

Toward a quantum field theoretical description of oscillation effects

Maxim Libanov^{a,b}

^a *Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
60th October Anniversary Prospect, 7a, 117312 Moscow, Russia*

^b *Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology,
Institutskii per., 9, 141700, Dolgoprudny, Moscow Region, Russia
ml@ms2.inr.ac.ru*

Abstract

In this paper, we propose an approach based on the theory of an axiomatic S matrix and partially switching on an interaction, which is extremely suitable for describing the phenomenon of oscillations within the framework of quantum field theory. We discuss the relation of the proposed approach with other approaches based on considering of wave packets as asymptotic states or introducing of “distance- or time-dependent propagators”.

1 Introduction

One of the most interesting effects of particle physics is the phenomenon of oscillations. This effect appears and is observed in the physics of neutrinos [1, 2], K and B mesons [3, 4], and should also manifest itself in the transitions of photons into hypothetical axion-like particles [5]. The key point for the appearance of oscillations is the presence in the model of several freely propagating degrees of freedom, which are the eigenstates of a free Hamiltonian with different masses m_i . Such states form a mass basis $|\phi_i\rangle$. However, due to the fact that the interaction Hamiltonian is non-diagonal in such a basis, such states cannot be produced or registered perse. Only their linear combinations, the so-called flavor states,

$$|\phi_\alpha\rangle = U_{\alpha i}^* |\phi_i\rangle, \quad |\phi_i\rangle = U_{\alpha i} |\phi_\alpha\rangle, \quad (1)$$

are produced or registered. These states obviously no longer have a certain mass and, as a result, if the produced state ϕ_α has, for instance, a defined energy, then its momentum is undefined.

On the other hand, the freely evolving state $|\phi_i\rangle$ at the initial moment with a defined energy E_i and defined momentum $|\mathbf{p}_i| = \sqrt{E_i^2 - m_i^2}$ at time T at a distance L from the source has the form¹

$$|\phi_j(T, L)\rangle = e^{-i(E_j T - |\mathbf{p}_j| L)} |\phi_j(0)\rangle \simeq e^{-i \frac{m_j^2}{2E} L} |\phi_j(0)\rangle$$

¹Here and in what follows we implicitly mean the case of neutrino oscillations. However, our discussion and main results easily extend to other cases of oscillations. In particular, if the mass states are unstable, like the kaons, this can be taken into account by the replacing in the corresponding equations (e.g., in (4)) $m_i^2 \rightarrow m_i^2 - im_i \Gamma_i$ where Γ_i is the decay width.

where the latter approximate equality holds for the ultrarelativistic case $E \gg m_i$, which is of interest in most cases. Accordingly, one has

$$|\phi_j(T, L)\rangle = \sum_j U_{\alpha j}^* e^{-i(E_j T - |\mathbf{p}_j| L)} |\phi_j(0)\rangle.$$

The amplitude of the transition of the flavor state α to the state β is given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\alpha \rightarrow \beta} &= \langle \phi_\beta | \phi_\alpha(T, L) \rangle = \sum_{i,j} U_{\beta i} \langle \phi_i | e^{-i(E_j T - |\mathbf{p}_j| L)} | \phi_j \rangle U_{\alpha j}^* = \\ &= \sum_j U_{\beta j} e^{-i(E_j T - |\mathbf{p}_j| L)} U_{\alpha j}^* \simeq \sum_j U_{\beta j} e^{-i \frac{m_j^2}{2E} L} U_{\alpha j}^* \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

what leads to well-known results for the probability of oscillatory transitions.

In the literature this approach is often called a *plane-wave approximation* and in fact exploits the apparatus of quantum mechanics rather than quantum field theory (QFT). However, despite its simplicity, this approach suffers from inconsistencies and leads to a number of paradoxes (see, for example, the criticism in [6]). In particular, in the literal application of this approach, energy and/or momentum are not conserved. Indeed, if the state $|\phi_\alpha\rangle$ is produced as a result of the interaction of other particles with defined energies and momenta, then its energy and momentum will be defined (we assume that in each local act of interaction, energy and momentum are conserved). Which, by virtue of (1), means the definiteness of the energy E and momentum $|\mathbf{p}|$ for all ϕ_i , but this contradicts the condition of the mass shell $E^2 - \mathbf{p}^2 = m_i^2$ with different masses m_i .

