

Vacuum polarization and photon mass in inflation

Tomislav Prokopec*

*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Heidelberg University,
Philosophenweg 16, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany and
Theory Division, CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland (Mar 01 - Aug 31 2003)*

Richard Woodard†

*Department of Physics, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA
(Dated: February 12, 2019)*

We give a pedagogical review of a mechanism through which long wave length photons can become massive during inflation. Our account begins with a discussion of the period of exponentially rapid expansion known as *inflation*. We next describe how, when the universe is not expanding, quantum fluctuations in charged particle fields cause even empty space to behave as a polarizable medium. This is the routinely observed phenomenon of *vacuum polarization*. We show that the quantum fluctuations of low mass, scalar fields are enormously amplified during inflation. If one of these fields is charged, the vacuum polarization effect of flat space is strengthened to the point that long wave length photons acquire mass. Our result for this mass is shown to agree with a simple model in which the massive photon electrodynamics of Proca emerges from applying the Hartree approximation to scalar quantum electrodynamics during inflation. One does not measure a huge photon mass today because the original phase of inflation ended when the universe was only a tiny fraction of a second old. However, the 0-point energy left over from the epoch of large photon mass may have persisted, during the post-inflationary universe, as very weak, but cosmological-scale, magnetic fields. It has been suggested that these small, seed fields were amplified by a dynamo mechanism to produce the micro-Gauss magnetic fields observed in galaxies and galactic clusters.

PACS numbers: 98.80.Cq, 98.80.Hw, 04.62.+v

I. EXPANDING UNIVERSE AND INFLATION

The universe is expanding, but with a rate so tiny it can only be seen by spectroscopic analysis of stars in distant galaxies. Suppose the light from such a star contains a distinctive absorption line at wave length λ . If the same line occurs at wave length λ_E on Earth we say the star's *redshift* is,

$$z = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda_E} - 1. \quad (1)$$

One can also measure the star's flux \mathcal{F} . If we understand the star enough to know it should emit radiation at luminosity \mathcal{L} , we can infer its *luminosity distance* d_L . This is the star's distance in Euclidean geometry,

$$\mathcal{F} = \frac{\mathcal{L}}{4\pi d_L^2} \implies d_L = \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{L}}{4\pi\mathcal{F}}}. \quad (2)$$

Astronomers measure the expansion of the universe by plotting z versus d_L for many stars.

Stars throughout the universe move with respect to their local environments at typical velocities of about

10^{-3} the speed of light c . This gives rise to a special relativistic Doppler shift of $\Delta z \sim \pm 10^{-3}$. If spacetime was not expanding this would be the only source of nonzero z , and averaging over many stars at the same luminosity distance would give zero redshift. That is just what happens for stars within our galaxy. However, the redshifts of stars in distant galaxies are observed to grow approximately linearly with their luminosity distances,

$$c^{-1}H_0 d_L = z + \frac{1}{2}(1 - q_0)z^2 + O(z^3). \quad (3)$$

This means that more and more distant objects seem to recede from us with greater and greater speed. A common analogy is to the way fixed spots move apart on the surface of a balloon that is being blown up.

The constant, $H_0 \simeq 2.3 \times 10^{-18}$ Hz, is called the *Hubble parameter*. Its name honors Edwin Hubble, who established the (nearly) linear relation in 1929 [1] based on his observations, and on earlier work of Slipher and Wirtz [2]. The other constant in (3) is known as the *deceleration parameter*, q_0 . Observations of Type Ia supernovae (whose luminosities can be precisely inferred) up to the enormous redshift of 1.7 indicate $q_0 \simeq -0.6$ [3, 4].

The geometry of spacetime is described by a symmetric tensor field $g_{\mu\nu}(x)$ known as the *metric*. It is used to translate the coordinate labels of points $x^\mu = (ct, \vec{x})$ into physical distances and angles. For example, the square of the distance between x^μ and an infinitesimally close

*T.Prokopec@thphys.uni-heidelberg.de

†woodard@phys.ufl.edu

point $x^\mu + dx^\mu$ is known as the *invariant interval*,

$$ds^2 \equiv g_{\mu\nu}(x)dx^\mu dx^\nu . \quad (4)$$

Note that we employ the *Einstein summation convention* in which repeated indices are summed over 0, 1, 2, 3.

The transition from nearby stars, whose redshifts are dominated by local motions, to more distant stars which obey (3), is known as entering the *Hubble flow*. It is typical in cosmology to ignore local features and model a simplified universe that has only the overall expansion effect. Such a universe does not change in moving between spatial points at the same time, nor are there any special directions. The first property is known as *homogeneity*; the second is *isotropy*.

With a simplifying assumption — about which more later — the invariant interval of a homogeneous and isotropic universe can be written as follows,

$$ds_{\text{HI}}^2 = -c^2 dt^2 + a^2(t) d\vec{x} \cdot d\vec{x} . \quad (5)$$

From this relation we see that t measures physical time the same way as in the Minkowski geometry. However, the spatial 3-vector \vec{x} must be multiplied by $a(t)$ to give physical distances. For this reason $a(t)$ is known as the *scale factor*. Its time variation gives the instantaneous values of the Hubble and deceleration parameters,

$$H(t) \equiv \frac{\dot{a}}{a} , \quad q(t) \equiv -\frac{a\ddot{a}}{\dot{a}^2} = -1 - \frac{\dot{H}}{H^2} . \quad (6)$$

The “0” subscripts on H_0 and q_0 indicate the current values of these parameters.

Homogeneity and isotropy restrict the stress-energy tensor to only an energy density $\rho(t)$ and a pressure $p(t)$,

$$T_{00} = -\rho(t)g_{00} , \quad T_{0i} = 0 , \quad T_{ij} = p(t)g_{ij} . \quad (7)$$

In this geometry Einstein’s equations take the form,

$$3H^2 = 8\pi Gc^{-2}\rho , \quad (8)$$

$$-2\dot{H} - 3H^2 = 8\pi Gc^{-2}p , \quad (9)$$

where G is Newton’s constant. The current energy density is,

$$\rho_0 = \frac{3c^2 H_0^2}{8\pi G} \simeq 8.5 \times 10^{-10} \text{ J/m}^3 , \quad (10)$$

equivalent to about 5.7 Hydrogen atoms per cubic meter. Solving for the instantaneous deceleration parameter,

$$q = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{3p}{2\rho} , \quad (11)$$

reveals that $p_0 \simeq -0.7\rho_0$ [5, 6].

By differentiating (8) and then adding $3H$ times (8) plus (9), one derives a relation between the energy density and pressure known as *stress-energy conservation*,

$$\dot{\rho} = -3H(\rho + p) . \quad (12)$$

If one also assumes a constant *equation of state*, $w \equiv p(t)/\rho(t)$, this relation can be used to express the energy density in terms of the scale factor,

$$\rho(t) = \rho_1 \left(\frac{a(t)}{a_1} \right)^{-3(1+w)} . \quad (13)$$

Substitution in (8) gives an equation whose solution is,

$$a(t) = a_1 \left[1 + \frac{3}{2}(1+w)H_1(t-t_1) \right]^{\frac{2}{3(1+w)}} . \quad (14)$$

The cases of $w = +\frac{1}{3}, 0, -\frac{1}{3}, -1$ correspond to radiation, non-relativistic matter, spatial curvature and vacuum energy, respectively. (We omit possible quintessence with nonconstant w .) The cosmology for each pure type of stress-energy can be read off from (13) and (14),

$$\text{Radiation} \implies \rho \propto a^{-4} , \quad a(t) \propto (H_1 t)^{\frac{1}{2}} , \quad (15)$$

$$\text{NR Matter} \implies \rho \propto a^{-3} , \quad a(t) \propto (H_1 t)^{\frac{2}{3}} , \quad (16)$$

$$\text{Curvature} \implies \rho \propto a^{-2} , \quad a(t) \propto H_1 t , \quad (17)$$

$$\text{Vac. Energy} \implies \rho \propto 1 , \quad a(t) \propto e^{H_1 t} . \quad (18)$$

The actual universe seems to be composed of at least three of the pure types, so the scale factor does not have a simple time dependence. However, as long as each type is separately conserved, we can use (13) to conclude,

$$\rho(t) = \frac{\rho_{\text{rad}}}{a^4(t)} + \frac{\rho_{\text{mat}}}{a^3(t)} + \frac{\rho_{\text{cur}}}{a^2(t)} + \rho_{\text{vac}} . \quad (19)$$

As the universe expands, the relative importance of the four types changes. Whenever a single type predominates one can infer $a(t)$ from (14). This is one reason it makes sense to think of an early universe dominated by radiation (15) evolving to a universe dominated by non-relativistic matter (16). It is also how one can understand that the current universe seems to be making the transition to domination by vacuum energy (18).

