

# Wigner multiplets in QFT: dark sector and CPT-violating scenarios

---

Cheng-Yang Lee<sup>a</sup> Ruifeng Leng<sup>b</sup> Siyi Zhou<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Center for theoretical physics, College of Physics, Sichuan University, Chengdu, 610064, China*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Physics and Center for Field Theory and Particle Physics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200438, China*

<sup>c</sup>*Department of Physics and Chongqing Key Laboratory for Strongly Coupled Physics, Chongqing University, Chongqing 401331, China*

*E-mail:* [cylee@scu.edu.cn](mailto:cylee@scu.edu.cn), [lruifeng@fudan.edu.cn](mailto:lruifeng@fudan.edu.cn), [siyi@cqu.edu.cn](mailto:siyi@cqu.edu.cn)

**ABSTRACT:** The classification of elementary particles based on unitary irreducible representations of the Poincaré group has been a cornerstone of modern Quantum Field Theory (QFT). While the Standard Model (SM) does not inherently include Dark Matter (DM), any fundamental DM candidate should still conform to this classification or its extensions. Beyond the standard representations, Wigner introduced a class of nontrivial states characterized by an additional discrete degree of freedom, known as the Wigner degeneracy. We systematically investigate the QFT of such Wigner degenerate multiplets, particularly focusing on the massive spin-1/2 case. We construct a theoretical framework where the two-fold Wigner spinor fields,  $\psi_{\pm\frac{1}{2}}(x)$ , form a doublet representation. We analyze their transformation properties under discrete symmetries (C, P, and T), revealing novel mixing effects due to Wigner degeneracy and an emergent accidental  $U(2)$  global symmetry. Furthermore, we explore their Yukawa and gauge interactions, demonstrating that such interactions generally break the CPT symmetry. However, we derive conditions for the CPT conservation and discuss potential phenomenological consequences beyond the SM. These results provide new insights into the possible role of Wigner-degenerate states in fundamental physics, particularly in the dark sector.

---

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>The Wigner degeneracy</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Standard representations	4
2.2	The Wigner degenerate multiplets	7
<b>3</b>	<b>The two-fold Wigner spinor fields</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Construct the Wigner fields from the Lorentz symmetry	10
3.2	Two inversions on the Wigner multiplets	12
3.3	Charge-conjugation on the Wigner multiplets	15
<b>4</b>	<b>A challenge to the CPT theorem</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1	Diagonal CPT	20
4.2	Block-diagonal CPT	22
<b>5</b>	<b>Canonical formalism: the Wigner Lagrangian</b>	<b>23</b>
5.1	Lagrangian of the free Wigner spinor fields	23
5.2	P, C, CP, T, and CPT in the free Wigner theory	24
5.3	Interactions with the Wigner degeneracy	27
<b>6</b>	<b>Summary and conclusions</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Notations &amp; conventions</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Block-diagonalization of <math>D(\mathcal{F})</math></b>	<b>33</b>

---

## 1 Introduction

The paradigm that elementary particles are described by unitary irreducible representations of the Poincaré group has been remarkably successful [1]. As long as the Poincaré symmetry remains valid and quantum gravitational effects are negligible, this paradigm is expected to be true. Although the SM does not originally include DM, there is no reason to doubt that DM should be described by the representations of the Poincaré group and its extension. The key question is: which representation does DM belong to?

In the search for physics beyond the SM, to ensure that no stones are left unturned, it is essential to explore all unitary irreducible representations of the extended Poincaré group and their corresponding quantum field theories. One such representation of interest here, which may serve as a potential DM candidate, was discovered by Eugene Wigner [2].

When the continuous Poincaré group is extended to include discrete symmetry transformations, Wigner demonstrated the existence of a class of nontrivial representations in which a one-particle state acquires an additional degree of freedom beyond the conventional attributes such as four-momentum and spin projection. Although Wigner did not further develop this idea, Steven Weinberg later examined these representations and referred to the corresponding states as *degenerate multiplets* [3, App. 2C]. In this work, we denote such an on-shell one-particle state by  $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n\rangle$  where  $\mathbf{p}$  is the three-momentum,  $\sigma$  is the spin projection, and  $n$  represents the additional discrete degree of freedom, characterizing the *Wigner degeneracy*. The state is degenerate in the sense that  $n$  remains invariant under continuous Lorentz transformations and spacetime translations. In contrast, it is fundamentally affected by discrete symmetry operations, which transform  $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n\rangle$  into a linear combination of states with different values of  $n$  with properly transformed  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\sigma$ .

Weinberg provided a brief exposition on the discrete symmetry transformations of degenerate multiplets. However, he did not proceed to study the corresponding quantum field theories, stating that *no examples are known of particles that furnish unconventional representations of inversions*. While this statement holds for the SM, it is important to recognize that approximately 25% of the total energy-matter content of the observable universe exists in the form of DM. Hence, one should not be prejudiced against these unconventional representations, as they may describe particles yet to be discovered. If DM particles are elementary and beyond the SM, they must be accommodated within representations of the Poincaré group, with or without discrete symmetries. While this viewpoint is valid for composing a monograph, those interested in physics beyond the SM should consider this theory worthy of further investigation. This nontrivial representation could play a fundamental role in the dark sector, governing the interactions between DM particles and SM matter. From a theoretical perspective, our understanding of the continuous and discrete symmetries of Wigner-degenerate states and the associated quantum fields remains incomplete.

The primary objective of this work is to explore the degenerate Wigner multiplets and their associated quantum field theories within a straightforward and intuitive framework. Our main focus here is on the massive spin-1/2 representation with the Wigner degeneracy in order to construct matter fields, aiming to construct matter fields that may serve as alternatives to Dirac and Majorana fermionic fields [3, 4]. The Wigner degeneracy parameter  $n$  can take values in the range  $-w, \dots, w$  where  $w$  is an arbitrary positive integer or half-integer. For simplicity, we consider the case  $w = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $n = \pm\frac{1}{2}$ , introducing two Wigner multiplets. A one-particle state in this framework possesses four degrees of freedom: two associated with spin projections  $\sigma = \pm\frac{1}{2}$  and two corresponding to  $n = \pm\frac{1}{2}$ . The quantum fields describing these states must incorporate both degrees of freedom while satisfying the constraints of causality and Poincaré symmetry. Since the Wigner degeneracy is independent of the Lorentz transformations and spacetime translations, we construct a pair of quantum fields  $\psi_{+\frac{1}{2}}(x)$  and  $\psi_{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)$  corresponding to two sectors  $n = +\frac{1}{2}$  and  $n = -\frac{1}{2}$  respectively. These fields are expected to be causal and Lorentz covariant. Notably, Lorentz transformations cannot mix fields from different degenerate sectors, while discrete symmetries, including charge conjugation, enable nontrivial mixing between them.

For causal and Lorentz-covariant quantum fields  $\psi_n(x)$ ,  $n = \pm\frac{1}{2}$ , their construction follows the prescriptions given in Ref. [3]. However, since states associated to two Wigner degeneracies  $n = +\frac{1}{2}$  and  $n = -\frac{1}{2}$  are mixed by discrete transformations, it is *impossible* to describe them using just only one of the two corresponding fields. Therefore, to fully capture the physics with two-fold Wigner degeneracy, it becomes essential to effectively combine the two fields. This raises the key question: *how should they be combined?* We consider two reasonable approaches:

1. Doublet construction:  $\Psi(x) \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \psi_{+\frac{1}{2}}(x) \\ \psi_{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) \end{bmatrix};$

2. Summation over the Wigner degeneracy:  $\lambda(x) \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ \psi_{+\frac{1}{2}}(x) + \psi_{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) \right].$

In this work, we primarily focus on the first approach, the doublet construction. We associate the two Dirac fields  $\psi_{\pm\frac{1}{2}}(x)$  with two massive Wigner fermion multiplets of the same mass respectively, thereby fixing their kinematics. The primary task then becomes the exploration of discrete transformations — parity and time-reversal, and charge-conjugation — on both (anti-)particle states and quantum fields, along with their bilinear forms. These transformations generally differ from those in conventional QFT due to the mixing of Wigner degeneracy, leading to modified symmetry properties.

We are simultaneously exploring the second possibility as a separate project. In the literature, this framework has been utilized in the theory of mass-dimension-one fields, which presents a shift in the standard paradigm [5–9]. These fields have been applied across various phenomenological domains, including cosmology [10–30], braneworld models [31–36] and models of self-interacting DM [37–42]. The theoretical foundation of Elko spinors has been clarified in Ref. [9, 43–45]. However, these works primarily focused on demonstrating the consistency of mass-dimension-one fields with the causality and rotational symmetries. A systematic methodology for constructing such fields remains unclear. Establishing this methodology is the goal we aim to pursue in the next stage of our research.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we begin by reviewing the standard representations of Lorentz and discrete transformations in conventional QFT, and then introduce the concept of Wigner degeneracy for massive states. In Section 3, we present a detailed study of two-fold Wigner spinor fields within the doublet construction framework. We derive the C, P, and T transformations on the one-particle states, the corresponding quantum fields, and their general bilinear forms. In Section 4, we analyze the CPT and  $(\text{CPT})^2$  transformations. For fermionic states with two-fold Wigner degeneracy, we identify two distinct classes of CPT transformations. One leads to the conventional result,  $(\text{CPT})^2 = +\mathbf{1}$ , while the other allows for an additional sign (or phases) in the action of  $(\text{CPT})^2$ , which is absent in conventional QFT. In Section 5, to explore the symmetries associated with Wigner degeneracy, we first establish the Lagrangian formalism for two-fold free Wigner spinor fields and derive their discrete symmetry properties. These transformations generally mix Wigner degeneracies and induce an accidental  $U(2)$  global symmetry. Finally, we analyze the Yukawa and gauge interactions involving the Wigner multiplets. While these interactions

typically violate CPT symmetry, we identify conditions under which CPT is conserved and discuss several representative examples. These findings suggest new phenomenological implications beyond the SM, warranting further investigation.

## 2 The Wigner degeneracy

In Minkowski spacetime, elementary particles are described by the irreducible unitary representations of the Poincaré group [1]. Since we are dealing with physical states, the relevant representations are the massive and massless ones, corresponding to particles with positive-definite mass and energy. That is, for a physical particle with four-momentum  $p^\mu = (E_{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{p})$ , we impose the conventional requirements  $p^\mu p_\mu = m^2 \geq 0$  and  $p^0 = E_{\mathbf{p}} \geq 0$ .

The representations of Poincaré group can be classified by the eigenvalues of the two Casimir invariants:  $P_\mu P^\mu$  and  $W_\mu W^\mu$  where  $P^\mu$  and  $W^\mu$  denote the four-momentum and the Pauli-Lubanski vector, respectively. The two corresponding eigenvalues are  $m^2$  and  $m^2 j(j+1)$  where  $m$  represents the mass of the particle, and  $j = 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \dots$  is its spin. For massless particles, these quantities are determined by the helicity  $\pm j$ . A notable class of nontrivial representations emerges when the Poincaré group is extended to include discrete symmetries. These were first discovered by Wigner [2] and later developed by Weinberg [3]. They describe a class of representations in the Hilbert space with an extra degeneracy  $n$ , referred to as the *Wigner degeneracy*, which is defined by discrete symmetries. In this work, we first provide a concise review of the standard representations for massive particles and introduce key formulations necessary for clarity.

### 2.1 Standard representations

For a massive particle with mass  $m$ , we take its standard four-momentum to be  $k^\mu = (m, 0, 0, 0)$ <sup>1</sup>. The standard boost taking  $k^\mu$  to an arbitrary massive momentum  $p^\mu$  is denoted as  $L(p)$  so that  $p^\mu = L^\mu{}_\nu(p)k^\nu$ , while  $\Lambda$  denotes an arbitrary Lorentz transformation. The little group is defined as the subgroup of the Lorentz group consisting of the Lorentz transformations  $W$  which hold  $k^\mu$  fixed. Thus, for the massive  $k^\mu$ , the little group is the rotation group  $\text{SO}(3)$  in the three dimensional space. The little-group transformation  $W$  can be decomposed in terms of  $\Lambda$  and  $L(p)$  as

$$W(\Lambda, p) = L^{-1}(\Lambda p) \Lambda L(p). \quad (2.1)$$

The unitary operator  $U(\Lambda, a)$  in the physical Hilbert space indicates the quantum transformation corresponding to the Poincaré transformation  $(\Lambda, a)$ . If there's no translation,  $U(\Lambda, 0) \equiv U(\Lambda)$  degrades to a Lorentz transformation. The operators  $U(\Lambda, a)$  form a unitary representation of the Poincaré group in the (infinite dimensional) Hilbert space and satisfy the composition rule

$$U(\Lambda', a') U(\Lambda, a) = U(\Lambda' \Lambda, \Lambda' a + a'), \quad (2.2)$$

and that of the Lorentz group can be derived by setting  $a' = a = 0$ . We need to clarify that, for physical purposes, what we are actually looking for is not exactly representations

---

<sup>1</sup>This standard four-momentum can't be achieved in the massless case due to the on-shell condition.

of the Poincaré (Lorentz) group, but projective representations of the Poincaré (Lorentz) group, where an additional phase can exist in the group product. In the physical quantum Hilbert space, we denote the one-particle states for a massive particle  $m > 0$  and spin  $j$  as  $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle$ <sup>2</sup> naturally in terms of eigenvectors of the four-momentum and the spin z-projection  $\sigma = -j, \dots, +j$ . They are orthonormalized in a Lorentz invariant convention [46]

$$\langle \mathbf{p}', \sigma' | \mathbf{p}, \sigma \rangle = 2E_{\mathbf{p}} (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p}) \delta_{\sigma'\sigma}. \quad (2.3)$$

The transformation of a one-particle state  $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle$  (with spin  $j$ ) under a homogeneous Lorentz transformation  $\Lambda$  will produce an eigenvector of the four-momentum operator with eigenvalue  $\Lambda p = (E_{\mathbf{p}_\Lambda}, \mathbf{p}_\Lambda)$ . The state after the Lorentz transformation  $U(\Lambda)|\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle$  can be written as a linear combination of  $|\mathbf{p}_\Lambda, \sigma'\rangle$  (see [3, Sec. 2] for details and the Poincaré algebra)

$$U(\Lambda)|\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle = \sum_{\sigma'} D_{\sigma'\sigma}^{(j)}(W(\Lambda, p)) |\mathbf{p}_\Lambda, \sigma'\rangle, \quad (2.4)$$

where  $D_{\sigma'\sigma}^{(j)}(W)$  is a  $2j+1$  (finite) dimensional unitary representation of the little group (2.1). On the other hand, the one-particle state  $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle$  can be generated by the associated creation operator  $a^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$  acting once on the vacuum state  $|0\rangle$ <sup>3</sup>

$$|\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle \equiv \sqrt{2E_{\mathbf{p}}} a^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)|0\rangle, \quad (2.5)$$

with the on-shell condition  $E_{\mathbf{p}} = \sqrt{|\mathbf{p}|^2 + m^2}$  and the canonical commutation (for bosons) or anticommutation (for fermions) relations are realized as

$$\left[ a(\mathbf{p}, \sigma), a^\dagger(\mathbf{p}', \sigma') \right]_{\mp} = (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p}) \delta_{\sigma'\sigma}, \quad (2.6)$$

with the signs  $-$  and  $+$  indicating a commutator (for bosons) and an anticommutator (for fermions) respectively. The vacuum state  $|0\rangle$  can be generally destroyed by the annihilation operator, i.e.,  $a(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)|0\rangle = 0$ . One can clearly verify that the canonical quantization relations (2.6) are compatible with the normalization of one-particle states in Eq. (2.3). The Lorentz transformations on the annihilation and creation operators can be derived by those on the states in Eq. (2.4)

$$\begin{aligned} U(\Lambda)a^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)U^{-1}(\Lambda) &= \sqrt{\frac{E_{\mathbf{p}_\Lambda}}{E_{\mathbf{p}}}} \sum_{\sigma'} D_{\sigma'\sigma}^{(j)}(W(\Lambda, p)) a^\dagger(\mathbf{p}_\Lambda, \sigma') \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{E_{\mathbf{p}_\Lambda}}{E_{\mathbf{p}}}} \sum_{\sigma'} D_{\sigma\sigma'}^{(j)*}(W^{-1}(\Lambda, p)) a^\dagger(\mathbf{p}_\Lambda, \sigma'), \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} U(\Lambda)a(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)U^{-1}(\Lambda) &= \sqrt{\frac{E_{\mathbf{p}_\Lambda}}{E_{\mathbf{p}}}} \sum_{\sigma'} D_{\sigma'\sigma}^{(j)*}(W(\Lambda, p)) a(\mathbf{p}_\Lambda, \sigma') \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{E_{\mathbf{p}_\Lambda}}{E_{\mathbf{p}}}} \sum_{\sigma'} D_{\sigma\sigma'}^{(j)}(W^{-1}(\Lambda, p)) a(\mathbf{p}_\Lambda, \sigma'), \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

<sup>2</sup>The index for particle species is hidden.

