

What is the Magnetic Moment of the Electron?

Othmar Steinmann
Fakultät für Physik
Universität Bielefeld
D-33501 Bielefeld, Germany

Abstract

Because of infrared effects the charged sectors of QED contain no eigenstates of the mass operator. The electron is therefore not definable as a Wigner particle. There exists no sharp, unambiguous, definition of the notion of a 1-electron state. The assignment of a fixed value of the magnetic moment – or similar quantities – to the electron is therefore at first problematic. It is not clear a priori that such a notion is meaningful. Conventionally this problem is solved by first calculating the desired quantity in an IR-regularized theory and then removing the regularization. If this method yields a finite value, that is considered sufficient proof of its soundness. This is clearly less than satisfactory. Here we propose a more convincing way of defining the intrinsic magnetic moment of the electron, which does not use any regularizations and is not based on an interaction with external fields. A pseudostatic 1-electron state is defined in a phenomenological way. Its magnetic moment, as defined here, does not depend on the unavoidable ambiguities inherent in this definition. The method leads to the same analytic expression as the conventional approach, thus preserving the excellent agreement between theory and experiment.

1 Introduction

The spectacular accuracy with which the theoretical QED-values of the anomalous magnetic moments of the electron and the muon agree with measurement¹ is one of the major triumphs of relativistic quantum field theory. It must be said, however, that from the point of view of a rigorous formulation of field theory, the theoretical derivation of these numbers leaves much to be desired. The method typically used, as briefly described in [3], can be epitomized by the following quote from this reference: “The magnetic property of an electron can be studied most conveniently by examining its scattering by a static magnetic field”. But the standard scattering formalism used in carrying out this program is not really applicable to QED even in the absence of an external field, due

¹A fairly recent review is [1]. The latest measurement in the muon case is reported in [2].

to the notorious infrared (IR) problems. Taking these problems seriously it is found that for charged particles a 1-particle state is a much more complex object than usually assumed. In particular it is *not* definable as an eigenstate of the mass operator $M^2 = P_\mu P^\mu$ (P_μ the 4-momentum operator). Green's functions and the like cannot be meaningfully restricted to the mass shell. A "1-particle state" can therefore not be specified by a 3-dimensional wave function. Customarily this fact is described by stating that a charged particle is necessarily accompanied by a cloud of soft photons, the exact composition of this cloud not being derivable from first principles. What is fixed is, crudely speaking, only the form of the singularity of $n(\omega)$ for $\omega \rightarrow 0$, when $n(\omega)$ is the number of soft photons of energy ω .² Besides invalidating the conventional scattering formalism, this unavoidable vagueness of the 1-particle states creates an obvious problem with the definition of their magnetic moment and similar quantities. Might they not be indeterminate because depending on the shape of the photon cloud?

The problem becomes even more serious if the system is acted upon by an external electromagnetic field. This destroys the Poincaré invariance of the theory, in particular the translation invariance which is a powerful tool in the ordinary treatment. This raises, for instance, the important question of how to define the vacuum state, which seems to be a prerequisite for a meaningful definition of a 1-particle state. Also, it is not clear that the quantum fields can still be expected to satisfy asymptotic conditions like the LSZ condition, that is, to converge in a suitable sense to free fields for large positive or negative times, unless the external fields tend to zero fast enough in this limit, which is clearly not the case for static external fields.

As a result, the scattering amplitude underlying the conventional formalism does actually not exist. In a perturbative treatment this non-existence manifests itself most prominently by the IR divergences of the formal expression of the amplitude. The traditional way of handling this problem consists in starting from an IR-regularized theory, typically by introducing a positive photon mass μ , and letting μ tend to zero in the final expression for whatever physical quantity one is interested in. But the fact that this derivation yields a finite (i.e. divergence-free) value of the magnetic moment does not make it any less suspect. It has hardly more than a heuristic value. Indeed, it has been shown in [6] that in the case of scattering cross sections this method very likely produces erroneous results.

In view of the undeniable success in describing observation, the theoretical formula for the magnetic moment thus deviously obtained is, however, undoubtedly correct. But because of the importance of this result a more convincing derivation is desirable. Such a derivation will be proposed in the present paper.

²This description uses the language of the interaction representation, which is mathematically unsound because of Haag's theorem [4, 5], a fact that is unfortunately still largely ignored in the literature.

2 Outline of the Method

The method to be presented is based on the particle notion introduced in [6]³. Particles play no fundamental role in the theory. They are secondary phenomenological objects which are useful for the description of observations. We are especially interested in the magnetic moment of the electron due to its spin. The major ingredients of the formalism are the notion of an approximate 1-electron state and an intrinsic definition of the magnetic moment not relying on its response to external fields.

We work throughout in the Heisenberg picture, using perturbation theory, since an exact treatment is beyond the possibilities of present-day field theory. An “approximate electron state” is defined by (see Eq. (14.36) of BK)

$$\Phi_f = \Psi(f) \Omega, \quad \Psi(f) = \int dx f(x) \Psi(x) = \int dp \tilde{f}(p) \tilde{\Psi}(p). \quad (1)$$

Here Ω is the vacuum state and $f(x)$ is a test spinor, that is a 4-component wave function whose components are infinitely differentiable functions of x with strong decrease at infinity. Its Fourier transform

$$\tilde{f}(p) = (2\pi)^{-3/2} \int dx e^{-ipx} f(x) \quad (2)$$

has a small compact support centered at a point P on the negative mass shell $\{P^2 = m^2, P_0 < 0\}$, m the mass of the electron. Ψ is the electron field in a physical gauge, which we choose for convenience to be a rotation invariant gauge like, for instance, the Coulomb gauge. $\tilde{f}(p)$ shall be smooth in the sense that it is C^∞ and slowly varying, i.e. not containing any violent wiggles. $f\Psi$ is an abbreviation for $f_\rho\Psi_\rho$ summed over the four spinor indices ρ .⁴ For later purposes we note

$$(\Psi(f))^* = \int dx \bar{\Psi}(x) \gamma^0 f^*(x) = \int dp \tilde{\bar{\Psi}}(-p) \gamma^0 \tilde{f}^*(p). \quad (3)$$

In BK it has been shown that Φ_f exhibits the behavior of a free particle of mass m if monitored by detectors placed at macroscopic spacetime distances from one another. This explains the appellation “approximate electron state”.

The operator of the magnetic moment we define by taking over the corresponding expression from classical magnetostatics (see [7], Sect. 5.6)

$$\mathbf{M} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x (\mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{j}(\mathbf{x})), \quad (4)$$

³This reference will henceforth be quoted as BK.

⁴For spinor indices we use the summation convention without regard to their position, while for Minkowski indices we sum over indices occurring twice only if one stands downstairs, one upstairs.

where $j(x)$ is the operator of the electromagnetic current density. The magnetic moment of a stationary state Φ we define as the expectation value

$$\mathbf{m} = \frac{(\Phi, \mathbf{M} \Phi)}{(\Phi, \Phi)} \quad (5)$$

of \mathbf{M} in Φ . This formula is not immediately applicable to our problem because Φ_f is clearly not stationary. But we can make Φ_f almost stationary by concentrating the support of \tilde{f} around the zero-momentum point $P = (-m, \mathbf{0})$ and making the diameter of this support arbitrarily small. Unfortunately it is not meaningful to let this diameter shrink to zero. The states Φ_f would not converge in this limit. And even if we considered only expectation values like in Eq. (5), the shrinking of the \tilde{f} -support would lead to an increasing delocalization of the state in x -space which might interfere with the \mathbf{x} -integration in (4). This integration might not commute with the \tilde{f} -limit, with awkward consequences.

