaly agrees with Eq. (5) of Dittrich and Gies [16]. These authors do not evaluate their expression Eq. (6) which requires several cancellations and which we did not check. We differ from these authors regarding the definition of the vacuum condensate in that they a-priori omit in their Eq. (4) the leading term proportional to  $\mathcal{S}$  seen in Eq. (7). The presence of the linear term in Eq. (7) often goes unnoticed in literature, see for example Eq. (8) in [19].

The difference in format between Eq. (4) and Eq. (6) is due to this leading linear term in  $\mathcal{S}$

$$m \frac{dV_{\text{eff}}}{dm} = m \frac{d\overline{V}_{\text{eff}}}{dm} + \frac{2\alpha}{3\pi}\mathcal{S}. \quad (10)$$

Thus as Eq. (7) exhibits, the energy-momentum anomaly is the condensate reduced by the leading term linear in  $\mathcal{S}$ . Our Eq. (7) and in particular the relative sign is analogous to Eq. (5) of Ref. [13] and Eqs.(35) in [17] with the recognition that the Gell-Man-Low  $\beta$ -function for fermions is positive definite. The relation between the anomaly and the  $\beta$ -function is explored in [18]. In our discussion, the cancellation between the two terms, the matter condensate and the gauge field term in Eq. (7) derives from the difference exhibited between  $V_{\text{eff}}$  and  $\overline{V}_{\text{eff}}$ , see Eq. (10). Note that this difference is inherent in the separation of the energy-momentum tensor into the two parts seen in Eq. (3) of which the first is traceless.

In numerical evaluation of the anomaly, we employ the methods presented in [4] and study first the stable field configuration  $B \neq 0, E = 0$ . We use the subtracted mero-

morphic (i.e. residue) expansions of the function:

$$x \coth x - 1 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2x^2}{x^2 + k^2\pi^2} = \frac{x^2}{3} - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k\pi)^2} \frac{2x^4}{x^2 + k^2\pi^2}. \quad (11)$$

The change in sign following from the second subtraction determines the physics outcome of this investigation and justifies the time and effort spent showing how the trace anomaly does not include the term linear in  $\mathcal{S}$ , while the condensate does. For the condensate and the anomaly we obtain respectively:

$$-m\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle_B = \frac{m^2(eB)^2}{2\pi^2} \int_0^\infty ds \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-m^2 s}}{(eBs)^2 + (k\pi)^2}, \quad (12)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_B = \frac{m^2(eB)^2}{2\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(eBs)^2}{k^2\pi^2} \frac{e^{-m^2 s} ds}{(eBs)^2 + k^2\pi^2}. \quad (13)$$

All terms are individually absolutely convergent, so we can reorder the sum and integral. After rescaling  $eBs/k\pi \rightarrow z$  and resumming, we obtain

$$-m\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle_B = -\frac{m^4}{2\pi^2\beta'} \int_0^\infty \frac{\ln(1 - e^{-\beta' z})}{1 + z^2} dz > 0, \quad (14)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_B = \frac{m^4}{2\pi^2\beta'} \int_0^\infty \frac{z^2 \ln(1 - e^{-\beta' z})}{1 + z^2} dz < 0. \quad (15)$$

in which  $\beta' = \pi m^2/eB = \pi/(B/E_c)$ . As shown, the trace anomaly is negative for any given field  $B$ . Except for  $B \rightarrow 0$  ( $\beta' \rightarrow \infty$ ), this form is easily integrated numerically and the results are displayed in figure 1, where the lower continuous solid line (red) is the condensate on the left, and the (negative of the) trace anomaly on the right, using natural units. For  $B \rightarrow 0$ , one can integrate the original EH expression and the result is consistent with the lowest order power-law semi-convergent expansion, of which the first two terms are

$$\mathcal{T}_B = -\frac{m^4}{90\pi^2} \frac{\mathcal{E}^4}{E_c^4} + \frac{4m^4}{315\pi^2} \frac{\mathcal{E}^6}{E_c^6} + \dots; \quad (16)$$

$$-m\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle_B = \frac{m^4}{12\pi^2} \frac{\mathcal{E}^2}{E_c^2} + \frac{m^4}{90\pi^2} \frac{\mathcal{E}^4}{E_c^4} + \dots \quad (17)$$

where  $\mathcal{E}^2 = B^2$  or  $\mathcal{E}^2 = -E^2$  for magnetic or electric fields, respectively.

