

Noncommutativity in Field Space and Lorentz Invariance Violation

J.M. Carmona and J.L. Cortés

Departamento de Física Teórica, Universidad de Zaragoza, 50009 Zaragoza, Spain

J. Gamboa and F. Méndez

Departamento de Física, Universidad de Santiago de Chile, Casilla 307, Santiago 2, Chile

Abstract

The connection between Lorentz invariance violation and noncommutativity of fields in a quantum field theory is investigated. A new dispersion relation for a free field theory with just one additional noncommutative parameter is obtained. While values for the noncommutative scale much larger than 10^{-20} eV^{-1} are ruled out by the present experimental status, cosmic ray physics would be compatible with and sensible to a noncommutativity arising from quantum gravity effects. We explore the matter-antimatter asymmetry which is naturally present in this framework.

Key words: Noncommutativity, Lorentz invariance violation, Field theory, Cosmic rays

PACS: 04.60.-m, 11.30.Cp, 98.70.Sa

Recently several groups have argued that quantum gravity relics could be seen from dispersion relations violating Lorentz invariance [1]. In order to explain these results, they used dispersion relations coming from loop quantum gravity or other arguments based on effective field theories. Lorentz invariance is then seen as a good low-energy symmetry which may be violated at very high energies [2]. This violation is usually compatible with translational and rotational invariance in a “preferred frame”. Since our low-energy theories are relativistic quantum field theories (QFT’s), it is interesting to explore possible extensions of the QFT framework which could produce departures from exact Lorentz invariance.

Email addresses: jcarmona,cortes@posta.unizar.es (J.M. Carmona and J.L. Cortés), gamboa,fmendez@lauca.usach.cl (J. Gamboa and F. Méndez).

The purpose of this letter is to show how the assumption of noncommutativity (NC) in the field space of a QFT produces Lorentz-violating dispersion relations. Moreover, we will show that cosmic ray physics is sensitive to a NC scale as low as the Planck length. In particular a consequence of NC at this scale would be the absence of the GZK cutoff [3] in the cosmic ray spectrum. NC will moreover be a possible source of an asymmetry between matter and antimatter, with physical processes distinguishing between them.

Let us firstly consider the theory of a complex scalar free field on a noncommutative space (i.e. $[x_i, x_j] = i\theta_{ij}$) described by the following action

$$\mathcal{S} = \int d^4x \left[\partial_\mu \phi^* \star \partial^\mu \phi - m^2 \phi^* \star \phi \right]. \quad (1)$$

Owing to the properties of the Moyal product

$$(\mathbf{A} \star \mathbf{B})(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{x}} e^{\frac{i}{2} \theta^{ij} \partial_i^{(1)} \partial_j^{(2)}} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}_1) \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}_2), \quad (2)$$

the action (1) is equivalent to the commutative one and, as a consequence, one concludes that free field theory cannot be modified by spacetime NC [4].

There is however another way to introduce NC in a QFT. We will illustrate this with an example in quantum mechanics. Let us consider the Hamiltonian of an harmonic oscillator in two dimensions,

$$H = \frac{1}{2} (p_1^2 + p_2^2) + \frac{1}{2} (q_1^2 + q_2^2), \quad (3)$$

where the (q_i, p_i) satisfy the canonical commutation relations

$$[p_i, p_j] = 0, \quad (4a)$$

$$[q_i, q_j] = 0, \quad (4b)$$

$$[q_i, p_j] = i\delta_{ij}. \quad (4c)$$

In the noncommutative space, one deforms the commutator (4b) as follows

$$[q_i, q_j] = i\epsilon_{ij}\theta, \quad (5)$$

where θ is a measure of the spatial NC. However, since Eq. (3) is invariant under the symmetry $q_i \leftrightarrow p_i$, then this is equivalent to a deformation of the commutator (4a):

$$[p_i, p_j] = i\epsilon_{ij}\theta, \quad (6)$$

and, as a consequence, the commutative and noncommutative two dimensional oscillators are very different systems [5].