We will therefore use a weaker notion of a “static limit”. All our calculations will be carried out in perturbation theory, writing $(\Phi_f, \mathbf{M} \Phi_f)$ and (Φ_f, Φ_f) as sums over generalized Feynman graphs (see below). In their integrands in p -space we replace p by P in all slowly varying factors. The resulting expression we call the “static limit” of the graph by abuse of language. Note that the wave function \tilde{f} itself is *not* slowly varying despite its smoothness, because its assumed tiny support necessitates large variations over small distances. Another point to be noted is that we are only interested in the contribution of the spin to the magnetic moment, excluding the effects of the orbital motion. We therefore consider only s-states in which an orbital contribution is not to be expected. This means that we assume the wave function \tilde{f} , more exactly each of its four components $\tilde{f}_\rho(p)$, to be invariant under space rotations: $\tilde{f}_\rho(p)$ is assumed to depend only on the two variables p^0 and $|\mathbf{p}|^2$:

$$\tilde{f}_\rho(p) = \tilde{f}_\rho(p^0, |\mathbf{p}|^2) . \quad (6)$$

The desired intrinsic magnetic moment of the electron is then defined as the static limit of

$$\mathbf{m} = \frac{(\Phi_f, \mathbf{M} \Phi_f)}{(\Phi_f, \Phi_f)} . \quad (7)$$

Rotational invariance being assumed, we can restrict ourselves to considering the 3-component

$$m_3 = \frac{(\Phi_f, M_3 \Phi_f)}{(\Phi_f, \Phi_f)} . \quad (8)$$

The field $\Psi(x)$ transforms under the rotation R as

$$\Psi(Rx) = S(R) U(R) \Psi(x) U^*(R) . \quad (9)$$

$U(R)$ is the unitary representation of the rotation group defined on the state space of the theory, $S(R)$ is the well-known 4-dimensional spinor representation acting on the spinor index ρ of Ψ_ρ . For R a rotation through the angle χ

around the 3-axis we define the spin matrix Σ_3 and the operator J_3 of angular momentum by

$$S(R) = e^{i\chi\Sigma_3} , \quad U(R) = e^{-i\chi J_3} . \quad (10)$$

With the conventions⁵ of BK we find

$$\Sigma_3 = -\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \sigma^{21} \quad (11)$$

with

$$\sigma^{\mu\nu} := \frac{i}{2} [\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu] . \quad (12)$$

J_3 may be decomposed into an orbital part L_3 and a spin part S_3 :

$$J_3 = L_3 + S_3 , \quad (13)$$

with L_3 the 3-component of the standard expression $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{x} \times \mathbf{P}$, $\mathbf{P} = -i\nabla$. Defining $\Phi(x) = \Psi(x)\Omega$, $\mathbf{L}\Omega = \mathbf{S}\Omega = 0$, and using Eq. (9) for an infinitesimal angle χ we find

$$S_3\Phi(x) = \Sigma_3\Phi(x) \quad (14)$$

which relation extends by linearity to Φ_f . We define the spin content of Φ_f as

$$\frac{(\Phi_f, S_3\Phi_f)}{(\Phi_f, \Phi_f)} \quad (15)$$

taken in the static limit. The ‘‘gyromagnetic ratio’’ g of the electron is defined by

$$(\Phi_f, M_3\Phi_f) = -\frac{eg}{2m} (\Phi_f, S_3\Phi_f) , \quad (16)$$

both sides being taken in the static limit. The coupling constant e is defined to be the elementary charge unit, i.e. the charge of the positron, not that of the electron as often done in the literature. This explains the negative sign in the right-hand side of Eq. (16). $e/2m$ is known as the Bohr magneton. The existence of such a constant g , solving Eq. (16) irrespective of the exact form of the chosen wave function, is by no means obvious. But the two sides of (16) clearly transform in the same way under rotations around the 3-axis. Hence we can choose f to be an eigenfunction of Σ_3 with eigenvalue $\pm 1/2$ without restriction of generality. We have then $S_3\Phi_f = \pm \frac{1}{2} \Phi_f$.

The problem that we want to solve is, then, to prove that Eq. (16) can be satisfied in perturbation theory for a suitable choice of g , to show how this g can be calculated as a formal power series

$$g = \sum_{\sigma=0}^{\infty} g_\sigma e^\sigma , \quad (17)$$

⁵The Dirac matrices are $\gamma^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{1} \\ \mathbf{1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\gamma^i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\sigma_i \\ \sigma_i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. All entries in these matrices are themselves 2×2 matrices. The σ_i are the Pauli matrices.

and to show that the result thus obtained coincides with the conventional expression used in the well-known numerical evaluations of g .

More concretely we propose to determine the perturbative coefficients g_σ as follows. The expectation values of M_3 and S_3 occurring in Eq. (16) can be expanded in perturbation series with the methods developed in BK, as will be explained in Sect. 4. Assume that g_τ is known for all $\tau < \sigma$. Then we find g_σ as solution of

$$\frac{g_\sigma}{2m} (\Phi_f, S_3 \Phi_f)_0 = -(\Phi_f, M_3 \Phi_f)_{\sigma+1} - \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{\tau=0}^{\sigma-1} g_\tau (\Phi_f, S_3 \Phi_f)_{\sigma-\tau}. \quad (18)$$

Here $(\Phi_f, \mathcal{O} \Phi_f)_\tau$ denotes the coefficient of order τ in the perturbative expansion of $(\Phi_f, \mathcal{O} \Phi_f)$ taken in the static limit. The main problem here, solved in Sect. 4, is the proof that this leads to an f -independent g_σ . That the result coincides with the conventional one will be shown in Sect. 5.

3 Calculation of g_o

In the lowest order $\sigma = 0$ of perturbation theory there are no radiative corrections and therefore no IR problems. Moreover, Ψ is the local, covariant, free Dirac field $\psi(x)$. Hence the conventional method is quite unobjectionable and trustworthy. The fact that our method yields the same result may help to create some confidence in its credibility.

In our method g_o is determined from

$$L := \frac{g_o}{2m} (\Phi_f, S_3 \Phi_f)_o = -(\Phi_f, M_3 \Phi_f)_1 =: R. \quad (19)$$

We may assume that $S_3 \Phi_f = \frac{1}{2} \Phi_f$. For L we find then

$$\begin{aligned} L &= -\frac{g_o}{4m} \int dq \delta_-(q) \tilde{f}(q) (\not{q} + m) \gamma^0 \tilde{f}^*(q) \\ &= \frac{g_o}{4m} \int \frac{d^3q}{2\omega} \tilde{f}(-\omega, \mathbf{q}) (\omega \gamma^0 - q_i \gamma^i - m) \gamma^0 \tilde{f}^*(-\omega, \mathbf{q}) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

with $\delta_-(q) = \theta(-q_0) \delta(q^2 - m^2)$, $\omega = \omega(\mathbf{q}) = \omega_{\mathbf{q}} = \sqrt{\mathbf{q}^2 + m^2}$. In the static limit the term $q_i \gamma^i$ vanishes and $\omega \rightarrow m$, so that in this limit we have

$$L = \frac{g_o}{8m} \int d^3q \tilde{f}(-\omega, \mathbf{q}) (\gamma^0 - 1) \gamma^0 \tilde{f}^*(-\omega, \mathbf{q}). \quad (21)$$

The right-hand side R of Eq.(19) is⁶

$$\begin{aligned} R &= -\frac{1}{2} \int dx dy d^3u f_\alpha(x) (\gamma^0 f^*(y))_\beta \\ &\quad \times \left(\Omega, \bar{\psi}_\beta(y) [u^1 : \bar{\psi}(u) \gamma^2 \psi(u) : -u^2 : \bar{\psi}(u) \gamma^1 \psi(u) :] \psi_\alpha(x) \Omega \right) \Big|_{u^0=0}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

⁶We exhibit spinor indices explicitly when the order of multiplication does not correspond to the order shown in the equation.

The value $u^0 = 0$ is chosen for convenience. In fact, R does not depend on u^0 in the static limit. ψ being a free Dirac field we can calculate the vacuum expectation values in this expression with the help of Wick's theorem. Fourier transforms are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(x) &= (2\pi)^{-3/2} \int dp e^{-ipx} \tilde{\psi}(p) , \\ f(x) &= (2\pi)^{-5/2} \int dq e^{iqx} \tilde{f}(q) .\end{aligned}\tag{23}$$

We obtain the p -space form of R :

$$\begin{aligned}R &= -\frac{i}{2} \int dp \delta_-(p) dq \delta_-(q) dk_0 \tilde{f}(q) (\not{q} + m) \left[\gamma^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial k_1} - \gamma^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial k_2} \right] \delta^4(k + q - p) \\ &\quad \times (\not{p} + m) \gamma^0 \tilde{f}^*(p) \Big|_{\mathbf{k}=0} \\ &= -\frac{i}{8} \int \frac{d^3q}{\omega(\mathbf{p})} \frac{d^3q}{\omega(\mathbf{q})} \tilde{f}(-\omega(\mathbf{q}), \mathbf{q}) (\omega(\mathbf{q})\gamma^0 - q_i\gamma^i - m) \times \\ &\quad \left[\gamma^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial k_1} - \gamma^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial k_2} \right] \delta^3(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}) (\omega(\mathbf{p})\gamma^0 - p_i\gamma^i - m) \gamma^0 \tilde{f}^*(-\omega(\mathbf{p}), \mathbf{p}) \Big|_{\mathbf{k}=0} .\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

Because of the derivations in the integrand we cannot yet neglect the weakly varying \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q} -terms. A simple algebraic calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\delta_-(q) \delta_-(p) (\not{q} + m) \gamma^\mu (\not{p} + m) \\ &= \delta_-(q) \delta_-(p) (\not{q} + m) \left(-\frac{1}{4m} [\not{p} - \not{q}, \gamma^\mu] + \frac{1}{2m} (p^\mu + q^\mu) \right) (\not{p} + m) .\end{aligned}\tag{25}$$

