

Some problems when calculating the quantum corrections to the classical 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole

Nathan F. Lepora*

(Submitted 24 March 2002; accepted April 27, 2002)

We examine whether the analysis of quantum corrections for the kink soliton carries over to the 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole. For the kink, it is central that the quantum fluctuations are eigenmodes of a Hermitian operator. For the monopole, we show the analogous operator is not Hermitian. This property raises some questions about the quantization procedure for a 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole.

Published in: Phys. Lett. **B524** (2002) 338.

1. Introduction

While quantum corrections to the classical 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole [1] have not been explicitly found, they have been for another soliton — the kink [2]. It seems reasonable that the calculations for the monopole and kink should be similar. Assuming such a similarity, a suitable framework would start with the classical monopole, then determine the quantum fluctuations and, from these, derive the quantum corrections.

In this paper we draw attention to a feature of the quantum fluctuations that significantly differs between the monopole and kink. While closer examination may reveal this difference to be merely a technical issue, we think it could reflect a subtlety in the way semi-classical solitons behave.

To introduce our arguments, we briefly describe the quantum fluctuations around a kink soliton. Then we cover the analogous situation for the 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole and indicate some problems. Finally, we discuss the cause of these problems.

2. The kink and its quantum corrections

The kink soliton [2] is a classical solution to a (1+1)-dimensional scalar field theory with Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L}[\Phi] = \frac{1}{2}\dot{\Phi}^2 - \frac{1}{2}\Phi'^2 - V[\Phi], \quad V[\Phi] = \frac{1}{4}\lambda(\Phi^2 - v^2)^2, \quad (1)$$

and has a classical scalar field profile

$$\Phi_{\text{cl}}(x) = \frac{m}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \tanh \frac{mx}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad m^2 = \lambda v^2. \quad (2)$$

This kink has a classical mass defined from the Hamiltonian

$$M_{\text{cl}} = H[\Phi_{\text{cl}}] = \int d^3x \mathcal{H}[\Phi_{\text{cl}}] = \frac{2\sqrt{3}m^3}{3\lambda}. \quad (3)$$

Here the Hamiltonian density is defined in the usual way

$$\mathcal{H}[\Phi, \Pi] = \Pi\dot{\Phi} - \mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\Pi^2 + \frac{1}{2}\Phi'^2 + V[\Phi], \quad (4)$$

where $\Pi = \partial\mathcal{L}/\partial\dot{\Phi} = \dot{\Phi}$ is the canonical momentum.

Quantum corrections to the classical kink originate from fluctuations ϕ around the classical background

$$\Phi = \Phi_{\text{cl}} + \phi. \quad (5)$$

Then the Hamiltonian for the fluctuations is found by substituting (5) into (4) and expanding to $O(\phi^3)$

$$H[\phi, \pi] = M_{\text{cl}} + \int d^3r \left[\frac{1}{2}\pi^2 + \frac{1}{2}\phi(-\partial_x^2 + \mathcal{V})\phi \right] \quad (6)$$

with $\pi = \dot{\phi}$ the canonical momentum and \mathcal{V} a potential for the fluctuations

$$\mathcal{V}(x) = 3m^2 \tanh^2 \frac{mx}{\sqrt{2}} - m^2. \quad (7)$$

This potential is a well with asymptote $\mathcal{V}(\infty) = 2m^2$.

It is crucial that the following operator is Hermitian:

$$\int d^3x \psi(-\partial_x^2 + \mathcal{V})\phi = \int d^3x \phi(-\partial_x^2 + \mathcal{V})\psi. \quad (8)$$

This relation follows from partial integration, neglecting surface terms. There is, therefore, a complete set of orthonormal eigenmodes

$$(-\partial_x^2 + \mathcal{V})\phi_s = \omega_s^2\phi_s, \quad \int d^3x \phi_s\phi_t = \delta_{st}. \quad (9)$$

Expanding the fluctuation field as a sum $\phi = \sum_s q_s\phi_s$ over these eigenmodes, we find

$$H(p_s, q_s) = M_{\text{cl}} + \sum_s \left[p_s^2 + \omega_s^2 q_s^2 \right] + \dots, \quad (10)$$

where $q_s = \int d^3x \phi\phi_s$; $p_s = \dot{q}_s$; the classical mass M_{cl} is from (3) and the dots represent $O(\phi^3)$ terms.