Under certain conditions there can be significant energy flows between three of the pure types of stress-energy. For example, as the early universe cooled, massive particles changed from behaving like radiation to behaving like non-relativistic matter. This would increase ρ_{mat} and decrease ρ_{rad} in (19). The parameter which cannot change is that of spatial curvature, ρ_{cur} . Strictly speaking, we should not regard spatial curvature as a type of stress-energy but rather as an additional parameter in the homogeneous and isotropic metric (5). We have avoided this complication because the extra terms it gives in the Einstein equations (8-9) can be subsumed into the energy density and pressure, as we have done, and because the measured value of ρ_{cur}/a_0^2 is consistent with zero [5, 6].

The cosmology in which a radiation dominated universe evolves to matter domination is known as the *Big Bang* scenario. Although strongly supported by observation, the composition of ρ at the start of radiation domination ($t = t_r$) does not seem natural,

$$\rho_{\text{rad}} a_r^{-4} \gg \rho_{\text{vac}} \gg \rho_{\text{cur}} a_r^{-2} . \quad (20)$$

One might expect instead that each of the three terms was comparable, in which case the universe would quickly become dominated by vacuum energy. There is no accepted explanation for the first inequality in (20), or for the seeming coincidence that $\rho_{\text{mat}} a_0^{-3} \sim \rho_{\text{vac}}$. However, the second inequality in (20) finds a natural explanation in the context of *inflation*.

In 1980 Alan Guth [7] suggested that the Big Bang scenario was preceded by a period of vacuum energy domination, or inflation, following which the vacuum energy changed almost completely into radiation. (Cosmologies which include a period of vacuum energy domination were independently considered by Starobinsky [8], Sato [9] and by Kazanas [10].) Suppose that all types of stress-energy are equally represented at some very early time. We see from (19) that the total energy density rapidly becomes dominated by vacuum energy, following which the scale factor grows exponentially with a constant Hubble parameter, H_I .

The duration of inflation in units of $1/H_I$ is known as the number of *inflationary e-foldings* N_I . Viable models must have $N_I \gtrsim 50$, and much larger values are common. If $\rho_{\text{cur}}/a_I^2 \sim \rho_{\text{vac}}$ at the start of inflation, equation (19) shows that curvature is negligible at the end,

$$\frac{\rho_{\text{cur}}/a_r^2}{\rho_{\text{vac}}} \sim \left(\frac{a_I}{a_r}\right)^2 = e^{-2N_I} \lesssim 10^{-44}. \quad (21)$$

Inflation makes the other types of stress-energy even smaller, but there are mechanisms through which vacuum energy can be converted into radiation. This process, which we will not discuss, is known as *reheating*.

Inflation also explains how the large scale universe became so nearly homogeneous and isotropic. This is crucial because gravity makes even tiny inhomogeneities grow, and the process has had 13.7 billion years to operate. It is believed that the galaxies of today's universe had their origins in *quantum fluctuations* of magnitude $\Delta\rho/\rho \simeq 10^{-5}$ which occurred near the end of inflation. The imprint of these fluctuations in the cosmic microwave background has recently been imaged with unprecedented accuracy by the WMAP satellite [5, 6].

The fact that WMAP did not see the imprint of quantum fluctuations of the metric field sets an upper limit of $H_I \lesssim 3.4 \times 10^{38}$ Hz. No one knows what caused inflation but a common assumption is that it occurred at the *grand unified* energy scale $E_{\text{GUT}} \simeq 6.5 \times 10^{15}$ GeV $\simeq 1.0 \times 10^6$ J at which electromagnetic, weak and strong interactions attain equal strength. From (8) this implies,

$$H_I = \left(\frac{8\pi G}{3c^2} \frac{E_{\text{GUT}}^4}{(\hbar c)^3}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \simeq 1.4 \times 10^{37} \text{ Hz}. \quad (22)$$

II. VACUUM POLARIZATION IN FLAT SPACE

Flat space corresponds to $a(t) = 1$ in (5),

$$ds_{\text{flat}}^2 = \eta_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu = -c^2 dt^2 + d\vec{x} \cdot d\vec{x}. \quad (23)$$

Note that the zero component of a spacetime point $x^\mu = (ct, \vec{x})$ is $x^0 = ct$, so all components of $\partial_\mu \equiv \partial/\partial x^\mu$ have the dimension of inverse length. Repeated Greek indices are summed over 0, 1, 2, 3 — for example, $\partial^2 \equiv \partial_\mu \partial^\mu$ — whereas repeated Latin indices are summed over 1, 2, 3 — for example, $\nabla^2 \equiv \partial_i \partial_i$. A dot denotes contraction over the appropriate index set — for example, $k \cdot x \equiv k_\mu x^\mu$ and $\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x} \equiv k_i x_i$.

Maxwell's equations in Heaviside-Lorentz units are,

$$\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{E} = \rho, \quad \vec{\nabla} \times \vec{B} - \partial_0 \vec{E} = c^{-1} \vec{J}, \quad (24)$$

$$\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{B} = 0, \quad \vec{\nabla} \times \vec{E} + \partial_0 \vec{B} = 0. \quad (25)$$

Here $\vec{E}(t, \vec{x})$ and $\vec{B}(t, \vec{x})$ denote the electric and magnetic fields, while the charge and current densities are $\rho(t, \vec{x})$ (for this section only) and $\vec{J}(t, \vec{x})$. It is well known that (25) can be enforced by representing the fields using a vector potential $A_\mu = (A_0, A_i)$,

$$E^i = \partial_0 A_i - \partial_i A_0, \quad B^i = -\epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j A_k. \quad (26)$$

Equations (24) combine to the relativistic form,

$$\partial_\nu F^{\nu\mu} = c^{-1} J^\mu, \quad (27)$$

using the field strength tensor $F_{\mu\nu} \equiv \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$ and the current 4-vector $J^\mu \equiv (c\rho, \vec{J})$.

Material media such as air and glass consist of an enormous number of atoms with negatively charged electrons bound to positively charged nuclei. On macroscopic scales such a medium appears neutral and free of currents, but the application of external fields can distort the bound charges to induce a density of atomic electric dipole moments known as the *polarization* $\vec{P}(t, \vec{x})$. Averaging the actual charge density to remove its violent fluctuations on the atomic scale leaves whatever charges are free, minus the gradient of \vec{P} ,

$$\langle \rho \rangle = \rho_{\text{free}} - \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{P}. \quad (28)$$

The medium's density of atomic magnetic dipole moments is known as its *magnetization* $\vec{M}(t, \vec{x})$. A similar averaging of the current density gives,

$$\langle \vec{J} \rangle = \vec{J}_{\text{free}} + c\partial_0 \vec{P} + c\vec{\nabla} \times \vec{M}. \quad (29)$$

Moving the polarization and magnetization terms to the left of (24) leads to the macroscopic Maxwell equations,

$$\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{D} = \rho_{\text{free}}, \quad \vec{\nabla} \times \vec{H} - \partial_0 \vec{D} = c^{-1} \vec{J}_{\text{free}}, \quad (30)$$

where $\vec{D} \equiv \vec{E} + \vec{P}$ and $\vec{H} \equiv \vec{B} - \vec{M}$.

Linear, isotropic media are characterized by,

$$\vec{P} = \chi_e \vec{E}, \quad \vec{M} = \frac{\chi_m}{1 + \chi_m} \vec{B}. \quad (31)$$

The dimensionless parameters χ_e and χ_m are known as the *electric and magnetic susceptibilities*. We would like

to express (30) as a single tensor equation like (27). For the case of constant susceptibilities the result is simple,

$$\partial_\nu F^{\nu\mu} + \Pi^{\mu\nu} A_\nu = c^{-1} J_{\text{free}}^\mu. \quad (32)$$

where $\Pi^{\mu\nu}$ is the following tensor differential operator,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^{\mu\nu} \equiv & \chi_e \left(\eta^{\mu\nu} \partial^2 - \partial^\mu \partial^\nu \right) \\ & - \left(\chi_e + \frac{\chi_m}{1 + \chi_m} \right) \eta^{\mu i} \eta^{\nu j} \left(\delta_{ij} \nabla^2 - \partial_i \partial_j \right). \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

The susceptibilities of media typically vary according to the frequency and sometimes even the wave number of the external field. Of course a general field is a superposition of frequencies and wave vectors. To compute the medium's response to such a field we must first resolve its amplitude for each wave 4-vector $k^\mu \equiv (\omega/c, \vec{k})$,

$$\tilde{E}^i(\omega, \vec{k}) \equiv \int d^4 x e^{i\omega t - i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x}} E^i(t, \vec{x}). \quad (34)$$