Note that Eq. (5) is a relation at the level of the degrees of freedom of the system. Analogously, the introduction of NC in a QFT at the level of the fields, which is different from the NC in spatial coordinates, will produce nontrivial modifications of the QFT framework already at the level of a free theory.

Let us then come back to QFT and consider the Hamiltonian of the free complex bosonic field theory

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2} \Pi_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \Phi_i \cdot \nabla \Phi_i + \frac{m^2}{2} \Phi_i^2 \quad (7)$$

where a sum over the two field components (the real and imaginary parts of the original complex field) is assumed. In the Schrödinger representation [6], for fields satisfying the usual canonical commutation relations, this Hamiltonian becomes the operator

$$\hat{H}_C = \frac{1}{2} \int d\mathbf{x} \left[-\frac{\delta^2}{\delta\phi_i(x)^2} + (\nabla\phi_i)^2 + m^2\phi_i^2 \right], \quad (8)$$

acting on functionals of classical fields ϕ , which are the eigenvalues of the Φ field operators.

We may introduce now a NC in field theory. The simplest option is to deform the commutator of fields in analogy with the deformation of the commutator of the coordinates, Eq. (5), in the previous quantum mechanical example. We might want to preserve the locality in the new set of canonical commutation relations, which become

$$[\Pi_i(x), \Pi_j(x')] = 0, \quad (9a)$$

$$[\Phi_i(x), \Phi_j(x')] = i\bar{\theta}\epsilon_{ij}\delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'), \quad (9b)$$

$$[\Phi_i(x'), \Pi_j(x)] = i\delta_{ij}\delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'). \quad (9c)$$

The NC parameter $\bar{\theta}$ has the dimension of $\sqrt{\theta}$, where θ is the usual parameter of NC in quantum mechanics.

The Moyal product Eq. (2) allows to map the study of noncommutative field theories into that of ordinary field theories where the ordinary product is replaced by the star product [7,8]. The fact that the noncommutativity of the base manifold can be bypassed with the help of the star operation may be also used to define a noncommutative quantum mechanics [9]. One can do the same trick here. We must propose a new Moyal product between functionals consistent with the commutation relations (9). Defining

$$\Psi_1[\phi] \star \Psi_2[\phi] = \lim_{\eta, \xi \rightarrow \phi} e^{\frac{i}{2}\bar{\theta}\epsilon_{ij} \int d\mathbf{x} \frac{\delta}{\delta\eta_i(x)} \frac{\delta}{\delta\xi_j(x)}} \Psi_1[\eta] \Psi_2[\xi], \quad (10)$$

we verify straightforwardly

$$[\phi_i(x), \phi_j(x')]_\star \equiv \phi_i(x) \star \phi_j(x') - \phi_j(x') \star \phi_i(x) = i\bar{\theta}\epsilon_{ij} \delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'), \quad (11)$$

and the standard properties of the Moyal product hold. One should note however that this star product is completely different from that of Eq. (2).

Given Eq. (10), the functional Schrödinger equation in the field configuration space becomes

$$\frac{1}{2} \int d\mathbf{x} \left[-\frac{\delta^2}{\delta\phi_i(x)^2} + (\nabla\phi_i)^2 + m^2\phi_i^2 \right] \star \Psi[\phi_j] = E\Psi[\phi_j], \quad (12)$$

where one should understand that the functional derivatives remain unchanged under the star operation.

The noncommutativity introduced by the star product in Eq. (12) is equivalent to replacing the Hamiltonian operator (8) by a new “noncommutative” Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_{NC} = \hat{H}_C + \frac{1}{2} \int d\mathbf{x} & \left[i\bar{\theta}\epsilon_{ij} \left(m^2\phi_i \frac{\delta}{\delta\phi_j} + \nabla\phi_i \nabla \left[\frac{\delta}{\delta\phi_j} \right] \right) \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{\bar{\theta}^2}{4} \epsilon_{ij}\epsilon_{ik} \left(\nabla \left[\frac{\delta}{\delta\phi_j(x)} \right] \nabla \left[\frac{\delta}{\delta\phi_k(x)} \right] + m^2 \frac{\delta^2}{\delta\phi_j(x)\delta\phi_k(x)} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

acting on the same space of functionals of classical fields.