Therefore the Hamiltonian (6) becomes a sum over individual Hamiltonians $H(p_s, q_s)$ that describe Harmonic oscillators. These oscillators can be quantized with Heisenberg's commutation relation $[p_s, q_t] = i\hbar\delta_{st}$, giving

$$H(n_{\omega_s}) = M_{\text{cl}} + \sum_s (n_{\omega_s} + \frac{1}{2})\hbar\omega_s + \dots \quad (11)$$

Here n_{ω_s} is the occupation number of the Harmonic oscillator with frequency ω_s .

In conclusion, the fluctuations around the classical kink can be written as a sum over eigenmodes that

are stationary states of a time-independent Schrödinger equation (9). When these states are quantized, the meson spectrum has energies $(n_{\omega_s} + \frac{1}{2})\hbar\omega_s$. Then the quantum correction to the classical kink mass is a sum over the differences between the meson's zero-point and vacuum energies

$$M = M_{\text{cl}} + \sum_s \frac{1}{2} \hbar \delta\omega_s + \dots \quad (12)$$

Regularization techniques are used to evaluate this sum, which gives a finite value of order $\hbar m$.

In the above discussion, there are a couple of points that will be relevant to our later arguments:

- (a) The operator in (8) is Hermitian — then the fluctuations can be expanded over a complete set of eigenmodes.
- (b) The quantum fluctuations solve a time-independent Schrödinger equation (9) — giving a connection between quantum field theory and quantum mechanics.

Later on in this paper, we compare these points with the behaviour of the 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole.

3. The 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole

Now we attempt to repeat the above arguments for a 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole. Our aim is to see whether there are any significant differences between the kink and monopole.

The 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole [1] is a classical solution to a (3+1)-dimensional SU(2) scalar-gauge field theory with Lagrangian density

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}[\Phi_a, A_a^i] &= -\frac{1}{4} F_a^{\mu\nu} F_{a\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} D^\mu \Phi_a D_\mu \Phi_a - V[\Phi_a], \\ F_a^{\mu\nu} &= \partial^\mu A_a^\nu - \partial^\nu A_a^\mu + e \epsilon_{abc} A_b^\mu A_c^\nu, \\ D^\mu \Phi_a &= \partial^\mu \Phi_a + e \epsilon_{abc} A_b^\mu \Phi_c, \\ V[\Phi_a] &= \frac{1}{4} \lambda (\Phi_a \Phi_a - v^2)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

and has classical scalar and gauge fields

$$(\Phi_a)_{\text{cl}} = \frac{H(r)}{er} \hat{r}_a, \quad (A_a^i)_{\text{cl}} = \frac{K(r) - 1}{er} \epsilon_{iab} \hat{r}_b \quad (14)$$

in the radial $\epsilon_{abc} \Phi_b \hat{r}_c$ and temporal $A_a^0 = 0$ gauge. Single-valuedness requires $H(0) = K(0) - 1 = 0$, while the asymptotic boundary conditions are $H/r \rightarrow ev$ and $K \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$.

This monopole has magnetic charge $4\pi/e$ and vanishing electric charge, both of which are defined in a gauge-invariant way

$$g = \frac{1}{v} \int_{S_\infty} dS^i \Phi_a B_a^i = \frac{4\pi}{e}, \quad q = \frac{1}{v} \int_{S_\infty} dS^i \Phi_a E_a^i = 0. \quad (15)$$

These charges are defined by the non-Abelian electric and magnetic fields, $E_a^i = F_a^{0i}$ and $B_a^i = -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ijk} F_a^{jk}$.

