

BARYOGENESIS IN MINKOWSKI SPACETIME

FELIX FINSTER AND MARCO VAN DEN BELD-SERRANO

AUGUST 2024

ABSTRACT. Based on a mechanism originally suggested for causal fermion systems, the present paper paves the way for a rigorous treatment of baryogenesis in the language of differential geometry and global analysis. Moreover, a formula for the rate of baryogenesis in Minkowski spacetime is derived.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries on globally hyperbolic spin geometry	3
3. The Dirac dynamics and its regularization	5
4. Going beyond the Dirac dynamics	9
5. Mathematical description of baryogenesis	10
6. The dynamics of the regularization	13
6.1. The Dirac dynamics	13
6.2. The locally rigid dynamics	15
7. The rate of baryogenesis in Minkowski spacetime	18
8. Discussion	31
Appendix A. Computation of regularized kernels	32
References	34

1. INTRODUCTION

The Dirac operator is the central object of spin geometry. In the Lorentzian setting, the Dirac equation describes the dynamics of spinor fields in spacetime. Physically, spinor fields model matter on the quantum level. A particular effect described by the Dirac equation is a process of pair creation, in which both a particle and a corresponding anti-particle are created. In this process, particles and anti-particles can be created only in pairs (pair creation), but not individually. Therefore, the Dirac equation cannot explain the asymmetry between matter and anti-matter as observed in the Universe. In order to explain this asymmetry, most physicists believe that the Universe went through a process of matter creation during an early stage of its history. This process is referred to as *baryogenesis*. Explaining if and why baryogenesis occurs is one of the main open questions in modern physics.

Various mechanisms of *baryogenesis* have been proposed (for a survey see for example [22] or [6]). Here we focus on the recent mechanism suggested in [10], which is based on a specific modification of the Dirac dynamics. One goal of the present paper

is to formulate this modified Dirac dynamics and the resulting mechanism of baryogenesis in the language of differential geometry and global analysis, thereby laying the foundations for a detailed mathematical treatment. With this in mind, the first part of our paper (Sections 2–6) provides a self-contained introduction for mathematicians working in Lorentzian and/or spin geometry. Another goal of this paper is to quantify the effect of the mechanism in Minkowski spacetime. More specifically, in the second part of the paper (Section 7) we show how to compute a rate of baryogenesis for Minkowski spacetime starting from the abstract mathematical framework developed in the first part. One of the motivations for this derivation is to set the stage for the study of more general spacetimes (e.g. FLRW or inflationary spacetimes). This is the first of a series of papers where the baryogenesis mechanism will be worked out in detail for different cosmologically relevant spacetimes.

The modification of the Dirac dynamics proposed in [10] stems from the theory of causal fermion systems. Taking results from this theory as external input, we here formulate baryogenesis in the familiar setting of Lorentzian spin geometry. More precisely, we take the following input from the causal fermion systems theory:

- ▶ The Dirac equation should not hold on all length scales, but only down to a “minimal length scale” ε (which can be thought of as the Planck length $\approx 10^{-34}$ meters). This is implemented mathematically by *regularizing* all spinor fields, in the simplest case by mollifying them on the scale ε .
- ▶ The regularization is described by a globally defined timelike vector field $u \in \Gamma(M, TM)$, the *regularizing vector field*. This vector field satisfies dynamical equations which are related to the null geodesic flow (the *locally rigid dynamics of the regularizing vector field*).
- ▶ The dynamics of the spinor fields is obtained from the Dirac dynamics by successive projections involving the regularizing vector field (so-called *adiabatic projections*). The resulting dynamics, referred to as the *locally rigid dynamics of the spinor fields*, deviates slightly from the Dirac dynamics, giving rise to baryogenesis.

More specifically, baryogenesis is mathematically described as follows. Given a foliation $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ and prescribing an initial timelike vector field u on a given hypersurface N_{t_0} , the dynamics of this vector field is obtained from the null geodesic flow forming integrals over the light cone (see Definition 6.4 and the illustration in Figure 1). The dynamics of the spinor fields is obtained by modifying the Dirac dynamics by successive projections to the spectral subspace of an operator A_t (cf. Definition 6.6). The operator A_t is a selfadjoint operator which involves the regularizing vector field. It has the form

$$A_t := \frac{1}{4}\{u^t, H_g + H_g^*\} + \frac{i}{4}\{u^\mu, \nabla_\mu^s - (\nabla_\mu^s)^*\},$$

where H_g is the Hamiltonian and ∇_μ^s denotes the spin connection. The operator A_t is, arguably, the simplest symmetrized version of the Dirac Hamiltonian H_g which in addition allows the spinor fields to evolve according to a more general dynamics (i.e. not necessarily Dirac). The different possible spinor dynamics are described by the timelike vector field u (e.g. the Dirac dynamics corresponds to a vector field u which is normal at every point to the leaves of the chosen foliation $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$, see Remark 5.4). We call A_t the *symmetrized Hamiltonian*. Note that the family $(A_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ depends by construction on the choice of the time function t . In this setting, baryogenesis is described by a relative change between suitably chosen subspaces of spinors. The

choice of these subspaces is not obvious and will be introduced in Definition 4.1 (see also the motivating Remark 3.7 and the motivating Example 5.1).

Our main result is Theorem 7.4 which gives a simple formula for the rate of baryogenesis in Minkowski spacetime. The setting is the following. We begin with a foliation $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ and a timelike vector u which initially is only defined on a Cauchy hypersurface N_{t_0} (with unit normal ν) by

$$u_p = (1 + \lambda \tilde{f}_p) \nu + \lambda X_p \quad \text{for all } p \in N_{t_0},$$

f is a smooth positive function taking values on N_{t_0} , X is a spacelike vector field and $\lambda > 0$. Assuming it follows the locally rigid dynamics, this vector field can be extended to the whole spacetime and an approximate (to first order in λ) locally rigid dynamical equation for u is derived (cf. Lemma 7.1):

$$\frac{du_p}{dt} = -\text{grad}_\delta(f_p^{-1}) + \frac{\lambda}{f_p^3} \left(\frac{f_p}{3} \text{div}_\delta(X_p) + 4X_p(f_p) \right) \nu + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2)$$

where δ denotes the Euclidean metric in \mathbb{R}^3 . In order to use this evolution equation to determine the rate of baryogenesis, a more technical result will be required (see Lemma 7.20): we will show that certain product operators (involving the spectral measure of the Dirac Hamiltonian H_η and the operator $\frac{dA_t}{dt}$) are trace class and give an explicit expression for the functional calculus associated to H_η . With these results at our disposal, we will show that the rate of baryogenesis due to the locally rigid evolution of the spinors is, to first order in λ , of the simple form

$$B_t = C \lambda \int_V \text{div}_\delta(X_p) d^3x + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2),$$

where $V \subset N_t$ and C is an explicit constant that depends on the regularization parameter ε (see Theorem 7.4 for the precise statement).

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we recall the basic spin-geometric concepts that will play an important role in our study. In Section 3 we focus on the usual setting in spin geometry, namely spinor fields evolving according to the Dirac dynamics in a general spacetime. The importance of this section is to lay the foundations for a generalization of the main mathematical concepts and considered spinor spaces of the Dirac setting to a wider class of possible dynamics. This extension from the Dirac dynamics to a more general dynamics takes place in Sections 4 and 5. Moreover, in Section 5 the main mathematical concepts in order to study and quantify baryogenesis are introduced. The particular dynamics that we will consider, the locally rigid dynamics, is presented in Section 6 and is obtained through adiabatic projections. In Section 7, we apply the mathematical framework we have constructed to Minkowski spacetime. In particular, after some tedious computations, a simple formula for the rate of baryogenesis will be derived. Finally, our study leaves open some interesting questions which will be discussed in Section 8. Appendix A provides the detailed computations of some of the formulas needed in the proof of Theorem 7.4.

2. PRELIMINARIES ON GLOBALLY HYPERBOLIC SPIN GEOMETRY

In this paper, all spacetimes (M, g) are considered to be four-dimensional, smooth, oriented, time oriented and globally hyperbolic. We denote by t a global time function and the associated global smooth foliation by $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$. We use the convention $(+, -, -, -)$ for the signature of the Lorentzian metric g . Furthermore, small

Latin indices j, k, \dots run from 0 to 3 and denote spacetime coordinate indices, whereas small Greek indices (except 'i', which is reserved for the imaginary unit) label the spatial coordinates and run from 1 to 3. Moreover, whenever a foliation $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is fixed in the spacetime (M, g) and a mathematical object is given in local coordinates, we always choose coordinates $(x^j)_{j=0, \dots, 3}$ such that $x^0 = t$ coincides with the time function. Finally, as is customary, the Einstein summation convention is used throughout the paper.

We denote *Clifford multiplication* in (M, g) by $\gamma_g : TM \otimes SM \rightarrow SM$ and, given an orthonormal basis $(e_j)_{j=0, \dots, 3}$, we denote $\gamma_{gj} := \gamma_g(e_j)$. A globally hyperbolic four-dimensional Lorentzian manifold satisfies the topological spin condition (for details see [3, 18]). Having chosen a spin structure, we denote the spinor bundle by SM . The associated fiber $S_p M \cong \mathbb{C}^4$ at a spacetime point $p \in M$ is a four-dimensional complex vector space endowed with an indefinite inner product of signature $(2, 2)$. Clifford multiplication is symmetric with respect to the inner product $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{S_p M}^1$. We refer to $S_p M$ as the *spinor space* and $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{S_p M}$ as the *spin inner product*. Sections in the spinor bundle are called *spinor fields*. The metric induces on the spinor bundle a unique metric *spin connection* ∇^s (also referred to as the Levi-Civita spin connection). In local coordinates, the spin connection can be written as (cf. [12, Section 4] or [7]):

$$\nabla_j^s = \partial_j - iE_j - ia_j, \quad (2.1)$$

where E_j, a_j are linear operators on the spinor space. In the physics literature, the E_j are referred to as the *spin coefficients*.

Finally, the *Dirac operator* $D_g : C^\infty(M, SM) \rightarrow C^\infty(M, SM)$ is given in local coordinates by

$$D_g = i\gamma_g^j \nabla_j^s.$$

For smooth spinor fields (i.e. smooth sections of the spinor bundle) the *Dirac equation* of mass $m \in [0, \infty)$ reads

$$(D_g - m)\psi = 0.$$

Consider a foliation $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ of the globally hyperbolic spacetime (M, g) and the space $C_{sc}^\infty(M, SM)$ of smooth spinor fields with spatially compact support (i.e. for any $N_{t'} \in (N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ and $\psi \in C_{sc}^\infty(M, SM)$, the support $\text{supp}(\psi|_{N_{t'}}) \subset SM$ is compact). Then, for any Cauchy hypersurface N_t with future directed normal ν and for all $\psi, \phi \in C_{sc}^\infty(N_t, SM)$ that are solutions to the Dirac equation of mass m , we define the scalar product $(\psi|\phi)_t$ at a time t as follows:

$$(\psi|\phi)_t := \int_{N_t} \langle \psi | \gamma_g(\nu) \phi \rangle_{S_p M} d\mu_{N_t}, \quad (2.2)$$

where $d\mu_{N_t}$ is the Riemannian volume measure on N_t (induced by the Lorentzian volume measure $d\mu_M$ in (M, g)). It can be proven that, whenever the considered spinor fields solve the Dirac equation, this inner product is actually independent of the considered Cauchy hypersurface (see [14, equation (2.6)] or [26, Corollaries 2.1.3 and 2.1.4])

¹For a manifold with a metric signature (p, q) an analogous indefinite inner product can be constructed. See [26, Proposition 1.1.20 and Corollary 1.1.21] for the proof and the symmetry properties of the Clifford multiplication associated to this inner product.

due to current conservation². In this paper, unless stated otherwise, whenever an adjoint operator is introduced it is understood that it is the adjoint with respect to the scalar product $(\cdot|\cdot)_t$ given by (2.2).

3. THE DIRAC DYNAMICS AND ITS REGULARIZATION

In this section we will focus on sections of the spinor bundle which follow the Dirac dynamics. We start by introducing some of the spinor spaces that will be relevant in this paper.

Definition 3.1. *Let (M, g) be a globally hyperbolic spacetime with spinor bundle SM and Dirac operator D_g and consider a foliation $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$. Then we define the following relevant spinor spaces:*

- (i) *Taking initial data in $C_0^\infty(N_t, SM)$, we get smooth Dirac solutions with spatially compact support $\psi \in C_{sc}^\infty(M, SM)$. Taking the completion with respect to the scalar product (2.2) gives a Hilbert space denoted by \mathcal{H}_m . Due to current conservation, the scalar product does not depend on time.*
- (ii) *We denote by \mathcal{H}_t the space of square integrable spinor fields on the Cauchy hypersurface N_t , i.e.*

$$\mathcal{H}_t := L^2(N_t, SM)$$

We note that spinor fields in \mathcal{H}_m are weak solutions of the Dirac equation. More specifically, they are in the Sobolev space $H_{loc}^{1,2}(M, SM)$. Applying the trace theorem, their restriction to a Cauchy surface is well-defined in $L_{loc}^2(N_t, SM)$. Moreover, it is even in $L^2(N_t, SM)$, and the scalar product $(\cdot|\cdot)_t$ is well-defined.

Given a foliation $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ and initial data $\psi_0 \in C_0^\infty(N_{t_0}, SM)$, where $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, the following Cauchy problem for the Dirac equation

$$(D_g - m)\psi = 0 \quad \text{with} \quad \psi|_{N_{t_0}} = \psi_0,$$

is known to be well-posed (cf. [12, Theorems 4.5.1 and 4.5.2]). By solving this Cauchy problem and evaluating the spinor field at a later time t , we obtain a unitary evolution operator $U_{t_0}^t$. Moreover, this operator is also well-defined and unitary for spinor fields in $\mathcal{H}_m|_{N_{t_0}}$ and will play an important role in the study of the baryogenesis mechanism.

Definition 3.2. *Consider a foliation $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ of the globally hyperbolic spacetime (M, g) and fix a specific Cauchy hypersurface N_{t_0} . The following operators are introduced:*

- (i) *The **Dirac evolution operator**,*

$$U_{t_0}^t : \mathcal{H}_m|_{N_{t_0}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_m|_{N_t}$$

is a unitary operator that restricts weak solutions to the Dirac equation to different Cauchy hypersurfaces. Moreover, a spinor field $\psi \in H^{1,2}(M, SM)$ follows the Dirac dynamics if, there exists a suitable initial $\psi_0 \in \mathcal{H}_{t_0}$ such that $\psi|_{N_t} = U_{t_0}^t \psi_0$.

- (ii) *The **Dirac Hamiltonian***

$$H_g : C_0^\infty(N_t, SM) \subset \mathcal{H}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_t$$

is an operator which, in local coordinates, is of the form:

$$H_g := -(\gamma_g^0)^{-1} (i\gamma_g^\mu \nabla_\mu^s - m) - E_0 - ia_0 \tag{3.1}$$

²By this we mean that $(\psi|\gamma_g^j\varphi)$ is divergence-free if ψ, φ satisfy the Dirac equation. Then, integrating and applying the Gauss divergence theorem it directly follows that $(\psi|\varphi)_{t_0} = (\psi|\varphi)_{t_1}$ for any $t_0, t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$.

In the next section we will consider spinor fields that evolve according to a more general dynamics than the Dirac dynamics.

