

QED Energy-Momentum-Trace 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: July 16, 2009)

We study the properties of the trace of the QED energy-momentum tensor in the presence of quasi-constant external electromagnetic fields. We discuss observable consequences of the dark energy-like behavior of these vacuum fluctuations.

PACS numbers: 12.20.Ds, 11.15.Tk, 95.30.-k, 42.50.Xa

Quantum electrodynamics (QED) in (quasi-)constant, homogeneous external fields provides an opportunity to study the modification of the vacuum state structure in this well-understood theory. Given the Poincaré symmetry a new vacuum energy term proportional to $g_{\mu\nu}$ arises. Such a term is similar to Einstein's form of dark energy, the cosmological constant, which is motivation to return to study of strong field QED. Moreover, laser pulse technology is advancing rapidly towards the 'critical' $E_c = m^2/e = 1.3 \times 10^{18}$ V/m = 4.4×10^9 T field strength where here addressed effects can be tested in laboratory [1]. Due to the instability of the vacuum to pair creation at such high electric fields, the magnetic supercritical configuration is preferable, and hence we look with emphasis on this situation below.

QED in the presence of an electromagnetic field that varies negligibly on the space-time scale of the electron-positron fluctuations in the vacuum $\lambda_c = \hbar/m_e c$ leads to an effective nonlinear electromagnetic theory via the Euler-Heisenberg (EH) effective action [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. The physical observables and effective action induced by quasi-constant external electromagnetic fields are well-defined, because QED is an infrared-stable theory in which the electron mass m_e is the key scale parameter. QED is not conformally symmetric, and consequently QED in external fields does not share in the more challenging issues, such as conformal symmetry breaking, surrounding parallel efforts in quantum chromodynamics (QCD) [12].

Much of what we present here is a general property of any nonlinear theory of electrodynamics [13]. The Born-Infeld (BI) nonlinear electromagnetic theory [14, 15, 16] arises naturally in the low energy limit of string theory [17]. We achieve considerable simplification and insight exploiting a common feature of any nonlinear electrodynamics, namely the presence of a dimensioned field scale $E_c = m^2/e$ which we express using a mass scale – m can be as large as a string theory scale or as small as the mass of the electron. We write the (nonlinear) effective electromagnetic action in the form

$$\overline{V_{\text{eff}}} \equiv -\mathcal{S} + m^4 \overline{f_{\text{eff}}} \left(\frac{\mathcal{S}}{m^4}, \frac{\mathcal{P}}{m^4} \right) \quad (1)$$

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 another linear term, e.g. $\mathcal{S} \ln m/\mu$ where μ is another scale and when such is included we omit the bar on f_{eff} . The barred $\overline{f_{\text{eff}}}$ thereby contains solely contributions nonlinear in \mathcal{S} .

We study the energy-momentum tensor for an effective nonlinear action

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

where g is the determinant of the metric tensor $g^{\mu\nu}$. The explicit form may be written (see e.g. Eq. (A3) in [18] and/or Eq. (4.17) in [19]):

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

The first term in Eq. (3) is traceless, being (up to the dimensionless polarization function $-\frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial \mathcal{S}}$) the classical Maxwell $V_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow -\mathcal{S}$ energy-momentum tensor. Using Eq. (1) the second term is the trace

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

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. Only nonlinear EM-theories generically have an energy-momentum trace, which we expect becomes important in the presence of fields approaching the critical magnitude E_c .

While we could evaluate directly the value of the EH trace in external fields using the known form of the effective action, a better understanding of the physics is achieved by connecting \mathcal{T} to the Dirac field (electron-positron) condensate induced in the vacuum [20]. Taking the spacetime and Dirac trace of the fermion propagator, one finds the well-known relation which is implicitly stated in Schwinger's proper time formulation for the Feynman Green's function [3]:

$$-m \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle = im \text{tr} (S_F - S_F^0) = m \frac{dV_{\text{eff}}}{dm}. \quad (5)$$