This is a corollary to the Gordon decomposition of the current operator into a spin part and an orbital part. Let us consider the contribution of the p^μ -term to R . It contains the expression

$$\left(p^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial k_1} - p^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial k_2} \right) \delta^3(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}) \Big|_{\mathbf{k}=0} = - \left(p^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial p_1} + p^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial p_2} \right) \delta^3(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}) \Big|_{\mathbf{k}=0} .$$

Since the derivations act no longer on k we can now set $\mathbf{k} = 0$ in the δ^3 -factor. Moreover,

$$-p^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial p_1} + p^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial p_2} = p_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial p_1} - p_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial p_2} = -iL_3 ,$$

with L_3 the generator of geometrical rotations around the x -axis. L_3 acting on $\delta^3(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q})$ can be transferred to the other p -dependent factors in R through integration by parts. But L_3 annihilates the rotation invariant factors $\delta_-(p)$, $\omega(\mathbf{p})$, and $\tilde{f}^*(p)$. The only remaining term contains $L_3 \not{p} = i(p^2\gamma^1 - p^1\gamma^2)$, which vanishes in the static limit. In the same way the irrelevance of the q^μ -term in Eq. (25) is shown.

There remains the commutator in (25) to be discussed. Consider the γ^2 -term in the last term of Eq. (24). We replace

$$\gamma^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial k_1} \delta^3(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}) \Big|_{\mathbf{k}=0}$$

by

$$-\frac{1}{4m} [(\omega(\mathbf{q}) - \omega(\mathbf{p})) \gamma^0 + (p_i - q_i) \gamma^i, \gamma^2] \frac{\partial}{\partial q_1} \delta^3(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}) .$$

Integration by parts transfers the derivation to the other q -dependent factors which are all C^∞ . The derivative of the factors other than $[\dots, \dots]$ gets multiplied with

$$[(\omega(\mathbf{q}) - \omega(\mathbf{p})) \gamma^0 + (p_i - q_i) \gamma^i, \gamma^2] \delta^3(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}) = 0 .$$

The derivative of the commutator is

$$-\left[\frac{q_1}{\omega(\mathbf{q})} \gamma^0 - \gamma^1, \gamma^2 \right] .$$

The γ^0 -term vanishes in the static limit and we remain with $[\gamma^1, \gamma^2]$. In the same way the γ^1 -term in (24) yields a factor $-\gamma^2, \gamma^1 = [\gamma^1, \gamma^2]$. The result is, taking again the static limit

$$R = -\frac{1}{4m} \int d^3q \tilde{f}(-\omega(\mathbf{q}), \mathbf{q}) (\gamma^0 - 1) \Sigma_3 (\gamma^0 - 1) \gamma^0 \tilde{f}^*(-\omega(\mathbf{q}), \mathbf{q}) .$$

Using that Σ_3 commutes with γ^0 and that $\Sigma_3 \tilde{f}^* = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{f}^*$ by assumption, we obtain

$$R = \frac{1}{4m} \int d^3q \tilde{f}(-\omega, \mathbf{q}) (\gamma^0 - 1) \gamma^0 \tilde{f}^*(-\omega, \mathbf{q}) . \quad (26)$$

Equating this with L as given in Eq.(21) we find

$$g_o = 2 , \quad (27)$$

the classical Dirac result.

4 Perturbation Theory in General Order

The coefficient g_σ of order e^σ of the gyromagnetic ratio is determined by Eq. (18). It is our task to show that this equation indeed possesses a unique solution which does not depend on the choice of f , within the restrictions specified in Sects. 2 and 3. In particular, we assume again that f is an eigenfunction of Σ_3 with eigenvalue $1/2$. The left-hand side of (18) is then given by the expression (21) with g_o replaced by g_σ . The right-hand side contains the g_τ with $\tau < \sigma$ which we assume to be known. The expectation values $(\Phi_f, M_3 \Phi_f)_{\sigma+1}$ and $(\Phi_f, S_3 \Phi_f)_{\sigma-\tau} = \frac{1}{2} (\Phi_f, \Phi_f)_{\sigma-\tau}$ can be calculated by the methods explained

in BK and stated more explicitly below. They contain the Wightman functions $(\Omega, \tilde{\Psi}(-p) \tilde{\Psi}(q) \Omega)$ or $(\Omega, \tilde{\Psi}(-p) \tilde{j}^\mu(k) \tilde{\Psi}(q) \Omega)$ respectively. Their perturbative expressions are given in unrenormalized form in Sect. 9.3 of BK⁷ for the Gupta-Bleuler fields, amended for physical gauges in Sect. 12.3.




Fig. 1. A S-graph

Take first the “S-terms” containing

$$(\Phi_f, \Phi_f)_\rho = \int dp dq \tilde{f}(q) (\Omega, \tilde{\Psi}(-p) \tilde{\Psi}(q) \Omega)_\rho \tilde{f}^*(p) .$$

The vacuum expectation value in this expression can be written as a sum over 3-sector graphs of the general form shown in Fig.1. The external sectors S_1 and S_3 are chosen to be T^- -sectors, the internal sector S_2 , which may be empty, a T^+ -sector. The bubbles denote subgraphs. There may be any number of photon cross lines. The sets of photon momenta of cross lines connecting S_1 with S_2 , S_2 with S_3 , S_1 with S_3 , respectively, are denoted by L_ℓ , L_r , L_m , the number of elements of these sets by $|L_\ell|$, $|L_r|$, $|L_m|$. The external fermion lines are connected by an unbroken fermion trajectory. Because of the assumed small support of \tilde{f} there cannot be any fermionic cross lines other than those of the trajectory. The graph rules inside the bubbles are the ordinary Feynman rules in a T^+ -sector, their antichronological form in a T^- -sector. This differs from the chronological form by sign changes of all vertex factors and propagators and of the $i\varepsilon$ -prescription. The lines crossing sector boundaries carry propagators containing factors $\delta_-(r) = \theta(-r_o) \delta(r^2 - m^2)$, analogously for s , for the trajectory lines, and $\delta_+(\ell) = \theta(\ell_o) \delta(\ell^2)$ for photon lines. The physical external vertices introduced in Sect. 12.3 of BK can only occur at the beginning and the end of the trajectory, that is in the T^- -sectors, while the rules in the internal sector S_2 are the ordinary Gupta-Bleuler ones. The individual graphs are in general IR divergent. But these divergences cancel in the sums over all graphs of order ρ , as has been shown in Chap. 11 of BK.

In the sequel it is occasionally convenient to consider our expressions as limits of the corresponding expressions in “massive QED”, in which the photon propagators are regularized with the help of a small photon mass $\mu > 0$. This means that $(k^2 \pm i\varepsilon)^{-1}$, $\delta(k^2)$, are replaced by $(k^2 - \mu^2 \pm i\varepsilon)^{-1}$, $\delta(k^2 - \mu^2)$.

⁷The sign rule iv) on p.119 contains an embarrassing error. It should state that *each* fermionic cross line pointing from a higher to a lower sector contributes a factor -1, not only those in closed loops.

This renders the individual graphs IR convergent. The limit $\mu \rightarrow 0$ does in general not exist for individual graphs. But it does exist for the sum over all graphs of a given order and yields the correct expression. This allows to discard graphs which vanish identically for $\mu > 0$, as is the case for our graphs if $|L_\ell| > 0$, $|L_r| = |L_m| = 0$, or $|L_r| > 0$, $|L_\ell| = |L_m| = 0$, because e.g. $\delta_-^m(r) \prod_{\ell_i \in L_\ell} \delta_+^\mu(\ell_i) \delta_-^m(s = r - \sum \ell_i) \equiv 0$ for $\mu > 0$. In the surviving graphs we will in general set $\mu = 0$ directly. Of course, the limit $\mu \rightarrow 0$ must be taken *before* any other limit, especially before the static limit.

UV divergent bubbles inside the sectors are renormalized by subtraction at vanishing external momenta. Fermionic self-energy parts (SEPs) are then caused to vanish at the mass shell by an additional *finite* mass renormalization. But no additional field renormalization is effected for giving the residue of the 1-electron pole a desired value, since the 1-particle singularity of the clothed electron propagator is not a pole due to IR effects.

