

Warm Inflation Dissipative Dynamics

ARJUN BERERA¹

*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Edinburgh
Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom*

Warm inflation dynamics is reviewed. Results on dissipative scalar field dynamics relevant to warm inflation are examined and estimates of radiation production are given.

PRESENTED AT

COSMO-01

Rovaniemi, Finland,
August 29 – September 4, 2001

¹PPARC Advanced Fellow

The inflation picture of accelerated scale factor expansion has been long recognized as a potentially important component of the early universe [1, 2], which could solve the cosmological horizon and flatness problems. However, consistent dynamical solutions of inflation founded on quantum field theory have been allusive. Moreover, the thermodynamic state during inflation is not unique. In the earliest conception of inflation [1, 2, 3, 4], it was pictured that inflation would result in a isentropic expansion that would rapidly put the universe in a supercooled thermodynamic phase. Subsequently it was observed that supercooled inflation is not mandatory and that nonisentropic inflationary expansion, warm inflation, also is possible [5] (see also [6]). Representing the early universe by a two fluid mixture of radiation energy density ρ_r and vacuum energy density ρ_v , the inflationary regime, when the scale factor accelerates $\ddot{R} > 0$, generally requires $\rho_v > \rho_r$. Thus from the point of view of two fluid Friedmann cosmology, isentropic inflationary expansion appears as a limiting case within the general regime of nonisentropic inflation.

In particle physics the vacuum equation of state $\rho_v = -p_v$ is realized by a scalar field with energy density $\rho(\phi) = \dot{\phi}^2/2 + (\nabla\phi)^2/2 + V(\phi)$, in which the potential energy density dominates

$$V(\phi) \gg \frac{1}{2}\dot{\phi}^2, \frac{1}{2}(\nabla\phi)^2. \quad (1)$$

Most field theory descriptions of inflation represent the vacuum energy through a scalar field satisfying Eq. (1), with ϕ referred to as the inflaton. The goal of inflationary scalar field dynamics is to sustain the vacuum energy sufficiently long for expansion of the scale factor to exceed observational lower bounds and then end the inflationary epoch by entering the radiation dominated epoch.

The most nontrivial aspect of the inflaton models is understanding the energy transfer dynamics from potential energy to radiation. A commonly followed picture is that dissipative effects of the inflaton field can be ignored throughout the inflation period, thus leading to a supercooled inflationary regime. However, from a thermodynamic perspective, this picture appears very restrictive. The point being, even if the inflaton were to allow a minuscule fraction of the energy to be released, say one part in 10^{20} , it still would constitute a significant radiation energy density component in the universe. For example, for inflation with vacuum (i.e. potential) energy at the GUT scale $\sim 10^{15-16}\text{GeV}$, leaking one part in 10^{20} of this energy into radiation corresponds to a temperature of 10^{11}GeV , which is nonnegligible. In fact, the most relevant lower bound that cosmology places on the temperature after inflation comes from the success of hot Big-Bang nucleosynthesis, which thus requires the universe to be within the radiation dominated regime by $T \gtrsim 1\text{GeV}$. This limit can be met in the above example by dissipating as little as one part in 10^{60} of the vacuum energy into radiation. Thus, from the perspective of both interacting field theory and basic notions of equipartition, it appears to be a highly tuned requirement of supercooled inflation to prohibit the inflaton from even such tiny amounts of dissipation.

These considerations have led to extensive examination of warm inflation. Several

types of phenomenological warm inflation models exist in the literature [5, 7]. The presence of radiation during inflation generally will affect the seeds of primordial density fluctuations induced in the inflaton field, which is a complicated two fluid problem. The basic model assumes perfect thermalization [8, 9] and for such models observational tests have been developed [10, 11]. These tests show possibilities that could differentiate warm inflation from supercooled inflation. Warm inflation dynamics also has been studied in quantum field theory [12, 13, 14, 15] and some of the phenomenological models can be derived from first principles [9, 16, 17]. Furthermore, conceptually there is a simplification in the warm inflation picture in that the dynamics is completely free of questions about quantum-to-classical transition. The scalar inflaton field, both background and fluctuation components [8, 9], is in a classical state, thus immediately justifying the application of a classical evolution equation and implying that the induced metric perturbations are classical.