The middle expression, arising from contraction via Wick's theorem, exhibits the condensate as the difference between normal ordering of operators in the no-field (also called perturbative) vacuum and the new, with-field vacuum. We see that the argument of the derivative in Eq. (5) and in Eq. (4) is not exactly the same: The difference in format between Eq. (4) and Eq. (5) is due to the leading linear term in \mathcal{S}

$$m \frac{dV_{\text{eff}}}{dm} = m \frac{d\overline{V}_{\text{eff}}}{dm} + \frac{2\alpha}{3\pi} \mathcal{S}. \quad (6)$$

We emphasize that the properties of the excited 'with field' vacuum are induced by the external field in the free non-interacting vacuum state, see Eq. (5). The subtraction of the unperturbed vacuum term is not a consequence of arbitrary removal of zero-point energy, but is a consequence of the application of rules of QED. For this reason our discussion has no bearing on the zero-point energy of quantum field theory and/or its gravitational coupling.

The proper time representation of the trace can then be stated in several ways (here presented in Schwinger's expressions and units, in which $\alpha = e^2/4\pi$ [3])

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

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

$$ebs \coth(ebs) - 1)$$

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

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

wherein the invariant magnetic- and electric-like field strengths are

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

which reduce as indicated to the classical magnetic and electric fields when one invariant vanishes.

As Eq. (7) shows, the trace of the energy-momentum tensor has two contributions, gauge field and matter field fluctuations, the origin of which lies in the difference between V_{eff} and $\overline{V}_{\text{eff}}$, as seen in the separation of the energy-momentum tensor into the two parts shown in Eq. (3). Our derivation makes further apparent the unphysical consequences of omitting the first term in Eq. (7): if \mathcal{T} were the negative of the condensate, the QED vacuum would reduce its energy by spontaneously generating magnetic fields and hence be unstable.

Our analysis agrees with Adler, Collins et al. [21] who also explore the relation to the β function. This relation helps explain why Eq. (9) agrees with [20], even though their derivation is obtained from the supposition that $\mathcal{T} = m \partial V_{\text{eff}} / \partial m$. Eq. (7) and in particular the relative sign is analogous to Eq. (5) of Ref. [12] and Eqs.(35) in

[22] with the recognition that the (fermion) Gell-Mann-Low β -function in QED is positive definite.

In numerical evaluation of the energy-momentum tensor for strong fields we employ the method developed in [7]. Consider first the stable field configuration $B \neq 0, E = 0$. The subtracted meromorphic (i.e. residue) expansions of the function

$$x \coth x - 1 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2x^2}{x^2 + k^2 \pi^2} = \frac{x^2}{3} - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k\pi)^2} \frac{2x^4}{x^2 + k^2 \pi^2}. \quad (10)$$

display the stabilizing change in sign following the second subtraction. The sums and integrals are absolutely convergent, so we may resum the resulting series, obtaining

$$-m \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle_B = -\frac{m^4}{2\pi^2 \beta'} \int_0^\infty \frac{\ln(1 - e^{-\beta' z})}{1 + z^2} dz > 0, \quad (11)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_B = -\frac{m^4}{2\pi^2 \beta'} \int_0^\infty \frac{z^2 \ln(1 - e^{-\beta' z})}{1 + z^2} dz > 0 \quad (12)$$

in which $\beta' = \pi m^2 / eB = \pi / (B/E_c)$. \mathcal{T} in the presence of a magnetic field is positive for any given field B , in contrast to the negative of the condensate. The manifest signs of the two terms, which determine the physics outcome of this investigation justify the time and effort spent showing how \mathcal{T} does not include the term linear in \mathcal{S} , while the condensate does. For completeness, we exhibit resummation of the renormalized effective action:

$$V_{\text{eff}}(B) = \frac{m^4}{16\pi^2 \beta'} \int_0^\infty dz \ln(z^2 + 1) \ln(1 - e^{-\beta' z}). \quad (13)$$

For 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.(11) and Eq.(12) the denominator $z^2 + 1 \rightarrow z^2 - 1 + i\epsilon$. Thus, in the presence of an electric field, there is also an imaginary part

$$\text{Im } m \frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial m} = -\frac{m^4}{4\pi\beta} \ln(1 - e^{-\beta}), \quad (14)$$

which is manifestly positive and strongly suppressed for field strengths less than $0.1E_c$. Here $\beta = \pi m^2 / eE = \pi / (E/E_c)$. Eq.(14) corresponds to pair production by strong electric fields.