Remark 3.3. Let us remark the following features of the Dirac Hamiltonian:

- (i) The defining equation (3.1) might seem familiar. Indeed, it is simply obtained by reordering terms in the Dirac equation $(D_g - m)\psi = 0$ using the coordinate expression (2.1) for the spin connection and defining the Dirac Hamiltonian as $H_g := i\partial_t$.
- (ii) In a general globally hyperbolic spacetime (M, g) , the Hamiltonian H_g is not symmetric unless the spacetime is stationary (see [12, Section 4.6] or the detailed computation of the symmetry of H_g in [16, page 4]). However, for general globally hyperbolic spacetimes, the Dirac Hamiltonian is still a suitable starting point in order to derive a mathematical description of baryogenesis (more in Example 5.1) because of the physical interpretation of the eigenvalues and eigenstates of H_g in stationary spacetimes. In stationary spacetimes, after constructing a suitable selfadjoint extension, the Dirac equation can be solved by exponentiation, i.e. $\psi(t) = e^{-itH_g} \psi_0$ with $\psi_0 \in C_0^\infty(N_{t_0}, SM)$. Due to finite propagation speed, the resulting solution has spatially compact support, $\psi \in C_{sc}^\infty(M, SM)$. Identifying the Cauchy data with the corresponding solutions, one can consider the Dirac Hamiltonian as an operator

$$H_g : C_{sc}^\infty(M, SM) \cap \mathcal{H}_m \rightarrow C_{sc}^\infty(M, SM) \cap \mathcal{H}_m . \quad \diamond$$

Often, we are only interested in a closed subspace of \mathcal{H}_m , which we denote by \mathcal{H} . This subspace models the particular physical situation (or spinor content) we want to describe in the spacetime (M, g) . Specific examples for the subspace \mathcal{H} are given in [11, Examples 2.3 and 2.6] and we will also choose such a Hilbert space in Remark 5.1 and Definition 5.5.

Note that, by construction, spinor fields in \mathcal{H}_m are in general only weak or distributional solutions to the Dirac equation. Thus, in order to evaluate the spinor fields in \mathcal{H}_m pointwise, they need to be regularized. For this purpose, the regularization operators are very useful. For the sake of completeness we recall their precise definition following [14, Definition 4.1] (see also [8, Definition 1.2.3] in the context of Minkowski spacetime).

Definition 3.4 (Regularization operator). *Let \mathcal{H} be a closed subspace of \mathcal{H}_m . Then, a family of bounded linear operators $(\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ which map $L^2(M, SM)$ to the continuous spinor fields,*

$$\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow C^0(M, SM) \cap \mathcal{H}_m .$$

are called **regularization operators** if the following conditions hold:

- (i) For every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $p \in M$ there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\|(\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon \psi)(p)\|_{S_p M} \leq c \|\psi\|_t .$$

where here $\|\cdot\|_{S_p M}$ denotes any norm on $S_p M$.

- (ii) In the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ the regularization operators go over to the identity with strong convergence of \mathfrak{R}_ε and $\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon^*$, i.e. for all $\psi \in L^2(M, SM)$ it holds that

$$\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon \psi, \mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon^* \psi \rightarrow \psi \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$$

Specific examples of regularization operators are mollifiers ([8, Example 1.2.4], [14, Section 4]), Fourier transforms ([12, equation (5.5.2)]) or the 'hard cut-off' regularization which we will discuss in Example 3.6. Note that these constructions are very similar to the smoothing operators or Friedrichs mollifiers used to map L^2 sections (over general vector bundles) to smooth sections, see, e.g. [1, Definitions 1.4.8 and 1.4.10] and [23, Definitions 5.19 and 5.20].

A regularization operator \mathfrak{R}_ε can also be considered as an operator defined on M such that for any $p \in M$ we have $\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon(p) : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow S_p M$ with $\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon(p)\psi := (\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon\psi)(p)$. In other words, instead of analyzing the dynamics of the spinor fields in the image of \mathfrak{R}_ε , we can alternatively focus on how \mathfrak{R}_ε changes from one point to another of the spacetime. Note that in some cases, given a point $p \in M$ with coordinates $(x^j)_{j=0,\dots,3}$, we will write $\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon(x)$ instead of $\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon(p)$ in order to make the coordinate dependence explicit. In Section 6.1 we study the Dirac dynamics of the regularization operators (and, thus, of the regularized spinor fields) in more detail.

In the next remark we discuss an important concept which is related to the regularization operators. Even though it will not play a central role in this paper, it will appear again in Section 6 when discussing the Dirac dynamics of the regularized spinor fields or in the computations of Section 7.

Remark 3.5. Consider a globally hyperbolic spacetime (M, g) , a positive parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ and a closed subspace $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}_m$. Then, the following operator maps smooth compactly supported spinor fields to regularized solutions to the Dirac equation:

$$P^\varepsilon := -\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon \pi_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon)^* k_m \quad : \quad C_0^\infty(M, SM) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_m \cap C^0(M, SM),$$

where $\pi_{\mathcal{H}}$ is the orthogonal projection operator onto \mathcal{H} , and the operator

$$k_m : C_0^\infty(M, SM) \rightarrow C_{sc}^\infty(M, SM) \cap \mathcal{H}_m$$

is called the *causal fundamental solution* and corresponds to the difference of the advanced and the retarded Green operators (see e.g. [2, Definition 3.4.1 and Theorem 3.4.5], for more details) of the Dirac operator. The importance of the causal fundamental solution k_m is that it encodes the Dirac dynamics of the spinors and, moreover, allows to represent solutions to the Dirac equation as follows. Any spinor field $\psi \in C_{sc}^\infty(M, SM)$ which solves the Cauchy problem for the Dirac equation can be represented at a point $p \in M$ with coordinates $x = (x^j)_{j=0,\dots,3}$ by the formula

$$\psi(x) = 2\pi \int_{N_{t_0}} k_m(x, y) (\gamma_g(\nu)\psi|_{N_{t_0}})(y) d\mu_{N_{t_0}},$$

where N_{t_0} is the Cauchy hypersurface on which the initial condition for the Cauchy problem is specified, ν denotes its normal vector field and $k_m(x, y)$ corresponds to the integral kernel of k_m . For the proof of the previous representation formula see [12, Proposition 13.6.1] or [14, Lemma 2.1]. In Lemma 7.20 an explicit expression for the kernel $k_m(x, y)$ in Minkowski spacetime (cf. equation (7.28)) will be used.

Coming back to the operator P^ε , it also corresponds (cf. [9, equation (5.7)]) to an integral operator whose integral kernel is given by:

$$P^\varepsilon(x, y) = -\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon(x)(\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon(y))^* : S_q M \rightarrow S_p M \quad (3.2)$$

where x, y are respectively the coordinates of two points $p, q \in M$. Moreover, this integral kernel is a bi-distributional solution to the Dirac equation (it is even the

unique smooth bi-distributional solution, see [9, Prop 5.1]), i.e.

$$(D_g - m)P^\varepsilon(x, y) = 0 \quad (3.3)$$

for all $p, q \in M$. Hence, from expression (3.2) it becomes clear that by solving the previous distributional equation we determine the Dirac dynamics of the regularized spinor fields in (M, g) . This scenario has already been studied in depth and, in particular, it has been proven (see [13]) that the solution $P^\varepsilon(x, y)$ of equation (3.3) admits a specific type of power expansion (known as the *regularized Hadamard expansion*). This will be the starting point in Section 6.1 where the Dirac dynamics of the regularized spinor fields will be discussed in more detail. \diamond

In the following example we construct a regularization operator in Minkowski spacetime.

Example 3.6 (Hard cut-off). Consider Minkowski spacetime $(\mathbb{R}^{1,3}, \eta)$ in Cartesian coordinates. In particular, we construct an example of a regularization operator using an integral operator,

$$(\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon \psi)(x) := \int_M K^\varepsilon(x, y) \psi(y) d\mu_M(y), \quad (3.4)$$

where $x = (x^j)_{j=0,\dots,3}$ corresponds to the coordinates of a point $p \in \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ and the integral kernel $K^\varepsilon(x, y)$ is given by

$$K^\varepsilon(x, y) = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} e^{-ik(x-y)} \Theta(1 + \varepsilon k^0),$$

where $k(x-y)$ is short notation for the (Minkowski) inner product between k and $x-y$. This specific regularization operator is often dubbed 'hard cut-off' regularization: because of the Heaviside function $\Theta(1 + \varepsilon k^0)$ the interval of integration over k^0 is only $(-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, 0)$. Note that, in terms of the Fourier transform \mathcal{F} and its inverse \mathcal{F}^{-1} (acting on tempered distributions), expression (3.4) can be rewritten as

$$(\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon \psi)(x) = (\mathcal{F}^{-1} (\Theta(1 + \varepsilon k^0) (\mathcal{F}\psi))) (x),$$

so $\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon \psi \in C^0(M, SM)$ (by proceeding analogously at all $p \in M$). In the particular case that \mathfrak{R}_ε is a hard cut-off regularization operator and $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}_m$ the subspace of negative-energy solutions to the Dirac equation, the integral kernel $P^\varepsilon(x, y)$ in (3.2) is computed to be

$$P^\varepsilon(x, y) = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} (\gamma_\eta^j k_j + m) \delta(k^2 - m^2) \Theta(-k^0) \Theta(1 + \varepsilon k^0) e^{-ik(x-y)} \quad (3.5)$$

For the derivation of the previous expression see [9, Lemma 4.2], taking into account that instead of $\Theta(1 + \varepsilon k^0)$ they consider a smooth regularizing factor $e^{-\varepsilon k^0}$. Note that throughout this paper the regularization parameter ε and the mass m will be assumed to satisfy that $m \ll \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. \diamond

The previous example will play an important role in Section 7 in order to construct the spectral measure associated to the Dirac Hamiltonian (cf. Lemma 7.3) and when computing the rate of baryogenesis (see Theorem 7.4).

The regularization operators lie at the core of the theory of causal fermion systems. In particular, only spinor fields in the image of \mathfrak{R}_ε are considered *physical*: in order to study the change of certain mathematical properties of the spinor fields with respect to a fixed global time function t , they need to be evaluated pointwise. So, instead of

focusing on the spinor fields in \mathcal{H}_m or \mathcal{H}_t , the main object of study are the *regularized* spinor fields. In this paper we will be mostly interested in specific spaces of continuous spinor fields, which will be introduced in the next Section and will be denoted by $\mathcal{H}_t^\varepsilon$ (cf. Definition 4.1). In order to highlight more explicitly the link between the regularization operators and the spinor spaces introduced previously, in the following remark we construct a space of regularized spinor fields $\mathcal{H}_t^\varepsilon$ using the regularization operators.

Remark 3.7. Consider a general globally hyperbolic spacetime (M, g) with a foliation $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$, a regularization operator \mathfrak{R}_ε and a closed subspace $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}_m$. Then, keeping the spinor spaces of Definition 3.1 in mind, one possibility to define a space of regularized spinor fields (which we will denote by $\mathcal{H}_{t_0}^\varepsilon$) is as follows

$$\mathcal{H}_{t_0}^\varepsilon := (\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon \mathcal{H})|_{N_{t_0}} \cap \mathcal{H}_{t_0},$$

where $N_{t_0} \in (N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$. If $U_{t_0}^t$ corresponds to the unitary Dirac dynamics operator, then $\mathcal{H}_t^\varepsilon := U_{t_0}^t(\mathcal{H}_{t_0}^\varepsilon)$ would correspond to the regularized spinor fields which evolved from a time t_0 to a time t following the Dirac equation dynamics. In other words,

$$(D_g - m)\psi = 0$$

for all spinor fields ψ with $\psi|_{N_t} \in \mathcal{H}_t^\varepsilon := U_{t_0}^t(\mathcal{H}_{t_0}^\varepsilon)$. ◇

Note that even though the Dirac dynamics of the regularized spinor fields is well understood, cf. [13], this is the usual spin geometric setting in which no baryogenesis takes place. Furthermore, in most quantum geometry models the Dirac equation is only considered to describe the approximate evolution of the spinor fields. For this reason, we are interested in the case in which the regularized spinor fields evolve according to a slight deviation from the Dirac dynamics. In Section 6.2, we will turn our attention to the *locally rigid dynamics*, in which small modifications of the Dirac dynamics are introduced through adiabatic projections. However, before discussing this specific type of dynamics, in the next section we set the stage and introduce the concepts required to study more general spinor dynamics.

4. GOING BEYOND THE DIRAC DYNAMICS

As pointed out in [10, Section 6.1], the Dirac dynamics does not give rise to baryogenesis. Therefore, in this section we shall introduce some concepts that will allow us to study a more general spinor dynamics. However, note that the particular dynamics that we will study in more detail in this paper (the locally rigid dynamics), only introduces 'small' modifications of the Dirac dynamics (cf. Definition 6.6). For the following definition it is useful to keep Remark 3.7 in mind as a starting point to generalize the spinor spaces we introduced in the previous section.

Definition 4.1. *Let (M, g) be a globally hyperbolic spacetime with spinor bundle SM and Dirac operator D_g and consider a foliation $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$. Then, given a hypersurface $N_{t_0} \in (N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$, a closed subspace $\mathcal{H}_{t_0}^\varepsilon \subset C^0(N_{t_0}, SM) \cap \mathcal{H}_{t_0}$ and an isometric operator $V_{t_0}^t : \mathcal{H}_{t_0}^\varepsilon \rightarrow C^0(N_t, SM) \cap \mathcal{H}_t$, we define the **space of regularized spinor fields at a time t** as*

$$\mathcal{H}_t^\varepsilon := V_{t_0}^t(\mathcal{H}_{t_0}^\varepsilon)$$

Note that as we demand the operator $V_{t_0}^t$ to be isometric we only consider, by construction, dynamics for which the scalar product $(\cdot, \cdot)_t$ is independent of the considered

Cauchy hypersurface N_t . This is motivated by the commutator inner product for causal fermion systems (see [10, Section 3.4 and 4] for the details).

The meaning of the operator $V_{t_0}^t$ is that it describes a general (i.e. not necessarily Dirac) evolution of the continuous spinor fields in the spacetime (M, g) analogously to how $U_{t_0}^t$ describes their Dirac dynamics. In this paper the focus will be on a specific example of such an isometric operator $V_{t_0}^t$, namely the locally rigid operator (see Definition 6.6), which is constructed through adiabatic projections. The relation between the spinor spaces \mathcal{H}_m , \mathcal{H}_t and $\mathcal{H}_t^\varepsilon$ in the case of the Dirac dynamics was already discussed in Remark 3.7.

5. MATHEMATICAL DESCRIPTION OF BARYOGENESIS

In the following remark we discuss how to describe mathematically a process of creation of particles (i.e. baryogenesis). As a guiding scenario, the simplest case, i.e. Minkowski spacetime, is analyzed with the aim of generalizing the discussion to arbitrary spacetimes.

Motivating Example 5.1. In Minkowski spacetime, the Dirac Hamiltonian

$$H_\eta = -i\gamma_{\eta t}\gamma_\eta^\alpha\partial_\alpha + \gamma_{\eta t}m : C_{\text{sc}}^\infty(M, SM) \cap \mathcal{H}_m \rightarrow C_{\text{sc}}^\infty(M, SM) \cap \mathcal{H}_m$$

is a self-adjoint operator with essential spectrum $\sigma_{\text{ess}} = (-\infty, -m) \cup (m, \infty)$ (where $m \in [0, \infty)$ is the mass parameter). *Particles* (or *anti-particles*) are eigenstates of H_η associated to positive (or negative) eigenvalues (which in the physics literature is referred to as the *energy* of the particle). Moreover, when a spinor field that initially is an eigenstate corresponding to a negative eigenvalue $E^- < -m$ of the Dirac Hamiltonian, at a later time, becomes an eigenstate corresponding to a positive eigenvalue $E^+ > m$, this is referred to as a process of *particle creation*. Therefore, one option to describe mathematically baryogenesis in Minkowski spacetime is the following:

- (i) We choose \mathcal{H} as a subset of the negative spectral subspace of the Hamiltonian, i.e. $\mathcal{H} = (\chi_{(-\Lambda, -m)}(H_\eta))\mathcal{H}_m$, where $\Lambda > m$ and \mathcal{H}_m is, as before, the completion of the space of smooth solutions to the Dirac equation with spatial compact support. Moreover, we choose a distinguished foliation $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ of Minkowski spacetime.
- (ii) Next, given a regularization operator \mathfrak{R}_ε and starting from

$$\mathcal{H}_{t_0}^\varepsilon := (\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon \mathcal{H})|_{N_{t_0}} \cap \mathcal{H}_{t_0},$$

with $N_{t_0} \in (N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$, the spinor fields are assumed to evolve in time according to given evolution equations (in the simplest case, the Dirac equation) described by a unitary operator $V_{t_0}^t$. Evaluating the regularized spinor fields on a later Cauchy surface, and recalling that $\mathcal{H}_t^\varepsilon := V_{t_0}^t(\mathcal{H}_{t_0}^\varepsilon)$, it may happen that

$$\text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{t_0}^\varepsilon} (\chi_{(-\Lambda, -m)}(H_\eta)) \neq \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_t^\varepsilon} (\chi_{(-\Lambda, -m)}(H_\eta)) \quad (5.1)$$

for $t > t_0$. If this is the case, one can say that baryogenesis takes place.