From a physical point of view, it is clear that in a consistent description of the oscillation effect, it is necessary to take into account that the energy and momentum of state ϕ_i cannot lie on a mass shell. Indeed, such "states" never appear as a free states, but are always produced and detected as linear combination (1), which means that they propagate between the acts of production and detection as virtual particles whose momentum is off shell. Therefore, a consistent description of the oscillations requires a QFT formalism.

The standard approach to describing processes in QFT framework is based on the introduction of the operator of the S -matrix and is presented in almost any textbook on QFT (see, for example, §20 of [7]). Its essence lies in the construction of the operator $S(t, t_0)$ by solving the operator equation

$$i \frac{\partial S(t, t_0)}{\partial t} = H_{\text{int}} \cdot S(t, t_0), \quad S(t_0, t_0) = 1, \quad (3)$$

which is a consequence of the Schrodinger equation written in the *interaction or Dirac representation*. The operator of the S -matrix is obtained by taking the limit

$$S = \lim_{t, t_0 \rightarrow \pm\infty} S(t, t_0).$$

The amplitude of the transition between states describing free particles, which correspond to plane waves for particles with defined energy and momentum, in the case of oscillations of interest to us has the form

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\alpha \rightarrow \beta} &= \langle \text{free particles}, \beta | S | \text{free particles}, \alpha \rangle \sim \\ &\sum_j U_{\alpha j}^* U_{\beta j} \int d^4 x d^4 y D_j(y - x) e^{-i p x + i q y} \sim \delta^4(p - q) \sum_j U_{\alpha j}^* U_{\beta j} \frac{i}{p^2 - m_j^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $D_j(x)$ is the Feynman propagator for a particle with a defined mass m_j , and p and q are the total incoming and outgoing 4-momenta correspondingly. In what follows, for simplicity sake, we skip all unimportant factors and consider the scalar propagator. The main ideas and results of this paper will not depend on this, and generalizations to the case of higher spin particles and recover skipped factors are quite trivial.

Despite the fact that $A_{\alpha \rightarrow \beta}$ in general does not vanish at $\alpha \neq \beta$, it does not describe the oscillations, that is, it does not lead to (2). The reason for this lies, of course, in the plane-wave approximation for initial and final particles (note the appearance of the exponent in the integral) and integration over the entire space-time volume. Therefore, to describe the oscillations, it is not enough to take into account the virtuality of particles and the standard S -matrix approach. It is also necessary to somehow limit the domain of the integration in (4), that is, take into account that the acts of interaction do not take place in the entire space-time, but are separated.

It seems that the most natural and consistent approach is to use wave packets [8, 9] (see also the review [6] and the references therein), which is allowed by the standard S -matrix approach. The essence of this approach is to abandon the plane-wave approximation for initial and final particles, and use a compact wave packet for each real particle involved in the reaction. Then the domain(s) of the integration in (4) is automatically limited to the overlap of the wave packets.

Although this approach seems to be natural and reflects the physical situation, in our opinion it suffers from the following two disadvantages. Firstly, the use of wave packets for each particle involved in the reaction leads to cumbersome formulas. Secondly, and more importantly, we do not have reliable considerations of which wave packet should be used. In fact, in the consequential approach, the wave packet in the initial state must be "prepared" and determined by the experimental conditions. However, usually such "preparation" is not carried out in experiments on the study of oscillations. Therefore, in the theoretical description based on wave packets, the Gaussian wave packet [8, 9] and its relativistic generalization [6, 10] are usually used. Although such a choice seems reasonable (recall that in a Gaussian package, the product of the uncertainty of momentum and coordinate is minimal), it is not completely unambiguous. For example, one can imagine an experiment to study neutrino oscillations formed as a result of the decay of a muon in a muonic atom or in a muonium. It is doubtful that modern experiments make it possible to distinguish such a process from the decay of a free muon described by a Gaussian packet. Therefore, taking into account the complexity of calculations, this approach seems to us, although consistent, but oftentimes redundant.