The numerical results for the real part of the condensate and trace in the presence of magnetic and electrical fields are shown in figure 1. We discuss elsewhere [13] how real and imaginary parts contribute together, the case that both E, B are non zero, and the case of spin-0 matter fields.

With our numerical evaluations establishing magnitude of the vacuum energy, we explore situations in which consequences of this contribution to the energy-momentum tensor become observable. As may be verified by direct calculation, the quantum vacuum behaves as any other nonlinear medium and as such cannot alter




FIG. 1: The condensate $-m\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle$ (left) and the trace of energy-momentum tensor T_{μ}^{μ} (right) in units of m^4 , as a function of magnetic B (red) and electric E (blue, dashed and solid) field strengths. The negative of the electric field result is plotted where appropriate on right. The dotted (for B) and dashed-dotted (for E) lines show the weak-field expansions.

the form of the Lorentz force $f^{\mu} = j_{\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$ arising from the coupling of EM potentials to matter dictated by the gauge invariance of the theory and Maxwell dynamical equations. However, when QED modifies particle properties, the Lorentz force obtains new terms, such as the $(g-2)F^{\mu\nu}\sigma_{\mu\nu}$ magnetic moment correction which must be introduced explicitly, requiring an effective gauge invariant coupling of EM fields with matter.

The formal validity of the Lorentz force does not exclude an interaction between the background field and the field of the probe particle arising from the breaking of the superposition principle [15, 23]. This interaction can be tracked through the Lorentz force formulation, but it is more easily evaluated using the weak field expansion of the EH effective potential. In the rest frame of a non-relativistic charged probe particle, we take the background magnetic field as constant $\vec{B} = B\hat{z}$ and the electric field as the particle's Coulomb field $\vec{E} = Ze\hat{r}/r^2$. Integrating the energy of the combined field configuration, T^{00} , over the volume with a short distance cutoff at the Compton wavelength λ , the leading contribution is the trace $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow u_{\text{eff}}$:

$$u_{\text{eff}} = \int d^4x \frac{2\alpha^2}{45m_e^4} (7\mathcal{P}^2 + 4\mathcal{S}^2) = \frac{2\alpha^2}{45m_e^4} \frac{4\pi}{3\lambda} (ZeB)^2, \quad (15)$$

keeping only the nonlinear-sourced cross terms. The coefficient of the Maxwell energy $-\frac{\partial V_{\text{eff}}}{\partial \mathcal{S}}$ also induces sub-leading cross terms at $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^3)$. The cutoff arises since at distances shorter than λ we must use quantum dynamics to describe the probe particle, consideration of which would be inconsistent with the classical particle dynamics.

This interaction energy is positive, independent of the sign of the charge, and comparable to the gravitational potential of a neutron star with dipolar magnetic field. As u_{grav} is negative and $\propto r^{-1}$ and the effective (scalar) potential goes with $B^2 \propto r^{-6}$,

$$\frac{u_{\text{eff}}}{u_{\text{grav}}} = \frac{8\pi(\alpha Z)^2}{135\lambda} \left(\frac{eB_{\text{surf}}}{m_e^2}\right)^2 \frac{R_{\text{surf}}^6}{r^6} \left(\frac{1.48M_{\odot}m}{r}\right)^{-1} \quad (16)$$

using $G = 1.48 \text{ km/solar mass}$. Note the λ cutoff in Eq. (15) cancels against particle mass m , making Eq. (16) independent of both the mass of the particle m and the cutoff λ . Remarkably, at the surface of a $1.5 M_{\odot}$, 14 km radius star with critical surface field $B_{\text{surf}} = B_c$, the nonlinear-electromagnetic effective potential is 34 times the gravitational potential, resulting in a large repulsive, quasi-Lorentz-scalar potential for charged particles entering the strong field region.