However despite the conceptual clarity and despite the suggestive thermodynamic considerations, deriving this dynamics from first principles quantum field theory is nontrivial. The key reasons primarily are technical. To clarify this point, a comparison with supercooled inflationary dynamics is useful. In supercooled inflation, the process of inflation and radiation production are neatly divided into two different epochs, whereas in warm inflation dynamics, both processes occur concurrently. As such, for warm inflation dynamics there is considerable and nontrivial interplay between the equations of background inflationary expansion and quantum field theory dynamics and thus it becomes technically more difficult to solve than supercooled inflation. In effect, warm inflation solutions are of an “all-or-nothing” type in that if a solution works, it solves everything and if something fails, the whole solution becomes useless. On the other hand, supercooled inflation solutions are of a “pick-and-choose” type, in that every aspect of the problem is compartmentalized, i.e. inflation, reheating, quantum-to-classical transition, and there is little continuity amongst the different problems.

Statements have been made about the impossibility of warm inflation dynamics [13]. However the dynamical considerations leading up to these conclusions were limited in their scope, as had been noted previous to this work [12]. In particular, these works looked for high temperature warm inflation solutions, under rigid adiabatic, equilibrium conditions. Nevertheless, within this limited framework, one type of warm inflation solution was obtained [9, 16, 17], and due to the “all-or-nothing” nature mentioned above, this solution can not be discarded as a serious contender in any more complete theory of inflation [17]. Moreover, these early works [12, 13] have explicated one very important point, that warm inflation dynamics is not trivial and before it can be directly solved, several missing gaps in the knowledge of dissipative dynamics must be clarified.

As one step in this direction to fill the missing gaps, recently we studied the zero temperature dissipative dynamics of interacting scalar field systems in Minkowski spacetime [14]. This is useful to understand, since the zero temperature limit constitutes a baseline effect that will be prevalent in any general statistical state. What our results show is

that for a broad range of cases, involving interaction with as few as one or two fields, dissipative regimes are found for the scalar field system. This is important for inflationary cosmology, since it suggests that dissipation may be the norm not exception for an interacting scalar field system, thus suggesting that warm inflation could be a natural dynamics once proper treatment of interactions is done.

Our analysis of dissipative dynamics starts with the general Lagrangian,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}[\Phi, \chi_j, \bar{\psi}_k, \psi_k] &= \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \Phi)^2 - \frac{m_\phi^2}{2}\Phi^2 - \frac{\lambda}{4!}\Phi^4 + \sum_{j=1}^{N_\chi} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \chi_j)^2 - \frac{m_{\chi_j}^2}{2}\chi_j^2 - \frac{f_j}{4!}\chi_j^4 - \frac{g_j^2}{2}\Phi^2\chi_j^2 \right\} \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^{N_\psi} \bar{\psi}_k \left[i \not{\partial} - m_{\psi_k} - h_{k,\phi}\Phi - \sum_{j=1}^{N_\chi} h_{k,j,\chi}\chi_j \right] \psi_k, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

with $\Phi \equiv \varphi + \phi$ such that $\langle \Phi \rangle = \varphi$. Our aim is to obtain the effective equation of motion for $\varphi(t)$ and from that determine the energy dissipated from the $\varphi(t)$ system into radiation.

Using the tadpole method [18], which requires $\langle \phi \rangle = 0$, the effective equation of motion for $\varphi(t)$ emerges

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{\varphi}(t) + m_\phi^2 \varphi(t) + \frac{\lambda}{6} \varphi^3(t) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \varphi(t) \langle \phi^2 \rangle + \frac{\lambda}{6} \langle \phi^3 \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^{N_\chi} g_j^2 [\varphi(t) \langle \chi_j^2 \rangle + \langle \phi \chi_j^2 \rangle] \\ + \sum_{k=1}^{N_\psi} h_{k,\phi} \langle \bar{\psi}_k \psi_k \rangle = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The field expectation values in this equation are obtained by solving the coupled set of field equations. In our calculation, we have evaluated them in a perturbative expansion using dressed Green's functions [14, 19, 12]. One general feature of these expectation values is they will depend of the causal history of $\varphi(t)$, so that Eq. (3) is a temporally nonlocal equation of motion for $\varphi(t)$.

The general expression for the effective equation of motion is given in [14] and is very complicated. Formally, we can examine Eq. (3) within a Markovian-adiabatic approximation, in which the equation of motion is local in time and the motion of $\varphi(t)$ is slow. At $T = 0$, such an approximation is not rigorously valid. Nevertheless, this approximation allows understanding the magnitude of dissipative effects. Furthermore, we have shown in [14] that the nonlocal effects tend to filter only increasingly higher frequency components of $\varphi(t)$ from nonlocal effects increasingly further back in time. Thus for low frequency components of $\varphi(t)$, memory only is retained to some short interval in the past. Since within the adiabatic approximation, $\varphi(t)$ only has low frequency components, we believe the Markovian-adiabatic approximation is legitimate at least for order of magnitude estimates. Within this approximation, the effective equation of motion for $\varphi(t)$ has the general form