Turning to the electric field case, the corresponding meromorphic expansions show poles on the real  $s$ -axis. We assign to the mass a small imaginary component  $m^2 \rightarrow m^2 + i\epsilon$ , replacing in Eq. (14) and Eq. (15) the denominator  $1 + z^2 \rightarrow 1 - z^2 - i\epsilon$ . Thus, in the presence of an electric field, we find an imaginary part

$$\text{Im } m \frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial m} = m^2 \frac{eE}{4\pi^2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} e^{-\frac{n\pi E_c}{E}} = -\frac{m^4}{4\pi\beta} \ln(1 - e^{-\beta}), \quad (18)$$




FIG. 1: The condensate  $-m\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle$  (on left) and conformal anomaly  $T_{\mu}^{\mu}$  (on right) in natural units of  $m^4$  as function of normalized field strengths in units of  $E_c = m^2/e$  for cases of magnetic and electric fields. For ease of comparison on a logarithmic scale, the negative of the function is plotted as appropriate (see axes and legend in figure). The dotted and dashed dotted lines show the weak-field expansions for each case.

which is manifestly positive and strongly suppressed for field strengths less than  $0.1E_c$ . Here  $\beta = \pi m^2/eE = \pi/(E/E_c)$ . Equation (18) corresponds to the pair production process in the presence of strong electric fields.

The numerical results for the real part of the condensate and anomaly in presence of electrical fields are also shown in figure 1, upper black dashed line. The conformal anomaly switches sign at  $E \simeq 42E_c$  and beyond we show the opposite sign result as a dashed (blue) line. However, for fields  $E > E_c$  the one loop expressions we are considering may not be adequate. Less compact expressions involving hypergeometric functions result upon following the same procedure in the general case of both  $E, B$  nonzero in which case we also are using in our numeric evaluation the convergent series displayed by [6]. We will discuss the details of these results as well as the case of spin-0 matter elsewhere.

$\mathcal{T}$  can be a significant source for gravitational interaction, which derives from the Einstein-Hilbert component of the total action

$$I = I_M + I_G = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left( V_{\text{eff}} - \frac{R + 2\Lambda}{16\pi G} \right) \quad (19)$$

where  $R$  is the curvature scalar and  $\Lambda$  the Einstein cosmological term, which has a reversed gravitational effect. By variation with respect to the metric, we find the Einstein equations

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R = 8\pi GT_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu}. \quad (20)$$

We recall  $\mathcal{T}_{\text{matter}} = \rho - 3p > 0$ . We introduce the trace of the energy-momentum tensor explicitly into the Einstein equations when we reinsert their trace  $R + 2\Lambda = -8\pi G(\mathcal{T}_{\text{matter}} + \mathcal{T} - 2\Lambda)$  and write:

$$\frac{1}{8\pi G}R_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}(\mathcal{T}_{\text{matter}} + \mathcal{T} + \Lambda_d) \quad (21)$$

A negative trace anomaly, with a sign like that of dark energy  $\Lambda_d = \Lambda/4\pi G$ , therefore indicates that a domain of space filled with strong magnetic field could experience a repulsive force in an external gravitational force-field, an effect emulating a counter-gravity force.

A solution of the Einstein equations on a finite (sub)domain in which a significant  $\mathcal{T} < 0$  is present does not yet exist. The cosmological solutions which shape our intuition about the counter-gravity action of the conformal anomaly do not address the case of a small space-time domain filled with (negative) trace anomaly. However, we note that the value of the dark energy  $\Lambda_d = 4.2\text{keV}/\text{cm}^3 = 2.5\text{meV}^4 = 3.7 \times 10^{-35}m_e^4$  is very small in terms of the electron mass scale, and yet a magnetic field  $B_d = 60\text{T}$  rivaling largest laboratory files would be needed to push the Universe apart.

