Scattering Amplitudes in Gauge Theories

> Sangmin Lee Seoul National University

APCTP-KIAS Summer Institute for Theoretical Physics 2011 Aug. 1~5 2011 @ Alpensia Resort



Lecture 1

Prerequisites

One semester course in Quantum Field Theory.
 (tree-level QED including 2-2 scattering process)

Lie algebra of SU(N).

References

Special volume of Journal of Physics A "Scattering Amplitudes in Gauge Theories"

A good starting point is [L. Dixon 1105.0771]

Scattering amplitude







Use of scattering amplitudes

Example: 2 to *m*-particle differential cross section



Scattering amplitudes in gauge theories - history

QED (1940's)

Feynman, Schwinger, Tomonaga, Dyson

Non-abelian gauge theory (1970's)

Faddeev-Popov 't Hooft-Veltman Slavnov-Taylor Lee-ZinnJustin Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin

Scattering amplitudes of non-abelian gauge theory has been a serious research topic from mid-1980's until ... now!

Amplitudes in non-abelian gauge theory





Jets are produced at a rate many orders of magnitude higher than those of "interesting" events.

n	3	4	5	6	7	•••
#(Feynman)	I	2	10	38	149	•••

reduced counting after color decomposition

Scope of the lecture

We will mostly focus on ... (but brifely comment on)

 \bigcirc (1+3) dimension ((1+2)-dimension)

Gauge theory (Gravity)

Massless particles

Tree amplitudes (Loop amplitudes)

Planar (large *N*) sector

Massless particle

Lorentz group and its extension to include spinors

 $\begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{SO}(1,3)\simeq\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}) & & \mathrm{SO}(4)\simeq\mathrm{SU}(2)\times\mathrm{SU}(2) \\ & & \mathrm{SO}(2,2)\simeq\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})\times\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R}) \end{array}$

 \bigcirc Fields at a given point $(\phi, \psi_{\alpha}, A_{\mu})$

finite dimensional, non-unitary representations

Particle states

es $|p_{\mu}, h\rangle$ Helicity

infinite dimensional, unitary representations

Momentum and Helicity



- Welicity = angular momentum around the momentum axis (spin under the SO(2) little group)
- Whelicity is Lorentz invariant only for massless particles.
- \bigcirc *h* = +1 and *h* = -1 are related by discrete symmetry like parity but not by Lorentz transformation.

Gauge redundancy (problem with h = I or higher)

$$A_{\mu=0,1,2,3}$$
 : (4 components)
 $|p,h=\pm 1\rangle$: (2 states)

"True" amplitudes are never written down in most QFT textbooks !!! (Exception: Srednicki)

General lessons

- Gauge redundancy is inevitable, if we want to keep locality and unitarity manifest at the same time.
- But, in Feynman diagram computations, gauge redundancy is the main source of computational complexity.
 (Individual diagrams are not gauge invariant.
 Gauge invariance is recovered only after summing over diagrams.)
- Explicit computations have shown that, quite often, a vast number of Feynman diagrams collapse into a simple 1-2 line expressions.

Could there be an alternative to Feynman calculus which reveals the secret behind the enormous simplification?

Spinor-helicity variables

Spinors for momenta

 $p^{\mu} = (p^{0}, \vec{p}) \qquad p_{\mu}p^{\mu} = (p^{0})^{2} - \vec{p}^{2} = 0$ $p \cdot \sigma = \begin{pmatrix} p^{0} + p^{3} & p^{1} - ip^{2} \\ p^{1} + ip^{2} & p^{0} - p^{3} \end{pmatrix} \equiv p_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \qquad \text{``bi-spinor''}$ $\det(p \cdot \sigma) = (p^{0})^{2} - \vec{p}^{2} = 0 \implies p_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} = \lambda_{\alpha}\bar{\lambda}_{\dot{\alpha}}$

Complexify all variables

$$\begin{split} SO(1,3) &\to SL(2)_{\lambda} \times SL(2)_{\bar{\lambda}} & \text{Complexified Lorentz group} \\ \langle ij \rangle &= \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} (\lambda_i)_{\alpha} (\lambda_j)_{\beta} , \ [ij] = \epsilon^{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} (\bar{\lambda}_i)_{\dot{\alpha}} (\bar{\lambda}_j)_{\dot{\beta}} & \text{Lorentz invariants} \end{split}$$

Polarization vectors revisited

 $\bigcirc \text{Momentum:} \quad p_{\mu} \to p_{\alpha \dot{\alpha}} = \lambda_{\alpha} \bar{\lambda}_{\dot{\alpha}}$

orthogonal

Polarization vectors are now uniquely determined!

Polarization vectors - further remarks

- Gauge redundancy has been transferred to the ambiguity in the choice of $\ell_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} = \rho_{\alpha}\bar{\rho}_{\dot{\alpha}}$.
- Solution The final "true" amplitude should be gauge invariant: dependence on $\rho, \overline{\rho}$

Bonus

Under the "helicity scaling" $(\lambda, \overline{\lambda}) \rightarrow (t\lambda, t^{-1}\overline{\lambda})$,

$$\epsilon^{+} \to t^{-2} \epsilon^{+}, \quad \epsilon^{-} \to t^{+2} \epsilon^{-}$$
$$\implies A_{n}(t_{i}\lambda_{i}, t_{i}^{-1}\bar{\lambda}_{i}, h_{i}) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} t_{i}^{-2h_{i}}\right) A_{n}(\lambda_{i}, \bar{\lambda}_{i}, h_{i})$$

Color ordering

 $\begin{aligned} & \bigotimes SU(N_c) \text{ gauge group} \\ & \text{ adjoint color indices:} & a, b, c \in \{1, \dots, N_c^2 - 1\} \\ & \text{ fundamental indices:} & i, j, \dots \in \{1, \dots, N_c\} \\ & \text{ anti-fundamental indices:} & \bar{\imath}, \bar{\jmath}, \dots \in \{1, \dots, N_c\} \end{aligned}$

 \bigcirc Generators of SU(N_c), $(T^a)_i^{\bar{j}}$, satisfy

 $[T^{a}, T^{b}] = f^{ab}{}_{c} T^{c}$ $\operatorname{tr}(T^{a} T^{b}) = \delta^{ab}$ $(T^{a})_{i_{1}}{}^{\bar{j}_{1}} (T^{a})_{i_{2}}{}^{\bar{j}_{2}} = \delta_{i_{1}}{}^{\bar{j}_{2}} \delta_{i_{2}}{}^{\bar{j}_{1}} - \frac{1}{N_{c}} \delta_{i_{1}}{}^{\bar{j}_{1}} \delta_{i_{2}}{}^{\bar{j}_{2}}$

Color ordering

Double-line notation ['t Hooft '74]



figures copied from [Dixon 1105.0771]

Color ordering



Heuristic argument [Dixon 1105.0771]