The classical mass of the monopole is defined from the Hamiltonian [3]

$$M_{\text{cl}} = H[(\Phi_a)_{\text{cl}}, (A_a^i)_{\text{cl}}] = \int d^3x \mathcal{H}[(\Phi_a)_{\text{cl}}, (A_a^i)_{\text{cl}}], \quad (16)$$

which is specified by the Hamiltonian density

$$\mathcal{H}[\Phi_a, \Pi_a; A_a^i, \Pi_a^i] = \Pi_a \dot{\Phi}_a + \Pi_a^i \dot{A}_a^i - \mathcal{L}[\Phi_a, A_a^i] \quad (17)$$

with canonical momenta $\Pi_a = \partial \mathcal{L} / \partial \dot{\Phi}_a = \dot{\Phi}_a$ for the scalar field and $\Pi_a^i = \partial \mathcal{L} / \partial \dot{A}_a^i = E_a^i$ for the gauge field.

4. Fluctuations around the monopole

Quantum corrections to the classical monopole mass originate from the fluctuations ϕ_a and a_a^i around the classical fields $(\Phi_a)_{\text{cl}}$ and $(A_a^i)_{\text{cl}}$. To ease the following calculations, we consider these fluctuations in the radial $\epsilon_{abc} \Phi_b \hat{r}_c = 0$ and temporal $A_a^0 = 0$ gauge

$$\Phi_a = (\Phi_a)_{\text{cl}} + \phi \hat{r}_a, \quad A_a^i = (A_a^i)_{\text{cl}} + a_a^i. \quad (18)$$

This gauge choice reduces the scalar field to only one degree-of-freedom.

To describe these fluctuations, we construct the Hamiltonian from the fluctuation fields and their canonical momenta [like with the kink in eqs. (5-7)]. These canonical momenta are related to the fluctuations (18) by

$$\Pi_a = (\Pi_a)_{\text{cl}} + \pi \hat{r}_a = \pi \hat{r}_a, \quad \Pi_a^i = (\Pi_a^i)_{\text{cl}} + \pi_a^i = \pi_a^i, \quad (19)$$

where $\pi = \dot{\phi}$ and $\pi_a^i = -\dot{a}_a^i$ in the temporal gauge. Then the Hamiltonian separates into zeroth-, linear- and quadratic-order terms in the fluctuations $\phi, \pi, a_a^i, \pi_a^i$:

$$H[\Phi_a, \Pi_a; A_a^i, \Pi_a^i] = H_{\text{cl}} + H_{\text{lin}} + H_{\text{qu}} + \dots \quad (20)$$

Clearly,

$$H_{\text{cl}} = H[(\Phi_a)_{\text{cl}}, (A_a^i)_{\text{cl}}] = M_{\text{cl}}, \quad (21)$$

while it can be shown that

$$H_{\text{lin}} = 0. \quad (22)$$

This linear Hamiltonian vanishes by $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lin}} = 0$, which is because the monopole (14) solves the equations of motion and is then a stationary point of the action.

Therefore we are left with only a quadratic-order Hamiltonian H_{qu} for the fluctuations, which has a density

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{qu}} = \pi_a \pi_a + \pi_a^i \pi_a^i - \mathcal{L}_{\text{qu}}. \quad (23)$$

Here \mathcal{L}_{qu} contains the quadratic-order fluctuation terms in the Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{qu}} = -\frac{1}{4} (F_a^{\mu\nu} F_{a\mu\nu})_{\text{qu}} + \frac{1}{2} (D^\mu \Phi_a D_\mu \Phi_a)_{\text{qu}} - V_{\text{qu}}. \quad (24)$$

We now determine each of these terms.

