

Projection Operator Approach to Langevin Equations in ϕ^4 Theory

Tomoi KOIDE*, Masahiro MARUYAMA and Fujio TAKAGI

* *Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan*

Department of Physics, Tohoku University, Sendai 980-8578, Japan

(Received October 10, 2001)

We apply the projection operator method (POM) to ϕ^4 theory and derive both quantum and semiclassical equations of motion for the soft modes. These equations have no time-convolution integral term, in sharp contrast with other well-known results obtained using the influence functional method (IFM) and the closed time path method (CTP). However, except for the fluctuation force field terms, these equations are similar to the corresponding equations obtained using IFM with the linear harmonic approximation, which was introduced to remove the time-convolution integral. The quantum equation of motion in POM can be regarded as a kind of quantum Langevin equation in which the fluctuation force field is given in terms of the operators of the hard modes. These operators are then replaced with c-numbers using a certain procedure to obtain a semiclassical Langevin equation. It is pointed out that there are significant differences between the fluctuation force fields introduced in this paper and those introduced in IFM. The arbitrariness of the definition of the fluctuation force field in IFM is also discussed.

§1. Introduction

In recent years, there have been many studies related to time dependent phenomena in quantum systems: the time development of order parameters in phase transitions,^{1), 2), 3), 4), 5), 6), 7), 8), 9), 10), 11)} the experimental observation of non-exponential decay in quantum tunneling,¹²⁾ the absence of the quantum Zeno effect in quantum field theory,¹³⁾ the time evolution of the Bose-Einstein condensate,^{14), 15)} renormalization in time evolution calculations,^{16), 17), 18), 19), 20), 21), 22)} and so on. In such studies, it is often important to evaluate the time evolution within quantum field theory. However, the equation of motion in quantum field theory is a nonlinear operator equation, and hence it is difficult to solve in general. There have been several attempts to solve it approximately.

One attempt to approximately solve the equation of motion involves a derivation of a semiclassical equation of motion that has a fluctuation force field term, in other words, colored noise. This equation can be regarded as a kind of a Langevin equation, and it may be possible to incorporate the effects of both quantum and thermal fluctuations into it through not only the coefficients in the equation but also the fluctuation force field. The Langevin equation is a well-developed tool in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics, and there exists many techniques for treating it, including mode coupling theory to calculate dynamical critical exponents,²³⁾ scaling theory of nonequilibrium systems near instability points.²⁴⁾ Furthermore, the effect of the fluctuation force field in the nonlinear Langevin equation is an im-

portant topic of study in various fields of physics, e.g. stochastic resonance²⁵⁾ and noise-induced phase transition.²⁶⁾ Such effects have not been studied in detail in cases that quantum field theory is needed to describe the relevant phenomena, for example the time evolution of a disoriented chiral condensate, which may be a signature of quark-gluon plasmas. The Langevin equation is the starting point in the analysis of such phenomena.

The derivation of Langevin equations in quantum field theory has been carried out mainly on the basis of the influence functional method (IFM) and the closed time path method (CTP).^{1), 2), 3), 4), 5), 6)} The resultant Langevin equation has two notable characteristics. First, it has in general a time-convolution integral term, which is often called a memory term. Such a term makes the Langevin equation difficult to solve. For this reason, it is usually removed by employing the quasi-instantaneous approximation^{1), 2)} or the linear harmonic approximation.⁵⁾ The meaning of the quasi-instantaneous approximation is very clear.²⁷⁾ However, it is known that with this approximation there can be no dissipation effect (as, for example, in ϕ^4 theory), and therefore an additional approximation is employed. Contrastingly, with the linear harmonic approximation there is a dissipation effect in ϕ^4 theory without the use of an additional approximation. However, the validity of this approximation is not clear. The second characteristic of the Langevin equation obtained using IFM and CTP is that the fluctuation force field is introduced using an auxiliary field. It is not clear why the auxiliary field introduced in this way can be interpreted as the fluctuation force field.^{28), 29)} Furthermore, the definition of the fluctuation force field is not unique, as is discussed in this paper.

The projection operator method (POM) is another method to derive the Langevin equation for quantum systems.^{30), 31), 32), 33), 34), 35), 36), 37)} A particular version of this method was proposed by Hashitsume, Shibata and Shingū,^{33), 34)} and was improved by Uchiyama and Shibata³⁵⁾ and Koide and Maruyama³⁶⁾ independently. Using the Mori projection as the projection operator, one can derive the Mori equation, which is a well-known linear Langevin equation applicable to classical and quantum systems.^{30), 31)} POM is the only method that can be used to systematically derive an equation of motion without the time-convolution integral, as far as we know. The fluctuation force field at the quantum level is explicitly given as a term representing the time variation in the space that is projected out, and there is no ambiguity regarding the nature of the fluctuation force field. Therefore, we believe that with POM it is possible to derive a new semiclassical Langevin equation that is free from the problems mentioned above.

The purpose of this paper is to derive both quantum and semiclassical Langevin equations within quantum field theory using POM and to compare the result so obtained with that obtained from IFM. We first derive a quantum Langevin equation using POM. In practice, it is difficult to numerically solve such a nonlinear operator equation. For this reason, we derive a semiclassical Langevin equation from the quantum equation employing a replacement procedure. We apply POM and IFM to ϕ^4 theory and derive Langevin equations for the soft modes projecting or integrating out the hard modes. The method of deriving the semiclassical Langevin equation from the quantum Langevin equation is not unique. Therefore, it is useful to compare

the semiclassical Langevin equation obtained using IFM with the quantum Langevin equation obtained using POM and investigate the differences between their results beforehand. In so doing, we show that the result given by POM is similar to that given by IFM with the linear harmonic approximation. Furthermore, the differences between the fluctuation force fields of POM and IFM can be partially eliminated by utilizing the arbitrariness of the definition of the fluctuation force field in IFM. Next, we discuss the derivation of the semiclassical Langevin equation in POM.

This paper is summarized as follows. In §2, POM is reviewed. In §3, we apply POM to ϕ^4 theory and derive a quantum Langevin equation for the soft modes. In §4, the derivation of the semiclassical Langevin equation in IFM is given. This section follows the work of Greiner et al.⁵⁾ The results of §3 and §4 are compared in §5. In §6, we derive the semiclassical Langevin equation by replacing the relevant operators with c-numbers. The result is compared with the semiclassical Langevin equation in IFM. Conclusions and discussion are given in §7.

§2. Projection operator method

The version of POM that we use in this paper has the following characteristics.^{33), 34), 35), 36)} First, it can be used in both Schrödinger and Heisenberg pictures; in other words, the master equation and the Langevin equation can be treated simultaneously. Second, there is great freedom in the choice of the projection operators. In fact, this projection operator method includes both the Mori and the Nakajima-Zwanzig methods.^{30), 31), 32)} Third, the equations both with and without a time-convolution integral can be treated systematically. Fourth, it can be used even when the Hamiltonian is explicitly time dependent. In this paper, we derive the result in Heisenberg picture.³⁶⁾

The starting point is the Heisenberg equation of motion,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}O(t) &= i[H, O(t)] \\ &= iLO(t), \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where L is the Liouville operator. We can rewrite the Heisenberg equation of motion by using the projection operator, which has the following general properties:

$$P^2 = P, \tag{2.2}$$

$$Q = 1 - P, \tag{2.3}$$

$$PQ = QP = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

Then, the Heisenberg equation of motion can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}O(t) &= e^{iL(t-t_0)}PiLO(t_0) + e^{iL(t-t_0)}P\Sigma(t, t_0)\frac{1}{1 - \Sigma(t, t_0)}iLO(t_0) \\ &\quad + Qe^{iLQ(t-t_0)}\frac{1}{1 - \Sigma(t, t_0)}iLO(t_0), \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$\Sigma(t, t_0) \equiv \int_{t_0}^t d\tau e^{-iL(t-\tau)} P i L Q e^{iLQ(t-\tau)}. \quad (2.6)$$

This equation is called the time-convolutionless (TCL) equation because it does not include time-convolution integral terms, as is shown below. When the system has a dissipation effect, it comes from the second term on the r.h.s. of the equation. The third term represents the time variation in the space which is projected out. Note that Q operates from the left in this term. We regard this term as the fluctuation force term, as in the case of the Mori equation. This equation is still equivalent to the Heisenberg equation of motion, and it is difficult to solve without approximation. To make an approximation, we have to specify the projection operator.

We consider the case in which the total system can be divided into two parts, the system and the environment. Then, the Hamiltonian is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H &= H_S + H_E + H_I \\ &= H_0 + H_I, \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

where H_S and H_E are the unperturbed Hamiltonians of the system and the environment, respectively, and H_I is the Hamiltonian that describes the interaction between the system and the environment. The self-interactions of the system and the environment are also included in H_I . We assume that the initial density matrix is given by the direct product of the system and the environment density matrices:

$$\rho = \rho_S \otimes \rho_E. \quad (2.8)$$

We then define the projection operator P as

$$PO = \text{Tr}_E[\rho_E O] = \langle O \rangle. \quad (2.9)$$

Here, Tr_E is the trace over only the environment degrees of freedom.

Using the above described projection operator, we can rewrite the TCL equation as³⁶⁾

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} O(t) &= e^{iL(t-t_0)} P i L O(t_0) \\ &\quad - e^{iL(t-t_0)} P e^{-iL_0(t-t_0)} \mathcal{C}(t, t_0) Q \frac{1}{1 + (\mathcal{C}(t, t_0) - 1)Q} e^{iL_0(t-t_0)} i L O(t_0) \\ &\quad + Q e^{iLQ(t-t_0)} \frac{1}{1 - \Sigma(t, t_0)} i L O(t_0). \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Here, the new function $\mathcal{C}(t, t_0)$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(t, t_0) &= e^{iL_0(t-t_0)} e^{-iL(t-t_0)} \\ &= 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-i)^n \int_{t_0}^t dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_0}^{t_{n-1}} dt_n \check{L}_I(t_1 - t_0) \check{L}_I(t_2 - t_0) \cdots \check{L}_I(t_n - t_0), \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

where

$$L_0 O = [H_0, O], \quad (2.12)$$

$$L_I O = [H_I, O], \quad (2.13)$$

$$\check{L}_I(t-t_0) \equiv e^{iL_0(t-t_0)} L_I e^{-iL_0(t-t_0)}. \quad (2.14)$$

The operator $\mathcal{C}(t, t_0)$ is a time-ordered function of the Liouville operator.

For the second term on the r.h.s. of the equation, we expand $\mathcal{C}(t, t_0)Q/\{1 + (\mathcal{C}(t, t_0) - 1)Q\}$ up to first order in L_I . Then, we have an approximate representation of the TCL equation,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} O(t) &= e^{iL(t-t_0)} P e^{-iL_0(t-t_0)} P e^{iL_0(t-t_0)} iLO(t_0) \\ &+ e^{iL(t-t_0)} P e^{-iL_0(t-t_0)} P \int_{t_0}^t ds e^{iL_0(s-t_0)} iL_I e^{-iL_0(s-t_0)} Q e^{iL_0(t-t_0)} iLO(t_0) \\ &+ Q e^{iLQ(t-t_0)} \frac{1}{1 - \Sigma(t, t_0)} iLO(t_0). \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

It can be seen that Eq. (2.15) does not contain a time-convolution integral, from the form of the full time-evolution operator, $e^{iL(t-t_0)}$, which operates from the left in the second term on the r.h.s. If this equation did contain a time-convolution integral, the form of the full time-evolution operator must be $e^{iL(t-s)}$, where s is an integral variable. This is the reason that the equation is called the ‘‘time-convolutionless equation’’.

Now, we expand the third term. It is not clear to what order we should expand this term. Here, we apply the fluctuation-dissipation theorem of second kind (2nd f-d theorem) to the second and the third terms in order to fix the order of the expansion. First, we rewrite the third term as

$$\begin{aligned} &Q e^{iLQ(t-t_0)} \frac{1}{1 - \Sigma(t, t_0)} iLO(t_0) \\ &= Q e^{iLQ(t-t_0)} \frac{1}{1 - Q\Sigma(t, t_0)} iLO(t_0) \\ &= Q\mathcal{D}(t, t_0)Q \\ &\quad \times \frac{1}{1 + (\mathcal{C}(t, t_0) - 1)Q + (\mathcal{D}(t, t_0) - 1) + (\mathcal{C}(t, t_0) - 1)Q(\mathcal{D}(t, t_0) - 1)} \\ &\quad \times e^{iL_0(t-t_0)} iLO(t_0). \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

Here, the function $\mathcal{D}(t, t_0)$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(t, t_0) &= e^{iQLQ(t-t_0)} e^{-iQL_0Q(t-t_0)} \\ &= 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} i^n \int_{t_0}^t dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_0}^{t_{n-1}} dt_n Q \check{L}_I^Q(t_n - t_0) Q \check{L}_I^Q(t_{n-1} - t_0) \\ &\quad \times \cdots \times Q \check{L}_I^Q(t_1 - t_0), \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

where

$$\check{L}_I^Q(t-t_0) \equiv e^{iL_0(t-t_0)} L_I Q e^{-iL_0(t-t_0)}. \quad (2\cdot18)$$

The function $\mathcal{D}(t, t_0)$ is an anti-time-ordered function of the Liouville operator. In the case of a linear Langevin equation, like the Mori equation, the 2nd f-d theorem, which relates the coefficient of the equation with the fluctuation force term, is exactly satisfied. Therefore, we require it to be satisfied order by order in the perturbative expansion. If we carry out the perturbative expansion up to zeroth order in L_I for $Q e^{iLQ(t-t_0)} \frac{1}{1-\Sigma(t, t_0)}$ [that is, if we take $\mathcal{C}(t, t_0) = 1$ and $\mathcal{D}(t, t_0) = 1$ in Eq. (2\cdot16)], the 2nd f-d theorem is satisfied in the case of the linear Langevin equation, as shown in Appendix A. As a result, we have the approximate TCL equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} O(t) &= e^{iL(t-t_0)} P i L O(t_0) \\ &+ e^{iL(t-t_0)} \int_{t_0}^t ds e^{-iL_0(s-t_0)} P i L_I e^{iL_0(s-t_0)} Q i L O(t_0) \\ &+ Q e^{iL_0(t-t_0)} i L O(t_0). \end{aligned} \quad (2\cdot19)$$

Here, we have used the additional condition $PL_0 = L_0P$ for simplicity, because in the following calculation, we consider only the case in which this condition is satisfied.