We have mapped the original theory given by the Hamiltonian (7) in terms of noncommutative fields (9) into a theory of ordinary fields having \hat{H}_{NC} as the Hamiltonian in its Schrödinger representation. This has some analogy with the Seiberg-Witten map [8] in Yang-Mills theories, which associates to every noncommutative gauge theory an ordinary gauge theory with a modified Hamiltonian.

Assuming that the $\bar{\theta} \rightarrow 0$ limit is not singular¹, the theory described by the Hamiltonian (13) will be a theory of free particles. Using translational invariance, one can derive their dispersion relation through the common eigenvalues of \hat{H}_{NC} and the momentum operator. The correspondence between classical and quantum theories allows to determine these eigenvalues easily by solving the evolution equation of the classical Hamiltonian

¹ See “Note added” at the end of this letter.

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{NC} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3\mathbf{x} & \left[\pi^2 - \bar{\theta} \epsilon_{ij} \left(\nabla \phi_i \nabla \pi_j + m^2 \phi_i \pi_j \right) \right. \\
& \left. + (\nabla \phi)^2 + m^2 \phi^2 + \frac{\bar{\theta}^2}{4} \left((\nabla \pi)^2 + m^2 \pi^2 \right) \right], \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

with a plane wave ansatz

$$\phi_i(\mathbf{x}, t) = A_i e^{iEt - i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}, \quad \pi_i(\mathbf{x}, t) = B_i e^{iEt - i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}}. \tag{15}$$

Defining $k \equiv |\mathbf{k}|$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= B_1 + \frac{\bar{\theta}}{2}(m^2 + k^2)A_2 + \frac{\bar{\theta}^2}{4}(m^2 + k^2)B_1 - iE A_1, \\
0 &= B_2 - \frac{\bar{\theta}}{2}(m^2 + k^2)A_1 + \frac{\bar{\theta}^2}{4}(m^2 + k^2)B_2 - iE A_2, \\
0 &= (m^2 + k^2)A_1 - \frac{\bar{\theta}}{2}(m^2 + k^2)B_2 + iE B_1, \\
0 &= (m^2 + k^2)A_2 + \frac{\bar{\theta}}{2}(m^2 + k^2)B_1 + iE B_2. \tag{16}
\end{aligned}$$

The energies $E(k)$ obtained as a solution of this linear system of equations are exactly the eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{NC} , with \mathbf{k} being the corresponding eigenvalues of the momentum operator. This can be easily proved from the correspondence between classical fields and matrix elements of the field operator.

Nontrivial solutions of the previous set of equations are obtained if and only if the principal determinant vanishes. Note that under the exchange $A_1 \leftrightarrow A_2, B_1 \leftrightarrow B_2$, the coefficient matrix in Eq. (16) remains identical if we change $\bar{\theta}$ by $-\bar{\theta}$. Therefore if its determinant vanishes for a certain $\bar{\theta}$, it will also do so for $-\bar{\theta}$. This is reflected in the double solution indicated by the \pm sign (we take from now on $\bar{\theta} > 0$) in the following dispersion relation obtained from the vanishing condition of the determinant:

$$E_{\pm}^2 = k^2 + m^2 + \frac{(k^2 + m^2)^2 \bar{\theta}^2}{2} \pm \frac{(k^2 + m^2)^{\frac{3}{2}} \bar{\theta} \sqrt{4 + (k^2 + m^2) \bar{\theta}^2}}{2}. \tag{17}$$

This dispersion relation is not Lorentz invariant, which could have been anticipated either from the commutation relations (9), which are no longer covariant owing to the different Lorentz transformation laws for the field and the momentum, or, alternatively, from the Lorentz noninvariant terms in the Hamiltonian (14).

Since the interchange $\phi_1 \leftrightarrow \phi_2$ corresponds (apart from a global i factor) to the exchange $\phi \leftrightarrow \phi^*$, we conclude that the term proportional to $\bar{\theta}$ in

Eq. (17) will be of opposite sign for the particle and antiparticle described by the complex field ϕ . This matter-antimatter asymmetry which comes out from the NC will have important consequences as we will explore later.