<sup>3</sup>The vacuum state is normalized dimensionlessly as  $\langle 0|0\rangle = 1$ .

where we have used the unitarity of rotation matrices  $D_{\sigma'\sigma}^{(j)}$  in the second equality induced by the normalization (2.3) and required that the vacuum state is Lorentz invariant

$$U(\Lambda)|0\rangle = |0\rangle. \quad (2.9)$$

After the proper orthochronous and continuous Lorentz group, we now consider discrete transformations namely, the parity (space inversion)  $\mathcal{P}$  and time-reversal  $\mathcal{T}$ . If they are conserved for the quantum system, there must exist the (projective) (anti)unitary representations corresponding to  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$ , denoted as  $U(\mathcal{P})$  and  $U(\mathcal{T})$  respectively, such that they satisfy the multiplication rule with respect to the Poincaré group

$$\begin{aligned} U(\mathcal{P})U(\Lambda, a)U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) &= U(\mathcal{P}\Lambda\mathcal{P}^{-1}, \mathcal{P}a), \\ U(\mathcal{T})U(\Lambda, a)U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) &= U(\mathcal{T}\Lambda\mathcal{T}^{-1}, \mathcal{T}a). \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Note that  $U(\mathcal{P})$  is linear and unitary while  $U(\mathcal{T})$  is antilinear and antiunitary, since we require there is no state of negative energy. We can determine the  $U(\mathcal{P})$  and  $U(\mathcal{T})$  transformations on the Poincaré generators using Eq. (2.10):

$$U(\mathcal{P})\mathbf{J}U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = +\mathbf{J}, \quad (2.11)$$

$$U(\mathcal{P})\mathbf{K}U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = -\mathbf{K}, \quad (2.12)$$

$$U(\mathcal{P})\mathbf{P}U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = -\mathbf{P}, \quad (2.13)$$

$$U(\mathcal{P})HU^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = +H, \quad (2.14)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T})\mathbf{J}U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) = -\mathbf{J}, \quad (2.15)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T})\mathbf{K}U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) = +\mathbf{K}, \quad (2.16)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T})\mathbf{P}U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) = -\mathbf{P}, \quad (2.17)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T})HU^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) = +H, \quad (2.18)$$

where  $H = P^0$  is the Hamiltonian,  $\mathbf{J}$  is the three angular momentum (pseudo-) vector,  $\mathbf{K}$  is the three boost vector and  $\mathbf{P}$  is the three momentum operator. We can then obtain the  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  transformations on the one-particle state  $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle$

$$U(\mathcal{P})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle = \eta_P|-\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle, \quad (2.19)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle = (-1)^{j-\sigma}\eta_T|-\mathbf{p}, -\sigma\rangle, \quad (2.20)$$

where  $\eta_{P,T}$  is the intrinsic phase and independent of the spin-projection  $\sigma$ , mainly induced by the transformation properties for  $\mathbf{J}$  given in Eqs. (2.11)-(2.15). It is remarkable that the time-reversal phase  $\eta_T$  has no physical influence since it can be eliminated by renormalizing the one-particle states, which is allowed by the antilinearity of  $U(\mathcal{T})$ . Furthermore,  $U^2(\mathcal{T})$  has a simple action on the states derived from Eq. (2.20):

$$U^2(\mathcal{T})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle = (-1)^{2j}|\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle, \quad (2.21)$$

which has eigenvalues  $\pm 1$ , only depending on the particle spin  $j$ . For parity, while we have  $\mathcal{P}^2 = \mathbf{1}$ , the corresponding transformation in the Hilbert space  $U^2(\mathcal{P})$  can differ from the

identity operator up to a phase  $U^2(\mathcal{P})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle = \eta_P^2|\mathbf{p}, \sigma\rangle$ . Since  $\eta_P$  may be complex, we cannot deduce  $\eta_P = \pm 1$  directly <sup>4</sup>.

In the same way as the Lorentz transformations in Eqs. (2.7)-(2.8), we can derive the discrete symmetry transformations for the annihilation  $a(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$  and creation operators  $a^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$

$$\begin{aligned} U(\mathcal{P})a(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) &= \eta_P^* a(-\mathbf{p}, \sigma), \\ U(\mathcal{P})a^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) &= \eta_P a^\dagger(-\mathbf{p}, \sigma), \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} U(\mathcal{T})a(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) &= (-1)^{j-\sigma} \eta_T^* a(-\mathbf{p}, -\sigma), \\ U(\mathcal{T})a^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) &= (-1)^{j-\sigma} \eta_T a^\dagger(-\mathbf{p}, -\sigma). \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

## 2.2 The Wigner degenerate multiplets

In the standard representations, the inversions  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  map a single state to another single state as shown explicitly in Eqs. (2.19)-(2.20). In 1964, Wigner introduced another class of nontrivial representations for inversions  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$ , where states have additional degrees of freedom and transform in a more complicated way [2]. In this framework, the actions of  $U(\mathcal{P})$  and  $U(\mathcal{T})$  may map one state to a superposition of degenerate states. Hence the representations of inversions on spacetime are not faithful and their kernels can be nontrivial so that the characteristic of the Wigner degeneracy is (partially) dropped there. Weinberg clarified this representation particularly on one-particles and referred to them as *degenerate multiplets* [3, App. 2C] under particular physical requirements (conservation of inversions) instead of imposing some of Wigner's limiting assumptions <sup>5</sup>.

We will follow Weinberg's prescriptions in this section. In addition to momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  and spin-projection  $\sigma$ , these states are characterized by an extra degree of freedom known as Wigner degeneracy, labeled by  $n$ . This additional index expands the notation of one-particle state as  $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n\rangle$ , explicitly showing the momentum  $\mathbf{p}$ , the spin-projection  $\sigma = -j, \dots, +j$ , and the Wigner degeneracy  $n = -w, \dots, +w$  <sup>6</sup>. They are orthonormalized in a Lorentz invariant formalism similar to Eq. (2.3)

$$\langle \mathbf{p}', \sigma', n' | \mathbf{p}, \sigma, n \rangle = 2E_{\mathbf{p}} (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p}) \delta_{\sigma'\sigma} \delta_{n'n}, \quad (2.24)$$

so that the associated creation operator becomes  $a_n^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$ . It satisfies the canonical quantization relations

$$\left[ a_n(\mathbf{p}, \sigma), a_{n'}^\dagger(\mathbf{p}', \sigma') \right]_{\mp} = (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p}) \delta_{\sigma'\sigma} \delta_{n'n}, \quad (2.25)$$

and creates the single-particle state via

$$|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n\rangle \equiv \sqrt{2E_{\mathbf{p}}} a_n^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) |0\rangle. \quad (2.26)$$

<sup>4</sup>In general, one can use some internal symmetry operator  $I_P$  to redefine  $U(\mathcal{P})I_P$  as a new parity operator such that  $[U(\mathcal{P})I_P]^2 = \mathbf{1}$  (see [3, Sec. 3.3] for more details).

<sup>5</sup>Wigner assumed the square of inversion operators are proportional to the unit operator; in other words, the (projective) representations of inversions on spacetime are faithful. Combining with Eq. (2.21), it will provide extra limitations on physical states or the time-reversal transformation in Eq. (2.20).

<sup>6</sup> $w$  may be either an integer or a half-integer.



The vacuum  $|0\rangle$  is annihilated by each  $a_n(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$  so that

$$a_n(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)|0\rangle = 0. \quad (2.27)$$

For the remainder of this section, we review the Lorentz and discrete symmetry transformations for massive one-particle states with Wigner degeneracy. The extension to associated field representations will be studied in the next section.

The Lorentz transformations are assumed to have no effect on the Wigner degeneracy. Therefore, the massive one-particle states transform in the same manner as in the standard representations of Eqs. (2.4)-(2.7) but with the Wigner degeneracy  $n$  unchanged

$$U(\Lambda)|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n\rangle = \sum_{\sigma'} D_{\sigma'\sigma}^{(j)}(W(\Lambda, p))|\mathbf{p}_\Lambda, \sigma', n\rangle. \quad (2.28)$$

From (2.28) we can see that each Wigner degeneracy implies an invariant subspace of the Lorentz group. The physical Hilbert space of the massive one-particle states with mass  $m$  can be decomposed into  $2w + 1$  Lorentz invariant subspaces via the direct sum as

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{n=-w}^{+w} V_n, \quad V_n \equiv \{|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n\rangle \mid \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^3, \text{ and } \sigma = -j, \dots, +j\}. \quad (2.29)$$

What may mix the Wigner multiplets is the discrete symmetry of inversions, which can act in a more complicated way than usual in Eqs. (2.19)-(2.20):

$$U(\mathcal{P})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n\rangle = \sum_{n'} D_{n'n}(\mathcal{P})|-\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n'\rangle, \quad (2.30)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n\rangle = (-1)^{j-\sigma} \sum_{n'} D_{n'n}(\mathcal{T})|-\mathbf{p}, -\sigma, n'\rangle, \quad (2.31)$$

where  $D_{n'n}(\mathcal{P})$  and  $D_{n'n}(\mathcal{T})$  are unknown matrices except that they are unitary, because we assume inversions are physically conserved. Hence, the normalization of physical states (2.24) is preserved. Since inversions are assumed to be conserved, the operators  $U(\mathcal{P})$  and  $U(\mathcal{T})$  in Eqs. (2.30-2.31) must still satisfy Eqs. (2.11)-(2.18). Wigner unphysically limited the squared actions of inversions and assumed them to be proportional to the unit operator, i.e.,  $U^2(\mathcal{P}) = \zeta_P \mathbf{1}$ <sup>7</sup> and  $U^2(\mathcal{T}) = \zeta_T \mathbf{1}$  with constants  $\zeta_{P,T}$ . If we impose Wigner's assumption, there will be an extra constraint for the proportionality factor  $\zeta_T = \pm 1$  that can be proved by the antiunitarity and antilinearity of  $U(\mathcal{T})$ <sup>8</sup>.

If there exists a basis that can diagonalize the two inversion matrices  $D_{n'n}(\mathcal{P})$  (2.30) and  $D_{n'n}(\mathcal{T})$  (2.31) simultaneously, the Wigner multiplets will be just trivial replications of

<sup>7</sup>To be clear, here '1' is the identity operator on the Hilbert space.

<sup>8</sup>Since  $U(\mathcal{T})$  is antiunitary and antilinear,  $U^2(\mathcal{T})$  is unitary so that  $\zeta_T$  is a phase at most. Then, the antilinearity of  $U^{(\dagger)}(\mathcal{T})$  implies  $\zeta_T = \zeta_T^*$  (real), demonstrated by

$$\zeta_T U^\dagger(\mathcal{T}) = U^2(\mathcal{T}) U^\dagger(\mathcal{T}) = U^\dagger(\mathcal{T}) U^2(\mathcal{T}) = \zeta_T^* U^\dagger(\mathcal{T}),$$

where we have used the property of antiunitary  $U(\mathcal{T})$  that  $U^\dagger(\mathcal{T})U(\mathcal{T}) = U(\mathcal{T})U^\dagger(\mathcal{T}) = \mathbf{1}$ . Thus, we can conclude that  $\zeta_T = \pm 1$  and  $\zeta_T$  is highly constrained under the Wigner's assumption. In contrast, we can only argue  $\zeta_P$  as a phase factor because  $U(\mathcal{P})$  is unitary and linear.

the standard representations. However, in general, we can only block-diagonalize  $D_{n'n}(\mathcal{T})$  with the block either a phase factor or a  $2 \times 2$  matrix of phases

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{i\phi/2} \\ e^{-i\phi/2} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \phi \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.32)$$

since  $U(\mathcal{T})$  (2.31) is actually antiunitary<sup>9</sup>. Even if we successfully diagonalize  $D_{n'n}(\mathcal{T})$  by accident under very limited conditions, the basis transformation for  $D_{n'n}(\mathcal{T})$  may not diagonalize  $D_{n'n}(\mathcal{P})$  (see [3, App. 2C] for more details). Two inversion transformations on the annihilation and creation operators can be derived from Eqs. (2.30)-(2.31)

$$U(\mathcal{P})a_n^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = \sum_{n'} D_{n'n}(\mathcal{P})a_{n'}^\dagger(-\mathbf{p}, \sigma), \quad (2.33)$$

$$U(\mathcal{P})a_n(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = \sum_{n'} D_{n'n}^*(\mathcal{P})a_{n'}(-\mathbf{p}, \sigma), \quad (2.34)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T})a_n^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) = (-1)^{j-\sigma} \sum_{n'} D_{n'n}(\mathcal{T})a_{n'}^\dagger(-\mathbf{p}, -\sigma), \quad (2.35)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T})a_n(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) = (-1)^{j-\sigma} \sum_{n'} D_{n'n}^*(\mathcal{T})a_{n'}(-\mathbf{p}, -\sigma). \quad (2.36)$$

In the following sections, we will study QFT with Wigner degeneracy. For the free fields, we study the most general constructs that are local and respect Lorentz symmetry. In particular, we will explore the possibility that these fields may have different kinematics with respect to its counterpart describing states furnishing the standard representations. In phenomenological aspects, we will look for interactions that can distinguish the Wigner degeneracy.

### 3 The two-fold Wigner spinor fields

In this section, we study the massive spinor field corresponding to the fermion of spin  $j = \frac{1}{2}$ , which has internal degrees of freedom, specifically the spin projection  $\sigma = \pm\frac{1}{2}$  and the Wigner degeneracy  $w = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $n = \pm\frac{1}{2}$ . Consequently, the fermion must be described by quantum spinor fields that incorporate both the spin projection and the Wigner degeneracy as part of their degrees of freedom.

---

<sup>9</sup>In contrast, we can always diagonalize the unitary  $D_{n'n}(\mathcal{P})$  (2.30) for the unitary and linear  $U(\mathcal{P})$  (2.30).