Being an objectively observable energy, \mathcal{T} gravitates, just as the Casimir energy does [24]; our derivation isolates the field induced energy-momentum of the vacuum. In contrast to matter for which the particle pressure acts outwards, the vacuum pressure of localized \mathcal{T} in the field volume acts inwards. This is a general feature of any deformed ‘false’ vacuum state: the outside true vacuum assures that the false vacuum is self-squeezing, and the three (isotropic) negative pressures overwhelm the positive energy density.

This sign reversal in the effect of vacuum fluctuations makes the behavior of \mathcal{T} akin to the cosmological constant, as noted before [12]. This is made explicit in the Einstein equation

$$\frac{1}{8\pi G} \left(R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R \right) = -\widetilde{T}_{\mu\nu} - g_{\mu\nu} \left(\frac{\mathcal{T}}{4} + \frac{\lambda}{2} \right). \quad (17)$$

by separating the trace, $\widetilde{T}_{\mu\nu} = T_{\mu\nu} - g_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{T}/4$.

With a sign like that of dark energy $\Lambda/4\pi G \equiv \lambda \simeq (2.3 \text{ meV})^4 = 4.1 \times 10^{-34} m_e^4$, \mathcal{T} is the dominant contribution in a domain of space with strong fields and is naively expected to generate a pressure that sweeps out matter, in analogy with the cosmological constant pushing the universe apart at large scales. At $B_d = 108 \text{ T}$, the scale of the largest macroscopic Earth-bound fields, the magnetic field-induced vacuum energy rivals λ . Much larger fields are encountered in the study of supernovae and post-main sequence stellar objects [25, 26, 27, 28], e.g. $10 - 100B_c$. At $60B_c$, $\mathcal{T} = 0.8m_e^4 = 1.14 \times 10^{25} \text{ erg/cm}^3$, 2-4 orders of magnitude larger than the gravitational po-

tential energy density of infalling stellar plasma, but 8 orders of magnitude smaller than the pressures expected in the high density nuclear matter expected in the collapsed core [28].

Energy-momentum sources in Eqs. (17) and (18) involving local dark energy-like contributions have only recently been studied [29, 30, 31, 32]. To see that the effects of local \mathcal{T} are anti-gravitational just like cosmological λ , we inspect the Oppenheimer-Volkov equation of hydrostatic equilibrium,

$$\frac{dp}{dr} = -\frac{G}{c^2}(T_0^0 + T_i^i) \frac{M + 4\pi r^3 T_i^i}{r(r - 2GM)} \quad (18)$$

where $M(r) = \int^r T_0^0 4\pi r'^2 dr'$ and T_i^i (no sum) is assumed isotropic. The first term ($T_0^0 + T_i^i$) in Eq. (18) can never be negative and vanishes for λ -like contributions to T_ν^μ , but the second ($M + 4\pi r^3 T_i^i$) can change sign. A λ -like contribution to T_ν^μ thereby weakens the pressure gradient and supports heavier stars than otherwise expected. In the dynamics of core collapse, the central dipole increases rapidly due to magnetic flux conservation, producing also

a large \mathcal{T} . The sparse infalling plasma has a small T_0^0 and T_i^i , while the λ -term makes $M + 4\pi r^3 T_i^i$ negative, rendering pressure above the surface of the collapsed core an increasing function of r . The effect dies rapidly since $\mathcal{T} \propto B^4 \sim r^{-12}$. Though direct gravitational modifications to the mass-radius relation remain negligible, on account of the orders of magnitude we believe \mathcal{T} offers a new mechanism (in addition to neutrinos [33]) driving the expulsion of matter in supernova explosions.

To summarize, we have evaluated the trace of the QED energy-momentum tensor in strong external EM fields and connected its presence to the properties of QED vacuum fluctuations. We highlighted areas in which the induced strong field vacuum nonlinearity produces observable effects and have shown that these can compete with the gravity of compact stellar objects.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by a grant from: the U.S. Department of Energy DE-FG02-04ER4131 and the DFG Cluster of Excellence MAP (Munich Centre of Advanced Photonics) – we thank Prof. D. Habs for hospitality.

