

Comment on ‘‘Covariant quantum field theory of tachyons’’

Krzysztof Jodłowski*

Particle Theory and Cosmology Group, Center for Theoretical Physics of the Universe, Institute for Basic Science (IBS), Daejeon, 34126, Korea

Recently, Paczos *et al.* [1] proposed a covariant quantum field theory for free and interacting tachyon fields. We show that the proposed Feynman propagator is *not* Lorentz invariant, proper asymptotic (in/out) tachyon states do *not* exist, and the proposed S-matrix describing interactions of tachyons and subluminal matter is ill-defined. Since tachyons behave as bosons, interacting tachyons may also self-interact, *e.g.*, any interaction with ordinary matter generates such terms. As a result, the physical vacuum, instead of being at the origin of the potential, may correspond to the proper minimum of the tachyon potential, or such state does not exist at all. Our analysis indicates that *quantum* tachyon field does *not* describe a *physical* on-shell particle with negative mass squared.

I. INTRODUCTION

Many works have investigated tachyons, superluminal particles characterized by a negative mass squared parameter, due to their peculiar behavior, *e.g.*, causality paradoxes or nondeterministic behavior. In fact, tachyons are usually regarded as unwelcome artifacts, which signal inconsistency or at least instability of the theory. Recently, however, tachyons have been studied as a major part of the program to derive the fundamental postulates of quantum mechanics (QM) by invoking the Galileo’s principle of relativity, provided that the superluminal reference frames are also allowed [2]. While such inertial observers are usually dismissed as unphysical, Ref. [2] has shown that they can not only be mathematically viable, but also lead to nondeterministic physics akin to QM, as they require a wave-like description of Nature using complex numbers. Moreover, Ref. [3] has shown that the proper formulation of superluminal reference frames must invoke field theory. In fact, both classical [3] and quantum [1] field theory (QFT) of tachyons have been developed. Since QFT is the most fundamental description of physical interactions, the *ultimate* test of such a program is construction of a consistent QFT of tachyons. If our results are correct, they indicate that such a program cannot succeed.

The goal of this paper is to closely examine the expressions describing QFT of tachyons given in the ‘‘Interacting theory’’ section of [1]. We aim to answer the following questions: i) Is the proposed formalism consistent with the robust standard QFT framework [4, 5, 7]?¹ ii) Is the reaction rate for the process of tachyon emission/absorption shown in Fig. 1 of Ref. [1] well-defined?, and iii) Since tachyons satisfy the Bose statistics² which principle forbids its self-interactions, represented by cubic, quartic, etc. terms in its potential? Due to quantum

fluctuations, such terms could modify the vacuum structure, *i.e.*, what protects the origin of the tachyon potential, corresponding to negative mass squared excitations, as the proper vacuum? These questions are particularly relevant, since it has been suggested in [1, 6] that tachyonic fields might shed light on the electroweak symmetry breaking (the Higgs mechanism). We show this cannot be the case since the proposed QFT of interacting tachyons violates principle of locality of interactions in an incurable way - asymptotic states of interacting tachyons do not exist. Therefore, negative mass squared particles likely do not exist, because the *QM description* of their interactions does not make sense.

II. TACHYON INTERACTIONS

We closely examine the expressions describing QFT of tachyons given in the ‘‘Interacting theory’’ section of [1], and, whenever relevant, we compare them to the formulas describing subluminal particles [4, 5, 7]. In the following, we will use the elementary fact that the sign of the energy, $\text{sgn}(x^0) = \theta(x^0) - \theta(-x^0)$, where θ is the Heaviside function, is not Lorentz invariant (LI) for spacelike four-vector x . In particular, the time-ordering operator is frame dependent, therefore so is the Feynman propagator (FP) defined as the two-point time-ordered correlation function (TOCF).

A. Feynman propagator

The following equation was given (Eq. 22) in [1] for the FP of a tachyon:

$$\int_{|\vec{k}|>m} \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{i e^{-ik(x-y)}}{k^2 + m^2 + i\epsilon} = \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \theta(|\vec{k}|-m) \frac{i e^{-ik(x-y)}}{k^2 + m^2 + i\epsilon}, \quad (1)$$

and it was stated that it is Lorentz invariant (LI). It is clear that it is true if and only if the condition $|\vec{k}| > m$ is LI. Indeed, it is the case for an *on-shell* tachyon moving with velocity \vec{v} , since we can use Eqs. 1 and 22 from [3] to obtain the magnitude of the momentum \vec{k}' after applying

* k.jodlowski@ibs.re.kr

¹ Which is based on only a few assumptions: relativistic covariance of fields, locality of interactions, and Lorentz invariance, unitarity and cluster decomposition property of the S matrix.