In this section, we derived the TCL equation from the Heisenberg equation of motion. We can derive the TC equation that contains the time-convolution integral similarly. (See, for example, Appendix C of Ref. 36.) In the present paper, we consider only the TCL equation because we wish to investigate the validity of the approximation employed in IFM in order to eliminate the time-convolution integral.

We note here that the difference between the expressions “time-convolutionless” and “memoryless” must be understood. “Time-convolutionless” does not mean that there is no memory effect. In fact, it has been confirmed that the TCL equation has a desirable non-Markovian effect.^{38), 39)} Any memory effect that exists in the TC equation is also incorporated in the TCL equation through the higher-order terms, because these equations are equivalent.

§3. Quantum Langevin equation in POM

In this section, we apply POM to ϕ^4 theory. The Lagrangian is given by

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \hat{\phi} \partial^\mu \hat{\phi} - \frac{1}{2} m^2 \hat{\phi}^2 - \frac{1}{4!} \lambda \hat{\phi}^4, \quad (3\cdot1)$$

where the symbol $\hat{}$ indicates an operator. We set up the physical picture to be the same as that employed in Ref. 5). In this paper, we treat the case $m^2 > 0$ and do not consider the symmetry breaking, to avoid the complication involving the selection of the Fock space associated with degenerate vacua. If we were to consider the case $m^2 < 0$, the system would have degenerate vacua and would undergo a phase transition to the symmetry broken phase. In this case, the expectation value of the field operator $\hat{\phi}$ would play the role of an order parameter and would be regarded as

a gross variable. For this point, we consider only the $m^2 > 0$ case. We may choose an initial conditions for which the order parameter is nonvanishing at $t = t_0$, due to its history before $t = t_0$. The condensate will consist of soft modes. We then introduce a cutoff Λ_I , which is the softest mode among the hard modes. That is, the hard modes are defined by $k \geq \Lambda_I$. The largest value of k among the modes contained in the condensate is assumed to be smaller than Λ_I . We then impose another set of initial conditions in which the hard modes are in thermal equilibrium with a high temperature T at $t = t_0$. In this situation, we regard the hard modes as irrelevant information and carry out a coarse-graining, as in the usual case of Brownian motion. Then the hard modes become the origin of dissipation and fluctuation in the soft mode equation.

The field $\hat{\phi}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ can be divided into soft modes and hard modes as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\phi}(\mathbf{x}, t) &= \int_0^{\Lambda_I} d^3\mathbf{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(2\pi)^3\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}} [a_{\mathbf{k}}(t)e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} + a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger(t)e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}}] \\ &\quad + \int_{\Lambda_I}^{\Lambda} d^3\mathbf{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(2\pi)^3\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}} [a_{\mathbf{k}}(t)e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} + a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger(t)e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}}] \\ &= \hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{x}, t) + \hat{\phi}_>(\mathbf{x}, t),\end{aligned}\tag{3.2}$$

where Λ is an ultraviolet cutoff and $\omega_{\mathbf{k}} = \sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2}$. The field $\hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{x}, t)$ contains only soft modes, and the field $\hat{\phi}_>(\mathbf{x}, t)$ hard modes. We consider the case in which the hard modes have already thermalized but the soft modes have not yet reached thermal equilibrium at $t = t_0$. Therefore, the momentum cutoff Λ_I is the lower limit of the momenta that constitute the thermalized hard modes. Then, the hard modes play the role of a heat bath for the soft modes. In this case, except for the vacuum polarization, which should be renormalized, the temperature T acts as an effective cutoff for the hard modes, due to the Bose distribution function. Therefore, to ensure that the hard modes have a sufficiently large number of degrees of freedom, we must consider the situation that $\Lambda_I \ll T$.⁵⁾

We are interested in only the slow evolution of the soft modes and hence have to coarse-grain the fast time dependence of the hard modes. Consider the case of a small coupling constant. Then, the time evolution of the soft modes and the hard modes is well approximated by that of the free field. The time scale of the slowest soft mode is $\sim m^{-1}$, while that of the slowest hard mode is $\sim 1/\sqrt{\Lambda_I^2 + m^2}$. To regard the hard modes as microscopic variables in relation to the soft modes, like a kind of random fluctuation, there must be a large difference between the typical time scales of the soft modes and the hard modes. For this, the condition $m \ll \Lambda_I$ must be satisfied. In short, we must impose the following condition for the cutoff Λ_I :

$$m \ll \Lambda_I \ll T.\tag{3.3}$$

In this way, we finally obtain a semiclassical Langevin equation using POM in §6, in which the operator-valued fluctuation force terms are replaced with c-number stochastic variables. Then, with the aforementioned initial conditions, the Langevin

equation describes the time development of the condensate—actually, the decay or the dissolution of the condensate on a time scale longer than $1/\Lambda_I$.

The conjugate field $\hat{\Pi}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is also divided as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Pi}(\mathbf{x}, t) &= -i \int_0^{\Lambda_I} d^3\mathbf{k} \sqrt{\frac{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}{2(2\pi)^3}} [a_{\mathbf{k}}(t)e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} - a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger(t)e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}}] \\ &\quad -i \int_{\Lambda_I}^{\Lambda} d^3\mathbf{k} \sqrt{\frac{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}{2(2\pi)^3}} [a_{\mathbf{k}}(t)e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} - a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger(t)e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}}] \\ &= \hat{\Pi}_<(\mathbf{x}, t) + \hat{\Pi}_>(\mathbf{x}, t).\end{aligned}\tag{3.4}$$

The soft modes and the corresponding conjugate fields satisfy the commutation relations

$$[\hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{x}, t), \hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{x}', t)] = 0,\tag{3.5}$$

$$[\hat{\Pi}_<(\mathbf{x}, t), \hat{\Pi}_<(\mathbf{x}', t)] = 0,\tag{3.6}$$

$$[\hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{x}, t), \hat{\Pi}_<(\mathbf{x}', t)] = i\delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'),\tag{3.7}$$

where

$$\delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}') \equiv \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_0^{\Lambda_I} d^3\mathbf{k} e^{i\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')}.\tag{3.8}$$

Here, the notation $\int_0^{\Lambda_I} d^3\mathbf{k}$ means that the integration is restricted to the region $0 \leq |\mathbf{k}| \leq \Lambda_I$. The function $\delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')$ becomes the usual Dirac delta function in the $\Lambda_I \rightarrow \infty$ limit. Hereafter, we call it the ‘‘cutoff delta function’’.

The Hamiltonians of the system, the environment and the interaction become

$$H_S = \int d^3\mathbf{x} \frac{1}{2} [\hat{\Pi}_<^2(\mathbf{x}, t_0) + (\nabla \hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{x}, t_0))^2 + m^2 \hat{\phi}_<^2(\mathbf{x}, t_0)],\tag{3.9}$$

$$H_E = \int d^3\mathbf{x} \frac{1}{2} [\hat{\Pi}_>^2(\mathbf{x}, t_0) + (\nabla \hat{\phi}_>(\mathbf{x}, t_0))^2 + m^2 \hat{\phi}_>^2(\mathbf{x}, t_0)],\tag{3.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}H_I &= \int d^3\mathbf{x} \frac{1}{4!} \lambda [\hat{\phi}_<^4(\mathbf{x}, t_0) + 4\hat{\phi}_<^3(\mathbf{x}, t_0)\hat{\phi}_>(\mathbf{x}, t_0) + 6\hat{\phi}_<^2(\mathbf{x}, t_0)\hat{\phi}_>^2(\mathbf{x}, t_0) \\ &\quad + 4\hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{x}, t_0)\hat{\phi}_>^3(\mathbf{x}, t_0) + \hat{\phi}_>^4(\mathbf{x}, t_0)].\end{aligned}\tag{3.11}$$

Note that the division of H into H_S , H_E and H_I is made at the initial time t_0 .

The initial density matrix is given by the direct product of the system and the environment density matrices as in Eq. (2.8). We consider the case in which the environment is in thermal equilibrium with the Hamiltonian H_E , and thus

$$\rho_E = e^{-\beta H_E} / Z,\tag{3.12}$$

$$Z = \text{Tr} e^{-\beta H_E},\tag{3.13}$$

where $\beta = 1/T$ is the inverse temperature. Then, the projection operator is defined by Eq. (2.9), with ρ_E given by Eq. (3.12).

Substituting the above conditions into Eq. (2·15), we obtain the quantum Langevin equation. Here, we summarize the approximations employed in our calculation. We prepare the thermal equilibrium state as the initial environment, and expand $\mathcal{C}(t, t_0)Q/\{1 + (\mathcal{C}(t, t_0) - 1)Q\}$ up to first order in L_I . This approximation is made for the following reasons. First, it is necessary to take into account at least first order in L_I to have a dissipation effect. Second, it was shown in a certain model that the system evolves toward the thermal equilibrium state at this level of approximation.⁴⁰⁾ Furthermore, an approximation similar to that employed in this paper is employed in Ref. 41). In that work, the nonlinear Langevin equation is solved numerically, and the temperature dependences of the order parameter and the effective masses of σ and π modes are determined. These temperature dependences are the same as those exhibited when the system thermalizes with an initial environment temperature T . Third, one of our main purposes is to compare our POM result with IFM result.⁵⁾ The present approximation is sufficient for this purpose.

Setting the initial time as $t_0 = 0$ in Eq. (2·15), we obtain the quantum Langevin equation for the operator $\hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{x}, t)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{x}, t) - \Delta \hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{x}, t) + m^2 \hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{x}, t) + \frac{\lambda}{6} \int d^3 \mathbf{y} \delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \hat{\phi}_<^3(\mathbf{y}, t) \\
 & + \frac{\lambda}{2} \int d^3 \mathbf{y} \delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \langle \hat{\phi}_{0>}^2(\mathbf{y}, t) \rangle \hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{y}, t) \\
 & + i\lambda^2 \int_0^t ds \int d^3 \mathbf{y}_1 d^3 \mathbf{y}_2 \delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}_2) \\
 & \times \left\{ \frac{1}{48} \langle [\hat{\phi}_{0>}^4(\mathbf{y}_1, s), \hat{\phi}_{0>}^2(\mathbf{y}_2, t)] \rangle \hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{y}_2, t) \right. \\
 & + \frac{1}{36} \langle [\hat{\phi}_{0>}^3(\mathbf{y}_1, s), \hat{\phi}_{0>}^3(\mathbf{y}_2, t)] \rangle \hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{y}_2, s - t, t) \\
 & + \frac{1}{16} \langle [\hat{\phi}_{0>}^2(\mathbf{y}_1, s), \hat{\phi}_{0>}^2(\mathbf{y}_2, t)] \rangle [\hat{\phi}_<^2(\mathbf{y}_1, s - t, t), \hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{y}_2, t)]_+ \\
 & + \frac{1}{24} \langle [\hat{\phi}_{0>}(\mathbf{y}_1, s), \hat{\phi}_{0>}(\mathbf{y}_2, t)] \rangle [\hat{\phi}_<^3(\mathbf{y}_1, s - t, t), \hat{\phi}_<^2(\mathbf{y}_2, t)]_+ \\
 & + \frac{1}{8} \langle [\hat{\phi}_{0>}(\mathbf{y}_1, s), \hat{\phi}_{0>}(\mathbf{y}_2, t)]_+ \rangle \\
 & \times [\hat{\phi}_{0<}(\mathbf{y}_1, s - t), \hat{\phi}_{0<}(\mathbf{y}_2)] [\hat{\phi}_<^2(\mathbf{y}_1, s - t, t), \hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{y}_2, t)]_+ \\
 & + \frac{1}{8} \langle [\hat{\phi}_{0>}^2(\mathbf{y}_1, s), \hat{\phi}_{0>}^2(\mathbf{y}_2, t) - \langle \hat{\phi}_{0>}^2(\mathbf{y}_2, t) \rangle]_+ \rangle \\
 & \times [\hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{y}_1, s - t, t), \hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{y}_2, t)] \hat{\phi}_<(\mathbf{y}_2, s - t, t) \left. \right\} \\
 & = \int d^3 \mathbf{y} \delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \{ \hat{f}_1(\mathbf{y}, t) + \hat{f}_2(\mathbf{y}, t) \hat{\phi}_{0<}(\mathbf{y}, t) + \hat{f}_3 \hat{\phi}_{0<}^2(\mathbf{y}, t) \} \quad (3·14)
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{\lambda}{6} \hat{\phi}_{0>}^3(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad (3·15)$$




Fig. 1 :Diagrams that contribute to the quantum Langevin equation in POM. The dashed lines represent the soft modes and the solid lines the hard modes.

$$\hat{f}_2(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{\lambda}{2}(\hat{\phi}_{0>}^2(\mathbf{x}, t) - \langle \hat{\phi}_{0>}^2(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle), \quad (3.16)$$

$$\hat{f}_3(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{\lambda}{2}\hat{\phi}_{0>}(\mathbf{x}, t). \quad (3.17)$$

Here, the fields with the subscript 0 evolve as free fields, and the newly introduced field $\hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{x}, s, t)$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{x}, s, t) &= \int_0^{\Lambda_I} d^3\mathbf{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(2\pi)^3\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}} [a_{\mathbf{k}}(t)e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}s+i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} + a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger(t)e^{i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}s-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}}] \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_0^{\Lambda_I} d^3\mathbf{k} \{ \hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{k}, t) \cos \omega_{\mathbf{k}}s + \frac{1}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \hat{\Pi}_{<}(\mathbf{k}, t) \sin \omega_{\mathbf{k}}s \} e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

where

$$\hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{k}, t) = \sqrt{\frac{(2\pi)^3}{2\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}} (a_{\mathbf{k}}(t) + a_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger(t)), \quad (3.19)$$

$$\hat{\Pi}_{<}(\mathbf{k}, t) = -i\sqrt{\frac{(2\pi)^3}{2\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}} (a_{\mathbf{k}}(t) - a_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger(t)). \quad (3.20)$$

Furthermore, $[\]$ and $[\]_+$ in Eq. (3.14) represent the commutation and the anti-commutation relations, respectively. The first four terms on the l.h.s. of this equation come from the first term on the r.h.s. of Eq. (2.19). The remaining terms on the l.h.s. come from the second term, and the terms on the r.h.s. come from the third term. The diagrams that correspond to the interaction terms on the r.h.s. of Eq. (3.14) are shown in Fig. 1. The diagrams (a) and (b) correspond to the fourth and the fifth terms on the l.h.s. of the equation, respectively. The diagrams (c) through (h) correspond to the first term through the sixth term within the brackets on the l.h.s. of the equation, respectively.