On the other hand we may ask how much gravitational volume “lift” we can expect in the presence of ultra-strong magnetic fields. Inspecting the right hand side of figure 1 we recognize that fields at the level of critical value ( $4.4 \times 10^9\text{T}$ ) could generate an anomaly of magnitude  $10^{-4}m_e^4 = 1.6\text{g}/\text{cm}^3$ . Such a field could be neutralizing gravity for normal matter filling a volume of comparable size. This observation is perhaps pertinent to research with pulsed lasers which should facilitate the formation of fields at near-critical QED level in laboratory in the foreseeable future [20].

To summarize, we have evaluated the trace anomaly of QED in strong external fields and have explored in a qualitative fashion its potential for counter-gravity effect.

## Acknowledgments

We thank for hospitality Prof. D. Habs, Director of the Cluster of Excellence in Laser Physics – Munich Center for Advanced Photonics, and Gerald Dunne for valuable

comments. This research was supported by the DFG–LMU-excellent grant, and by a grant from: the U.S. De-

partment of Energy DE-FG02-04ER4131.

- 
- [1] H. Euler and B. Kockel, *Naturwiss.* **23**, 246 (1935); H. Euler, *Ann. Physik. V* **26**, 398 (1936); W. Heisenberg and H. Euler, *Z. Phys.* **98** (1936) 714 [for translation see: arXiv:physics/0605038].
- [2] J. S. Schwinger, *Phys. Rev.* **82**, 664 (1951).
- [3] Z. Bialynicka-Birula and I. Bialynicki-Birula, *Phys. Rev. D* **2**, 2341 (1970).
- [4] B. Müller and W. Greiner and J. Rafelski, *Phys. Lett.* **63A**, 181 (1977).
- [5] W. Dittrich and H. Gies, *Springer Tracts Mod. Phys.* **166**, 1 (2000).
- [6] Y. M. Cho and D. G. Pak, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 1947 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0006057]; W. S. Bae, Y. M. Cho and D. G. Pak, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 017303 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0011196].
- [7] U. D. Jentschura, H. Gies, S. R. Valluri, D. R. Lamm and E. J. Weniger, *Can. J. Phys.* **80**, 267 (2002) [arXiv:hep-th/0107135].
- [8] G. V. Dunne, “Heisenberg-Euler effective Lagrangians: Basics and extensions,” in \*Shifman, M. (ed.) et al.: From fields to strings, vol. 1\* 445-522. [arXiv:hep-th/0406216.]
- [9] M. Born and L. Infeld, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **144**, 425 (1934).
- [10] J. Rafelski, L. P. Fulcher and W. Greiner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **27**, 958 (1971); and *Nuovo Cim. B* **13**, 135 (1973).
- [11] Z. Bialynicka-Birula, *Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. (Phys. Astron.)* **27**, 41 (1979)
- [12] E. S. Fradkin and A. A. Tseytlin, *Phys. Lett. B* **163**, 123 (1985); A. A. Tseytlin, *Nucl. Phys. B* **501**, 41 (1997) [arXiv:hep-th/9701125].
- [13] R. Schutzhold, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 081302 (2002). [arXiv:gr-qc/0204018.]
- [14] G. M. Shore, *Nucl. Phys. B* **460**, 379 (1996) [arXiv:gr-qc/9504041].
- [15] J. Grundberg and T. H. Hansson, *Annals Phys.* **242**, 413 (1995) [arXiv:hep-th/9407139].
- [16] W. Dittrich and H. Gies, *Phys. Lett. B* **392**, 182 (1997) [arXiv:hep-th/9609197].
- [17] E. V. Gorbar and A. A. Natale, *Phys. Rev. D* **61**, 054012 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9906299].
- [18] K. Fujikawa, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 3922 (1993).
- [19] J. S. Dowker and R. Critchley, *Phys. Rev. D* **16**, 3390 (1977).
- [20] G. A. Mourou, T. Tajima and S. V. Bulanov, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **78**, 309 (2006).