

Jan de Boer², Bas Peeters³, Kostas Skenderis⁴ and Peter van Nieuwenhuizen⁵,

Institute for Theoretical Physics
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, NY 11794-3840, USA

Abstract

By carefully analyzing the relations between operator methods and the discretized and continuum path integral formulations of quantum-mechanical systems, we have found the correct Feynman rules for one-dimensional path integrals in curved spacetime. Although the prescription how to deal with the products of distributions that appear in the computation of Feynman diagrams in configuration space is surprising, this prescription follows unambiguously from the discretized path integral. We check our results by an explicit two-loop calculation.

¹This research was supported in part by NSF grant no PHY9309888.

²e-mail: deboer@insti.physics.sunysb.edu

³e-mail: peeters@insti.physics.sunysb.edu

⁴e-mail: kostas@insti.physics.sunysb.edu

⁵e-mail: vannieu@insti.physics.sunysb.edu

One-dimensional path integrals are interesting for a variety of reasons. They are the simplest toy models of higher dimensional path integrals, and since they describe quantum mechanics, which is a finite theory, it should be possible to understand them completely and rigorously. Indeed, it is relatively straightforward to reproduce some standard quantum mechanical facts for the harmonic oscillator and other simple systems from the corresponding path integrals. However, to do the same for a point particle in curved space turns out to be a much more delicate problem [1, 2]. The corresponding path integrals can be used to compute one-loop anomalies of n-dimensional quantum field theories. This was first shown by Alvarez-Gaumé and Witten for various chiral anomalies [3], and later for trace anomalies in [4]. In the first case, only one-loop worldline graphs contribute, but in the second case one needs to go to higher loops, and details of the action and measure can no longer be neglected. This is yet another reason to properly understand one-dimensional path integrals. Inspired by this application we will in this article consider the path integral for a point particle in curved space, defined on a finite time interval $[-\beta, 0]$. Since the corresponding Hamiltonian \hat{H} appears as a regulator when we write anomalies A as the regularized trace of a Jacobian \hat{J} , $A = \text{Tr}(\hat{J}\exp(-\beta \hat{H}))$, the Hamiltonian and its operator ordering are completely fixed by the properties of the original quantum field theory. Therefore, we will in this article only focus on the path integral computation of the transition element 6 $T=< z|\exp(-\beta \hat{H})|y>$, given a fixed quantum Hamiltonian H. The supersymmetric generalization, a full-fledged path integral treatment of (Majorana) fermions and internal symmetry ghosts and the explicit evaluation of various anomalies will be discussed in a future publication [5].

At first sight it may seem surprising that one can find a fundamental new result in such an arcane subject as path integrals for a point particle. However, most of

 $^{^6}$ We work in Euclidean space. For loop calculations, there is no essential difference with Minkowski space, and we ignore instantons, since we are interested in the short time expansion of T only.




Figure 1: Flow chart with equations. The asterisk locates the main result.

the vast literature on this subject deals with infinite intervals, and those articles in which finite intervals are considered do not contain explicit higher loop calculations. Finally, some authors do not require that path integrals should reproduce the results obtained from a Hamiltonian approach, but rather they freely invent a new definition of Feynman path integrals directly in configuration space. Because of the connection with anomalies, we define path integrals as derived from the Hamiltonian approach. In [6], an explicit complete two-loop calculation of the trace anomaly was performed, using mode regularization to define products of δ - and θ -functions. Surprisingly, the results disagreed with the results of [4] obtained from the heat kernel. A thorough and lengthy study finally revealed that mode regularization is incompatible with the discretized Hamiltonian approach.

Various ways to obtain an explicit expression for T have been depicted in figure 1. Our main result, denoted by a star in figure 1, will be the precise rules how to obtain T at the perturbative level from a continuous configuration space path integral. Our strategy will be to insert complete sets of states in $\langle z | \exp(-\beta \hat{H}) | y \rangle$, leading to a discrete phase space path integral. As was noted by Berezin [7], the