### 3.1 Construct the Wigner fields from the Lorentz symmetry

Following the same methodology of the standard spinor field construction, we can describe the massive fermions with two-fold Wigner degeneracy with a doublet <sup>10</sup>

$$\Psi(x) \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \psi_{+\frac{1}{2}}(x) \\ \psi_{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.1)$$

consisting of two Dirac casual fields:

$$\psi_{n,\ell}(x) = \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E_{\mathbf{p}}}} \sum_{\sigma} \left[ e^{-ip \cdot x} u_{n,\ell}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) a_n(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) + e^{ip \cdot x} v_{n,\ell}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) a_n^{c\dagger}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) \right], \quad (3.2)$$

so that each  $\psi_n(x)$ ,  $n = \pm\frac{1}{2}$ , is covariant under the Poincaré transformations. Here,  $a_n^{(\dagger)}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$  and  $a_n^{c(\dagger)}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$  are the annihilation (creation) operators for the particle and its associated anti-particle respectively with the identical mass  $m$  so that the one-particle state is defined as <sup>11</sup>

$$|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^{(c)}\rangle \equiv \sqrt{2E_{\mathbf{p}}} a_n^{(c)\dagger}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) |0\rangle, \quad (3.3)$$

which are orthonormalized as

$$\langle \mathbf{p}', \sigma', n'; a^{(c)} | \mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^{(c)} \rangle = 2E_{\mathbf{p}} (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p}) \delta_{\sigma'\sigma} \delta_{n'n}, \quad (3.4)$$

with the canonical quantization for fermions specialized from the general case in Eqs. (2.26)-(2.25) under the convention that

$$\left\{ a_n(\mathbf{p}, \sigma), a_{n'}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{p}', \sigma') \right\} = \left\{ a_n^c(\mathbf{p}, \sigma), a_{n'}^{c\dagger}(\mathbf{p}', \sigma') \right\} = (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}') \delta_{\sigma\sigma'} \delta_{nn'}, \quad (3.5)$$

$$\left\{ a_n(\mathbf{p}, \sigma), a_{n'}^c(\mathbf{p}', \sigma') \right\} = \left\{ a_n^{\dagger}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma), a_{n'}^{c\dagger}(\mathbf{p}', \sigma') \right\} = \left\{ a_n(\mathbf{p}, \sigma), a_{n'}^{c\dagger}(\mathbf{p}', \sigma') \right\} = 0, \quad (3.6)$$

and transform under the Lorentz group as Eqs. (2.7)-(2.8). The vacuum  $|0\rangle$  is defined to be the state such that

$$a_n(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) |0\rangle = a_n^c(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) |0\rangle = 0. \quad (3.7)$$

In particular, the exponential phases  $e^{\pm ip \cdot x}$  in Eq. (3.2) ensures that the field is covariant under spacetime translations. The covariance under Lorentz transformation requires

$$U(\Lambda) \psi_{n,\ell}(x) U^{-1}(\Lambda) = \sum_{\ell'} \mathcal{D}_{\ell\ell'}(\Lambda^{-1}) \psi_{n,\ell'}(\Lambda x), \quad (3.8)$$

<sup>10</sup>One may be naively tempted to construct a quantum field via the linear combination  $\psi(x) \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ \psi_{+\frac{1}{2}}(x) + \psi_{-\frac{1}{2}}(x) \right]$  instead of the doublet (3.1) and proceed to quantize it with the Lagrangian density  $\mathcal{L}_{\psi} = \bar{\psi}(i\gamma^{\mu}\partial_{\mu} - m)\psi$ . However, using the explicit configurations of spinor fields in this section, canonical calculation reveals that  $\mathcal{L}_{\psi}$  does not yield the correct free Hamiltonian (see Section 5.1). To quantize  $\psi(x)$ , a different strategy similar to those proposed in Ref. [9, 45] is necessary.

<sup>11</sup>We use the bracket to denote an alternative item. For instance, in Eq. (3.3), the expression can be interpreted using either  $a, a_n^{\dagger}$  or  $a^c, a_n^{c\dagger}$ .

where  $\mathcal{D}_{\ell\ell'}$  is the finite-dimensional Dirac spinor representation of the Lorentz group as in the common sense, satisfying the pseudo-unitary relation

$$\gamma^0 \mathcal{D}^\dagger(\Lambda) \gamma^0 = \mathcal{D}^{-1}(\Lambda), \quad (3.9)$$

and transforming the Dirac matrices  $\gamma^\mu$  as vectors <sup>12</sup>

$$\mathcal{D}(\Lambda) \gamma^\mu \mathcal{D}^{-1}(\Lambda) = \Lambda_\nu^\mu \gamma^\nu. \quad (3.10)$$

It also provides the solutions of the coefficients  $u_{n,\ell}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$  and  $v_{n,\ell}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$  in the casual field of Eq. (3.2). Causality is preserved by evaluating the two-point correlation function  $\{\psi_{n,\ell}, \psi_{n',\ell'}^\dagger\}$  which must vanish at space-like intervals. Notice that nontrivial correlation functions are only provided by the commutators between two fields with the same Wigner degeneracy (i.e.,  $\{\psi_{n,\ell}, \psi_{n,\ell'}^\dagger\}$ ) due to the canonical quantization relations (3.5)-(3.6). Although the parity is different from the original case in Eq. (2.19), it still transform the fields at the point  $x$  into something superpositioned by these fields at  $\mathcal{P}x$ , referring to Eq. (2.30). Thus, we are allowed without the loss of generality to determine the Dirac spinors  $u_{\pm\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$  and  $v_{\pm\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$  in Eq. (3.2) as

$$u(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) = u_{\pm\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) = \sqrt{\frac{E_{\mathbf{p}} + m}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \left(1 - \frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}}{E_{\mathbf{p}} + m}\right) \xi^\sigma \\ \left(1 + \frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}}{E_{\mathbf{p}} + m}\right) \xi^\sigma \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{p \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}} \xi^\sigma \\ \sqrt{p \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}} \xi^\sigma \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.11)$$

$$v(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) = v_{\pm\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) = \sqrt{\frac{E_{\mathbf{p}} + m}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \left(1 - \frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}}{E_{\mathbf{p}} + m}\right) \chi^\sigma \\ -\left(1 + \frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}}{E_{\mathbf{p}} + m}\right) \chi^\sigma \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{p \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}} \chi^\sigma \\ -\sqrt{p \cdot \bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}} \chi^\sigma \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.12)$$

where  $u(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$  and  $v(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$  are the solutions of the free Dirac spinors without the Wigner degeneracy and satisfy

$$\bar{u}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) u(\mathbf{p}, \sigma') = -\bar{v}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) v(\mathbf{p}, \sigma') = 2m \delta_{\sigma\sigma'}, \quad (3.13)$$

$$\bar{u}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) v(\mathbf{p}, \sigma') = u^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) v(-\mathbf{p}, \sigma') = \bar{v}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) u(\mathbf{p}, \sigma') = v^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) u(-\mathbf{p}, \sigma') = 0, \quad (3.14)$$

with

$$\xi^+ = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \xi^- = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \chi^+ = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \chi^- = \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.15)$$

In particular for the zero-momentum case  $\mathbf{p} = 0$ , the Dirac spinors can be chosen in the chiral representation as

$$u(\mathbf{0}, \frac{1}{2}) = \sqrt{m} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad u(\mathbf{0}, -\frac{1}{2}) = \sqrt{m} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.16)$$

$$v(\mathbf{0}, \frac{1}{2}) = \sqrt{m} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad v(\mathbf{0}, -\frac{1}{2}) = \sqrt{m} \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.17)$$

---

<sup>12</sup> $\Lambda_\nu^\mu \equiv (\Lambda^{-1})^\mu_\nu = \eta_{\nu\rho} \eta^{\mu\sigma} \Lambda^\rho_\sigma.$

### 3.2 Two inversions on the Wigner multiplets

We can now see that the doublet  $\Psi(x)$  (3.1)-(3.2) furnishes a reducible representation of the continuous Lorentz transformations. As a result, fermion bilinear forms constructed with the Wigner spinors in the form of  $\bar{\chi}_m \Gamma \psi_n$ , where  $m, n = \pm \frac{1}{2}$ <sup>13</sup>, have the same Lorentz transformation property as standard spinor fields without the Wigner degeneracy. For it to be irreducible, the two discrete inversions must mix  $\psi_{+\frac{1}{2}}(x)$  and  $\psi_{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)$  and act on one-particle states as

$$U(\mathcal{P})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^{(c)}\rangle = \sum_{n'} D_{n'n}^{(c)}(\mathcal{P})|-\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n'; a^{(c)}\rangle, \quad (3.18)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^{(c)}\rangle = (-1)^{\frac{1}{2}-\sigma} \sum_{n'} D_{n'n}^{(c)}(\mathcal{T})|-\mathbf{p}, -\sigma, n'; a^{(c)}\rangle. \quad (3.19)$$

Inversions on the annihilation and creation operators are given in Eqs. (2.33)-(2.36) but with  $D_{n'n}^{(c)}(\mathcal{P})$  and  $D_{n'n}^{(c)}(\mathcal{T})$ . Since  $U(\mathcal{P})$  is linear and unitary, its associated matrix  $D_{n'n}^{(c)}(\mathcal{P})$  (3.18) is a  $2 \times 2$  unitary matrix and can always be diagonalized by a choice of basis. In contrast, we can only block-diagonalize the matrix  $D_{n'n}^{(c)}(\mathcal{T})$  for the time-reversal  $U(\mathcal{T})$  (3.19) in the general case. In order to obtain a simple but nontrivial result, we assume there exists a basis of the particle and anti-particle states with the Wigner degeneracy (3.3) to diagonalize  $D_{n'n}^{(c)}(\mathcal{P})$  (3.18) and block-diagonalize  $D_{n'n}^{(c)}(\mathcal{T})$  (3.19) in terms of Eq. (2.32) simultaneously,

$$D(\mathcal{P}) = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{+\frac{1}{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & \eta_{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad D^c(\mathcal{P}) = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{+\frac{1}{2}}^c & 0 \\ 0 & \eta_{-\frac{1}{2}}^c \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.20)$$

$$D(\mathcal{T}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{i\phi/2} \\ e^{-i\phi/2} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad D^c(\mathcal{T}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{i\phi^c/2} \\ e^{-i\phi^c/2} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.21)$$

where phases  $\eta_{\pm\frac{1}{2}}^{(c)}$  are intrinsic parities for the particle and the anti-particle with the Wigner degeneracy  $n = \pm\frac{1}{2}$  respectively.  $\phi, \phi^c \in \mathbb{R}$  are phases of the time-reversal for the particle and the anti-particle respectively. To be clear, we denote the  $2 \times 2$  matrix element with the Wigner degeneracy  $n$  as

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} D_{+\frac{1}{2},+\frac{1}{2}} & D_{+\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2}} \\ D_{-\frac{1}{2},+\frac{1}{2}} & D_{-\frac{1}{2},-\frac{1}{2}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.22)$$

---

<sup>13</sup> $\chi$  and  $\psi$  can refer to the same particle species with  $\chi = \psi$ .  $\Gamma$  is an arbitrary  $4 \times 4$  matrix.

Applying these results to the fields  $\psi_{\pm\frac{1}{2}}(x)$  (3.2), we can see that

$$U(\mathcal{P})\psi_n(x)U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = \gamma^0 \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E_{\mathbf{p}}}} \sum_{\sigma} \left[ \eta_n^* e^{-ip \cdot \mathcal{P}x} u(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) a_n(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) - \eta_n^c e^{ip \cdot \mathcal{P}x} v(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) a_n^{c\dagger}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) \right], \quad (3.23)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T})\psi_n(x)U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) = \gamma^1 \gamma^3 \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E_{\mathbf{p}}}} \sum_{\sigma} \left[ e^{in\phi} e^{-ip \cdot \mathcal{T}x} u(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) a_{-n}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) + e^{-in\phi^c} e^{ip \cdot \mathcal{T}x} v(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) a_{-n}^{c\dagger}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) \right], \quad (3.24)$$

using the identities derived from Eqs. (3.11)-(3.12) explicitly

$$\gamma^0 u(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) = u(-\mathbf{p}, \sigma), \quad (3.25)$$

$$\gamma^0 v(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) = -v(-\mathbf{p}, \sigma), \quad (3.26)$$

$$\gamma^3 \gamma^1 u(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) = (-1)^{\frac{1}{2}-\sigma} u^*(-\mathbf{p}, -\sigma), \quad (3.27)$$

$$\gamma^3 \gamma^1 v(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) = (-1)^{\frac{1}{2}-\sigma} v^*(-\mathbf{p}, -\sigma). \quad (3.28)$$

If we expect the two inversions to map the field at some point  $x$  into something proportional to itself at the corresponding point  $x'$ , it is necessary to set the intrinsic parities  $\eta_{\pm\frac{1}{2}}, \eta_{\pm\frac{1}{2}}^c$  (3.20) and the time-reversal phases  $\phi, \phi^c$  (3.21) for the particle and its anti-particle related respectively as

$$\eta_{\pm\frac{1}{2}}^* = -\eta_{\pm\frac{1}{2}}^c, \quad \phi = -\phi^c, \quad (3.29)$$

which implies the intrinsic parities of particles and their anti-particles are related as in the standard case without the Wigner degeneracy. In this case, transformations on the fields can be highly simplified as

$$U(\mathcal{P})\psi_n(x)U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = \eta_n^* \gamma^0 \psi_n(\mathcal{P}x), \quad (3.30)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T})\psi_n(x)U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) = e^{in\phi} \gamma^1 \gamma^3 \psi_{-n}(\mathcal{T}x), \quad (3.31)$$

and

$$U(\mathcal{P})\bar{\psi}_n(x)U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = \eta_n \bar{\psi}_n(\mathcal{P}x) \gamma^0, \quad (3.32)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T})\bar{\psi}_n(x)U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) = e^{-in\phi} \bar{\psi}_{-n}(\mathcal{T}x) \gamma^3 \gamma^1. \quad (3.33)$$

We can also rewrite the transformations in terms of the doublet  $\Psi(x)$  (3.1) as

$$U(\mathcal{P})\Psi(x)U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{P})\Psi(\mathcal{P}x), \quad (3.34)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T})\Psi(x)U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{T})\Psi(\mathcal{T}x), \quad (3.35)$$

with the two unitary matrices

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{P}) = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{+\frac{1}{2}}^* \gamma^0 & 0 \\ 0 & \eta_{-\frac{1}{2}}^* \gamma^0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{T}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{i\phi/2} \gamma^1 \gamma^3 \\ e^{-i\phi/2} \gamma^1 \gamma^3 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.36)$$

The general formula of the two discrete inversions on the Wigner multiplets (3.18)-(3.19) can be simplified via Eqs. (3.20),(3.21), and (3.29)

$$\begin{aligned} U(\mathcal{P})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a\rangle &= \eta_m |-\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a\rangle, \\ U(\mathcal{P})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^c\rangle &= -\eta_m^* |-\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^c\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (3.37)$$

$$\begin{aligned} U(\mathcal{T})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a\rangle &= (-1)^{\frac{1}{2}-\sigma} e^{-in\phi} |-\mathbf{p}, -\sigma, -n; a\rangle, \\ U(\mathcal{T})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^c\rangle &= (-1)^{\frac{1}{2}-\sigma} e^{in\phi} |-\mathbf{p}, -\sigma, -n; a^c\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

It is remarkable to note that the Wigner degeneracy generally provides additional contribution to the action of  $U^2(\mathcal{T})$  on the one-particle states with  $e^{i\phi} \neq 1$

$$U^2(\mathcal{T})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, \pm\frac{1}{2}; a^{(c)}\rangle = -e^{\pm i\phi^{(c)}} |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, \pm\frac{1}{2}; a^{(c)}\rangle = -[e^{\pm i\phi}]^{(*)} |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, \pm\frac{1}{2}; a^{(c)}\rangle, \quad (3.39)$$

which recovers the standard case of Eq. (2.21) with  $e^{i\phi} = 1$  and we have imposed the relation of the time-reversal phases (3.29) in the second equality. In particular, the action of  $U^2(\mathcal{T})$  on the one-particle states will have an opposite sign to the standard case with  $e^{i\phi} = -1$ .

It is very important to know how the various bilinear forms transform under the two inversions, especially in constructing Lagrangians. The bilinear form of the Wigner fields  $\bar{\chi}_m \Gamma \psi_n$  have five standard forms of the matrix  $\Gamma$ :

$$\mathbb{1}, \gamma^\mu, \sigma^{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{i}{2} [\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu], \gamma^\mu \gamma^5, \gamma^5, \quad (3.40)$$

We can have the spatial parity transformation on the bilinear form utilizing that on the Wigner fields (3.30)

$$U(\mathcal{P}) [\bar{\chi}_m(x) \Gamma \psi_n(x)] U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = (\tilde{\eta}_m / \eta_m) \bar{\chi}_m(\mathcal{P}x) \gamma^0 \Gamma \gamma^0 \psi_n(\mathcal{P}x), \quad (3.41)$$

where  $\tilde{\eta}_m$  and  $\eta_m$  are intrinsic parities for  $\chi_m$  and  $\psi_n$  respectively. So taking the matrix  $\Gamma$  as the five standard forms (3.40) yield the bilinear form that transforms as a scalar, vector, tensor, pseudo- (or axial-) vector, and pseudoscalar, respectively up to a ratio of intrinsic parities<sup>14</sup>. This result is consistent with the conventional QFT since the transformation matrix of the spatial parity (3.20) is taken to be diagonal with respect to the Wigner degeneracy here. The exotic phenomena occurs when we act the time-reversal (3.21) on the bilinear form

$$U(\mathcal{T}) [\bar{\chi}_m(x) \Gamma \psi_n(x)] U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) = e^{-i(m\tilde{\phi}-n\phi)} \bar{\chi}_{-m}(\mathcal{T}x) \Gamma_t \psi_{-n}(\mathcal{T}x), \quad (3.42)$$

with  $\Gamma_t \equiv \mathcal{T} \Gamma^* \mathcal{T}^{-1}$ ,  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}^{-1} = i\gamma^1 \gamma^3$ . We can see that the time-reversal flips the Wigner degeneracy but remains a similar formula as the standard case up to a discrepancy of the time-reversal phase factor.