Now, we call \hat{f}_i the fluctuation force fields. We examine the correlations of \hat{f}_i . The expectation values of \hat{f}_i can be calculated using the initial density matrix ρ .

However, it is also possible to replace ρ with ρ_E , because \hat{f}_i consists of only operators of the hard modes. The first-order correlations are

$$\langle \hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle = \langle \hat{f}_2(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle = \langle \hat{f}_3(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle = 0. \quad (3.21)$$

The second-order correlations are calculated as follows:

$$\langle \hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1) \hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle = \frac{i\lambda^2}{36} [6G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2)^3 + 9G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2)G_{A_I}(0, 0)^2], \quad (3.22)$$

$$\langle \hat{f}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1) \hat{f}_2(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle = -\frac{\lambda^2}{2} G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2)^2, \quad (3.23)$$

$$\langle \hat{f}_3(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1) \hat{f}_3(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle = -\frac{i\lambda^2}{4} G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2). \quad (3.24)$$

The propagator on the r.h.s. of Eqs. (3.22), (3.23) and (3.24) is defined as

$$G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}, t) = i \int_{A_I} d^3\mathbf{p} \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^3 \omega_{\mathbf{p}}} \{(1 + 2n_{\omega_{\mathbf{p}}}) \cos \omega_{\mathbf{p}} t - i \sin \omega_{\mathbf{p}} t\} e^{i\mathbf{p}\mathbf{x}}. \quad (3.25)$$

It has the property

$$G_{A_I}^*(\mathbf{x}, t) = -G_{A_I}(-\mathbf{x}, -t). \quad (3.26)$$

This propagator includes only the hard modes. The Bose distribution function $n_{\omega_{\mathbf{p}}}$ is given by

$$n_{\omega_{\mathbf{p}}} = \frac{1}{e^{\beta\omega_{\mathbf{p}}} - 1}. \quad (3.27)$$

The correlation functions in Eqs. (3.22), (3.23) and (3.24) are complex, and change form under the exchange $\mathbf{x}_1 \leftrightarrow \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 \leftrightarrow t_2$. Now, we examine the real and the imaginary parts of the correlations. The real parts of the second-order correlations are

$$\begin{aligned} \langle [\hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1), \hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2)]_+ \rangle / 2 &= -\frac{\lambda^2}{12i} [G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2)^3 + G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1, t_2 - t_1)^3] \\ &\quad + \frac{i\lambda^2}{8} G_{A_I}(0, 0)^2 [G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2) + G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1, t_2 - t_1)], \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

$$\langle [\hat{f}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1), \hat{f}_2(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2)]_+ \rangle / 2 = -\frac{\lambda^2}{4} [G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2)^2 + G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1, t_2 - t_1)^2], \quad (3.29)$$

$$\langle [\hat{f}_3(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1), \hat{f}_3(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2)]_+ \rangle / 2 = \frac{\lambda^2}{8i} [G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2) + G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1, t_2 - t_1)]. \quad (3.30)$$

We can see that these quantities are symmetric under the exchange of the arguments $\mathbf{x}_1 \leftrightarrow \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 \leftrightarrow t_2$. These correlations play an important role in our investigation of the relation between the fluctuation force fields in POM and those in IFM.

The imaginary parts of the second-order correlations are

$$\langle [\hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1), \hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2)] \rangle / 2 = \frac{\lambda^2}{72} \langle [\hat{\phi}_{0>}^3(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1), \hat{\phi}_{0>}^3(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2)] \rangle, \quad (3\cdot31)$$

$$\langle [\hat{f}_2(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1), \hat{f}_2(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2)] \rangle / 2 = \frac{\lambda^2}{8} \langle [\hat{\phi}_{0>}^2(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1), \hat{\phi}_{0>}^2(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2)] \rangle, \quad (3\cdot32)$$

$$\langle [\hat{f}_3(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1), \hat{f}_3(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2)] \rangle / 2 = \frac{\lambda^2}{8} \langle [\hat{\phi}_{0>}(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1), \hat{\phi}_{0>}(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2)] \rangle. \quad (3\cdot33)$$

These quantities are related to the coefficients of the Langevin equation. The Langevin equation can be expressed in terms of the above quantities as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \square \hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{x}, t) + m^2 \hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{x}, t) + \frac{\lambda}{6} \int d^3 \mathbf{y} \delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \hat{\phi}_{<}^3(\mathbf{y}, t) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \int d^3 \mathbf{y} \delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \langle \hat{\phi}_{0>}^2(\mathbf{y}, t) \rangle \hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{y}, t) \\ + i \int_0^t ds \int d^3 \mathbf{y}_1 d^3 \mathbf{y}_2 \delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}_2) \\ \times \left\{ \frac{\lambda^2}{48} \langle [\hat{\phi}_{0>}^4(\mathbf{y}_1, s), \hat{\phi}_{0>}^2(\mathbf{y}_2, t)] \rangle \hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{y}_2, t) \right. \\ + \langle [\hat{f}_1(\mathbf{y}_1, s), \hat{f}_1(\mathbf{y}_2, t)] \rangle \hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{y}_2, s - t, t) \\ + \frac{1}{4} \langle [\hat{f}_2(\mathbf{y}_1, s), \hat{f}_2(\mathbf{y}_2, t)] \rangle [\hat{\phi}_{<}^2(\mathbf{y}_1, s - t, t), \hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{y}_2, t)]_+ \\ + \frac{1}{6} \langle [\hat{f}_3(\mathbf{y}_1, s), \hat{f}_3(\mathbf{y}_2, t)] \rangle [\hat{\phi}_{<}^3(\mathbf{y}_1, s - t, t), \hat{\phi}_{<}^2(\mathbf{y}_2, t)]_+ \\ + \frac{1}{8} \langle [\hat{\phi}_{0>}(\mathbf{y}_1, s), \hat{\phi}_{0>}(\mathbf{y}_2, t)]_+ \rangle [\hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{y}_1, s - t), \hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{y}_2)] [\hat{\phi}_{<}^2(\mathbf{y}_1, s - t, t), \hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{y}_2, t)]_+ \\ + \frac{1}{8} \langle [\hat{\phi}_{0>}^2(\mathbf{y}_1, s), \hat{\phi}_{0>}^2(\mathbf{y}_2, t) - \langle \hat{\phi}_{0>}^2(\mathbf{y}_2, t) \rangle]_+ \rangle [\hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{y}_1, s - t, t), \hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{y}_2, t)] \hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{y}_2, s - t, t) \left. \right\} \\ = \int d^3 \mathbf{y} \{ \hat{f}_1(\mathbf{y}, t) + \hat{f}_2(\mathbf{y}, t) \hat{\phi}_{0<}(\mathbf{y}, t) + \hat{f}_3(\mathbf{y}, t) \hat{\phi}_{0<}^2(\mathbf{y}, t) \} \delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}). \quad (3\cdot34) \end{aligned}$$

In case of the nonlinear equation, it is in general not clear what kind of relation should be satisfied between the coefficients of the Langevin equation and the fluctuation force field. *) In the present case, the fluctuation force fields are related to the coefficients of the Langevin equation that are similar to those given by the 2nd f-d theorem for the linear Langevin equation.^{34), 37)} For this reason, we regard these relations as constituting the 2nd f-d theorem for the nonlinear equation. **)

§4. Semiclassical Langevin equation in IFM

In this section, we present the result of the application of IFM to ϕ^4 theory. It is essentially due to the work of Greiner et al.⁵⁾ (For a detailed derivation, see

*) Shibata and Hashitsume studied the nonlinear Langevin equation in the quantal spin system interacting with a heat reservoir and derive a nonlinear fluctuation-dissipation theorem.³⁷⁾

**) It is worth noting that some terms of order λ^2 on the l.h.s. of Eq. (3·34) cannot be expressed in terms of \hat{f}_i .

Appendix B.)

The c-number field ϕ is divided into two parts again by employing the momentum cutoff Λ_I as

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(\mathbf{x}, t) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3\mathbf{p} \{ \phi(\mathbf{p}, t) \theta(\Lambda_I - |\mathbf{p}|) + \phi(\mathbf{p}, t) \theta(|\mathbf{p}| - \Lambda_I) \} e^{i\mathbf{p}\mathbf{x}} \\ &= \phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}, t) + \phi_{>}(\mathbf{x}, t).\end{aligned}\quad (4.1)$$

Here, the field $\phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is that of soft modes and $\phi_{>}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ that of hard modes.

The action of this system is

$$\begin{aligned}S[\phi_{<}, \phi_{>}] &= \int_{t_0}^t d^4x \left[\frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi_{<} \partial^\mu \phi_{<} - \frac{1}{2} m^2 \phi_{<}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi_{>} \partial^\mu \phi_{>} - \frac{1}{2} m^2 \phi_{>}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\lambda}{4!} (\phi_{<}^4 + 4\phi_{<}^3 \phi_{>} + 6\phi_{<}^2 \phi_{>}^2 + 4\phi_{<} \phi_{>}^3 + \phi_{>}^4) \right] \\ &= S_{\phi_{<}}[\phi_{<}] + S_{\phi_{>}}[\phi_{>}] + S_{int}[\phi_{<}, \phi_{>}],\end{aligned}\quad (4.2)$$

where

$$S_{\phi_{<(>)}}[\phi_{<(>)}] = \int_{t_0}^t d^4x \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \phi_{<(>)} \partial^\mu \phi_{<(>)} - m^2 \phi_{<(>)}^2), \quad (4.3)$$

$$S_{int}[\phi_{<}, \phi_{>}] = - \int_{t_0}^t d^4x \frac{\lambda}{4!} (\phi_{<}^4 + 4\phi_{<}^3 \phi_{>} + 6\phi_{<}^2 \phi_{>}^2 + 4\phi_{<} \phi_{>}^3 + \phi_{>}^4). \quad (4.4)$$

Now, as in case of POM, we assume that the initial density matrix of the total system is given by the direct product of the system and the environment density matrices:

$$\rho(\phi_{<}, \phi'_{<}, \phi_{>}, \phi'_{>}; t_0) = \rho_s(\phi_{<}, \phi'_{<}; t_0) \otimes \rho_h(\phi_{>}, \phi'_{>}; t_0). \quad (4.5)$$

Then, the influence functional is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}e^{iS_{IF}[\phi_{<}, \phi'_{<}; t]} &= \int d\phi_{>f} d\phi_{>i} d\phi'_{>i} \int_{\phi_{>i}}^{\phi_{>f}} D\phi_{>} \int_{\phi'_{>i}}^{\phi_{>f}} D\phi'_{>} \\ &\quad \times \exp\{i(S_{\phi_{>}}[\phi_{>}] + S_{int}[\phi_{<}, \phi_{>}] - S_{\phi_{>}}[\phi'_{>}] - S_{int}[\phi'_{<}, \phi'_{>}])\} \rho_h(\phi_{>i}, \phi'_{>i}; t_0),\end{aligned}\quad (4.6)$$

where the fields $\phi_{>i}$, $\phi'_{>i}$ and $\phi_{>f}$ correspond to the fields $\phi_{>}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)$, $\phi'_{>}(\mathbf{x}, t_0)$ and $\phi_{>}(\mathbf{x}, t)$, respectively. S_{IF} is called the ‘‘influence action’’. Because it is difficult to calculate the influence action exactly, we usually carry out a perturbative expansion. In this calculation, we keep terms through the second order. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Re}S_{IF}[\phi_{<}, \phi'_{<}] &= -\frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{t_0}^t d^4x \phi_{\Delta}(x) \text{Im}[G_{++}^{A_I}(0)] \bar{\phi}(x) \\ &\quad + \lambda^2 \int_{t_0}^t d^4x_1 d^4x_2 \theta(t_1 - t_2) \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \phi_{\Delta}(x_1) \text{Im}G_{++}^{A_I}(0) \text{Im}[G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2)^2] \bar{\phi}(x_1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{3} \phi_{\Delta}(x_1) \text{Re}[G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2)^3] \bar{\phi}(x_2) \right.\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{2} \phi_{\Delta}(x_1) \bar{\phi}(x_1) \text{Im}[G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2)^2][\bar{\phi}^2(x_2) + \frac{1}{4} \phi_{\Delta}^2(x_2)] \\
& + \frac{1}{6} \phi_{\Delta}(x_1) [\bar{\phi}^2(x_1) + \frac{1}{12} \phi_{\Delta}^2(x_1)] \text{Re}[G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2)] \bar{\phi}(x_2) [\bar{\phi}^2(x_2 + \frac{3}{4} \phi_{\Delta}^2(x_2))] \Big\}, \\
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Im} S_{IF}[\phi_{<}, \phi'_{<}] &= \lambda^2 \int_{t_0}^t d^4 x_1 d^4 x_2 \left\{ -\frac{1}{12} \phi_{\Delta}(x_1) \text{Im}[G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2)^3] \phi_{\Delta}(x_2) \right. \\
& - \frac{1}{4} \phi_{\Delta}(x_1) \bar{\phi}(x_1) \text{Re}[G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2)^2] \phi_{\Delta}(x_2) \bar{\phi}(x_2) \\
& \left. + \frac{1}{8} \phi_{\Delta}(x_1) [\bar{\phi}^2(x_1) + \frac{1}{12} \phi_{\Delta}^2(x_1)] \text{Im}[G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2)] \phi_{\Delta}(x_2) [\bar{\phi}^2(x_2) + \frac{1}{12} \phi_{\Delta}^2(x_2)] \right\}, \\
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

where

$$\bar{\phi}(x) = \frac{1}{2}(\phi_{<}(x) + \phi'_{<}(x)), \quad \phi_{\Delta}(x) = \phi_{<}(x) - \phi'_{<}(x). \tag{4.9}$$