Now multiply by the k^μ dependent susceptibility and reconstitute using the Fourier inversion theorem,

$$P^i(t, \vec{x}) = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} e^{ik \cdot x} \chi_e(k) \tilde{E}^i(\omega, \vec{k}). \quad (35)$$

By defining a nonlocal susceptibility,

$$\chi_e(x, x') \equiv \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \chi_e(k) e^{ik \cdot (x - x')}, \quad (36)$$

we can reduce the response to a single spacetime integral,

$$P^i(t, \vec{x}) = \int d^4 x' \chi_e(x, x') E^i(t', \vec{x}'). \quad (37)$$

This suggests a comprehensive form for (30),

$$\eta^{\mu\nu} \eta^{\rho\sigma} \partial_\rho F_{\sigma\nu}(x) + \int d^4 x' [{}^\mu \Pi^\nu](x, x') A_\nu(x') = c^{-1} J_{\text{free}}^\mu(x). \quad (38)$$

Our *polarization bi-tensor* has the general form,

$$\begin{aligned} [{}^\mu \Pi^\nu](x, x') \equiv & [\eta^{\mu\nu} \eta^{\rho\sigma} - \eta^{\mu\rho} \eta^{\sigma\nu}] \partial'_\rho \partial_\sigma \Pi^{(1)}(x, x') \\ & + \eta^{\mu i} \eta^{\nu j} [\delta_{ij} \partial'_k \partial_k - \partial'_i \partial_j] \Pi^{(2)}(x, x'), \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where $\partial_\mu = \partial/\partial x^\mu$ and $\partial'_\mu = \partial/\partial x'^\mu$. Note that $[{}^\mu \Pi^\nu]$ is transverse on both indices,

$$\partial_\mu [{}^\mu \Pi^\nu](x, x') = 0 = \partial'_\nu [{}^\mu \Pi^\nu](x, x'). \quad (40)$$

The designation of $[{}^\mu \Pi^\nu](x, x')$ as a ‘‘bi-tensor’’ derives from general relativity in which the index μ transforms according to the vector space at x^μ and the index ν according to the vector space at x'^μ . For linear, isotropic media the functions $\Pi^{(1,2)}$ are,

$$\Pi^{(1)}(x, x') = - \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \chi_e(k) e^{ik \cdot (x - x')}, \quad (41)$$

$$\Pi^{(2)}(x, x') = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \left(\chi_e(k) + \frac{\chi_m(k)}{1 + \chi_m(k)} \right) e^{ik \cdot (x - x')}. \quad (42)$$

The polarization bi-tensor encapsulates the medium's effect on electromagnetic forces and on propagating electromagnetic fields. It is useful to recall the familiar formulae for the relative permittivity and permeability, and for the index of refraction,

$$\epsilon = 1 + \chi_e, \quad \mu = 1 + \chi_m, \quad n = (\epsilon\mu)^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (43)$$

$\Pi^{(1)}(x, x')$ gives the medium's corrections to the electric response to a static distribution of charge. Positive χ_e means that the medium's dipoles line up to weaken an applied electric field by a factor of $1/\epsilon$. This is known as *charge screening*. The other term can be understood by recasting its integrand,

$$\chi_e + \frac{\chi_m}{1 + \chi_m} = \frac{\epsilon\mu - 1}{\mu} = \frac{n^{-2} - 1}{\mu} = \epsilon - \frac{1}{\mu}. \quad (44)$$

$\Pi^{(2)}(x, x')$ therefore gives the medium's corrections to the magnetic response to currents. It also governs the speed nc at which electromagnetic waves propagate.




FIG. 1: A gas of polarized atoms. In the absence of an external electric field the dipoles orient randomly (*left image*). When an external field \vec{E} is applied, the dipoles tend to line up with it (*right image*). This produces a net polarization, $\vec{P} = \chi_e \vec{E}$, which weakens the electric force by $1/(1 + \chi_e)$. There is a similar effect in vacuum due to oppositely charged pairs of evanescent, virtual particles.

The preceding comments can be brought into sharp focus by Fourier transforming (38) in Coulomb gauge, $k_i \tilde{A}_i(k) = 0$. The $\mu = 0$ component,

$$-\epsilon(k) \|\vec{k}\|^2 \tilde{A}^0(k) = c^{-1} \tilde{J}^0(k), \quad (45)$$

determines the scalar potential from the charge density. As claimed, the medium screens electric forces by a factor of $1/\epsilon(k)$. The $\mu = i$ equations are more interesting,

$$-\epsilon(k) \left[n^2(k) \|\vec{k}\|^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} \right] \tilde{A}^i(k) = \frac{1}{c} \left[\delta^{ij} - \frac{k^i k^j}{\|\vec{k}\|^2} \right] \tilde{J}^j(k). \quad (46)$$

In addition to the response to a current, the 3-vector potential can also support plane waves which obey the following *dispersion relation*,

$$\epsilon(k) \left[n^2(k) \|\vec{k}\|^2 - c^{-2} \omega^2 \right] = 0. \quad (47)$$

Einstein's great contribution to quantum theory was the inference (from the photoelectric effect) that light is quantized in discrete *photons* of energy $E = \hbar\omega$ and 3-momentum $\vec{p} = \hbar\vec{k}$, where $\hbar \simeq 1.05 \times 10^{-34}$ Js is the reduced Planck constant.

When $\epsilon(k)$ is nonsingular, (47) implies the usual relation, $\omega = nc\|\vec{k}\|$. For this case the energy vanishes as the wave length becomes infinite. However, suppose the medium obeys,

$$\chi_e(k) = \frac{m_\gamma^2 c^2}{\hbar^2 k \cdot k} \quad , \quad n(k) = 1 . \quad (48)$$

Substituting (48) in (47) gives,

$$\epsilon(k) \left[n^2(k) \|\vec{k}\|^2 - \frac{\omega^2}{c^2} \right] = k \cdot k + \frac{m_\gamma^2 c^2}{\hbar^2} = 0 . \quad (49)$$

Such a photon's energy is that of a massive particle,

$$E = \hbar\omega = \sqrt{\|\vec{p}\|^2 c^2 + m_\gamma^2 c^4} \quad (50)$$

We have so far discussed classical media. Quantum field theory predicts that particle-antiparticle pairs are continually being created. They live for a brief period of time and then annihilate one another. The lifetime of such a *virtual particle pair* is governed by its energy through the *energy-time uncertainty principle*,

$$\Delta t \Delta E \gtrsim \hbar , \quad (51)$$

The meaning of (51) is that a minimum time Δt is needed to resolve the energy with accuracy ΔE . Suppose each partner of a virtual particle pair has energy E . Before they emerged from the vacuum the energy was zero, whereas it is $2E$ afterwards. This is a nonconservation of energy! However, (51) says the violation is not detectable in a period shorter than $\hbar/2E$, so virtual particles can survive roughly that long.

All types of particles experience virtual particle creation with all possible energies and 3-momenta. One way of understanding the electrostatic force is through the exchange of virtual photons. Since normal photons are massless, they can have arbitrarily small energies and can therefore survive long enough to mediate the force between distant charges. However, the lifetimes of massive particles are extremely short. For example, the minimum energy an electron can have is that of its rest mass, $m_e c^2 \simeq 8.2 \times 10^{-14}$ J. By (51) we see that an electron-positron pair can only live about $\hbar/2m_e c^2 \simeq 6.4 \times 10^{-22}$ s. Even moving at nearly the speed of light (which implies higher energy, and hence shorter lifetime) a virtual electron would only cover about 10^{-13} m before annihilating. That is a thousand times smaller than the scale upon which the discrete electrons and nuclei are separated in atoms! This explains why macroscopic experiments do not detect virtual electron-positron pairs.

Charged virtual particles behave much like the bound charges of atoms in a polarizable medium. When no external field is present the positive partner of a virtual pair

emerges as often in one direction as any other. However, the application of an electric field makes it preferable for the positive partner to emerge in the direction of the field, while the negative partner emerges in the opposite direction. In this way even empty space can acquire a polarization. The effect is known as *vacuum polarization* and it is described with the same formulae (38-39) we introduced to quantify the polarization of material media.

Although all charged virtual particles contribute to vacuum polarization, the largest effect comes from the lightest particles because they live longest. Electrons and positrons are about 200 times lighter than the next lightest charged particles, so almost all vacuum polarization comes from them. At lowest order they induce the following electric susceptibility [11],

$$\chi_e(k) = -\frac{2\alpha}{\pi} \int_0^1 dx x(1-x) \ln \left[1+x(1-x) \frac{\hbar^2 k \cdot k}{m_e^2 c^2} \right], \quad (52)$$

where $\alpha \equiv e^2/4\pi\hbar c \simeq 1/137$ is the *fine structure constant*. Charged particles have been brought as close as $\sim 10^{-18}$ m in high energy accelerators such as LEP at CERN and SLC at Stanford. Substituting $k \cdot k = (2\pi/10^{-18} \text{ m})^2$ in (52) gives $\chi_e \simeq -.023$, or a 2.3% enhancement of the electromagnetic force. This effect is known as *running* of the force law and it is seen routinely in precision measurements.

