

# Reply to the Comment of X. Ji on “Spin and orbital angular momentum in gauge theories” [PRL 100:232002 (2008)]

Xiang-Song Chen,<sup>1,2</sup> Xiao-Fu Lü,<sup>1</sup> Wei-Min Sun,<sup>2</sup> Fan Wang,<sup>2</sup> and T. Goldman<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, Nanjing University, CPNPC, Nanjing 210093, China*

<sup>3</sup>*Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA*

(Dated: November 11, 2018)

We reply to the Comment of X. Ji [1] on our paper [2], concerning angular momentum algebra, locality, Lorentz covariance, and measurability of our gauge-invariant description of the spin and orbital angular momentum of quarks and gluons.

PACS numbers: 14.20.Dh, 11.15.-q, 12.38.-t

It is certainly true and common that a bare-operator algebra may acquire scale-dependence and even anomalous terms when matrix elements are computed, but one must start from the bare-operator algebra when assigning appropriate physical meaning to any operator. In fact, this is exactly what one compares to when speaking of an anomaly. E.g.,  $\psi^\dagger \frac{\vec{\sigma}}{2} \psi$  (but not anything else) is identified as the quark spin operator purely because of its bare-operator property, irregardless of the axial anomaly. Actually, even the basic canonical quantization rule  $\{\psi(\vec{r}, t), \psi^\dagger(\vec{r}', t)\} = \delta(\vec{r} - \vec{r}')$  is modified by renormalization. There is no justification for abandoning such a bare-operator algebra due to its modification in renormalization. Moreover, these algebra are the basic elements in quantum mechanics without renormalization, where the gauge-invariance problem with angular momentum is already encountered and our solution is needed.

To examine Ji’s comment that our proposal “clashes” with locality, one must first distinguish between locality and local expression. Locality means vanishing of commutator at space-like intervals, but it by no means requires a physical expression to be local function of all field variables, because (in a gauge theory, particularly) not all field components are independent variables to which the quantization rules apply. It must be further clarified that quantum field theory can *accommodate* non-locality for certain field variables without violating causality. The point is that the field variables are not always observables. Locality is required only for the operators for physical observables, which must commute at space-like intervals so that experiments at space-like intervals produce uncorrelated results. A celebrated example is the quantization of gauge theory in Coulomb gauge. In fact, as Strocchi and Wightman proved in [3], quantization of gauge theory with only physical degrees of freedom necessarily involves non-locality and complex Lorentz transformation rule.

Contrary to Ji’s comment, our formalism does preserve Lorentz covariance. To appreciate this point, recall the well-known fact that the gauge field  $A^\mu$  does *not*, in fact,

transform as a four-vector [4, 5, 6]. Instead, it acquires an extra pure-gauge term:

$$U(\Lambda)A^\mu U^{-1}(\Lambda) = \Lambda^\mu{}_\nu A^\nu(\Lambda x) + \partial^\mu \Omega(x, \Lambda). \quad (1)$$

The expression for  $\Omega$  can be explicitly worked out by consistent canonical quantization and computation of the commutator of  $A^\mu$  with the generators of Lorentz transformation (a most complete treatment is offered in [5]), or, in the spirit of Weinberg [6], by starting with physical photons and constructing  $A^\mu$  using the photon creation and annihilation operators. A remarkable fact is that if one applies the apparently non-covariant Coulomb gauge  $\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{A} = 0$  in one frame, then the extra pure-gauge term  $\partial^\mu \Omega$  restores  $\vec{\nabla}' \cdot \vec{A}' = 0$  in a transformed frame. Since the canonical quantization rule for the physical field  $\vec{A}_{\text{phys}}$  would be exactly the same as that for  $\vec{A}$  in Coulomb gauge (in which  $\vec{A}_{\text{pure}} = 0$  and  $\vec{A}_{\text{phys}} = \vec{A}$ ), in our formulation  $\vec{A}_{\text{phys}}$  transforms just as in Eq. (1), and hence  $\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{A}_{\text{phys}} = 0$  is preserved under Lorentz transformation. That is, the physical field is not transformed to include non-physical components by changing the reference frame.

Eq. (1) reminds us a profound fact, contrary to Ji’s belief, that it is not always possible to have all physical variables transforming in the simple manner of Lorentz scalar, vector, etc. Such complexity is *physical* and *intrinsic*: The transformation rule of any operator (such as the gluon spin) is dictated by its commutators with the generators of Lorentz transformation, and can be explicitly worked out, though this is certainly a non-trivial exercise in QCD.

In conclusion: the angular momentum operators which we construct are indeed physically sound, and provide a firm and consistent basis for further theoretical and experimental investigation of the nucleon spin structure in terms of the four (physically intuitive) contributions: quark/gluon spin and quark/gluon orbital angular momentum. In the approach advocated by Ji [7], however, there is not even an identification for the gluon or photon spin, while separate manipulation of photon spin and orbital angular momentum is already a routine practice in

modern optics [8], both theoretically and experimentally, and great effort is being devoted to measuring the gluon spin inside the nucleon [9].

This work is supported in part by the China NSF under grants 10475057, 10875082 and 90503011, and in part by the U.S. DOE under contract W-7405-ENG-36.

- 
- [1] X. Ji, arXiv:0810.4913 [hep-ph].  
 [2] X.S. Chen, X.F. Lü, W.M. Sun, F. Wang, and T. Goldman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 232002 (2008).  
 [3] F. Strocchi and A.S. Wightman, J. Math. Phys. **15**, 2198 (1974).

- [4] J.D. Bjorken and S.D. Drell, *Relativistic Quantum Fields* (McGraw-Hill, New York 1965), Sections 14.3 and 15.3.  
 [5] E.B. Manoukian, J. Phys. G **13**, 1013 (1987).  
 [6] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum Theory of Fields I* (Cambridge, New York 1995), Section 5.9.  
 [7] X. Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 610 (1997); Phys. Rev. D **55**, 7114 (1997). Two of the present authors (Chen and Wang) had also presented this decomposition, and pointed out its violation of the angular momentum algebra; see Commun. Theor. Phys. **27**, 212 (1997).  
 [8] See, e.g., S.J. van Enk and G. Nienhuis, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 053825 (2007).  
 [9] See, e.g., M. Stratmann and W. Vogelsang, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **69**, 012035 (2007).