If $|L_\ell| + |L_m| = 0$ or $|L_r| + |L_m| = 0$, there is a factor $\delta_-(q)$ from a trajectory cross line present, so that only the restriction

$$\tilde{f}_M(\mathbf{q}) := \tilde{f}(-\omega(\mathbf{q}), \mathbf{q}) \quad (28)$$

of $\tilde{f}(q)$ to the mass shell contributes, in accordance with the desired result. If neither of these conditions is satisfied, then the off-mass-shell values of \tilde{f} contribute to the individual graphs. Accordingly we separate the set of graphs of order ρ into two classes, the $\tilde{f}_M - \tilde{f}_M$ class and the $\tilde{f} - \tilde{f}$ class. Unfortunately, the IR cancellations mentioned above involve graphs from both classes, they are not operative within a class. But we will find that instead the IR divergences inside a class are cancelled by divergences of the corresponding class of the ‘‘M-terms’’ in Eq.(18), the terms containing M_3 .




Fig. 2. A M-graph

Let us turn to these M-terms. They involve the vacuum expectation value $(\Omega, \tilde{\Psi}(-p) \tilde{j}^\mu(k) \tilde{\Psi}(q) \Omega)_{\sigma+1}$ which can again be expressed as a sum over 3-sector graphs of order $\sigma + 1$, but this time with all sectors being external. They are of the general form shown in Fig. 2. The only difference to the S-graphs of Fig. 1 is that now the central S_2 -bubble contains an external j^μ -vertex with one amputated line (see Fig. 3). Its vertex factor is $(2\pi)^{-3/2} \gamma^\mu \delta^4(k + s' - r')$.

Inserting this into the definition (4) of \mathbf{M} , which yields

$$M_3 = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x (x^1 j^2(x) - x^2 j^1(x)) \Big|_{x^0=0} ,$$

and Fourier transforming, we find that $(\Omega, \tilde{\Psi}(-p) M_3 \tilde{\Psi}(q) \Omega)_{\sigma+1}$ is given by a sum over the same graphs, only with the j -vertex replaced by an M -vertex carrying the vertex factor

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{i}{2} \int dk_o \left(\gamma^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial k_1} - \gamma^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial k_2} \right) \delta^4(k + s' - r') \Big|_{\mathbf{k}=0} \\ & = -\frac{i}{2} \left(\gamma^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial k_1} - \gamma^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial k_2} \right) \delta^3(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{s}' - \mathbf{r}') \Big|_{\mathbf{k}=0} . \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Here k is the original \tilde{j} -variable. Henceforth the name ‘‘M-graphs’’ will be used for graphs containing this vertex factor, while those with the original j -vertex are called ‘‘j-graphs’’.




Fig. 3. A j -vertex

In contrast to the similar looking S-graphs, the external variables p, q , are now independent. So, if $|L_r| + |L_m| = 0$, then q is restricted to the mass shell but p is not. Hence $\tilde{f}(q)$ contributes only via its mass-shell restriction \tilde{f}_M , while $\tilde{f}^*(p)$ also contributes off mass-shell unless we have $L_\ell = 0$ too. But if $|L_\ell| = |L_r| = |L_m| = 0$, then only the combination $\tilde{f}_M - \tilde{f}_M^*$ contributes, as is the case for the left-hand side of Eq. (18). In order for (18) to be meaningful, the graphs on its right-hand side containing the combinations $\tilde{f} - \tilde{f}^*, \tilde{f} - \tilde{f}_M^*, \tilde{f}_M - \tilde{f}^*$, must add to zero. To establish this is our foremost task. This hinges on the ability to handle the IR structure of our expressions.

At first let us disregard the singularities inside the sectors, that is we assume that the subgraphs shown as bubbles in Figs. 1 and 2 are smooth functions of their external variables r, s, k , and the photon cross momenta $\{\ell_i\}$. The ℓ_j are negligibly small in the static limit on account of the small \tilde{f} -support and momentum conservation. $r = p + \sum_{L_\ell \cup L_m} \ell_j$ and $s = q + \sum_{L_r \cup L_m} \ell_j$ must lie on the negative mass shell, ℓ_j on the positive mass shell, p and q in the support of \tilde{f} , which is only possible for small ℓ_j .

Let $\Delta_p = p_o + m$ and $\Delta_q = q_o + m$ measure the distance of p and q from the mass shell. If $|L_m| = 0$ and $|L_r| > 0$ there occurs a phase space integral

$$I_r = \int \prod_{L_r} \frac{d^3 \ell_i}{2|\ell_i|} \frac{\delta(s_o + \omega_s)}{2\omega_s} \quad (30)$$

with $s = q + \sum_{L_r} \ell_i$. But $\omega_s = \omega(\mathbf{q} + \sum \ell_i) = m + \mathcal{O}((\mathbf{q} + \sum \ell_i)^2)$, and this may be replaced by m in the static limit even if occurring inside a singular factor.

Hence $\delta(s_o + \omega_s) \sim \delta(\Delta_q + \sum |\ell_i|)$. For $\Delta_q \rightarrow 0$, hence $|\ell_i| \rightarrow 0$, the integral is easily seen to vanish like

$$I_r(\Delta_q) = \mathcal{O}\left(|\Delta_q|^{2|L_r|-1}\right). \quad (31)$$

In the same way one finds a factor

$$I_\ell(\Delta_p) = \mathcal{O}\left(|\Delta_p|^{2L_\ell-1}\right) \quad (32)$$

if $|L_\ell| > 0$, $|L_m| = 0$. For arbitrary $|L_m|$ we obtain the general result, defining $\Delta = (\Delta_p^2 + \Delta_q^2)^{1/2}$:

$$I_m(\Delta) = \int \prod \frac{d^3 \ell_i}{2|\ell_i|} \frac{\delta(s_o + \omega_s)}{2\omega_s} \frac{\delta(r_o + \omega_r)}{2\omega_r} = \mathcal{O}\left(|\Delta|^{2(|L_\ell|+|L_r|+|L_m|-1)}\right). \quad (33)$$

This simple consideration is not correct if $|L_\ell| = |L_r| = 0$. But this case will not be needed later on.

The vanishing of the factors I in the static limit is offset by the singular behavior of the other factors. The left-most sector S_1 in Figs. 1, 2, contains the propagator $(p^2 - m^2)^{-1}$ which diverges like Δ^{-1} in the static limit, which implies $\Delta \rightarrow 0$.⁸ If no bubble is present in S_1 , then this is replaced by $\delta_m^-(p)$ which is singular of order Δ^{-1} too. The same holds for the right-most sector S_3 . The bubbles in all three sectors may be singular themselves, contrary to our provisional assumption. Singularities of power type occur in bubbles which are 1-particle reducible (1PI), meaning that they can be partitioned into two disconnected parts by cutting a single line. If this line is a photon line, then the bubble contributes the factor $B_1(L, L)^{-1} B_2$, where $L = \sum' \ell_i$ is a sum over a subset σ' of $\{\ell_i\}$, B_1 is a subgraph with external variables σ' and L , and B_2 with external variables $\sigma \setminus \sigma'$ and L , if $\sigma = \{p, q, \ell_i\}$. Inserting this new singular factor into the phase integrals (30) and (33) we obtain at first an additional factor Δ^{-2} in the estimated order of vanishing for $\Delta \rightarrow 0$. However, this is offset by the fact that the residue factor B_1 , depending exclusively on the photonic variables ℓ_i , vanishes at least like Δ^2 in the static limit (which implies $\ell_i \rightarrow 0$) due to the Ward-Takahashi identity and to covariance. Hence these singularities do not disturb our estimates. This is different if the cut line is fermionic, in which case it must belong to the q - p -trajectory. We find then a propagator singularity $((q + L)^2 - m^2)^{-1}$ with $L = \sum' (\pm \ell_i)$, \sum' summing over a subset of σ . This factor diverges like Δ^{-1} and this divergence is in general not cancelled by an additional factor of order Δ . Moreover, even 1PI bubbles are in general singular at the mass shell of their external fermionic variables, due to IR effects. These IR singularities are, however, not of power type, but only powers of logarithms.

We need to show that these internal singularities do not overpower the vanishing of the phase space. Notice that the left-hand side of Eq. (18) shown

⁸In fact $(p^2 - m^2)^{-1}$ diverges like Δ_p^{-1} even if $\Delta_q \neq 0$ and therefore $\Delta \neq 0$. But we are only concerned with the total order of the singularity occurring in the static limit, in which both Δ_p and Δ_q tend to zero. Future statements about the order of $(\Delta \rightarrow 0)$ singularities must also be understood in this sense.

explicitly in Eq. (20) contains the factor $\delta_-(q)$ which is singular of order 1 in our way of counting. Such a singularity must then also be present in the right-hand side. But stronger singularities are not admissible. We need, then, to determine the strongest $\Delta \rightarrow 0$ singularities that may occur in our graphs. In S-graphs this maximal singularity is given by their “web” parts defined in Sect. 15.2 of BK, to which we refer for details⁹. The replacement of the full graphs by their webs commits an error of order Δ , hence is justified for our purposes. The same is true for the j-graphs containing the vertex of Fig. 3. But this situation is changed in going over to the M-vertex of the M-graph defined by Eq. (29), because the derivations in this expression may, and occasionally will, produce a non-negligible singularity in the correction term. We will return to this important point later on. At the moment we consider only the web contributions.