We note for clarity that the spectral subspace $\chi_{(-\Lambda, -m)}(H_\eta)$ is the same on both sides of the equation. The subspace $\mathcal{H}_{t_0}^\varepsilon$ has evolved to the new subspace $\mathcal{H}_t^\varepsilon$. The change of this subspace relative to the fixed subspace $\chi_{(-\Lambda, -m)}(H_\eta)$ is quantified by the trace (5.1). Moreover, it will be important to verify that the difference in (5.1) is independent of the value of Λ . In this way, we make sure that we focus on the behavior near the spectral point $-m$. \diamond

We would like to generalize the previous description to arbitrary globally hyperbolic spacetimes. In particular, it would be interesting to describe baryogenesis as a relative change between the spectral subspaces of a, yet to be defined, self adjoint operator and the space of regularized spinor fields \mathcal{H}_t^ξ . Nevertheless, two main limitations of the Dirac Hamiltonian H_g have to be circumvented:

- (i) As already discussed, the Dirac Hamiltonian H_g is not symmetric in a general spacetime. Hence, H_g is not suitable for our purposes as it doesn't allow to generalize the spectral theory arguments of the previous Remark.
- (ii) We want to consider a more general dynamics than the Dirac dynamics.

This motivates the following definition which can be seen as, arguably, the simplest symmetrized generalization of the Dirac Hamiltonian H_g . Furthermore, in order to incorporate a more general spinor dynamics, it introduces a globally defined timelike vector field u . The idea is that it is this vector field which should encode the deviations from the Dirac dynamics.

Definition 5.2. (Symmetrized Hamiltonian) *Let (M, g) be a globally hyperbolic spacetime and $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ a distinguished foliation where $\nu|_{N_t}$ is the unit normal vector field to each hypersurface N_t . Moreover, choose coordinates $(x^j)_{j=1, \dots, 3}$ with $x^0 = t$ and consider a smooth global future directed timelike vector field $u : M \rightarrow TM$, which will be referred to as the **regularizing vector field**. Then, we define the **symmetrized Hamiltonian** at a time t as the operator*

$$A_t : C_0^\infty(N_t, SM) \subset \mathcal{H}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_t$$

which in local coordinates is given by the following expression:

$$A_t := \frac{1}{4} \{u^0, H_g + H_g^*\} + \frac{i}{4} \{u^\mu, \nabla_\mu^s - (\nabla_\mu^s)^*\} \quad (5.2)$$

where H_g is the Dirac Hamiltonian.

By construction, $(A_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ is a family of symmetric operators acting on $C_0^\infty(N_t, SM) \subset \mathcal{H}_t$. We now show that these operators are even essentially self-adjoint.

Lemma 5.3. *For any $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, the operator A_{t_0} with domain $C_0^\infty(N_{t_0}, SM) \subset \mathcal{H}_{t_0}$ is essentially self-adjoint on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_{t_0} .*

Proof. For a real parameter τ (which can be thought of as the time of an artificial static spacetime), we consider the Cauchy problem on $\mathbb{R} \times N_{t_0}$

$$i \partial_\tau \psi(\tau) = A_{t_0} \psi(\tau), \quad \psi(0) = \psi_0 \in C_0^\infty(N_{t_0}, SM)$$

(where $\psi(\tau) := \psi|_{\{\tau\} \times N_{t_0}}$). Because A_{t_0} is a symmetric operator on $C_0^\infty(N_{t_0}, SM) \subset \mathcal{H}_{t_0}$, this Cauchy problem can be solved using the theory of linear symmetric hyperbolic systems (see for example [17, 25] or [12, Chapter 13]). Due to finite propagation speed, the solution is compactly supported for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e. $\psi(\tau) \in C_0^\infty(\{\tau\} \times N_{t_0}, SM)$. We thus obtain a family of “time evolution operators”

$$U_{\tau', \tau} : C_0^\infty(\{\tau\} \times N_{t_0}, SM) \rightarrow C_0^\infty(\{\tau'\} \times N_{t_0}, SM),$$

which form a one-parameter group. Moreover, the computation

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} (\psi(\tau) | \phi(\tau))_{t_0} = ((-iA_{t_0})\psi(\tau) | \phi(\tau))_{t_0} + (\psi(\tau) | (-iA_{t_0})\phi(\tau))_{t_0} = 0$$

(where in the last step we used that A_{t_0} is a symmetric operator) shows this group is formed of unitary operators. This makes it possible to apply a result by Chernoff [5, Lemma 2.1] to conclude that the Hamiltonian is essentially self-adjoint with domain $C_0^\infty(N_{t_0}, SM)$. \square

In what follows, we denote the unique self-adjoint extension of A_t by the same symbol.

In the following remark we show in what sense the symmetrized Hamiltonian A_t encodes general spinor dynamics and that, in some particular cases, it has a very simple form.

Remark 5.4. Consider a distinguished foliation $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ of a globally hyperbolic spacetime (M, g) and the unit length vector field $u : M \rightarrow TM$ normal to any Cauchy hypersurface, i.e. $u|_{N_t} = \nu|_{N_t} = \partial_0|_{N_t}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, the symmetrized Hamiltonian simplifies to

$$A_t = \frac{1}{2}(H_g + H_g^*)$$

,i.e. A_t is nothing more than the symmetrization of the Dirac Hamiltonian. Furthermore, if the spacetime is stationary, then H_g is a self adjoint operator and the previous expression simply becomes:

$$A_t = H_g$$

This makes it clearer in what sense the symmetrized Hamiltonian does incorporate the Dirac dynamics: given a foliation of (M, g) , it suffices to choose a vector field $u : M \rightarrow TM$ normal to each Cauchy hypersurface.

However, for a general timelike vector field u in, for example Minkowski spacetime $(\mathbb{R}^{1,3}, \eta)$ in Cartesian coordinates, the operator A_t is given by

$$A_t = \frac{1}{2}\{u^0, H_\eta\} + \frac{i}{2}\{u^\mu, \partial_\mu\} = \frac{1}{2}\{u^0, -i\gamma_{\eta 0}\gamma_\eta^\mu \partial_\mu\} + \frac{i}{2}\{u^\mu, \partial_\mu\} \quad \diamond$$

As previously discussed, it seems convenient to describe mathematically baryogenesis as a shift in a subset of the spectrum of the family of self-adjoint operators $(A_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$. This motivates the following definition for baryogenesis.

Definition 5.5. (Baryogenesis). *Let (M, g) be a globally hyperbolic spacetime with a distinguished foliation $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$. Furthermore, let $\varepsilon, \Lambda > 0$ and consider the family of symmetrized Hamiltonians $(A_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ with spectral measure $\chi_I(A_t)$ (where $I := (-1/\varepsilon, -m)$). In the first place, fix an initial subspace $\mathcal{H}_{t_0}^\varepsilon \subset C^0(N_{t_0}, SM) \cap \mathcal{H}_t$ with $N_{t_0} \in (N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$. Then, we say that **baryogenesis** takes place at a time $t_1 > t_0$ provided that*

$$\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{t_1}^\varepsilon}(\eta_\Lambda(A_{t_1})\chi_I(A_{t_1})) \neq \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{t_0}^\varepsilon}(\eta_\Lambda(A_{t_0})\chi_I(A_{t_0})), \quad (5.3)$$

where $\eta_\Lambda \in C_0^\infty((-\Lambda, \Lambda), [0, \infty))$ is a smooth cut-off operator.

The formula (5.3) can be understood as a generalization of (5.1) to arbitrary globally hyperbolic spacetimes. One obvious difference is that the Dirac Hamiltonian H_η has been replaced by the time-dependent operator A_t . Therefore, the difference of the traces quantifies tells us about the relative change between the subspace $\mathcal{H}_t^\varepsilon$ and the spectral subspace of A_t , which now are both time dependent. Moreover, a technical difference is that we now prefer to work with a smooth cutoff near $-\Lambda$.

The previous definition triggers the following natural questions: if baryogenesis does take place in a spacetime (M, g) , how can it be quantified? In particular, does there exist a notion of *rate of baryogenesis* in this context? This question was affirmatively

answered in [10] for Minkowski spacetime assuming a constant regularizing vector field and an explicit formula for the rate of baryogenesis was proven. As we will use this result in Section 7, we refer to Lemma 7.3 for the explicit expression of the rate of baryogenesis. However, the previous questions are not yet answered for a general globally hyperbolic spacetime. It remains unclear, and will be explored in the future, how such an expression could be derived for a more general spacetime.

6. THE DYNAMICS OF THE REGULARIZATION

6.1. The Dirac dynamics. Our starting point is the discussion initiated in Remark 3.5 on the Dirac dynamics of the regularized spinor fields in an arbitrary globally hyperbolic spacetime (M, g) following [13]. Consider a closed subspace $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}_m$ and regularization operators which map to solutions to the Dirac equation, i.e.

$$\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow C^0(M, SM) \cap \mathcal{H}_m .$$

Recall that, in this setting, it holds that for all $p, q \in M$ (with coordinates $x = (x^j)_{j=0, \dots, 3}$ and $y = (y^j)_{j=0, \dots, 3}$ respectively), $P^\varepsilon(x, y) = -\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon(x)(\mathfrak{R}_\varepsilon(y))^* : S_q M \rightarrow S_p M$ is a regularized bi-solution to the Dirac equation (i.e. $(D_g - m)P^\varepsilon(x, y) = 0$). Thus it encodes the Dirac dynamics of the regularized spinor fields and it additionally satisfies that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} P^\varepsilon(x, y)$ is a distributional bi-solution to the Dirac equation.

Furthermore, in [13] it was shown that this regularized bi-solution to the Dirac equation admits, locally, a regularized Hadamard expansion in each geodesically convex neighborhood. The physical importance of this Hadamard form is that the corresponding quantum state satisfies a micro-local energy condition [21]. For the purposes of this paper, we do not need to enter the details of Hadamard states and/or Hadamard expansion. It suffices to note that the regularized Hadamard expansion gives explicit information on the behavior of $P^\varepsilon(x, y)$ near the lightcone (i.e. for points x and y which are lightlike separated or whose geodesic distance is very small). This expansion is formulated in terms of two functions Γ and f (cf. [13, equations (1.10)-(1.13) and (5.1)]), as we now briefly summarize.

Let V be a geodesically convex neighborhood and $\gamma : [\tau_q, \tau_p] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ the unique geodesic (up to reparametrizations) from $q = \gamma(\tau_q) \in V$ to $p = \gamma(\tau_p)$, with length $L_g(\gamma)$. Then $\Gamma : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as the geodesic distance squared, i.e.

$$\Gamma(p, q) := \pm(L_g(\gamma))^2 = g(\exp_{T_q M}^{-1}(p), \exp_{T_q M}^{-1}(p)) ,$$

where $\exp : TM \rightarrow M$ denotes the exponential map and with the convention of choosing the $-$ (or $+$) sign for spacelike (or timelike) separated points. By construction, Γ vanishes for lightlike separated points (see also [2, Lemma 1.3.19] or [15, Lemma B.1] for some of the properties of Γ).

On the other hand, $f : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a real valued function which is related to Γ by the following transport equations (cf. [13, Proposition 2.2]; similar transport equations are also derived in [2, Section 2.1]):

$$2g(\text{grad}_p \Gamma(p, q), \text{grad}_p f(p, q)) = 4f(p, q) \quad \text{and} \quad f(q, q) = 0 \quad (6.1)$$

for all $p, q \in V$, where V denotes again a geodesically convex neighborhood in M (for our purpose it suffices to consider the case that p and q are lightlike separated or have small geodesic distance). By solving these transport equations, the coefficients of the Hadamard expansion of $P^\varepsilon(x, y)$ are determined and, in the light of the previous discussion, the Dirac dynamics of the regularized spinor fields in (M, g) is obtained.

Lemma 6.1. *Let V be a geodesically convex neighborhood and f a real valued function satisfying equation (6.1). Given a geodesic $\gamma : [\tau_q, \tau_p] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ with $\gamma(\tau_q) = q \in V$ and $\gamma(\tau_p) = p \in V$, it holds that*

$$f(p, q) = \tau_p - \tau_q.$$

Proof. Let $\gamma : [\tau_q, \tau_p] \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ be a geodesic with $\gamma(\tau_q) = q$ and $\gamma(\tau_p) = p$. For an arbitrary $\tau \in [\tau_p, \tau_q]$ we denote:

$$\Gamma_q(\gamma(\tau)) := \Gamma(q, \gamma(\tau)) \quad \text{and} \quad f_q(\gamma(\tau)) := f(q, \gamma(\tau))$$

We use the following expression from [15, equation (B.6)]:

$$\text{grad}_{\gamma(\tau)} \Gamma_q(\gamma(\tau)) = 2\tau \dot{\gamma}(\tau).$$

Note that this result directly follows from [15, Lemma B.2] or [2, Lemma 1.3.19 and equation (1.18)]. We can then rewrite the transport equation (6.1) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} g(\tau \dot{\gamma}(\tau), \text{grad}_{\gamma(\tau)}(f_q(\gamma(\tau)))) &= f_q(\gamma(\tau)) \\ \iff \tau \dot{\gamma}^j(\tau) \partial_j(f_q(\gamma(\tau))) &= f_q(\gamma(\tau)) \end{aligned}$$

By the chain rule $\frac{d}{d\tau} f_q(\gamma(\tau)) = \dot{\gamma}^j(\tau) \partial_j(f_q(\gamma(\tau)))$, the previous expression can be rewritten as an ordinary differential equation which can be easily solved by separation of variables with the initial condition that $f_q(\gamma(\tau_q)) = f(q, q) = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau \frac{d}{d\tau} f_q(\gamma(\tau)) &= f_q(\gamma(\tau)) \\ \iff \int_0^{f_q(p)} \left(\frac{d}{d\tau} f_q(\gamma(\tau)) \right) \frac{d\tau}{f(\gamma(\tau))} &= \int_{\tau_q}^{\tau_p} \frac{d\tau}{\tau} \end{aligned}$$

which yields $f_q(p) = \tau_p - \tau_q$. □

The importance of the previous lemma is that it implies that, if a point $q \in M$ and a geodesically convex neighborhood V are fixed, at any other lightlike separated point p in V the value of $f(p, q)$ is given by the difference in the value of the affine parameter of the unique (unparametrized) null geodesic γ joining them. However, because of the freedom to reparametrize the chosen null geodesic γ , the function $f(p, q)$ does not have a unique value. Note that, given a particular parametrized null geodesic $\gamma : [\tau_q, \tau_p] \rightarrow M$ with $\gamma(\tau_q) = q$ and $\gamma(\tau_p) = p$, additive reparametrizations of this geodesic do not change the value of $f(p, q)$ (as its value is given by a *difference* in the value of the chosen affine parameter). But multiplicative reparametrizations of γ do yield a different value of $f(p, q)$. Hence, the function f solving the transport equations (6.1) is unique up to a multiplicative constant.