Thus, it seems desirable to develop a formalism for describing the oscillations that combines the simplicity of the plane-wave approximation and the rigor of the QFT formalism. Such an attempt was made in a series of works [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. The authors, rightly noting the need to limit the domain of the integration in (4) and thereby take into account the space-time picture of the processes, proposed[11] replacing the integral in (4)

$$\int d^4x d^4y D_i(y-x) e^{-ipx+iqy} \rightarrow \int d^4x d^4y D_i(y-x) \delta^3(\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x}) - |\mathbf{p}|L) e^{-ipx+iqy}$$

or (equivalently) replacing the usual Feynman propagator in the momentum representation with a "distance-dependent" propagator

$$\frac{i}{p^2 - m_i^2} \rightarrow D_i(p, L) = \int d^4z e^{ipz} D_i(z) \delta^3(\mathbf{p}\mathbf{z} - |\mathbf{p}|L). \quad (5)$$

In other versions [12] of this approach, it was proposed to replace with the “time-dependent” propagator

$$\frac{i}{p^2 - m_i^2} \rightarrow D_i(p, T) = \int d^4z e^{ipz} D_i(z) \delta(z_0 - T). \quad (6)$$

Of course, such substitutions look unreasonable at first glance and are at odds with the standard S -matrix formalism. But the authors appeal to Feynman [17], who developed the diagrammatic technique regardless of the S -matrix.

The aim of the present paper is to develop a formalism that allows one to describe the effect of oscillations within the S -matrix framework. In addition, we will find out what the substitutions (5) and (6) correspond to and give them meaning.

2 Axiomatic S -matrix

There is a widespread opinion in the literature that the S -matrix approach in QFT is not suitable for describing the oscillation effect. It’s really so, if we keep in mind the standard approach based on eq. (3). Indeed, the equation (3) does not contain an explicit dependence on spatial coordinates and, as a result, the spatial pattern of interaction in the S -matrix constructed in this way is lost. In addition, to obtain a relativistic S -matrix, it is necessary to take a limit $t, t_0 \rightarrow \pm\infty$ at the end of calculations. As a result, all dependence on the space-time coordinates in the S -matrix constructed in this way disappears. On the other hand, a nontrivial space-time picture is required to describe the oscillations. Therefore, in fact, the only way to get this picture back is to take it into account in the in- and out-states. At the same time, since the plane-wave approach does not cope with this (due to the fact that the plane wave is defined uniformly throughout space-time), the only way out is to use wave packets.

However, fortunately, there is another approach to the construction of the S -matrix, known as axiomatic, without reference to the Schroedinger equation. This approach was proposed by Stueckelberg et al and formulated and developed by Bogolyubov at the dawn of QFT (see §20, §21 of textbook [7] and references therein). It is based on the physical conditions explicitly formulated for the S matrix: causality, unitarity, relativistic covariance and the correspondence principle.

In order to give these conditions a mathematical form, it is necessary (as in the standard approach) to resort to the operation of “switching on” and switching off” of the interaction and replace the interaction Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow f(x)\mathcal{L}$ where $0 \leq f(x) \leq 1$ is a function with a compact support. It is assumed that at asymptotically large space-time distances (at infinity) $f(x)$ tends to zero and, as a result, the S -matrix becomes the unit one and the states correspond to the free particles, that is, can be described by the plane waves if their energies and momenta are defined. However, in the domain(s) where $f(x)$ is nonzero S -matrix is a functional of f : $S \rightarrow S[f(x)]$. The transition amplitudes becomes functionals as well and can be found by the following equation

$$A \rightarrow A[f] = \langle \text{free particles} | S[f] | \text{free particles} \rangle.$$

The functional $S[f]$ can be constructed by making use the explicit equations that correspond to the physical conditions mentioned above. The result is (up to the set of quasilocal

operators which are not relevant to this discussion)

$$S[f] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{i^n}{n!} \int T \left(\prod_{k=1}^n f(x_k) \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(x_k) dx_k \right) = T \exp \left(i \int d^4x f(x) \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(x) \right). \quad (7)$$

The standard S -matrix is restored by means of a transition to the limit in which the region within which $f = 1$ is (adiabatically) extended to entire space-time, that is

$$S = S[1] = \lim_{f(x) \rightarrow 1} S[f(x)]. \quad (8)$$

The key point to the following is that the generalized $S[f]$ -matrix is nothing worse than $S[1]$. By the construction, it satisfies all required physical conditions. Thus, in general, there is no need to take the limit (8). On the contrary, one can use $f(x)$ to simulate a physical situation in the problem at hands, in particular, to localize interactions.

Let's get back to the discussion of the oscillation phenomena.