First, we consider the components of $-\frac{1}{4} F_a^{\mu\nu} F_{a\mu\nu}$ that are quadratic in the fluctuations. These components are

more easily found from the non-Abelian electric and magnetic fields

$$-\frac{1}{4}(F_a^{\mu\nu}F_{a\mu\nu})_{\text{qu}} = \frac{1}{2}(E_a^i)_{\text{lin}}(E_a^i)_{\text{lin}} + (E_a^i)_{\text{cl}}(E_a^i)_{\text{qu}} - \frac{1}{2}(B_a^i)_{\text{lin}}(B_a^i)_{\text{lin}} - (B_a^i)_{\text{cl}}(B_a^i)_{\text{qu}}. \quad (25)$$

Here the zeroth-, linear- and quadratic-order fields are found from $E_a^i = F_a^{0i}$ and $B_a^i = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ijk}F_a^{jk}$. For the non-Abelian electric field, we find

$$(E_a^i)_{\text{lin}} = -\dot{a}_a^i = \pi_a^i, \quad (E_a^i)_{\text{qu}} = 0; \quad (26)$$

while for the non-Abelian magnetic field,

$$(B_a^i)_{\text{lin}} = \epsilon_{ijk}\partial^j a_a^k + e\epsilon_{ijk}\epsilon_{abc}(A_b^j)_{\text{cl}}a_c^k, \quad (27)$$

$$(B_a^i)_{\text{qu}} = \frac{1}{2}e\epsilon_{abc}\epsilon_{ijk}a_b^j a_c^k. \quad (28)$$

To keep things simple, we shall write the classical fields as $(A_a^i)_{\text{cl}}$ and $(B_a^i)_{\text{cl}}$. Substituting (26-28) into (25), we then find

$$-\frac{1}{4}(F_a^{\mu\nu}F_{a\mu\nu})_{\text{qu}} = \pi_a^i\pi_a^i - \frac{1}{2}(B_a^i)_{\text{lin}}(B_a^i)_{\text{lin}} - (B_a^i)_{\text{cl}}(B_a^i)_{\text{qu}}, \quad (29)$$

where upon partial integration and then neglecting the surface terms

$$(B_a^i)_{\text{lin}}(B_a^i)_{\text{lin}} = a_a^i(\nabla^2\delta^{ij} - \partial^j\partial^i)a_a^j + a_a^i[e^2\epsilon_{ikm}\epsilon_{jlm}\epsilon_{acd}\epsilon_{bce}(A_d^k)_{\text{cl}}(A_e^l)_{\text{cl}}]a_b^j - a_a^i[2e\epsilon_{ikm}\epsilon_{abc}\epsilon_{jlm}(A_c^k)_{\text{cl}}\partial^l]a_b^j, \quad (30)$$

$$(B_a^i)_{\text{cl}}(B_a^i)_{\text{qu}} = \frac{1}{2}e\epsilon_{abc}\epsilon_{ijk}(B_c^k)_{\text{cl}}a_a^i a_b^j. \quad (31)$$

Note the linear-derivative term in (30) — this will be troublesome later.

Next, we consider the components of $\frac{1}{2}D^\mu\Phi D_\mu\Phi$ that are quadratic in the fluctuations. These components are found by expanding

$$\frac{1}{2}(D^\mu\Phi_a D_\mu\Phi_a)_{\text{qu}} = \frac{1}{2}\pi_a\pi_a - \frac{1}{2}(D^i\Phi_a)_{\text{lin}}(D^i\Phi_a)_{\text{lin}} - (D^i\Phi_a)_{\text{cl}}(D^i\Phi_a)_{\text{quad}}. \quad (32)$$

Here we write $\phi_a = \phi\hat{r}_a$, which gives $D^0\phi_a = \dot{\phi}_a = \pi_a$ in a temporal gauge. Similarly, the linear- and quadratic-order components of the covariant derivative are

$$(D^i\Phi_a)_{\text{lin}} = \partial^i\phi_a + e\epsilon_{abc}a_b^i(\Phi_c)_{\text{cl}} + e\epsilon_{abc}(A_b^i)_{\text{cl}}\phi_c, \quad (33)$$

$$(D^i\Phi_a)_{\text{qu}} = e\epsilon_{abc}a_b^i\phi_c. \quad (34)$$

To keep things simple, we shall write the classical component of the covariant derivative as $(D^i\Phi_a)_{\text{cl}}$. Then the expressions in (32) are