A web graph in the rightmost sector S_3 consists of the part of the trajectory (called a semitrajectory) contained in S_3 , of a vertex lying on it for each $\ell_i \in L_r \cup L_m$, and of internal photon lines with momenta $\{u_j\}$ connecting the semitrajectory to itself. The u_j are integrated over. The trajectory propagators are, apart from numerical factors of no present interest, of the form¹⁰ $((s, L) - i\varepsilon)^{-1}$ with L a non-empty sum over $\ell_i \in \{L_r \cup L_m\}$. Since $s - q$ is negligible in the static limit we can replace s by q in this expression. At each vertex we have a factor s^μ , replaceable by q^μ . μ is the index occurring in the vertex factor γ^μ of the original full graph from which the web is derived. Momentum is conserved at each vertex (the photon lines are directed from left to right in Figs. 1 and 2). If no u_j -lines are present, then there exist $|L_r| + |L_m|$ singular propagator factors producing a $\Delta^{-|L_r| - |L_m|}$ -singularity in the static limit. The presence of u_j -lines leads to additional IR singularities of logarithmic type. u_j -lines can produce SEPs which at first sight even increase the order of the power singularities. But this effect is cancelled by the inclusion of appropriate mass renormalization vertices in the web rules. The presence of a physical Ψ_n -vertex at the end of the trajectory may introduce n further Δ -singularities coming from the factors $\tilde{r}(\ell_j)$ in the rules pertaining to physical vertices. But this is compensated by a corresponding lowering of the number of trajectory propagators. In the same way we find in S_1 a singularity of order $\Delta^{-|L_\ell| - |L_m|}$ possibly multiplied by a weak IR singularity.

In the central T^+ -sector S_2 the trajectory starts and ends at a cross line. It is found that the web construction can be started at either end resulting both times in the same singular behavior. In a S-graph this yields a product of $|L_\ell| + |L_r| - 1$ singular factors of the form $(s, L)^{-1}$ if there are no u -lines, hence a singularity of order $\Delta^{-|L_\ell| - |L_r| + 1}$. This remains true up to weak singularities if u -lines are present.

Hence we find in an S-graph a total power singularity of strength

$$\Delta^{-2(|L_\ell| + |L_r| + |L_m|) + 1},$$

⁹The derivation of the web rules in BK contains gaps. But the result is correct as stated.

¹⁰Notice the presence of a factor $\delta_-(s)$, meaning that Δ in the web rules of BK (p.258) vanishes. The Δ of BK should not be confused with our present Δ which is differently defined.

which together with the phase space (33) gives a resultant singularity of order Δ^{-1} , possibly multiplied with a weak IR singularity. Apart from the IR complications this is the desired behavior, as has been remarked earlier.

In the central sector of a j-graph we have, besides the ℓ -vertices, also a current vertex with momentum k as shown in Fig. 3. It occurs in our final expression in the form (29). Hence we are only interested in values of \mathbf{k} in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of the origin, and $k_o = r'_o - s'_o$ vanishes in the static limit. The leading singularity of this sector can be found exactly like in S-graphs, simply treating the k -vertex like an additional ℓ -vertex. Because of the additional vertex on the web trajectory, the order of the singularity is at first increased by 1 relative to the corresponding S-graph. But, inserting this into (29) we see that the k_o -integration lowers the singularity strength by one order. On the other hand, the k -derivations tend to worsen the singularity again. In order to see this we write the \mathbf{k} -dependent part of the first term in the last form of (29) as $\frac{\partial}{\partial k_1} \delta^3(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{s} - \mathbf{r} + \sum(\pm \ell_i))$ where r and s are the momenta of the cut trajectory lines. We can then transfer the k -derivations to the other factors of the integrand via integration by parts. And then we can use the remaining δ^3 to integrate over \mathbf{p} , resulting in the replacement $\mathbf{r} \rightarrow \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{k}$ in the other factors. Applying $\frac{\partial}{\partial k_1}$ to the propagator

$$\left(s, \sum'(\pm \ell_i) + \sum''(\pm u_j) + k \right)^{-1}$$

gives

$$\frac{s^1}{(s, \sum' + \sum'' + k)^2}$$

which raises the order of the singularity by 1. Here Σ' and Σ'' are partial sums over ℓ 's and u 's respectively. But associated with this k_1 -derivative is a vertex factor s^2 , so that we obtain in the numerator the symmetric factor $s^1 s^2$. The term in question is thus cancelled by an analogous term in the k_2 -derivation part. The singular factor $\delta_-(r)$ can be removed by using it to first integrate over r_o before differentiating. There remains the factor $\tilde{f}^*(p)$, which depends on $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{k} + \sum' \ell_i$ only in the combination $|\mathbf{p}|^2$. Hence

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial k_i} \tilde{f} \Big|_{\mathbf{k}=0} = 2(s_1 + \sum' \ell_{i,1}) \tilde{f}'(|\mathbf{p}|^2) \quad (34)$$

where f' is the derivative of \tilde{f} with respect to $|\mathbf{p}|^2$ and the p_o -dependence of \tilde{f} has been ignored. The bracket on the right-hand side is small in the static limit, but this is not sufficient to make the term negligible, because the static approximation relies on the assumption that the support of \tilde{f} is tiny, which implies that \tilde{f}' is large. If D is the diameter of the support, then \tilde{f}' is large of order D^{-2} relative to \tilde{f} itself, while the factor $(s_1 + \dots)$ is only small of order D . But there is also the vertex factor s^2 of the k -vertex in the web which is again of order D . Together, these two small factors still do not render the \tilde{f} -derivative negligible, but at least the term does not explode for $D \rightarrow 0$. And

it is multiplied with a web of the original, undifferentiated, j-type. This will turn out to be important. Using these results we obtain for M-graphs the same Δ^{-1} behavior, up to weak singularities, as for the S-graphs.

We turn now to the problem of the possible relevance in M-graphs of terms neglected in going over from the full graph to its web. In BK it has only been shown that these terms are less singular than the web by one order. Hence the k -derivatives might produce singularities of the same order as that of the web, which could not be neglected. The construction of the web as explained in BK proceeds in several steps. In the first step it is shown that the relevant singularity is correctly described by graphs not containing any closed fermionic loops, but with their vertices and propagators acquiring additional, but finite, numerical factors. In this step it was used that a loop integral vanishes at the origin of its external variables. But this vanishing is actually of second order, which makes the k -derivation innocuous. In the following steps of the construction the propagators and vertex factors of the trajectories of the remaining graphs are simplified by a procedure acting locally in an “active region” which sets out from the s -line (the cross line from S_3 to S_2) and moves along the trajectory until it reaches the r -line. In the part of the trajectory already traversed by the active region the web rules hold, ahead of it the original Feynman rules. The active region itself consists of a difference of the two forms (an example will be shown presently). The “static” singularity of the active region is better by at least one order than in either the full or the web graph. We transfer the k -derivations from δ^3 to the other factors and use then δ^3 to integrate over \mathbf{r} . The remaining independent variables are s, k, ℓ_i, u_j . The semitrajectory before the k -vertex (that is on its s -side) is k -independent and therefore not involved in the differentiations. The k_1 -derivative of the web propagator $(s, L + k)^{-1}$ after the k -vertex, L a sum of $\ell_i s$ and $u_j s$, is cancelled against a k_2 -derivative as explained earlier. The k_1 -derivative of the full propagator singularity $[(s + L + k)^2 - m^2]^{-1}$ is $-(s^1 + L^1 + k^1) [\dots]^{-2}$. The increased order of singularity is offset by the vanishing of the numerator $(s^1 + L^1)$ in the static limit (remember $k^1 = 0$), so that the weakening of the singularity from the active region remains effective. If the active region lies before the k -vertex it gets not differentiated. If it lies after the k -vertex, its differentiation may restore the dangerous degree of singularity of the original graph. But in this case the k -vertex belongs to the web and carries the small factor s^1 or s^2 , so that the term remains negligible in the static limit. The critical case is that of the active region containing the k -vertex. It has then essentially the form

$$(\not{s}' + m) \gamma^i - 2s^i = 2(s'^i - s^i) - \gamma^i (\not{s}' + \not{k} - m) + \gamma^i \not{k}, \quad i = 1 \text{ or } 2,$$

where s' is the trajectory momentum entering the k -vertex. The factor $(\not{s}' + m)$ is the numerator of the s' -propagator. The difference $(s'^i - s^i)$ in this expression is k -independent and vanishes in the static limit, hence is not causing problems. The factor $(\not{s}' + \not{k} - m)$ multiplied into the next propagator $(\not{s}' + \not{k} - m)^{-1}$ removes the latter's singularity, giving the k -independent value 1. The factor \not{k} in the last term is small, but its k -derivatives are not. This term persists

and must not be neglected. As is easily seen from (29) it produces a vertex factor $[\gamma^2, \gamma^1] = -4i\Sigma_3$. As a result we obtain from the correction terms a non-negligible contribution of the same form as the j-web, except that in the k-vertex we have a vertex factor $-4i\Sigma_3$ instead of $2s^i$. Notice that this Σ_3 is the only surviving factor containing γ -matrices, so that it commutes with the other web factors. This term occurs in addition to the term found earlier, which contains an ordinary j-web multiplied with a \tilde{f} -derivative. Both these terms have the correct power singularity but may in addition contain weak IR singularities.