classical Hamiltonian that appears in the phase space path integral is related to Hvia Weyl ordering (explained below, see (6),(7)), and is not covariant⁷. In [8] it was shown that the non-covariant terms in the Hamiltonian are needed for consistency by doing a two-loop calculation for the continuous phase space path integral for a free point particle submitted to an arbitrary co-ordinate transformation. How can one understand this non-covariant term, which also shows up in the configuration space path integral? After all, the final result for the transition element is covariant. The answer is that path integrals are defined as the limit of time-discretized path integrals, and the latter use the midpoint rule, i.e. they replace in a small time interval the co-ordinates in the Hamiltonian or Lagrangian by the average of their values at the endpoints of the interval. Clearly, taking the average of the co-ordinates of two points in curved space-time is not a covariant operation. This non-covariance conspires with the non-covariant term in the action to yield a covariant result for T. After taking the continuum limit, one does not see the midpoint rule anymore, nor the fact that it is non-covariant. The reason one still finds a covariant answer for T from the continuum path integrals lies in the Feynman rules, and the way in which we compute the Feynman diagrams. From the discretized path integral, we not only find the continuum action and vertices and propagators, but also the prescription how to compute Feynman diagrams. These rules and their derivation are new, and constitute our main result, indicated by an asterisk in figure 1. The unambiguous answer will (not surprisingly) look a lot like lattice regularization, and this non-covariant regularization is the remnant of the non-covariant midpoint rule. Only with this regularization can one reproduce the covariant answer for T. By explicit calculation we have found that more conventional methods such as momentum cut-off or mode-regularization [4] do not yield the correct answer for T [5, 6]! In

⁷In our subsequent discussion of non-covariance we mean of course covariance in target space, not to be confused with problems with Lorentz invariance on the world-sheet, which can exist only in dimensions larger than one.

[1], DeWitt defines the Feynman path integral from covariance arguments, without recourse to the Hamiltonian formalism, and does not find the non-covariant term (which is proportional to the product of two Christoffel symbols) in his action. Since he works in an inertial frame, he finds no contradictions at the 2-loop level, but our results demonstrate that from 3 loops on, the $\Gamma\Gamma$ term, or something equivalent, can not be neglected.

The non-covariant time-discretized path integral which we use in this article follows naturally if one inserts complete sets of x- and p-eigenstates and only retains terms of order 1/N in the phase space path integral. There are possibilities to construct a covariant time-discretized path integral, but these are all very problematic. One can try to construct a path integral which is discretized using a mid-geodesic rule, but we do not know to what operator ordering this corresponds, and neither what the Feynman rules should be. Another possibility is to glue together N times the exact result for T with β replaced by β/N , keeping only terms up to order 1/N, and to take this as the definition of the discretized path integral. This will in the limit $N \to \infty$ certainly reproduce the correct answer for T, but the corresponding continuum configuration space path integral turns out to have a non-local kernel (see (5)), and it is not clear how to derive the Feynman rules. Hence, we will stick to the local action in the path integral with its non-covariant term. It is an interesting phenomenon that one can obtain the same result for T by taking the large N limit of the Nth power of two different kernels that even differ by terms of order 1/N.

The path integrals we consider are defined on a finite time interval $[-\beta, 0]$. Consequently, propagators depend on σ and τ , and not only on $\sigma - \tau$, so that the usual momentum space manipulations of Feynman cannot be used to give meaning to the product of distributions which always occur in Feynman graphs. We shall therefore work in co-ordinate space. Although individual graphs are divergent by power counting, all infinities cancel if one introduces the ghosts of ref [4]. Consequently, there

is no need for renormalization. However, we have to specify how to deal with the products of distributions that appear. For example, the discretized path integral tells us unambiguously that⁸

$$\int_{-1}^{0} \int_{-1}^{0} \delta(\sigma - \tau)\theta(\sigma - \tau)\theta(\tau - \sigma) = \frac{1}{4}.$$
 (1)

Mathematically, products of distributions are not well-defined. If we expand δ and θ in a complete set of trigonometric functions then the left hand side of (1) yields a not absolutely convergent sum. Indeed, one might as well claim it is zero (arguing that $\theta(\sigma - \tau)\theta(\tau - \sigma)$ is a bounded function which is almost everywhere zero) or 1/3 (arguing that $\delta(\sigma - \tau) = \partial_{\sigma}\theta(\sigma - \tau)$ or using mode regularization). Besides (1), the discretized path integral also yields the equal-time contractions of two-point functions, which we need but which in continuum path integrals are often claimed to be undefined [11]. We now give details.

For a quantum field theory with scalar fields coupled to external gravity, the consistent regulator can be found from a general method [12], and reads $g^{-1/4}\partial_i g^{1/2}g^{ij}\partial_j g^{-1/4}$ where $g = \det g_{ij}$. Following [3], we represent this regulator as the Hamiltonian of the nonlinear sigma model with $S = \int_{-\beta}^{0} \frac{1}{2}g_{ij}\dot{x}^{i}\dot{x}^{j}dt$, but with the same operator ordering as the regulator

$$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{2}g^{-1/4}p_i\sqrt{g}g^{ij}p_jg^{-1/4}$$
(2)

This operator is Einstein (general co-ordinate) invariant [1]. Using complete sets of position and momentum eigenstates $(\int |x| > \sqrt{g(x)} < x| d^n x = \int |p| > < p| d^n p = I)$, we can evaluate the transition element

$$T = \langle z|e^{-\frac{\beta\hat{H}}{\hbar}}|y\rangle = \int \langle z|e^{-\frac{\beta\hat{H}}{\hbar}}|p\rangle \langle p|y\rangle d^{n}p \tag{3}$$