In order to circumvent the non-uniqueness of f , a distinguished multiplicative parametrization for the null geodesics in (M, g) can be (and will be) fixed. Geometrically, this is the scenario we are interested in, as then the flow of these unique null geodesics in (M, g) encodes the unique Dirac dynamics of the regularized spinor fields in this spacetime.

In the following definition, a distinguished reparametrization for the null geodesics in (M, g) is chosen as follows. Starting from a foliation $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ and fixing a Cauchy hypersurface N_{t_0} , a future-directed timelike vector field u on N_{t_0} is assumed. This timelike vector field can be used to choose a distinguished set of null geodesics $\gamma : I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ (and to fix a unique reparametrization) by demanding that $g_{\gamma(s)}(u_{\gamma(s)}, \dot{\gamma}(s)) = 1$ whenever $\gamma(s) \in N_{t_0}$.

Definition 6.2. Let $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ be a foliation of the globally hyperbolic spacetime (M, g) and choose a Cauchy hypersurface N_{t_0} . Furthermore, let $u : N_{t_0} \rightarrow TM$ be a smooth future directed timelike vector field. Then, \mathcal{L} is the set of maximally extended future directed null geodesics $\gamma : I \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ (together with the interval of parametrization I) in (M, g) such that whenever $\gamma(s) \in N_{t_0}$ it holds that

$$g_{\gamma(s)}(u_{\gamma(s)}, \dot{\gamma}(s)) = 1 \quad (6.2)$$

Furthermore, for an arbitrary point $p \in M$ we define the hypersurface $D_p\mathcal{L}$ of the null bundle as

$$D_p\mathcal{L} := \{\dot{\gamma}(s) \mid (I, \gamma) \in \mathcal{L} \text{ and } \gamma(s) = p\}.$$

By definition, for a point $q \in M \setminus N_{t_0}$ it holds that:

$$D_q\mathcal{L} = \{P_{s_0, s_1}^\gamma \dot{\gamma}(s_0) : \dot{\gamma}(s_0) \in D_{N_{t_0}}\mathcal{L}, \gamma(s_1) = q\} \quad (6.3)$$

where, $D_{N_{t_0}}\mathcal{L} := \bigcup_{p \in N_{t_0}} D_p\mathcal{L}$ and $P_{s_0, s_1}^\gamma : T_{\gamma(s_0)}M \rightarrow T_{\gamma(s_1)}M$ denotes the parallel transport map in (M, g) along the curve γ . Writing $D_q\mathcal{L}$ in terms of the parallel transport map as in expression (6.3) has the advantage of highlighting that, upon the initial choice of u on N_{t_0} , the specific form of these null hypersurfaces is fully determined by the geometry of (M, g) . Note that $D_p\mathcal{L}$ is a topological sphere (cf. [15, Appendix A]).

Remark 6.3. Consider a Cauchy hypersurface N_{t_1} with $t_1 > t_0$ and a point $q \in N_{t_1}$. Note that although, by definition, for each $p \in N_{t_0}$ and each $\dot{\gamma}(s) \in D_p\mathcal{L}$ it holds that $g_p(u_p, \dot{\gamma}(s)) = 1$, in general (unless if u_p is constant for each $p \in N_{t_0}$) there does not exist anymore a timelike vector field u such that $g_q(u_q, \dot{\gamma}(s')) = 1$ for all $\dot{\gamma}(s') \in D_q\mathcal{L}$. Intuitively, this means that even if for $p \in N_{t_0}$ the cross section $D_p\mathcal{L}$ will have a clear ellipsoidal shape, the shape of the hypersurfaces $D_q\mathcal{L}$ (with $q \in N_{t_1}$) will deviate from the original ellipsoid and become more irregular (see the lower part of Figure 1). In particular, while $D_p\mathcal{L}$ is fully determined by the value of u_p , $D_q\mathcal{L}$ (with $q \in N_{t_1}$) will be determined by the initial $u|_{N_{t_0}}$ and the parallel transport map (along the null geodesics in \mathcal{L}) in M (cf. expression (6.3)). Hence, in general (i.e. unless u is constant in N_{t_0}), there is no one-to-one correspondence anymore between a subset $D_q\mathcal{L}$ (with $q \in N_{t_1}$ and $t_1 > t$ arbitrary) of the null bundle and a timelike vector field at the same point. \diamond

6.2. The locally rigid dynamics. The locally rigid dynamics aims to obtain small modifications to the Dirac dynamics through adiabatic projections. The starting point is the cross section of the light cone $D_p\mathcal{L}$ with $p \in N_{t_0}$ and the discussion in Remark 6.3. The idea is to consider a small time-step Δt and to slightly perturb $D_q\mathcal{L}$ such that this hypersurface is again completely determined by a timelike vector field at y satisfying condition (6.2).

We start by presenting the locally rigid dynamics of the regularizing vector field u and, afterward, discuss how the locally rigid dynamics of the spinor fields is obtained.

Definition 6.4 (Locally rigid dynamics of u). Let $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ be a foliation of the globally hyperbolic spacetime (M, g) and choose a Cauchy hypersurface N_{t_0} . Furthermore, let $u : N_{t_0} \rightarrow TM$ be a smooth future directed timelike vector field, and let \mathcal{L} and $D_q\mathcal{L}$ (for an arbitrary point $q \in M$) be as in Definition 6.2. Consider a sufficiently small Δt such that for any $q \in N_{t_0 + \Delta t}$ there exists a normal neighborhood $U \subset M$ of q with $U \cap$




FIGURE 1. Dirac dynamics vs locally rigid dynamics.

$N_{t_0} \neq \emptyset$. Then we define the following timelike vector field at q :

$$\bar{\xi}_q := \frac{1}{\mu_q(D_q \mathcal{L})} \int_{D_q \mathcal{L}} \dot{\gamma}(s) d\mu_q(\dot{\gamma}(s)),$$

where $d\mu_q(\dot{\gamma}(s))$ is the induced volume measure on $D_q \mathcal{L}$, $(I, \gamma) \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\gamma(s) = q$. Using the vector field $\bar{\xi}_q$, we define the regularizing vector field at q by

$$u_q := \frac{1}{\bar{\xi}_q^2} \bar{\xi}_q.$$

Proceeding in an analogous way at each $q \in N_{t_0+\Delta t}$ the timelike vector field u is extended to $N_{t_0+\Delta t}$. We refer to this process as the **locally rigid dynamics** of u .

Note that, because by assumption Δt can be arbitrarily small, it might seem more convenient to refer in the previous definition to a *short-time* locally rigid dynamics

of u . However, by the following argument, the previous definition can be extended to construct a *global* locally rigid dynamics.

We now proceed iteratively in k time steps Δt with (i.e. $k = 0, 1, \dots, k_{\max} - 1$):

(i) First, at each $q \in N_{t_0+(k+1)\Delta t}$ we define

$$\bar{\xi}_q^{k+1} := \frac{1}{\mu_q(D_q\mathcal{L}^k)} \int_{D_q\mathcal{L}^k} \dot{\gamma}(s) d\mu_q(\dot{\gamma}(s)) \quad \text{and} \quad u_q := \frac{1}{|\bar{\xi}_q^{k+1}|^2} \bar{\xi}_q^{k+1}.$$

(ii) In the second step, the set \mathcal{L}^{k+1} is defined as the collection of maximal null geodesics that satisfy the condition

$$g_{\gamma(s)}(u_{\gamma(s)}, \dot{\gamma}(s)) = 1$$

with $\gamma(s) \in N_{t_0+k\Delta t}$. We also define for each point $p \in M$ the set $D_p\mathcal{L}^{k+1}$:

$$D_p\mathcal{L}^{k+1} := \{\dot{\gamma}(s) \mid (I, \gamma) \in \mathcal{L} \text{ and } \gamma(s) = p\}$$

Hence, in this way, we have constructed a timelike vector field on the Cauchy hypersurfaces separated by a time step Δt . Furthermore, if we now take the limit $k_{\max} \rightarrow \infty$, a global timelike vector field u is obtained.

Remark 6.5. The name *locally rigid* for the dynamics introduced in the previous definition can be motivated as follows. Consider a foliation $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ with initial N_{t_0} , $\Delta t > 0$ small enough and an initial timelike vector field $u : N_{t_0} \rightarrow TM$. As discussed in Remark 6.3, the hypersurface $D_p\mathcal{L}$ has an ellipsoidal shape for any $p \in N_{t_0}$ whereas for $q \in N_{t_0+\Delta t}$, $D_q\mathcal{L}$ is, in general, not an ellipsoid anymore. However, if u follows the locally rigid dynamics, then $D_q\mathcal{L}'$ still has an ellipsoidal shape. In other words, the dynamics given by Definition 6.4 is 'locally rigid', in the sense that at each point $q \in M$ there exists a timelike vector field u_q and an associated $D_q\mathcal{L}$ (or $D_q\mathcal{L}'$) which preserves an ellipsoidal shape (see the upper part of 1). \diamond

Until now the locally rigid dynamics of the regularizing vector field u has been introduced. However, the interest in this vector field is that it should describe the evolution of regularized spinor fields in (M, g) according to a dynamics that deviates slightly from the Dirac dynamics. How is the locally rigid dynamics of the spinor fields linked to the locally rigid dynamics of u ? This is addressed in the following Definition.

Definition 6.6 (Locally rigid operator). *Let (M, g) be a globally hyperbolic spacetime and $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ a foliation. Furthermore, let $u : M \rightarrow TM$ be the regularizing vector field satisfying the locally rigid dynamics (see Definition 6.4). Moreover, let $(A_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ be the associated family of symmetrized Hamiltonians (as introduced in (5.2)) and $\mathcal{H}_{t_0}^\varepsilon := \chi_I(A_{t_0})\mathcal{H}_{t_0}$. For each $\Delta t > 0$ and iterating in $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we introduce the following spaces of regularized spinor fields,*

$$\mathcal{H}_{t_0+k\Delta t}^\varepsilon := (\chi_I(A_{t_0+k\Delta t})U_{t_0+(k-1)\Delta t}^{t_0+k\Delta t} \cdots \chi_I(A_{t_0+\Delta t})U_{t_0}^{t_0+\Delta t})(\mathcal{H}_{t_0}^\varepsilon),$$

where for any $t_k < t_{k+1}$, the operator $U_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} : \mathcal{H}_{t_k} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{t_{k+1}}$ is the unitary operator that describes the Dirac evolution of the regularized spinor fields. Moreover, the **locally rigid operator** $V_{t_0}^t : \mathcal{H}_{t_0}^\varepsilon \rightarrow C^0(N_t, SM) \cap \mathcal{H}_t$ is defined by

$$V_{t_0}^t := \lim_{k_{\max} \rightarrow \infty} \chi_I(A_t)U_{t-\Delta t}^t \cdots \chi_I(A_{t_0+\Delta t})U_{t_0}^{t_0+\Delta t} \quad \text{with} \quad \Delta t := \frac{t - t_0}{k_{\max}}.$$

By construction, the locally rigid operator $V_{t_0}^t$ describes the locally rigid evolution of the regularized spinor fields. The adiabatic projections have the advantage of implementing deviations from the Dirac dynamics. Moreover, they guarantee that the locally rigid operator $V_{t_0}^t$ is unitary and thus that the scalar product $(\cdot)_t$ is independent of the chosen Cauchy hypersurface.

7. THE RATE OF BARYOGENESIS IN MINKOWSKI SPACETIME

In this section we determine the baryogenesis rate in Minkowski spacetime in the case that the regularized spinor fields follow the locally rigid dynamics. In particular, we show that baryogenesis typically does take place if we assume a non-trivial initial regularizing vector field u (i.e. if u is not constant on the initial Cauchy hypersurface N_{t_0}). The main result of this section is Theorem 7.4 where an approximate formula for the rate of baryogenesis is derived. However, before presenting this result, a dynamical equation describing the locally rigid evolution of the regularizing vector field u will be derived (cf. Lemma 7.1) and the concept of *rate of baryogenesis* will be introduced (cf. Lemma 7.3).

Minkowski spacetime $(\mathbb{R}^{1,3}, \eta)$ in Cartesian coordinates is given by the manifold \mathbb{R}^4 with the metric

$$\eta = dt^2 - dx^2 - dy^2 - dz^2.$$

Note that instead of the coordinates (t, x, y, z) we will often use (x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3) . With respect to Clifford multiplication, the Dirac representation will be used. In other words, Clifford multiplication will be given by the following matrices

$$\gamma_\eta^0 = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Id} & 0 \\ 0 & -\text{Id} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma_\eta^j = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma^j \\ -\sigma^j & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where σ^j denotes the Pauli matrices:

$$\sigma^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Clearly, with respect to the usual inner product $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^4}$ on \mathbb{C}^4 , the previous matrices satisfy that $(\gamma^0)^* = \gamma^0$ and $(\gamma^\mu)^* = -\gamma^\mu$ for $\mu \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Moreover, with respect to the inner product $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{S_p M} = \langle \gamma_{\eta 0} \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{\mathbb{C}^4}$ on the spin space $S_p M \cong \mathbb{C}^4$, a direct computation (using that $\gamma_\eta^0 \gamma_\eta^\mu = -\gamma_\eta^\mu \gamma_\eta^0$) yields that all matrices γ_η^j are symmetric with respect to this inner product (i.e. $(\gamma^j)^* = \gamma^j$). This was already mentioned to hold for general globally hyperbolic spacetimes (M, g) in Section 2.

In the following lemma we determine an approximate evolution equation for the regularizing vector field u considering that, starting from an arbitrary initial value (i.e. considering a general initial vector field on the Cauchy hypersurface N_{t_0}) it follows the locally rigid dynamics given by Definition 6.4.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ be the foliation of Minkowski spacetime given by the level sets of the global time function t . Given an initial time t_0 , we consider a positive and smooth function $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}_{>0})$ on the initial Cauchy surface N_{t_0} (with $f_p = f(x, y, z)$) and an arbitrary constant $\lambda \geq 0$. Assume that on this Cauchy surface, the regularizing vector field is given by*

$$u_p = f_p \nu + \lambda X_p \quad \text{for all } p \in N_{t_0}, \quad (7.1)$$

where ν is the normal vector field to the Cauchy hypersurface N_{t_0} and $X_p \in T_p M$ is an arbitrary spacelike vector field. Then, the locally rigid dynamical equation of u at $p \in N_{t_0}$ is given to first order in λ by

$$\frac{du_p}{dt} = -\text{grad}_\delta(f_p^{-1}) + \frac{\lambda}{f_p^3} \left(\frac{f_p}{3} \text{div}_\delta(X_p) + 4X_p(f_p) \right) \nu + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) \quad (7.2)$$

where δ denotes the Euclidean metric in \mathbb{R}^3 .

Proof. Before delving into the details of the proof, note that u_p can be rewritten in local coordinates as follows,

$$u_p = u_{p,1} + u_{p,2} + u_{p,3} \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} u_{p,1} = \frac{f_p}{3} \partial_t + \varepsilon X_p^x \partial_x \\ u_{p,2} = \frac{f_p}{3} \partial_t + \varepsilon X_p^y \partial_y \\ u_{p,3} = \frac{f_p}{3} \partial_t + \varepsilon X_p^z \partial_z \end{cases} \quad (7.3)$$

where we used that, in local coordinates, the following relations hold,

$$\nu_p = \partial_t \quad \text{and} \quad X_p = X_p^\alpha \partial_\alpha \quad \text{with} \quad X_p^\alpha = X_p^\alpha(x, y, z).$$

Then, by linearity, computing $\frac{du_p}{dt}$ reduces to determining dynamical equations of the form $\frac{du_{p,\alpha}}{dt}$, with $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Computing the latter is much easier as now each $u_{p,\alpha}$ is the sum of a timelike vector field and a spacelike vector field which points exclusively in one direction. Moreover, we want to determine the dynamical equation linearly in λ . For this reason, without loss of generality, in this proof it suffices to consider the case that X_p only points in one direction, i.e. we consider that, in local coordinates, it holds that

$$u_p = f_p \partial_t + \lambda h_p \partial_\mu \quad \text{for all } p \in N_{t_0}$$

with $\mu \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and where $h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}_{>0})$ is a function of all three coordinates (x, y, z) . At the end of the proof, when rewriting the coordinate-dependent dynamical equation for u_p in a more abstract and geometric way, we will, however, take into account that the spacelike vector field can point in an arbitrary direction (as in expression (7.3)). However, it is important to note that the previous argument would not work if we wanted to obtain the expansion of the dynamical equation to second (or higher) order in λ (i.e. terms which are not linear in λ anymore).