² A scalar field is the only finite irreducible unitary representation of the Poincare group for $m^2 < 0$.

a subluminal boost with velocity \vec{u} :

$$|\vec{k}'| = \frac{|\vec{k} - E\vec{u}|}{\sqrt{1-u^2}} \geq \frac{|\vec{k}| - |E|u}{\sqrt{1-u^2}} = \frac{m(v-u)}{\sqrt{1-u^2}\sqrt{v^2-1}} \stackrel{?}{\geq} m. \quad (2)$$

Since $v = |\vec{v}| > 1 > u = |\vec{u}|$, we can square both sides and show that our condition is equivalent to the true statement $(1-uv)^2 \geq 0$. We used the reverse triangle inequality for the length of 3-momentum, and the on-shell condition by using $|\vec{k}/E| = v$. In particular, an off-shell tachyon with $E = |\vec{k}/u|$ has $|\vec{k}'| = 0$, and therefore Eq. (1) is not LI for off-shell tachyons.

An important role of the FP of a scalar field is to obtain LI solution by convolution of FP with the field describing the initial data. The ordinary FP (corresponding to the Klein-Gordon (KG) equation with positive mass squared) accomplishes this by propagating only the positive energy states, both particles and antiparticles, towards the future, and negative energy states towards the past. This is implemented by a specific choice of the contour, which is equivalent to the definition of the two-point TOCF.

In fact, the TOCFs are the main object in QFT, since they allow for perturbative computation of the S matrix elements due to the LSZ formula. They also satisfy the Schwinger-Dyson equations, which are then used to derive the Feynman rules for interactions in position space. In particular, the two-point TOCFs should be a Green function for the KG operator, and not a solution, which clearly shows that FP is an *off-shell* object. However, applying $(\square - m^2)$ to Eq. (1) results in

$$-i\delta^4(x-y) - \frac{i\delta(x^0-y^0)}{2\pi^2} \times \frac{\sin(m|\vec{x}-\vec{y}|) - m|\vec{x}-\vec{y}|\cos(m|\vec{x}-\vec{y}|)}{|\vec{x}-\vec{y}|^3}, \quad (3)$$

instead. Therefore, Eq. (1) not only is not LI, but also does not satisfy the equations of motion for a TOCF.

This is a serious flaw in the construction of Paczos *et al.* [1], which calls into question the consistency of even non-interacting tachyon fields. Moreover, free fields may be unphysical in the following sense: there is an positive-definite energy-momentum tensor that can be contracted with the metric tensor, giving gravitational interactions described at perturbative level. For this reason, in the next section, we present an independent argument for why the theory of interacting tachyons is ill-defined.

B. S matrix

We already noted that constructing the S matrix is problematic. In particular, the usual definition using the Dyson series cannot be employed since it relies on the time-ordering operator. Moreover, there is no guarantee that such an expression is LI - since microcausality is violated, the interacting Hamiltonian, which is expressed

in terms of Φ and $\partial_\mu\Phi$, has no reason to commute at spacelike separations either. On the other hand, one can try not to construct the S matrix explicitly, but instead use the LSZ formalism. We neglect a serious problem that scattering theory is defined only for stable particles. Tachyons interacting with any particle make it unstable, which begs the question, how is the S matrix of the known particles constructed in such case. Since the LSZ formula allows perturbative computation of the S matrix elements by means of TOCF, let us try to derive it for the tachyon field, following the reasoning given for the ordinary KG field [4, 5, 7]. In fact, assuming the existence of asymptotic (in/out) states, all manipulations can be formally repeated, and it seems there is no change to the results, provided we restrict the states to these satisfying $|\vec{k}| > m$. Unfortunately, as we show below, the in/out states for tachyons do not exist.

We follow the discussion of Lecture 14 from Ref. [5], in particular pages 160-162. In order to have a physical interpretation of scattering theory, we need to consider interactions of particles which are far from each another in space at initial and final times. Therefore, we represent the initial/final states as wave packets normalized to a finite number because plane waves, which are momentum eigenstates, cover the whole space (since they are normalizable only in distributional sense) and thus cannot be used to model scattering. If one demands that interactions have a finite range, the wave packet associated with interacting field should have a compact support. This is impossible for a tachyon field, since by the Paley-Wiener theorem the Fourier transform of a compact function is analytical in the entire complex plane. Thus, it cannot vanish on a compact set, which is violated due to the $|\vec{k}| > m$ condition. For ordinary particles, nothing forbids the wave packets to have compact support. This assumption guarantees that the interacting field behaves as a free field in the $t \rightarrow \pm\infty$ limit. Physically, compact wave packets are necessary since they are part of the definition of microcausality of a quantum field. Indeed, requiring a set (of positions) in Euclidean space to be compact is equivalent to making it bounded.