⁸Such a rule has appeared previously in the literature in e.g. [1, 9, 10]. The rules $\delta(t,t)dt = 1$ and $\theta(t,t) = 1/2$ are proposed in [1], page 333, as 'two formal identifications' and combined they yield (1). In [9, 10] similar rules were found necessary to reproduce the non-covariant term in the action from respectively an auxiliary fermionic and an auxiliary ghost system. We give a proper derivation of these and other rules.

by expanding the exponent and moving all operators \hat{x}^j to the left and \hat{p}_j to the right, keeping track of commutators. We stress that the answer for T is thus finite and unambiguous. To given order in β all the terms in the expansion of $\exp(-\beta \hat{H}/\hbar)$ contribute, but only a finite number of commutators in each term are needed, and one may resum the infinite series. (Each commutator removes one factor p, and integration over p shows that p is of order z-y. We take z-y of order $\beta^{1/2}$, which is often justified by arguments concerning Brownian motion [2]). To given order in β , T is then a Gaussian factor involving p, multiplied by a polynomial in p. The Gaussian p integral can then easily be performed, and in this way we have found (after much algebra) the following result, exact through order β (this result agrees with [13], see also [14, 15])

$$T = (2\pi\hbar\beta)^{-n/2} \left(\exp\left(-\frac{1}{\hbar}S_{cl}^{B}[z,y,\beta]\right) D \exp\left(-\frac{\beta\hbar}{12}R\right)$$
 (4)

Here $(2\pi\hbar\beta)^{-n/2}$ is the usual Feynman factor, $S_{cl}^B[z,y,\beta]$ is the classical action for a geodesic with $x^j(-\beta)=y^j, x^j(0)=z^j$, while $-\frac{1}{12}R$ is the trace anomaly in n=2 dimensions, and D contains the Van Vleck determinant which gives the one-loop corrections to T

$$D = \beta^{n/2} g^{-1/4}(z) \det \left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial z^i} \frac{\partial}{\partial y^j} S_{cl}[z, y, \beta] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} g^{-1/4}(y)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{1}{12} R_{ij}(z) (z - y)^i (z - y)^j + \mathcal{O}(\beta^{3/2})$$
(5)

Note that if we view T for $\beta \to 0$ as the kernel of a continuum path integral action, then D corresponds to a non-local term. Requiring that the composition of two transition elements $T(\beta)$ reproduces $T(2\beta)$ up to order $\mathcal{O}(\beta^{3/2})$, fixes the R_{ij} term but does not fix the coefficient of the R term. Clearly, all factors in (4) are Einstein invariant. By rescaling $t = \beta \tau$, (4) only depends on the product $\hbar \beta$, which is the loop counting parameter. We must now construct the path integral whose loop expansion reproduces (4).

We begin by rewriting \hat{H} in Weyl-ordered form. Weyl ordering [7, 16, 17, 18, 19] is defined by $(n+m)!(p^nq^m)_W = \partial_a^n \partial_b^m (ap+bq)^{m+n}$, and we find the well known result [17, 20]

$$\hat{H} = \left(\frac{1}{2}g^{ij}p_ip_j\right)_W + \frac{\hbar^2}{8}\left(\Gamma^{\rho}_{\mu\sigma}\Gamma^{\sigma}_{\nu\rho}g^{\mu\nu} + R\right) \tag{6}$$

Then we use the fact that Weyl ordering leads to the midpoint rule [7]

$$\int \langle x_{k+1}|G_W|p \rangle \langle p|x_k \rangle d^n p = \int G(p, x_{k+1/2}) \langle x_{k+1}|p \rangle \langle p|x_k \rangle d^n p,$$

where we defined $x_{k+1/2} = (x_{k+1} + x_k)/2$, and G is any function of p, q. Applying this to $G = \exp(-\epsilon H/\hbar)$ and using $\exp(-\epsilon (H)_W/\hbar) = \exp(-\epsilon H/\hbar)_W + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$ we find

$$\int \langle x_{k+1} | \exp{-\frac{\epsilon}{\hbar}} (H)_W | p \rangle \langle p | x_k \rangle d^n p =$$

$$\int \exp{-\frac{\epsilon}{\hbar}} H(p, x_{k+1/2}) \langle x_{k+1} | p \rangle \langle p | x_k \rangle d^n p + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2). \tag{7}$$