-
- [1] G. A. Mourou, T. Tajima and S. V. Bulanov, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **78**, 309 (2006).
- [2] 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.
- [3] J. S. Schwinger, *Phys. Rev.* **82**, 664 (1951).
- [4] E. Brezin and C. Itzykson, *Phys. Rev. D* **2**, 1191 (1970).
- [5] Z. Bialynicka-Birula and I. Bialynicki-Birula, *Phys. Rev. D* **2**, 2341 (1970).
- [6] S. L. Adler, *Annals Phys.* **67**, 599 (1971).
- [7] B. Müller and W. Greiner and J. Rafelski, *Phys. Lett.* **63A**, 181 (1977).
- [8] W. Dittrich and H. Gies, *Springer Tracts Mod. Phys.* **166**, 1 (2000).
- [9] Y. M. Cho and D. G. Pak, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 1947 (2001); W. S. Bae, Y. M. Cho and D. G. Pak, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 017303 (2001).
- [10] U. D. Jentschura, H. Gies, S. R. Valluri, D. R. Lamm and E. J. Weniger, *Can. J. Phys.* **80**, 267 (2002).
- [11] G. V. Dunne, “Heisenberg-Euler effective Lagrangians: Basics and extensions,” in *Shifman, M. (ed.) et al.: From fields to strings, vol. 1* 445-522.
- [12] R. Schutzhold, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 081302 (2002).
- [13] L. Labun and J. Rafelski, arXiv:0811.4467 [hep-th].
- [14] M. Born and L. Infeld, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **144**, 425 (1934).
- [15] J. Rafelski, L. P. Fulcher and W. Greiner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **27**, 958 (1971); and *Nuovo Cim. B* **13**, 135 (1973).
- [16] Z. Bialynicka-Birula, *Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. (Phys. Astron.)* **27**, 41 (1979)
- [17] E. S. Fradkin and A. A. Tseytlin, *Phys. Lett. B* **163**, 123 (1985); A. A. Tseytlin, *Nucl. Phys. B* **501**, 41 (1997).
- [18] J. Grundberg and T. H. Hansson, *Annals Phys.* **242**, 413 (1995) [arXiv:hep-th/9407139].
- [19] G. M. Shore, *Nucl. Phys. B* **460**, 379 (1996).
- [20] W. Dittrich and M. Sieber, *J. Phys. A* **21**, L711 (1988); W. Dittrich and H. Gies, *Phys. Lett. B* **392**, 182 (1997).
- [21] S. L. Adler, J. C. Collins and A. Duncan, *Phys. Rev. D* **15**, 1712 (1977); J. C. Collins, A. Duncan and S. D. Joglekar, *Phys. Rev. D* **16**, 438 (1977).
- [22] E. V. Gorbar and A. A. Natale, *Phys. Rev. D* **61**, 054012 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9906299].
- [23] C. A. Dominguez, H. Falomir, M. Ipinza, M. Loewe and J. C. Rojas, arXiv:0808.2897 [hep-ph].
- [24] S. A. Fulling, K. A. Milton, P. Parashar, A. Romeo, K. V. Shajesh and J. Wagner, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 025004 (2007).
- [25] N. V. Ardeljan, G. S. Bisnovaty-Kogan and S. G. Moiseenko, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **359** (2005) 333.
- [26] S. E. Woosley and J. S. Bloom, *Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **44** (2006) 507.
- [27] Q. Peng and H. Tong, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **378** (2007) 159.
- [28] H. T. Janka, K. Langanke, A. Marek, G. Martinez-Pinedo and B. Mueller, *Phys. Rept.* **442**, 38 (2007).
- [29] P. O. Mazur and E. Mottola, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **101**, 9545 (2004).
- [30] G. Chapline, “Dark energy stars,” *Proceedings of 22nd Texas Symposium on Relativistic Astrophysics at Stanford University, Stanford, California, 13-17 Dec 2004, pp 205, ed. Pisin Chen et al.* Proceedings at: <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/econf/C041213/> [arXiv:astro-ph/0503200].
- [31] F. S. N. Lobo, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **23** (2006) 1525; F. S. N. Lobo and A. V. B. Arellano, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24** (2007) 1069.
- [32] R. Chan, M. F. A. da Silva and J. F. Villas da Rocha, arXiv:0803.3064 [gr-qc].
- [33] J. W. Murphy and A. Burrows, *Astrophys. J.* **688** (2008) 1159.