3 Oscillations and the axiomatic S -matrix approach

Let's choose the support of $f(x)$ in the source and the detector domains and take into account that the distance between the source and the detector $|\mathbf{L}|$ is much large than the source and detector sizes. Then we write $f(x) = g_s(x) + g_d(x - L)$, where hereafter $L^\mu = (T, \mathbf{L})$ is a 4-vector, and the functions $g_{s,d}$ are nonzero in a small enough domain in a vicinity of the origin. In this way, the integral contributing to the second order amplitude (4) is replaced

$$\int dx dy D_j(y - x) e^{-ipx + iquy} \rightarrow I_j = \int dx dy \cdot g_d(y - L) g_s(x) D_j(y - x) e^{-ipx + iquy}. \quad (9)$$

By making use of the change of variables $x = u - z/2$, $y = u + z/2$ one rewrites the integral in (9) as follows

$$I_j = \int du dz \cdot g_d \left(u + \frac{z}{2} - L \right) g_s \left(u - \frac{z}{2} \right) D_j(z) e^{-iu(p-q) + i\frac{z}{2}(p+q)}. \quad (10)$$

Now let's look at some special cases of choosing the source and detector functions $g_{s,d}$.

3.1 Eternal localized source and detector

Let's consider well localized static source and detector. This choice is suitable, for example, in the case of the oscillations of the reactor neutrinos. If overall sizes of the source and detector much smaller than $|\mathbf{L}|$ then one can choose $g_s(x) \sim g_d(x) \sim \delta^3(\mathbf{x})$, and the integral (10) becomes

$$I_j^{(1)} \sim 2\pi \delta(p_0 - q_0) \tilde{D}_j(q, \mathbf{L}), \quad (11)$$

where

$$\tilde{D}_j(q, \mathbf{L}) = \int dz_0 e^{iq_0 z_0 - i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{L}} D_j(z_0, \mathbf{L}). \quad (12)$$

Note that, in general, the momentum is not conserved $\mathbf{p} \neq \mathbf{q}$ what can be expected since $g_{s,d}$ depend on the coordinates.

The integral (12) can be easily calculated. To this end, one substitutes the momentum representation for the scalar propagator

$$D_j(z) = \frac{i}{(2\pi)^4} \int d^4k \frac{e^{-ikz}}{k^2 - m_j^2 + i\varepsilon}$$

into (12) and performs the integration firstly over z_0 , what gives $\delta(q_0 - k_0)$, then over k_0 and finally over \mathbf{k} . As a result one gets

$$\tilde{D}(q, \mathbf{L}) = -\frac{i}{4\pi|\mathbf{L}|} e^{-i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{L} + iM_j|\mathbf{L}|}, \quad (13)$$

where

$$M_j = \sqrt{q_0^2 - m_j^2} + i\varepsilon.$$

The equation (13) leads to all known expressions for the probability of oscillatory transitions. Indeed, in this case the amplitude (4) of the transitions takes the form

$$A_{\alpha \rightarrow \beta} \sim \frac{\delta(p_0 - q_0)}{|\mathbf{L}|} \sum_j U_{\alpha j}^* U_{\beta j} e^{-i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{L} + iM_j|\mathbf{L}|},$$

and, so, the probability becomes

$$P_{\alpha \rightarrow \beta} \sim |A_{\alpha \rightarrow \beta}|^2 \sim \frac{1}{\mathbf{L}^2} \sum_{j,k} U_{\alpha j}^* U_{\beta j} U_{\alpha k} U_{\beta k}^* e^{i(M_j - M_k)|\mathbf{L}|}. \quad (14)$$

The oscillations appear from the exponent in (14)

$$\Delta M_{jk} = \sqrt{q_0^2 - m_j^2} - \sqrt{q_0^2 - m_k^2}. \quad (15)$$

Let's consider several different limits of (15).

- Ultrarelativistic case: $q_0 \gg m_j, m_k$. In that case, which is the case, say, for the oscillations of neutrinos, one finds from (15)

$$\Delta M_{jk} \simeq -\frac{\Delta m_{jk}^2}{2q_0}, \quad (16)$$

what leads to the well known result.

- Small mass differences $\Delta m_{jk} = m_j - m_k \ll m_{j,k}$. In the relativistic limit $q_0 \gg m_j, m_k$ one again gets the equation (16). So let's consider nonrelativistic case: $M = \sqrt{q_0^2 - m^2} < m$, but still $M \gg \Delta m_{jk}$. One has

$$\Delta M_{jk} \simeq -\frac{m_k \Delta m_{jk}}{M_k}.$$

Note that since \mathbf{L} is macroscopic, the particle is almost on a mass shell, and M is (almost) coincides with the absolute value of the 3-momenta. Thus, in the non-relativistic limit $|\mathbf{L}| \simeq M_k/m_k \cdot T$, and for the phase in (14) one finds

$$\Delta M_{kj} \cdot |\mathbf{L}| \simeq \Delta m_{jk} \cdot T.$$

This is well known result for the kaon oscillation.

