

Comment on “Spin and Orbital Angular Momentum in Gauge Theories” by X. S. Chen et. al. (PRL100, 232002 (2008))

Xiangdong Ji^{1,2}

¹*Department of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA*

²*Center for High-Energy Physics and Institute of Theoretical Physics,
Peking University Beijing, 100080, P. R. China*

(Dated: May 29, 2018)

The individual parts of the total angular momentum operator in interacting theories cannot satisfy the canonical angular momentum commutation rule, including those proposed in the above paper. Furthermore, the operators in the new proposal a) are non-local in general gauge, b) do not have proper Lorentz transformation properties, and c) do not have any known physical measurements.

In a recent article [1], Chen et al. claim to have solved a “long-standing gauge-invariance problem of the nucleon spin structure” and “this was previously thought to be an impossible task.” In this comment, I would like to point out that the solution proposed in [1] is less satisfactory than the authors have thought.

According to [1], the *long-standing problem* is to find out the *appropriate* operators for the spin and orbital angular momentum (OAM) of the quark and gluon fields. A careful reading of the paper finds two specific conditions: 1) gauge invariance and 2) individual parts obeying the angular momentum algebra, $[J_i, J_j] = i\hbar\epsilon_{ijk}J_k$. The first condition is of course a must, but the second requirement is an “impossible task” in interacting quantum field theories (QFTs), and the operators proposed in Ref. [1] certainly do not satisfy this, contrary to their claim. The argument is relatively simple:

The total angular momentum operators \vec{J} of any Lorentz-invariant field theory obey the angular momentum algebra. However, when breaking them into sums of parts, $\vec{J} = \sum_i \vec{J}_i(\mu)$, $\vec{J}_i(\mu)$ are not conserved and hence depend on the renormalization scale μ when non-trivial interactions are present. Therefore, even when $\vec{J}_i(\mu)$ satisfy the angular momentum relations at μ_1 , they ought to be violated at scale μ_2 as both sides of the equation necessarily have different μ dependence. Since there is no one scale more superior than other, the angular momentum relations for the individual parts are generally untrue. This is the case even for $\psi^\dagger \frac{\vec{\Sigma}}{2} \psi$ because the singlet axial current is not conserved and has an anomalous dimension due to the well-known Adler-Bell-Jackiw anomaly [2].

Now turn to the more delicate issue of gauge invariance. Chen et al. proposed a new gauge-invariant representation of the QED and QCD angular momenta [1]. However, what they regard as “gauge-invariant” operators are not the usual textbook type, and the new notion of gauge invariance clashes with locality and Lorentz symmetry, and ultimately has limited physical significance and value.

First, the so-called “physical” part of the gauge potential defined in Ref. [1] has the following manifest non-

local solution,

$$\vec{A}_{\text{phys}} = \vec{A} - \frac{\vec{\nabla}}{\nabla^2} \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{A} \quad (1)$$

Thus the quark orbital angular momentum (OAM), the gluon spin, and gluon OAM as they defined, although formally gauge-invariant, are all non-local operators of the gauge potential. In local QFT’s, the gauge symmetry impose important constraints, however, if locality is ignored, many quantities can be made trivially gauge-invariant by simply adding a gauge link to infinity.

A more serious problem is Lorentz symmetry: If a gauge potential \vec{A}_{phys} satisfies the “physical condition” in one frame $\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{A}_{\text{phys}} = 0$, the transformed potential no longer satisfies the condition $\vec{\nabla}' \cdot \vec{A}'_{\text{phys}} \neq 0$ in a different frame. Thus, observables in terms of the “physical part” of \vec{A} in one frame will in general contain non-physical contribution as seen by different observers! Moreover, these non-local observables do not in general transform as Lorentz scalar, vector, or tensor. To give a specific example, the matrix element of the gluon spin operator $\int d^3x \vec{E} \times \vec{A}_{\text{phys}}$ in [1] depends on the speed of the parent hadron, even when measured in helicity eigenstates. There is no transformation rule relating the spin matrix elements of different frames, making the notion of gluon spin contribution non-intrinsic and less physical.

Gauge theories in the textbooks construct physical observables as gauge-invariant *local operators*. When solving a specific problem, such as hydrogen atom, one can choose a particular reference of frame and gauge, the wave functions (electron’s or photon multipoles) are obviously gauge-dependent, but the true physical observables calculated from them are not and transform properly under Lorentz transformation. An example for QCD angular momentum is what has been considered in Ref. [3]. Ultimately, the physics is learnt only when there are real experimental measurements so that one can compare theoretical calculations with data. If operators constructed are fundamentally unsound, it is doubtful that any experiment can ever be found to measure their matrix elements.

I thank T. Cohen for an interesting discussion. This

work was partially supported by the U. S. Department of Energy via grant DE-FG02-93ER-40762.

[1] X. S. Chen, X. F. Lu, W. M. Sun, F. Wang and T. Goldman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 232002 (2008)

[arXiv:0806.3166 [hep-ph]].

- [2] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, *An Introduction To Quantum Field Theory*, (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1995)
- [3] X. D. Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 610 (1997); Phys. Rev. D **55**, 7114 (1997); Phys. Rev. D **58**, 056003 (1998); also X. S. Chen and F. Wang, Commun. Theor. Phys. **27**, 212 (1997).