

# **Dirac equation in a gravitational field: wave mechanics vs equivalence principle**

*Mayeul Arminjon*

**Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Bari**

**& INFN, Sezione di Bari**

**(On leave from CNRS, Grenoble, France)**

*Dipart. di Fisica, Univ. & INFN Bari, May 23, 2006*

## Quantum Mechanics (QM) in a gravitational field: ?

- ▶ Gravity is described by theories with curved space-time.
- ▶ Usual way to write QM wave eqs: covariantization (or *equivalence principle*): searched eq. in curved S-T should coincide with flat-S-T version in a local freely falling frame. But ambiguities may arise due to non-commuting covariant derivatives. E.g.: covariant Klein-Gordon eqs.
- ▶ Alternatively, one may try to *apply directly the classical-quantum correspondence*. But:
  - Is there a classical Hamiltonian?
  - Canonical quantization will depend on coordinates.
  - Even in given coordinates, ambiguities arise because metric contains position which doesn't commute with momentum.

## Dispersion equation of a linear wave eqn

Whitham's theory of dispersive linear waves, a bit extended.

A linear (wave) eq.:  $a_0(X)\psi + a_1^\mu(X)\partial_\mu\psi + a_2^{\mu\nu}(X)\partial_\mu\partial_\nu\psi = 0$ ,  
where  $X = (t, \mathbf{x}) =$  position in (configuration-)space-time.

Look for "locally plane-wave" solutions:  $\psi(X) = A \exp[i\theta(X)]$ ,  
with, at  $X_0$ ,  $\partial_\nu\partial_\mu\theta(X_0) = \partial_\nu K_\mu(X_0) = 0$ , where  $K_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu\theta$ :  
 $\mathbf{K} = (K_\mu) = (-\omega, \mathbf{k})$  is the wave (co)vector, with  $\omega =$  frequency  
and  $\mathbf{k} =$  "spatial" wave covector.

This leads to the *dispersion equation*:

$$\Pi_X(\mathbf{K}) \equiv a_0(X) + i a_1^\mu(X)K_\mu + i^2 a_2^{\mu\nu}(X)K_\mu K_\nu = 0.$$

## Dispersion equation & wave equation

Clearly, the wave equation:

$$a_0(X)\psi + a_1^\mu(X)\partial_\mu\psi + a_2^{\mu\nu}(X)\partial_\mu\partial_\nu\psi = 0 \quad (1)$$

and the dispersion equation:

$$\Pi_X(\mathbf{K}) \equiv a_0(X) + i a_1^\mu(X)K_\mu + i^2 a_2^{\mu\nu}(X)K_\mu K_\nu = 0 \quad (2)$$

are in *one-to-one correspondence*.

*Inverse correspondence* (from (2) to (1)):

$$K_\mu \longrightarrow \partial_\mu/i, \quad (\mu = 0, \dots, N \equiv \text{dim. of configur}^n \text{ space})$$

The *dispersion relation(s)*:  $\omega = W(\mathbf{k}; X)$ , fix the wave mode.

Obtained by solving  $\Pi_X(\mathbf{K}) = 0$  for  $\omega \equiv -K_0$ .

## The classical-quantum correspondence

Witham's theory of dispersive waves: still, propagation of  $\mathbf{k}$  turns out to be ruled by a *Hamiltonian system*:

$$\frac{dk_j}{dt} = -\frac{\partial W}{\partial x^j},$$

$$\frac{dx^j}{dt} = \frac{\partial W}{\partial k_j} \quad (j = 1, \dots, N \equiv \text{dimension of configuration space}).$$

*Wave mechanics*: a classical Hamiltonian  $H$  describes the skeleton of a wave pattern. Then, the wave eqn should give a dispersion  $W$  with the same Hamiltonian trajectories as  $H$ . Simplest way to do that: assume that  $H$  and  $W$  are proportional,  $H = \hbar W$ ... Leads first to  $E = \hbar\omega$ ,  $\mathbf{p} = \hbar\mathbf{k}$ . Then, substituting  $K_\mu \rightarrow \partial_\mu/i$ , it leads to the correspondence between a classical Hamiltonian and a wave operator.

(M.A.: *Nuovo Cim.* **B114**, 71, 1999.)