Here, we have introduced the propagator

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2) &= i \langle T[\phi_{>}(x_1) \phi_{>}(x_2)] \rangle \\
&= \theta(t_1 - t_2) i \langle \phi_{>}(x_1) \phi_{>}(x_2) \rangle + \theta(t_2 - t_1) i \langle \phi_{>}(x_2) \phi_{>}(x_1) \rangle \\
&= \theta(t_1 - t_2) G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2) + \theta(t_2 - t_1) G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1, t_2 - t_1). \\
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Furthermore, we introduce the following notation for simplicity:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Re}[G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2)^n] &= [\theta(t_1 - t_2) + (-1)^n \theta(t_1 - t_2)] \\
& \times \frac{1}{2} [G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2)^n + (-1)^n G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1, t_2 - t_1)^n], \\
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Im}[G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2)^n] &= [\theta(t_1 - t_2) - (-1)^n \theta(t_1 - t_2)] \\
& \times \frac{1}{2i} [G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2)^n - (-1)^n G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1, t_2 - t_1)^n]. \\
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Note that the influence action S_{IF} is complex in general. Our next task is to define a new action \tilde{S}_{IF} which is purely real. It is called the ‘‘stochastic influence action’’ and is defined as

$$e^{i S_{IF}[\phi_{<}, \phi'_{<}]} = \int D\xi_1 D\xi_2 D\xi_3 P_1[\xi_1] P_2[\xi_2] P_3[\xi_3] e^{i \tilde{S}_{IF}[\phi_{<}, \phi'_{<}; \xi_i]}. \tag{4.13}$$

Here, the stochastic weights P_i are given by

$$P_i[\xi_i] = N_i \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^t d^4 x_1 d^4 x_2 \xi_i(x_1) I_i^{-1}(x_1 - x_2) \xi_i(x_2) \right\}, \tag{4.14}$$

where

$$I_1^{-1}(x_1 - x_2) = \frac{3}{\lambda^2} [\text{Im}G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2)^3]^{-1}, \quad (4.15)$$

$$I_2^{-1}(x_1 - x_2) = \frac{1}{\lambda^2} [\text{Re}G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2)^2]^{-1}, \quad (4.16)$$

$$I_3^{-1}(x_1 - x_2) = -\frac{2}{\lambda^2} [\text{Im}G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2)]^{-1}. \quad (4.17)$$

Here, N_i is a normalization constant. The auxiliary fields ξ_1 , ξ_2 and ξ_3 have been introduced to eliminate the imaginary part of the influence action. Then, the stochastic influence action \tilde{S}_{IF} is given by

$$\tilde{S}_{IF}[\phi_{<}, \phi'_{<}; \xi_i] = \text{Re}[S_{IF}[\phi_{<}, \phi'_{<}]] + \sum_{N=1}^3 \frac{1}{N} \int_{t_0}^t d^4x (\phi_{<}^N(x) - \phi'_{<}^N(x)) \xi_N(x). \quad (4.18)$$

To prove Eq. (4.18), we have to assume the relation

$$e^{-(1/2)\chi^T A \chi} = [\det(2\pi A)]^{-1/2} \int D\xi \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\xi^T A^{-1}\xi + i\chi^T \xi\right). \quad (4.19)$$

(See Appendix C for details.)

Finally, the stochastic effective action is defined as

$$\tilde{S}_{eff}[\bar{\phi}, \phi_{\Delta}, \xi_i] \equiv S[\phi_{<}] - S[\phi'_{<}] + \tilde{S}_{IF}[\phi_{<}, \phi'_{<}; \xi_i]. \quad (4.20)$$

Note that this action is real. If the soft modes behave quasiclassically, we can apply the variational relation

$$\left. \frac{\delta \tilde{S}_{eff}[\bar{\phi}, \phi_{\Delta}, \xi_i]}{\delta \phi_{\Delta}} \right|_{\phi_{\Delta}=0} = 0 \quad (4.21)$$

to the stochastic effective action to obtain a semiclassical Langevin equation. In order to carry out this functional derivative, we must define a functional derivative for the soft modes. Greiner et al. used the usual definition,

$$\frac{\delta \phi_{<}(x')}{\delta \phi_{<}(x)} = \delta^{(4)}(x' - x). \quad (4.22)$$

Thus we obtain the semiclassical Langevin equation

$$\begin{aligned} \square \phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}, t) + m^2 \phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}, t) + \sum_{i=a, \dots, f} (-1) \frac{\delta \text{Re}[S_{IF}^{(i)}[\phi_{<}, \phi'_{<}]]}{\delta \phi_{\Delta}} \Big|_{\phi_{\Delta}=0} \\ = [\xi_1(\mathbf{x}, t) + \phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}, t) \xi_2(\mathbf{x}, t) + \phi_{<}^2(\mathbf{x}, t) \xi_3(\mathbf{x}, t)], \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$




Fig. 2 :Diagrams that contribute to the semiclassical Langevin equation in IFM.
The dashed lines represent the soft modes and the solid lines the hard modes.

where

$$-\frac{\delta \text{Re}[S_{IF}^{(a)}]}{\delta \phi_{\Delta}(x)} \Big|_{\phi_{\Delta=0}} = \frac{\lambda}{6} \phi_{<}^3(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad (4.24)$$

$$-\frac{\delta \text{Re}[S_{IF}^{(b)}]}{\delta \phi_{\Delta}(x)} \Big|_{\phi_{\Delta=0}} = -\frac{i\lambda}{2} G_{\Lambda_I}(0, 0) \phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad (4.25)$$

$$-\frac{\delta \text{Re}[S_{IF}^{(c)}]}{\delta \phi_{\Delta}(x)} \Big|_{\phi_{\Delta=0}} = \int_0^{t-t_0} d\tau \int d^3 \mathbf{x}' \frac{\lambda^2}{4} G_{\Lambda_I}(0, 0) [G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}', \tau)^2 - G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}, -\tau)^2] \phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad (4.26)$$

$$-\frac{\delta \text{Re}[S_{IF}^{(d)}]}{\delta \phi_{\Delta}(x)} \Big|_{\phi_{\Delta=0}} = \int_0^{t-t_0} d\tau \int d^3 \mathbf{x}' \frac{\lambda^2}{6} [G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}', \tau)^3 - G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}, -\tau)^3] \phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}', t - \tau) \quad (4.27)$$

$$-\frac{\delta \text{Re}[S_{IF}^{(e)}]}{\delta \phi_{\Delta}(x)} \Big|_{\phi_{\Delta=0}} = \phi_{<}(x) \int_0^{t-t_0} d\tau \int d^3 \mathbf{x}' \frac{i\lambda^2}{4} [G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}', \tau)^2 - G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}, -\tau)^2] \phi_{<}^2(\mathbf{x}', t - \tau), \quad (4.28)$$

$$-\frac{\delta \text{Re}[S_{IF}^{(f)}]}{\delta \phi_{\Delta}(x)} \Big|_{\phi_{\Delta=0}} = \phi_{<}^2(x) \int_0^{t-t_0} d\tau \int d^3 \mathbf{x}' \frac{-\lambda^2}{12} [G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}', \tau) - G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}, -\tau)] \phi_{<}^3(\mathbf{x}', t - \tau). \quad (4.29)$$

Here, the superscripts (a),(b), \dots correspond, respectively, to the diagrams (a),(b), \dots in Fig. 2. This classical treatment of the soft modes is justified in weakly coupled bosonic quantum fields at high temperature. (See Refs. 5), 6) and 41) for details.)

In IFM, the derived semiclassical equation in general possesses a time-convolution integral. In the present case, it is contained in Eqs. (4.27), (4.28) and (4.29). To remove such an integral, Greiner et al. introduced an approximation called the “linear

harmonic approximation". To explain this approximation, we consider the equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}a(t) = -i\omega a(t) + g \int_0^t ds F(s)a(t-s) \quad (4.30)$$

for some variable $a(t)$, where ω is a frequency, g is a coupling constant and $F(s)$ is an appropriate function of s . This equation has a time-convolution integral in the second term on the r.h.s. The quasi-instantaneous approximation is often used to remove such an integral. In this approximation, one makes the replacement

$$a(t-s) \longrightarrow a(t) - s \frac{da(t)}{dt}. \quad (4.31)$$

This approximation is justified when the time dependence of $a(t)$ is sufficiently weak.²⁷⁾ However, if we use this approximation in ϕ^4 theory, the dissipation effect is lost. To retain the dissipation effect, an additional approximation is needed. For example, one may use a propagator with an explicit width instead of the propagator defined in Eq. (4.10).^{1), 2)}

The linear harmonic approximation recently introduced by Greiner et al.⁵⁾ implies the replacement

$$a(t-s) \longrightarrow a(t)e^{i\omega s}. \quad (4.32)$$

Here, the dependence of $a(t-s)$ on the integration variable s is replaced with that of the free vibration. It is obvious that the time-convolution integral in Eq. (4.30) is eliminated through this replacement. In this approximation, we can retain the dissipation effect without imposing any further approximation in ϕ^4 theory. However, the physical meaning of the approximation is not clear.

In ϕ^4 theory, the linear harmonic approximation implies the replacement

$$\phi_{<}(\mathbf{k}, t-\tau) \longrightarrow \phi_{<}(\mathbf{k}, t) \cos \omega_{\mathbf{k}}\tau - \dot{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{k}, t) \frac{1}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \sin \omega_{\mathbf{k}}\tau. \quad (4.33)$$

With this replacement, the three terms defined in Eqs. (4.27), (4.28) and (4.29) can be rewritten as follows:

$$-\left. \frac{\delta \text{Re}[S_{IF}^{(d)}]}{\delta \phi_{\Delta}(x)} \right|_{\phi_{\Delta=0}} = \int_0^{t-t_0} d\tau \int d^3 \mathbf{x}' \frac{\lambda^2}{6} [G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{x}', \tau)^3 - G_{\Lambda_I}(-\mathbf{x}', -\tau)^3] \varphi_{<}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}', -\tau, t), \quad (4.34)$$

$$-\left. \frac{\delta \text{Re}[S_{IF}^{(e)}]}{\delta \phi_{\Delta}(x)} \right|_{\phi_{\Delta=0}} = \phi_{<}(x) \int_0^{t-t_0} d\tau \int d^3 \mathbf{x}' \frac{i\lambda^2}{4} [G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{x}', \tau)^2 - G_{\Lambda_I}(-\mathbf{x}', -\tau)^2] \varphi_{<}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}', -\tau, t)^2, \quad (4.35)$$

$$-\left. \frac{\delta \text{Re}[S_{IF}^{(f)}]}{\delta \phi_{\Delta}(x)} \right|_{\phi_{\Delta=0}} = \phi_{<}^2(x) \int_0^{t-t_0} d\tau \int d^3 \mathbf{x}' \frac{-\lambda^2}{12} [G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{x}', \tau) - G_{\Lambda_I}(-\mathbf{x}', -\tau)] \varphi_{<}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}', -\tau, t)^3. \quad (4.36)$$

Here, we have introduced the function [cf. Eq. (3.18)]

$$\varphi_{<}(\mathbf{x}, \tau, t) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int_0^{\Lambda_I} d^3 \mathbf{k} (\phi_{<}(\mathbf{k}, t) \cos \omega_{\mathbf{k}}\tau + \dot{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{k}, t) \frac{1}{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \sin \omega_{\mathbf{k}}\tau) e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}}. \quad (4.37)$$

Finally, the semiclassical Langevin equation without a time-convolution integral is obtained if we use the above expressions instead of Eqs. (4.27), (4.28) and (4.29).

Now, we examine the r.h.s. of Eq. (4.23). In the IFM calculation, the auxiliary fields ξ_i are interpreted as the fluctuation force field.^{28), 29)} Their expectation values are calculated by using the stochastic weights P_i . Then, the first order correlations are

$$\langle \xi_1(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle_P = \langle \xi_2(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle_P = \langle \xi_3(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle_P = 0, \quad (4.38)$$

where

$$\langle \xi_i(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle_P = \int D\xi_i P_i[\xi_i] \xi_i(\mathbf{x}, t). \quad (4.39)$$

To know the characteristics of the correlations, it is necessary to calculate the correlations up to at least second-order. We have

$$\langle \xi_1(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1) \xi_1(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle_P = -\frac{\lambda^2}{12i} [G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2)^3 + G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1, t_2 - t_1)^3], \quad (4.40)$$

$$\langle \xi_2(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1) \xi_2(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle_P = -\frac{\lambda^2}{4} [G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2)^2 + G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1, t_2 - t_1)^2], \quad (4.41)$$

$$\langle \xi_3(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1) \xi_3(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle_P = \frac{\lambda^2}{8i} [G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2) + G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1, t_2 - t_1)] \quad (4.42)$$

$$\langle \xi_i(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1) \xi_j(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle_P = 0. \quad (\text{for } i \neq j) \quad (4.43)$$

It is noteworthy that there is no correlation between ξ_i and ξ_j for $i \neq j$.