$$\ddot{\varphi}(t) + m_\phi^2 \varphi(t) + \frac{\lambda}{6} \varphi^3(t) + \eta(\varphi) \dot{\varphi}(t) = 0, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta(\varphi) = & \varphi^2(t) \frac{\lambda^2 \alpha_{\phi,\psi}^2}{128\pi \sqrt{m_\phi^4 + \alpha_{\phi,\psi}^4} \sqrt{2\sqrt{m_\phi^4 + \alpha_{\phi,\psi}^4} + 2m_\phi^2}} \\
& + \frac{\lambda^2 \alpha_{\phi,\psi}^2}{4} \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{q}_1}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d^3 \mathbf{q}_2}{(2\pi)^3} \left\{ \frac{1}{\omega_\phi(\mathbf{q}_1)^2 \omega_\phi(\mathbf{q}_2) \omega_\phi(\mathbf{q}_1 + \mathbf{q}_2) [\omega_\phi(\mathbf{q}_1) + \omega_\phi(\mathbf{q}_2) + \omega_\phi(\mathbf{q}_1 + \mathbf{q}_2)]^3} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\Gamma_\phi^2}{\omega_\phi^2}\right) \right\} \\
& + \varphi^2(t) \sum_{j=1}^{N_\chi} g_j^4 \frac{\alpha_{\chi,\psi}^2}{32\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_{\chi_j}^4 + \alpha_{\chi,\psi}^4} \sqrt{2\sqrt{m_{\chi_j}^4 + \alpha_{\chi,\psi}^4} + 2m_{\chi_j}^2}} \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^{N_\chi} \frac{g_j^4 \alpha_{\chi,\psi}^2}{4} \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{q}_1}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d^3 \mathbf{q}_2}{(2\pi)^3} \left\{ \frac{1}{\omega_{\chi_j}(\mathbf{q}_1)^2 \omega_\phi(\mathbf{q}_2) \omega_\phi(\mathbf{q}_1 + \mathbf{q}_2) [\omega_{\chi_j}(\mathbf{q}_1) + \omega_\phi(\mathbf{q}_2) + \omega_\phi(\mathbf{q}_1 + \mathbf{q}_2)]^3} \right. \\
& \left. + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{\chi_j}^2, \Gamma_\phi^2}{\omega^2}\right) \right\}, \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\alpha_{\phi,\psi}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{N_\psi} \frac{h_k^2}{8\pi} m_\phi^2 \left(1 - \frac{4m_{\psi_k}^2}{m_\phi^2}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}, \tag{6}$$

and

$$\alpha_{\chi,\psi}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{N_\psi} \frac{h_{kj,\chi}^2}{8\pi} m_{\chi_j}^2 \left(1 - \frac{4m_{\psi_k}^2}{m_{\chi_j}^2}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}. \tag{7}$$

As an alternative to the above Lagrangian based derivation, a canonical derivation also can be attempted based on the formalism developed by Morikawa and Sasaki in the mid 80's [20]. Although the canonical and Lagrangian approaches should yield the same final answer, the former is far less developed in dissipative quantum field theory, in particular for treating interactions. Nevertheless, the canonical approach provides useful insight, especially for understanding the origin of particle creation. For example, consider the $\langle \chi_j^2 \rangle$ terms in Eq. (3). In the canonical approach this expectation value is expressed as

$$\langle \chi_j^2 \rangle = \int \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{2\text{Re}\omega_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}} \left[2x_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}(t) + 2\text{Re}y_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}(t) + 1 \right], \tag{8}$$

where $x_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}(t) = \langle a_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}^\dagger(t) a_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}(t) \rangle$ is the particle number density and $y_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}(t) = \langle a_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}(t) a_{-\mathbf{q},\chi_j}(t) \rangle$ is the off-diagonal correlation. The evolution equations for $x_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}(t)$ and $y_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}(t)$ can be obtained from the field equation for χ_j to give

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j} &= \frac{\dot{\omega}_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}}{\omega_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}} \text{Re} y_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}, \\
\dot{y}_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j} &= \frac{\dot{\omega}_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}}{\omega_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}} \left[x_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j} + \frac{1}{2} \right] - 2i\omega_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j} y_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}. \tag{9}
\end{aligned}$$