Non-compact wave packets would be not only unphysical, but also would bring additional mathematical problems. Strictly speaking, a quantum field is an operator valued distribution, which results in a proper field (the value of a field in any spacetime point is well-defined) only after smearing it with a sufficiently regular test functions. For ordinary KG field, the test functions are assumed to belong to the Schwartz space and have compact support. Then, for the quantum fields which is a tempered distribution, *i.e.*, the result of acting on any test functions from Schwartz space is bounded, operations such as integration by parts,³ Fourier transform, etc., are well-defined. Introducing test functions without

³ In particular, the equations of motion are derived from the prin-

compact support would not keep these desirable properties. Moreover, for tachyons the LI measure contains non-analytical term $1/\omega_{\vec{k}}$, which blows up for $|\vec{k}| \rightarrow m$, and hence it is not clear if Φ can be a tempered distribution.

Let us show that the incompleteness of the tachyon mode expansion leads to a phenomenon in which an interacting tachyon field does not behave as a free field at asymptotic times. Therefore, one cannot construct local scattering theory of tachyons, because these states are not localizable in space - single-particle states and multiparticle states do not separate from each other even after allowing for an infinite time of interactions. Let $f(x)$ represent the tachyon wave packet and let $\phi'(x)$ be an interacting state that satisfies $\langle 0|\phi'(x)|0\rangle = 0$ and $\langle k|\phi'(x)|0\rangle = e^{ikx} \theta(|\vec{k}|-m)$. We study matrix elements of the operator $\phi'^f(t) = i \int d^3\vec{x}(\phi' \partial_0 f - f \partial_0 \phi')$, which for $f(x) = e^{-ikx}$ and a free field $\phi'(x)$ is proportional to the creation operator \hat{c}_k^\dagger . Direct computation shows that at all times ϕ'^f acts as a creation operator for the momentum eigenstates used in the construction of the wave packet $f(x)$, and that its overlap with the vacuum is 0. We must also consider all multiparticle states. The following overlap between a normalizable state ψ , the operator $\phi'^f(t)$, and the vacuum must vanish in the infinite time limit, if the in/out states (the states appearing in the S matrix elements, which are created from the vacuum by the operator $\phi'^f(t)$) exist:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \int d^3\vec{x} \langle \psi | n \rangle \langle n | \phi'^f(t) | 0 \rangle = \lim_{t \rightarrow \pm\infty} \int d^3\vec{x} f(x) g(x) e^{-iEt}, \quad (4)$$

where $E = \omega_{\vec{p}} - p_n^0 \neq 0$ is a real number and $g(x)$ is a regular function. The limit exists only if the function $h(x) = f(x)g(x)$ is integrable. By regularity assumption, $g(x)$ is integrable. In particular, the limit exists, and is equal to 0, when $f(x)$ is a compact function. This corresponds to the ordinary KG case, but is impossible for tachyons. For them, we use the fact that the Fourier transform of an integrable function is sufficiently regular (uniformly continuous), which is impossible to satisfy because of the $\theta(|\vec{k}|-m)$ term. This shows that Eq. (4) does not vanish for tachyons. Therefore, the multiparticle states produced by the $\phi'^f(t)$ operator do not get separated in space from the one-particle wave packet in the infinite time limit. Such states would contribute to any S matrix element, making it divergent (the limit does not exist).

Therefore, the nonlocality of tachyons has clear observable consequences - it prohibits the existence of proper

ciple of least action under the assumption that fields decay at the boundary (spatial infinity in field theory) fast enough. This is guaranteed for ordinary fields because they have compact support. Giving up on this property, one would need to construct the full formalism from scratch.




Figure 1: The tachyon potential terms generated by the exchange of virtual ordinary particles denoted by solid lines. In the top row, we show one (*left*) and two-point (*right*) TOCF, which correspond to tachyon vacuum expectation value and its self-energy, respectively. The former can be set to 0 by field redefinition, while the latter renormalizes the mass squared parameter of the tachyon, which we assume stays negative. The bottom row presents examples of the diagrams generating tachyon self-interactions: cubic (*left*) and quartic (*right*).

asymptotic states, if one uses the restricted mode expansion. Obviously, one cannot use the full modes expansion either, as it would lead to exponentially increasing terms in the wave function normalization. In other words, complex energies would violate the unitarity of the free theory.