$$(D^i\Phi_a)_{\text{lin}}(D^i\Phi_a)_{\text{lin}} = -\phi_a\nabla^2\phi_a + e^2\epsilon_{abc}\epsilon_{ade}[(A_b^i)_{\text{cl}}(A_d^i)_{\text{cl}}\phi_c\phi_e + (\Phi_c)_{\text{cl}}(\Phi_e)_{\text{cl}}a_b^i a_d^i] + 2e\partial^i\phi_a\epsilon_{abc}[a_b^i(\Phi_c)_{\text{cl}} + (A_b^i)_{\text{cl}}\phi_c] + 2e^2\epsilon_{abc}\epsilon_{ade}(\Phi_c)_{\text{cl}}(A_d^i)_{\text{cl}}a_b^i\phi_e, \quad (35)$$

$$(D^i\Phi_a)_{\text{cl}}(D^i\Phi_a)_{\text{qu}} = e\epsilon_{abc}(D^i\Phi_a)_{\text{cl}}a_b^i\phi_c. \quad (36)$$

Again we find several terms that are linear in the field derivatives. However, this time the radial gauge expression $\partial^i\phi_a = r\partial^i(\phi/r)\hat{r}_a + (\phi/r)\delta_{ia}$ implies

$$e\epsilon_{abc}(A_b^i)_{\text{cl}}(\partial^i\phi_a)\phi_c = e\epsilon_{ibc}(A_b^i)_{\text{cl}}\hat{r}_c\phi^2/r, \quad (37)$$

$$e\epsilon_{abc}(\Phi_c)_{\text{cl}}(\partial^i\phi_a)a_b^i = e\epsilon_{ibc}(\Phi_c)_{\text{cl}}a_b^i\phi/r. \quad (38)$$

Therefore these terms are not problematic.

Finally, there are also quadratic fluctuation terms in the scalar potential,

$$V_{\text{qu}}[\phi] = \frac{3}{2}\lambda(\Phi_a)_{\text{cl}}(\Phi_a)_{\text{cl}}\phi^2 - \frac{1}{2}\lambda v^2\phi^2. \quad (39)$$

These are found by substituting (14) into $V[\Phi]$.

Hence the final expression for the Hamiltonian is found by putting everything between (16) and (39) together into

$$H = M_{\text{cl}} + H_{\text{qu}}[\phi, \pi; a_a^i, \pi_a^i] + \dots \quad (40)$$

This H_{qu} splits into scalar, gauge and mixed parts

$$H_{\text{qu}} = H_{\text{qu}}[\phi, \pi] + H_{\text{qu}}[a_a^i, \pi_a^i] + I_{\text{qu}}[\phi, \pi; a_a^i, \pi_a^i], \quad (41)$$

specified by a Hamiltonian density for scalar fluctuations

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{qu}}[\phi, \pi] = \frac{1}{2}\pi_a\pi_a - \frac{1}{2}\phi_a\nabla^2\phi_a + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{V}_\phi\phi^2, \quad (42)$$

$$\mathcal{V}_\phi(r) = e^2\epsilon_{abc}\epsilon_{ade}(A_b^i)_{\text{cl}}(A_d^i)_{\text{cl}} + 3\lambda(\Phi_a)_{\text{cl}}(\Phi_a)_{\text{cl}} + 2e\epsilon_{ibc}(A_b^i)_{\text{cl}}\hat{r}_c/r - \lambda v^2; \quad (43)$$

a Hamiltonian density for gauge fluctuations

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{qu}}[a_a^i, \pi_a^i] = \frac{1}{2}\pi_a^i\pi_a^i - \frac{1}{2}a_a^i(\nabla^2\delta^{ij} - \partial^j\partial^i)a_a^j + \frac{1}{2}a_a^i\mathcal{V}_{ab}^{ij}a_b^j + \frac{1}{2}a_a^i\mathcal{D}_{ab}^{ij}a_b^j, \quad (44)$$

$$\mathcal{V}_{ab}^{ij}(r) = e^2\epsilon_{ikm}\epsilon_{jlm}\epsilon_{bcd}\epsilon_{ace}(A_d^k)_{\text{cl}}(A_e^l)_{\text{cl}} \quad (45)$$