- Large mass difference $m_j \gg m_k$ and $\Delta m_{jk} \simeq m_j$. The equation (16) is still in force with the replacement $\Delta m_{jk} \rightarrow m_j$. Thus, for the case of the oscillations of the charged leptons, e.g., for $e \leftrightarrow \mu$, one finds for the ultrarelativistic case

$$q_0 \sim m_\mu^2 |\mathbf{L}| \sim 10^9 \cdot \text{TeV} \cdot \left(\frac{|\mathbf{L}|}{\text{cm}} \right).$$

In the non-relativistic case the phase in (14) becomes

$$\Delta M_{jk} |\mathbf{L}| \simeq -m_j |\mathbf{L}|,$$

and, hence,

$$|\mathbf{L}| \sim \frac{1}{m_\mu} \sim 10^{-13} \cdot \text{cm}.$$

In both cases, the corresponding values are far beyond the experimental abilities. Therefore, oscillations of charged leptons are not observed².

Let's now reproduce the prescription of the paper [11]. To this end one integrates (12) over \mathbf{L} along plane which lies at the distance L_0 in the direction \mathbf{q} from the source,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int d^3 L \delta(\mathbf{L}\mathbf{q} - L_0|\mathbf{q}|) \tilde{D}(q, \mathbf{L}) = \int d^3 z \delta(\mathbf{z}\mathbf{q} - L_0|\mathbf{q}|) \tilde{D}(q, \mathbf{z}) \\ & = \int d^3 z \delta(\mathbf{z}\mathbf{q} - L_0|\mathbf{q}|) \int dz_0 e^{iq_0 z_0 - i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{z}} D(z_0, \mathbf{z}) = \int d^4 z \delta(\mathbf{z}\mathbf{q} - L_0|\mathbf{q}|) e^{iqz} D(z). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The r.h.s. is the “distance-dependent” propagator introduced in (5). Thus, we see that the prescription (5) corresponds to the case of the point-like source and the “plane-like” detector located at the distance L_0 in the direction \mathbf{q} from the source. Note, however, that although (17) coincides with the “distance-dependent” propagator, the integral (11), which contributes to the transition amplitudes, does not. The difference is that in the paper [11] the amplitude is proportional to $\delta^4(p - q)$, i.e. the 4-momentum is conserved, while in the present approach the only energy is conserved. It is clear that this is due to the fact that the position of the source (detector) is rigidly fixed in space: the source (detector) turns on at the point $\mathbf{r} = 0$ ($\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{L}$), which violates the invariance with respect to space translations, and part of the 3-momentum goes into an external system that holds the source (detector) at this point. To get around this and restore the law of conservation of 3-momentum, one needs to “release” the source (detector) and let it move freely. However, since we do not want to investigate the full dynamics of the source, we can proceed as follows. One puts the source (detector) at the point \mathbf{r} ($\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{L}$), then the integral (11) becomes a function of \mathbf{r} ,

$$I_j^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}) = e^{i\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{q})} I_j^{(1)}(0).$$

Integrating this expression over all positions \mathbf{r} , i.e. actually summing up contributions from various sources (detectors) located at various points numbered by a vector \mathbf{r} , we arrive to $\delta^3(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q})$. Therefore, we see that the prescription [11] corresponds not only point-like source and plane-like detector, but also requires summation of the amplitudes over all source positions.

²For a more detailed discussion of why charged leptons do not oscillate, see, for example, [19].

3.2 Distributed eternal source and detector

Above we have taken the source and detector functions to be proportional to $\delta(\mathbf{x})$. One may object that in this case the S -matrix (7) may be bad defined. Apart from, we seen that the 3-momentum is not conserved (see eq. (11)). To clarify these issues let's consider distributed source and detector functions. For simplicity we take the following functions

$$g_s(\mathbf{x}) = g_d(\mathbf{x}) = e^{-\mathbf{x}^2 a^2}. \quad (18)$$

We note that the case of completely "switching on" interaction corresponds to the limit $a \rightarrow 0$ while the considered above case of δ -like source and detector is reproduced in the limit

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\mathbf{x}^2 a^2} \rightarrow \left(\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{a} \right)^3 \delta(\mathbf{x}). \quad (19)$$