---

<sup>14</sup> $\tilde{\eta}_m \eta_n^* = \tilde{\eta}_m / \eta_n$ , with  $\eta_n \eta_n^* = 1$ .

### 3.3 Charge-conjugation on the Wigner multiplets

In preceding sections, we have investigated the representations of the Poincaré group, the isometry group of the Minkowski spacetime. In this section, we will introduce the charge-conjugation symmetry between particles and their associated anti-particles, which have nothing to do with the Lorentz invariance but is a typical internal symmetry. In the standard representation, charge-conjugation interchanges particles and anti-particles with an additional phase

$$U(\mathcal{C})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma; a\rangle = \eta_C |\mathbf{p}, \sigma; a^c\rangle, \quad (3.43)$$

$$U(\mathcal{C})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma; a^c\rangle = \eta_C^c |\mathbf{p}, \sigma; a\rangle = \eta_C^* |\mathbf{p}, \sigma; a\rangle, \quad (3.44)$$

$$U^2(\mathcal{C})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma; a^{(c)}\rangle = \eta_C \eta_C^c |\mathbf{p}, \sigma; a^{(c)}\rangle = |\mathbf{p}, \sigma; a^{(c)}\rangle, \quad (3.45)$$

where the phases  $\eta_C$  and  $\eta_C^c$  are the charge-conjugation parities for the particle and the antiparticle respectively. Their equality  $\eta_C^* = \eta_C^c$  can be further derived by the requirement of the causal field to be transformed into another field commuting at space-like separations. Similar to  $U(\mathcal{P})$  described generally in Section 2.1,  $U(\mathcal{C})$  can also be redefined by multiplying other existing continuous internal symmetries. In Section 3, we have seen that the time-reversal transformation for the degenerate multiplet can be different from the standard representation without the Wigner degeneracy. Utilizing the same methodology, for the particle state  $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a\rangle$  with the Wigner degeneracy, the unitary charge-conjugation operator  $U(\mathcal{C})$  maps it to a linear superposition of anti-particle states  $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^c\rangle$  summed over the degenerate degrees of freedom

$$U(\mathcal{C})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a\rangle = \sum_{n'} D_{n'n}(\mathcal{C}) |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n'; a^c\rangle, \quad (3.46)$$

and in the reverse direction,  $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^c\rangle$  transformed to a linear combination of  $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a\rangle$

$$U(\mathcal{C})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^c\rangle = \sum_{n'} D_{n'n}^c(\mathcal{C}) |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n'; a\rangle. \quad (3.47)$$

Therefore, the annihilation and creation operators transform as

$$U(\mathcal{C})a_n^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)U^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) = \sum_{n'} D_{n'n}(\mathcal{C})a_{n'}^{c\dagger}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma), \quad (3.48)$$

$$U(\mathcal{C})a_n(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)U^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) = \sum_{n'} D_{n'n}^*(\mathcal{C})a_{n'}^c(\mathbf{p}, \sigma), \quad (3.49)$$

$$U(\mathcal{C})a_n^{c\dagger}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)U^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) = \sum_{n'} D_{n'n}^c(\mathcal{C})a_{n'}^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma), \quad (3.50)$$

$$U(\mathcal{C})a_n^c(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)U^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) = \sum_{n'} D_{n'n}^{c*}(\mathcal{C})a_{n'}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma), \quad (3.51)$$

inducing the charge-conjugation transformation for  $\psi_n(x)$

$$U(\mathcal{C})\psi_n(x)U^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) = -i\gamma^2 \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E_{\mathbf{p}}}} \sum_{\sigma, n'} \left[ e^{-ip \cdot x} v^*(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) D_{n'n}^*(\mathcal{C}) a_{n'}^c(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) + e^{ip \cdot x} u^*(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) D_{n'n}^c(\mathcal{C}) a_{n'}^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) \right], \quad (3.52)$$



where we have imposed the following identities compatible with the polarizations (3.11)-(3.12)

$$-i\gamma^2 u^*(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) = v(\mathbf{p}, \sigma), \quad (3.53)$$

$$-i\gamma^2 v^*(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) = u(\mathbf{p}, \sigma). \quad (3.54)$$

If we expect charge conjugation to map  $\psi_n(x)$  to a linear combination of  $\psi_n^*(x)$  summed over  $n$ , then  $D(\mathcal{C})$  and  $D^c(\mathcal{C})$  must satisfy

$$D^*(\mathcal{C}) = D^c(\mathcal{C}), \quad (3.55)$$

which is consistent with the result in the standard case (3.44). Then, we can obtain the action of the charge-conjugation on the field

$$U(\mathcal{C})\psi_n(x)U^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) = -i \sum_{n'} D_{n'n}^*(\mathcal{C})\gamma^2\psi_{n'}^*(x), \quad (3.56)$$

and

$$U(\mathcal{C})\bar{\psi}_n(x)U^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) = i \sum_{n'} D_{n'n}(\mathcal{C})\psi_{n'}^T(x)\gamma^0\gamma^2. \quad (3.57)$$

In order to clarify the possibilities provided by the Wigner degeneracy, we can apply two successive charge-conjugation transformations (3.46)-(3.47) on the one-particle state

$$U^2(\mathcal{C})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^{(c)}\rangle = \sum_{n'} [D^*(\mathcal{C})D(\mathcal{C})]_{n'n}^{(*)} |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n'; a^{(c)}\rangle, \quad (3.58)$$

where  $D(\mathcal{C}) \in U(2) = U(1) \times SU(2)$  can be factorized by a factor  $\theta$  and a three dimensional vector  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)$

$$\begin{aligned} D[\mathcal{C}(\theta, \boldsymbol{\theta})] &= e^{i\theta/2} \exp(i\theta_a \tau^a), \\ D^*[\mathcal{C}(\theta, \boldsymbol{\theta})] &= e^{-i\theta/2} \exp(-i\theta_a \tau^{a*}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.59)$$

with  $\tau^a = \frac{\sigma^a}{2}$ ,  $a = 1, 2, 3$  so that

$$D^*[\mathcal{C}(\theta, \boldsymbol{\theta})]D[\mathcal{C}(\theta, \boldsymbol{\theta})] = \exp(-i\theta_a \tau^{a*}) \exp(i\theta_a \tau^a). \quad (3.60)$$

The general formula of  $D[\mathcal{C}(\theta, \boldsymbol{\theta})]$  can thus be given as

$$D[\mathcal{C}(\theta, \boldsymbol{\theta})] = e^{i\theta/2} \begin{bmatrix} \cos \frac{|\boldsymbol{\theta}|}{2} + i\hat{\theta}_3 \sin \frac{|\boldsymbol{\theta}|}{2} & (\hat{\theta}_2 + i\hat{\theta}_1) \sin \frac{|\boldsymbol{\theta}|}{2} \\ (-\hat{\theta}_2 + i\hat{\theta}_1) \sin \frac{|\boldsymbol{\theta}|}{2} & \cos \frac{|\boldsymbol{\theta}|}{2} - i\hat{\theta}_3 \sin \frac{|\boldsymbol{\theta}|}{2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.61)$$

$$D^*[\mathcal{C}(\theta, \boldsymbol{\theta})] = e^{-i\theta/2} \begin{bmatrix} \cos \frac{|\boldsymbol{\theta}|}{2} - i\hat{\theta}_3 \sin \frac{|\boldsymbol{\theta}|}{2} & (\hat{\theta}_2 - i\hat{\theta}_1) \sin \frac{|\boldsymbol{\theta}|}{2} \\ (-\hat{\theta}_2 - i\hat{\theta}_1) \sin \frac{|\boldsymbol{\theta}|}{2} & \cos \frac{|\boldsymbol{\theta}|}{2} + i\hat{\theta}_3 \sin \frac{|\boldsymbol{\theta}|}{2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.62)$$

with  $\hat{\theta}_a \equiv \theta_a/|\boldsymbol{\theta}|$ ,  $a = 1, 2, 3$ <sup>15</sup>,  $|\boldsymbol{\theta}| \equiv \sqrt{\theta_1^2 + \theta_2^2 + \theta_3^2}$  so that

$$\begin{aligned} &D^*[\mathcal{C}(\theta, \boldsymbol{\theta})]D[\mathcal{C}(\theta, \boldsymbol{\theta})] \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} (\hat{\theta}_1^2 + i\hat{\theta}_1\hat{\theta}_2 + \hat{\theta}_3^2) + \hat{\theta}_2(\hat{\theta}_2 - i\hat{\theta}_1) \cos |\boldsymbol{\theta}| & \hat{\theta}_2 [\sin |\boldsymbol{\theta}| - i\hat{\theta}_3(1 - \cos |\boldsymbol{\theta}|)] \\ -\hat{\theta}_2 [\sin |\boldsymbol{\theta}| + i\hat{\theta}_3(1 - \cos |\boldsymbol{\theta}|)] & (\hat{\theta}_1^2 - i\hat{\theta}_1\hat{\theta}_2 + \hat{\theta}_3^2) + \hat{\theta}_2(\hat{\theta}_2 + i\hat{\theta}_1) \cos |\boldsymbol{\theta}| \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.63)$$

<sup>15</sup>If  $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \theta_3 = 0$ ,  $\hat{\theta}_1 = \hat{\theta}_2 = \hat{\theta}_3 \equiv 1$ .

If  $\theta_2 = 0$ , we have  $D^*[\mathcal{C}(\theta, \theta_1, 0, \theta_3)] = D[\mathcal{C}(-\theta, -\theta_1, 0, -\theta_3)]$  and

$$D^*[\mathcal{C}(\theta, \theta_1, 0, \theta_3)]D[\mathcal{C}(\theta, \theta_1, 0, \theta_3)] = \mathbf{1}, \quad (3.64)$$

since  $\tau^{1,3*} = \tau^{1,3}$ . If  $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} D[\mathcal{C}(\theta, 0, 0, \theta_3)] &= e^{i\theta/2} e^{i\theta_3 \tau^3} = e^{i\theta/2} \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\theta_3/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\theta_3/2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\zeta_+} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\zeta_-} \end{bmatrix}, \\ D^*[\mathcal{C}(\theta, 0, 0, \theta_3)] &= e^{-i\theta/2} e^{-i\theta_3 \tau^3} = e^{-i\theta/2} \begin{bmatrix} e^{-i\theta_3/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\theta_3/2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-i\zeta_+} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\zeta_-} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.65)$$

with  $\zeta_{\pm} \equiv (\theta \pm \theta_3)/2$ . If  $\theta_2 = \theta_3 = 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} D[\mathcal{C}(\theta, \boldsymbol{\theta})] &= e^{i\theta/2} e^{i\theta_1 \tau^1} = e^{i\theta/2} \begin{bmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} & i \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} \\ i \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} & \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \end{bmatrix}, \\ D^*[\mathcal{C}(\theta, \boldsymbol{\theta})] &= e^{-i\theta/2} e^{-i\theta_1 \tau^1} = e^{-i\theta/2} \begin{bmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} & -i \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} \\ -i \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} & \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.66)$$

In contrast, if  $\theta_1 = \theta_3 = 0$ , we have  $D^*[\mathcal{C}(\theta, 0, \theta_2, 0)] = e^{-i\theta} D[\mathcal{C}(\theta, 0, \theta_2, 0)]$  and

$$\begin{aligned} D[\mathcal{C}(\theta, 0, \theta_2, 0)] &= e^{i\theta/2} e^{i\theta_2 \tau^2} = e^{i\theta/2} \begin{bmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} & \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} \\ -\sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} & \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} \end{bmatrix}, \\ D^*[\mathcal{C}(\theta, 0, \theta_2, 0)] &= e^{-i\theta/2} e^{i\theta_2 \tau^2} = e^{-i\theta/2} \begin{bmatrix} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} & \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} \\ -\sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} & \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} \end{bmatrix}, \\ D^*[\mathcal{C}(\theta, 0, \theta_2, 0)]D[\mathcal{C}(\theta, 0, \theta_2, 0)] &= \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta_2 & \sin \theta_2 \\ -\sin \theta_2 & \cos \theta_2 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.67)$$

In particular, if we impose  $\theta_1 = \theta_3 = 0$  and  $\theta_2 = \pi$ ,  $D^*[\mathcal{C}(\theta, 0, \pi, 0)]D[\mathcal{C}(\theta, 0, \pi, 0)] = -\mathbf{1}$  can be provided, which has an additional sign compared to the case of  $\theta_2 = 0$  (3.64) and the conventional QFT without the Wigner degeneracy (3.45), referring to Eq. (3.58). It is also interesting to study the charge-conjugation properties of bilinear forms by Eqs. (3.56)-(3.57)

$$\begin{aligned} U(\mathcal{C}) [\bar{\chi}_m(x) \Gamma \psi_n(x)] U^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) &= \sum_{m', n'} \tilde{D}_{m'm}(\mathcal{C}) D_{n'n}^*(\mathcal{C}) [\bar{\psi}_{n'}(x) \Gamma_c \chi_{m'}(x)] \\ &= \sum_{m', n'} \tilde{D}_{m'm}(\mathcal{C}) D_{n'n}^*(\mathcal{C}) [\bar{\chi}_{m'}(x) \gamma^0 \Gamma_c^\dagger \gamma^0 \psi_{n'}(x)]^\dagger, \end{aligned} \quad (3.68)$$

where we have inserted anticommuting relations for two fermionic spinors in the fourth step and ignored a c-number anticommutator. We define  $\Gamma_c \equiv (\mathcal{C}^{-1} \Gamma \mathcal{C})^T = \mathcal{C}^{-1} \Gamma^T \mathcal{C}$  with  $\mathcal{C} \equiv -i\gamma^2 \gamma^0 = -\mathcal{C}^{-1} = -\mathcal{C}^\dagger = -\mathcal{C}^T$ , satisfying  $\mathcal{C}^{-1} \gamma^\mu \mathcal{C} = -\gamma^{\mu T}$ . We can see that the item in the bracket of Eq. (3.68) has the similar form with the standard case without the Wigner degeneracy, while the diagonal  $\tilde{D}(\mathcal{C})$  and  $D(\mathcal{C})$  for the fields  $\chi_m(x)$  and  $\psi_n(x)$ , indicating no Wigner degeneracy mixing, will recover the standard case. In contrast, the non-diagonal

$\tilde{D}(\mathcal{C})$  and  $D(\mathcal{C})$  introduce the Wigner degeneracy mixing and manifestly break the charge-conjugation symmetry, unless some particular combination of the Wigner fields is imposed on purpose. Besides, since the transformation matrix  $D(\mathcal{P})$  (3.30) for the space inversion is diagonal, the invariance of the CP product transformation keep consistent with that of the charge-conjugation.