## Algebraic vs polynomial Hamiltonians

For a non-relativistic particle, the Hamiltonian  $H$  is polynomial in the momentum  $\mathbf{p}$  (at fixed  $X$ ):

$$H(\mathbf{p}, X) = \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2m} + V(X), \quad (3)$$

and the correspondence leads to the Schrödinger equation. For a relativistic particle (say a free one),  $H$  is *algebraic* in  $\mathbf{p}$  instead:

$$Q(E, \mathbf{p}) \equiv E^2 - \mathbf{p}^2 c^2 - m^2 c^4 = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad E = H(\mathbf{p}). \quad (4)$$

Applying the correspondence to (4), leads to the *Klein-Gordon* eq. The problem here is that (4) has also the solution  $H' = -H$ . Hence, the K-G eq. also will have *too much solutions*.

## A variant derivation of the Dirac equation

Therefore, it is tempting to try a *factorization* of the dispersion equation associated with the algebraic relation (4):

$$\Pi(\mathbf{K}) \equiv (g^{\mu\nu} K_\mu K_\nu - m^2)1 = (\alpha + i\gamma^\mu K_\mu)(\beta + i\zeta^\nu K_\nu). \quad (5)$$

*Identifying coeffs. in (5) (with noncommutative algebra), and substituting  $K_\mu \longrightarrow \partial_\mu/i$ , leads to the Dirac equation.*

*This derivation works also with an electromagnetic field, and even also (as will be seen) in a static gravitational field.*

*(M.A.: Found. Phys. Lett. **19**, 225, 2006)*



## Transformation of Dirac wave function

One asks that, after linear coordinate changes  $L$ , the Dirac wave function  $\psi$  becomes

$$\psi'(X') = S.\psi(X), \quad S = S(L), \quad (6)$$

for some operator function  $S$  of  $L$ . It follows that Dirac eq. becomes

$$(i\gamma'^{\nu} \partial'_{\nu} - m)\psi' = 0, \quad \gamma'^{\nu} \equiv L^{\nu}_{\mu} S \gamma^{\mu} S^{-1}. \quad (7)$$

Standard statement: *Relativity asks that*  $\gamma'^{\nu} = \gamma^{\nu}$  (whence the spinor representation). *But no!* Archetypically relativistic is the eq of motion for a particle with 4-velocity  $U^{\mu}$  in e.m. field  $F^{\mu}_{\nu}$ :

$$m \frac{dU^{\mu}}{ds} = q F^{\mu}_{\nu} U^{\nu}, \quad \text{or} \quad m \frac{dU}{ds} = q F U. \quad (8)$$

Here, matrix  $F \equiv (F^{\mu}_{\nu})$  is *not* invariant:  $F' = L F L^{-1}$ .

## 4-vector transformation of Dirac wave function

The simplest possibility for  $S$  is the identity:  $S(L) = L$ , thus the 4-vector transformation of the Dirac wave function:

$$\psi'(X') = L.\psi(X), \quad \text{or} \quad \psi'^{\mu} = L_{\nu}^{\mu}\psi^{\nu}. \quad (9)$$

Then, the Dirac matrices transform in the following way:

$$\gamma'^{\mu} \equiv L_{\nu}^{\mu}L\gamma^{\nu}L^{-1}, \quad (10)$$

which means that *the components*  $(\gamma^{\mu})_{\nu}^{\rho}$  *form a*  $\binom{2}{1}$  *tensor.*

- ▶ The anticommutation is preserved,  $[\gamma'^{\mu}, \gamma'^{\nu}]_{+} = 2g'^{\mu\nu} 1$ .
- ▶ Direct physical consequences of the Dirac eq unchanged: the *equation*, hence its *solutions*, stay unchanged.

## Gravitational Dirac equation from wave mechanics

For geodesic motion in a *static* metric, the particle's conserved energy  $E$  turns out to be a Hamiltonian (PIRT'98, gr-qc/0203104):

$$E \equiv \sqrt{g_{00}} mc^2 \gamma_v = H(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{x}) = [g_{00} (h^{jk} p_j p_k c^2 + m^2 c^4)]^{1/2},$$

with  $\mathbf{h} \equiv (h_{jk})$  the spatial metric in the static reference frame.