C. Tachyon potential

In this subsection, we study some consequences of introducing tachyon interactions with ordinary matter, which are represented by fields ϕ and ψ , respectively. We will assume the interaction Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L} = \begin{cases} g\Lambda \phi |\psi|^2 & \psi \text{ is a boson,} \\ g \phi \bar{\psi}\psi & \psi \text{ is a fermion,} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where g is a dimensionless coupling, while Λ is some energy scale. The tachyon potential with radiatively generated terms is as follows:

$$V(\phi) = \frac{-m^2}{2} \phi^2 + \frac{\lambda_3}{3!} \phi^3 + \frac{\lambda_4}{4!} \phi^4, \quad (6)$$

where the cubic and quartic terms (which have a mass dimension ≤ 4 , so perhaps they should be accounted for already at the tree level) not only describe tachyon self-interactions, but also can change the vacuum structure due to quantum fluctuations. We note that while a full 1-loop analysis would require working with the Coleman-Weinberg potential, we expect it would lead to similar conclusions.

The additional terms in the potential can change its character, from unbounded to bounded from below, depending on the signs of λ_3, λ_4 . In fact, one studies

such potential, *e.g.*, in the Higgs mechanism and in theories of inflation. Since these theories are not restricted to the $|\vec{k}| > m$ modes, one shows that a positive λ_4 leads to spontaneous electroweak symmetry breaking - the field settles in the proper minimum of the potential which breaks/hides the gauge symmetry. On the other hand, negative λ_4 causes the runaway ($|\phi| \rightarrow \infty$) in *finite time*, which makes the whole theory unphysical. The tachyon case is more involved, and detailed analysis is beyond the scope of this paper. However, they at least present another challenge for constructing consistent QFT of tachyons.

In Fig. 1, we present the relevant diagrams generated at 1-loop by interaction given by Eq. (5). All the diagrams are UV divergent, and to renormalize the theory, we use the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme with dimensional regularization. We note that for the fermionic case, evaluation of such diagrams is given as an exercise in Chapter 51 of [7]. We interpret the interaction as an effective field theory valid below a high energy scale $\Lambda' \gg m_\psi$. Then, we can replace the divergence by a finite value: $1/\epsilon + 2\log(\mu/m_\psi) \rightarrow \log(\Lambda'/m_\psi)$. The result is

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_3 &\simeq \begin{cases} \frac{g^3 \Lambda^3}{4\pi^2} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda'}{m_\psi}\right) & \psi \text{ is a boson,} \\ -\frac{g^3}{4\pi^2} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda'}{m_\psi}\right) & \psi \text{ is a fermion,} \end{cases} \\ \lambda_4 &\simeq \begin{cases} \frac{g^4 \Lambda^4}{4\pi^2} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda'}{m_\psi}\right) & \psi \text{ is a boson,} \\ -\frac{3g^4}{\pi^2} \log\left(\frac{\Lambda'}{m_\psi}\right) & \psi \text{ is a fermion.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Note the opposite signs of the terms generated by bosons and fermions. This difference stems from the fact that a closed fermion loop requires the reordering of the anticommuting fermionic fields, resulting in a (-1) factor. Our result is consistent with the fact that the top quark contribution to the Coleman-Weinberg potential of the Higgs is negative. Eq. (7) implies that the tachyon potential has a proper minimum if ψ is a boson, while it becomes even more unstable if ψ is a fermion. The first case may result in a Higgs-like mechanism transforming tachyon to an ordinary particle, while the second one presents another problem to be solved if one desires to describe stable particles with negative mass squared.

III. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The theory proposed in Ref. [1] is not LI, and the existence of S matrix with physical properties has not been established. A serious obstacle is the lack of LI of the sign of the energy (or time) component of a space-like four-vector, which prevents the direct use of formulas used for subluminal particles. While for subluminal particles, the mass shell, given by the set $p = (E, \vec{p})$ satisfying $p^2 = E^2 - |\vec{p}|^2 = m^2$, has two sheets, each characterized in a LI way by the sign of the energy, tachyon mass shell has only one sheet. Therefore, there is a geometrical obstacle to the LI of time-ordering or LI definition

of which states are initial/final, if one desires that *all* tachyon/antitachyon states have positive energy. In particular, the FP (and any TOCF), S matrix defined as the Dyson series, and the phase space of tachyons are not well-defined.