In the construction of the discretized path integral we will neglect the terms of order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$. This is a subtle issue [15]. Naively, it is based on the fact that $\lim_{N\to\infty}(1+aN^{-1}+bN^{-2}+\ldots)^N=e^a$ is independent of b. For operators, it usually goes under the name of the Trotter formula, although we are not aware of a rigorous proof for the case of curved space. One of the subtleties is the meaning of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$. In (7) we mean that we view p and q of order one, but if we integrate over p and remember that H contains a term proportional to ϵp^2 we could argue that p is really of order $\epsilon^{-1/2}$, by looking at the identity $\int dpp^2 \exp(-\epsilon p^2)/\int dp \exp(-\epsilon p^2) = 1/(2\epsilon)$. An identity like (7), valid up to order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{3/2})$ while counting p as order $\epsilon^{-1/2}$ can be written down for (3), and it contains additional terms on the right hand side [6, 14, 21]. After performing the p integrals we are left with extra terms proportional to $x_{k+1} - x_k$, where this difference has order $\epsilon^{1/2}$. These terms cannot be obtained from the discretization of a continuum action unless it contains non local terms. It has been argued in [22] that they can be replaced by effective potentials depending

only on $x_{k+1/2}$. Now it is easy to see⁹ that the combined operation of (i) keeping extra terms in (7), (ii) doing the p-integrals and (iii) replacing the extra terms by effective potentials is exactly zero. This is ultimately the justification why (7) is sufficient for our purposes. It follows that the difference between the kernel in (4) and that in (7) is exactly the difference between terms containing z - y (including the R_{ij} term in (5)) and their effective potentials. We believe that all equivalent kernels are related by such manipulations [21], although we have no general proof of this.

Coming back to the derivation of T from (7), we insert N-1 sets of x-eigenstates and N sets of p-eigenstates into $\langle z | \exp{-\frac{\beta}{\hbar}\hat{H}} | y \rangle$, and we arrive at the discretized phase space path integral using $\langle x | p \rangle = (2\pi\hbar)^{-n/2}(\exp{\frac{i}{\hbar}p} \cdot x)g^{-1/4}(x)$. Integrating out the N momenta we find the discretized configuration space path integral, with N factors $g^{1/2}(x_{k+1/2})$ in the measure from the p integrals, N products $g^{-1/4}(x_{k+1})g^{-1/4}(x_k)$ from the inner products $\langle x | p \rangle$ and N-1 factors $g^{1/2}(x_k)$ from the completeness relation in x-space. The action is given by

$$S = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2\epsilon} g_{ij}(x_{k+1/2})(x_{k+1} - x_k)^i (x_{k+1} - x_k)^j - \frac{\hbar^2 \epsilon}{8} (\Gamma \Gamma + R), \tag{8}$$

where we define $x_N = z$ and $x_0 = y$, and $\epsilon = \beta/N$. We decompose x_k^j into a background and a quantum part, and S into a free and interacting part

$$x_k^j = x_{\text{bg},k}^j + q_k^j, \qquad S = S^{(0)} + S^{(\text{int})}; \qquad k = 1, \dots, N - 1,$$
 (9)

where $S^{(0)} = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2\epsilon} g_{ij}(z) (q_{k+1} - q_k)^i (q_{k+1} - q_k)^j$. We take the metric in $S^{(0)}$ at z in order to facilitate comparison with (4), although any other choice should give the same result as long as one uses the Feynman rules derived below. In general, $S^{(\text{int})}$ contains in addition to the true interactions also a pure background piece and

⁹Let us sketch the argument. Since the extra terms in (7) appear when we count p as $\epsilon^{-1/2}$, they must contain p and vanish as $p \to 0$. The effective potentials associated to some function of \dot{q} can be found be performing an integral over \dot{q} . Denoting the extra terms by \mathcal{E} we find that (i), (ii) and (iii) combined yield $\int d\dot{q} \int dp \exp(ip\dot{q} - H)\mathcal{E}$. Interchanging the order of integration yields a delta function of p and the result follows from $\mathcal{E}(p=0)=0$.

terms linear in q_k^j , but to a given order in ϵ only a few tadpoles contribute, since the coefficients of these linear terms will be of order $\epsilon^{1/2}$. The N factors $g^{1/2}(x_{k+1/2})$ are exponentiated following ref. [4] by using anti-commuting ghosts b and c and a commuting ghost a

$$\sqrt{\det g_{ij}(x_{k+1/2})} = \int db_{k+1/2}^j dc_{k+1/2}^j da_{k+1/2}^j
\exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon}{2\beta^2 \hbar} g_{ij}(x_{k+1/2}) (b_{k+1/2}^i c_{k+1/2}^j + a_{k+1/2}^i a_{k+1/2}^j)\right) (10)$$