Finally we must note that an important problem concerning IR divergent SEPs has been suppressed in our considerations. To wit: the external variable of a SEP next to a cross line, e.g. the s -line, not being separated from it by a VP (= vertex part), is restricted to the mass shell. Hence that SEP is in general divergent, that means non-existent, not merely singular. But we know from Chap. 11 of BK that these divergences cancel between graphs with the same scaffolding¹¹. This means that the said divergence in a given L-class (defined by the numbers $|L_\ell|$, $|L_r|$, $|L_m|$) cancel against corresponding divergences in other L-classes. And this cancellation happens identically, not only in the static limit. Therefore the dependence on the neglected “small” external variables Δ , \mathbf{p} , \mathbf{q} , k_0 , must be the same in all classes, so that the divergences occurring in the separate classes are irrelevant because they cancel in the sum over classes. Alternatively we could circumvent this problem by not integrating over the internal variables u_j at once, working at the level of integrands instead of integrals, as was habitually done in BK.

We turn to proving the cancellation of the undesirable terms of the right-hand side of Eq. (18) containing the combinations $\tilde{f}-\tilde{f}^*$, $\tilde{f}_M-\tilde{f}^*$, $\tilde{f}-\tilde{f}_M^*$. We start with the case $\tilde{f}_M(q)-\tilde{f}^*(p)$. This combination occurs in the M-graphs with $|L_\ell| > 0$, $|L_r| = |L_m| = 0$, but *not* in the corresponding S-graphs, because there we have $p = q$ so that if q is restricted to the mass shell, so is p .

It has been shown above that the leading Δ -singularity is of the same order $1/\Delta$ as that of the left-hand side of Eq. (18), and that it can be expressed as a sum of two terms, both of j-web form. The first contains a \tilde{f} -derivative, the second a factor Σ_3 at the k-vertex. Hence the contribution of a single M-graph is not negligible. However, if we permute the vertices of a given web in the central sector, we obtain another legitimate web. And summation over these permutations removes the leading singularity, as will now be shown. A trajectory propagator of the central web is of the form (up to irrelevant constant factors) $(q, L' + U'(+k))^{-1}$, where L' and U' are partial sums of cross variables $\pm\ell_i$ and internal photon variables $\pm u_j$ ¹² respectively, and the term $+k$ may or may not be present. We have started the web construction at the q -end. Summing the product of these factors over all permutations of the vertices

¹¹A scaffolding is a Feynman graph not yet divided into sectors.

¹² u_j is IR critical only at $u_j = 0$.

yields (see BK, p.326)

$$\prod_j \left(-\frac{1}{(q, u_j)^2} \right) \prod_i \left(\frac{1}{(q, \ell_i)} \right) \frac{1}{(q, k)} (q, L + k) \quad (35)$$

with $L = \sum_{L_\ell} \ell_i$. There is one factor more in the denominator (notice that the u -factors are integrated over and are thus irrelevant for the power behavior) than in our previous estimate of the singularity strength. But we also have the additional factor $(q, L + k) = (q_o(L^o + k^o) - (\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{k}))$ which multiplies the cross propagators $\delta(q^o + L^o + k^o + \omega(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{k})) \delta(q_o + \omega(\mathbf{q}))$. This implies that

$$L^o + k^o = -\omega(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{k}) + \omega(\mathbf{q})$$

which vanishes of second order in the static limit $\mathbf{q} \rightarrow 0$, $\mathbf{L} \rightarrow 0$, remembering that $\mathbf{k} = 0$. This is then also true for $(q, L + k)$. Hence the expression (35) vanishes stronger by one order than the individual terms of the sum, and this suffices to make the $\tilde{f}_M - \tilde{f}^*$ term vanish in the static limit. Note that this argument works only if at least one ℓ -line is present.

The vanishing of the $\tilde{f}(q) - \tilde{f}_M^*(p)$ term, that is the term with $|L_\ell| = |L_m| = 0$, $|L_r| > 0$, is shown in the same way.

$\tilde{f}(q) - \tilde{f}^*(p)$ terms occur in graphs in which neither of the external momenta is restricted to the mass shell by a factor δ_- , that is in the graphs in which both $|L_\ell| + |L_m|$ and $|L_r| + |L_m|$ are positive. The corresponding M-graphs with $|L_r| > 0$ (or similarly with $|L_\ell| > 0$) can be shown to vanish in the static limit in the same way as in the $\tilde{f}_M - \tilde{f}^*$ case. Just replace q by the cross momentum s and ℓ_i by $-\ell_i$ for photon lines crossing into the q -sector. But note that this result relies on cancellations between graphs with permuted vertices in the central sector. Hence it does not apply to the case $|L_\ell| + |L_r| = 0$.

For S-graphs with $|L_\ell| + |L_r| > 1$ we can again use the same method to show their irrelevance. The S-graphs with $|L_\ell| + |L_r| = 1$ vanish if defined as limits $\mu \rightarrow 0$ from massive QED as mentioned near the beginning of this section. For instance, if $|L_\ell| = 1$, $|L_r| = 0$, then the two fermionic cross momenta r , s , of Fig. 1 are related by $r = \ell + s$ with ℓ the momentum of the only L_ℓ -line. But this relation cannot be satisfied if $\ell^2 = \mu^2 > 0$ because both r and s are restricted to the negative mass shell. So, like in the M-case, only the graphs with $|L_\ell| = |L_r| = 0$ remain. Remember that then we must have $|L_m| > 0$ in order to get a $\tilde{f} - \tilde{f}^*$ term.

The graphs in question are of the form shown in Fig. 4. We consider now the full graphs, not webs. B_2 and B_4 are chains of SEPs. B_3 is a chain of SEPs in an S-graph, and such a chain interrupted at one place by a M_3 vertex part in an M-graph. B_1 and B_5 are chains of SEPs, and 1PI graphs connected to at least one ℓ -line, such that the link next to B_2 or B_4 respectively is of the latter type (i.e. not a SEP). We fix the perturbative order σ and B_1 , B_2 , but sum over all possible subgraphs \mathcal{S} of the appropriate order $\rho < \sigma$ occurring in any of the terms of the right-hand side of Eq. (18), including their numerical factors, in particular the factors g_τ . We find that these \mathcal{S} -terms are simply the $\tilde{f}_M - \tilde{f}_M^*$




Fig. 4. $\tilde{f}-\tilde{f}^*$ graph

terms of (18) taken in order ρ , and that they sum to zero if this equation is assumed to be satisfied to all orders lower than σ .

We are now in a position to solve Eq. (18) for the unknown g_σ . The left-hand side L is well defined and depends only on \tilde{f}_M . Explicitly it is given by (20) with g_o replaced by g_σ :

$$L = \frac{g_\sigma}{4m} \int \frac{d^3q}{2\omega} \tilde{f}(-\omega, \mathbf{q}) (\omega\gamma^o - q_i\gamma^i - m) \gamma^o \tilde{f}^*(-\omega, \mathbf{q}), \quad (36)$$

$\omega = \omega(\mathbf{q})$. We must show that the surviving $\tilde{f}_M - \tilde{f}_M^*$ term in the right-hand side exists, is well defined, and is of the form (36) up to a numerical factor. The contributing M- and S-graphs are those with $|L_\ell| = |L_r| = |L_m| = 0$. They are of the form shown in Fig. 4, but without the extremal bubbles B_1 and B_5 . Remember that B_2 and B_4 are (possibly empty) chains of SEPs. We show first by general induction that the S-graphs and M-graphs cancel unless B_2 and B_4 are empty. Assume this to be true in lower orders. Keep $B_{2,4}$ fixed and sum over all B_3 of the relevant order in all terms of Eq.(18). These terms are exactly the surviving terms of (18) in this lower order, hence they cancel in the static limit if the problem has already been solved in this order.