In §3, we have pointed out that, in POM, the 2nd f-d theorem is satisfied for the coefficients and the fluctuation force fields. In IFM, it is said that there is a relation called the ‘‘generalized fluctuation-dissipation theorem’’.^{42), 43)} To confirm the validity of this relation, it is convenient to introduce the following functions $\mathcal{M}^{(i)}(\mathbf{k}, \omega)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & -\left. \frac{\delta \text{Re}[S_{IF}^{(d)}]}{\delta \phi_\Delta(x)} \right|_{\phi_\Delta=0} \\ &= \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} \theta(\Lambda_I - |\mathbf{k}|) \int_0^{t-t_0} d\tau \varphi_{<}(\mathbf{k}, -\tau, t) \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} e^{-i\omega\tau} \mathcal{M}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k}, \omega), \end{aligned} \quad (4.44)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & -\left. \frac{\delta \text{Re}[S_{IF}^{(e)}]}{\delta \phi_\Delta(x)} \right|_{\phi_\Delta=0} \\ &= \phi_{<}(x) \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} \int_0^{\Lambda_I} \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}_1}{(2\pi)^3} \theta(\Lambda_I - |\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1|) \\ & \quad \times \int_0^{t-t_0} d\tau \varphi_{<}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1, -\tau, t) \varphi_{<}(\mathbf{k}_1, -\tau, t) \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} e^{-i\omega\tau} \mathcal{M}^{(2)}(\mathbf{k}, \omega), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left. \frac{\delta \text{Re}[S_{IF}^{(f)}]}{\delta \phi_{\Delta}(x)} \right|_{\phi_{\Delta}=0} \\
 &= \phi_{<}^2(x) \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} \int_0^{\Lambda_I} \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}_1 d^3 \mathbf{k}_2}{(2\pi)^6} \theta(\Lambda_I - |\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2|) \\
 & \quad \times \int_0^{t-t_0} d\tau \varphi_{<}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2, -\tau, t) \varphi_{<}(\mathbf{k}_1, -\tau, t) \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} e^{-i\omega\tau} \mathcal{M}^{(3)}(\mathbf{k}, \omega).
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.45}$$

Here, $\varphi_{<}(\mathbf{k}, \tau, t)$ is the Fourier transform of $\varphi_{<}(\mathbf{x}, \tau, t)$. Furthermore, the Fourier transform of the function $I_i(x)$, which is the inverse of the matrix $I_i^{-1}(x)$ given by Eq. (4.15), (4.16) and (4.17), is defined as

$$I_i(x) = \int \frac{d\omega d^3 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^4} e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} e^{-i\omega t} I_i(\mathbf{k}, \omega). \tag{4.47}$$

Then, we obtain the relation

$$I_i(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{i}{\omega} K^{(i)}(\omega) \mathcal{M}^{(i)}(\mathbf{k}, \omega), \tag{4.48}$$

where

$$K^{(i)}(\omega) \propto \omega \frac{\exp \beta\omega + 1}{\exp \beta\omega - 1}. \tag{4.49}$$

This relates the quantities $\mathcal{M}^{(i)}$, which are the coefficients in the Langevin equation, with the quantities I_i , which characterizes the fluctuation force field. This is the generalized fluctuation-dissipation theorem. In Refs. 42) and 43), it is pointed out that this relation is equivalent to the well-known Einstein formula in the classical or high-temperature limit for the case of quantum Brownian motion.

We now discuss the arbitrariness of the definition of the fluctuation force field in IFM calculation. In the case of IFM, an auxiliary field is introduced to define the real stochastic effective action. It is interpreted as the fluctuation force field. However, in such a definition, this force field cannot be uniquely fixed. For example, the influence action does not change even if the term δI_i^{-1} , which has the property

$$\delta I_i^{-1}(x_1 - x_2) = -\delta I_i^{-1}(x_2 - x_1), \tag{4.50}$$

is added to I_i^{-1} , because of the property

$$\int_{t_0}^t d^4 x_1 d^4 x_2 \xi_i(x_1) \delta I_i^{-1}(x_1 - x_2) \xi_i(x_2) = 0. \tag{4.51}$$

Another point of arbitrariness in the definition of the fluctuation force field is that it is possible to use only one kind of auxiliary field instead of three.⁶⁾ In this case, the stochastic influence action is given as

$$\tilde{S}_{IF}[\phi_{<}, \phi'_{<}; \xi'] = \text{Re}[S_{IF}[\phi_{<}, \phi'_{<}]] + \int_{t_0}^t d^4 x (\phi_{<}(x) - \phi'_{<}(x)) \xi'(x), \tag{4.52}$$

and the stochastic weight is

$$P'[\xi'] = N \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^t d^4 x_1 d^4 x_2 \xi'(x_1) I^{-1}(x_1 - x_2) \xi'(x_2) \right\}, \quad (4.53)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I^{-1}(x_1 - x_2) &= I_1^{-1}(x_1 - x_2) + \bar{\phi}(x_1) I_2^{-1}(x_1 - x_2) \bar{\phi}(x_2) \\ &\quad + [\bar{\phi}^2(x_1) + \frac{1}{12} \phi_\Delta^2(x_1)] I_3^{-1}(x_1 - x_2) [\bar{\phi}^2(x_2) + \frac{1}{12} \phi_\Delta^2(x_2)] \\ &= I_1^{-1}(x_1 - x_2) + \phi_{<}(x_1) I_2^{-1}(x_1 - x_2) \phi_{<}(x_2) \\ &\quad + \phi_{<}^2(x_1) I_3^{-1}(x_1 - x_2) \phi_{<}^2(x_2). \end{aligned} \quad (4.54)$$

In the last line, we have taken the limit $\phi_\Delta(x) \rightarrow 0$. The derived semiclassical Langevin equation is

$$\begin{aligned} \square \phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}, t) + m^2 \phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}, t) + \frac{\lambda}{6} \phi_{<}^3(\mathbf{x}, t) + \sum_{i=a,b,c,d,e} (-1) \frac{\delta \text{Re}[S_{IF}^{(i)}[\phi_{<}, \phi'_{<}]]}{\delta \phi_\Delta} \Big|_{\phi_\Delta=0} \\ = \xi'(\mathbf{x}, t). \end{aligned} \quad (4.55)$$

Now, we have only one kind of fluctuation force field. Therefore, the fluctuation force field introduced in Eq. (4.23) is only one of several possibilities. There is still another point of arbitrariness, as is discussed in the next section. It plays an important role when we compare the quantum Langevin equation derived using POM with the semiclassical Langevin equation derived using IFM.

§5. Quantum Langevin equation in POM and semiclassical Langevin equation in IFM

To this point, we have applied POM and IFM to ϕ^4 theory and have derived two Langevin equations, (3.14) and (4.23). The equation derived with POM is the quantum Langevin equation, while that derived with IFM is the semiclassical Langevin equation. It is useful to compare the POM quantum Langevin equation with the IFM semiclassical Langevin equation and study the correspondence between them. For the remainder of this section, we ignore the difference between operators and c-numbers for the soft modes. More precisely, we make the identification $[\hat{A}, \hat{B}]_+ = 2AB$, where A and B are appropriate c-numbers corresponding to \hat{A} and \hat{B} , respectively.

First, we compare the l.h.s. of the two equations. It is easily seen that there are two differences between the two equations. The first difference is that in POM, there are additional contributions that correspond to the diagrams shown in Figs.1 (g) and (h), which contain the propagator of the soft modes. Such terms are not included in IFM equation, because the quantum effects from the soft modes are omitted there.

The second difference is that between the cutoff delta function and the Dirac delta function. The origin of this difference is the definition of the functional derivative, which is used to derive the Langevin equation from the stochastic effective

action in IFM. Greiner et al.⁵⁾ used the usual definition of the functional derivative,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\delta\phi_{<}(x')}{\delta\phi_{<}(x)} &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{[\phi_{<}(x') + \epsilon\delta^{(4)}(x' - x)] - \phi_{<}(x')}{\epsilon} \\ &= \delta^{(4)}(x' - x).\end{aligned}\quad (5.1)$$

In this definition, the function with small variation $\phi_{<}(x') + \epsilon\delta^{(4)}(x' - x)$ includes the hard modes. This is unsatisfactory because, in our method of calculation, all the fields that contain the hard components should be integrated or projected out. This point can be confirmed by comparing the Fourier components of the two Langevin equations. We consider, for example, the third terms on the l.h.s. of the two equations. In IFM, the \mathbf{k} component of the third term is

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\lambda}{6} \int d^3\mathbf{x} \phi_{<}^3(\mathbf{x}) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{6(2\pi)^6} \int_0^{\Lambda_I} d^3\mathbf{k}_1 d^3\mathbf{k}_2 \theta(\Lambda_I - |\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2|) \phi_{<}(\mathbf{k}_1) \phi_{<}(\mathbf{k}_2) \phi_{<}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2),\end{aligned}\quad (5.2)$$

and in POM, it is

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\lambda}{6} \int d^3\mathbf{x} \int d^3\mathbf{y} \delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \phi_{<}^3(\mathbf{y}) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{6(2\pi)^6} \int_0^{\Lambda_I} d^3\mathbf{k}_1 d^3\mathbf{k}_2 \theta(\Lambda_I - |\mathbf{k}|) \theta(\Lambda_I - |\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2|) \\ &\quad \times \phi_{<}(\mathbf{k}_1) \phi_{<}(\mathbf{k}_2) \phi_{<}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2).\end{aligned}\quad (5.3)$$

Here, the time argument of $\phi_{<}$ has been omitted. The only difference between Eq. (5.2) and Eq. (5.3) is the existence of the step function $\theta(\Lambda_I - |\mathbf{k}|)$ in Eq. (5.3). The absolute values of the momenta \mathbf{k}_1 , \mathbf{k}_2 and $\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2$ are always smaller than Λ_I in both cases. However, the situation is different in the case of the momentum \mathbf{k} . In POM, only components smaller than Λ_I are included, even for momentum \mathbf{k} . Contrastingly, in IFM, all components satisfying the condition $0 \leq |\mathbf{k}| \leq 3\Lambda_I$ are included, because the step function $\theta(\Lambda_I - |\mathbf{k}|)$ does not appear. This means that the separation of soft modes and hard modes is incomplete in the IFM calculation.

To solve this problem, we use the following definition of the functional derivative:

$$\frac{\delta\phi_{<}(x')}{\delta\phi_{<}(x)} = \delta(x'_0 - x_0) \delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}), \quad (5.4)$$

where $\delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x})$ is the cutoff delta function defined in Eq. (3.8). If this new definition is adopted in IFM, the l.h.s. of the two equations coincide, except for the terms corresponding to (g) and (h) in Fig. 1.

Now, we compare the r.h.s. of the two equations. If we use the definition (5.4) instead of Eq. (4.22), we obtain Eq. (4.23) with the r.h.s. replaced by

$$\int d^3\mathbf{y} \{ \xi_1(\mathbf{y}, t) + \phi_{<}(\mathbf{y}, t) \xi_2(\mathbf{y}, t) + \phi_{<}^2(\mathbf{y}, t) \xi_3(\mathbf{y}, t) \} \delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}). \quad (5.5)$$

Comparing this with the r.h.s. of Eq. (3·14), we see that there are still the following differences between them. First, the time dependences of the soft modes that appear on the r.h.s. of the two equations are different. In IFM, this time dependence is determined by solving the equation, while in POM, they evolve as free fields. This is a considerable difference. In POM, the r.h.s. of the quantum Langevin equation vanishes when we calculate the expectation value with the initial density matrix, because the soft modes cannot include the \hat{f}_i dependence. By contrast, in IFM, the soft modes included in the r.h.s. of the semiclassical Langevin equation have a ξ_i dependence, and therefore the r.h.s. does not necessarily become zero when we calculate the expectation value with stochastic weights; that is,

$$\langle \hat{f}_i(\mathbf{x}, t) \hat{\phi}_{0<}^n(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle = 0, \quad (5·6)$$

$$\langle \xi_i(\mathbf{x}, t) \phi_{<}^n(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle_P = \langle \xi_i(\mathbf{x}, t) \phi_{<}^n(\mathbf{x}, t; \xi_i) \rangle_P \neq 0. \quad (5·7)$$

Second, the correlations of the fluctuation force fields are different. Consider, for example, the second order correlations $\langle \xi_i(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1) \xi_j(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle_P$ and $\langle \hat{f}_i(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1) \hat{f}_j(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle$. The former is real and invariant under the exchange of the arguments $\mathbf{x}_1 \leftrightarrow \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 \leftrightarrow t_2$, as seen from Eqs. (4·40), (4·41) and (4·42). The latter is complex and is not invariant under the same exchange, as seen from Eqs. (3·22), (3·23) and (3·24). Therefore, the corresponding correlations in POM are considered to be the symmetrized correlations given by the real parts of the second-order correlations defined in Eqs. (3·28), (3·29) and (3·30). Then, we notice that Eqs. (4·41) and (4·42) are identical to Eqs. (3·29) and (3·30), respectively:

$$\langle [\hat{f}_2(\mathbf{x}, t), \hat{f}_2(\mathbf{x}', t')]_+ \rangle / 2 = \langle \xi_2(\mathbf{x}, t) \xi_2(\mathbf{x}', t') \rangle_P, \quad (5·8)$$

$$\langle [\hat{f}_3(\mathbf{x}, t), \hat{f}_3(\mathbf{x}', t')]_+ \rangle / 2 = \langle \xi_3(\mathbf{x}, t) \xi_3(\mathbf{x}', t') \rangle_P. \quad (5·9)$$

Contrastingly, Eq. (4·40) differs from Eq. (3·28) because of the existence of the additional term δI_1 :

$$\langle [\hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}, t), \hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}', t')]_+ \rangle / 2 = \langle \xi_1(\mathbf{x}, t) \xi_1(\mathbf{x}', t') \rangle_P - \frac{1}{2} \delta I_1(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}', t - t'), \quad (5·10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \delta I_1(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}', t - t') &= -i \frac{\lambda^2}{4} G_{A_I}(0, 0)^2 [G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}', t - t') + G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}, t' - t)] \\ &= \frac{\lambda^2}{2} G_{++}^{A_I}(0)^2 \text{Im} G_{++}^{A_I}(x - x'). \end{aligned} \quad (5·11)$$

However, this difference can be removed by modifying ξ_1 . First, note that δI_1 has the following property

$$\int d^4 x_1 d^4 x_2 \phi_{<}(x_1) \delta I_1^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2) \phi_{<}(x_2) = 0. \quad (5·12)$$