This formula defines our ghost measure. Introducing modes for the quantum fluctuations q by the orthonormal transformation

$$q_k^j = \sum d_m^j \sqrt{\frac{2}{N}} \sin(\frac{km\pi}{N});$$
 $k, m = 1, ..., N - 1$ (11)

we may change $dx_k^j \to dq_k^j \to dd_m^j$. Obviously, the Jacobian for this transformation is 1. Next, we couple to external sources

$$S^{\text{(source)}} = -\epsilon \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left(F_{k+1/2} \frac{q_{k+1} - q_k}{\epsilon} + G_{k+1/2} q_{k+1/2} + \text{sources for ghosts} \right)$$
 (12)

so that we can extract the exact discretized propagators in the usual way. Completing squares and performing the final integration over $d_m^j, b_{k+1/2}^j, c_{k+1/2}^j, a_{k+1/2}^j$ leads to N-1 factors $g^{-1/2}(z)$ and N factors $g^{1/2}(z)$. Hence

$$T = \left(\frac{g(z)}{g(y)}\right)^{1/4} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\hbar}S^{(\text{int})}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\hbar}S^{(\text{source})}\right). \tag{13}$$

From $S^{(\text{int})}$ we find the vertices while $S^{(\text{source})}$ yields the discretized propagators. Defining $\dot{x}_{k+1/2} = (x_{k+1} - x_k)/\epsilon$ and omitting superscripts and a factor of \hbar for the time being, they come out as follows [5]

$$\langle q_{k+1/2}q_{l+1/2} \rangle = -\frac{\epsilon}{4N}(2k+1)(2l+1) + \frac{\epsilon}{2}(2\min(k,l) + \eta_{k,l})$$

$$\langle q_{k+1/2}\dot{q}_{l+1/2} \rangle = -\frac{k+1/2}{N} + \theta_{k,l}$$

$$\langle \dot{q}_{k+1/2}\dot{q}_{l+1/2} \rangle = -\frac{1}{N\epsilon} + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\delta_{k,l}$$

$$\langle b_{k+1/2}c_{l+1/2} \rangle = -\frac{2}{\epsilon}\delta_{k,l}$$

$$\langle a_{k+1/2}a_{l+1/2} \rangle = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\delta_{k,l},$$

$$(14)$$

where $\eta_{k,l} = 1$ if $k \neq l$ but $\eta_{k,l} = 1/2$ if k = l, while $\theta_{k,l} = 0$ if k < l, $\theta_{k,l} = 1/2$ if k = l and $\theta_{k,l} = 1$ if k > l. We require that $x_{\text{bg},k}^j$ satisfies the boundary conditions and the equation of motion of $S^{(0)}$. In the continuum limit this becomes $x_{\text{bg}}^j(t) = z^j + (z - y)^j(t/\beta)$, while $q^j(t)$ vanishes at the endpoints. In this limit the two-point functions become (reinstating the superscripts, factors of \hbar , and recalling that $t = \beta \tau$)

$$\langle q^{i}(\sigma)q^{j}(\tau) \rangle = -\beta \hbar g^{ij}(z)\Delta(\sigma,\tau)$$

$$\langle b^{i}(\sigma)c^{j}(\tau) \rangle = -2\beta \hbar g^{ij}(z)\partial_{\sigma}^{2}\Delta(\sigma,\tau)$$

$$\langle a^{i}(\sigma)a^{j}(\tau) \rangle = \beta \hbar g^{ij}(z)\partial_{\sigma}^{2}\Delta(\sigma,\tau)$$

$$\Delta(\sigma,\tau) = \sigma(\tau+1)\theta(\sigma-\tau) + \tau(\sigma+1)\theta(\tau-\sigma). \tag{15}$$

Note that $\Delta(\sigma,\tau) = \Delta_F(\sigma-\tau) + \sigma\tau + \frac{1}{2}(\sigma+\tau)$, where $\Delta_F(\sigma-\tau) = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma-\tau)\theta(\sigma-\tau) + \frac{1}{2}(\tau-\sigma)\theta(\tau-\sigma)$ is the Feynman propagator, and formally $\partial_{\sigma}^2\Delta(\sigma,\tau) = \delta(\sigma-\tau)$ while $\Delta(\sigma,\tau) = 0$ at the boundaries. However, the $\delta(\sigma-\tau)$ is a Kronecker delta and moreover the equal-time contractions are unambiguously defined. Kronecker delta here means that $\int dx \delta(x) f(x) = f(0)$, even when f is a product of distributions. From (14) we further find in the continuum limit

$$\langle q^{i}(\sigma)\dot{q}^{j}(\tau)\rangle = -\beta\hbar g^{ij}(z)(\sigma + \theta(\tau - \sigma))$$

$$\langle \dot{q}^{i}(\sigma)\dot{q}^{j}(\tau)\rangle = -\beta\hbar g^{ij}(z)(1 - \delta(\sigma - \tau)).$$
 (16)