$$+ e\epsilon_{abc}\epsilon_{ijk}(B_c^k)_{\text{cl}} + e^2\epsilon_{bcd}\epsilon_{aed}(\Phi_c)_{\text{cl}}(\Phi_e)_{\text{cl}}\delta^{ij}, \quad (46)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{ab}^{ij} = -2e\epsilon_{ikm}\epsilon_{abc}\epsilon_{jlm}(A_c^k)_{\text{cl}}\partial^l; \quad (46)$$

and a scalar-gauge mixing term

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{qu}}[\phi, \pi; a_a^i, \pi_a^i] = \mathcal{V}_a^i a_a^i \phi, \quad (47)$$

$$\mathcal{V}_a^i = e^2\epsilon_{abc}\epsilon_{bde}(\Phi_c)_{\text{cl}}(A_d^i)_{\text{cl}} + e\epsilon_{abc}(D^i\Phi_b)_{\text{cl}} + e\epsilon_{aic}(\Phi_c)_{\text{cl}}/r. \quad (48)$$

Collectively, the above equations (40-48) are analogous to (6) and (7) for the kink.

5. Problems with quantization

We now comment on these equations and indicate some differences from the kink in section 2.

The Hamiltonian (40) has a similar layout to that for the kink: with one part the classical mass and the other a quadratic Hamiltonian for the fluctuations. Therefore one might expect the next step would be to expand

$$\phi = \sum_s \phi_s q_s, \quad a_a^i = \sum_s (a_a^i)_s Q_s \quad (49)$$

with $\phi_s, (a_a^i)_s$ the eigenfunctions of

$$(-\nabla^2 + \mathcal{V}_\phi) \phi_s = \omega_s^2 \phi_s, \quad (50)$$

$$(\delta_{ab} \partial^j \partial^i - \nabla^2 \delta_{ab} \delta^{ij} + \mathcal{V}_{ab}^{ij} + \mathcal{D}_{ab}^{ij}) (a_a^i)_s = \Omega_s^2 (a_b^j)_s. \quad (51)$$

Afterwards we could write each quadratic-order Hamiltonian as a sum over Harmonic oscillators. These oscillators could then be quantized.

However, there are a couple of obstacles to this procedure.

First, there is a scalar-gauge mixing term (47). Then the eigenmodes are not separate scalar and gauge modes, but are instead a mixture of the two. This problem is mainly technical and makes any calculation more difficult.

Secondly, the linear derivative term \mathcal{D}_{ab}^{ij} in (46) means the operator

$$-\nabla^2 \delta_{ab} \delta^{ij} + \delta_{ab} \partial^j \partial^i + \mathcal{V}_{ab}^{ij} + \mathcal{D}_{ab}^{ij} \quad (52)$$

is not Hermitian because

$$\int d^3x a_a^i \mathcal{D}_{ab}^{ij} b_b^j \neq \int d^3x b_a^i \mathcal{D}_{ab}^{ij} a_b^j. \quad (53)$$

In fact, examination of (53) reveals Hermiticity only holds for gauge perturbations that satisfy

$$(A_a^i)_{\text{cl}} \partial^j a_b^j = (\partial^i A_a^l)_{\text{cl}} a_b^j + (A_a^l)_{\text{cl}} \partial^i a_b^j. \quad (54)$$

One cannot expect such an arbitrary constraint to hold for general gauge perturbations.

Hence it seems there is a fundamental problem with quantizing the fluctuations. For quantization, the fluctuation fields should be expanded over the eigenmodes. Then the Hamiltonian can be expanded as a sum over Harmonic oscillators $H = \sum_s p_s^2 + \omega_s^2 q_s^2$, which can then be quantized with $[p_s, q_t] = i\hbar \delta_{st}$. But if the operator (52) is not Hermitian there are problems with the eigenmode expansion. In particular:

(a) The eigenmodes may no longer be complete — then the expansions in (49) cannot be justified since there may be gauge fluctuations without an eigenmode sum.

(b) The eigenmodes may no longer be orthogonal — then the coefficients Q_s may not be written as $Q_s = \int d^3x a a_s$. This problem is less serious than (a).