This property can be proved using the fact that $\phi_{<}(x)$ contains only soft modes, while δI_1^{-1} contains only hard modes. With this fact, the imaginary part of the

influence action (4·8) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Im}S_{IF}[\phi_{<}, \phi'_{<}] \\
 & \rightarrow \lambda^2 \int_{t_0}^t d^4x_1 d^4x_2 \left\{ \phi_{\Delta}(x_1) \left(-\frac{1}{12} \text{Im}[G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2)^3] - \frac{1}{8} G_{++}^{A_I}(0)^2 \text{Im}G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2) \right) \phi_{\Delta}(x_2) \right. \\
 & \quad - \frac{1}{4} \phi_{\Delta}(x_1) \bar{\phi}(x_1) \text{Re}[G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2)^2] \phi_{\Delta}(x_2) \bar{\phi}(x_2) \\
 & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{8} \phi_{\Delta}(x_1) [\bar{\phi}^2(x_1) + \frac{1}{12} \phi_{\Delta}^2(x_1)] \text{Im}[G_{++}^{A_I}(x_1 - x_2)] \phi_{\Delta}(x_2) [\bar{\phi}^2(x_2) + \frac{1}{12} \phi_{\Delta}^2(x_2)] \right\}. \quad (5.13)
 \end{aligned}$$

This imaginary part can be reproduced by replacing ξ_1 in the stochastic effective action (4·20) with the auxiliary field ξ'_1 with the stochastic weight

$$P_1[\xi'_1] = N'_1 \exp \left\{ \int_{t_0}^t d^4x_1 d^4x_2 \xi'_1(x_1) (I_1^{-1}(x_1 - x_2) + \delta I_1^{-1}(x_1 - x_2)) \xi'_1(x_2) \right\}. \quad (5.14)$$

The second-order correlation of ξ'_1 then becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle \xi'_1(\mathbf{x}, t) \xi'_1(\mathbf{x}', t') \rangle_P &= -\frac{1}{2} (I_1(x_1 - x_2) + \delta I_1(x_1 - x_2)) \\
 &= \langle [\hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}, t), \hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}', t')]_+ \rangle / 2. \quad (5.15)
 \end{aligned}$$

In short, we have shown that the second-order correlations in IFM coincide with those in POM by utilizing the arbitrariness of the definition of the fluctuation force field in IFM. However, it should be noted that in POM, there is also the nonzero correlation

$$\langle [\hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1), \hat{f}_3(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2)]_+ \rangle / 2 = -\frac{\lambda^2}{8} G_{A_I}(0, 0) [G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2) + G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1, t_2 - t_1)]. \quad (5.16)$$

The corresponding correlation is implicitly assumed to vanish in IFM.

Now, we briefly discuss the fluctuation-dissipation theorem. In IFM, it is pointed out that the generalized f-d theorem is satisfied. This theorem asserts that there is a relation between the quantities $\mathcal{M}^{(i)}$, which are defined by Eqs. (4·44), (4·45) and (4·46), and the quantities I_i that determines the second-order correlation of the fluctuation force field. In order to see whether such a relation is satisfied in POM, it is necessary to identify the corresponding quantities $\mathcal{M}^{(i)}$ and I_i in POM. From the fact that the l.h.s. of the two equations have the same form, it is seen that the $\mathcal{M}^{(i)}$ in IFM are the same as those in POM. On the other hand, the correspondence between the r.h.s. of the two equations is not clear. We assume that I_1 , I_2 and I_3 in POM correspond to the l.h.s. (or the r.h.s.) of Eqs. (3·28), (3·29) and (3·30), respectively. Equations (3·29) and (3·30) are proportional to I_2 and I_3 given in IFM. Therefore, the generalized f-d theorem is satisfied for them. However, the r.h.s. of Eq. (3·28) is not proportional to I_1 , and therefore, the generalized f-d theorem is not satisfied for the \hat{f}_1 part.

In POM, there is a relation (the 2nd f-d theorem) between the fluctuation force fields and the coefficients in the quantum Langevin equation. There is no such relation in IFM, because the imaginary part of the second-order correlations is absent. In other words, the fluctuation force field in POM possesses more information than that in IFM.

§6. Derivation of a semiclassical Langevin equation in POM

In this section, we derive a semiclassical Langevin equation from the quantum Langevin equation (3·14).

First, we must remove quantum effects that come from the system. For this purpose, we replace the operators of the soft modes with c-numbers. There are two possible methods for this replacement. In the first, we make this replacement after taking the expectation value using the initial density matrix:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1)\hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2)\cdots\hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{x}_n, t_n) &\longrightarrow \text{Tr}[\rho\hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1)\hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2)\cdots\hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{x}_n, t_n)] \\ &\sim \phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1)\phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2)\cdots\phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}_n, t_n), \end{aligned} \quad (6\cdot1)$$

for $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. Here ρ is the initial density matrix of the total system. In the second, we replace the operators themselves with the c-numbers:

$$\hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1)\hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2)\cdots\hat{\phi}_{<}(\mathbf{x}_n, t_n) \longrightarrow \phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1)\phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2)\cdots\phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}_n, t_n). \quad (6\cdot2)$$

In the former method of replacement, we cannot obtain the fluctuation force field, because the r.h.s. of the equation becomes zero when we take the expectation value, as follows from its definition. For this reason, we adopt the latter method of replacement. Note that a similar replacement should be made for $\hat{\phi}_{0<}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and $\hat{\phi}_{0<}^2(\mathbf{x}, t)$ in the fluctuation force field. Furthermore, in Eq. (3·14), there are two terms including the soft mode propagator, which correspond to the diagrams shown in Figs. 1 (g) and (h). In deriving our semiclassical equation, we simply drop these terms.

Next, we have to replace the fluctuation force field with a c-number. The simplest method to do so is to introduce c-number fields f_1 , f_2 and f_3 that have the following correlations:

$$\langle f_1(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle_c = \langle f_2(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle_c = \langle f_3(\mathbf{x}, t) \rangle_c = 0. \quad (6\cdot3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f_1(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1)f_1(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle_c &= -\frac{\lambda^2}{12i}[G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2)^3 + G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1, t_2 - t_1)^3] \\ &\quad + \frac{i\lambda^2}{8}G_{A_I}(0, 0)^2[G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2) + G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1, t_2 - t_1)], \end{aligned} \quad (6\cdot4)$$

$$\langle f_2(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1)f_2(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle_c = -\frac{\lambda^2}{4}[G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2)^2 + G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1, t_2 - t_1)^2], \quad (6\cdot5)$$

$$\langle f_3(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1)f_3(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle_c = \frac{\lambda^2}{8i}[G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2) + G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1, t_2 - t_1)], \quad (6\cdot6)$$

$$\langle f_1(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1)f_3(\mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle_c = -\frac{\lambda^2}{8}G_{A_I}(0, 0)[G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2, t_1 - t_2) + G_{A_I}(\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1, t_2 - t_1)]. \quad (6\cdot7)$$

Here, $\langle \rangle_c$ represents an average evaluated with respect to suitable stochastic weights. Other second-order correlations are assumed to be zero. These values are determined so as to reproduce the real part of the second-order correlations, in other word, the symmetrized correlations of \hat{f}_i . If there are no correlations between different f_i , we obtain Gaussian stochastic weights, as in case of IFM. Actually, there is a correlation between f_1 and f_3 in this case, and it is not clear whether or not one can construct a stochastic weight that reproduces all the above correlations.

Because of the above stated problem, we consider another replacement, which is explicitly defined in terms of a definite stochastic weight. In the IFM calculation, the field ξ_i is treated as the stochastic variable. We regard the creation-annihilation operator as the stochastic variable. The creation-annihilation operators of the hard modes, which develop as free fields, have the correlation

$$\begin{aligned} \langle a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger(t)a_{\mathbf{k}'}(t') \rangle &= \text{Tr}_E[\rho_E a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{k}'} e^{i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}t} e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}'}t'}] \\ &= n_{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}} e^{i\omega_{\mathbf{k}}(t-t')} \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}') \\ &\equiv n(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'; t, t') \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

We consider the replacement of the creation-annihilation operators of the hard modes $a_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$ and $a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger(t)$ with the c-numbers $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$ and $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^*(t)$, respectively. Then, to realize the above correlation for these c-numbers, we introduce the stochastic weight $P[\beta, \beta^*]$ which has the property

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^*(t)\beta_{\mathbf{k}'}(t') \rangle_\beta &= \prod_{\mathbf{k} \geq \Lambda_I} \int D\beta_{\mathbf{k}} D\beta_{\mathbf{k}}^* P[\beta, \beta^*] \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^*(t)\beta_{\mathbf{k}'}(t') \\ &= n(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'; t, t'), \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

where

$$P[\beta, \beta^*] = N \exp \left[- \int_{t_0}^t ds_1 ds_2 \int d^3\mathbf{k}_1 d^3\mathbf{k}_2 \beta_{\mathbf{k}_1}(s_1) n^{-1}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2; s_1, s_2) \beta_{\mathbf{k}_2}^*(s_2) \right]. \quad (6.10)$$

In this replacement, the field operator $\hat{\phi}_{0>}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is replaced with the c-number field $\phi_{>}(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}, t)$, given by

$$\phi_{>}(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}, t) = \int_{\Lambda_I}^{\Lambda} d^3\mathbf{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(2\pi)^3\omega_{\mathbf{k}}}} [\beta_{\mathbf{k}}(t)e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}} + \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^*(t)e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{x}}]. \quad (6.11)$$

Using this function $\phi_{>}$, we replace \hat{f}_i with c-numbers as follows:

$$\hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}, t) \longrightarrow f_1(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{\lambda}{6} \phi_{>}(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}, t)^3, \quad (6.12)$$

$$\hat{f}_2(\mathbf{x}, t) \longrightarrow f_2(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{\lambda}{2} (\phi_{>}(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}, t)^2 - \langle \phi_{>}(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}, t)^2 \rangle_\beta), \quad (6.13)$$

$$\hat{f}_3(\mathbf{x}, t) \longrightarrow f_3(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \phi_{>}(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}, t), \quad (6.14)$$

Summarizing the above result, the semiclassical Langevin equation in POM is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \square\phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}, t) + m^2\phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}, t) + \sum_{i=a, \dots, f} \int d^3\mathbf{y} \delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) G_i[\phi_{<}(\mathbf{y}, t)] \\ = \int d^3\mathbf{y} \delta_{\Lambda_I}^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \{f_1(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{y}, t) + \phi_{0<}(\mathbf{y}, t) f_2(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{y}, t) + \phi_{0<}^2(\mathbf{y}, t) f_3(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{y}, t)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.15)$$

For comparison, the semiclassical equation in IFM is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \square\phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}, t) + m^2\phi_{<}(\mathbf{x}, t) + \sum_{i=a, \dots, f} \int d^3\mathbf{y} \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) G_i[\phi_{<}(\mathbf{y}, t)] \\ = \int d^3\mathbf{y} \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \{\xi_1(\mathbf{y}, t) + \phi_{<}(\mathbf{y}, t) \xi_2(\mathbf{y}, t) + \phi_{<}^2(\mathbf{y}, t) \xi_3(\mathbf{y}, t)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.16)$$

where

$$G_a[\phi_{<}(\mathbf{y}, t)] = \frac{\lambda}{6} \phi_{<}^3(\mathbf{y}, t), \quad (6.17)$$

$$G_b[\phi_{<}(\mathbf{y}, t)] = -\frac{i\lambda}{2} G_{\Lambda_I}(0, 0) \phi_{<}(\mathbf{y}, t), \quad (6.18)$$

$$G_c[\phi_{<}(\mathbf{y}, t)] = -\frac{\lambda^2}{4} \int_0^t ds \int d^3\mathbf{y}_1 [G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{y}_1 - \mathbf{y}, s - t)^2 - G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}_1, t - s)^2] G_{\Lambda_I}(0, 0) \phi_{<}(\mathbf{y}, t), \quad (6.19)$$

$$G_d[\phi_{<}(\mathbf{y}, t)] = -\frac{\lambda^2}{6} \int_0^t ds \int d^3\mathbf{y}_1 [G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{y}_1 - \mathbf{y}, -s)^3 - G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}_1, s)^3] \varphi_{<}(\mathbf{y}_1, -s, t), \quad (6.20)$$

$$G_e[\phi_{<}(\mathbf{y}, t)] = -\frac{i\lambda^2}{4} \int_0^t ds \int d^3\mathbf{y}_1 [G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{y}_1 - \mathbf{y}, -s)^2 - G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}_1, s)^2] \varphi_{<}^2(\mathbf{y}_1, -s, t) \phi_{<}(\mathbf{y}, t), \quad (6.21)$$

$$G_f[\phi_{<}(\mathbf{y}, t)] = \frac{\lambda^2}{12} \int_0^t ds \int d^3\mathbf{y}_1 [G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{y}_1 - \mathbf{y}, -s) - G_{\Lambda_I}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}_1, s)] \varphi_{<}^3(\mathbf{y}_1, -s, t) \phi_{<}^2(\mathbf{y}, t). \quad (6.22)$$

It is clear from the discussion in the previous section that the l.h.s. of the two equations are identical except for the difference between the Dirac delta function and the cutoff delta function. For the fluctuation force fields, which are the r.h.s. of the equations, there is a difference between POM and IFM at the level of the semiclassical Langevin equation: In IFM, ξ_1 , ξ_2 and ξ_3 are treated as stochastic variables, while in POM, there are only two stochastic variables β and β^* . As a result, there are some differences in the correlations. To show this, we calculate the correlations of $f_i(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}, t)$.