#### 4 A challenge to the CPT theorem

We now derive the CPT transformation for the states and quantum fields. For the particle and antiparticle states with Wigner degeneracy, by inserting the general results from Eqs. (3.18), (3.19), and (3.46)-(3.47), we have

$$\Theta|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a\rangle = (-1)^{1/2-\sigma} \sum_{n'} \Xi_{n'n} |\mathbf{p}, -\sigma, n'; a^c\rangle, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\Theta|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^c\rangle = (-1)^{1/2-\sigma} \sum_{n'} \Xi_{n'n}^c |\mathbf{p}, -\sigma, n'; a\rangle, \quad (4.2)$$

where  $\Theta$  is an antiunitary and antilinear operator, defined as  $\Theta \equiv U(\mathcal{C})U(\mathcal{P})U(\mathcal{T})$ , with the associated unitary matrix  $\Xi^{(c)} \equiv D^{(c)}(\mathcal{C})D^{(c)}(\mathcal{P})D^{(c)}(\mathcal{T})$ . As shown in the previous section, when C, P and T are symmetries of the quantum fields, the matrices on the right-hand side of Eqs. (4.1)-(4.2) are related by

$$D^*(\mathcal{C}) = D^c(\mathcal{C}), \quad D^*(\mathcal{P}) = -D^c(\mathcal{P}), \quad D^*(\mathcal{T}) = D^c(\mathcal{T}), \quad (4.3)$$

which leads to the relationship

$$\Xi^* = -\Xi^c. \quad (4.4)$$

The explicit formula of  $\Xi$  can be obtained by a direct calculation with Eq. (3.20), (3.21), and (3.61)

$$\Theta|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a\rangle = (-1)^{\frac{1}{2}-\sigma} \eta_{-n} e^{-in\phi} \sum_{n'} D_{n'-n}(\mathcal{C}) |\mathbf{p}, -\sigma, n'; a^c\rangle, \quad (4.5)$$

so that

$$\Xi_{n'n} = \eta_{-n} e^{-in\phi} D_{n'-n}(\mathcal{C}), \quad (4.6)$$

$$\Xi = e^{i\theta/2} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{-\frac{1}{2}}(i\hat{\theta}_1 + \hat{\theta}_2)e^{-i\phi/2} \sin \frac{|\theta|}{2} & \eta_{+\frac{1}{2}} \left( \cos \frac{|\theta|}{2} + i\hat{\theta}_3 \sin \frac{|\theta|}{2} \right) e^{i\phi/2} \\ \eta_{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( \cos \frac{|\theta|}{2} - i\hat{\theta}_3 \sin \frac{|\theta|}{2} \right) e^{-i\phi/2} & \eta_{+\frac{1}{2}}(i\hat{\theta}_1 - \hat{\theta}_2)e^{i\phi/2} \sin \frac{|\theta|}{2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.7)$$

In the conventional QFT without the Wigner degeneracy, two successive CPT transformations on the states can be calculated by Eqs. (2.19), (2.20), and (3.43)-(3.45)

$$\Theta^2|\mathbf{p}, \sigma; a\rangle = -\eta_C^* \eta_P^* \eta_T^* \eta_C^c \eta_P^c \eta_T^c |\mathbf{p}, \sigma; a\rangle = |\mathbf{p}, \sigma; a\rangle, \quad (4.8)$$

where  $\eta_P^c = -\eta_P^*$ ,  $\eta_T^c = \eta_T^*$ ,  $\eta_C^c = \eta_C^*$  and we conventionally set  $\eta_C \eta_P \eta_T = 1$  for particle  $a$ . Thus, the fermionic state is invariant under two CPT reflections. Let us now consider two successive CPT transformations on the Wigner multiplets

$$\Theta^2 |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a\rangle = \sum_{n'} \Xi_{n'n}^{*2} |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n'; a\rangle, \quad (4.9)$$

$$\Theta^2 |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^c\rangle = \sum_{n'} \Xi_{n'n}^2 |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n'; a^c\rangle, \quad (4.10)$$

where we have used the property of  $\Xi$  in Eq. (4.4).

We will explore the CPT transformations of the states and the properties of  $\Xi$  in further detail in Sections 4.1 and 4.2. The Wigner degeneracy introduces additional complexity to the CPT symmetry, which in conventional QFT is a direct consequence in the standard representation of the Lorentz invariance. It is a remarkable result that the scattering amplitude for a given process is exactly the same as that for the reverse process, where all the incoming particles are turned into outgoing anti-particles and vice versa, to all orders of perturbation theory. However, due to the presence of  $\Xi$  in the CPT transformations for states with Wigner degeneracy, this symmetry requires a careful examination. Therefore, we need to review the CPT theorem thoroughly, taking these additional factors into account. Let us write down the action of the product CPT transformation on the free Wigner fields,

$$\Theta \psi_n(x) \Theta^{-1} = \sum_{n'} \Xi_{n'n}^* \gamma^5 \psi_{n'}^*(-x), \quad (4.11)$$

$$\Theta \bar{\psi}_n(x) \Theta^{-1} = \sum_{n'} \Xi_{n'n} \psi_{n'}^T(-x) \gamma^5 \gamma^0, \quad (4.12)$$

while two successive CPT transformations can also be applied

$$\Theta^2 \psi_n(x) \Theta^{-2} = \sum_{n'} \Xi_{n'n}^2 \psi_{n'}(x), \quad (4.13)$$

$$\Theta^2 \bar{\psi}_n(x) \Theta^{-2} = \sum_{n'} \Xi_{n'n}^{*2} \bar{\psi}_{n'}(x). \quad (4.14)$$

Applying Eqs. (4.11)-(4.12) to the product CPT transformation on bilinear forms of the Wigner spinors gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta [\bar{\chi}_m(x) \Gamma \psi_n(x)] \Theta^{-1} &= \sum_{m', n'} \tilde{\Xi}_{m'm} \Xi_{n'n}^* [\chi_{m'}^T(-x) \gamma^5 \gamma^0 \Gamma^* \gamma^5 \psi_{n'}^*(-x)] \\ &= (-1)^r \sum_{m', n'} \tilde{\Xi}_{m'm} \Xi_{n'n}^* [\bar{\chi}_{m'}(-x) \Gamma \psi_{n'}(-x)]^\dagger, \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{m'}^T(-x) \gamma^5 \gamma^0 \Gamma^* \gamma^5 \psi_{n'}^*(-x) &= \bar{\psi}_{n'}(-x) (\gamma^0 \gamma^5 \Gamma^* \gamma^5 \gamma^0)^T \chi_{m'}(-x) \\ &= [\bar{\chi}_{m'}(-x) (\gamma^5 \Gamma \gamma^5) \psi_{n'}(-x)]^\dagger, \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

$$\gamma^5 \Gamma \gamma^5 = (-1)^r \Gamma, \quad (4.17)$$

where  $\chi_m$  and  $\psi_n$  are anticommuting fields as in Eq. (3.68).  $r$  is the rank of the tensor  $\Gamma$ . In particular, if one chooses the same CPT matrix for all the Wigner fields (even for different particle species)<sup>16</sup>, inserting  $\tilde{\Xi} = \Xi$  to Eq. (4.15) gives

$$\Theta \left[ \sum_n \bar{\chi}_n(x) \Gamma \psi_n(x) \right] \Theta^{-1} = (-1)^r \left[ \sum_n \bar{\chi}_n(-x) \Gamma \psi_n(-x) \right]^\dagger. \quad (4.18)$$

While the general form of  $\Xi$  (4.7) depends on eight parameters, the CPT transformation  $\Theta$  can be separated into two distinct and typical classes. Since  $\Theta$  is antilinear and antiunitary, the unitary matrix  $\Xi$  can generally be transformed to be either diagonal or block-diagonal. In the block-diagonal case, the diagonal elements vanish, and the off-diagonal elements (phases) are related by complex conjugation, assuming no other constraints. To clearly present the nontrivial effects of  $\Xi$ , we simplify it by choosing the appropriate parameters to make  $\Xi$  either diagonal (see Section 4.1) or block-diagonal (see Section 4.2). We will demonstrate that the invariance under CPT transformations is interestingly the opposite of the invariance under the CP (or C) transformation described in Section 3.3, with this difference fundamentally arising from the block-diagonal nature of the time-reversal transformation discussed in Eqs. (3.21) and (3.36).

#### 4.1 Diagonal CPT

Let us first consider the diagonal configuration of the CPT matrix  $\Xi$  (4.7), factorized as

$$\Xi = \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\vartheta_+/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\vartheta_-/2} \end{bmatrix} \equiv e^{i\theta/2} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{-\frac{1}{2}}(i\hat{\theta}_1 + \hat{\theta}_2)e^{-i\phi/2} & 0 \\ 0 & \eta_{+\frac{1}{2}}(i\hat{\theta}_1 - \hat{\theta}_2)e^{i\phi/2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4.19)$$

with  $\vartheta_\pm \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\hat{\theta}_3 = 0$ ,  $|\theta| = \pi$ , i.e., diagonal elements of  $D(\mathcal{C})$  (3.61) vanish. Using Eqs. (4.1)-(4.2), we obtain

$$\Theta |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a\rangle = (-1)^{1/2-\sigma} e^{i\vartheta_{2n}/2} |\mathbf{p}, -\sigma, n; a^c\rangle, \quad (4.20)$$

$$\Theta |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^c\rangle = -(-1)^{1/2-\sigma} e^{-i\vartheta_{2n}/2} |\mathbf{p}, -\sigma, n; a\rangle, \quad (4.21)$$

and Eqs. (4.9)-(4.10) give

$$\Theta^2 |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a\rangle = e^{-i\vartheta_{2n}} |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a\rangle, \quad (4.22)$$

$$\Theta^2 |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^c\rangle = e^{i\vartheta_{2n}} |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^c\rangle. \quad (4.23)$$

Note that  $e^{i\vartheta_{2n}} = -1$ , with  $n = +\frac{1}{2}$  or  $-\frac{1}{2}$ , provides the new possibility of an additional sign relative to the result in the conventional QFT (4.8). Furthermore, if we require the action of  $\Theta^2$  on the particle and anti-particle states corresponding to any Wigner index to be the same, the phases in Eq. (4.19) must be set to  $e^{i\vartheta_+} = e^{i\vartheta_-} = \pm 1$  which then corresponds to  $\Theta^2 = \pm 1$  respectively. When  $\Xi$  is given by Eq. (4.19), the CPT transformations on the Wigner fields in Eqs. (4.11)-(4.12) can be simplified into

$$\Theta \psi_n(x) \Theta^{-1} = e^{-i\vartheta_{2n}/2} \gamma^5 \psi_n^*(-x), \quad (4.24)$$

$$\Theta \bar{\psi}_n(x) \Theta^{-1} = e^{i\vartheta_{2n}/2} \psi_n^T(-x) \gamma^5 \gamma^0, \quad (4.25)$$

---

<sup>16</sup>This convention is analogous to that in the conventional QFT.

so that the doublet  $\Psi(x)$  (3.1) and its Dirac dual <sup>17</sup>

$$\bar{\Psi}(x) \equiv \Psi^\dagger(x)\gamma^0, \quad (4.26)$$

are given by

$$\Theta\Psi(x)\Theta^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-i\vartheta_+/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\vartheta_-/2} \end{bmatrix} \gamma^5 \Psi^*(-x), \quad (4.27)$$

$$\Theta\bar{\Psi}(x)\Theta^{-1} = \Psi^T(-x)\gamma^5\gamma^0 \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\vartheta_+/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\vartheta_-/2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.28)$$

Performing another successive CPT transformation on Eqs. (4.24)-(4.25) yield

$$\Theta^2\psi_n(x)\Theta^{-2} = e^{i\vartheta_{2n}}\psi_n(x), \quad (4.29)$$

$$\Theta^2\bar{\psi}_n(x)\Theta^{-2} = e^{-i\vartheta_{2n}}\bar{\psi}_n(x), \quad (4.30)$$

and

$$\Theta^2\Psi(x)\Theta^{-2} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\vartheta_+} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\vartheta_-} \end{bmatrix} \Psi(x), \quad (4.31)$$

$$\Theta^2\bar{\Psi}(x)\Theta^{-2} = \bar{\Psi}(x) \begin{bmatrix} e^{-i\vartheta_+} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\vartheta_-} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4.32)$$

so it corroborates with the general formula we obtained in Eqs. (4.13)-(4.14). The general result of the CPT product transformation on bilinear forms of Eq. (4.15) can be further simplified with the diagonal  $\tilde{\Xi}$  and  $\Xi$  in the form of Eq. (4.19)

$$\Theta [\bar{\chi}_m(x)\Gamma\psi_n(x)] \Theta^{-1} = (-1)^r e^{i\tilde{\vartheta}_{2m}/2} e^{-i\vartheta_{2n}/2} [\bar{\chi}_m(-x)\Gamma\psi_n(-x)]^\dagger, \quad (4.33)$$

which keeps the identical form as the conventional QFT. Thus, under the diagonal configuration of the CPT matrix  $\Xi$  (4.7), one can always chooses the intrinsic CPT phases so that every Poincaré invariant term in  $\mathcal{L}(x)$  will be mapped to its Hermitian conjugate evaluated at  $-x$ , leaving the action invariant. This result aligns with our original expectation since the diagonal  $\Xi$  (4.7) does not introduce any mixing of the Wigner degeneracy. In particular, the CPT transformation on  $\bar{\Psi}(x)\Psi(x)$  can be derived directly from Eq. (4.33) with  $\chi = \psi$ ,  $\Gamma = \mathbb{1}$  or from Eqs. (4.27)-(4.28):

$$\Theta\bar{\Psi}(x)\Psi(x)\Theta^{-1} = \bar{\Psi}(-x)\Psi(-x), \quad (4.34)$$

which is consistent with the general result in Eq. (4.18).

---

<sup>17</sup>In matrix form  $\bar{\Psi}(x) \equiv [\bar{\psi}_{+\frac{1}{2}}(x) \ \bar{\psi}_{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)]$ .

## 4.2 Block-diagonal CPT

Next, we consider the block-diagonal configuration of the CPT matrix  $\Xi$  (4.7)

$$\Xi = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{i\varphi/2} \\ e^{-i\varphi/2} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \eta_{+\frac{1}{2}} e^{i\theta_3/2} e^{i\phi/2} \\ \eta_{+\frac{1}{2}}^* e^{-i\theta_3/2} e^{-i\phi/2} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4.35)$$

with  $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\eta_{+\frac{1}{2}} = \eta_{-\frac{1}{2}}^*$ ,  $(\theta, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = (0, 0, 0, \theta_3)$ . That is,  $D(\mathcal{C})$  (3.61) becomes a diagonal element of the  $SU(2)$  group. Using Eqs. (4.1)-(4.2), we find

$$\Theta|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a\rangle = (-1)^{1/2-\sigma} e^{-in\varphi} |\mathbf{p}, -\sigma, -n; a^c\rangle, \quad (4.36)$$

$$\Theta|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^c\rangle = -(-1)^{1/2-\sigma} e^{in\varphi} |\mathbf{p}, -\sigma, -n; a\rangle. \quad (4.37)$$

Imposing the general formula of Eqs. (4.9)-(4.10), the results of two successive CPT transformations are

$$\Theta^2|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a\rangle = |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a\rangle, \quad (4.38)$$

$$\Theta^2|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^c\rangle = |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n; a^c\rangle, \quad (4.39)$$

which agree with the result in conventional QFT (4.8). When the block-diagonal  $\Xi$  is given by Eq. (4.19), the CPT transformations on the Wigner fields in Eqs. (4.11)-(4.12) can be simplified to

$$\Theta\psi_n(x)\Theta^{-1} = e^{in\varphi}\gamma^5\psi_{-n}^*(-x), \quad (4.40)$$

$$\Theta\bar{\psi}_n(x)\Theta^{-1} = e^{-in\varphi}\psi_{-n}^T(-x)\gamma^5\gamma^0, \quad (4.41)$$

and

$$\Theta\Psi(x)\Theta^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{i\varphi/2} \\ e^{-i\varphi/2} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \gamma^5 \Psi^*(-x), \quad (4.42)$$

$$\Theta\bar{\Psi}(x)\Theta^{-1} = \Psi^T(-x)\gamma^5\gamma^0 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{i\varphi/2} \\ e^{-i\varphi/2} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.43)$$

Performing another successive CPT transformation on Eqs. (4.40)-(4.41) yield

$$\Theta^2\psi_n(x)\Theta^{-2} = \psi_n(x), \quad (4.44)$$

$$\Theta^2\bar{\psi}_n(x)\Theta^{-2} = \bar{\psi}_n(x), \quad (4.45)$$

and

$$\Theta^2\Psi(x)\Theta^2 = \Psi(x), \quad (4.46)$$

$$\Theta^2\bar{\Psi}(x)\Theta^{-2} = \bar{\Psi}(x), \quad (4.47)$$

without any additional phases and recovering the result in Eqs. (4.11)-(4.12) with the block-diagonal configuration (4.35). The general result of the CPT product transformation on

bilinear forms of Eq. (4.15) can be further simplified with the block-diagonal  $\tilde{\Xi}$  and  $\Xi$  in the form of Eq. (4.35):

$$\Theta [\bar{\chi}_m(x)\Gamma\psi_n(x)] \Theta^{-1} = (-1)^r e^{-im\tilde{\varphi}} e^{in\varphi} [\bar{\chi}_{-m}(-x)\Gamma\psi_{-n}(-x)]^\dagger, \quad (4.48)$$

which flips the Wigner degeneracies, distinguishing from the diagonal case of Eq. (4.33). However, this exchange of the Wigner degeneracies would not change the Lagrangian if there is a sum over the Wigner degeneracy. For instance, the CPT transformation on  $\bar{\Psi}(x)\Psi(x)$  derived from Eq. (4.48) with  $\chi = \psi$ ,  $\Gamma = \mathbf{1}$  or Eqs. (4.42)-(4.43)

$$\Theta \bar{\Psi}(x)\Psi(x)\Theta^{-1} = \bar{\Psi}(-x)\Psi(-x), \quad (4.49)$$

keeps the Lagrangian term invariant, while its general formula of Eq. (4.18) also insists on this consequence.