In fact, Ref. [1] introduces the past-future symmetric two-state formalism for this very reason. It is shown there that the amplitude describing the process illustrated in Fig. 1 therein is LI. On the other hand, amplitudes are not directly observable. To have a proper physical quantity, the amplitude needs to be integrated over LI phase space. However, one cannot remove the negative energy states in a LI way and preserve the notion which states are initial and which are final - the Sudarshan's reinterpretation principle alone does not accomplish this, while the two-state formalism introduces different form of non-determinism than ordinary QM. Since superluminal observers were introduced to deduce QM in the first place, it is puzzling (but not impossible) that a covariant description of tachyons would require such a radical departure from the known formalism.

For example, the aforementioned tachyon emission/absorption process is a $1 \rightarrow 2$ decay in one frame and an inverse $2 \rightarrow 1$ decay in another. The former is described by a decay width, which is defined in the rest frame of the decaying particle, while the latter - by a LI cross-section. These quantities cannot describe the same process if there is a notion of a prepared initial state. In ordinary QM, when the initial states are not fixed, a LI reaction rate can be obtained by averaging over their phase space as well, *e.g.*, one describes in such a way a particle freeze-out from thermal plasma due to decays and inverse decays. However, one can, at least in principle, prepare the initial states, and particle being stable does not depend on the reference frame.

Therefore, to have a physical meaning, the formulas adapted from the "standard toolkit of QFT" need to be adjusted, and there seems no simple way to do so, which would not spoil other postulates of QFT. For example, abandoning relativistic invariance and formulating the theory in a preferred reference frame in which all negative mass squared states have positive energy could fix most of these problems. However, the tachyon single-particle states remain delocalized in space, as argued below.

Paraphrasing Sidney Coleman [5], one can say that, since $E = mc^2$, particle number is not conserved in QFT. Therefore, one cannot consider quantum fields acting only in a single-particle Hilbert space. Instead, an interacting quantum field acts nontrivially also on a countable number of multi-particle states. To interpret the state created from the vacuum by creation operator of such field as a particle, it is mandatory that the overlap with any multiparticle state and the vacuum must vanish in the infinite time limit. In ordinary theory, it does due to Riemann-Lebesgue lemma, because the states can be localized in space, which is impossible for tachyons due to the incompleteness of the orthogonal basis. Therefore, interacting tachyon states do not converge, in the

weak sense, to the one-particle states. In particular, the LSZ asymptotic condition cannot be satisfied, and the expressions used to compute the S matrix elements are not well-defined. While the incompleteness of such an expansion, which is directly responsible for the lack of microcausality of the tachyon field, is well-known, our analysis of the in/out states in the S matrix construction provides a different perspective on whether tachyon non-locality has physical consequences.

Tachyons behave differently than ordinary fields also because they turn any stable field they interact with into unstable one, or at least such interactions cannot be predicted since the S matrix is ill-defined. Again, this is different kind of nondeterminism from that exhibited by QM, since QM allows for stable states, while any QM theory with tachyons does not.

In summary, tachyon non-locality has direct physical consequence, *i.e.*, the S matrix is ill-defined and it is not even formally LI. Moreover, a particle interpretation of Φ is impossible if tachyons are propagating on-shell states. While the tachyon fields are covariant in the twin space, the postulate of locality of interactions is permanently violated by considering a truncated set of plane-waves as an (incomplete) orthogonal basis. In light of the above arguments, formulation of a consistent relativistic theory of an interacting tachyon field seems impossible.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Institute for Basic Science under the project code, IBS-R018-D1. I thank Hanseul for motivation.

-
- [1] J. Paczos, K. Dębski, S. Cedrowski, S. Charzyński, K. Turzyński, A. Ekert, and A. Dragan, “Covariant quantum field theory of tachyons,” [arXiv:2308.00450 \[quant-ph\]](#).
 - [2] A. Dragan and A. Ekert, “Quantum principle of relativity,” *New J. Phys.* **22** no. 3, (2020) 033038, [arXiv:1910.02780 \[quant-ph\]](#). [Addendum: *New J. Phys.* 25, 088002 (2023)].
 - [3] A. Dragan, K. Dębski, S. Charzyński, K. Turzyński, and A. Ekert, “Relativity of superluminal observers in 1 + 3 spacetime,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **40** no. 2, (2023) 025013, [arXiv:2209.01836 \[physics.gen-ph\]](#).
 - [4] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
 - [5] S. Coleman, “Notes from Sidney Coleman’s Physics 253a: Quantum Field Theory,” [arXiv:1110.5013 \[physics.ed-ph\]](#).
 - [6] A. Dragan and A. Ekert, “Reply to the Comment on ‘Quantum principle of relativity’,” *New J. Phys.* **25** no. 12, (2023) 128002, [arXiv:2309.00020 \[quant-ph\]](#).
 - [7] M. Srednicki, *Quantum field theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1, 2007.