Let us simplify Eq. (17) a little bit. Defining $E_{LI} \equiv \sqrt{k^2 + m^2}$, we see that E_{\pm}^2/E_{LI}^2 is a function of the variable $a \equiv E_{LI}\bar{\theta}$. In fact

$$\frac{E_{\pm}^2}{E_{LI}^2} = 1 + \frac{a^2}{2} \pm \frac{a\sqrt{4+a^2}}{2}. \quad (18)$$

Lorentz invariance is a very good low-energy approximation, well tested at least up to the TeV scale. This puts an upper bound on the NC parameter, $\bar{\theta} \lesssim 10^{-12} \text{ eV}^{-1}$. Small deviations mean $a \ll 1$. Up to order a^3 , we therefore get

$$E_{\pm}^2 = k^2 + m^2 \pm (k^2 + m^2)^{3/2} \bar{\theta} + (k^2 + m^2)^2 \frac{\bar{\theta}^2}{2}. \quad (19)$$

In the ultrarelativistic limit, $k \gg m$, keeping only each of the first terms in the expansion in both powers of m^2 and $\bar{\theta}$ of Eq. (19), we get

$$E_{\pm} = k + \frac{m^2}{2k} \pm \frac{1}{2} \bar{\theta} k^2. \quad (20)$$

In the nonrelativistic limit, $k \ll m$, then expanding Eq. (19) in powers of k^2 and $\bar{\theta}$, we obtain to first order

$$E_{\pm} = m + \frac{k^2}{2m} \pm \frac{1}{2} \bar{\theta} m^2. \quad (21)$$

In contrast with a general parametrization of a Lorentz-violating dispersion relation involving many undetermined coefficients [10], the phenomenological analysis of a Lorentz invariance violation (LIV) produced by NC in field space is more economical because the only coefficient present in Eq. (17) is the NC parameter $\bar{\theta}$ and, therefore, one could search for an appropriate experiment in order to extract some limits on it.

The LIV's induced by the NC are a high-energy effect (of scale $\bar{\theta}^{-1}$). They could therefore be observed in high-energy experiments or in low-energy experiments of very high precision. Complete analyses of the noncommutative effects to low-energy experiments would be quite involved, and in particular would require to go beyond free theory. But in order to get an estimate of the sensitivity to $\bar{\theta}$ at low-energies it is enough to concentrate on a simple experiment, such as the tritium beta-decay, and study the modifications induced by the noncommutative dispersion relation Eq. (17). The tritium beta decay is a low-energy experiment [11], with scales the electron mass and Q ,

the total energy available for the process. However, its high precision makes it sensitive to tiny deviations induced by a very small non-zero mass from the $E = k$ relation for a massless neutrino. What about the small deviation from the relativistic dispersion relation coming from the NC? Since for a neutrino $k \gg m$, the energy-momentum relation is Eq. (20). The mass term gets important at the end of the beta-decay spectrum (small k for the neutrino), while the NC term is important at the beginning of the spectrum. Both corrections are comparable at a neutrino momentum given by

$$k \sim \left(\frac{m}{\text{eV}}\right)^{2/3} \left[\frac{(10^{13} \text{ eV})^{-1}}{\bar{\theta}}\right]^{1/3} (20 \text{ keV}). \quad (22)$$

Since 20 keV is the order of magnitude of the maximum momentum for the neutrino in the tritium beta-decay, the possibility to detect a parameter of NC $\bar{\theta} \sim (10^{13} \text{ eV})^{-1}$ using data from the beginning of the electron energy spectrum is comparable to the possibility to detect a neutrino mass of order the eV using the experimental data from the tail of the spectrum. In fact, this $\bar{\theta}$ would require a precision in the determination of the energy of the neutrino $\delta E_\nu \sim 10^{-4} - 10^{-5} \text{ eV}$, far from the experimental possibilities.