Concerning the existence of the remaining graphs we are faced with two problems. The first problem is that of the ‘‘collinear singularities’’ which are present even in massive QED. In this theory, a SEP in the central sector with external momentum q is, after mass renormalization, of the form $(q^2 - m^2) \Sigma(q)$ with Σ continuous at the mass shell $q^2 = m^2$. In an M-graph we find then on the q -side of the M_3 vertex-part a product

$$\left(\frac{1}{Q + i\varepsilon} (Q + i\varepsilon) \Sigma(q) \right)^\alpha \theta(-q_o) \delta(Q) \quad (37)$$

where $Q = q^2 - m^2$ and α is the number of SEPs present. This expression is at first undefined because the product $(Q + i\varepsilon)^{-1} Q \delta(Q)$ is not associative and therefore ill defined. We solve this problem by defining

$$\delta(Q) = \frac{i}{2\pi} \left(\frac{1}{Q + i\varepsilon} - \frac{1}{Q - i\varepsilon} \right) \quad (38)$$

with the ε occurring already in (37). This means that the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ must be taken simultaneously in all factors. This prescription is justified as follows. Using the Fourier transform

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{\pm}(q) = \pm i(2\pi)^{-3} \theta(\pm q_o) \delta(q^2 - m^2)$$

of the familiar singular functions $\Delta_{\pm}(\xi)$, Eq. (38) is obtained by Fourier transform from the relation

$$\Delta_+(\xi) - \Delta_-(\xi) = \Delta_F(\xi) - \overline{\Delta_F(-\xi)}$$

which is a basic ingredient in many calculations used in our formalism. For instance, the proof of the important Lemma 9.2 of BK, transposed into momentum space, works as stated in x -space only with the convention introduced here. Notice that

$$(Q + i\varepsilon)(Q - i\varepsilon)^{-n} = 1 + 2i\varepsilon(Q - i\varepsilon)^{-n} = 1$$

in the sense of distributions, where the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ is understood. With this definition the expression (37) becomes $\theta(-q_o) ((\Sigma(q))^\alpha \delta(Q))$, which is well defined for $\mu > 0$ (μ the photon mass). The same consideration applies of course to the p -side of the trajectory from the M_3 vertex part. For the S-graphs we distinguish two cases. If no SEP is present in the central section, then the trajectory is a single line leading directly from the external sector S_3 to the external sector S_1 , and by our rules the corresponding propagator is the well defined expression $(\not{q} + m) \delta_-(q)$. If there are $\alpha > 0$ SEPs present we find the ambiguous product

$$\theta(-q_o) \delta(Q) (\Sigma(q) (Q + i\varepsilon))^\alpha (Q + i\varepsilon)^{-\alpha+1} \delta(Q) .$$

This is again uniquely fixed by the definition (38) to be

$$\frac{i}{2\pi} \theta(-q_o) (\Sigma(q))^\alpha \delta(Q)$$

The second problem is the IR problem. $\Sigma(q)$ and the k -vertex part, even of a j -graph, diverge for $\mu \rightarrow 0$ weakly (i.e. like a power of $\log Q$) at the mass shell, so that the expressions obtained above for individual graphs no longer exist. We must show that these IR divergences cancel between graphs in the static limit. For this we need an explicit expression for g_σ . Let $m_\tau(q, p, \mathbf{k})$ be the sum over all 3-line T^+ -graphs of order $2\tau + 1$ intersecting the trajectory and containing the k -vertex, before setting $\mathbf{k} = 0$. q is the momentum of the entering fermion line, p of the leaving one. Let $s_\tau(q)$ be the sum over all properly renormalized 2-line T^+ -graphs of order 2τ intersecting the trajectory. Let m'_τ and s'_τ be the analogous sums over 1PI graphs only. This means that s'_τ is a sum over SEPs, m'_τ a sum over VPs. Eq. (18) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{g_{2\sigma}}{4m} \int dq \delta_-(q) \tilde{f}_M(\mathbf{q}) (\not{q} + m) \gamma^\sigma \tilde{f}_M^*(\mathbf{q}) \\ &= - \int dp dq \tilde{f}_M(\mathbf{q}) \delta_-(q) (\not{q} + m) m_\sigma(q, p, \mathbf{k}) (\not{p} + m) \gamma^\sigma \delta_-(p) \tilde{f}_M^*(\mathbf{p}) \Big|_{\mathbf{k}=0} \\ & - \frac{1}{4m} \sum_{\tau=0}^{\sigma-1} g_{2\tau} \int dq \delta_-(q) \tilde{f}_M(\mathbf{q}) (\not{q} + m) s_{\sigma-\tau}(q) (\not{q} + m) \gamma^\sigma \delta_-(q) \tilde{f}_M^*(\mathbf{q}) , \quad (39) \end{aligned}$$

both sides to be taken in the static limit. This expression is at first purely formal, since the individual terms on the right do in general not exist. The following operations, which are largely algebraic, will at first also be carried out at this formal level. They can be given a strict meaning by arguing at the level of (properly subtracted) integrands before carrying out the integrations over internal momenta.

In the S-terms on the right-hand side we use that after mass renormalization s_ρ is, for $\rho > 0$, of the form

$$s_\rho(q) = -2\pi i (\not{q} - m) T_\rho(q)$$

where the spin scalar T_ρ is finite at $q^2 = m^2$ in the massive case $\mu > 0$, while it develops there a weak singularity for $\mu \rightarrow 0$. Using Eq. (38) and noticing that the factor $(q^2 - m^2)$ must be read as $(q^2 - m^2 + i\varepsilon)$ in a T^+ -sector we find that

$$-2\pi i \delta_-(q) (q^2 - m^2) T_{\sigma-\tau}(q) (\not{q} + m) \gamma^\sigma \delta_-(q) = T_{\sigma-\tau}(q) (\not{q} + m) \gamma^\sigma \delta_-(q). \quad (40)$$

The q_o -integration can be carried out with the help of the factor δ_- , producing a new factor $(2\omega_{\mathbf{q}})^{-1}$ and the replacement of q^o by $-\omega_{\mathbf{q}}$ in the remaining factors. This meaning of q^o will be understood in the sequel.

The M-term in Eq. (39) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum_{\alpha+\beta+\gamma=\sigma} \int dp dq \delta_-(q) \delta_-(p) \tilde{f}_M(q) (\not{q} + m) T_\alpha(q) m'_\beta(q, p, \mathbf{k}) \\ & \quad \times T_\gamma(p) (\not{p} + m) \gamma^\sigma \tilde{f}_M^*(\mathbf{p}) \Big|_{\mathbf{k}=0}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

We have defined $T_o = 1$. The factors δ_- can be removed by integration over p_o, q_o , resulting in a factor $(4\omega_{\mathbf{q}}\omega_{\mathbf{p}})^{-1}$ and the replacement of q_o, p_o , by $-\omega_{\mathbf{q}}, -\omega_{\mathbf{p}}$, respectively. It seems at first troublesome that the factor \tilde{f}^* depends on \mathbf{p} instead of \mathbf{q} like in the S-terms. This problem is solved as follows. We remember that the relevant contribution to the integrand of (41) is a sum of two terms. The first term consists of a j-web multiplied with a \tilde{f} -derivative of the form (34), but without any ℓ_i 's. That is, the factor in front of \tilde{f}' is simply s_1 or s_2 , and it is multiplied with a factor s_2 or s_1 at the k-vertex of the j-web, which leads to the familiar cancellation between the two terms in the definition of M_3 . This term does therefore *not* contribute! The remaining second term contains a web which is a j-web except that the k -vertex carries a factor Σ_3 . No derivatives are present in this term, hence we can set $\mathbf{k} = 0$ in $\tilde{f}_M^*(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k})$ without further ado, obtaining the desired result $\tilde{f}_M^*(\mathbf{q})$. Therefore we can replace in the expression (41) the argument \mathbf{p} of \tilde{f}_M^* by \mathbf{q} without changing the result. The relevant part of m'_β can be written as $-(2m)^{-1}\Sigma_3 U_\beta(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}) \delta^3(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p})$, U_β a spin scalar. And it can be treated as an isolated factor, like T_γ , not containing differential operators possibly acting on the other factors. This allows us to take the static limit termwise. Moreover, the relevant web contributions to T are spin scalars, while m'_β contains Σ_3 as the only spinorial factor. And Σ_3 commutes with γ^σ , hence with $(\not{q} + m)$ in the static limit.