To yield dissipation, it is noted in [20] that the correlation amongst produced particles needs to be destroyed sufficiently rapidly and $\dot{x}_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}(t)$ and $\langle\chi_j(t)\rangle$ should become local functions of time involving $\varphi(t)$ and $\dot{\varphi}(t)$. Based on this requirement, [20] assert that $\omega_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}$ in the above equation for $\dot{y}_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}(t)$ must have an imaginary part, which in fact should be the χ_j -particle decay width, $\text{Im}\omega_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j} \propto \Gamma_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}$. Applying these assumptions, the contribution to $\eta(\varphi)$ in Eq. (4) from the χ_j field, say $\eta_{\chi_j}(\varphi)$, once again is obtained (up to $O(1)$ factors). Since there are ad-hoc assumptions necessary, this approach still is incomplete and requires further development. Nevertheless, the approach is interesting and for the time being accepting the assumptions, the origin of particle creation and energy conservation can be seen very clearly. In particular, the particle production rate is given by $\int(d^3k/(2\pi)^3)\dot{x}_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}(t)\omega_{\mathbf{q},\chi_j}$ and analogous to the example in [20], it can be shown this is exactly equal to the vacuum energy loss rate from the χ_j field contribution, $\eta_{\chi_j}(\varphi)\dot{\varphi}^2$.

Returning to equation (4), some estimated magnitudes of energy production will be obtained here with full details given in [14]. Our primary interest is in the overdamped regime

$$m^2(\phi) = m_\phi^2 + \lambda\phi^2/2 < \eta^2, \quad (10)$$

since this is the regime ultimately of interest to warm inflation. In this regime, the energy dissipated by the scalar field goes into radiation energy density ρ_r at the rate

$$\dot{\rho}_r = -\frac{dE_\phi}{dt} = \eta(\varphi)\dot{\varphi}^2. \quad (11)$$

In [14] we have determined radiation production for two cases

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(a).} \quad & m(\varphi) > m_\chi > 2m_\psi \\ \text{(b).} \quad & m_\chi > 2m_\psi > m(\varphi). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

To focus on a case typical for inflation, suppose the potential energy is at the GUT scale $V(\varphi)^{1/4} \sim 10^{15}\text{GeV}$ and we consider the other parameters in a regime consistent with the e-fold and density fluctuation requirements of inflation. Note, although this is a flat nonexpanding spacetime analysis, since the dissipative effects will be at subhorizon scale, one expects these estimates to give a reasonable idea of what to expect from a similar calculation done in expanding spacetime. Expressing the radiation in terms of a temperature scale as $T \sim \rho_r^{1/4}$, we find for case (a) $1\text{GeV} < T < 10^7\text{GeV} < H$ and for case (b) $T \gtrsim 10^{14}\text{GeV} > H$, where $H = \sqrt{8\pi V/(3m_p^2)}$.

It should be clarified that the results discussed here do not require supersymmetry, although they easily could be applied in SUSY models. For such models, the low- T warm inflation solutions suggested by case (a) could be useful in avoiding gravitino overproduction [21]. Although, as an aside, even high temperature warm inflation solutions could avoid gravitino overproduction by thermal inflation type mechanisms [22], in which the inflaton is placed in a metastable phase after warm inflation, and the universe inflates isentropically, thus allowing the gravitinos to dilute. Turning to case (b), in general this

case seems more interesting, since it offers a very robust possibility for radiation production. This is what the formal calculation indicates. Moreover, the canonical approach suggests a clear physical picture, that as the background field $\varphi(t)$ evolves, it changes the mass of the χ_j -bosons, so that their positive and negative frequency components mix. This in turn results in the coherent production of χ_j particles, which then rapidly decohere through decay into lighter ψ_k -fermions. This process appears to yield robust warm inflation. As such, we believe further investigation of it is necessary.

In regards the potential implications of the results discussed in this talk to inflationary cosmology, we infer that under generic circumstances the scalar inflaton field will dissipate a nonnegligible amount of radiation during inflation. In particular, the lower bound suggested by the above estimates already are sufficiently high to preclude a mandatory requirement for a reheating period. Moreover, the high temperature results of case (b) could lead to robust warm inflation. These results suggest that warm inflation may be a very natural dynamics once proper treatment of the dissipative dynamics is made, thus corroborating with similar suggestions from other considerations. For one, as mentioned above, the quantum-classical problem is greatly alleviated in warm inflation. Second, as shown in [23], a dissipative component in the scalar field field evolution equation can alleviate the initial condition problem of inflation, since dissipative effects will damp kinetic energy, thus allow the potential energy to dominate more quickly. Third, as an interesting addition, presence of radiation during inflation makes it conducive to generate large scale magnetic fields of sizable magnitudes [24]. Finally and perhaps most important, as already noted the presence of radiation generally affects the seeds of density perturbations. Up to now only simplified models based on ideal thermalization have been considered [8, 9, 7]. Beyond that, much remains to be understood about the role radiation plays in influencing density fluctuations. One of the hopes of warm inflation is that it may solve the scalar potential fine tuning problem, but a qualified attempt at this requires much further understanding about the interplay between radiation and the scalar field. As a hypothetical example to illustrate the importance of this problem, if one went to the opposite limit from ideal thermalization to that of negligible influence from the radiation field on the density perturbations, so that only the quantum fluctuations contributed, then interestingly warm inflation models would *not* require fine tuning, so that scalar potentials of reasonably large curvature would be acceptable. This is a revealing observation, which provides motivation to better understand the full dynamics of field interactions in warm inflation models.