The first order correlations are

$$\langle f_1(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}, t) \rangle_\beta = \langle f_2(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}, t) \rangle_\beta = \langle f_3(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}, t) \rangle_\beta = 0. \quad (6.23)$$

Thus all the first-order correlations disappear. This is also the case in IFM. The second order correlations are

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \langle f_1(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}_1, t_1) f_1(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle_\beta \\
 &= \frac{4\lambda^2}{3} \int_{\Lambda_I} d^3\mathbf{l}_1 d^3\mathbf{l}_2 d^3\mathbf{l}_3 \frac{1}{8(2\pi)^9 \omega_{\mathbf{l}_1} \omega_{\mathbf{l}_2} \omega_{\mathbf{l}_3}} n_{\omega_{\mathbf{l}_1}} n_{\omega_{\mathbf{l}_2}} n_{\omega_{\mathbf{l}_3}} \\
 & \quad \times \cos \omega_{\mathbf{l}_1}(t_1 - t_2) \cos \omega_{\mathbf{l}_2}(t_1 - t_2) \cos \omega_{\mathbf{l}_3}(t_1 - t_2) e^{i(\mathbf{l}_1 + \mathbf{l}_2 + \mathbf{l}_3)(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2)} \\
 & \quad + 2\lambda^2 \int_{\Lambda_I} d^3\mathbf{l}_1 d^3\mathbf{l}_2 d^3\mathbf{l}_3 \frac{1}{8(2\pi)^9 \omega_{\mathbf{l}_1} \omega_{\mathbf{l}_2} \omega_{\mathbf{l}_3}} n_{\omega_{\mathbf{l}_1}} n_{\omega_{\mathbf{l}_2}} n_{\omega_{\mathbf{l}_3}} \cos \omega_{\mathbf{l}_3}(t_1 - t_2) e^{i\mathbf{l}_3(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2)},
 \end{aligned} \tag{6.24}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \langle f_2(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}_1, t_1) f_2(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle_\beta \\
 &= 2\lambda^2 \int_{\Lambda_I} d^3\mathbf{l}_1 d^3\mathbf{l}_2 \frac{1}{4(2\pi)^6 \omega_{\mathbf{l}_1} \omega_{\mathbf{l}_2}} n_{\omega_{\mathbf{l}_1}} n_{\omega_{\mathbf{l}_2}} \\
 & \quad \times \cos \omega_{\mathbf{l}_1}(t_1 - t_2) \cos \omega_{\mathbf{l}_2}(t_1 - t_2) e^{i(\mathbf{l}_1 + \mathbf{l}_2)(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2)},
 \end{aligned} \tag{6.25}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \langle f_3(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}_1, t_1) f_3(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle_\beta \\
 &= \prod_{\mathbf{k} \geq \Lambda_I} \int \frac{d^2\beta_{\mathbf{k}}}{\pi} P(\beta_{\mathbf{k}}) f_3(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}_1, t_1) f_3(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \\
 &= \frac{\lambda^2}{4} \int_{\Lambda_I} d^3\mathbf{k} \frac{1}{2(2\pi)^3 \omega_{\mathbf{k}}} 2n_{\omega_{\mathbf{k}}} \cos \omega_{\mathbf{k}}(t_1 - t_2) e^{i\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2)},
 \end{aligned} \tag{6.26}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \langle f_1(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}_1, t_1) f_3(\beta, \beta^*, \mathbf{x}_2, t_2) \rangle_\beta \\
 &= \lambda^2 \int_{\Lambda_I} d^3\mathbf{l}_1 d^3\mathbf{l}_2 \frac{1}{4(2\pi)^6 \omega_{\mathbf{l}_1} \omega_{\mathbf{l}_2}} n_{\omega_{\mathbf{l}_1}} n_{\omega_{\mathbf{l}_2}} \cos \omega_{\mathbf{l}_1}(t_1 - t_2) \cos \omega_{\mathbf{l}_2}(t_1 - t_2) e^{i\mathbf{l}_2(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2)}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{6.27}$$

These correlations are identical with the symmetrized second-order correlations if $1 + 2n_{\omega_{\mathbf{p}}}$ is replaced with $2n_{\omega_{\mathbf{p}}}$ in Eqs. (3.28), (3.29), (3.30) and (5.16). This can be understood as follows. The creation-annihilation operators $a_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger$ depends on their order of the operation:

$$\langle a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger a_{\mathbf{k}'} \rangle \neq \langle a_{\mathbf{k}'} a_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \rangle. \tag{6.28}$$

However, in the replacement under consideration, the corresponding situation does not exist, as

$$\langle \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^* \beta_{\mathbf{k}'} \rangle_\beta = \langle \beta_{\mathbf{k}'} \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^* \rangle_\beta. \tag{6.29}$$

In other words, in the present replacement, all the contributions from the vacuum are ignored.

In this section, we have derived a semiclassical Langevin equation from a quantum Langevin equation in POM ignoring the noncommutativity of the soft mode operators and diagrams with soft mode propagation. The problem we encounter is that the procedure of replacing the fluctuation force fields with c-number stochastic

variables is not unique. With the procedure we employed here, the correct correlations between the fluctuation force fields with different indices, like Eq. (6.27), are realized but the correct contribution from the vacuum is not realized.

§7. Conclusions and discussion

In this paper, we applied POM to ϕ^4 theory and derived correct quantum and semiclassical Langevin equations that describe the time evolution of the soft modes. We have examined in detail the differences and similarities of the results obtained using POM and IFM.

In the case of POM, the quantum Langevin equation is derived systematically from a perturbative expansion of the Heisenberg equation of motion. The fluctuation-dissipation theorem of second kind is applied to determine the order of the expansion. In this formalism, we can derive an equation of motion with no time-convolution integral term without imposing an approximation, like the linear harmonic approximation. To derive the semiclassical Langevin equation from this equation of motion, the quantum effect arising from the soft modes must be removed by replacing the operators of the system, i.e. the soft modes, with c-numbers, and we ignored the contribution that includes the soft mode propagator. Furthermore, we replaced the fluctuation force field with a c-number by regarding the creation-annihilation operators of the hard modes as stochastic variables.

In IFM, the semiclassical Langevin equation is derived by applying a variational principle to the stochastic effective action. This equation has time-convolution integral terms, and the linear harmonic approximation is employed to remove them, while maintaining the dissipation effect. To derive the stochastic effective action, the imaginary part of the influence action was removed by introducing auxiliary fields. These fields are interpreted as the fluctuation force fields.

We compared the semiclassical Langevin equation obtained using IFM with the quantum Langevin equation obtained using POM. If we ignore the fluctuation force field, the difference between the two equations comes only from the difference between the Dirac delta function and the cutoff delta function. This difference results from the definition of the functional derivative that is used to derive the semiclassical Langevin equation from the stochastic effective action in IFM. In POM, the momentum component that is larger than the cutoff Λ_I is always projected out, due to this cutoff delta function. In IFM, by contrast, the separation of the momentum is incomplete. Note that this agreement of the respective of the l.h.s. is also due to the linear harmonic approximation employed in IFM. There is no such agreement if the quasi-instantaneous approximation is used. In this sense, it may be the case that POM provides the basis for the validity of the linear harmonic approximation.

With regard to the fluctuation force field, the relation between the two approaches is more complicated. The soft modes that are coupled to the fluctuation force field in POM develop as free fields, and therefore the fluctuation force field term always disappears if the expectation value is calculated using the initial density matrix. Contractingly, in IFM, the time dependence of the soft modes is to be determined by solving the equation. Therefore, the expectation values of the

fluctuation force terms in IFM do not vanish in general.

Moreover, in IFM, there is an arbitrariness in the auxiliary fields. It is noteworthy that the correlations $\langle \xi_1(\mathbf{x}, t) \xi_1(\mathbf{x}', t') \rangle_P$ and $\langle [\hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}, t), \hat{f}_1(\mathbf{x}', t')]_+ \rangle / 2$ can be made identical by utilizing this arbitrariness. In short, we can conclude that in POM, we can determine the fluctuation force field uniquely, and the result suggests that the fluctuation force field in IFM may have to be modified. In IFM, it is necessary to introduce another principle to determine the fluctuation force field uniquely. Furthermore, it is implicitly assumed that there is no correlation between different fluctuation force fields in IFM. Our POM study indicates that such an assumption is not necessarily valid.

In short, the derivation of the Langevin equation in POM seems to be more systematic and less ambiguous than that in IFM. Furthermore, the fact that the differences between the two approaches can be attributed to ambiguities in IFM seems to indicate the superiority of POM. However, such a claim cannot yet be made conclusively, and it is a future problem to study the deeper physical meaning of the differences between the two approaches.

Greiner et al. have asserted that the system should thermalize with the approximations used in the present paper. However, there is no common understanding about what condition a nonlinear Langevin equation should satisfy to ensure the evolution of the system toward thermal equilibrium. The well-known fluctuation-dissipation theorem may ensure thermal equilibrium for the linear case, but this is an open question for the nonlinear case.³⁷⁾ Therefore, it is not clear at present under what condition the equation of motion obtained with either POM or IFM guarantees the realization of thermal equilibrium. In the present paper, we have compared the two equations obtained from POM and IFM with respect to the assumptions and arbitrariness contained in each formalism. On the basis of this comparison, we conclude that POM is better than IFM.

Finally, we derived the semiclassical Langevin equation in POM. A crucial problem here is to determine how to replace the fluctuation force field, which consists of an environment operator, with a c-number. In this paper, we replace the creation-annihilation operators of the environment with corresponding to the stochastic variables. In this replacement, all the vacuum contributions are dropped. It is a future problem to further study the justification of this replacement.

Appendix A

— Fluctuation-dissipation theorem of second kind —

In conventional statistical mechanics, the following two relations are known as the fluctuation-dissipation theorem. The first is that the transport coefficient is represented in terms of the fluctuations of macroscopic variables. This is called the fluctuation-dissipation theorem of first kind (1st f-d theorem). The second is the fluctuation-dissipation theorem of second kind (2nd f-d theorem), according to which the transport coefficients are represented by the fluctuation force. In POM, the 2nd f-d theorem is applied to determine the order of the expansion of the fluctuation force.

The 2nd f-d theorem is usually understood in terms of the Mori-Langevin equation,³⁰⁾

$$\frac{d}{dt}A(t) = i\omega A(t) - \int_0^t ds \varphi(t-s)A(s) + f(t), \quad (\text{A}\cdot 1)$$

where A is a macroscopic variable, $\varphi(t)$ the memory function and $f(t)$ the fluctuation force. The memory function is given by

$$\varphi(t) = (f(t), f^\dagger(0)), \quad (\text{A}\cdot 2)$$

where $(\)$ represents an inner product satisfying the following properties:

$$(F, G)^* = (G, F), \quad (\text{A}\cdot 3)$$

$$\left(\sum_i c_i F_i, G\right) = \sum_i c_i (F_i, G) \quad (\text{A}\cdot 4)$$

It can be seen in Eq. (A·2) that the memory function is represented by the time correlation of the fluctuation forces. This is the 2nd f-d theorem. From the above discussion, we can see that if the memory function is of second order in the coupling constant, the fluctuation force must be of first order for the 2nd f-d theorem to be satisfied. The Mori equation is derived exactly from the Heisenberg equation of motion, and therefore, the 2nd f-d theorem holds exactly in the case of a linear equation. In this paper, we would like to propose that this theorem holds to every order in the perturbative expansion in the case of a linear equation.

In the calculation of the Langevin equation in POM, we expand the factor $e^{iLQ(t-t_0)} \frac{1}{1-\Sigma(t,t_0)}$ up to zeroth order in L_I and determine the form of the fluctuation force,

$$\begin{aligned} & Q e^{iLQ(t-t_0)} \frac{1}{1-\Sigma(t,t_0)} iLO(t_0) \\ &= Q \mathcal{D}(t, t_0) Q \\ & \quad \times \frac{1}{1 + (\mathcal{C}(t, t_0) - 1)Q + (\mathcal{D}(t, t_0) - 1) + (\mathcal{C}(t, t_0) - 1)Q(\mathcal{D}(t, t_0) - 1)} e^{iL_0(t-t_0)} \\ & \sim Q e^{iL_0(t-t_0)} iLO(t_0). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A}\cdot 5)$$

Now, we confirm that this fluctuation force satisfies the 2nd f-d theorem employing the following model. The Hamiltonian is

$$H = \omega_a a^\dagger a + \int d\omega \omega b^\dagger(\omega) b(\omega) + g \int d\omega (a^\dagger b(\omega) + a b^\dagger(\omega)), \quad (\text{A}\cdot 6)$$

where both a and $b(\omega)$ are boson operators, which satisfy the following commutation relations:

$$[a, a^\dagger] = 1, \quad [b(\omega), b^\dagger(\omega')] = \delta(\omega - \omega'). \quad (\text{A}\cdot 7)$$

We consider the case in which a is the system operator and $b(\omega)$ the environment operator and divide the Hamiltonian into three parts:

$$H_s = \omega_a a^\dagger a, \quad (\text{A}\cdot 8)$$

$$H_E = \int d\omega \omega b^\dagger(\omega) b(\omega), \quad (\text{A}\cdot 9)$$

$$H_I = g \int d\omega (a^\dagger b(\omega) + a b^\dagger(\omega)). \quad (\text{A}\cdot 10)$$

The projection operator is defined as

$$PO = {}_b\langle 0|O|0\rangle_b, \quad (\text{A}\cdot 11)$$

where

$$b(\omega)|0\rangle_b = 0. \quad (\text{A}\cdot 12)$$

Substituting these ingredients into Eq. (2.19), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} a^\dagger(t) = i\omega_a a^\dagger(t) - g^2 \int d\omega \frac{e^{i(\omega-\omega_a)t} - 1}{i(\omega - \omega_a)} a^\dagger(t) + f(t), \quad (\text{A}\cdot 13)$$

where

$$f(t) = ig \int d\omega e^{i\omega t} b^\dagger(\omega). \quad (\text{A}\cdot 14)$$

This equation can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} a^\dagger(t) &= i\omega_a a^\dagger(t) + \int_0^t ds \langle 0|[f(t), f^\dagger(s)]|0\rangle e^{-i\omega_a(t-s)} a^\dagger(t) + f(t) \\ &= i\omega_a a^\dagger(t) + \int_0^t ds \phi(t-s) e^{-i\omega_a(t-s)} a^\dagger(t) + f(t) \\ &= i\omega_a a^\dagger(t) + \int_0^t ds \phi(s) e^{-i\omega_a s} a^\dagger(t) + f(t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A}\cdot 15)$$

This equation is the TCL equation, and therefore, we cannot compare this result with the Mori-Langevin equation, which has a time-convolution integral term. However, if we accept the approximation $a^\dagger(t-s) \sim e^{-i\omega_a s} a^\dagger(t)$, as in case of the linear harmonic approximation, we can conclude that this equation satisfies the 2nd f-d theorem to this order of the perturbative expansion. Therefore, the definition of the fluctuation force (A.5) is consistent with the 2nd f-d theorem in this case of a linear Langevin equation. We apply this approximate fluctuation force to the nonlinear case.