Using $\Sigma_3 \tilde{f}_M = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{f}_M$ and dropping in the static limit of Eq. (39) the factor

$$(8m)^{-1} \int d^3q \tilde{f}_M(\mathbf{q}) (\gamma^o - 1) \tilde{f}_M^*(\mathbf{q})$$

which is common to all the terms, we find

$$g_{2\sigma} = \left[\sum_{\alpha+\beta+\gamma=\sigma} T_\alpha(q) U_\beta(q, p) T_\gamma(p) - \sum_{\tau=0}^{\sigma-1} g_{2\tau} T_{\sigma-\tau}(q) \right]_{\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{q}}. \quad (42)$$

Here the limit $q = p \rightarrow (-m, \vec{0})$ must be taken, whose existence has not yet been established. At the moment we consider therefore (42) as defining a function $g_{2\sigma}(q)$ defined in a small neighborhood of the mass shell. We use the following lemma:

Lemma. $g_{2\sigma}$ as defined by Eq.(42) can be written as

$$g_{2\sigma} = \sum_{\tau=0}^{\sigma} U_\tau(q, p) T_{\sigma-\tau}(p) \Big|_{p=q}. \quad (43)$$

The proof proceeds by induction with respect to σ . The result is clearly correct for $\sigma = 0$ (remember $T_o = 1$). Let $\sigma > 0$ and assume that (43) holds for $g_{2\tau}$ with $\tau < \sigma$. We insert this inductive ansatz into (42) and obtain, using that T_α and U_β commute,

$$\begin{aligned} g_{2\sigma} = & \left(\sum_{\alpha+\beta+\gamma=\sigma} T_\alpha(q) U_\beta(q, p) T_\gamma(p) \right. \\ & \left. - \sum_{\alpha+\beta+\gamma=\sigma} T_\alpha(q) U_\beta(q, p) T_\gamma(p) + \sum_{\tau=0}^{\sigma} U_\tau(q, p) T_{\sigma-\tau}(p) \right) \Big|_{p=q}, \end{aligned}$$

the claimed result.

The expression (43) is IR finite. We know that the possible IR divergences are given by replacing U_τ and $T_{\sigma-\tau}$ by their webs. The web construction starts from the q -end of the trajectory in the central sector S_2 , and q is restricted to the mass shell. The webs in question contain only one vertex associated with an external variable, namely the k -vertex. The photon lines incident at the other vertices are internal lines of S_2 , starting and ending at the trajectory. It follows from the proof of Lemma 17.1 in BK that in the sum over all webs of this form only the graphs survive in which no vertices exist *after* the k -vertex. This also excludes photon lines starting after the k -vertex and ending in front of it. And SEPs situated in front of the k -vertex are not present because such terms are not present in the expression (43).

5 Equality to the Conventional Result

In this final section it will be shown that our result (43) agrees with the conventional result. We can avoid the IR problem by starting from massive QED

and then taking the limit $\mu \rightarrow 0$. This is legitimate in our method, as has been shown in the preceding section. On the other hand, we have argued that this procedure is of doubtful legitimacy in the conventional approach. But it *is* the method used there, so that the comparison of the two results rightfully employs it.

The conventional approach finds the magnetic moment of the electron from an investigation of its scattering in an external magnetic field (see, e.g., [3], [8], [9]). The corresponding scattering amplitude is essentially given by the 3-point Green's function $\Gamma^\mu(q, p)$, where q is the momentum of the incoming electron, p that of the outgoing one, and $k = p - q$ is a photon variable not explicitly shown. The external k -vertex is a current vertex with the vertex factor $(2\pi)^{-3/2}\gamma^\mu$. Γ^μ occurs in the amplitude in the sandwiched combination

$$\delta_-(q) (\not{q} + m) \Gamma^\mu(q, p) (\not{p} + m) \delta_-(p) . \quad (44)$$

The electron field is conventionally renormalized such that its clothed propagator has the same pole at the mass shell with the same residue as the bare propagator.¹³ Graphs containing SEPs in the variables q or p do therefore not contribute to the expression (44), so that Γ_μ may be replaced by the proper vertex part Λ^μ defined as a sum over 1PI graphs only. From covariance and the Ward-Takahashi identities it follows¹⁴ that Λ^μ , sandwiched like in (44), can be decomposed as

$$\Lambda^\mu(q, p) = \frac{e}{(2\pi)^{3/2}} \left[\gamma^\mu F_1(k^2) + \frac{1}{2m} k_\nu \sigma^{\mu\nu} F_2(k^2) \right] . \quad (45)$$

F_1 and F_2 are the functions occurring in Eq. (1.5) of Ref. [3]. The coefficients in the two expressions differ due to the use of different conventions. Charge renormalization, that is the condition that the coupling constant e is equal to the charge of the positron, demands that $F_1(0) = 1$, so that $F_{1,\sigma}(0) = 0$ for $\sigma > 0$, when $F_{i,\sigma}$ is the coefficient of e^σ in the perturbation expansion of F_i . Moreover, $F_{1,\sigma}$ is \mathcal{C}^∞ at $k = 0$ if $\mu > 0$. For $\mu = 0$ its strongest possible singularity at $k = 0$ is of the form $k^2(\log k^2)^n$, n a positive integer. Hence

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial k_\mu} F_{1,\sigma} \Big|_{k=0} = 0 .$$

For the gyromagnetic ratio one finds

$$g_\sigma = 2 F_{2,\sigma}(0) \quad (46)$$

for $\sigma > 0$. Remember that the equivalence of the two methods in the order $\sigma = 0$ has already been established in Sect. 3.

According to the results just mentioned, $F_{2,\sigma}(0)$ may be determined from

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial k_\nu} \Lambda_{\sigma+1}^\mu \Big|_{k=0} = \frac{-i}{2m(2\pi)^{3/2}} \sigma^{\mu\nu} F_{2,\sigma}(0) \quad (47)$$

¹³Remember that this is not possible in the case $\mu = 0$ because of the IR problem.

¹⁴For a proof see e.g. Sect.10.6 of [9]

or, more particularly, from

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{i}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial k_1} \Lambda_{\sigma+1}^2 - \frac{\partial}{\partial k_2} \Lambda_{\sigma+1}^1 \right)_{p=q=P} &= \frac{1}{m(2\pi)^{3/2}} \Sigma_3 F_{2,\sigma}(0) \\ &= \frac{1}{2m(2\pi)^{3/2}} F_{2,\sigma}(0) \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

if $\Sigma_3 = 1/2$.

In the method proposed in this paper we have on the one hand

$$\begin{aligned} m'_\tau &= -\frac{i}{2} (2\pi)^{3/2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial k_1} \Lambda_{2\tau+1}^2 - \frac{\partial}{\partial k_2} \Lambda_{2\tau+1}^1 \right)_{p=q=P} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2m} F_{2,2\tau}(0) , \end{aligned}$$

on the other hand

$$m'_\tau = -(4m)^{-1} U_\tau ,$$

where again $\Sigma_3 = 1/2$ has been assumed. Hence

$$U_\tau = 2 F_{2,2\tau}(0) . \quad (49)$$

Inserting this into our result (43) we find agreement with the conventional result (46). The T -containing terms $\tau < \sigma$ in (43), which are not present in (46), correct for the fact that we use “intermediate renormalization” instead of the conventional ψ -renormalization mentioned above. In intermediate renormalization the fermionic SEPs are subtracted at the origin instead of at the mass shell, thus avoiding the problem of the IR divergence of the renormalization constant Z_2 . The proper position of the 1-particle singularity of the ψ -propagator, which is *not* a pole if $\mu = 0$, is then secured by a finite mass renormalization. Of course, in the conventional method we have $T(p) = 0$ at the mass shell, so that the $\tau < \sigma$ terms in (43) do not occur.

As a last remark we note that this equivalence proof tells us that the UV finiteness of our g_σ follows from the known UV finiteness of the conventional result. There is no need to renormalize (that is, subtract) our expression for M_3 . This is also seen by realizing that our result depends only on first derivatives of the vertex part Λ^μ , not on Λ^μ itself. They are UV convergent since Λ_μ is only logarithmically divergent.

References

- [1] V.W. Hughes and T. Kinoshita: Revs. Mod. Phys. 71, S133, 1999.
- [2] Muon (g-2) Collaboration: Phys. Rev. Letters 89, 101804, 2002.
- [3] T. Kinoshita, in *Quantum Electrodynamics*, ed. T. Kinoshita: Singapore, World Scientific 1990.

- [4] R.F. Streater and A.S. Wightman: *PCT, Spin & Statistics, and All That*, 2nd edition: Reading MA, Benjamin/Cummings 1978.
- [5] N.N. Bogolubov et al.: *General Principles of Quantum Field Theory*: Dordrecht, Kluwer 1990.
- [6] O. Steinmann: *Perturbative QED and Axiomatic Field Theory*: Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, Springer 2000.
- [7] J.D. Jackson: *Classical Electrodynamics*: New York, John Wiley 1975.
- [8] J.J. Sakurai: *Advanced Quantum Mechanics*: Reading MA, Addison-Wesley 1967.
- [9] S. Weinberg: *The Quantum Theory of Fields, Vol.1*: Cambridge University Press 1995.