Substituting (18) into r.h.s. of eq. (10), using α -representation for the propagator

$$\frac{i}{k^2 - m^2 + i\varepsilon} = \int_0^\infty d\alpha e^{i\alpha(k^2 - m^2 + i\varepsilon)},$$

integrating over u_0, z_0 and k_0 we obtain the following integral

$$\frac{\delta(p_0 - q_0)}{(2\pi)^2} \int_0^\infty d\alpha \int d^3k d^3z d^3u \exp \left(-a^2 \left(\mathbf{u} + \frac{\mathbf{z}}{2} - \mathbf{L} \right)^2 - a^2 \left(\mathbf{u} - \frac{\mathbf{z}}{2} \right)^2 + i(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q})\mathbf{u} - i(\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q} - 2\mathbf{k})\frac{\mathbf{z}}{2} + i\alpha(M^2 - \mathbf{k}^2) \right).$$

Then one uses the Gaussian integral and performs the integration over $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k}$. Finally, by making change of the variable $2a^2\alpha \rightarrow \alpha$ one arrives to

$$(2\pi)\delta(p_0 - q_0) \left(\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{2}a} \right)^3 \exp \left(-\frac{(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q})^2}{8a^2} + \frac{i\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q})}{2} \right) \times \int_0^\infty \frac{d\alpha}{(1 + i\alpha)^{3/2}} \frac{1}{2a^2} \exp \left[\frac{1}{2a^2} \left(\frac{Q^2}{1 + i\alpha} + (1 + i\alpha)M^2 - Q^2 - M^2 - a^4\mathbf{L}^2 \right) \right], \quad (20)$$

where

$$\mathbf{Q} = \frac{\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}}{2} + ia^2\mathbf{L}, \quad Q^2 = \mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{Q}, \quad Q = \sqrt{Q^2}, \quad M = \sqrt{q_0^2 - m^2} + i\varepsilon.$$

The integral in the second line of (20) can be calculated. The result is

$$J = \frac{1}{2aQ} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} e^{-\frac{a^4\mathbf{L}^2 + (M+Q)^2}{2a^2}} \left(e^{\frac{2MQ}{a^2}} \left[1 + \text{Erf} \left(i \frac{M - Q}{\sqrt{2}a} \right) \right] - \left[1 + \text{Erf} \left(i \frac{M + Q}{\sqrt{2}a} \right) \right] \right). \quad (21)$$

It worth to stress that in real situations a is an inverse size of the source (detector) and, so, is always macroscopic, say, $a \leq (0.1\text{m})^{-1} \sim 10^{-7}\text{eV}$, while the typical momenta are large enough $|\mathbf{q}|, |\mathbf{p}| > 1\text{eV} \gg a$. Thus, the first line in eq. (20) can be always replaced by $\delta^4(p - q)$. In what follows we will drop this factor taking into account that $|\mathbf{p}| = |\mathbf{q}|$ up to order of a . Let's consider the following two limits.

- **Switching on interaction.** $a \rightarrow 0$. In this limit one finds from (21)

$$J = \frac{i}{q^2 - m^2 + i\varepsilon} + \mathcal{O}(a^2),$$

that is, ordinary propagator, as it should be.

- **δ -like source and detector.** $a \rightarrow \infty$. In this formal limit the momentum is not conserved: the first term in the exponent of the first line of eq. (20) vanishes at any finite momenta. Hence, we do not assume that $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}$. Then, the behaviour of J in this limit is

$$J = -i\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{e^{i(|\mathbf{L}|M - \mathbf{L} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{q}}{2})}}{a^3 |\mathbf{L}|} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{a^4}\right). \quad (22)$$

To restore from this equation the obtained result (13) one note the difference between δ -like source (detector) which have been used in above and distributed source (detector) (18) by the factor $a^3/\pi^{3/2}$ (see eq. (19)). Taking this factor into account, and substituting (22) in (20) one comes to eq. (11) with $\tilde{D}(q, \mathbf{L})$ given by eq. (13).

3.3 Instant unlocalized source and detector

Let's consider the opposite case: the source and detector are unlocalized in space, but localized in time. If the time interval, during which the source and detector operate, is small enough compared to T , then the approximation $g_s(x) \sim g_d(x) \sim \delta(t)$ can be used, and the integral (10) becomes

$$I_j^{(2)} \sim (2\pi)^3 \delta^3(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}) \hat{D}_j(q, T),$$

where

$$\hat{D}_j(q, T) = \int d^3z e^{iq_0 T - i\mathbf{qz}} D_j(T, \mathbf{z}) = \int dz e^{iqz} D_j(z) \delta(z_0 - T) = \frac{e^{iT(q_0 - \sqrt{\mathbf{q}^2 + m_i^2})}}{2\sqrt{\mathbf{q}^2 + m_i^2}}. \quad (23)$$

This is nothing but a “time-dependent” propagator (6) from paper [12]. Thus, we see that the prescription (6) corresponds to the case of the instantaneous switching on/off source and detector unlocalized in the space. In addition, to restore the conservation law of the 4-momentum, it is necessary to perform integration of the amplitudes over all moments of switching on the source (detector) in the same way as it was done in the section 3.1.