All propagators are now proportional to $\beta\hbar$ (this motivated the normalization of the ghost action in (10)), and the interactions are given by

$$\frac{1}{\hbar}S^{(\text{int})} = \frac{1}{\beta\hbar} \int_{-1}^{0} \left[\frac{1}{2} g_{ij} (x_{\text{cl}} + q) \left\{ (\dot{x}_{\text{cl}} + \dot{q})^{i} (\dot{x}_{\text{cl}} + \dot{q})^{j} + b^{i} c^{j} + a^{i} a^{j} \right\} - \frac{1}{2} g_{ij}(z) \dot{q}^{i} \dot{q}^{j} \right] d\tau
-\beta\hbar \int_{-1}^{0} \frac{1}{8} (\Gamma \Gamma + R) d\tau.$$
(17)

To compute the configuration space path integral, we note that we must expand the prefactor $g^{1/4}(z)/g^{1/4}(y)$, which came from the measure, and evaluate all vacuum graphs with external x_{bg} , using the propagators in (15), (16) and the vertices in (17). The q-independent part of $S^{(\text{int})}$ does not yield the full S_{cl} of (4) since x_{bg} is only a solution of the $S^{(0)}$ equation of motion; rather, tree graphs with two vertices from $S^{(\text{int})}$ contribute to order β as well. In the one-loop graphs with one vertex $S^{(\text{int})}$ one finds from the equal-time contractions $\langle \dot{q}^i \dot{q}^j + b^i c^j + a^i a^j \rangle$ a contribution proportional to $\int_{-1}^0 \tau (\partial_\sigma \partial_\tau \Delta + \partial_\sigma^2 \Delta)_{\sigma=\tau} = -\frac{1}{2}$ times $(z-y)^k \partial_k g_{ij}(z) g^{ij}(z)$, which cancels a similar contribution from the non-trivial measure factor in (13). There are many other one-loop and two-loop graphs, and the contribution of each corresponds to a particular term in (4). In particular, the two-loop graph with one $\dot{q}\dot{q}$, one $\dot{q}q$ and one $q\dot{q}$ propagator leads to the integral

$$\int_{-1}^{0} d\sigma \int_{-1}^{0} d\tau \partial_{\sigma} \partial_{\tau} \Delta(\sigma, \tau) \partial_{\sigma} \Delta(\sigma, \tau) \partial_{\tau} \Delta(\sigma, \tau), \tag{18}$$

where $\partial_{\sigma}\Delta(\sigma,\tau) = \tau + \theta(\sigma - \tau)$ and $\partial_{\sigma}\partial_{\tau}\Delta(\sigma,\tau) = 1 - \delta(\sigma - \tau)$, and one finds agreement with (4) only if one uses (1). Adding all contributions we have found complete agreement. The non-covariant vertices $\frac{1}{8}(\Gamma\Gamma + R)$ conspire with the non-covariant vertices found by expanding $g_{ij}(x)$ in (17) and the measure in (13), and yield the Einstein invariant expression (4). The Feynman rules one has to use in this calculation follow from (14), and they amount to the following. First, one writes down expressions for all Feynman diagrams using the propagators given by (15). Adding everything, all divergencies coming from products of delta functions will cancel (the ghosts of [4] are crucial for this). The resulting integrals should be worked out using the rules that delta functions should really be seen as Kronecker deltas and that $\theta(0) = 1/2$. If there are explicit delta functions in the integrals, one should be careful with partial integrations and identities like $\int_a^b f' = f(b) - f(a)$, since these are not always compatible with our Kronecker delta prescription one finds agreement to the following and the first products of the propagators given by (15).

The easiest example is $\int_{-1}^{1} dx \delta(x) \theta^{n}(x)$, which is 2^{-n} according to our prescription, but 1/(n+1) if one uses $\delta \theta^{n} = (\theta^{n+1})'/(n+1)$. The reason the latter is incorrect is that the discretized derivative Δ which satisfies $\sum \Delta f = f(b) - f(a)$ is given by $\Delta f(k+1/2) = (f(k+1) - f(k))/\epsilon$, but this Δ does not map the discretized θ function to the discretized δ function in the form in which they appear in (14). Conversely, we could try to define an operator Δ_2 by the requirement $\sum \Delta f \Delta g = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \, dx \, dx$

in (18) yields -1/6, but if we first partially integrate the ∂_{σ} in $\partial_{\sigma}\partial_{\tau}\Delta(\sigma,\tau)$ we find 1/12.