It is worth commenting on the negative sign of the quantum electrodynamic susceptibility (52). Our previous discussion of classical media leads one to expect a positive sign. In fact the *bare* susceptibility induced by virtual electron-positron pairs is positive, just as one would expect. It is actually infinite! Recall that virtual pairs are created with arbitrary 3-momenta, so the total susceptibility comes from integrating the contributions from each momentum. Although virtual pairs with large momentum do not contribute much to the susceptibility — because they survive such a short time — the fall-off is not quite enough to make the integral converge. The result is a positive divergent constant, χ_{bare} , plus the finite result (52). This is a classic example of an *ultraviolet divergence* in quantum field theory.

The infinite bare susceptibility χ_{bare} is not directly observable. The observable quantity is the force one fundamental particle exerts on another. Suppose we make the distance r between them so large that the finite contribution (52) is small. If the particles each have charge e_{bare} , the force between them is $1/r^2$ times $e_{\text{bare}}^2/4\pi(1+\chi_{\text{bare}})$. We cannot measure either e_{bare} or χ_{bare} separately, only the combination $e_{\text{bare}}^2/4\pi(1+\chi_{\text{bare}})$. Since that is measured to be finite, it follows that the divergence from χ_{bare} must be canceled by a divergence in e_{bare} .

This is how the process of *renormalization* works in quantum field theory. We mention it only to explain why the finite remainder, (52) can make electromagnetic forces stronger at short distances. Recall that the least energetic electron-positron pairs can only survive long enough to travel about 10^{-13} m. More energetic virtual pairs are limited to even shorter distances. This

means that charged particles separated by more than about 10^{-13} m feel the polarizations contributed by virtual pairs of all 3-momenta. But at separations of less than 10^{-13} m the lower energy virtual pairs leave the electric field between the two charges before fully polarizing. The net effect is less charge screening than at large distances, and hence a relative enhancement of the electromagnetic force at short distances.

If the electron mass had been zero we would see the electromagnetic force law run even at macroscopic distances. In that case the renormalized e^2 would be $4\pi R^2$ times the measured force at some R , and this length would enter the formula for $\chi_e(k)$,

$$\chi_e(k)\Big|_{m_e=0} \rightarrow -\frac{\alpha}{3\pi} \ln(\mu^2 k \cdot k) \quad \text{where} \quad \mu = \frac{R}{2\pi}. \quad (53)$$

For $r > R$ we would measure the force to be smaller than $e^2/4\pi r^2$, whereas it would be greater for $r < R$. The experiment could be done using the apparatus depicted in Figure 2 [12, 13].




FIG. 2: A sketch of the Maxwell-Cavendish experiment. Two metal concentric spheres of radii a and b are first grounded, then the outer sphere is raised to a high potential. If Coulomb's law were violated, the galvanometer G would show a non-zero voltage.

We have so far discussed only the term $\Pi^{(1)}(x; x')$. It turns out that $\Pi^{(2)}(x; x')$ is zero for all relativistic quantum field theories in flat space. This must be so because the tensor coefficient of $\Pi^{(2)}(x; x')$ in (39) breaks the Lorentz symmetry between space and time. One consequence is that the index of refraction is one, so vacuum polarization does not modify the speed of light. Since the invariant element of an expanding universe (5) also distinguishes between space and time one might expect that $\Pi^{(2)}(x; x') \neq 0$ when the Hubble parameter is nonzero and we will see that this is the case.

Because (52) has no pole at $k \cdot k = 0$, the vacuum polarization from quantum electrodynamics preserves the photon's masslessness. This turns out to be a slightly mass and dimension-dependent statement. In 1962 Julian Schwinger showed that zero mass electrons in one

spatial dimension would induce the following electric susceptibility [14],

$$\chi_e(k) = \frac{4\alpha}{k \cdot k}. \quad (54)$$

(In two spacetime dimensions e^2 has the dimension of energy/length, which means that α has the dimension of length $^{-2}$.) Comparison with (48) implies a photon mass of $m_\gamma = 2\sqrt{\alpha}\hbar/c$. We will see later that the expansion of spacetime can also induce a nonzero photon mass.

Electrons and positrons are not the only kinds of charged particles. To get the susceptibility contributed by other kinds of spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particles one simply replaces m_e in (52) with the appropriate mass. Charged particles with spin zero — which are known as *scalars* — entail additionally replacing the factor of $x(1-x)$ which multiplies the logarithm in (52) by $(1-2x)^2/8$. The susceptibility of a zero mass scalar would be $\frac{1}{4}$ times that of (53). It is actually simpler to express the polarization of massless particles in position space by performing the integration in (41). The result for a massless, charged scalar is,

$$\Pi^{(1)}(x; x') = \frac{\alpha}{96\pi^2} \partial^4 \left\{ \theta(\Delta t) \theta(\Delta\tau^2) [1 - \ln(\nu^2 \Delta\tau^2)] \right\}, \quad (55)$$

where $\Delta t \equiv t - t'$, $\Delta\tau^2 \equiv (t - t')^2 - c^{-2} \|\vec{x} - \vec{x}'\|^2$ and $\nu = c/R$ is the *frequency scale of renormalization*. Note that (55) is zero whenever the point x'^μ lies outside the past light-cone of x^μ . This feature, which is a fundamental requirement on any $\Pi^{(1,2)}(x; x')$, is known as *causality*.

III. VIRTUAL PARTICLES WITH EXPANSION

Leonard Parker was the first to give a quantitative assessment of how the universe's expansion can affect virtual particles [15]. The mechanism is that the partners of a virtual pair must cover more distance getting back together than they did moving apart. This causes them to stay apart longer. Under certain conditions they can become trapped in the Hubble flow and get pulled apart, leading to physical particle creation. The purpose of this section is to explain why the effect is strongest for massless, minimally coupled scalars and gravitons during inflation.

First consider how the energy-time uncertainty principle (51) generalizes to the homogeneous and isotropic geometry (5). Just like photons, a general quantum mechanical particle is characterized by its wave vector \vec{k} , which points in the particle's direction of propagation and has magnitude 2π divided by the particle's wavelength. Now recall from (5) that the physical length between two fixed spatial points is $a(t)$ times their coordinate separation. It follows that the physical wave vector is $\vec{k}_{\text{ph}} = \vec{k}/a(t)$. The 3-momentum of a quantum mechanical particle is \hbar times its physical wave vector. Hence the energy of a particle with mass m and coordi-

nate wave vector \vec{k} is,

$$E(t, \vec{k}) = \sqrt{m^2 c^4 + \hbar^2 c^2 \|\vec{k}\|^2 / a^2(t)}. \quad (56)$$

This changes with t so the energy-time uncertainty principle says we cannot detect a violation of energy conservation at time $t + \Delta t$ from a pair of such particles created at t , provided

$$\int_t^{t+\Delta t} dt' 2E(t', \vec{k}) \lesssim \hbar. \quad (57)$$

We see from (56) that the growth of $a(t)$ always reduces the energy relative to constant scale factor. From (57) we see that this always increases the time a virtual pair can survive. For a given \vec{k} and time dependence $a(t)$, the rate at which $E(t, \vec{k})$ falls increases as the mass decreases. Hence massless virtual particles experience the largest increase in their lifetimes.

To understand why inflation maximizes the effect, consider the form of (57) for a massless particle,

$$2\hbar c \|\vec{k}\| \int_t^{t+\Delta t} dt' \frac{1}{a(t')} \lesssim \hbar. \quad (58)$$

For the radiation dominated scale factor (15) the integral grows like $(\Delta t)^{\frac{1}{2}}$; for matter domination (16) its growth is like $(\Delta t)^{\frac{2}{3}}$; and the growth is logarithmic for curvature domination (17). In each of these cases the inequality is eventually violated as Δt grows. However, for the inflationary scale factor (18) the integral approaches a constant as Δt becomes infinite. This means that a long enough wave length pair need never recombine. Substituting $a(t) \propto e^{H_I t}$ we infer the relation,

$$2 \frac{c \|\vec{k}\|}{a(t)} \left[1 - e^{-H_I \Delta t} \right] \lesssim H_I. \quad (59)$$

Therefore massless particles of coordinate wave vector \vec{k} are created during inflation when $c \|\vec{k}_{\text{ph}}\| \sim H_I$. This is known as *first horizon crossing*.