In summary, warm inflation shows promise as a dynamical solution to the cosmological puzzles. In regards the crucial question of its first principles quantum field theory dynamics, verification of the expectations discussed above requires a proper extension of these calculations to expanding spacetime, and within a nonequilibrium formulation [25], which we plan to examine.

References

- [1] A. H. Guth, Phys. Rev **D23**, 347 (1981); K. Sato, Phys. Lett. B **99**, 66 (1981).
- [2] E. Gliner and I. G. Dymnikova, Sov. Astron. Lett. **1**, 93 (1975); R. Brout, F. Englert and E. Gunzig, Ann. Phys. **115**, 78 (1978); R. Brout, F. Englert and P. Spindel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 417 (1979); A. A. Starobinsky, Phys. Lett. B **91**, 154 (1980); L. Z. Fang, Phys. Lett. B **95**, 154 (1980); E. Kolb and S. Wolfram, Astrophys. J. **239**, 428 (1980); K. Sato, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **195**, 467 (1981); D. Kazanas, Astrophys. J. **241**, L59 (1980).
- [3] A. Albrecht and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1220 (1982); A. Linde, Phys. Lett. **108B**, 389 (1982).
- [4] A. Linde, Phys. Lett. **129B**, 177 (1983).
- [5] A. Berera, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3218 (1995); Phys. Rev. D **54**, 2519 (1996); Phys. Rev. D **55**, 3346 (1997).
- [6] I. Moss, Phys. Lett. B **154**, 120 (1985); R. Brout and S. P. Spindel, Nucl. Phys. B **348**, 405 (1991); S. P. Spindel and R. Brout, Phys. Lett. B **320**, 241 (1994).
- [7] W. Lee and L. Z. Fang, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D6**, 305 (1997); E. Gunzig, R. Maartens, and A. V. Nesteruk, Class. Quant. Grav. **15**, 923 (1998); H. P. de Oliveira and R. O. Ramos, Phys. Rev. **D57**, 741 (1998); J. M. F. Maia and J. A. S. Lima, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 101301 (1999); W. Lee and L.-Z. Fang, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 083503 (1999); H. P. De Oliveira and S. E. Joras, gr-qc/0103089.
- [8] A. Berera and L. Z. Fang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 1912 (1995).
- [9] A. Berera, Nucl. Phys. B **585**, 666 (2000).
- [10] A. N. Taylor and A. Berera, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 083517 (2000).
- [11] A. Berera and A. F. Heavens, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 123513 (2000).
- [12] A. Berera, M. Gleiser and R. O. Ramos, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 123508 (1998).
- [13] J. Yokoyama and A. Linde, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 083509 (1999).
- [14] A. Berera and R. O. Ramos, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 103509 (2001).
- [15] I. G. Moss, hep-ph/0103191.
- [16] A. Berera, M. Gleiser and R. O. Ramos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 264 (1999).

- [17] A. Berera and T. W. Kephart, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1084 (1999); Phys. Lett. B **456**, 135 (1999).
- [18] G. Semenoff and N. Weiss, Phys. Rev. D **31**, 699 (1985); A. Ringwald, Phys. Rev. D **36**, 2598 (1987); Ann. Phys. **177**, 129 (1987); Z. Phys. C **34**, 481 (1987).
- [19] I. D. Lawrie, J. Phys. A **25**, 6493 (1992); Phys. Rev. D **60**, 063510 (1999);
- [20] M. Morikawa and M. Sasaki, Prog. Theor. Phys. **72**, 782 (1984).
- [21] A. N. Taylor and A. R. Liddle, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 023513 (2001).
- [22] D. H. Lyth and E. D. Stewart, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 201 (1995); T. Barreiro, E. J. Copeland, D. H. Lyth, and T. Prokopec, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 1379 (1996).
- [23] A. Berera and C. Gordon, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 063505 (2001).
- [24] A. Berera, T. W. Kephart, and S. D. Wick, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 043510 (1999).
- [25] I. D. Lawrie, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 3330 (1989).