3.4 Other cases of choosing the source and detector functions

For completeness, let's list a few more different cases of choosing the source and detector functions:

- $g_s \sim \delta^4(x)$, $g_d \sim \delta^3(\mathbf{x})$

$$I_j^{(3)} \sim \tilde{D}_j(q, \mathbf{L}), \quad I_j^{(1)} = 2\pi \delta(p_0 - q_0) I_j^{(3)}$$

- $g_s \sim \delta^3(\mathbf{x})$, $g_d \sim \delta^4(x)$

$$I_j^{(4)} \sim e^{iT(p_0 - q_0)} \tilde{D}_j((p_0, \mathbf{q}), \mathbf{L}), \quad I_j^{(1)} = \int dT I_j^{(4)}$$

- $g_s \sim \delta^4(x)$, $g_d \sim \delta^4(x)$

$$I_j^{(5)} \sim e^{iqL} D_j(L), \quad I_j^{(1)} = 2\pi\delta(p_0 - q_0) \int dT I_j^{(5)} \quad (24)$$

In all considered cases the corresponding integrals $I_j^{(1)}, \dots, I_j^{(5)}$ lead to an oscillating pattern for the probability of the flavor transitions. However, the oscillating exponent may be different. In particular, in the case (24) the phase, which gives rise the oscillations, is

$$\Delta m_{jk} \cdot \sqrt{T^2 - \mathbf{L}^2} = \Delta m_{jk} L.$$

Herewith the oscillations will appear if $\max(m_j, m_k) \cdot L \sim 1$, that is, if the detector is deep enough in the lightcone of the source.

Also note that not every choice of a localized source and detector leads to the oscillation. The source and detector must be well separated in space, or in time, or both in space and time. For example, if the source localized in time $g_s \sim \delta(t)$, but the detector is localized in space $g_d \sim \delta^3(\mathbf{x})$, the integral (10) takes the form

$$I_j = \frac{i}{q_0^2 - \mathbf{p}^2 - m_j^2} e^{i\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{q})},$$

and no oscillations will appear.

Yet, in our opinion the choice of a time-localized detector is not physically interesting. In fact, this choice just means that the detector does not operate almost all the time, except for a short period around of T , and no one can observe anything. In this respect the “time-dependent” propagator (6), (23) corresponds to not very interesting physical situation.

4 Discussion and Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed an approach to describing the oscillation phenomenon based on the axiomatic construction of the S -matrix. The axiomatic S -matrix, being a functional of the extent of switching on the interaction, by construction satisfies such important physical principles as causality, unitarity and relativistic covariance. Therefore, it allows us to consistently describe the processes of particles transitions with partially localized interaction, using free particles with a certain momentum, i.e. plane waves, as asymptotic states. On the other hand, to describe oscillations within the framework of quantum field theory, a non-trivial space-time picture with well-separated interaction domains is required. So, the axiomatic $S[f]$ -matrix is extremely suitable for describing the oscillation effect. Another way to obtain such a picture is to use localized wave packets for asymptotic states. However, the latter approach, although consistent, requires rather cumbersome calculations, and also has the disadvantage of ambiguity in choosing the package shape. Although there is a similar drawback in the proposed approach: the choice of the function of switching on the interaction $f(x)$ is ambiguous, but it is simpler computationally. Therefore, in our opinion, both wave packets and the switching on the interaction should be considered rather as some regularization procedures, on the details of which the observed physical effects of oscillations should not depend, at least until the choice of a specific wave packet is unambiguously fixed by the experimental conditions.

It is worth noting that, as noted in [7], the function $f(x)$ can be introduced in a more “physical” way, without violating the requirements for the S -matrix formulated above. For example, it can be considered as a given external classical field or as a given external particle flux: a similar approach was used, e.g., in [18] without referring to the axiomatic S -matrix. In particular, the profile of a wave packet or a product of wave packets can be taken as the function $f(x)$. Then, at least formally, the approach proposed here will reproduce the results obtained within the framework of the usual S -matrix approach with the using wave packets. Despite this remark, it is nevertheless interesting to study within the framework of the proposed approach other effects related to oscillations, for example, decoherence. We postpone these questions for further research.