The reason massless, minimally coupled scalars (and also gravitons) are preferred has to do with the *rate* at which virtual particles emerge from the vacuum. All other kinds of massless particles possess a symmetry which causes this rate to decrease as the universe expands. So any of these particles which emerge with $c \|\vec{k}_{\text{ph}}\| \lesssim H_I$ become real, but not many emerge.

The symmetry is called *conformal invariance*. It means that the Lagrangian is unchanged when we multiply each field by a certain power of an arbitrary function of space and time $\Omega(x)$. Some interesting fields are the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$, the vector potential A_μ , the Dirac field ψ_i of spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particles, and the scalar field ϕ . Their conformal transformations are,

$$g_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \Omega^2 g_{\mu\nu}, \quad A_\mu \rightarrow A_\mu, \quad \psi_i \rightarrow \Omega^{-\frac{3}{2}} \psi_i, \quad \phi \rightarrow \Omega^{-1} \phi. \quad (60)$$




FIG. 3: Evolution of a quantum particle's physical wave length $\lambda_{\text{ph}} = a(t)\lambda$ as the universe expands. Wave lengths which are now of cosmological size were originally minuscule. First horizon crossing occurs (at a_x) when λ_{ph} becomes comparable to the inflationary Hubble radius, c/H_I . This is when massless, minimally coupled scalars and gravitons of that wave length are ripped out of the vacuum by the expansion of spacetime. These particles ride the subsequent evolution of the universe relatively undisturbed until second horizon crossing at $\lambda_{\text{ph}} \simeq c/H(t)$. Then the particles manifest as cosmological-scale correlations which cannot have formed causally after inflation.

A typical conformally invariant Lagrangian is that of electromagnetism,

$$\mathcal{L}_{EM} = -\frac{1}{4} F_{\alpha\beta} F_{\rho\sigma} g^{\alpha\rho} g^{\beta\sigma} \sqrt{-g}, \quad (61)$$

where $g = \det(g_{\mu\nu})$ denotes the determinant of the metric and $g^{\mu\nu}$ is its matrix inverse.

Conformal invariance is so important because there is a coordinate system in which a general homogeneous and isotropic metric (5) is just a conformal factor times the metric of flat space. The change of variables is defined by the differential relation, $d\eta = dt/a(t)$,

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t) d\vec{x} \cdot d\vec{x} = a^2[-d\eta^2 + d\vec{x} \cdot d\vec{x}]. \quad (62)$$

In the (η, \vec{x}) coordinate system — which we shall henceforth employ — the metric and its inverse are,

$$g_{\mu\nu} = a^2 \eta_{\mu\nu}, \quad g^{\mu\nu} = a^{-2} \eta^{\mu\nu}. \quad (63)$$

In this coordinate system, a conformally invariant Lagrangian is the same as in flat space, when expressed in terms of the conformally rescaled fields (60) with $\Omega = a^{-1}$. For example, the Lagrangians of electromagnetism, massless Dirac fermions, and a massless, conformally coupled, complex scalar are,

$$\mathcal{L}_{EM} = -\frac{1}{4} F_{\alpha\beta} F_{\rho\sigma} \eta^{\alpha\rho} \eta^{\beta\sigma}, \quad (64)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_D = i(a^{\frac{3}{2}} \bar{\psi}_i) \gamma_{ij}^\mu \partial_\mu (a^{\frac{3}{2}} \psi_j), \quad (65)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{CS} = -\partial_\mu (a \phi^*) \partial_\nu (a \phi) \eta^{\mu\nu}. \quad (66)$$

The physics of a conformally invariant Lagrangian is the same, in conformal coordinates, as it is in flat space. This applies to all local processes such as the rate —

call it Γ — at which virtual particles emerge from the vacuum. Γ gives the number of virtual particles emerging *per unit conformal time* η . This means that the number per unit physical time t is,

$$\frac{dn}{dt} = \frac{d\eta}{dt} \frac{dn}{d\eta} = \frac{\Gamma}{a}. \quad (67)$$

Hence the emergence rate falls like $1/a(t)$, as claimed.

The reason this does not happen for massless, minimally coupled scalars (and gravitons) is that they are not conformally invariant. The Lagrangian of a complex, massless, minimally coupled scalar is,

$$\mathcal{L}_{MS} = -\partial_\mu \phi^* \partial_\nu \phi g^{\mu\nu} \sqrt{-g} = -a^2 \partial_\mu \phi^* \partial_\nu \phi \eta^{\mu\nu}. \quad (68)$$

It turns out that each wave vector of this system corresponds to two independent harmonic oscillators with the following time dependent mass and frequency,

$$m(t) = c^{-2} \hbar H_I a^3(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega(t) = c \|\vec{k}\| / a(t). \quad (69)$$

Harmonic oscillators with time dependent mass and frequency have been much studied in quantum mechanics. The minimum energy at time t is well known to be $\frac{1}{2} \hbar \omega(t)$, however, the state with this energy does not generally evolve onto itself. For the inflationary case of $a(t) \propto e^{H_I t}$ the system's time dependence can be solved exactly. The state whose energy is minimum in the distant past has instantaneous average energy,

$$E_{0-pt}(t, \vec{k}) = \frac{\hbar c \|\vec{k}\|}{a(t)} + \frac{\hbar H_I^2 a(t)}{2c \|\vec{k}\|}. \quad (70)$$

The second term in (70) is attributable to particle production. The energy of a single particle with this wave vector is $\hbar c \|\vec{k}\| / a(t)$, so the average number of particles with wave vector \vec{k} is,

$$N(t, \vec{k}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{H_I a(t)}{c \|\vec{k}\|} \right)^2. \quad (71)$$

As we expect, $N(t, \vec{k})$ is small for very early times and becomes comparable to one at horizon crossing. Summing the contributions from all wave vectors which have experienced horizon crossing and dividing by the spatial volume gives the number density,

$$\frac{N}{V} = \frac{H_I^3}{4\pi^2 c^3}. \quad (72)$$

This corresponds to $1/8\pi^2$ particles per Hubble volume for each degree of freedom.

We close by commenting that there can be no question about the reality of inflationary particle production because its impact has been detected. It is what caused the anisotropies imaged by WMAP [5]. Indeed, all the cosmological structures of the current universe are the result of gravitational collapse into these (originally) quantum fluctuations over the course of 13.7 billion years!

IV. VACUUM POLARIZATION IN INFLATION

The inflationary Hubble parameter (22) corresponds to an enormous energy,

$$\hbar H_I \simeq 1.5 \times 10^3 \text{ J} \simeq 9.4 \times 10^{12} \text{ GeV}. \quad (73)$$

On this scale all the charged particles in the Standard Model of particle physics are effectively massless. Even a particle we normally consider very massive, such as the t quark, has less than 10^{-10} times as much rest mass energy. However, all but one of the Standard Model charged particles are described by the Dirac field ψ_i , whose Lagrangian (65) becomes conformally invariant when we ignore masses. As explained in the previous section, conformally invariant particles are not produced much during inflation. This means that they do not contribute much more to the polarization of the vacuum during inflation than they do in flat space.

The lone exception within the Standard Model is the charged sector of the Higgs scalar. At low energy it manifests as the longitudinal component of the W^\pm . Its mass of about 80 GeV is also insignificant on the scale on inflation. No one really knows how it couples to the metric but the usual assumption, based on how the field renormalizes, is minimal coupling. We can therefore model it with the Lagrangian of a massless, charged, and minimally coupled scalar,

$$\mathcal{L}_{SQED} = -(\partial_\mu - ie' A_\mu) \phi^* (\partial_\nu + ie' A_\nu) \phi g^{\mu\nu} \sqrt{-g}, \quad (74)$$

$$= -a^2 (\partial_\mu - ie' A_\mu) \phi^* (\partial_\nu + ie' A_\nu) \phi \eta^{\mu\nu}. \quad (75)$$

(Here $e' \equiv e/\hbar c$, and $e \simeq -0.30\sqrt{\hbar c}$ is the charge of the electron.) There may be more, so-far undiscovered charged scalars of this type lurking between the $\sim 10^2$ GeV energies which can be explored at accelerators and the enormous energy (73) of the inflationary Hubble parameter.