In order to compute the locally rigid dynamical equation of u , we need to use some of the formulas derived in the proof of [10, Theorem A.2]. For the sake of completeness, we begin by presenting the first part of their proof until we reach the expressions needed for the derivation of the dynamical equation.

In the first part of the proof, the set \mathcal{L} and $D_p \mathcal{L}$ (for an arbitrary $p \in M$) are determined explicitly. Let $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ be the foliation of Minkowski spacetime given by the level sets of the global time function t . Following Definition 6.2, \mathcal{L} is the set of maximal null geodesics $\gamma : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{1,3}$ (together with the interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$) that satisfy the relation

$$g(u_p, \xi_p(n)) = 1 \quad (7.4)$$

whenever $p = \gamma(s) \in N_{t_0}$, and where $\xi_p(n)$ denotes the tangent vector of γ at the point $p = \gamma(s)$. The reason that we denote the tangent vector by $\xi_p(n)$ is due to the

fact that any null vector $\dot{\gamma}(s)$ can also be written in the computationally convenient form (see [15, Appendix A])

$$\dot{\gamma}(s) = b_p(n)\zeta(n) =: \xi_p(n). \quad (7.5)$$

where $n \in \mathbb{S}^2$, $\zeta(n) = (1, n)$ and $b_p : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow (0, \infty)$. Note that equations (7.4) and (7.5) imply that for any $p \in N_{t_0}$, the function $b_p(n)$ must be given by

$$b_p(n) = \frac{1}{g(u_p, \zeta(n))}. \quad (7.6)$$

This equation fully determines the set \mathcal{L} . Moreover, at any point $q \in M$ (not necessarily $q \in N_{t_0}$), $D_q\mathcal{L}$ can be written as the following set:

$$D_q\mathcal{L} := \{\xi_q(n) = \dot{\gamma}(s) \mid (I, \gamma) \in \mathcal{L} \text{ and } \gamma(s) = q\},$$

In particular, the measure on $D_q\mathcal{L}$ presents the simple form (see [15, equation (A.3)]):

$$d\mu_q = b_q(n)^2 d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^2},$$

where $d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^2}$ is the Lebesgue measure on the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 . Whereas (7.6) fixes the explicit value of $b_p(n)$ (and thus $\xi_p(n)$) for all $p \in N_{t_0}$, how does $b_q(n)$ for a point $q \notin N_{t_0}$ look like? Note that this is a very important question in order to compute the dynamical equation of u . The value of $b_q(n)$ and thus $D_q\mathcal{L}$ are determined by the Dirac dynamics of the spinor fields. The Dirac dynamics is easily implemented in Minkowski spacetime because null geodesics are given by straight lines. Let $q \in N_{t'}$ and $p' \in N_{t_0}$ be two points with coordinates $(t', 0, 0, 0)$ and $(t_0, -t'n^1, -t'n^2, -t'n^3)$ and $t' > t$. Then, the Dirac dynamics is simply implemented by demanding that

$$b_q(n) = b_{p'}(n).$$

This finishes the first part of the proof in which the main objects that will be used in the computations are presented.

In the second part of the proof we determine the differential equation that governs the locally rigid dynamics of the regularizing vector field u . Without loss of generality we choose $t_0 = 0$. Moreover, consider the points $p, q, p' \in M$ with coordinates $(0, 0, 0, 0)$, $(\Delta t, 0, 0, 0)$ and $(0, -\Delta t n^1, -\Delta t n^2, -\Delta t n^3)$, respectively (with $n \in \mathbb{S}^2$ a unit vector).

In the first place, for a fixed unit vector $n \in \mathbb{S}^2$ the linear Taylor expansion in Δt of $b_{p'}(n) = b_{(0, -\Delta t n)}(n)$ is

$$b_{p'}(n) = b_p(n) + \left. \frac{\partial b_{(0, -\Delta t n)}}{\partial \Delta t} \right|_{\Delta t=0} \Delta t + \mathcal{O}((\Delta t)^2), \quad (7.7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} b_p(n) &= \frac{1}{g(u_p, \zeta(n))} \quad (7.8) \\ \left. \frac{\partial b_{(0, -\Delta t n)}}{\partial \Delta t} \right|_{\Delta t=0} &= -\frac{1}{[g(u_p, \zeta(n))]^2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta t} g(u_{(0, -\Delta t n)}, \zeta(n)) \right) \Big|_{\Delta t=0} \\ &= \frac{1}{[g(u_p, \zeta(n))]^2} n^\mu g(\partial_\mu u_p, \zeta(n)) \\ &= \frac{1}{[g(u_p, \zeta(n))]^2} \zeta^i \pi(\nu^\perp)_i^j g(\zeta(n), \partial_j u_p). \quad (7.9) \end{aligned}$$

Here ζ^j denotes the components of the vector $\zeta(n)$ and for an arbitrary timelike vector v we denote the projections to the span of v and to its orthogonal complement by

$$\pi(v)_j^i := \frac{v^i v_j}{v^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \pi(v^\perp)_j^i := \delta_j^i - \frac{v^i v_j}{v^2}.$$

Substituting (7.8) and (7.9) into (7.7), we get the following expression,

$$b_{p'}(n) = \frac{1}{g(u_p, \zeta(n))} + \frac{\Delta t}{[g(u_p, \zeta(n))]^2} \zeta^i \pi(\nu^\perp)_i^j \langle \zeta(n), \partial_j u_p \rangle + \mathcal{O}((\Delta t)^2).$$

Next, using that

$$b_p(n) = \frac{1}{g(u_p, \zeta(n))} \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_p^j = b_p(n) \zeta^j,$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} b_{p'}(n) &= b_p(n) \left(1 + \Delta t \zeta^i b_p(n) \pi(\nu^\perp)_i^j g(\zeta(n), \partial_j u_p) \right) + \mathcal{O}((\Delta t)^2) \\ &= b_p(n) \left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{b_p(n)} \xi_p^i \pi(\nu^\perp)_i^j g(\xi_p(n), \partial_j u_p) \right) + \mathcal{O}((\Delta t)^2) \\ &= b_p(n) \left(1 + \frac{\Delta t}{g(\xi_p(n), \nu)} \xi_p^i \pi(\nu^\perp)_i^j g(\xi_p, \partial_j u_p) \right) + \mathcal{O}((\Delta t)^2), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used that $b_p(n) = g(\nu, \xi_p(n))$. As discussed in the first part of the proof, we now implement the Dirac dynamics by demanding that $b_q(n) = b_{p'}(n)$. We thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d\mu_q(\xi_q) &= b_q^2(n) d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^2}(n) = b_{p'}^2(n) d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^2}(n) \\ &= b_p^2(n) \left[1 + 2\Delta t \frac{\xi_p^k(n)}{g(\xi_p(n), \nu)} \pi(\nu^\perp)_k^j g(\xi_p(n), \partial_j u_p) + \mathcal{O}((\Delta t)^2) \right] d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^2}(n) \end{aligned} \quad (7.10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_q d\mu_q(\xi_q) &= \xi_{p'} d\mu_{p'}(\xi_{p'}) = b_{p'}^3(n) \zeta(n) d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^2}(n) \\ &= b_p^3(n) \left[1 + 3\Delta t \frac{\xi_p^k(n)}{g(\xi_p(n), \nu)} \pi(\nu^\perp)_k^j g(\xi_p(n), \partial_j u_p) + \mathcal{O}((\Delta t)^2) \right] \xi_p(n) d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^2}(n). \end{aligned} \quad (7.11)$$

Note that in (7.10) and (7.11) only spatial derivatives of u_p come into play because $\pi(\nu^\perp)_j^0 = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. From now on, for notational simplicity, we drop explicit reference to the normal vector n .

By the chain rule we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\xi}_p &:= \frac{1}{\mu_p(D_p \mathcal{L})} \int_{D_p \mathcal{L}} \xi_p d\mu_p(\xi_p) \\ \frac{d\bar{\xi}_p}{dt} &= -\frac{\bar{\xi}_p}{\mu_p(D_p \mathcal{L})} \frac{d}{dt}(\mu_p(D_p \mathcal{L})) + \frac{1}{\mu_p(D_p \mathcal{L})} \int_{D_p \mathcal{L}} \frac{d}{dt}(\xi_p d\mu_p(\xi_p)) \end{aligned} \quad (7.12)$$

We compute each term individually using (7.10) and (7.11) and combine them with expression (7.12) in order to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}(\mu_p(D_p\mathcal{L})) &= \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu_{p+\Delta t}(D_{p+\Delta t}\mathcal{L}) - \mu_p(D_p\mathcal{L})}{\Delta t} = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu_q(D_q\mathcal{L}) - \mu_p(D_p\mathcal{L})}{\Delta t} \\
&= \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \left[\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} b_p^2 \left(1 + 2\Delta t \frac{\xi_p^k}{g(\xi_p, \nu)} \pi(\nu^\perp)^j_k g(\xi_p, \partial_j u_p) + \mathcal{O}((\Delta t)^2) \right) d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^2} - \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} b_p^2 d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^2} \right] \\
&= \int_{D_p\mathcal{L}} 2 \frac{\xi_p^k}{g(\xi_p, \nu)} \pi(\nu^\perp)^j_k g(\xi_p, \partial_j u_p) d\mu_p(\xi_p) \\
\frac{d}{dt}(\xi_p d\mu_p(\xi_p)) &= \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\xi_q d\mu_q(\xi_q) - \xi_p d\mu_p(\xi_p)}{\Delta t} \\
&= \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \left[\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} b_p^3 \left(1 + 3\Delta t \frac{\xi_p^k}{g(\xi_p, \nu)} \pi(\nu^\perp)^j_k g(\xi_p, \partial_j u_p) + \mathcal{O}((\Delta t)^2) \right) d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^2} - \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} b_p^3 d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^2} \right] \\
&= \int_{D_p\mathcal{L}} 3 \frac{\xi_p^k}{g(\xi_p, \nu)} \pi(\nu^\perp)^j_k g(\xi_p, \partial_j u_p) \xi_p d\mu_p(\xi_p) \\
\frac{d\bar{\xi}_p}{dt} &= \int_{D_p\mathcal{L}} \frac{\xi_p^k}{g(\xi_p, \nu)} \pi(\nu^\perp)^j_k g(\xi_p, \partial_j u_p) \left[3\xi_p - 2\frac{u_p}{u_p^2} \right] d\mu_p(\xi_p),
\end{aligned}$$

where we also used that $\bar{\xi}_p = \frac{u_p}{|u_p|^2}$.

For ease in notation, from now on we omit the subscript p , which denotes the point at which the vector fields are evaluated. As $u = \frac{\bar{\xi}}{|\bar{\xi}|^2}$, applying the chain rule and using the previous computation, we get the following dynamical equation for u ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{du}{dt} &= \frac{1}{|\bar{\xi}|^2} \frac{d\bar{\xi}}{dt} - 2 \frac{\bar{\xi}}{|\bar{\xi}|^4} g \left(\bar{\xi}, \frac{d\bar{\xi}}{dt} \right) \\
&= u^2 \frac{d\bar{\xi}}{dt} - 2 \frac{u}{|\bar{\xi}|^2} g \left(\bar{\xi}, \frac{d\bar{\xi}}{dt} \right) = u^2 \left[\frac{d\bar{\xi}}{dt} - 2ug \left(\bar{\xi}, \frac{d\bar{\xi}}{dt} \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\mu_p(D_p\mathcal{L})} \int_{D_p\mathcal{L}} \frac{\xi^k}{g(\xi, \nu)} \pi(\nu^\perp)^j_k g(\xi, \partial_j u) [3u^2\xi + 2u - 6uu^i\xi_i] d\mu(\xi),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that

$$u^2 = \frac{1}{\bar{\xi}^2} \quad \text{and} \quad 2g(\bar{\xi}, 3\xi - 2\bar{\xi}) = 6\bar{\xi}^i \xi_i - 4\bar{\xi}^2 = \frac{1}{u^2} [6u^i \xi_i - 4].$$

This is a system of quasi-linear partial differential equations of first order which can be rewritten for each component of u as follows

$$\frac{du^l}{dt} = \pi(\nu^\perp)^j_k g_{mn} \left[3u^i u_i (I_3)^{knl} + 2u^l (I_2)^{kn} - 6u^l u^i g_{si} (I_3)^{nks} \right] \partial_j u^m, \quad (7.13)$$

where the integrals I_3 and I_2 are given by

$$(I_3)^{knl} = \frac{1}{\mu_p(D_p\mathcal{L})} \int_{D_p\mathcal{L}} \frac{1}{g(\xi, \nu)} \xi^k \xi^n \xi^l d\mu(\xi) \quad (7.14)$$

$$(I_2)^{kn} = \frac{1}{\mu_p(D_p\mathcal{L})} \int_{D_p\mathcal{L}} \frac{1}{g(\xi, \nu)} \xi^k \xi^n d\mu(\xi). \quad (7.15)$$

The expressions (7.13) are the differential equations that determine the locally rigid dynamical equation of u . This finishes the second part of the proof.

In the last part of the proof, the integrals $(I_2)^{kn}$ and $(I_3)^{knl}$ will be computed and a simpler locally rigid dynamical equation for u is obtained by expanding (7.13) in powers of λ . It is only at this stage that the particular form considered for the regularizing vector field u on the initial Cauchy hypersurface will come into play.