An alternative would be to consider the dispersion relation for the electron. Since in the tritium beta-decay the electron is nonrelativistic, its energy-momentum relation is Eq. (21). Detection of $\bar{\theta} \sim (10^{13} \text{ eV})^{-1}$ here requires a determination of the energy of the electron with a $10^{-1} - 10^{-2} \text{ eV}$ precision. But there is an extra difficulty here: the modification in the energy is a constant (acting as an additional “effective” mass) that cannot be distinguished from a change in the Q factor, whose determination certainly contains errors greater than the eV.

On the other hand, the mass of the electron is known with a precision of $2 \times 10^{-2} \text{ eV}$. So a $\bar{\theta} \sim (10^{13} \text{ eV})^{-1}$ would be detectable from the experiments used to measure the electron mass if they were able to separate the effective mass coming from the NC. If this were so also in the case of the proton, even a $\bar{\theta} \sim (10^{16} \text{ eV})^{-1}$ would be detectable (since the “effective” mass, $\approx m_p^2 \bar{\theta}$, is larger in this case). But to see this, one should go beyond the free theory in the discussion of noncommutative quantum fields. We turn instead to the possibility of direct exploration of scales $1/\bar{\theta}$ offered by the physics of high-energy cosmic rays, which is known to change drastically by violation of Lorentz symmetry [10,12]. We will see how this physics is sensitive to much lower values of the NC parameter $\bar{\theta}$.

For high energy cosmic rays ($E_{LI} \sim k \geq 10^{16} \text{ eV}$) and a NC parameter $\bar{\theta} \sim (10^{13} \text{ eV})^{-1}$, we are no longer in the limit $a \ll 1$; instead we have $k\bar{\theta} \gg 1$. The energy-momentum relation for this case can be easily obtained from Eq. (18):

$$E_+ \approx k^2 \bar{\theta}, \quad E_-^2 \approx \bar{\theta}^{-2} - 2/(k^2 \bar{\theta}^4). \quad (23)$$

Experimental observation of cosmic rays up to energies $E \sim 10^{20}$ eV rules out both solutions [13]: with the E_+ relation, any disintegration of one particle into two particles allowed by the conservation laws of the strong interaction (e.g. $p \rightarrow n + \pi^+$) is also allowed by energy conservation, whatever their masses are. This is an effective mechanism of energy loss for primary cosmic rays. A particle with the E_- relation would have a maximum energy of $1/\bar{\theta}$. Therefore the parameter of NC cannot be much higher than $(10^{20} \text{ eV})^{-1}$. In particular the values $\bar{\theta} \sim (10^{13} \text{ eV})^{-1}$ are completely excluded.

An interesting possibility is that the NC would be a quantum gravity effect, so that $\bar{\theta}^{-1}$ would naturally be of order the Planck scale, $M_P \sim 10^{28}$ eV. In general, for $\bar{\theta} \ll (10^{20} \text{ eV})^{-1}$, we can use the approximation $a \ll 1$ in the physics of high-energy cosmic rays and the energy-momentum relation given by Eq. (20). Let us consider the kinematics of the disintegration of a particle of mass m into two particles m_1 and m_2 of momenta \mathbf{p}_1 and \mathbf{p}_2 with relative angle ϕ . Energy conservation leads to

$$\cos \phi \approx 1 + \left(\frac{m_1^2}{2p_1} + \frac{m_2^2}{2p_2} - \frac{m^2}{2(p_1 + p_2)} \right) \left(\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} \right) \mp \bar{\theta} (p_1 + p_2). \quad (24)$$

Without the NC contribution, $\cos \phi > 1$ if $m_1 + m_2 > m$ and the disintegration is forbidden, while it is kinematically allowed if $m_1 + m_2 < m$. A positive correction to the energy in Eq. (20) coming from the NC enlarges the range of masses for which the disintegration is allowed, while the negative correction produces the inverse effect: kinematically allowed disintegrations in the relativistic invariant theory are no longer allowed above a certain value of the momentum.