## 5 Canonical formalism: the Wigner Lagrangian

In modern QFT, the canonical formalism, based on postulating the Lagrangian and applying canonical quantization, serves as the foundational starting point for analyzing any given system. The Lagrangian formalism provides a clear path to identifying symmetries such as Lorentz (or Poincaré) invariance, as well as other imposed symmetries. In this section, we will develop a suitable Lagrangian form and canonical quantization relations to describe free spinor fields that include the Wigner degeneracy, which arises from Lorentz invariance and discrete symmetry transformations, as outlined in previous sections.

### 5.1 Lagrangian of the free Wigner spinor fields

The free Lagrangian density of the two-fold Wigner spinor fields can be constructed as

$$\mathcal{L}_0(x) = \bar{\Psi}(x)(i\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu - m)\Psi(x), \quad (5.1)$$

where  $\Psi(x)$  is the corresponding doublet (3.1) and  $\bar{\Psi}(x)$  is its Dirac conjugation (4.26). This compact form can also be written in terms of the two Wigner fields  $\psi_n$ ,  $n = \pm\frac{1}{2}$  with the identical mass  $m$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}_0(x) = \sum_n \bar{\psi}_n(x)(i\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu - m)\psi_n(x), \quad (5.2)$$

which is a direct combination of two free Dirac fields associated to two Wigner multiplets respectively, without any term mixing the Wigner degeneracy. Thus, its Euler-Lagrange equations are simply two Dirac equations for the two Wigner degeneracy  $\psi_n(x)$ ,  $n = \pm\frac{1}{2}$  respectively. The canonical anti-commutation relations of the Wigner fields  $\psi_{n,\ell}(x)$  and their conjugate momenta  $i\psi_{n,\ell}^\dagger(x)$  can be directly extended as

$$\left\{ \psi_{n,\ell}(t, \mathbf{x}), i\psi_{n',\ell'}^\dagger(t, \mathbf{x}') \right\} = i\delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')\delta_{nn'}\delta_{\ell\ell'}, \quad (5.3)$$

$$\left\{ \psi_{n,\ell}(t, \mathbf{x}), \psi_{n',\ell'}^\dagger(t, \mathbf{x}') \right\} = \left\{ \psi_{n,\ell}^\dagger(t, \mathbf{x}), \psi_{n',\ell'}(t, \mathbf{x}') \right\} = 0, \quad (5.4)$$



which is almost identical to that in the standard free Dirac theory but with an extra Kronecker delta function  $\delta_{nn'}$  due to the Wigner degeneracy. In this configuration, these two solutions  $\psi_n(x)$ ,  $n = \pm\frac{1}{2}$  satisfy the causality conditions independently. One can Fourier expand  $\psi_n(x)$  in the momentum space with the annihilation  $a_n(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$  and creation  $a_n^{c\dagger}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$  operators for the particle and its associated anti-particle with the identical mass  $m$  as before in Eq. (3.2). The canonical quantization of Eqs. (3.5)-(3.6) is still applied to the creation and annihilation operators that generate the one particle states (3.3)-(3.4), with the particular vacuum (3.7). These two individual spinor field solutions  $\psi_n(x)$ ,  $n = \pm\frac{1}{2}$  of Eq. (3.2) share the same polarizations  $u(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$  and  $v(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)$  of Eqs. (3.11)-(3.12).

After performing the Legendre transformation, it is straightforward to show that the Lagrangian density of Eq. (5.1) yields the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &= \sum_n \int d^3x \left[ i\psi_n^\dagger(x)\dot{\psi}_n(x) - \mathcal{L}_0(x) \right] \\ &= \sum_n \int d^3x \bar{\psi}_n(x)(-i\gamma^i\partial_i + m)\psi_n(x) \\ &= \int d^3x \bar{\Psi}(x)(-i\gamma^i\partial_i + m)\Psi(x). \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

This formulates the Hamiltonian in terms of the Wigner spinor fields and their conjugate momenta. Applying the Fourier decomposition of the two spinor fields  $\psi_n(x)$ ,  $n = \pm\frac{1}{2}$  (3.2) and the ortho-normalization relations of polarizations (3.13)-(3.14), we find that

$$H_0 = \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{n,\sigma} E_{\mathbf{p}} \left[ a_n^\dagger(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)a_n(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) + a_n^{c\dagger}(\mathbf{p}, \sigma)a_n^c(\mathbf{p}, \sigma) \right], \quad (5.6)$$

which confirms a correct free Hamiltonian as always. We have omitted an infinite zero-point energy shift, which is typically irrelevant for physical calculations currently. In principle, if a given Lagrangian for free particles does not yield a Hamiltonian in terms of ladder operators (up to a constant term) and does not ensure a bounded from below spectrum, we would consider it to be the wrong Lagrangian.

## 5.2 P, C, CP, T, and CPT in the free Wigner theory

In the conventional QFT, the free fermion sector is invariant under P, C, CP, T, and CPT transformations separately. However, now they may mix different Wigner degeneracies, so we need to carefully examine how each of these symmetries acts on the Lagrangian of free Wigner spinor fields of Eqs. (5.1)-(5.2). Applying Eqs. (3.41), (3.42), (3.68), and (4.18)

with  $\Gamma = \gamma^\mu$ , we obtain

$$U(\mathcal{P}) [\bar{\psi}_n(x) \gamma^\mu \psi_n(x)] U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = \begin{cases} + \bar{\psi}_n \gamma^0 \psi_n(\mathcal{P}x), \\ - \bar{\psi}_n \gamma^i \psi_n(\mathcal{P}x), \end{cases} \quad (5.7)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T}) [\bar{\psi}_n(x) \gamma^\mu \psi_n(x)] U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) = \begin{cases} + \bar{\psi}_{-n} \gamma^0 \psi_{-n}(\mathcal{T}x), \\ - \bar{\psi}_{-n} \gamma^i \psi_{-n}(\mathcal{T}x), \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

$$U(\mathcal{C}) \left[ \sum_n \bar{\psi}_n(x) \gamma^\mu \psi_n(x) \right] U^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) = - \sum_n \bar{\psi}_n \gamma^\mu \psi_n(x), \quad (5.9)$$

$$\Theta \left[ \sum_n \bar{\psi}_n(x) \gamma^\mu \psi_n(x) \right] \Theta^{-1} = - \sum_n \bar{\psi}_n \gamma^\mu \psi_n(-x), \quad (5.10)$$

which lead to the invariance of the kinematic terms (5.1)-(5.2)

$$U(\mathcal{P}) [i\bar{\Psi}(x) \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \Psi(x)] U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = i\bar{\Psi} \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \Psi(\mathcal{P}x), \quad (5.11)$$

$$U(\mathcal{C}) [i\bar{\Psi}(x) \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \Psi(x)] U^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) = -i (\partial_\mu \bar{\Psi}) \gamma^\mu \Psi(x), \quad (5.12)$$

$$U(\mathcal{C})U(\mathcal{P}) [i\bar{\Psi}(x) \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \Psi(x)] U^{-1}(\mathcal{P})U^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) = -i (\partial_\mu \bar{\Psi}) \gamma^\mu \Psi(\mathcal{P}x), \quad (5.13)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T}) [i\bar{\Psi}(x) \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \Psi(x)] U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) = i\bar{\Psi} \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \Psi(\mathcal{T}x), \quad (5.14)$$

$$\Theta [i\bar{\Psi}(x) \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \Psi(x)] \Theta^{-1} = -i (\partial_\mu \bar{\Psi}) \gamma^\mu \Psi(-x). \quad (5.15)$$

The transformations of the scalar terms are given by Eqs. (3.41), (3.42), (3.68), and (4.18) with  $\Gamma = \mathbb{1}$ :

$$U(\mathcal{P}) [\bar{\psi}_n(x) \psi_n(x)] U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = \bar{\psi}_n \psi_n(\mathcal{P}x), \quad (5.16)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T}) [\bar{\psi}_n(x) \psi_n(x)] U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) = \bar{\psi}_{-n} \psi_{-n}(\mathcal{T}x), \quad (5.17)$$

$$U(\mathcal{C}) \left[ \sum_n \bar{\psi}_n(x) \psi_n(x) \right] U^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) = \sum_n \bar{\psi}_n \psi_n(x), \quad (5.18)$$

$$\Theta \left[ \sum_n \bar{\psi}_n(x) \psi_n(x) \right] \Theta^{-1} = \sum_n \bar{\psi}_n \psi_n(-x), \quad (5.19)$$

implying the invariance of the mass terms (5.1)-(5.2)

$$U(\mathcal{P}) [\bar{\Psi}(x) \Psi(x)] U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = \bar{\Psi} \Psi(\mathcal{P}x), \quad (5.20)$$

$$U(\mathcal{C}) [\bar{\Psi}(x) \Psi(x)] U^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) = \bar{\Psi} \Psi(x), \quad (5.21)$$

$$U(\mathcal{C})U(\mathcal{P}) [\bar{\Psi}(x) \Psi(x)] U^{-1}(\mathcal{P})U^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) = \bar{\Psi} \Psi(\mathcal{P}x), \quad (5.22)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T}) [\bar{\Psi}(x) \Psi(x)] U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) = \bar{\Psi} \Psi(\mathcal{T}x), \quad (5.23)$$

$$\Theta [\bar{\Psi}(x) \Psi(x)] \Theta^{-1} = \bar{\Psi} \Psi(-x). \quad (5.24)$$

Combining the transformations on the kinematic terms (5.11)-(5.15) with the mass terms (5.20)-(5.24) together, we can have P, C, CP, T, and CPT transformations on the free Lagrangian

density  $\mathcal{L}_0(x)$  (5.1)-(5.2)

$$U(\mathcal{P})\mathcal{L}_0(x)U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{P}x), \quad (5.25)$$

$$U(\mathcal{C})\mathcal{L}_0(x)U^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{L}_0(x), \quad (5.26)$$

$$U(\mathcal{C})U(\mathcal{P})\mathcal{L}_0(x)U^{-1}(\mathcal{P})U^{-1}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{P}x), \quad (5.27)$$

$$U(\mathcal{T})\mathcal{L}_0(x)U^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{T}x), \quad (5.28)$$

$$\Theta\mathcal{L}_0(x)\Theta^{-1} = \mathcal{L}_0(-x), \quad (5.29)$$

where we have omitted a total derivative in the charge-conjugation (5.26) and CPT (5.29) transformations. We can hence see that the free action, which is the integral of the free Lagrangian density  $\mathcal{L}_0(x)$ , incorporating the two-fold Wigner degeneracy (5.1)-(5.2) over spacetime, truly remains invariant under P, C, CP, T, and CPT transformations separately. It is important to emphasize that this invariance holds independently of the concrete matrix forms for the charge-conjugation (3.61) and CPT (4.7) transformations. Although detailed analyses are provided in Sections 3.3 and 4, highlighting properties associated with the exchange of Wigner degeneracy in relation to these specific forms, these invariances still impose constraints on the interactions involving the Wigner degeneracy, as discussed in Section 5.3.

The Lagrangian formalism provides a natural framework to represent symmetries in the theory. Although the free Lagrangian density with the Wigner degeneracy (5.1)-(5.2) is designed to be invariant under the continuous Lorentz group, the discrete C, P, T, and realize the correct Hamiltonian, rather than imposing by hand, it is accidentally invariant under the internal  $U(2)$  transformation

$$U(\beta) = \exp(i\beta_a T^a), \quad (5.30)$$

where  $T^a$ , with  $a = 0, 1, 2, 3$  are the  $U(2)$  group generators.  $\psi_n(x)$ ,  $n = \pm\frac{1}{2}$  transform as

$$[T^a, \psi_n] = -\sum_{n'} \tau_{nn'}^a \psi_{n'}, \quad [T^a, \psi_n^\dagger] = +\sum_{n'} \tau_{nn'}^{a*} \psi_{n'}^\dagger, \quad (5.31)$$

with  $\tau^a = \frac{\sigma^a}{2}$ ,  $a = 0, 1, 2, 3$ , so that

$$[T^a, \mathcal{L}_0(x)] = 0, \quad (5.32)$$

due to the Hermiticity of  $\tau^a$ , leads to the invariance of the free Lagrangian density  $\mathcal{L}_0(x)$  (5.1)-(5.2) under the internal  $U(2)$  transformation manifestly

$$U(\beta)\mathcal{L}_0(x)U^{-1}(\beta) = \mathcal{L}_0(x). \quad (5.33)$$

It also implies conserved currents and charges according to the Noether's theorem. The Noether's current corresponding to each generator  $T^a$  is given by

$$J^{a\mu} = \sum_{n,n'} \bar{\psi}_n \gamma^\mu \tau_{nn'}^a \psi_{n'} = \bar{\Psi} \gamma^\mu \tau^a \Psi, \quad \text{with } \partial_\mu J^{a\mu} = 0, \quad (5.34)$$

inducing the conserved charge

$$Q^a = \int d^3x J^{a0}(x) = \int d^3x \Psi^\dagger(x) \tau^a \Psi(x). \quad (5.35)$$

Using the canonical anti-commutation relations (5.3)-(5.4), one can straightforwardly show that the charges  $Q^a$ ,  $a = 0, 1, 2, 3$  (5.35) satisfy the Lie algebra of  $U(2)$  and transform the fields in the way of Eq. (5.31) if we identify  $Q^a = T^a$ , with  $a = 0, 1, 2, 3$ . Thus,  $Q^a$ ,  $a = 0, 1, 2, 3$  can be treated as a concrete construction of the  $U(2)$  generators in terms of fields. Although the kinematic term is invariant under  $U(2)$ , the invariance of the mass term is coincidental. That is, the full  $U(2)$  symmetry is preserved only when  $\psi_{+\frac{1}{2}}(x)$  and  $\psi_{-\frac{1}{2}}(x)$  have the degenerate mass. The symmetry is explicitly broken to  $U(1) \times U(1)$  if there are two distinct masses. It is intriguing that explicit internal  $U(2)$  symmetry breaking implies breaking of either the CP or the CPT symmetry. This result can be directly generalized to the  $n$ -fold Wigner degeneracy.

### 5.3 Interactions with the Wigner degeneracy

Let  $\mathcal{H}(x)$  be the interacting density for conventional QFT without Wigner degeneracy. By choosing the appropriate intrinsic discrete symmetry phases, the CPT transformation for  $\mathcal{H}_I(x)$  can always satisfy [3]

$$\Theta \mathcal{H}_I(x) \Theta^{-1} = \mathcal{H}_I(-x). \quad (5.36)$$

Therefore, the interaction  $V \equiv \int d^3x \mathcal{H}_I(0, \mathbf{x})$  commutes with  $\Theta$  and CPT is conserved.

The interaction terms for the Wigner spinor fields can be constructed using the bilinear forms studied in the previous section. They can be classified into two categories: those that satisfy Eq. (5.36) and those that do not. It might appear counter-intuitive that interaction terms could break Eq. (5.36). To illustrate our point, we focus on two typical interacting models in the subsequent discussions.