The integrals $(I_3)^{knl}$ and $(I_3)^{knl}$ are easier to compute after applying a (proper orthochronous) Lorentz transformation $\Lambda \in \text{SO}^+(3,1)$ such that, in local coordinates, $u' = \Lambda u \stackrel{!}{=} |u|(1,0)$. In this reference frame, $f'(n) = \frac{1}{|u|}$ and thus $\xi'^j = \frac{1}{|u|}\zeta^j$. Hence, the integrals simplify to

$$(I_3')^{knl} = \frac{1}{|u|^4} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \frac{1}{g(\zeta, \nu)} \zeta^k \zeta^n \zeta^l d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^2} \quad (7.16)$$

$$(I_2')^{kn} = \frac{1}{|u|^3} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \frac{1}{g(\zeta, \nu)} \zeta^k \zeta^n d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^2}, \quad (7.17)$$

where the measure on the sphere is $d\mu_{\mathbb{S}^2} = d\varphi dv$ with $v = \cos \theta \in (-1,1)$ and $\varphi \in [0, 2\pi)$. Moreover, $\zeta(n) = (1, n) = (1, \sqrt{1-v^2} \cos \varphi, \sqrt{1-v^2} \sin \varphi, v)$. The original integrals are obtained by the transformations

$$(I_3)^{knl} = (\Lambda^{-1})_i^k (\Lambda^{-1})_j^n (\Lambda^{-1})_l^i (I_3')^{ijk} \quad \text{and} \quad (I_2)^{kn} = (\Lambda^{-1})_i^k (\Lambda^{-1})_j^n (I_2')^{ij}.$$

The integrals given by (7.16) are straightforward to compute³. In order to obtain the dynamical equation of u we study separately the following cases:

- (1) $u = (f_p, \lambda h, 0, 0)$:

In the first case, the series expansion of equation (7.14) to first order in λ yields

$$\frac{du}{dt} = \left(\frac{4\lambda h}{f^3} \partial_x(f) + \frac{\lambda}{3f^2} \partial_x(h), \frac{\partial_x f}{f^2}, \frac{\partial_y f}{f^2}, \frac{\partial_z f}{f^2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2).$$

- (2) $u = (f, 0, \lambda h, 0)$:

In the second case, the series expansion of equation (7.14) to first order in λ yields

$$\frac{du}{dt} = \left(\frac{4\lambda h}{f^3} \partial_y(f) + \frac{\lambda}{3f^2} \partial_y(h), \frac{\partial_x f}{f^2}, \frac{\partial_y f}{f^2}, \frac{\partial_z f}{f^2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2).$$

- (3) $u = (f, 0, 0, \lambda h)$:

Finally, the series expansion of equation (7.14) to first order in λ yields

$$\frac{du}{dt} = \left(\frac{4\lambda h}{f^3} \partial_z(f) + \frac{\lambda}{3f^2} \partial_z(h), \frac{\partial_x f}{f^2}, \frac{\partial_y f}{f^2}, \frac{\partial_z f}{f^2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2).$$

Hence, for a general initial timelike vector field $u = f_p \partial_t + \lambda X_p$ (where X_p is an arbitrary spacelike vector field, recall the discussion at the beginning of this proof), the locally rigid dynamical equation becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{du_p}{dt} &= \left(4 \frac{\partial_\mu(f_p)}{f_p^3} h_p + \frac{\partial_\mu(h_p)}{3f_p^2} \right) \lambda \partial_t + \frac{\partial_x f_p}{f_p^2} \partial_x + \frac{\partial_y f_p}{f_p^2} \partial_y + \frac{\partial_z f_p}{f_p^2} \partial_z + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) \\ &= -\text{grad}_\delta(f_p^{-1}) + \frac{\lambda}{f_p^3} \left(\frac{f_p}{3} \text{div}_\delta(X_p) + 4X_p(f_p) \right) \nu + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

³This computation was carried out with the help of computer algebra. The corresponding **Wolfram Mathematica** worksheet is included as an ancillary file to the arXiv submission of this paper.

Note that, while the parameter λ scales the spatial component of the initial regularizing vector field u in the direction of the spacelike vector X , the function f scales the normal component of u at each point of the initial Cauchy hypersurface.

Remark 7.2. A surprising feature of the previous evolution equation is that, even in the simplest case in which $\lambda = 0$, the locally rigid dynamics of u is still non trivial, i.e.

$$\frac{du_p}{dt} = -\text{grad}_\delta(f_p^{-1}).$$

In other words, even if initially the regularizing vector field is proportional to ∂_t , the locally rigid evolution of u gives rise to a non-zero spatial component of the regularizing vector field: unless $u|_{N_{t_0}}$ is constant (i.e. $\partial_\mu f_p = 0$ for all $\mu \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $p \in N_{t_0}$), at a later time, u is not parallel to ∂_t anymore. \diamond

Before presenting the main theorem of this paper, we introduce a notion of *rate of baryogenesis* in the Minkowski spacetime. Note that in the following lemma and subsequent theorem we will assume that, on the initial Cauchy hypersurface, the regularizing vector field is given by

$$u_p = (1 + \lambda \tilde{f}_p) \nu + \lambda X_p \quad \text{for all } p \in N_{t_0} \quad (7.18)$$

with \tilde{f} a smooth positive function of the spatial coordinates. Note that this ansatz for the regularizing vector field agrees with that of the previous lemma (cf. (7.1)) if we choose $f = 1 + \lambda \tilde{f}$. The main advantage of expression (7.18) is that it makes a perturbative analysis (and the involved computations) simpler. In particular, by perturbing around $\lambda = 0$ we recover a well known scenario: 1) perturbations around $\lambda = 0$ in the initial vector field u correspond to perturbations around the normal vector field $u|_{\lambda=0} = \nu = \partial_t$ and 2) perturbations of A_t around $\lambda = 0$ correspond to perturbations around the Dirac Hamiltonian $A_t|_{\lambda=0} = H_\eta$.

Lemma 7.3. *Consider Minkowski spacetime with an initial regularizing vector field u given by expression (7.18). Then, linearly in λ , the rate of baryogenesis is given by*

$$B_t = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_t^\varepsilon} \left(\left(\frac{d}{dt} A_t \right) \chi_I(H_\eta) \right) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2). \quad (7.19)$$

Moreover, $\chi_I(H_\eta)$ is an integral operator. Applied to a spinor field $\psi \in C_{sc}^\infty \cap \mathcal{H}_m$ at a point p with coordinates $x = (t, x^\mu)$, the operator $\chi_I(H_\eta)$ is given by

$$(\chi_I(H_\eta)\psi)(x) = -2\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} P^\varepsilon(x, y) \gamma_\eta^0 \psi(y) d^3y, \quad (7.20)$$

with $y = (0, y^\mu)$ and where $P^\varepsilon(x, y)$ is again the distributional kernel (3.5).

Proof. In the first place, note that if the regularizing vector field u is constant, in [10, Section 7] a formula for the rate of baryogenesis was derived:

$$B_t = \text{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_t^\varepsilon} \left(\left(\frac{d}{dt} A_t \right) \chi_I(A_t) \right) \quad (7.21)$$

where $I := (-1/\varepsilon, -m)$. Note that the previous formula only applies to constant regularizing vector fields u and that for the one given by (7.18), a constant vector field is recovered for $\lambda = 0$ (namely $u = \partial_t$). Therefore, in order to compute B_t linearly in λ using the previous formula and the dynamical equation for u to first order in λ

(which yields the linear expansion of $\frac{dA_t}{dt}$), the product operator $\chi_I(A_t)\dot{A}_t$ has to be evaluated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{A}_t\chi_I(A_t) &= \left(\dot{A}_t|_{\lambda=0} + \frac{d\dot{A}_t}{d\lambda}|_{\lambda=0} \lambda \right) \chi_I(A_t|_{\lambda=0}) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) \\ &= \left(\frac{d\dot{A}_t}{d\lambda}|_{\lambda=0} \lambda \right) \chi_I(H_\eta) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2)\end{aligned}\tag{7.22}$$

where $\dot{A}_t := \frac{dA_t}{dt}$, $\dot{A}_t|_{\lambda=0} = 0$ and the explicit expression for $\left(\frac{d\dot{A}_t}{d\lambda}|_{\lambda=0} \lambda \right)$ comes from the expansion to linear order of the dynamical equation for u and will be computed later (see equation (7.30)). Taking the trace on both sides of the previous expression (and identifying $\left(\frac{d\dot{A}_t}{d\lambda}|_{\lambda=0} \lambda \right)$ with \dot{A}_t) yields equation (7.19).

We now proceed to show that the product operator $\dot{A}_t\chi_I(H_\eta)$ is trace-class. To this end, we note that $\chi_I(H_\eta)$ is an integral operator with smooth kernel (as is obvious from (7.20) and the fact that the integrand in (3.5) is compactly supported). Moreover, \dot{A}_t is a differential operator with smooth, compactly supported coefficients. Therefore, the operator product in (7.19) is an integral operator of the form

$$\left(\left(\frac{d}{dt} A_t \right) \chi_I(H_\eta) \psi \right) (x) = (K\psi)(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} K(x, y) \psi(y) d^3y$$

with $x = (t, x^\mu)$, $y = (0, y^\mu)$, $\psi \in C_{\text{sc}}^\infty(M, SM) \cap \mathcal{H}_m$ and a smooth, compactly supported kernel $K(x, y)$. Now we can follow the procedure in [19, Section 30, Theorem 13]: The operator K^*K is positive and has again a smooth, compactly supported kernel. It then follows from Mercer's theorem that this operator is trace class and thus that it has a purely discrete spectrum. We order its eigenvalues in descending order $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq 0$. Moreover, approximating the kernel by polynomials (using the Stone-Weierstraß theorem), one concludes as in [19, Section 30, Theorem 13] that the eigenvalues λ_n of K^*K decay faster than any polynomial (i.e. for any $b > 0$ there is a constant $c > 0$ such that $\lambda_n \leq cn^{-b/2}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$). A decay faster than quadratic (i.e. $b > 4$) implies that K is trace class (and thus also the product operator $\dot{A}_t\chi_I(H_\eta)$) as the decay of the eigenvalues of K^*K guarantees that the series given by the sum over all singular values of K (i.e. the non-zero eigenvalues of $\sqrt{K^*K}$) converges:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} s_n(K) \leq C \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^\beta} < \infty$$

where $\beta := b/4 > 1$, C is a constant and $s_n(K)$ denotes the n -th singular value of K (note that from the previous bound on λ_n , we have that $s_n(K) = \sqrt{\lambda_n} \leq \sqrt{cn^{-b/4}}$).

It remains to prove expression (7.20). The strategy that will be followed in order to achieve this (and to show that it does define a projection-valued measure) will be to construct the functional calculus of the self-adjoint operator

$$H_\eta : C_{\text{sc}}^\infty(M, SM) \cap \mathcal{H}_m \rightarrow C_{\text{sc}}^\infty(M, SM) \cap \mathcal{H}_m$$

and then apply it to the characteristic function χ_I .

Consider the algebra \mathcal{A} of continuous bounded functions from the spectrum $\sigma(H_\eta)$ to \mathbb{C} . For a given function $g \in \mathcal{A}$ and using coordinates $x = (t, x^\mu)$, $y = (0, y^\mu)$ we

define the following integral operator

$$(g(H_\eta)\psi)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} g(H_\eta)(x, y) \psi(y) d^3y ,$$

with integral kernel

$$\begin{aligned} g(H_\eta)(x, y) &= 2\pi \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} g(k^0) (\gamma_{\eta j} k^j + m) \delta(k^2 - m^2) \epsilon(k^0) e^{-ik(x-y)} \gamma_\eta^0 \\ &=: 2\pi Q_g(x, y) \gamma_\eta^0 \end{aligned} \quad (7.23)$$

where, as in Remark 3.6, $k(x-y)$ is short notation for the (Minkowski) inner product between k and $x-y$. In the rest of the proof, we proceed to show that the map

$$\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(C_{\text{sc}}^\infty(M, SM) \cap \mathcal{H}_m), \quad g \mapsto g(H_\eta) ,$$

defines the functional calculus associated to the self-adjoint operator H_η . Note that in the previous formula $d^3y = dy^1 dy^2 dy^3$ denotes the Lebesgue measure on the spatial slice $N_t \cong \mathbb{R}^3$.

- The map Φ is an algebra-homomorphism, i.e. for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and functions $g, h \in \mathcal{A}$ it holds that

$$(g + \alpha h)(H_\eta) = g(H_\eta) + \alpha h(H_\eta) \quad (7.24)$$

$$g(H_\eta) h(H_\eta) = (gh)(H_\eta) \quad (7.25)$$

The first expression follows directly from linearity of the integral, whereas the second one requires a longer computation. Consider points with coordinates $x = (t, x^\mu), y = (t_0, y^\mu), z = (t_1, z^\mu)$. For simplicity, we set $t_0 = 0$. Then, for a spinor field ψ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (g(H_\eta)(h(H_\eta)\psi))(x) &= 2\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} Q_g(x, y) \gamma_\eta^0 (h(H_\eta)\psi)(y) d^3y \\ &= (2\pi)^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} Q_g(x, y) \gamma_\eta^0 Q_h(y, z) \gamma_\eta^0 \psi(z) d^3y d^3z \\ ((gh)(H_\eta)\psi)(x) &= 2\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} Q_{gh}(x, z) \gamma_\eta^0 \psi(z) d^3z \end{aligned}$$

Hence, equation (7.25) only holds provided the following expression is satisfied:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} Q_g(x, y) \gamma_\eta^0 Q_h(y, z) d^3y = \frac{1}{2\pi} Q_{gh}(x, z) \quad (7.26)$$

We now proceed to show that the previous equation holds, inspired by the proof of expression (1.2.24) in [8]. We start by rewriting the left-hand side of equation (7.26) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} Q_g(x, y) \gamma_\eta^0 Q_h(y, z) d^3y \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d^3y e^{iy(k-k')} \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} e^{-ikx} \int \frac{d^4k'}{(2\pi)^4} e^{ik'z} \tilde{Q}_g(k) \gamma_\eta^0 \tilde{Q}_h(k') \\ &= \int \frac{d^4k}{2\pi} \delta^3(k^\mu - k'^\mu) e^{-ikx} \int \frac{d^4k'}{(2\pi)^4} e^{ik'z} \tilde{Q}_g(k) \gamma_\eta^0 \tilde{Q}_h(k') \\ &= \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \int \frac{dk'^0}{2\pi} \left[e^{ik'z - ikx} \tilde{Q}_g(k) \gamma_\eta^0 \tilde{Q}_h(k') \right] \Big|_{k'=(k^0, k^\mu)} \end{aligned} \quad (7.27)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{Q}_g(k) &:= g(k^0)(\gamma_{\eta j}k + m)\delta(k^2 - m^2)\epsilon(k^0) \\ \tilde{Q}_h(k') &:= h(k'^0)(\gamma_{\eta j}k' + m)\delta(k'^2 - m^2)\epsilon(k'^0)\end{aligned}$$

The computation in [8, Lemma 1.2.8] shows that the following identity holds

$$\begin{aligned}(\gamma_{\eta j}k^j + m)\gamma_{\eta 0}(\gamma_{\eta j}k'^j + m)\delta(k^2 - m^2)\delta(k'^2 - m^2) \\ = \epsilon(k^0)(\gamma_{\eta j}k^j + m)\delta(k'^0 - k^0)\delta(k^2 - m^2)\end{aligned}$$

Inserting the previous expression in equation (7.27) with $k' = (k'^0, k^\mu)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}& \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} Q_g(x, y)\gamma_{\eta}^0 Q_h(y, z)d^3y \\ &= \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \int e^{i(k'z - kx)} \frac{dk'^0}{2\pi} (\gamma_{\eta j}k^j + m)\delta(k'^0 - k^0)\delta(k^2 - m^2)\epsilon(k'^0)g(k^0)h(k'^0) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} e^{-ik(x-z)} (\gamma_{\eta j}k^j + m)\delta(k^2 - m^2)\epsilon(k^0)(gh)(k^0) = \frac{1}{2\pi} Q_{gh}(x, z)\end{aligned}$$

- Moreover, we now show that for the identity map $g \equiv \text{Id} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \lambda \mapsto \lambda$, it holds that $\text{id}(H_\eta) = H_\eta$. As discussed in Remark 3.5, a solution to the Cauchy problem of the Dirac equation can be represented (see [12, Theorem 13.4.2] for the proof in Minkowski spacetime) at any point p with coordinates $(x^j)_{j=0,\dots,3}$ by the following formula:

$$\psi(x) = 2\pi \int k_m(x, y)\gamma_{\eta 0}\psi(y)d^3y$$

For simplicity, we set $x = (t, x^\mu)$ and $y = (0, y^\mu)$. Furthermore, in Minkowski spacetime the integral kernel $k_m(x, y)$ is (cf. [8, equations (2.1.10), (2.1.13) and ((2.1.14))] and [12, Section 16]):

$$k_m(x, y) = \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} (\gamma_{\eta j}k^j + m) \delta(k^2 - m^2) \epsilon(k^0) e^{-ik(x-y)}. \quad (7.28)$$

Hence, for $g \equiv \text{id}$, we recover the following integral kernel and corresponding integral operator:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{id}(H_\eta)(x, y) &= 2\pi \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} k^0 (\gamma_{\eta j}k^j + m) \delta(k^2 - m^2) \epsilon(k^0) e^{-ik(x-y)} \gamma_\eta^0 \\ &= 2\pi i \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} (\gamma_{\eta j}k^j + m) \delta(k^2 - m^2) \epsilon(k^0) \partial_t(e^{-ik(x-y)}) \gamma_\eta^0 \\ &= 2\pi i (\partial_t k_m(x, y)) \\ (\text{id}(H_\eta)\psi)(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \text{id}(H_\eta)(x, y) \psi(y) d^3y = 2\pi i \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (\partial_t k_m(x, y)) \psi(y) d^3y \\ &= i\partial_t \psi(x) = (H_\eta \psi)(x)\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used that $H_\eta = i\partial_t$ (cf. Remark 3.3). On the other hand, note that it almost directly follows from equation (7.28) that for the constant function $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \lambda \mapsto 1$ the associated integral operator satisfies that $g(H_\eta) = \text{Id}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}$.