With Ola Törnkvist we have computed the vacuum polarization from \mathcal{L}_{SQED} [16, 17]. In the $x^\mu = (\eta, \vec{x})$ coordinates (62) our result for the polarization bi-tensor takes the same form (39) as it does for the linear, isotropic medium discussed in section II. With the scale factor normalized to unity at the start of inflation the two bi-scalar functions are,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^{(1)}(x; x') &= \Pi_{\text{flat}}^{(1)}(x; x') + \frac{\alpha}{6\pi} \ln(a) \delta^4(x - x') \\ &\quad - \frac{\alpha a a' H_I^2}{8\pi^2 c^2} \partial^2 \left\{ \theta(\Delta\eta) \theta(\Delta\tau^2) [1 + \ln(H_I^2 \Delta\tau^2)] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

$$\Pi^{(2)}(x; x') = \frac{\alpha a^2 a'^2 H_I^4}{4\pi^2 c^4} \theta(\Delta\eta) \theta(\Delta\tau^2) [2 + \ln(H_I^2 \Delta\tau^2)]. \quad (77)$$

Here $\Delta\eta \equiv \eta - \eta'$ and $\Delta\tau^2 \equiv (\eta - \eta')^2 - c^{-2} \|\vec{x} - \vec{x}'\|^2$. $\Pi_{\text{flat}}^{(1)}(x; x')$ is the flat space result (55), with t and t' replaced by η and η' . This term is renormalized precisely as in flat space, and it contains no scale factors. The inflationary corrections are completely finite and depend

upon the scale factors — a at x^μ and a' at x'^μ . These inflationary corrections come from the long wave length virtual particles that are ripped out of the vacuum by the inflationary Hubble flow. This should obviously increase polarization because it fills spacetime with a plasma of charged particles.

A significant feature of our result is nonzero $\Pi^{(2)}(x; x')$. Recall that it must always vanish in flat space quantum field theory by virtue of the Lorentz symmetry between space and time. The time-dependent metric of inflation (63) does not possess this symmetry, so one can have $\Pi^{(2)}(x; x') \neq 0$. In terms of electrodynamics, this means that \mathcal{L}_{SQED} induces a relative permittivity which is not the inverse of the permeability, so the index of refraction is not unity even in “empty” space.

Because the inflationary metric is time dependent one cannot compute the mass of the photon by checking for a pole in the Fourier transform of the susceptibility as we did in flat space (48). A better way to proceed is by comparison with the Proca Lagrangian which governs the dynamics of a fundamental massive photon,

$$\mathcal{L}_P \equiv -\frac{1}{4}F_{\alpha\beta}F_{\rho\sigma}g^{\alpha\rho}g^{\beta\sigma}\sqrt{-g} - \frac{m_\gamma^2 c^2}{2\hbar^2}A_\mu A_\nu g^{\mu\nu}\sqrt{-g}, \quad (78)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{4}F_{\alpha\beta}F_{\rho\sigma}\eta^{\alpha\rho}\eta^{\beta\sigma} - \frac{m_\gamma^2 c^2}{2\hbar^2}A_\mu A_\nu \eta^{\mu\nu} a^2. \quad (79)$$

The field equations associated with this Lagrangian are,

$$\eta^{\mu\nu}\eta^{\rho\sigma}\partial_\rho F_{\sigma\nu} - c^2\hbar^{-2}m_\gamma^2\eta^{\mu\nu}A_\nu a^2 = 0. \quad (80)$$

The mass term is distinguished by its factor of a^2 .

Now recall Maxwell’s equations with vacuum polarization (38), which we re-write without the current,

$$\eta^{\mu\nu}\eta^{\rho\sigma}\partial_\rho F_{\sigma\nu}(x) + \int d^4x' [{}^\mu\Pi^\nu](x, x')A_\nu(x') = 0. \quad (81)$$

We also recall the polarization bi-tensor (39),

$$[{}^\mu\Pi^\nu](x, x') \equiv [\eta^{\mu\nu}\eta^{\rho\sigma} - \eta^{\mu\rho}\eta^{\sigma\nu}]\partial'_\rho\partial_\sigma\Pi^{(1)}(x, x') \\ + \eta^{\mu i}\eta^{\nu j}[\delta_{ij}\partial'_k\partial_k - \partial'_i\partial_j]\Pi^{(2)}(x, x'). \quad (82)$$

One sees from (77) that $\Pi^{(2)}(x; x')$ contributes a factor of a^2 . The $\Pi^{(1)}(x; x')$ term (76) has at most a single factor of a , but note from $\partial_\sigma a = \delta_\sigma^0 H_I a^2$ that this can also give an a^2 in (81). Comparison with the Proca equations (80) suggests $m_\gamma \sim \sqrt{\alpha} H_I \hbar / c^2$.

One can get a quantitative result by solving (81) perturbatively in α . First expand the vector potential in a series of terms $A_\mu^{(n)}(x)$ which go like α^n ,

$$A_\mu(x) = A_\mu^{(0)}(x) + A_\mu^{(1)}(x) + \dots \quad (83)$$

Now recall that the polarization bi-tensor is first order in α , and segregate (81) in powers of α . We see that $A_\mu^{(0)}(x)$ obeys the classical equation,

$$\eta^{\mu\nu}\eta^{\rho\sigma}\partial_\rho F_{\sigma\nu}^{(0)}(x) = 0, \quad (84)$$

the general solution of which consists of a superposition of transverse plane waves,

$$A_\mu^{(0)}(x) = \epsilon_\mu(\vec{k})e^{-ic\|\vec{k}\|\eta+i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}} \text{ where, } \epsilon_0 = 0 = k_i\epsilon_i. \quad (85)$$

The order α correction obeys,

$$\eta^{\mu\nu}\eta^{\rho\sigma}\partial_\rho F_{\sigma\nu}^{(1)}(x) + \int d^4x' [{}^\mu\Pi^\nu](x, x')A_\nu^{(0)}(x') = 0. \quad (86)$$

Now substitute (85) and evaluate the integral assuming the photon experienced first horizon crossing (see Figure 3) long before, and after a long period of inflation,

$$a \gg \frac{c\|\vec{k}\|}{H_I} \gg 1. \quad (87)$$

After some tedious expansions the result is,

$$\int d^4x' [{}^\mu\Pi^\nu](x, x')A_\nu^{(0)}(x') = \\ -\alpha c^{-2}H_I^2\eta^{\mu\nu}A_\nu^{(0)}(x) \left[\frac{2}{\pi} \ln\left(\frac{c\|\vec{k}\|}{H_I}\right) + O(1) \right] a^2 + O(a). \quad (88)$$

The analogous first order Proca equation,

$$\eta^{\mu\nu}\eta^{\rho\sigma}\partial_\rho F_{\sigma\nu}^{(1)} - c^2\hbar^{-2}m_\gamma^2\eta^{\mu\nu}A_\nu^{(0)}a^2 = 0, \quad (89)$$

implies that the photon mass must be,

$$m_\gamma = \sqrt{\alpha}c^{-2}\hbar H_I \left[\frac{2}{\pi} \ln\left(\frac{c\|\vec{k}\|}{H_I}\right) + O(1) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (90)$$

V. HARTREE APPROXIMATION

A simple way of getting almost the same result was previously suggested by one of us (Prokopec) in collaboration with Anne Davis, Konstantinos Dimopoulos and Ola Törnkvist [18, 19, 20]. The technique is to pretend that photons move in the quantum mechanical average of the scalar field. This is known as the *Hartree* or *mean field* approximation.

To implement the Hartree approximation we first take the average of \mathcal{L}_{SQED} (75) over quantum mechanical fluctuations of the scalar field. Of course this eliminates the scalar fields, but it leaves behind some function of the vector potential,

$$\langle \mathcal{L}_{SQED} \rangle = -\langle \partial_\mu\phi^*\partial_\nu\phi \rangle \eta^{\mu\nu} a^2 + \frac{ie}{\hbar c} \langle \phi^*\partial_\mu\phi - \partial_\mu\phi^*\phi \rangle \\ \times A_\nu \eta^{\mu\nu} a^2 - \frac{e^2}{\hbar^2 c^2} \langle \phi^*\phi^* \rangle A_\mu A_\nu \eta^{\mu\nu} a^2. \quad (91)$$

Now add this function to the Maxwell Lagrangian (61).

The quantum average of the scalar’s norm-squared consists of a divergent constant plus a finite term that grows like the logarithm of the scale factor, [21]

$$\langle \phi^*(x)\phi(x) \rangle = \text{U.V.} + \frac{H_I^2\hbar}{4\pi^2 c} \ln(a), \quad (92)$$

The other averages in (91) are either zero or else they do not multiply functions of the vector potential. The Hartree approximation Lagrangian is therefore,

$$\mathcal{L}_{Hartree} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\alpha\beta}F_{\rho\sigma}\eta^{\alpha\rho}\eta^{\beta\sigma} + \text{U.V.} \\ - \frac{e^2}{\hbar^2 c^2} \left[\text{U.V.} + \frac{H_I^2 \hbar}{4\pi^2 c} \ln(a) \right] A_\mu A_\nu \eta^{\mu\nu} a^2. \quad (93)$$

Expression (93) contains ultraviolet divergences because scalars of all wave vectors contribute to the average. The divergence without any vector potentials is harmless, but the other one could only be renormalized using a fundamental photon mass, which we do not have. This is one reason why the vacuum polarization — which can be consistently renormalized — is the correct way to study the kinematical properties of photons. But let us simply ignore the divergences in (93). Comparison of the finite parts with the Proca Lagrangian (79) suggests the correspondence,

$$m_\gamma \iff \sqrt{\alpha} c^{-2} \hbar H_I \left[\frac{2}{\pi} \ln(a) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (94)$$

Complete agreement with (90) requires only the additional assumption that the growth of (94) ceases for the mode of wave vector \vec{k} when it experiences horizon crossing, $a = c\|\vec{k}\|/H_I$. This is consistent with the causal picture according to which a photon's mass only receives contributions from virtual scalars whose wave lengths are greater than the photon's wave length.