With  $E = \hbar\omega$ ,  $\mathbf{p} = \hbar\mathbf{k}$ , it leads to the same dispersion equation as in the flat case:  $g^{\mu\nu} K_\mu K_\nu - m^2 = 0$  ( $\hbar = 1 = c$ ). Hence, the same factorization leads to the same Dirac eq:

$$(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m)\psi = 0 \quad (\text{with "deformed" matrices, for } g^{\mu\nu} \neq \eta^{\mu\nu}).$$

However, *our interpretation of the classical-quantum correspondence implies that it makes sense only in very special coordinate systems.* In the static case, these are such that

$$x^0 = at, \quad h_{jk,l}(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \quad j, k, l \in \{1, 2, 3\}.$$

The foregoing “**wave-mechanical**” **gravitational Dirac eq.** may be rewritten in the form below, covariant under coordinate changes which are *internal to the static reference frame*:

$$(i\gamma^\nu \Delta_\nu - m) \psi = 0, \quad (11)$$

with

$$(\Delta_\nu \psi)^\mu \equiv \psi^\mu_{,\nu} \quad \text{if } \mu = 0 \text{ or } \nu = 0 \quad (12)$$

and

$$(\Delta_\nu \psi)^\mu \equiv \psi^\mu_{;\nu} \quad (\text{covariant derivative w.r. to } \mathbf{h}\text{) otherwise.} \quad (13)$$

This is *definitely non-equivalent to the standard gravitational extension of the Dirac equation* – the latter being obtained by the “*covariantization*” of the Dirac eq. with spinor transform. Which is the more correct one? *Experiment*, in particular with **ultra-cold neutrons in gravity field (Nesvizhevsky et al., ILL)**, could tell us.

## Hamiltonian operator for the Dirac equation in a static gravitational field

We are looking for *stationary solutions*

$$\psi(t, \mathbf{x}) = \phi(t) a(\mathbf{x}) \quad (14)$$

of the Dirac eq in a static metric. The “*wave-mechanical*” version of the latter eq. may be rewritten in Schrödinger form:

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \hbar c g_{00} (M \gamma^0 \psi - i \gamma^0 \gamma^j \Delta_j \psi) \equiv H \psi, \quad M \equiv \frac{mc}{\hbar}. \quad (15)$$

One shows that  $H\psi$  is a 4-vector under *spatial* coord. changes. And, there is just *one* invariant Hermitian product that appears naturally for 4-vector wave functions in a static metric.

Same job done also for the *standard* gravitational Dirac eq.

## Weak-field limits vs. stationary Schrödinger eq. in the gravity potential $U$

**Aim:** to find corrections to the latter eq., and to compare these corrections as found with either the standard or the proposed version of the Dirac eq. in a static metric.

**Framework:** particle velocity is  $O(\epsilon)$  and gravitational field strength  $U/c^2$  is  $O(\epsilon^2)$ , with  $\epsilon \ll 1$ . Then, the stationary energy levels  $E$  should satisfy

$$E = \hbar\omega = mc^2 + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (16)$$

*This automatically selects positive-energy solutions! Thus, a Foldy-Wouthuysen transform is unnecessary.*

## Weak-field limits vs. stationary Schrödinger eq. in the gravity potential $U$

The weak-field eqs have been calculated, first without checking hermiticity (!) The 2 put *different* corrections to Schrödinger eq in the gravity field.

It turns out that the Hamiltonian of the *standard* (Dirac-Fock-Weyl) equation *is* Hermitian for the relevant *invariant* scalar product. Corresponding weak-field eq.:

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\Delta\varphi - mU\varphi + \frac{\hbar^2}{2mc^2} \left[ \frac{3}{2}i\varepsilon_{jkl}\partial_j U \sigma^l \partial_k \varphi + \frac{1}{2}\partial_j U \partial_j \varphi - \frac{1}{2}\varphi\Delta U \right] = (E - mc^2)\varphi + O(\epsilon^4).$$

In this eq., all terms are order  $\epsilon^2$ , thus all have *the same order* in  $\epsilon$ . *Corrections to Schrödinger eq. don't need to be negligible !!*

## Summary and conclusions

- ▶ To write QM in a gravitational field: first interpret the classical-quantum correspondence.
- ▶ A variant derivation of the Dirac equation.
- ▶ *4-vector transform<sup>n</sup> of Dirac wave function.*
- ▶ *Dirac eq. with gravitation: wave mechanics clashes with equivalence principle.*
- ▶ Weak-field limits investigated to evaluate corrections to energy levels w.r.t. Schrödinger eq in gravity potential. These corrections will very likely differ for the 2 competing gravitational Dirac eqs. and *don't need to be negligible.*