**Yukawa interaction.** Let  $\chi_m(x)$ ,  $\psi_n(x)$ , with  $m, n = \pm\frac{1}{2}$ , be two two-fold Wigner spinor fields and  $\phi(x)$  be a complex scalar field. Here, we denote the corresponding left- and right-handed chiral fields as  $\chi_{mL,R}(x)$ ,  $\psi_{nL,R}(x)$  respectively, defined by the chiral projection operators

$$P_{L,R} \equiv \frac{1 \mp \gamma^5}{2}, \quad (5.37)$$

and

$$\chi_{mL,R} \equiv P_{L,R} \chi_m, \quad \bar{\chi}_{mL,R} \equiv (\chi_{mL,R})^\dagger \gamma^0, \quad (5.38)$$

$$\psi_{nL,R} \equiv P_{L,R} \psi_n, \quad \bar{\psi}_{nL,R} \equiv (\psi_{nL,R})^\dagger \gamma^0. \quad (5.39)$$

The generic Yukawa interaction takes an explicit chiral form

$$\mathcal{H}_{Yuk}(x; y^R, y^L) = \sum_{m,n} [y_{mn}^R \bar{\chi}_{mL}(x) \phi(x) \psi_{nR}(x) + y_{mn}^L \bar{\chi}_{mR}(x) \phi(x) \psi_{nL}(x)] + \text{h.c.}, \quad (5.40)$$

where  $y_{mn}^R, y_{mn}^L$  are the chiral Yukawa coupling constants that may be complex. In terms of  $\chi_m(x)$  and  $\psi_n(x)$ , we can rewrite the Yukawa interaction of Eq. (5.40) compactly as

$$\mathcal{H}_{Yuk}(x; Y) = \sum_{m,n} \bar{\chi}_m(x) Y_{mn} \phi(x) \psi_n(x) + \text{h.c.}, \quad (5.41)$$

with the Yukawa coupling matrix

$$Y_{mn} \equiv y_{mn}^L P_L + y_{mn}^R P_R = \begin{bmatrix} y_{mn}^L \mathbb{1}_{2 \times 2} & 0 \\ 0 & y_{mn}^R \mathbb{1}_{2 \times 2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.42)$$

Using Eq. (4.15) with  $\Gamma = Y_{mn}$ ,  $r = 4$ , the CPT transformation for  $\mathcal{H}_{Yuk}(x; Y)$  is

$$\Theta \mathcal{H}_{Yuk}(x; Y) \Theta^{-1} = \mathcal{H}_{Yuk}(-x; Y'), \quad (5.43)$$

where

$$Y'_{m'n'} \equiv \sum_{m,n} \tilde{\Xi}_{m'm}^* \Xi_{n'n} Y_{mn}, \quad (5.44)$$

and we conventionally set  $\Theta \phi(x) \Theta^{-1} = \phi^\dagger(-x)$ . Unlike  $\mathcal{H}(x)$  in conventional QFTs, the right-hand side of Eq. (5.43) is in general not equal to  $\mathcal{H}_{Yuk}(-x; Y)$ . As a result, the Yukawa interaction  $V_{Yukawa}(Y) = \int d^3x \mathcal{H}_{Yuk}(0, \mathbf{x}; Y)$  does not commute with  $\Theta$  and thus breaks the CPT symmetry.

In general,  $Y' \neq Y$  and the CPT symmetry is violated due to the mixing of Wigner degeneracies through  $\tilde{\Xi}, \Xi$ . This explicit CPT symmetry breaking is forbidden in the conventional QFT. However, the CPT symmetry of the Yukawa interactions (5.40)-(5.41) can be occasionally restored if<sup>18</sup>

$$[Y, \Xi^T] = 0, \quad \tilde{\Xi} = \Xi. \quad (5.45)$$

Since  $\Xi$  is an arbitrary constant  $U(2)$  matrix as factorized explicitly in Eq. (4.7), one trivial solution which preserves the CPT symmetry is  $\tilde{\Xi} = \Xi = \mathbb{1}$ , which implies no Wigner mixing under the CPT transformation. In contrast, degenerating the Yukawa coupling matrix  $Y$  (5.42) to a non-chiral Yukawa coupling constant  $Y_{nm} = y \delta_{nm}$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{C}$  also satisfies the commuting condition (5.45). Alternatively, nontrivial solutions to Eq. (5.45) might be  $Y = y \Xi^T$  or  $y \Xi^*$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{C}$ , which are derived by the unitarity of  $\Xi$  (4.7) and generally induce the Yukawa interaction to exchange the Wigner degeneracy.

**Gauge interactions.** As demonstrated in the previous section, the free Lagrangian density of the two-fold Wigner spinor fields (5.1)-(5.2) exhibits a non-chiral global  $U(2)$  symmetry. In order to gauge the  $U(2)$  symmetry, which can be decomposed as  $U(2) = U(1) \times SU(2)$ , one need to introduce a gauge field  $A_\mu(x)$  for the  $U(1)$  sector and three other gauge fields  $W_\mu^a(x)$ ,  $a = 1, 2, 3$  for the  $SU(2)$  sector. These gauge fields couple to the Wigner spinor fields through minimal coupling, leading to fermion-gauge interaction terms

$$\mathcal{H}_{gauge}(x) = \mathcal{H}_A(x) + \mathcal{H}_{YM}(x), \quad (5.46)$$

---

<sup>18</sup>Matrix product is calculated with respect to the Wigner index, i.e.  $\sum_{m'} Y_{mm'} \Xi_{m'n}^T = \sum_{m'} \Xi_{mm'}^T Y_{m'n}$ .

and

$$\mathcal{H}_A(x) = gJ_A^\mu(x)A_\mu(x), \quad (5.47)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{YM}(x) = g' \sum_a J_W^{a\mu}(x)W_\mu^a(x), \quad (5.48)$$

with the gauge couplings  $g, g' \in \mathbb{R}$  and the associated currents

$$J_A^\mu(x) = \bar{\Psi}(x)\gamma^\mu\tau^0\Psi(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_n \bar{\psi}_n(x)\gamma^\mu\psi_n(x), \quad (5.49)$$

$$J_W^{a\mu}(x) = \bar{\Psi}(x)\gamma^\mu\tau^a\Psi(x) = \sum_{n,n'} \bar{\psi}_n(x)\gamma^\mu\tau_{nn'}^a\psi_{n'}(x), \quad (5.50)$$

where  $\tau^0 = \frac{1}{2}$  is the generator of  $U(1)$ , and  $\tau^a = \frac{\sigma^a}{2}$ ,  $a = 1, 2, 3$  are the three generators of  $SU(2)$ . It is obvious that  $A_\mu$  and  $W_\mu^3$  couple to the Wigner neutral currents, preserving the Wigner degeneracy. In contrast, the gauge interactions mediated by  $W_\mu^{1,2}$  induce transitions between different Wigner degenerate states. To gain further insight, we can reformulate the fermion-gauge interaction terms by rotating the field basis

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A}_\mu \\ \mathcal{B}_\mu \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \cos\theta_W & \sin\theta_W \\ -\sin\theta_W & \cos\theta_W \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_\mu \\ W_\mu^3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5.51)$$

$$\mathcal{W}_\mu^+ \equiv \frac{W_\mu^1 - iW_\mu^2}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \mathcal{W}_\mu^- \equiv \frac{W_\mu^1 + iW_\mu^2}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad (5.52)$$

with

$$\sin\theta_W = \frac{g}{g_W}, \quad \cos\theta_W = \frac{g'}{g_W}, \quad g_W \equiv \sqrt{g^2 + g'^2}. \quad (5.53)$$

The fermion-gauge interaction  $\mathcal{H}_{gauge}$  (5.46)-(5.48) can then be decomposed as

$$\mathcal{H}_{gauge} = \mathcal{H}_A + \mathcal{H}_B + \mathcal{H}_W, \quad (5.54)$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}_A = \frac{gg'}{g_W} J_A^\mu \mathcal{A}_\mu, \quad J_A^\mu = \bar{\psi}_{+\frac{1}{2}}\gamma^\mu\psi_{+\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (5.55)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_B = \frac{gW}{2} J_B^\mu \mathcal{B}_\mu, \quad J_B^\mu = (1 - 2\sin^2\theta_W) J_A^\mu - \bar{\psi}_{-\frac{1}{2}}\gamma^\mu\psi_{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (5.56)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_W = \frac{g'}{\sqrt{2}} \left( J_W^{\mu\dagger} \mathcal{W}_\mu^+ + J_W^\mu \mathcal{W}_\mu^- \right), \quad J_W^\mu = \bar{\psi}_{-\frac{1}{2}}\gamma^\mu\psi_{+\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (5.57)$$

The  $\mathcal{W}^\pm$  terms (5.57) correspond to the Wigner charged current interactions, responsible for raising and lowering the Wigner indices. Meanwhile,  $\mathcal{A}_\mu$  and  $\mathcal{B}_\mu$  couple to the Wigner neutral currents without affecting the Wigner degeneracy. Notice that  $\mathcal{A}_\mu$  (5.55) interacts exclusively with the  $n = +\frac{1}{2}$  Wigner currents. If  $|g| = |g'|$  is satisfied in Eq. (5.53), then  $\mathcal{B}_\mu$  will only couple to the  $n = -\frac{1}{2}$  Wigner currents, ensuring that the Wigner neutral currents for  $n = \pm\frac{1}{2}$  decouple to each other.

Let us first consider the CPT symmetry on the  $U(1)$  gauge interaction terms (5.47). A straightforward calculation, using Eq. (4.18) with  $\Gamma = \gamma^\mu$ ,  $r = 1$ , or alternatively Eq. (5.10), yields the transformation

$$\Theta \mathcal{H}_A(x) \Theta^{-1} = \mathcal{H}_A(-x), \quad (5.58)$$

where  $\Theta A_\mu(x) \Theta^{-1} = -A_\mu(-x)$  is imposed as in the conventional QFT. This result directly implies that the  $U(1)$  gauge interaction  $V_A = \int d^3x \mathcal{H}_A(0, \mathbf{x})$  commutes with  $\Theta$  and thus preserves CPT symmetry. However, taking into account of the non-Abelian  $SU(2)$  gauge interactions (5.48) will disrupt the CPT symmetry. This violation becomes obvious in the basis presented in Eqs. (5.55)-(5.57). In particular,  $\mathcal{H}_A$  (5.55) explicitly breaks the CPT symmetry, as it involves exchanges between different Wigner degeneracies. This symmetry breaking persists unless additional constraints enforcing Wigner symmetry between the two Wigner neutral gauge fields  $\mathcal{A}_\mu(x)$  and  $\mathcal{B}_\mu(x)$  are introduced. To be more precise, let us identify the gauge couplings

$$g = g', \quad \sin \theta_W = \cos \theta_W = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \quad (5.59)$$

so that the fermion-gauge interactions of Eqs. (5.54)-(5.57) can be further simplified to

$$\mathcal{H}_A = \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} J_A^\mu \mathcal{A}_\mu, \quad J_A^\mu = \bar{\psi}_{+\frac{1}{2}} \gamma^\mu \psi_{+\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (5.60)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_B = \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} J_B^\mu \mathcal{B}_\mu, \quad J_B^\mu = -\bar{\psi}_{-\frac{1}{2}} \gamma^\mu \psi_{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (5.61)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_W = \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \left( J_W^{\mu\dagger} \mathcal{W}_\mu^+ + J_W^\mu \mathcal{W}_\mu^- \right), \quad J_W^\mu = \bar{\psi}_{-\frac{1}{2}} \gamma^\mu \psi_{+\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (5.62)$$

We consider a CPT transformation that mixes the Wigner degeneracy, which corresponds to a block-diagonal matrix  $\Xi$  as shown in Eq. (4.45). By selecting appropriate phases  $\varphi = 0$ ,  $\Xi$  can be chosen as

$$\Xi = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5.63)$$

which would directly exchange the Wigner degeneracy without introducing additional phases. This leads to the following transformations on the Wigner neutral currents in Eqs. (5.60)-(5.61)

$$\Theta J_A^\mu(x) \Theta^{-1} = J_B^\mu(-x), \quad \Theta J_B^\mu(x) \Theta^{-1} = J_A^\mu(-x), \quad (5.64)$$

and for the  $\mathcal{W}^\pm$  currents (5.62)

$$\Theta J_W^\mu(x) \Theta^{-1} = -J_W^\mu(-x), \quad \Theta J_W^{\mu\dagger}(x) \Theta^{-1} = -J_W^{\mu\dagger}(-x). \quad (5.65)$$

Imposing the CPT transformation on the Wigner charged gauge fields  $\mathcal{W}_\mu^\pm(x)$  as

$$\Theta \mathcal{W}_\mu^\pm(x) \Theta^{-1} = -\mathcal{W}_\mu^\pm(-x), \quad (5.66)$$

one can show that the CPT symmetry is valid for the  $\mathcal{W}^\pm$  terms (5.62),

$$\Theta \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{W}}(x) \Theta^{-1} = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{W}}(-x), \quad (5.67)$$

where Eq. (5.65) has been inserted. The CPT transformation on the gauge fields  $W_\mu^{1,2}(x)$  can be derived by combing Eqs. (5.52) and (5.66) together, yielding:

$$\Theta \begin{bmatrix} W_\mu^1(x) \\ W_\mu^2(x) \end{bmatrix} \Theta^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} -W_\mu^1(-x) \\ W_\mu^2(-x) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.68)$$

On the other hand, the CPT symmetry in the Wigner neutral part of the fermion-gauge interactions  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}} + \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}$  (5.60)-(5.61) can be dramatically preserved by imposing the Wigner symmetry between the Wigner neutral gauge fields  $\mathcal{A}_\mu(x)$  and  $\mathcal{B}_\mu(x)$

$$\Theta \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A}_\mu(x) \\ \mathcal{B}_\mu(x) \end{bmatrix} \Theta^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{B}_\mu(-x) \\ \mathcal{A}_\mu(-x) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.69)$$

which implies the CPT transformation on the gauge fields  $A_\mu(x)$  and  $W_\mu^3(x)$

$$\Theta \begin{bmatrix} A_\mu(x) \\ W_\mu^3(x) \end{bmatrix} \Theta^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} -A_\mu(-x) \\ W_\mu^3(-x) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5.70)$$

where  $A_\mu(x)$  transforms in the same way as for the  $U(1)$  gauge in Eq. (5.58). Combing this with the CPT transformation on the neutral currents in Eq. (5.64) together, we find

$$\Theta [\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) + \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}(x)] \Theta^{-1} = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}(-x) + \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}(-x). \quad (5.71)$$

Finally, although the product CPT is generally not conserved in the gauge sector in the presence of the Wigner degeneracy, putting Eqs. (5.67) and (5.71) together gives

$$\Theta \mathcal{H}_{gauge}(x) \Theta^{-1} = \mathcal{H}_{gauge}(-x), \quad (5.72)$$

which demonstrates that the  $U(2)$  gauge interaction  $V_{gauge} = \int d^3x \mathcal{H}_{gauge}(0, \mathbf{x})$  commutes with  $\Theta$  and thus preserves the CPT symmetry in a proper configuration (5.63) where gauge couplings are uniform (5.59) and the appropriate Wigner symmetries are applied to the gauge fields (5.66), (5.68), (5.69), and (5.70).

## 6 Summary and conclusions

As a natural extension of conventional QFT for the SM particles, we have established the theoretical foundation for a QFT with Wigner degeneracy, which may offer a viable framework for describing DM. In this framework, Wigner fields and their corresponding particle states furnish unitary irreducible representations of the extended Poincaré group. This suggests that DM candidates could be described by these representations.

In particular, we introduced massive fermionic states with two-fold Wigner degeneracy. We demonstrated that discrete transformations can map a one-particle state with Wigner



degeneracy to a linear combination of Wigner multiplets, illustrating the intrinsic mixing of Wigner degeneracy. To explore this mixing explicitly, we studied a simple yet nontrivial representation where the spatial reflection matrix is diagonal, the time-reversal transformation is block-diagonal, and the charge conjugation matrix is a general unitary transformation. We highlighted two possible approaches to formulating a QFT for Wigner-degenerate fermions: the doublet formalism or a linear summation. In this work, we focused on the doublet framework, where each doublet consists of two Dirac spinor fields corresponding to distinct Wigner degeneracies. This formulation ensures that the Wigner spinor fields and their Dirac dual fields manifestly respect causality and Lorentz covariance.