We conclude this section by commenting on the size of the photon mass induced by our mechanism. During inflation we get $m_\gamma \sim 10^{13}$ GeV/ c^2 , which is enormous compared to the center-of-mass energies of ~ 100 GeV attainable in the largest accelerators. One does not detect a photon mass today because our result derives from the huge density of free charged particles ripped out of the vacuum by inflation. This plasma has been thoroughly dissipated at any wave length we can access in today's laboratories.

According to the supernovae results [3, 4] the current universe may be entering another phase of inflation. This will also lead to a nonzero photon mass, but with the replacement of H_I by the vastly smaller Hubble parameter of today, H_0 . Making this substitution in (90) gives a minuscule photon mass, $m_\gamma \sim 10^{-41}$ GeV/ c^2 . This is far below the best current laboratory bounds of $m_\gamma \lesssim 10^{-49}$ kg $\approx 10^{-23}$ GeV/ c^2 [12, 13].

VI. COSMOLOGICAL MAGNETIC FIELDS

The phenomenon of nonzero photon mass during inflation offers a fascinating 4-dimensional analogue to the Schwinger model of two dimensions [14]. However, it was proposed [18, 19, 20] not for aesthetic appeal but rather to explain the curious fact that galaxies seem to possess micro-Gauss magnetic fields, correlated on scales

of a few kilo-parsecs [22]. (The conversion factors to MKS units are, $1 \text{ J/m}^3 = 10 \text{ Gauss}^2$ and $10 \text{ kpc} \approx 3.1 \times 10^{20} \text{ m}$.) There is also evidence that galactic clusters possess micro-Gauss magnetic fields correlated on scales of 10-100 kpc [23].

The difficulty is not these field strengths but rather their enormous coherence lengths. A galaxy's differential rotation can combine with the turbulent motion of ionized gas to power a phenomenon known as the α - ω dynamo [24]. In this mechanism the lines of a coherent seed field are stretched by rotation, twisted by turbulence and then recombined to result in an exponential amplification. Kinetic energy from turbulent motion is converted into magnetic field energy in this way until equipartition is reached. Although many astrophysicists question the α - ω dynamo, it is significant that the measured field strengths are at roughly the equipartition limit [23].

Estimates for the dynamo time constant vary from .2 to .8 billion years [25]. The WMAP satellite has seen reionization from the first star formation at about .2 billion years into the 13.7 billion years of the universe's existence [6]. One might expect large spiral galaxies to form at about .4 billion years [25]. This implies dynamo operation for $13.7 - .4 = 13.3$ billion years, or between 17 to 66 time constants. Exponentiation results in amplification factors ranging from $e^{17} \simeq 2.4 \times 10^7$ to $e^{66} \simeq 4.6 \times 10^{28}$. Therefore the cosmological magnetic fields of today might derive from correlated seeds as weak as 10^{-34} Gauss at the time of galaxy formation. The real question is, what produced the correlated seed fields in the hot, dense and very smooth early universe?

This is how the nonzero photon mass of inflation might help. As explained in section III, a nonzero mass suppresses the creation of particles. On the other hand, it vastly enhances the 0-point energy that quantum mechanics predicts must reside in each photon wave vector \vec{k} , even if there are no particles with that wave vector anywhere in the universe. With no mass this 0-point energy falls as the universe expands,

$$E_\gamma(t, \vec{k}) \Big|_{m_\gamma=0} = \frac{\hbar c \|\vec{k}\|}{2a(t)}. \quad (95)$$

A nonzero photon mass causes the 0-point energy of wave vectors which have experienced first horizon crossing to approach a constant instead,

$$E_\gamma(t, \vec{k}) = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{m_\gamma^2 c^4 + \hbar^2 c^2 \|\vec{k}\|^2 / a^2} \longrightarrow \frac{1}{2} m_\gamma c^2. \quad (96)$$

After the end of inflation this wave vector eventually experiences second horizon crossing, $c\|\vec{k}\| = a(t)H(t)$. If the mass goes to zero quickly thereafter, about half of the enormous 0-point energy must be shed in the form of long wave length photons at numbers vastly higher than thermal. The idea is that the mysterious seed fields derive from these long wave length photons becoming frozen in the plasma of the early universe.

Consider a wave vector \vec{k} which is about to experience second horizon crossing. Each polarization of this

system behaves as an independent harmonic oscillator whose frequency is suddenly changed from a large value $\Omega = m_\gamma c^2/\hbar$ to a much smaller one $\omega = c\|\vec{k}\|/a(t)$. Let q and p stand for the position and momentum operators of this oscillator. The Hamiltonians before and after are,

$$H_B = \frac{p^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2}m\Omega^2 q^2 \quad , \quad H_A = \frac{p^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2}m\omega^2 q^2 . \quad (97)$$

Before transition the system is in its ground state,

$$H_B|0\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\hbar\Omega|0\rangle . \quad (98)$$

The kinetic and potential terms each contribute half,

$$\frac{1}{2m}\langle 0|p^2|0\rangle = \frac{1}{4}\hbar\Omega = \frac{1}{2}m\Omega^2\langle 0|q^2|0\rangle . \quad (99)$$

After transition the system is no longer an eigenstate, but we can find its average energy from the fact that the expectation values of p^2 and q^2 are continuous,

$$\langle 0|H_A|0\rangle = \frac{1}{4}\hbar\Omega\left[1 + \frac{\omega^2}{\Omega^2}\right] \approx \frac{1}{4}\hbar\Omega . \quad (100)$$

Comparing this energy with the post-transition eigenstates $(N + \frac{1}{2})\hbar\omega$, we see that the average occupation number after transition is,

$$N(\vec{k}) \simeq \frac{\Omega}{4\omega} = \frac{m_\gamma ca}{4\hbar\|\vec{k}\|} . \quad (101)$$

A digression on cosmology is necessary to express the scale factor in (101) as a function of $\|\vec{k}\|$. It is convenient to use redshift, $z \equiv a_0/a(t) - 1$, rather than time to label events. This implies $a = a_0/(1+z)$. For simplicity we assume perfect matter domination from matter-radiation equality ($z_{eq} \simeq 3200$) to the present ($z_0 = 0$),

$$aH = a_0H_0\sqrt{1+z} \quad (\text{matter domination}) . \quad (102)$$

For $z > z_{eq}$ we assume perfect radiation domination,

$$aH = a_0H_0\frac{1+z}{\sqrt{1+z_{eq}}} \quad (\text{radiation domination}) . \quad (103)$$

Suppose galaxies form at $z = 10$. A physical wave length of 10 kpc then would have experienced second horizon crossing during the radiation dominated epoch at about $z \simeq 1.5 \times 10^7$. Therefore the relevant scales crossed during the radiation dominated phase and we conclude,

$$\frac{a_0H_0z}{\sqrt{z_{eq}}} \simeq c\|\vec{k}\| \implies a \simeq \frac{a_0}{z} = \frac{a_0^2H_0}{\sqrt{z_{eq}}c\|\vec{k}\|} . \quad (104)$$

Substituting (104) in (101) gives the average occupation number for each polarization of wave vector \vec{k} ,

$$N(\vec{k}) = \frac{m_\gamma a_0^2 H_0}{4\sqrt{z_{eq}}\hbar\|\vec{k}\|^2} . \quad (105)$$

To within factors of order one the temperature at time t is $T = T_0 a_0/a(t)$, where $T_0 \simeq 2.73$ K is the current temperature of the cosmic microwave background. The thermal occupation number is therefore,

$$N_{th}(\vec{k}) = \frac{k_B T_0 a_0}{\hbar c\|\vec{k}\|} , \quad (106)$$

where $k_B \simeq 1.38 \times 10^{-23}$ J/K is the Boltzmann constant. The ratio of m_γ photons to thermal ones can be expressed in terms of the present-day physical wave length λ_0 ,

$$\frac{N(\vec{k})}{N_{th}(\vec{k})} = \frac{m_\gamma c H_0 \lambda_0}{8\pi\sqrt{z_{eq}}k_B T_0} = \frac{\hbar H_I H_0 \lambda_0}{8\pi\sqrt{z_{eq}}c k_B T_0} \left[\frac{2\alpha}{\pi} \ln\left(\frac{2\pi c a_0}{H_I \lambda_0}\right) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} . \quad (107)$$

Recall that we normalize the scale factor to one at the start of inflation. For models with a long period of inflation the final factor in square brackets is dominated by $\ln(a_0)$, which might be quite large. We parameterize our ignorance by making the definition,

$$\varepsilon \equiv \left[\frac{2\alpha}{\pi} \ln\left(\frac{2\pi c a_0}{H_I (10 \text{ kpc})}\right) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} . \quad (108)$$

Working out the other numbers gives,

$$\frac{N(\vec{k})}{N_{th}(\vec{k})} = \varepsilon(2.1 \times 10^{-4}) \left(\frac{\lambda_0}{\text{m}}\right) = \varepsilon(6.5 \times 10^{16}) \left(\frac{\lambda_0}{10 \text{ kpc}}\right) . \quad (109)$$

We see that m_γ photons are negligible compared to thermal ones on the $\lambda_0 \sim .005$ m scale of the cosmic microwave background, but they are enormously dominant on the $\lambda_0 \sim 10$ kpc scale relevant to galaxies.