(c) We lose the connection between quantum field theory and quantum mechanics.

Without fully examining the eigenmodes of (52), which is a very difficult problem, one cannot really say how the analysis should be modified. It is possible that if there are fewer quantum fluctuations then there could be a smaller quantum mass-correction. In addition, there could be other effects that are difficult to anticipate.

We should mention that a more detailed calculation for the 't Hooft-Polyakov monopole will be presented elsewhere [4]. In that paper, many expressions given here will be presented in terms of the profile functions, rather than the classical fields. We will also estimate the quantum correction to the monopole mass.

6. Discussion

To complete our discussion, we examine when this loss of Hermiticity can occur in other situations by taking two illustrative examples: purely scalar field theory and Maxwell theory.

For the first example, we consider a scalar field theory with potential $V[\Phi]$

$$\mathcal{L}[\Phi] = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \Phi \partial^\mu \Phi - V[\Phi]. \quad (55)$$

We take an arbitrary classical background Φ_{cl} and introduce a fluctuation field ϕ with

$$\Phi = \Phi_{\text{cl}} + \phi. \quad (56)$$

While $\phi \ll \Phi_{\text{cl}}$, the potential is to $\mathcal{O}(\phi^3)$

$$V[\Phi] = V[\Phi_{\text{cl}}] + \frac{\partial V}{\partial \Phi}[\Phi_{\text{cl}}] \phi + \frac{1}{2!} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \Phi^2}[\Phi_{\text{cl}}] \phi^2. \quad (57)$$

Hence the quadratic terms are

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{qu}}[\phi] = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi - \frac{1}{2!} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \Phi^2}[\Phi_{\text{cl}}] \phi^2, \quad (58)$$

and the quadratic Hamiltonian is

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{qu}}[\phi, \pi] = \frac{1}{2} \pi^2 + \frac{1}{2} \phi \left(-\nabla^2 + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \Phi^2}[\Phi_{\text{cl}}] \right) \phi. \quad (59)$$

In this purely scalar field theory, the relevant, bracketed, operator is Hermitian. Therefore the loss of Hermiticity for the monopole appears to be a gauge sector effect.

In our second example, we consider a similar analysis to above, but for Maxwell theory

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}, \quad F^{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu A^\nu - \partial^\nu A^\mu. \quad (60)$$

Again we take an arbitrary classical background A_{cl}^μ and introduce a fluctuation field a^μ with

$$A^\mu = A_{\text{cl}}^\mu + a^\mu. \quad (61)$$

Substituting this into (60), we find a quadratic Lagrangian density

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{qu}}[a^\mu] = -\frac{1}{4} f^{\mu\nu} f_{\mu\nu}, \quad f^{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu a^\nu - \partial^\nu a^\mu. \quad (62)$$

Because of the linearity of Maxwell theory, the fluctuation field decouples from the classical background. In

Maxwell theory there is no problem with quantizing the fluctuations.

Therefore the loss of Hermiticity in the fluctuation Hamiltonian appears to be caused by the non-Abelian nature of the gauge theory. In purely scalar or Abelian theories no such loss of Hermiticity occurs.

For a final comment, we note this effect could be relevant to other classical solutions that contain non-Abelian gauge fields — an example being Skyrmions in the gauged sigma model.

-
- [1] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. **B79** (1974) 276; A. M. Polyakov, JETP Lett. 20 (1974) 194.
[2] R. Rajaraman, *Solitons and Instantons*, North-Holland (1996); see also T. Weidig, hep-th/9912005.
[3] In closed form $M_{\text{cl}} = 4\pi/e^2 \int dr [(K')^2 + \frac{1}{2}(H' - H/r)^2 + K^2 H^2/r^2 + \frac{1}{2}(K^2 - 1)^2/r^2 + \frac{1}{4}\lambda(H^2 - e^2 v^2 r^2)^2/r^2]$.
[4] N. Lepora, submitted to Nucl. Phys. **B**.

* email: n_lepora@hotmail.com