Taking masses of the order of the GeV, the momentum scale p_{nc} above which: either disintegration is an effective mechanism for energy loss in E_+ case, or kinematically allowed disintegrations in the Lorentz invariant theory are forbidden because of the NC in the E_- case, is

$$p_{nc} \sim \left[\frac{(10^{28} \text{ eV})^{-1}}{\bar{\theta}} \right]^{1/3} 2 \times 10^{15} \text{ eV}. \quad (25)$$

Again, the existence of cosmic rays of energies as high as $E \sim 10^{20}$ eV discards the E_+ energy-momentum relation for them [at least for values $\bar{\theta} \geq (10^{43} \text{ eV})^{-1}$], while the E_- relation would still be compatible with the observation of such energetic cosmic rays. In this last case, we could consider the energy loss mechanism coming from the interaction with the microwave background of photons, which in standard Lorentz invariant kinematics produces the GZK cutoff [3] at 10^{19} eV. Incorporating the energy of the photon

$\omega \sim 10^{-4}$ eV to the energy balance Eq. (24), the reaction $p + \gamma \rightarrow n + \pi^+$ is kinematically allowed with the E_- relation coming from NC if

$$\left[\omega + \frac{m^2}{2(p_1 + p_2)} - \frac{m_1^2}{2p_1} - \frac{m_2^2}{2p_2} \right] \geq \bar{\theta} p_1 p_2. \quad (26)$$

Without NC, the right hand side (rhs) of Eq. (26) is zero and the inequality is satisfied above a certain value of the momentum $p_1 + p_2$ (the standard GZK cutoff). However, for values of the NC parameter $\bar{\theta} \geq (10^{43} \text{ eV})^{-1}$, Eq. (26) is no longer satisfied for any momentum: the GZK cutoff disappears.

In summary, for the energy-momentum relation Eq. (17) which comes out from noncommutative quantum fields [Eq. (9)], only the E_- solution for particles would be compatible with the observation of very high-energy cosmic rays. Moreover, the NC washes out the standard GZK cutoff, and is therefore a possible explanation of why this cutoff is not observed in the cosmic ray spectrum. Recalling the comments following Eq. (16), the E_+ relation should be assigned to antiparticles. According to our previous discussion, they would present a very efficient energy loss mechanism at high energies (disintegration by strong processes) and could not propagate through very large distances. These conclusions apply to very tiny values of the NC parameter [the limitation is just $\bar{\theta} \geq (10^{43} \text{ eV})^{-1}$], including the suggestive scenario in which NC arises from quantum gravity effects ($\bar{\theta}^{-1} \sim M_P$).

We should note that for certain particles the assignation of the E_- or E_+ energy-momentum relations is still ambiguous. For example, the distinction between matter and antimatter for the π^+ and the π^- is not clear. We used the E_- relation for the π^+ in Eq. (26), but we could have equally chosen the E_+ relation for it. Moreover, the π^0 is described by a real field, so that we cannot make it noncommutative (according to Eq. (9b) we need two-component fields for the introduction of noncommutativity). Since the π^0 , together with the π^+ and the π^- forms an SU(2) triplet, one could argue the absence of noncommutative corrections for the three particles based on symmetry arguments. However, in this case the ambiguity does not affect the conclusion of the disappearance of the GZK cutoff. Taking the E_+ relation for the π^+ modifies the rhs of Eq. (26) by the factor $(1 + p_2/p_1)$. The factor is $(1 + p_2/2p_1)$ if the π^+ does not present any $\bar{\theta}$ correction. In both cases the corresponding inequality is even more difficult to satisfy than Eq. (26). On the other hand, since we are considering different dispersion relations for particles and antiparticles, a very stringent bound ($\bar{\theta} \lesssim 10^{-27} \text{ eV}^{-1}$) is given by kinematic CPT violation in neutral kaons [14]. If however one extends the previous symmetry arguments for pions to SU(3) then there are no bounds to $\bar{\theta}$ coming from kaon physics.

Finally, let us comment that QFT formulated in a noncommutative space also produces violations of relativistic invariance if one goes beyond free theory. This is a “dynamic” LIV, in the sense that it is produced only in the presence

of an interaction. Existing experiments bound the NC energy scale to 10^{13} eV [15]. In contrast, NC in field space produces a “kinematic” violation, which allows the identification of corrections to the relativistic dispersion relation containing a single parameter $\bar{\theta}$. In this case high-energy cosmic rays put a much more stringent bound on the NC energy scale $\bar{\theta}^{-1}$.