At first the energy in these photons is almost completely electric, but Maxwell's equations carry it to the magnetic sector. The physical magnetic field in a homogeneous and isotropic geometry is,

$$B^i(t, \vec{x}) = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ijk} F_{jk}(t, \vec{x})/a^2(t) . \quad (110)$$

Assuming half the energy of m_γ photons winds up in these magnetic fields, we conclude that their spatial Fourier transforms obey,

$$\langle \tilde{B}^i(t, \vec{k}) \tilde{B}^i(t, \vec{q}) \rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta^3(\vec{k} + \vec{q}) N(\vec{k}) \frac{\hbar c\|\vec{k}\|}{a^4(t)} , \quad (111)$$

$$= (2\pi)^3 \delta^3(\vec{k} + \vec{q}) \frac{\varepsilon \hbar H_I H_0 a_0^2}{4\sqrt{z_{eq}}c\|\vec{k}\|a^4} . \quad (112)$$

The quantity of interest is the magnetic field averaged over a region of coordinate size $\ell = \ell_0/a(t)$,

$$B^i(t, \vec{x}; \ell_0) \equiv (2\pi\ell^2)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \int d^3 y e^{-\frac{\|\vec{x}-\vec{y}\|^2}{2\ell^2}} B^i(t, \vec{y}) , \quad (113)$$

$$= \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{x}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\ell^2\|\vec{k}\|^2} \tilde{B}^i(t, \vec{k}) . \quad (114)$$

This is an operator, but its average is a number,

$$B^2(t, \ell_0) \equiv \left\langle B^i(t, \vec{x}; \ell_0) B^i(t, \vec{x}; \ell_0) \right\rangle = \frac{\varepsilon \hbar H_I H_0 (1+z)^2}{16\pi^2 \sqrt{z_{eq}} c \ell_0^2}. \quad (115)$$

Plugging in the known numbers gives,

$$B(t, \ell_0) \simeq \sqrt{\varepsilon} (3.6 \times 10^{-34} \text{ Gauss}) \left(\frac{1+z}{\ell_0/10 \text{ kpc}} \right). \quad (116)$$

This is already within the lower range of conceivable seed fields. Turbulent evolution might contribute a factor of ten by transferring power from small scales [18]. An additional factor of $(\rho_{\text{gal}}/\rho_0)^{\frac{2}{3}} \simeq 3 \times 10^3$ accrues from field compression when the proto-galaxy collapses. Assuming $\varepsilon \sim 1$ and galaxy formation at $z \sim 10$, we might expect field strengths of about 10^{-28} Gauss at $\ell \sim 100$ pc.

It should be emphasized that this is just one of many potential explanations for cosmological magnetic fields

[23]. This section's analysis is also highly simplified. We need to better understand the process through which a given wave vector's mass dissipates at second horizon crossing. A proper calculation would also require careful study of the dynamics of electric and magnetic fields during the epochs of reheating, radiation domination, and matter domination.

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to acknowledge Ola Törnkvist's collaboration in much of the work reported here. We have also profited from conversations with Konstantinos Dimopoulos, Sasha Dolgov, Glenn Starkman and Tanmay Vachaspati. This work was partially supported by DOE contract DE-FG02-97ER41029 and by the Institute for Fundamental Theory of the University of Florida.

-
- [1] E. Hubble, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **15** (1929) 168.
 - [2] C. Wirtz, Astron. Nachr. **222** (1924) 21.
 - [3] S. Perlmutter *et al.* [Supernova Cosmology Project Collaboration], Measurements of Omega and Lambda from 42 High-Redshift Supernovae, *Astrophys. J.* **517** (1999) 565 [arXiv:astro-ph/9812133].
 - [4] A. G. Riess *et al.* [Supernova Search Team Collaboration], Observational Evidence from Supernovae for an Accelerating Universe and a Cosmological Constant, *Astron. J.* **116** (1998) 1009 [arXiv:astro-ph/9805201].
 - [5] C. L. Bennett *et al.*, First Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Preliminary Maps and Basic Results, arXiv:astro-ph/0302207.
 - [6] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, First Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Determination of Cosmological Parameters, arXiv:astro-ph/0302209.
 - [7] A. H. Guth, The Inflationary Universe: A Possible Solution To The Horizon And Flatness Problems, *Phys. Rev. D* **23** (1981) 347.
 - [8] A. A. Starobinsky, A New Type Of Isotropic Cosmological Models Without Singularity, *Phys. Lett. B* **91** (1980) 99.
 - [9] K. Sato, Cosmological Baryon Number Domain Structure And The First Order Phase Transition Of A Vacuum, *Phys. Lett. B* **99** (1981) 66.
 - [10] D. Kazanas, Dynamics Of The Universe And Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking, *Astrophys. J.* **241** (1980) L59.
 - [11] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1995).
 - [12] E. R. Williams, J. E. Faller and H. A. Hill, New Experimental Test Of Coulomb's Law: A Laboratory Upper Limit On The Photon Rest Mass, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **26** (1971) 721.
 - [13] A. S. Goldhaber and M. M. Nieto, Terrestrial And Extra-Terrestrial Limits On The Photon Mass, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **43** (1971) 277.
 - [14] J. Schwinger, Gauge Invariance and Mass II, *Phys. Rev.* **128** (1962) 2425.
 - [15] L. Parker, Quantized Fields and Particle Creation in Expanding Universes. 1., *Phys. Rev.* **183** (1969) 1057.
 - [16] T. Prokopec, O. Törnkvist and R. Woodard, Photon mass from inflation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89** (2002) 101301 [arXiv:astro-ph/0205331].
 - [17] T. Prokopec, O. Törnkvist and R. P. Woodard, One loop vacuum polarization in a locally de Sitter background, *Ann. Phys.* **303** (2003) 251. [arXiv:gr-qc/0205130].
 - [18] A. C. Davis, K. Dimopoulos, T. Prokopec and O. Törnkvist, Primordial spectrum of gauge fields from inflation, *Phys. Lett. B* **501** (2001) 165 [astro-ph/0007214].
 - [19] O. Törnkvist, A. C. Davis, K. Dimopoulos and T. Prokopec, Large scale primordial magnetic fields from inflation and reheating, *astro-ph/0011278*.
 - [20] K. Dimopoulos, T. Prokopec, O. Törnkvist and A. C. Davis, Natural Magnetogenesis from Inflation, *Phys. Rev. D* **65** (2002) 063505 [astro-ph/0108093].
 - [21] A. Vilenkin and L. H. Ford, Gravitational Effects Upon Cosmological Phase Transitions, *Phys. Rev. D* **26** (1982) 1231. A. D. Linde, Scalar Field Fluctuations In Expanding Universe And The New Inflationary Universe Scenario, *Phys. Lett. B* **116** (1982) 335. A. A. Starobinsky, Dynamics Of Phase Transitions In The New Inflationary Scenario And Generation Of Perturbations, *Phys. Lett. B* **117** (1982) 175.
 - [22] P. P. Kronberg, Extragalactic magnetic fields, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **57** (1994) 325.
 - [23] D. Grasso and H. R. Rubinstein, Magnetic Fields In The Early Universe, *Phys. Rept.* **348** (2001) 163, [astro-ph/0009061].
 - [24] E. N. Parker, *Cosmic magnetic fields* (Clarendon, Oxford, 1979). Ya. B. Zeldovich, A. A. Ruzmaikin and D. D. Sokoloff, *Magnetic fields in astrophysics* (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1983).
 - [25] A. C. Davis, M. Lilley and O. Törnkvist, Relaxing the Bounds on Primordial Magnetic Seed Fields, *Phys. Rev. D* **60** (1999) 021301, [astro-ph/9904022].