Finally we discuss the phase space approach. We again decompose x_k^j into a quantum part q_k^j and a background part $x_{\text{bg},k}^j$, but we do not decompose $p_{k+1/2}^j$ (although one could do so). We couple $p_{k+1/2}$ to external sources $F_{k+1/2}$, and the midpoint fluctuations $q_{k+1/2} = \frac{1}{2}(q_{k+1} + q_k)$ again to $G_{k+1/2}$. As free part of the Hamiltonian we take $H^0 = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2}g^{ij}(z)p_{k+1/2,i}p_{k+1/2,j}$. All factors $g^{1/4}$ from $|x>g^{1/2}< x|$ and |x|>0 cancel, except at the endpoints, and we find

$$T = \left(\frac{g(z)}{g(y)}\right)^{1/4} (2\pi\hbar)^{-nN} \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon}{\hbar} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} H_{k+1/2}^{\text{int}} \left(\frac{i\hbar}{\epsilon} \frac{\partial}{\partial F}, \frac{\hbar}{\epsilon} \frac{\partial}{\partial G}\right)\right) \int \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(\prod_{k=0}^{N-1} dp_{k+1/2,j} \prod_{l=1}^{N-1} dx_{l}^{j}\right) \times \exp\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left(-\frac{\epsilon}{2\hbar} g^{ij}(z) p_{k+\frac{1}{2},i} p_{k+\frac{1}{2},j} + \frac{i}{\hbar} p_{k+\frac{1}{2},j} (q_{k+1}^{j} - q_{k}^{j}) - \frac{i\epsilon}{\hbar} F_{k+\frac{1}{2}}^{j} p_{k+\frac{1}{2},j} + \frac{\epsilon}{\hbar} G_{k+\frac{1}{2},j} q_{k+\frac{1}{2}}^{j}\right).$$
(19)

We moved the terms $p\dot{x}_{\rm bg}$ to $H^{\rm int}$; they give rise to tadpoles, but to a given order in β only a few tadpoles contribute, like in configuration space. Completing squares and performing the p-integrals, we find in the exponent a term with

$$\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2\hbar}\right) \left\{ -iF_{k+1/2}^j + \frac{i}{\epsilon} (q_{k+1}^j - q_k^j) \right\}^2.$$
(20)

Expanding this term, we regain the discretized configuration space path integral, multiplied by a factor

$$\exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon}{2\hbar} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} g_{ij}(z) F_{k+1/2}^i F_{k+1/2}^j\right). \tag{21}$$

It follows that the discrete qq and pq propagators in phase space are the same as the qq and $i\dot{q}q$ propagators in configuration space, but the pp propagator has an extra term

$$\langle p_{k+1/2,i}p_{l+1/2,j} \rangle = -g_{ii'}(z)g_{jj'}(z) \langle \dot{q}_{k+1/2}^{i'}\dot{q}_{l+1/2}^{j'} \rangle + \frac{\hbar}{\epsilon}g_{ij}(z)\delta_{k,l}$$
 (22)

 $[\]overline{-\sum \bar{f}\Delta_2\Delta g + (\bar{f}\Delta g)(b-\epsilon/2) - (\bar{f}\Delta g)(a+\epsilon/2)}, \text{ with } \bar{f}(k+1/2) = (f(k)+f(k+1))/2, \text{ so that it would be guaranteed that } \Delta_2 \text{ maps the discretized } \theta \text{ function into the discretized } \delta \text{ function. The problem with this is that we cannot define } \bar{f}\Delta g \text{ strictly at the boundary, and if } \Delta g \text{ would be a discretized version of } \theta(x-b) \text{ we would find that } \lim_{\epsilon\to 0}(\bar{f}\Delta g)(b-\epsilon/2) = 0, \text{ which would disagree with the continuum result } f(b)/2.$

The last term cancels the Kronecker delta present in (16), so that the pp propagator is non-singular. The continuum limit is now obvious

$$\langle p_i(\sigma)p_j(\tau) \rangle = \beta \hbar g_{ij}(z)$$

 $\langle q^i(\sigma)p_j(\tau) \rangle = -i\beta \hbar \delta^i_j(\sigma + \theta(\tau - \sigma)).$ (23)

No subtleties like (1) are needed to evaluate the loops in phase space.

In the discretized phase space approach the boundary conditions $x_0^j = y^j$ and $x_N^j = z^j$ are taken into account in $x_{\mathrm{bg},k}^j$. It is instructive to compare this with the more conventional continuum approach. There the propagators for $q(\tau)$ and $p(\tau)$ form a 2×2 matrix, and are determined by the equation $F(\sigma)G(\sigma,\tau) = \delta(\sigma-\tau)\mathbf{1}_{2\times 2}$ and the boundary conditions $q(\sigma=-1)=q(\sigma=0)=0$, where F is the field operator corresponding to $ip\dot{q}-H^{(0)}$,

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -i\partial_{\sigma} \\ i\partial_{\sigma} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{24}$$