Finally, we have clarified the meaning of the prescriptions proposed in [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16], and found that they correspond to not very interesting physical situations.

Acknowledgments

At the end of 2017, Valery Rubakov, being the editor of the IJMPA, asked me to look at article [11], which already had several negative reviews from scientists who, apparently, deal more with the phenomenological aspects of the oscillation phenomenon. At least, that’s what the author of [11] claimed and asked Valery to send the paper to a referee who was more able to evaluate the theoretical aspects of his proposed approach. I looked at the paper and realized that I had no arguments why it should be rejected: within the framework of fairly clearly formulated assumptions, first of all prescriptions (5), the work was done flawlessly. So, I gave a recommendation to publish the article “as it is”, and leave the controversial prescription (5) to the scientific community. In addition, I myself became interested in what prescription (5) corresponds to in the framework of the usual S -matrix approach. The result of this research is the present article. Thus, I am grateful to Valery for bringing this issue to my attention, as well as for numerous and fruitful discussions. I am also grateful to I. Volobuev, V. Egorov, D. Naumov and V. Naumov for useful discussions and remarks. I thank S. Demidov, A. Kataev and S. Troitsky for their interest in the work.

References

- [1] B. Pontecorvo, Sov. Phys. JETP **6**, 429 (1957)
- [2] V. N. Gribov and B. Pontecorvo, Phys. Lett. B **28**, 493 (1969) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(69)90525-5
- [3] A. Pais and O. Piccioni, Phys. Rev. **100**, 1487-1489 (1955) doi:10.1103/PhysRev.100.1487
- [4] L. B. Okun, B. M. Pontecorvo and V. I. Zakharov, Lett. Nuovo Cim. **13**, 218 (1975) doi:10.1007/BF02742679
- [5] G. Raffelt and L. Stodolsky, Phys. Rev. D **37**, 1237 (1988) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.37.1237
- [6] D. V. Naumov and V. A. Naumov, Phys. Part. Nucl. **51**, no.1, 1-106 (2020) doi:10.1134/S1063779620010050

- [7] N. N. Bogoliubov and D. V. Shirkov, "Introduction to the theory of quantized fields", 3d edition, John Wiley & Sons, New York Chichester Brisbane Toronto, (1980)
- [8] B. Kayser and S. P. Rosen, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 669 (1981) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.23.669
- [9] C. Giunti, C. W. Kim, J. A. Lee and U. W. Lee, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 4310-4317 (1993) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.48.4310 [arXiv:hep-ph/9305276 [hep-ph]].
- [10] D. V. Naumov and V. A. Naumov, J. Phys. G **37**, 105014 (2010) doi:10.1088/0954-3899/37/10/105014 [arXiv:1008.0306 [hep-ph]].
- [11] I. P. Volobuev, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **33**, no.13, 1850075 (2018) doi:10.1142/S0217751X18500756 [arXiv:1703.08070 [hep-ph]].
- [12] V. O. Egorov and I. P. Volobuev, Phys. Rev. D **97**, no.9, 093002 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.093002 [arXiv:1709.09915 [hep-ph]].
- [13] I. P. Volobuev and V. O. Egorov, J. Exp. Theor. Phys. **128**, no.5, 713-719 (2019) doi:10.1134/S106377611905008X [arXiv:1712.04335 [hep-ph]].
- [14] V. O. Egorov and I. P. Volobuev, Phys. Rev. D **100**, no.3, 033004 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.033004 [arXiv:1902.03602 [hep-ph]].
- [15] I. P. Volobuev and V. O. Egorov, Teor. Mat. Fiz. **199**, no.1, 104-122 (2019) doi:10.1134/S0040577919040068
- [16] V. Egorov and I. Volobuev, J. Exp. Theor. Phys. **135**, no.2, 197-208 (2022) doi:10.1134/S1063776122080118 [arXiv:2107.11570 [hep-ph]].
- [17] R. P. Feynman, Phys. Rev. **76**, 769-789 (1949) doi:10.1103/PhysRev.76.769
- [18] I. Y. Kobzarev, B. V. Martemyanov, L. B. Okun and M. G. Shchepkin, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **32**, 823 (1980) ITEP-90-1980.
- [19] E. K. Akhmedov, JHEP **09**, 116 (2007) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/09/116 [arXiv:0706.1216 [hep-ph]].