- Finally, we also show that for any g it holds that

$$\bar{g}(H_\eta) = g(H_\eta)^*$$

,i.e. the map Φ is a *-algebra homomorphism. Recall the discussion at the beginning of this section on the symmetry of the maps γ_η^j with respect to the spin space inner product $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{S_{xM}}$. The adjoint operator $(g(H_\eta))^*$ is

$$\begin{aligned} (\psi | g(H_\eta) \varphi)_t &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \langle \psi(x) | \gamma_{\eta 0} (g(H_\eta) \varphi)(x) \rangle_{S_{xM}} d^3x \\ &= 2\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \langle \gamma_{\eta 0} \psi(x) | Q_g(x, y) \gamma_{\eta 0} \varphi(y) \rangle_{S_{xM}} d^3y d^3x \\ &= 2\pi \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \langle Q_{\bar{g}}(y, x) \gamma_\eta^0 \psi(x) | \gamma_{\eta 0} \varphi(y) \rangle_{S_{yM}} d^3y d^3x \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \langle (\bar{g}(H_\eta) \psi)(y) | \gamma_{\eta 0} \varphi(y) \rangle_{S_{yM}} d^3y = (\bar{g}(H_\eta) \psi | \varphi)_t = (g(H_\eta)^* \psi | \varphi)_t \end{aligned}$$

where $Q_{\bar{g}}(y, x)$ is the adjoint of $Q_g(x, y)$ with respect to $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle_{S_{xM}}$.

Thus we obtain the functional calculus associated to the self-adjoint operator H_η . Considering now the interval $I = (-\frac{1}{\varepsilon}, -m)$, the characteristic function $g = \chi_I$ and using that $\chi_I(k^0) = \Theta(1 + \varepsilon k^0) \Theta(-k^0 - m)$ we recover expression (7.20) with $Q_g = P^\varepsilon(x, y)$ as in equation (3.5). Note that in (3.5) we have $\Theta(-k^0)$ instead of $\Theta(-k^0 - m)$; because of the factor $\delta(k^2 - m^2)$ in (3.5) and (7.23) both yield the same integration interval over k^0 . The (-1) factor in (7.20) is simply due to the sign function $\varepsilon(k^0)$. \square

Using the previous lemmata we can compute the rate of baryogenesis, which is the main result of this section.

Theorem 7.4. *Let $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ be the foliation of Minkowski spacetime given by the level sets of the global time function t . Given an initial time t_0 , we consider a compact subset $V \subset N_{t_0}$ and a positive and smooth function $\tilde{f} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}_{>0})$ on the initial Cauchy surface N_{t_0} (with $\tilde{f}_p = \tilde{f}(x, y, z)$) and a spacelike vector field X . Furthermore, assume that $\tilde{f}_p = 1$ for all $p \in N_{t_0} \setminus V$ and that the vector field X vanishes outside the compact subset V . Consider the regularizing vector field $u : M \rightarrow TM$ constructed from the locally rigid evolution (cf. Lemma 7.1) of the initial vector field*

$$u_p = (1 + \lambda \tilde{f}_p) \nu + \lambda X_p \quad \text{for all } p \in N_{t_0}$$

(where ν is again the normal vector field to N_{t_0} and $\lambda \geq 0$ is an arbitrary constant). Then, the series expansion to first order in λ of the rate of baryogenesis associated to this regularizing vector field is given by

$$B_t = \frac{1}{6(2\pi)^2} \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^4} \int_V \operatorname{div}_\delta(X_p) d^3x + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^4} \mathcal{O}(m^2 \varepsilon^2). \quad (7.29)$$

Proof. We first give the proof in the massless case $m = 0$; the error term involving the mass will be determined at the very end of the proof. As discussed at the beginning of the proof of Lemma 7.1, we can assume without loss of generality that, in local coordinates, the initial regularizing vector field is given by

$$u_p = f_p \partial_t + \lambda h_p \partial_\mu \quad \text{for all } p \in N_{t_0}$$

with $\mu \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, where $h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}_{>0})$ is a function of all three (x, y, z) coordinates and $f_p := 1 + \lambda f_p$. Note that, for simplicity, we will use f_p in the computations and only replace it by $1 + \lambda \tilde{f}_p$ at the very end of the proof.

In the first place, note that for $p \in N_{t_0} \setminus V$, it holds that $\frac{du_p}{dt} = 0$ and thus also $\frac{dA_t}{dt} = 0$. For $p \in V$, using the dynamical equation (7.2), the series expansion to first order in λ of $\frac{dA_t}{dt}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} A_t &= \frac{1}{2} \{u^t, -i\gamma_{\eta t} \gamma_\eta^\alpha \partial_\alpha\} + \frac{i}{2} \{u^\alpha, \partial_\alpha\} \\ \dot{A}_t &:= \frac{dA_t}{dt} = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{du^t}{dt}, -i\gamma_{\eta t} \gamma_\eta^\alpha \partial_\alpha \right\} + \frac{i}{2} \left\{ \frac{du^\alpha}{dt}, \partial_\alpha \right\} \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\{ 4 \frac{(\partial_\mu f)}{f^3} h + \frac{(\partial_\mu h)}{3f^2}, H_\eta \right\} - \frac{i}{2} \{ \delta^{\alpha\beta} (\partial_\alpha f^{-1}), \partial_\beta \} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{2} \left[\left(8 \frac{(\partial_\mu f)}{f^3} h + \frac{2(\partial_\mu h)}{3f^2} \right) H_\eta + \left(H_\eta \left(4 \frac{(\partial_\mu f)}{f^3} h + \frac{(\partial_\mu h)}{3f^2} \right) \right) \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{2} \left(2\delta^{\alpha\beta} (\partial_\alpha f^{-1}) \partial_\beta + (\Delta_\delta f^{-1}) \right) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2), \end{aligned} \quad (7.30)$$

where Δ_δ is the Laplacian operator (in Euclidean space (\mathbb{R}^3, δ)). Note that, applying the differential operator \dot{A}_t to a spinor field ψ , we obtain two terms involving second order spatial derivatives of h or f , and the other two terms involve first order spatial derivatives of ψ .

We now proceed to compute the ratio of baryogenesis B_t starting from expression (7.19). It is known that the trace of an integral operator with an integral kernel in $C^0([0, 1])$ and which is trace-class is given by the integral over the diagonal elements of its kernel (cf. [19, Section 30, Theorem 13]; for a generalization of this statement to integral operators in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, see [4, Theorem 3.1]). We use this in order to compute the trace of the integral operator $\dot{A}_t \chi_I(A_t)$, which has a compactly supported (in V) integral kernel. Hence, combining expressions (7.19) and (7.20) it follows

$$B_t = -2\pi \int_V \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4} \left(\dot{A}_t(P^\varepsilon(x, y)) \gamma_\eta^0 \right) \Big|_{y=x} d^3x + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2), \quad (7.31)$$

where we restricted the region of integration from all of \mathbb{R}^3 to V as \dot{A}_t vanishes outside of this region. Inserting (7.30) in the previous expression yields four different integrals, which require to determine explicitly $P^\varepsilon(x, x)$ and $(\partial_\mu P^\varepsilon(x, y))|_{y=x}$, with $\mu \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. As the detailed computation of these quantities is relatively long, we have moved it to the appendix (cf. equations (A.6) and (A.7)). The integrals in expression (7.31) are determined combining (A.6) and (A.7) with some known trace identities (e.g. $\text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4}(\gamma_\eta^\mu \gamma_{\eta\mu}) = 3\text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4}(\text{Id}_{\mathbb{C}^4}) = 12$, $\text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4}(\gamma_\eta^0 \gamma_{\eta 0}) = \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4}(\text{Id}_{\mathbb{C}^4}) = 4$, $\text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4}(\gamma_{\eta j} \gamma_{\eta k}) = \eta_{jk}$):

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= \int_V \frac{\lambda}{2} \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4} \left(\left(8h \frac{(\partial_\mu f)}{f^3} + \frac{2(\partial_\mu h)}{3f^2} \right) H_\eta (P^\varepsilon(x, y) \gamma_\eta^0) \Big|_{y=x} \right) d^3x \\ &= -i\lambda \int_V \left(4h \frac{(\partial_\mu f)}{f^3} + \frac{(\partial_\mu h)}{3f^2} \right) \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4} \left(\gamma_{\eta 0} \gamma_\eta^\alpha (\partial_\alpha P^\varepsilon(x, y)) \Big|_{y=x} \gamma_\eta^0 \right) d^3x \\ &= -\frac{1}{24(2\pi)^3} \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^4} \int_V \left(4h \frac{(\partial_\mu f)}{f^3} + \frac{(\partial_\mu h)}{3f^2} \right) \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4} (\gamma_{\eta 0} \gamma_\eta^\alpha \gamma_{\eta\alpha} \gamma_\eta^0) d^3x \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -\frac{1}{2(2\pi)^3} \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^4} \int_V \left(4h \frac{(\partial_\mu f)}{f^3} + \frac{(\partial_\mu h)}{3f^2} \right) d^3x \\
I_2 &:= \int_V \frac{\lambda}{2} \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4} \left(H_\eta \left(4 \frac{(\partial_\mu f)}{f^3} h + \frac{(\partial_\mu h)}{3f^2} \right) (P^\varepsilon(x, x) \gamma_\eta^0) \right) d^3x \\
&= +\frac{i}{6(2\pi)^3} \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^3} \int_V \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4} \left(\gamma_{\eta 0} \gamma_\eta^\alpha \partial_\alpha \left(4 \frac{(\partial_\mu f)}{f^3} h + \frac{(\partial_\mu h)}{3f^2} \right) \gamma_{\eta 0} \gamma_\eta^0 \right) d^3x \\
&= +\frac{i}{6(2\pi)^3} \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^3} \int_V \partial_\alpha \left(4 \frac{(\partial_\mu f)}{f^3} h + \frac{(\partial_\mu h)}{3f^2} \right) \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4} (\gamma_{\eta 0} \gamma_\eta^\alpha) d^3x = 0 \\
I_3 &:= -\int_V \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4} \left(\frac{i}{2} 2\delta^{\alpha\beta} (\partial_\alpha f^{-1}) \partial_\beta (P^\varepsilon(x, y) \gamma_\eta^0) \Big|_{y=x} \right) d^3x \\
&= -\frac{2}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^4} \int_V \delta^{\alpha\beta} (\partial_\alpha f^{-1}) \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4} (\gamma_{\eta\beta} \gamma_\eta^0) d^3x = 0 \\
I_4 &:= -\int_V \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4} \left(\frac{i}{2} (\Delta_\delta f^{-1}) P^\varepsilon(x, x) \gamma_\eta^0 \right) d^3x = \frac{i}{6(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \int_V (\Delta_\delta f^{-1}) \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4} (\gamma_{\eta 0} \gamma_\eta^0) d^3x \\
&= \frac{2i}{3(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \int_V (\Delta_\delta f^{-1}) d^3x = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last integral vanishes by the divergence theorem. Using these integrals in expression (7.31), the rate of baryogenesis to first order in λ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
B_t &= -2\pi \int_V \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4} \left(\dot{A}_t (P^\varepsilon(x, y) \gamma_\eta^0) \Big|_{y=x} \right) d^3x + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) \\
&= -2\pi (I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) \\
&= \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^2} \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^4} \int_V \left(4h \frac{(\partial_\mu f)}{f^3} + \frac{(\partial_\mu h)}{3f^2} \right) d^3x + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2),
\end{aligned}$$

which is finite as $V \subset N_t \cong \mathbb{R}^3$ is compact. However, as $f_p = 1 + \lambda \tilde{f}_p$ the previous expression simplifies to

$$B_t = \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^2} \frac{\lambda}{\varepsilon^4} \int_V \frac{(\partial_\mu h)}{3} d^3x + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2),$$

which agrees (by linearity of the derivative) with expression (7.29) if, as discussed at the beginning of this proof, we now allow X_p to point in all three spatial directions.

We finally analyze the error terms due to the fact that we only considered the massless case $m = 0$. Note that if we consider $m \neq 0$ only two additional error terms need to be taken into account in order to compute B_t . The first term arises from the linear expansion in λ of \dot{A}_t : i.e. for $m \neq 0$ equation (7.30) for \dot{A}_t should be replaced by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{A}_t &= \dot{A}_t|_{m=0} + \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{du^t}{dt}, m\gamma_{\eta 0} \right\} = \dot{A}_t|_{m=0} + \frac{m\lambda}{2} \left\{ 4 \frac{(\partial_\mu f)}{f^3} h + \frac{(\partial_\mu h)}{3f^2}, \gamma_{\eta 0} \right\} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) \\
&= \dot{A}_t|_{m=0} + m\lambda \left[\left(4 \frac{(\partial_\mu f)}{f^3} h + \frac{(\partial_\mu h)}{3f^2} \right) \gamma_{\eta 0} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{7.32}$$

where $\dot{A}_t|_{m=0}$ is given by equation (7.30) and, as the notation suggests, is simply the previously computed linear order expansion of \dot{A}_t in the massless case. Hence, there is only one new term in equation (7.32) with respect to expression (7.30), which gives

rise to one additional integral in the computation of B_t from (7.31). This integral is of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} I_5 &:= m\lambda \int_V \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4} \left(\left(4 \frac{(\partial_\mu f)}{f^3} h + \frac{(\partial_\mu h)}{3f^2} \right) \gamma_{\eta 0} (P^\varepsilon(x, x) \gamma_\eta^0) \right) d^3x \\ &= -\frac{1}{3(2\pi)^3} \frac{m\lambda}{(\varepsilon)^3} \int_V \left(4 \frac{(\partial_\mu f)}{f^3} h + \frac{(\partial_\mu h)}{3f^2} \right) \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4} (\gamma_{\eta 0} \gamma_{\eta 0} \gamma_\eta^0) d^3x = 0 \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used that $\text{Tr}_{\mathbb{C}^4}(\gamma_\eta^0) = 0$.