Appendix B

— Derivation of a semiclassical equation in IFM —

For simplicity, we consider the case of quantum mechanics, in which the system is denoted by X and the environment by Q . The time evolution of the density matrix is described by

$$\begin{aligned} &\rho_{X \cup Q}(x, q; x', q'; t) \\ &= \int dx_i dq_i dx'_i dq'_i U(x, q; x_i, q_i; t, t_i) \rho_{X \cup Q}(x_i, q_i; x'_i, q'_i; t_i) U^*(x', q'; x'_i, q'_i; t, t_i), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B}\cdot 1)$$

where

$$U(x, q; x_i, q_i; t, t_i) = \int_{x_i}^x Dx' \int_{q_i}^q Dq' e^{iS(x', q')/\hbar}, \quad (\text{B}\cdot 2)$$

with

$$S(x, q) = \int_{t_i}^t ds \mathcal{L}(x(s), q(s)). \quad (\text{B}\cdot 3)$$

Here, the action $S(x, q)$ is given by

$$S(x, q) = S_X(x) + S_Q(q) + S_{int}(x, q), \quad (\text{B}\cdot 4)$$

where $S_X(x)$ is the action of the system, $S_Q(q)$ the action of the environment, and $S_{int}(x, q)$ the action of the interaction part. As in case of POM, we assume no initial correlation between X and Q :

$$\rho_{X \cup Q}(x_i, q_i; x'_i, q'_i; t_i) = \rho_X(x_i, x'_i; t_i) \otimes \rho_Q(q_i, q'_i; t_i). \quad (\text{B}\cdot 5)$$

The reduced density matrix is defined by tracing out the environment degrees of freedom, as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_r(x, x'; t) &= \text{Tr}_{(q)} \{ \rho_{X \cup Q}(x, q; x', q'; t) \} \\ &\sim \int dx_i dx'_i \int_{x_i}^x Dx \int_{x'_i}^{x'} Dx' e^{i(S_X(x) - S_X(x'))} e^{iS_{IF}(x, x')} \rho_X(x_i, x'_i; t) \\ &= \int dx_i dx'_i \int_{x_i}^x Dx \int_{x'_i}^{x'} Dx' e^{iS_{eff}(x, x')} \rho_X(x_i, x'_i; t), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B}\cdot 6)$$

where the functions $e^{iS_{IF}(x, x')}$ and $S_{eff}(x, x')$ are the influence functional and the effective action, respectively. It is difficult to trace out the environment degrees of freedom completely, and therefore, we have carried out a perturbative expansion in going from the first line to the second line. As an example, we consider the interaction

$$\mathcal{L}_{int}(x, q) = x \Xi(q). \quad (\text{B}\cdot 7)$$

The influence action $S_{IF}(x, x')$ is expanded up to second order in powers of x :

$$\begin{aligned} S_{IF}[x, x'] &= \int_{t_i}^t ds F(s) [x(s) - x'(s)] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{t_i}^t ds ds' \left[\left(R(s, s') + iI(s, s') \right) x(s)x(s') + \left(-R(s, s') + iI(s, s') \right) x'(s)x'(s') \right. \\ &\left. + \left(R(s, s') - iI(s, s') \right) x(s)x'(s') + \left(-R(s, s') - iI(s, s') \right) x'(s)x(s') \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B}\cdot 8)$$

where $F(s)$, $R(s, s')$ and $I(s, s')$ are real (Hermitian) functions. The effective action S_{eff} is a complex function. To make it real, we introduce a new variable ξ , and with it we obtain the stochastic effective action,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{S}_{eff}(x, x', \xi) &= S_X(x) - S_X(x') + \text{Re}(S_{IF}(x, x')) + \int_{t_i}^t ds \xi(s)[x(s) - x'(s)] \\ &= S_X(x) - S_X(x') + \tilde{S}_{IF}(x, x', \xi).\end{aligned}\tag{B.9}$$

This is derived by using the relation

$$e^{i/\hbar S_{eff}(x, x')} \equiv \int D\xi P[\xi] e^{i/\hbar \tilde{S}_{eff}(x, x', \xi)},\tag{B.10}$$

where $P[\xi]$ is the stochastic weight defined by

$$P[\xi] = \frac{1}{N} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\hbar} \int_{t_i}^t ds_1 ds_2 \xi(s_1) I^{-1}(s_1, s_2) \xi(s_2)\right).\tag{B.11}$$

In deriving this relation, we have assumed that it is possible to carry out the Gaussian integral. (See Appendix C for more details.)

If the system behaves quasi-classically, the reduced density matrix becomes nearly diagonal. Then, the major contributing path is obtained by applying a variational principle to the stochastic effective action:

$$\left. \frac{\delta \tilde{S}_{eff}(\bar{x}, \Delta, \xi)}{\delta \Delta} \right|_{\Delta=0} = 0,\tag{B.12}$$

where

$$\bar{x} = \frac{x + x'}{2},\tag{B.13}$$

$$\Delta = x - x'.\tag{B.14}$$

The equation derived in this manner is a semiclassical equation that includes quantum effects of the environment:

$$\frac{\delta S_X(\bar{x})}{\delta \bar{x}(s)} + F(s) + \int_{t_i}^s ds' R(s, s') \bar{x}(s') = -\xi(s).\tag{B.15}$$

Here, we assume that the new variable ξ can be interpreted as a fluctuation force that is distributed with the stochastic weight $P[\xi]$ defined in Eq. (B.11). Then, Eq. (B.15) can be regarded as a kind of Langevin equation.

Appendix C

— Gaussian integral —

To confirm Eq. (B.10), we calculate the following integral:

$$\int D\xi P[\xi] e^{(i/\hbar) \tilde{S}_{IF}(x, x', \xi)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int D\xi \frac{1}{N} \exp \left\{ \frac{i}{\hbar} \text{Re} S_{IF}(x, x') + \frac{i}{\hbar} \int_{t_i}^t ds \xi(s) (x(s) - x'(s)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2\hbar} \int_{t_i}^t ds_1 ds_2 \xi(s_1) I^{-1}(s_1, s_2) \xi(s_2) \right\} \\
&= \int D\xi \frac{1}{N} \exp \left\{ \frac{i}{\hbar} \text{Re} S_{IF}(x, x') + \frac{i}{\hbar} \xi_i (x_i - x'_i) - \frac{1}{2\hbar} \xi_i I_{ij}^{-1} \xi_j \right\}. \quad (\text{C}\cdot 1)
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we omit the summation symbol. We assume that the matrix I^{-1} can be diagonalized by a unitary matrix U :

$$UI^{-1}U^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & & \\ & \lambda_2 & \\ & & \ddots \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{C}\cdot 2)$$

The terms that appear in the brackets on the r.h.s. of Eq. (C-1) can be transformed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{i}{\hbar} \xi_i (x_i - x'_i) - \frac{1}{2\hbar} \xi_i I_{ij}^{-1} \xi_j &= -\frac{\lambda_i}{2\hbar} \eta_i^2 + \frac{i}{\hbar} \eta_i (y_i - y'_i) \\
&= -\frac{\lambda_i}{2\hbar} \left\{ \eta_i^2 - \frac{2i}{\lambda_i} \eta_i (y_i - y'_i) \right\} \\
&= -\frac{\lambda_i}{2\hbar} \left\{ \left(\eta_i - \frac{i}{\lambda_i} (y_i - y'_i) \right)^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda_i^2} (y_i - y'_i)^2 \right\}, \quad (\text{C}\cdot 3)
\end{aligned}$$

where $(Ux)_i = y_i$, $(U\xi)_i = \eta_i$. Furthermore, we assume that all the eigenvalues λ_i are positive. Then, we can carry out the Gaussian integral:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int D\xi \exp \left\{ -\frac{\lambda_i}{2\hbar} \left(\eta_i - \frac{i}{\lambda_i} (y_i - y'_i) \right)^2 \right\} &= \prod_i \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\eta_i \exp \left\{ -\frac{\lambda_i}{2\hbar} \eta_i^2 \right\} \\
&= \prod_i \sqrt{\frac{2\hbar\pi}{\lambda_i}} \\
&= [\det(2\hbar\pi I_{ij})]^{1/2}. \quad (\text{C}\cdot 4)
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int D\xi P[\xi] e^{(i/\hbar) \tilde{S}_{IF}(x, x', \xi)} &= \exp \left\{ \frac{i}{\hbar} \text{Re} S_{IF}(x, x') - \frac{1}{2\hbar\lambda_i} (y_i - y'_i)^2 \right\} \\
&= \exp \frac{i}{\hbar} \left\{ \text{Re} S_{IF}(x, x') + \frac{i}{2} (x_i - x'_i) I_{ij} (x_j - x'_j) \right\} \\
&= e^{(i/\hbar) S_{IF}(x, x')}, \quad (\text{C}\cdot 5)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$N = [\text{Det}(2\hbar\pi I)]^{1/2}. \quad (\text{C}\cdot 6)$$

Thus, the relation (B-10) is confirmed. Equation (4-19) is the quantum field theoretical version of this relation.

References

- [1] M. Morikawa, Phys. Rev. D33, 3607 (1986).
- [2] M. Gleiser and R. O. Ramos, Phys. Rev. D50, 2441 (1994).
- [3] A. Berera, M. Gleiser and R. Ramos, Phys. Rev. D58, 123508 (1998).
- [4] F. Lombardo and F. D. Mazzitelli, Phys. Rev. D53, 2001 (1996).
- [5] C. Greiner and B. Müller, Phys. Rev. D55, 1026 (1997).
- [6] D. H. Rischke, Phys. Rev. C58, 2331 (1998).
- [7] T. S. Biro and C. Greiner, Phys. Rev. Lett 79, 3138 (1997).
- [8] D. Boyanovsky, H. J. de Vega and R. Holman, Phys. Rev. D51, 734 (1995).
- [9] D. Boyanovsky, M. D' Attanasio, H. J. de Vega and R. Holman, Phys. Rev. D54, 1748 (1996).
- [10] F. Cooper, Y. Kluger, E. Mottola and J. P. Paz, Phys. Rev. D51, 2377 (1995).
- [11] J. Randrup, Phys. Rev. D55, 1188 (1997).
- [12] S. R. Wilkinson et al. Nature 387, 575 (1997).
- [13] R. F. Alvarez-Estrada and J. L. Sánchez-Gómez, Phys. Lett. A253, 252 (1999).
- [14] H.-J. Miesner et al., Science 279, 1005 (1998).
- [15] D. G. Barci, E. S. Fraga and R. O. Ramos, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 479 (2000).
- [16] E. C. G. Stueckelberg, Phys. Rev. 81, 130 (1951).
- [17] N. N. Bogoliubov and D. V. Shirkov, *INTRODUCTION TO THE THEORY OF QUANTIZED FIELDS*. 3rd ed. (John Wiley, 1980).
- [18] T. Koide, M. Maruyama and F. Takagi, Prog. Theor. Phys. Supp. 129, 133 (1997).
- [19] T. Koide, M. Maruyama and F. Takagi, Prog. Theor. Phys. 101, 373 (1999).
- [20] J. Baacke, K. Heitmann and C. Pätzold Phys. Rev. D57, 6398 (1998).
- [21] J. Baacke, D. Boyanovsky and H. J. de Vega, hep-th/9907337.
- [22] O. Y. Shvedov, Phys. Lett. B443, 373 (1998).
- [23] K. Kawasaki and J. D. Gunton, *Progress in liquid physics* edited by C. A. Croxton, 175 (Wiley, Chichester, England, 1978).
- [24] M. Suzuki, Prog. Theor. Phys. 56, 77 (1976).
- [25] L. Gammaitoni, P. Hänggi, P. Jung and F. Marchesoni, Rev. Mod. Phys. 70, 223 (1998).
- [26] A. A. Zaikin, J. Garía-Ojalvo and L. Schimansky-Geier, Phys. Rev. E60, R6275 (1999) and references therein.
- [27] J. Rau and B. Müller, Phys. Rep. **272**, 1 (1996).
- [28] A. Schmid, J. Low Temp. Phys. 49, 609 (1982).
- [29] A. O. Caldeira and A. I. Leggett, Physica A 121, 587 (1983).
- [30] H. Mori, Prog. Theor. Phys. 33, 423 (1965).
- [31] M. Tokuyama and H. Mori, Prog. Theor. Phys. 55, 411 (1976).
- [32] S. Nakajima, Prog. Theor. Phys. 20, 948 (1958); R. Zwanzig, J. Chem. Phys. 33, 1338 (1960).
- [33] N. Hashitsume, F. Shibata and M. Shingū, J. Stati. Phys. 17, 155 (1977).
- [34] F. Shibata and N. Hashitsume, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 44, 1435 (1978).
- [35] C. Uchiyama and F. Shibata, Phys. Rev. E60, 2636 (1999).
- [36] T. Koide and M. Maruyama, Prog. Theor. Phys. 104, 575 (2000).
- [37] F. Shibata and N. Hashitsume, Supp. Prog. Theor. Phys. 64, 83 (1978).
- [38] F. Shibata and T. Arimitsu, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 49, 891 (1980).
- [39] D. Ahn, Phys. Rev. B 50, 8310 (1994).
- [40] F. Shibata, Y. Hamano and N. Hashitsume, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 50, 2166 (1981).
- [41] Z. Xu and C. Greiner, Phys. Rev. D62, 036012 (2000).
- [42] B. L. Hu, Juan Pablo Paz and Yuhong Zhang, Phys. Rev. D45, 2843 (1992).
- [43] B. L. Hu, Juan Pablo Paz and Yuhong Zhang, Phys. Rev. D47, 1576 (1992).