Although Wigner spinor fields have nontrivial CPT transformations, we have demonstrated that the free Lagrangian density remains CPT symmetric. Furthermore, we identified an accidental global  $U(2)$  symmetry induced by the discrete CPT transformation. Upon gauging this symmetry, the Wigner spinor fields naturally couple to  $U(2)$  gauge vector fields. However, interactions introduce a novel aspect: CPT symmetry can be explicitly broken, unlike in conventional QFT. This CPT violation does not originate from Lorentz symmetry breaking but rather from the intrinsic structure of the interactions, which mix the Wigner degenerate states. We analyzed CPT violation and conservation conditions in two fundamental types of fermion interactions: Yukawa interactions and fermion-gauge interactions. We found that generic Yukawa and gauge interactions violate CPT unless specific configurations are imposed. In the case of Yukawa interactions, the CPT conservation requires the Yukawa coupling matrix to align with the CPT transformation matrix, allowing the exchange of Wigner degeneracies via additional scalar fields. For fermion-gauge interactions, the situation is even more dramatic. In general, there are two types of gauge vector fields: Wigner-neutral fields, which preserve Wigner degeneracy, and Wigner-charged fields, which mediate transitions between Wigner degenerate states. Rather than merely adjusting coupling constants, gauge fields themselves must be Wigner-symmetric. By gauging the global  $U(2)$  symmetry, we found that gauge fields must transform nontrivially and mix under the CPT transformation rather than remain self-invariant uniformly, as in conventional QFT.

There remain several important directions for future research. From a phenomenological perspective, this framework provides new avenues for exploring physics beyond the SM using the doublet formalism. The Yukawa and gauge interactions discussed in Section 5.3 provide a foundation for further investigations, particularly regarding the implications of CPT violation. From a theoretical standpoint, an alternative approach to organize Wigner spinor fields involves constructing a QFT based on their superposition, i.e., a linear summation. While previous literature [9, 45] has demonstrated the self-consistency of such a framework using mass-dimension-one fields with Klein-Gordon kinematics, a systematic construction remains an open challenge. Addressing this issue will be a key objective in our future work.

## Acknowledgments

SZ is supported by Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No.12347101 and No.2024CDJXY022 at Chongqing University.

## Appendix

### A Notations & conventions

Throughout the paper, we use the conventions of Ref. [46]. The 4D Minkowski metric is,

$$\eta_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(+1, -1, -1, -1), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where  $\mu, \nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ .

The  $4 \times 4$  Dirac matrices are taken in the Weyl representation,

$$\gamma^\mu = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \sigma^\mu \\ \bar{\sigma}^\mu & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} \sigma^\mu = (\mathbb{1}_{2 \times 2}, \sigma^i), \\ \bar{\sigma}^\mu = (\mathbb{1}_{2 \times 2}, -\sigma^i), \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where  $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$  and  $\sigma^i$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) are the three Pauli matrices:

$$\sigma^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \sigma^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \sigma^3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

One has also the chiral operator,

$$\gamma^5 = i\gamma^0\gamma^1\gamma^2\gamma^3 = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathbb{1}_{2 \times 2} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{1}_{2 \times 2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

### B Block-diagonalization of $D(\mathcal{I})$

In [3, app. 2C], by exploiting the fact that  $U(\mathcal{I})$  is antilinear and antiunitary, Weinberg was able to choose an appropriate basis where  $D(\mathcal{I})$  takes the form

$$D(\mathcal{I}) = V \oplus W \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where

$$V = \text{diag}(e^{i\theta_1}, e^{i\theta_2}, \dots), \quad \theta_i \in \mathbb{R} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$W = W_1 \oplus W_2 \oplus \dots, \quad W_i = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{i\phi_i/2} \\ e^{-i\phi_i/2} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \phi_i \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Since Weinberg's proof is for an arbitrary number of degeneracies, it is difficult to follow. For this reason, it is instructive to review the proof where  $D(\mathcal{I})$  is a  $2 \times 2$  unitary matrix. Consider the state  $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n\rangle'$  whose time-reversal transformation is

$$U(\mathcal{I})|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n\rangle' = (-1)^{1/2-\sigma} \sum_m D'_{mn}(\mathcal{I})|-\mathbf{p}, -\sigma, m\rangle'. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Let  $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n\rangle'$  be related to  $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n\rangle$  via a unitary transformation

$$|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n\rangle = \sum_m \mathcal{U}_{mn} |\mathbf{p}, \sigma, m\rangle'. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Since  $U(\mathcal{T})$  is antilinear and antiunitary, the time-reversal matrix  $D(\mathcal{T})$  for  $|\mathbf{p}, \sigma, n\rangle$  is related to  $D'(\mathcal{T})$  via

$$D(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{U}^{-1} D'(\mathcal{T}) \mathcal{U}^*. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

This transformation is not unitary so  $D(\mathcal{T})$  cannot be diagonalized using Eq. (B.6). However, the basis transformation for  $D(\mathcal{T})D^*(\mathcal{T})$  is unitary

$$D(\mathcal{T})D^*(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{U}^{-1} D(\mathcal{T})D^*(\mathcal{T})\mathcal{U}, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

so it can be diagonalized

$$D(\mathcal{T})D^*(\mathcal{T}) = d = \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\phi/2} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\phi'/2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \phi, \phi' \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Take the complex conjugate of Eq. (B.8), we find  $D^*(\mathcal{T})D(\mathcal{T}) = d^{-1}$  and

$$D(\mathcal{T}) = \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\phi} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\phi'} \end{bmatrix} D^T(\mathcal{T}). \quad (\text{B.9})$$

We can classify the solutions by setting the two phases equal to or not equal to one. When  $e^{i\phi} = e^{i\phi'} = 1$ ,  $D(\mathcal{T})$  is symmetric and unitary so it can be written as the exponential of a skew-symmetric matrix which can be diagonalized. Therefore,  $D(\mathcal{T})$  can be made to take the form

$$D(\mathcal{T}) = \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\theta_1} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\theta_2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \theta_i \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

The case for  $e^{i\phi} = 1$ ,  $e^{i\phi'} \neq 1$  leads to a non invertible  $D(\mathcal{T})$  so it is not an admissible solution. Finally, for  $e^\phi \neq 1$ ,  $e^{i\phi'} \neq 1$ , let us take

$$D(\mathcal{T}) = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{B.11})$$

and substitute it into Eq. (B.9). In this case, the diagonal entries of  $D(\mathcal{T})$  vanish and  $\gamma = e^{i\phi}\beta$ ,  $e^{i\phi} = e^{-i\phi'}$ , so we have

$$D(\mathcal{T}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \beta \\ e^{-i\phi}\beta & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

By performing another basis transformation, we can make the upper right and lower left entries of  $D(\mathcal{T})$  to be complex conjugate of each other. This is equivalent to  $\beta = e^{i\phi/2}$  so we obtain

$$D(\mathcal{T}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{i\phi/2} \\ e^{-i\phi/2} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \phi \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

## References

- [1] E. Wigner, *On Unitary Representations of the Inhomogeneous Lorentz Group*, *Annals of Mathematics* **40** (Jan., 1939) 149–204.
- [2] E. P. Wigner, *Unitary representations of the inhomogeneous Lorentz group including reflections*, in *Group theoretical concepts and methods in elementary particle physics*, pp. 37–80, Gordon and Breach, 1964.
- [3] S. Weinberg, *The Quantum theory of fields. Vol. 1: Foundations*. Cambridge University Press, 6, 2005.
- [4] S. Weinberg, *Feynman Rules for Any Spin*, *Phys. Rev.* **133** (1964) B1318–B1332.
- [5] D. V. Ahluwalia, *Spin-half bosons with mass dimension three half: towards a resolution of the cosmological constant problem*, *EPL* **131** (2020), no. 4 41001, [[arXiv:2008.02630](#)].
- [6] D. V. Ahluwalia and C.-Y. Lee, *Spin-half bosons with mass dimension three-half: Evading the spin-statistics theorem*, *EPL* **140** (2022), no. 2 24001, [[arXiv:2212.09457](#)]. [Erratum: *EPL* 140, 69901 (2022)].
- [7] D. Ahluwalia, *Mass Dimension One Fermions*. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [8] D. V. Ahluwalia, J. M. H. da Silva, C.-Y. Lee, Y.-X. Liu, S. H. Pereira, and M. M. Sorkhi, *Mass dimension one fermions: Constructing darkness*, *Phys. Rept.* **967** (2022) 1–43, [[arXiv:2205.04754](#)].
- [9] D. V. Ahluwalia, J. M. H. da Silva, and C.-Y. Lee, *Mass dimension one fields with Wigner degeneracy: A theory of dark matter*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **987** (2023) 116092, [[arXiv:2212.13114](#)].
- [10] A. Basak and S. Shankaranarayanan, *Super-inflation and generation of first order vector perturbations in Elko*, *JCAP* **1505** (2015) 034, [[arXiv:1410.5768](#)].
- [11] C. G. Boehmer, *The Einstein-Cartan-Elko system*, *Annalen Phys.* **16** (2007) 38–44, [[gr-qc/0607088](#)].
- [12] C. G. Boehmer, *The Einstein-Elko system: Can dark matter drive inflation?*, *Annalen Phys.* **16** (2007) 325–341, [[gr-qc/0701087](#)].
- [13] C. G. Boehmer and J. Burnett, *Dark spinors with torsion in cosmology*, *Phys. Rev. D* **78** (2008) 104001, [[arXiv:0809.0469](#)].
- [14] C. G. Boehmer, *Dark spinor inflation: Theory primer and dynamics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **77** (2008) 123535, [[arXiv:0804.0616](#)].
- [15] C. G. Boehmer and J. Burnett, *Dark energy with dark spinors*, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **25** (2010) 101–110, [[arXiv:0906.1351](#)].
- [16] C. G. Boehmer, J. Burnett, D. F. Mota, and D. J. Shaw, *Dark spinor models in gravitation and cosmology*, *JHEP* **07** (2010) 053, [[arXiv:1003.3858](#)].
- [17] J. M. Hoff da Silva and S. H. Pereira, *Exact solutions to Elko spinors in spatially flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker spacetimes*, *JCAP* **03** (2014) 009, [[arXiv:1401.3252](#)].
- [18] S. H. Pereira, S. A. P. S., and J. M. Hoff da Silva, *Some remarks on the attractor behaviour in ELKO cosmology*, *JCAP* **08** (2014) 020, [[arXiv:1402.6723](#)].
- [19] A. P. S. Souza, S. H. Pereira, and J. F. Jesus, *A new approach on the stability analysis in ELKO cosmology*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75** (2015), no. 1 36, [[arXiv:1407.3401](#)].

- [20] S. H. Pereira and A. P. S. Souza, *ELKO applications in cosmology*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **23** (2014), no. 14 1444008.
- [21] S. H. Pereira, A. P. S. Souza, J. M. Hoff da Silva, and J. F. Jesus,  *$\Lambda(t)$  cosmology induced by a slowly varying Elko field*, *JCAP* **01** (2017) 055, [[arXiv:1608.02777](#)].
- [22] S. H. Pereira and R. C. Lima, *Creation of mass dimension one fermionic particles in asymptotically expanding universe*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **26** (2017), no. 12 1730028, [[arXiv:1612.02240](#)].
- [23] S. H. Pereira and T. M. Guimarães, *From inflation to recent cosmic acceleration: The fermionic Elko field driving the evolution of the universe*, *JCAP* **09** (2017) 038, [[arXiv:1702.07385](#)].
- [24] S. H. Pereira, R. F. L. Holanda, and A. P. S. Souza, *Evolution of the universe driven by a mass dimension one fermion field*, *EPL* **120** (2017), no. 3 31001, [[arXiv:1703.07636](#)].
- [25] R. J. B. Rogerio, J. M. Hoff da Silva, M. Dias, and S. H. Pereira, *Effective lagrangian for a mass dimension one fermionic field in curved spacetime*, *JHEP* **02** (2018) 145, [[arXiv:1709.08707](#)].
- [26] S. H. Pereira and R. S. Costa, *Partition function for a mass dimension one fermionic field and the dark matter halo of galaxies*, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **34** (2019), no. 16 1950126, [[arXiv:1807.06944](#)].
- [27] S. H. Pereira, M. E. S. Alves, and T. M. Guimarães, *An unified cosmological evolution driven by a mass dimension one fermionic field*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** (2019), no. 6 543, [[arXiv:1811.00390](#)].
- [28] S. H. Pereira, R. C. Lima, M. E. S. Alves, T. M. Guimarães, J. F. Jesus, and A. P. S. Souza, *Cosmology with mass dimension one fields: recent developments*, *Eur. Phys. J. ST* **229** (2020), no. 11 2079–2116.
- [29] S. H. Pereira, *Degeneracy pressure of mass dimension one fermionic fields and the dark matter halo of galaxies*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **31** (2022), no. 07 2250056, [[arXiv:2110.12890](#)].
- [30] R. C. Lima, T. M. Guimarães, and S. H. Pereira, *A pilot study on canonical gravity with mass dimension one fermions*, *JHEP* **09** (2022) 132, [[arXiv:2206.13941](#)].
- [31] I. C. Jardim, G. Alencar, R. R. Landim, and R. N. Costa Filho, *Solutions to the problem of Elko spinor localization in brane models*, *Phys. Rev.* **D91** (2015) 085008, [[arXiv:1411.6962](#)].
- [32] D. M. Dantas, R. da Rocha, and C. A. S. Almeida, *Exotic Elko on String-Like Defects in Six Dimensions*, *EPL* **117** (2017), no. 5 51001, [[arXiv:1512.07888](#)].
- [33] X.-N. Zhou, Y.-Z. Du, Z.-H. Zhao, and Y.-X. Liu, *Localization of five-dimensional Elko spinors with non-minimal coupling on thick branes*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78** (2018), no. 6 493, [[arXiv:1710.02842](#)].
- [34] X.-N. Zhou, Y.-Z. Du, X.-Y. Ma, and Z.-H. Zhao, *Localization of five-dimensional Elko spinors on  $dS/AdS$  thick branes*, *Chin. Phys. C* **46** (2022), no. 2 023101, [[arXiv:1812.08332](#)].
- [35] M. M. Sorkhi and Z. Ghalenovi, *Localization of massless Elko spinor fields on de Sitter thick branes*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **33** (2018), no. 29 1850172.
- [36] M. M. Sorkhi and Z. Ghalenovi, *Localization of Elko spinor fields in tachyonic de Sitter braneworld models*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020), no. 4 314.

- [37] M. Dias, F. de Campos, and J. M. Hoff da Silva, *Exploring Elko typical signature*, *Phys. Lett. B* **706** (2012) 352–359, [[arXiv:1012.4642](#)].
- [38] B. Agarwal, P. Jain, S. Mitra, A. C. Nayak, and R. K. Verma, *ELKO fermions as dark matter candidates*, *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) 075027, [[arXiv:1407.0797](#)].
- [39] A. Alves, F. de Campos, M. Dias, and J. M. Hoff da Silva, *Searching for Elko dark matter spinors at the CERN LHC*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **30** (2015), no. 01 1550006, [[arXiv:1401.1127](#)].
- [40] A. Alves, M. Dias, and F. de Campos, *Perspectives for an Elko Phenomenology using Monojets at the 14 TeV LHC*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **23** (2014), no. 14 1444005, [[arXiv:1410.3766](#)].
- [41] A. Alves, M. Dias, F. de Campos, L. Duarte, and J. M. Hoff da Silva, *Constraining Elko Dark Matter at the LHC with Monophoton Events*, *EPL* **121** (2018), no. 3 31001, [[arXiv:1712.05180](#)].
- [42] C. A. Moura, F. Kamiya, L. Duarte, M. Dias, and J. M. Hoff da Silva, *Sensitivity of accelerator-based neutrino experiments to neutrino-dark matter interaction: Elko as a viable dark matter candidate*, *EPL* **140** (2022), no. 1 10002, [[arXiv:2109.03881](#)].
- [43] D. V. Ahluwalia and D. Grumiller, *Dark matter: A spin one half fermion field with mass dimension one?*, *Phys. Rev.* **D72** (2005) 067701, [[hep-th/0410192](#)].
- [44] D. V. Ahluwalia and D. Grumiller, *Spin half fermions with mass dimension one: Theory, phenomenology, and dark matter*, *JCAP* **0507** (2005) 012, [[hep-th/0412080](#)].
- [45] D. V. Ahluwalia, G. B. de Gracia, J. M. H. da Silva, C.-Y. Lee, and B. M. Pimentel, *Irreducible representations of the Poincaré group with reflections and two-fold Wigner degeneracy*, *JHEP* **04** (2024) 075, [[arXiv:2312.17038](#)].
- [46] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, *An Introduction to quantum field theory*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, USA, 1995.