The second error term that appears if we set $m \neq 0$ stems from the computation of $P^\varepsilon(x, x)$ and $(\partial_\mu P^\varepsilon(x, y))|_{y=x}$. In Appendix A (cf. equations (A.8) and (A.9)) they are derived in the massive case. As $\varepsilon m \ll 1$ is very small, it is clear that setting $m = 0$ in $P^\varepsilon(x, x)$ and $(\partial_\mu P^\varepsilon(x, y))|_{y=x}$ simply gives rise to a small error term $\mathcal{O}(m)$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} P^\varepsilon(x, x) &= P^\varepsilon(x, x)|_{m=0} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(m^2 \varepsilon^2) \right) \\ (\partial_\mu P^\varepsilon(x, y))|_{y=x} &= (\partial_\mu P^\varepsilon(x, y))|_{y=x, m=0} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(m^2 \varepsilon^2) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $P^\varepsilon(x, x)$ and $(\partial_\mu P^\varepsilon(x, y))|_{y=x}$ are given by expressions (A.8) and (A.9), whereas the kernels $P^\varepsilon(x, x)|_{m=0}$ and $(\partial_\mu P^\varepsilon(x, y))|_{y=x, m=0}$ are given by the previously mentioned equations (A.6) and (A.7) for the massless case. For the detailed derivation of these error terms we refer again to Section A. In conclusion, the determined error terms justify our initial assumption of choosing $m = 0$. \square

Corollary 7.5. *Consider the setup of Theorem 7.4. The rate of baryogenesis vanishes (to first order in λ) if u is constant on the initial Cauchy hypersurface N_{t_0} .*

Proof. The claim directly follows from a closer inspection of expression (7.29). The rate of baryogenesis vanishes (to first order in λ), provided that the regularizing vector field u is constant on the initial Cauchy hypersurface, so $(\partial_\mu h) = 0$. \square

8. DISCUSSION

The above study of baryogenesis in Minkowski spacetime sets the stage for working out the baryogenesis mechanism in specific, physically relevant cosmological spacetimes. It is expected that baryogenesis occurred in an early stage of the evolution of the Universe (e.g. during the inflationary era) in which metric perturbations of the FLRW spacetimes played an important role. For this reason, we would like to extend our analysis to conformally flat spacetimes and perturbations thereof. A particular class of promising spacetimes that enter this category are the generalized Robertson-Walker (GRW) spacetimes (a specific type of twisted product spacetime, cf. [24]). Other interesting scenarios in which we would like to apply our analysis is to the de Sitter and Milne-like spacetimes (see [20, Sections 3 and 4] for an introduction to the latter) which also model the early Universe.

Secondly, our study naturally prompts a number of interesting mathematical questions. For example, which properties does the regularizing vector field have? What are its connections to the flow of the null geodesics? For example, under which conditions is the regularizing vector field divergence free? We also point out that all our constructions depend on the choice of a foliation. The physical picture is that the

regularizing vector field distinguishes a foliation. How can this picture be made mathematically precise? In our above analysis, we assumed that the regularizing vector field coincides with the normal to the foliation, up to small corrections. Can this picture be extended to a general globally hyperbolic spacetime? The ultimate goal is not to begin with a foliation, but instead to construct both the foliation and the regularizing vector together in one construction step. How can this be accomplished? Analyzing these questions should complete the geometric picture of how baryogenesis arises in the general globally hyperbolic setting.

APPENDIX A. COMPUTATION OF REGULARIZED KERNELS

We now explicitly compute the kernels $P^\varepsilon(x, x)$ and $(\partial_\mu P^\varepsilon(x, y))|_{y=x}$ used in the proof of Theorem 7.4 in the massless and in the massive case.

1. Massless case:

Using (3.5) with $m = 0$ we get

$$P^\varepsilon(x, x) = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \gamma_\eta^j k_j \delta(k^2) \Theta(-k^0) \Theta(1 + \varepsilon k^0) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$(\partial_\mu P^\varepsilon(x, y))|_{y=x} = -i \int k^\mu \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \gamma_\eta^j k_j \delta(k^2) \Theta(-k^0) \Theta(1 + \varepsilon k^0). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Both integrals have a very similar structure. Let $f(k^0)$ be an arbitrary smooth function of k^0 and $\omega_k := \sqrt{k^\mu k_\mu} = |\vec{k}|$. In order to compute the previous integrals, we will use the following (known) result:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk^0 f(k^0) \Theta(-k^0) \delta(k^2) &= \frac{1}{2\omega_k} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk^0 f(k^0) \Theta(-k^0) (\delta(k^0 - \omega_k) + \delta(k^0 + \omega_k)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\omega_k} \int_{-\infty}^0 dk^0 f(k^0) \delta(k^0 + \omega_k) = \frac{1}{2\omega_k} f(k^0 = -\omega_k) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where, up to constants, in expression (A.1) it holds that $f(k^0) = (\gamma_{\eta 0} k^0 + \gamma_{\eta \mu} k^\mu) \Theta(1 + \varepsilon k^0)$, whereas in expression (A.2) we have that $f(k^0) = k^\mu (\gamma_{\eta 0} k^0 + \gamma_{\eta \mu} k^\mu) \Theta(1 + \varepsilon k^0)$. Then the previous integrals simplify to

$$\begin{aligned} P^\varepsilon(x, x) &= \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{2\omega_k} (-\gamma_{\eta 0} \omega_k + \gamma_{\eta \mu} k^\mu) \Theta(1 - \varepsilon \omega_k) \\ &= \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^4} \left[-\gamma_{\eta 0} \int d^3 k \Theta(1 - \varepsilon \omega_k) + \gamma_{\eta \mu} \int d^3 k \frac{k^\mu}{\omega_k} \Theta(1 - \varepsilon \omega_k) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_\mu P^\varepsilon(x, y))|_{y=x} &= -i \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{k^\mu}{2\omega_k} (-\gamma_{\eta 0} \omega_k + \gamma_{\eta \nu} k^\nu) \Theta(1 - \varepsilon \omega_k) \\ &= -\frac{i}{2(2\pi)^4} \left[-\gamma_{\eta 0} \int d^3 k k^\mu \Theta(1 - \varepsilon \omega_k) + \gamma_{\eta \nu} \int d^3 k \frac{k^\nu k^\mu}{\omega_k} \Theta(1 - \varepsilon \omega_k) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

The previous integrals are easier to solve using spherical coordinates $(r, \theta, \phi) \in (0, \infty) \times (0, \pi) \times (0, 2\pi)$, with $r = \omega_k = \sqrt{k^\mu k_\mu}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int \Theta(1 - \varepsilon\omega_k) d^3k &= \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_0^\pi \sin\theta d\theta \int_0^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} r^2 dr = \frac{4\pi}{3} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \\ \int \frac{k^\mu}{\omega_k} \Theta(1 - \varepsilon\omega_k) d^3k &= \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_0^\pi \sin\theta d\theta \int_0^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} r \tilde{k}^\mu dr = 0 \\ \Rightarrow P^\varepsilon(x, x) &= -\frac{1}{3(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \gamma_{\eta 0} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \int k^\mu \Theta(1 - \varepsilon\omega_k) d^3k &= 0 \\ \int \frac{(k^\mu)^2}{\omega_k} \Theta(1 - \varepsilon\omega_k) d^3k &= \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_0^\pi \sin\theta d\theta \int_0^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} r (\tilde{k}^\mu)^2 dr = \frac{4\pi}{3} \int_0^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} r^3 = \frac{\pi}{3} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^4} \\ \Rightarrow (\partial_\mu P^\varepsilon(x, y)) \Big|_{y=x} &= -\frac{i}{12(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^4} \gamma_{\eta\mu} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where \tilde{k}^μ denotes the the spatial components of k in spherical coordinates. Here we used that for any $\mu, \nu \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, with $\mu \neq \nu$, the following angular integrals vanish by spherical symmetry:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_0^\pi \sin\theta \tilde{k}^\mu d\theta &= 0 \\ \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_0^\pi \sin\theta \tilde{k}^\mu \tilde{k}^\nu d\theta &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

2. Massive case:

If $m \neq 0$, the computation of $P^\varepsilon(x, x)$ and $(\partial_\mu P^\varepsilon(x, y)) \Big|_{y=x}$ only changes slightly with respect to the massless case. In the first place, in the integrands appearing in equations (A.1) and (A.2), the distribution $\delta(k^2)$ has to be replaced by $\delta(k^2 - m^2)$. Note that redefining ω_k as $\omega_k := \sqrt{k^\mu k_\mu + m^2}$, expressions (A.3), (A.4) and (A.5) remain the same. However, in order to compute the spatial integrals in $P^\varepsilon(x, x)$ and $(\partial_\mu P^\varepsilon(x, y)) \Big|_{y=x}$ for $m \neq 0$ using spherical coordinates (r, θ, φ) , we now have that $\omega_k^2 = r^2 + m^2$. Thus the interval of integration over the radial coordinate r changes slightly with respect to the one of the massless case (in particular, the interval of integration over r becomes $(0, \frac{\sqrt{1-\varepsilon^2 m^2}}{\varepsilon})$). Defining the constant $\tilde{\varepsilon} := \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{1-\varepsilon^2 m^2}}$, the computation of $P^\varepsilon(x, x)$ and $(\partial_\mu P^\varepsilon(x, y)) \Big|_{y=x}$ in the massive case yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \int \Theta(1 - \varepsilon\omega_k) d^3k &= \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_0^\pi \sin\theta d\theta \int_0^{\frac{1}{\tilde{\varepsilon}}} r^2 dr = \frac{4\pi}{3} \frac{1}{\tilde{\varepsilon}^3} \\ \int \frac{k^\mu}{\omega_k} \Theta(1 - \varepsilon\omega_k) d^3k &= \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_0^\pi \sin\theta d\theta \int_0^{\frac{1}{\tilde{\varepsilon}}} \frac{r^2}{\sqrt{r^2 + m^2}} \tilde{k}^\mu dr = 0 \\ \Rightarrow P^\varepsilon(x, x) &= -\frac{1}{3(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\tilde{\varepsilon}^3} \gamma_{\eta 0} = -\frac{1}{3(2\pi)^3} \left(\frac{\sqrt{1-\varepsilon^2 m^2}}{\varepsilon} \right)^3 \gamma_{\eta 0} \\ &= -\frac{1}{3(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(m^2 \varepsilon^2) \right) \gamma_{\eta 0} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int k^\mu \Theta(1 - \varepsilon \omega_k) d^3 k = 0 \\
& \int \frac{(k^\mu)^2}{\omega_k} \Theta(1 - \varepsilon \omega_k) d^3 k = \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_0^\pi \sin \theta d\theta \int_0^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \frac{r^2}{\sqrt{r^2 + m^2}} (\tilde{k}^\mu)^2 dr \\
& = \frac{4\pi}{3} \int_0^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \frac{r^4}{\sqrt{r^2 + m^2}} dr = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^4} (1 + \mathcal{O}(m^2 \varepsilon^2)) \\
& \Rightarrow (\partial_\mu P^\varepsilon(x, y)) \Big|_{y=x} = -\frac{i}{12(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^4} (1 + \mathcal{O}(m^2 \varepsilon^2)) \gamma_{\eta\mu} \\
& = -\frac{i}{12(2\pi)^3} \frac{(1 - \varepsilon^2 m^2)^2}{\varepsilon^4} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{m^2 \varepsilon^2}{1 - \varepsilon^2 m^2}\right) \right) \gamma_{\eta\mu} \\
& = -\frac{i}{12(2\pi)^3} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^4} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{m^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right) \right) \gamma_{\eta\mu} = -\frac{i}{12(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^4} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(m^2 \varepsilon^2) \right) \gamma_{\eta\mu} \quad (\text{A.9})
\end{aligned}$$

where the last integral was estimated using a Taylor expansion around $m = 0$:

$$\frac{r^4}{\sqrt{r^2 + m^2}} = \frac{r^3}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{m^2}{r^2}}} = r^3 + \mathcal{O}(m^2 r) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \int_0^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \frac{r^4}{\sqrt{r^2 + m^2}} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^4} (1 + \mathcal{O}(m^2 \varepsilon^2))$$

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank Claudio F. Paganini for helpful discussions. The second author gratefully acknowledges support by the Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Bär, *Spin Geometry*, Lecture Notes, Universität Potsdam, PDF (2011).
- [2] C. Bär, N. Ginoux, and F. Pfäffle, *Wave Equations on Lorentzian Manifolds and Quantization*, arXiv:0806.1036 [math.DG], ESI Lectures in Mathematics and Physics, European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2007.
- [3] H. Baum, *Spinor structures and Dirac operators on pseudo-Riemannian manifolds*, Bull. Polish Acad. Sci. Math. **33** (1985), no. 3-4, 165–171.
- [4] C. Brislawn, *Kernels of trace class operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **104** (1988), no. 4, 1181–1190.
- [5] P.R. Chernoff, *Essential self-adjointness of powers of generators of hyperbolic equations*, J. Funct. Anal. **12** (1973), 401–414.
- [6] J.M. Cline, *Baryogenesis*, hep-ph/0609145, Les Houches Summer School - Session 86: Particle Physics and Cosmology: The Fabric of Spacetime, 9 2006.
- [7] F. Finster, *Local U(2, 2) symmetry in relativistic quantum mechanics*, arXiv:hep-th/9703083, J. Math. Phys. **39** (1998), no. 12, 6276–6290.
- [8] ———, *The Continuum Limit of Causal Fermion Systems*, arXiv:1605.04742 [math-ph], Fundamental Theories of Physics, vol. 186, Springer, 2016.
- [9] F. Finster and A. Grotz, *A Lorentzian quantum geometry*, arXiv:1107.2026 [math-ph], Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **16** (2012), no. 4, 1197–1290.
- [10] F. Finster, M. Jökel, and C.F. Paganini, *A mechanism of baryogenesis for causal fermion systems*, arXiv:2111.05556 [gr-qc], Class. Quant. Gravity **39** (2022), no. 16, 165005, 50.
- [11] F. Finster and N. Kamran, *Spinors on singular spaces and the topology of causal fermion systems*, arXiv:1403.7885 [math-ph], Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **259** (2019), no. 1251, v+83 pp.
- [12] F. Finster, S. Kindermann, and J.-H. Treude, *An Introductory Course on Causal Fermion Systems*, in preparation, www.causal-fermion-system.com/intro-public.pdf (2024).
- [13] F. Finster and M. Kraus, *The regularized Hadamard expansion*, arXiv:1708.04447 [math-ph], J. Math. Anal. Appl. **491** (2020), no. 2, 124340.

- [14] F. Finster and M. Reintjes, *A non-perturbative construction of the fermionic projector on globally hyperbolic manifolds I – Space-times of finite lifetime*, arXiv:1301.5420 [math-ph], Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **19** (2015), no. 4, 761–803.
- [15] F. Finster and C. Röken, *Dynamical gravitational coupling as a modified theory of General Relativity*, arXiv:1604.03872 [gr-qc], preprint (2016).
- [16] ———, *Self-adjointness of the Dirac Hamiltonian for a class of non-uniformly elliptic boundary value problems*, arXiv:1512.00761 [math-ph], Annals of Mathematical Sciences and Applications **1** (2016), no. 2, 301—320.
- [17] F. John, *Partial Differential Equations*, fourth ed., Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 1, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.
- [18] H.B. Lawson, Jr. and M.-L. Michelsohn, *Spin Geometry*, Princeton Mathematical Series, vol. 38, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1989.
- [19] P.D. Lax, *Functional Analysis*, Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York), Wiley-Interscience [John Wiley & Sons], New York, 2002.
- [20] E. Ling, *The big bang is a coordinate singularity for $k = -1$ inflationary FLRW spacetimes*, arXiv:1810.06789 [gr-qc], Found. Phys. **50** (2020), no. 5, 385–428.
- [21] M.J. Radzikowski, *Micro-local approach to the Hadamard condition in quantum field theory on curved space-time*, Commun. Math. Phys. **179** (1996), no. 3, 529–553.
- [22] A. Riotto, *Theories of baryogenesis*, High Energy Physics and Cosmology, 1998 Summer School (A. Masiero, G. Senjanovic, and A. Smirnov, eds.), January 1999, p. 326.
- [23] J. Roe, *Elliptic Operators, Topology and Asymptotic Methods*, second ed., Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, vol. 395, Longman, Harlow, 1998.
- [24] Miguel Sánchez, *On the geometry of generalized robertson-walker spacetimes: geodesics*, General Relativity and Gravitation **30** (1998), no. 6, 915–932.
- [25] M.E. Taylor, *Partial Differential Equations. III*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 117, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.
- [26] J.-H. Treude, *Decay in Outgoing Null Directions of Solutions of the Massive Dirac Equation in Certain Asymptotically Flat, Static Spacetimes*, Dissertation, Universität Regensburg, <https://doi.org/10.5283/epub.32344/> (2015).

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT REGENSBURG, D-93040 REGENSBURG, GERMANY
 Email address: `finster@ur.de`

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT REGENSBURG, D-93040 REGENSBURG, GERMANY
 Email address: `marco.van-den-beld-serrano@ur.de`