The solution is $G(\sigma, \tau) = G_F(\sigma - \tau) + P(\sigma, \tau)$, and Bose symmetry implies $G^{\alpha\beta}(\sigma, \tau) = G^{\beta\alpha}(\tau, \sigma)$, where $\alpha = 1, 2$ denotes p or q. The polynomial P is partly fixed by FP = 0, while the boundary conditions on $q(\sigma)$ fix the rest. Hence, one should not impose any boundary conditions on $p_j(\sigma)$, nor is there any need since the p-integrals are all convergent (in contrast to q, p has no zero modes). The result reads

$$G(\sigma,\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{i}{2}\epsilon(\sigma-\tau) \\ \frac{i}{2}\epsilon(\sigma-\tau) & \frac{1}{2}(\sigma-\tau)\theta(\sigma-\tau) + \sigma \leftrightarrow \tau \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -i(\tau+\frac{1}{2}) \\ -i(\sigma+\frac{1}{2}) & \sigma\tau + \frac{1}{2}(\sigma+\tau) \end{pmatrix}$$
(25)

Given the continuum vertices and propagators in phase space, one can now again compute the transition element. The vertices are different because one now expands $g^{ij}(x)$ instead of $g_{ij}(x)$, but also the propagators are different (no $\delta(\sigma-\tau)$ nor ghosts). Matthews' theorem asserts that one should again find (4), and its validity will be demonstrated elsewhere in more detail [5].

In this article we have found the correct way to evaluate Feynman diagrams for bosonic non-linear sigma models in one dimension. In [6] an explicit two-loop calculation of the trace anomaly revealed that the naive Feynman rules together with mode regularization [4] give an incorrect result. We have traced the origin of this discrepancy to the presence of products of distributions. These products of distributions were defined by going back to the origin of the path integral as a time-discretized expression, and studying the discrete propagators in (14) and (22). The non-covariant term $\Gamma\Gamma$ in the action (17) can have interesting implications for field theory in higher dimensions. In local field theories, it will not contribute if one uses dimensional regularization. However, it might give rise to additional finite terms in the action if one makes a non-local field redefinition, for example when one makes a transformation to go from the axial to the Coulomb gauge in QCD. Indeed, it has been claimed that such extra terms appear [23, 24]. This, supersymmetric generalizations, and actual computations of anomalies, will appear elsewhere [5].

References

- [1] B. DeWitt, 'Supermanifolds', 2nd edition, Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- [2] L. Schulman, 'Techniques and applications of path integration', John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1981, chapters 24 and 31.
- [3] L. Alvarez-Gaumé and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B234 (1989) 269; L. Alvarez-Gaumé, in 'Supersymmetry', eds. K. Dietz et al., Plenum Press, 1984.
- [4] F. Bastianelli, Nucl. Phys. B376 (1992) 113; F. Bastianelli and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Nucl. Phys. B389 (1993) 53.
- [5] J. de Boer, B. Peeters, K. Skenderis and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, in preparation.
- [6] B. Peeters and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, 'The Hamiltonian approach and phase space path integration for nonlinear sigma models with and without fermions', ITP-SB-93-51.

- [7] F.A. Berezin, Theor. Math. Phys. 6 (1971) 194.
- [8] J.-L. Gervais and A. Jevicki, Nucl. Phys. 110 (1976) 93.
- [9] M. O'Connor, J. Phys. **A23** (1990) 2665.
- [10] J. Alfaro, P.H. Damgaard, Ann. Phys. **220** (1992) 188.
- [11] see e.g. C. Itzykson and J.-B. Zuber, 'Quantum field theory', McGraw-Hill, New York, 1980, page 136.
- [12] A. Diaz, W. Troost, P van Nieuwenhuizen and A. van Proeyen, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A4 (1989) 3959.
- [13] B. DeWitt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **29** (1957) 377.
- [14] R. Graham, Z. Phys. **B26** (1977) 281.
- [15] A. Shiekh, Can. J. Phys. **68** (1990) 428.
- [16] H. Weyl, 'Theory of groups and quantum mechanics', Dover, New York, 1950.
- [17] M. Mizrahi, J. Math. Phys. **16** (1975) 2201.
- [18] M. Sato, Progr. Theor. Phys. **58** (1977) 1262.
- [19] For an elementary discussion of Weyl ordering, see e.g. T.D. Lee, 'Particle physics and introduction to field theory', Harwood Academic Publishers, New York, 1981 (Contemporary concepts in physics, 1).
- [20] M. Omote, Nucl. Phys. **B120** (1977) 325.
- [21] F. Langouche, D. Roekaerts and E. Tirapegui, 'Functional integration and semiclassical expansions', D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, Holland, 1982.
- [22] D. McLaughlin and L.S. Schulman, J. Math. Phys. 12 (1971) 2520.

- [23] J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **127** (1962) 324; Phys. Rev. **130** (1963) 406.
- [24] N.H. Christ and T.D. Lee, Phys. Rev. **D22** (1980) 939.