We would like to thank Prof M. Loewe for discussions. This work has been partially supported by the grants 1010596, 7010596 and 3000005 from Fondecyt-Chile, by M.AA.EE./AECI and by MCYT (Spain), grants FPA2000-1252 and FPA2001-1813.

Note added: After this work was submitted for publication, we proved the validity of the hypothesis that the Hamiltonian (13) describes a theory of free particles by defining an explicit quantization in Fock space [16]. This reformulation allowed us to go beyond the simplest option of noncommutativity by including a nontrivial commutator for the momenta [a deformation of the relation (9a)].

References

- [1] G. Amelino-Camelia, J. Ellis, N.E. Mavromatos, D.V. Nanopoulos and S. Sarkar, *Nature* **393**, 763 (1998); R. Gambini and J. Pullin, *Phys. Rev.* **59**, 124021 (1999); J. Alfaro, H. A. Morales-Técolt and L. F. Urrutia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2318 (2000); J. Alfaro, H. A. Morales-Técolt and L. F. Urrutia, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 103509 (2002); J. Alfaro and G. Palma, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 103516 (2002); T. Jacobson, S. Liberati, D. Mattingly, hep-ph/0112207.
- [2] The problem of Lorentz violation invariance has been extensively studied in the last years by Kostelecký and collaborators. Some references are: D. Colladay and V.A. Kostelecký, *Phys. Lett.* **B511**, 209 (2001); V.A. Kostelecký, R. Lehnert, *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 065008 (2001); R. Bluhm and V.A. Kostelecký, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 1381 (2000); V.A. Kostelecký and Charles D. Lane, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 116010 (1999); R. Jackiw and V.A. Kostelecký, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 3572 (1999); D. Colladay, V.A. Kostelecký, *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 116002 (1998).
- [3] K. Greisen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **16**, 748 (1966); G.T. Zatsepin and V.A. Kuzmin, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. Pis'ma Red.* **4**, 414 (1966) [*JETP Lett.* **4**, 78 (1966)].
- [4] For a recent review on noncommutative QFT see *e.g.* R. Szabo, hep-th/0109162.
- [5] V.P. Nair and A.P. Polychronakos, *Phys. Lett. B* **505**, 267 (2001).
- [6] See *e.g.* B. Hatfield, *Quantum Field Theory of Point Particles and Strings*, p. 199 (Benjamin, 1992).
- [7] A. Connes, M.R. Douglas, A. Shwartz, *J. High Energy Phys.* **02** (1999) 003.

- [8] N. Seiberg, E. Witten, J. High Energy Phys. **09** (1999) 032.
- [9] L. Mezincescu, hep-th/0007046.
- [10] S. Coleman and S.L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 116008 (1999); R. Aloisio, P. Blasi, P. Ghia and A. Grillo, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 053010 (2000).
- [11] For a review on the tritium beta-decay see *e.g.* J. Bonn and C. Weinheimer, Acta Phys. Polon. **B31**, 1209 (2000).
- [12] G. Amelino-Camelia and T. Piran, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 036005 (2001); O. Bertolami, Gen. Rel. Grav. **34**, 707 (2002); J.M. Carmona and J.L. Cortés, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 025006 (2001).
- [13] For a recent review on cosmic rays see *e.g.* F. Halzen and D. Hooper, astro-ph/0204527.
- [14] T. Hambye, R. Man and U. Sarkar, Phys. Lett. B **421**, 105 (1998).
- [15] S. Carroll, J. Harvey, V. Kostelecký, C. Lane and T. Okamoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 141601 (2001); M. Chaichian, M. Sheikh-Jabbari and A. Tureanu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2716 (2001); H. Falomir, J. Gamboa, M. Loewe, F. Méndez and J.C. Rojas, hep-th/0203260, to appear in Phys. Rev. D.
- [16] J.M. Carmona, J.L. Cortés, J. Gamboa and F. Méndez, J. High Energy Phys. **03** (2003) 058.