

# THE HEAVY FERMION DAMPING RATE PUZZLE

**S. Peigne, E. Pilon and D. Schiff**

Laboratoire de Physique Theorique et Hautes Energies\*  
Universite de Paris XI, batiment 211, 91405 Orsay Cedex, France

## Abstract

We examine again the problem of the damping rate of a moving heavy fermion in a hot plasma within the resummed perturbative theory of Pisarski and Braaten. The ansatz for its evaluation which relates it to the imaginary part of the fermion propagator pole in the framework of a self-consistent approach is critically analyzed. As already pointed out by various authors, the only way to define the rate is through additional implementation of magnetic screening. We show in detail how the ansatz works in this case and where we disagree with other authors. We conclude that the self-consistent approach is not satisfactory.

LPTHE Orsay 93-13

April 1993

---

\* Laboratoire associe au Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique

## 1. Introduction

Hot gauge theories are the framework to study perturbatively plasmas of weakly interacting particles. Of special interest are the properties of quasiparticle modes. The knowledge of the fermion self-energy, first computed by Klimov and Weldon [1], has yielded the dispersion relations of thermal fermionic excitations at leading order in the coupling constant  $g$  (in hot QED/QCD). They are obtained by equating the real part of the inverse effective propagator to zero.

To go further in the quasiparticle interpretation, a question has arisen : what is the damping rate of this quasiparticle ? In other words, by which coefficient  $\Gamma$  the large time  $e^{-\Gamma t}$  behaviour of the corresponding response function is governed ? When the effective fermion propagator has a pole, an hypothesis always assumed in previous works [2-7], the width  $\Gamma$  of the quasiparticle is given by the opposite of the pole imaginary part.

Initially, the damping rate of a gluon at rest raised a problem : one-loop calculations led to gauge-dependent results. The solution of this "plasmon puzzle" required to take into account all diagrams contributing to leading order in  $g$  [3, 8], thus giving a finite and gauge-independent result [8, 9].

Similarly, a finite damping rate  $\Gamma$  was found for a massive fermion at rest [2]. In that case, only the longitudinal component of the gauge boson propagator contributes to  $\Gamma$  and the long range interactions are screened by the Debye length in the framework of the resummed theory [10]. As soon as the fermion is moving, the transverse component also contributes. Its behaviour in the space-like region leads to a logarithmic infrared divergence [2]. The resummation program is apparently not sufficient to screen the long range magnetic interactions.

Many authors [3-5, 7] have nevertheless tried to calculate  $\Gamma$  with the hypothesis that the fermion propagator has a pole, i.e. to find the pole imaginary part. Their attempts to screen the infrared divergence are based on a self-consistent approach, originally proposed

by Lebedev and Smilga [3], but results are often different or even contradictory. Our purpose here is to study this situation. In agreement with previous authors [4], we find that pursuing literally the search of a pole of the propagator (i.e. naïvely using a "complex energy-shell" condition to define the rate) in the framework of the self-consistent approach leads to a failure : the logarithmic singularity is not screened. On the other hand, going on with this approach in the QCD case, in presence of magnetic screening, leads to an answer for the rate only in the case of a fast moving fermion ; the corresponding equation for a non relativistic heavy fermion has no solution. The result obtained for the relativistic fermion differs from the usual intuitive "narrow width" expression,  $O(g^2 T \ln(1/g))$  pointing out at possible difficulties connected with the simple minded analytic continuation performed to define the propagator in the complex energy plane. In this respect, let us stress that our results disagree with those of ref. [7]. We think that the source of the disagreement lies in the way analytic continuation is performed to evaluate the damping rate.

After relating the damping rate with the presumed pole of the fermion propagator (section 2), we calculate the fermion self-energy in the imaginary time formalism and perform the analytic continuation to complex external energy (section 3). In section 4, first discussing the solution obtained without magnetic screening, we then analyze the QCD case in presence of a magnetic mass both for a nonrelativistic and a fast heavy fermion. Section 5 is the conclusion.

## **2. Definition of the damping rate**

We assume the existence of a pole in the complete fermion propagator. The damping rate is then given by the opposite of the imaginary part of this pole. Working in the imaginary time formalism, the complete fermion propagator is :

$$S(p_4, \vec{p}) = \frac{1}{-i \not{p} + M - \Sigma_E(p_4, \vec{p})} \quad , \quad (1)$$

where  $\Sigma_E$  is the fermion self-energy in euclidean space\*. The usual analytic continuation for the retarded propagator is  $ip_4 \rightarrow p_0 + i\varepsilon$  with  $p_0$  real. In order to locate the position of the complex pole in the lower half energy plane, we tentatively assume that we may continue the retarded propagator to complex values of  $p_0$  as  $ip_4 \rightarrow p_0$ . The pole is the value of  $p_0$  for which :

$$\det \{p_0\gamma_0 - \vec{p} \vec{\gamma} - M - \Sigma(p_0, \vec{p})\} = 0 \quad , \quad (2)$$

where  $\Sigma(p_0, \vec{p}) = -\Sigma_E(-ip_0, \vec{p})$ . In general,  $p_0$  is complex :

$$p_0 = E - i\Gamma \quad , \quad (3)$$

with  $\Gamma$  the fermion damping rate.

By rotational invariance in the rest frame of the plasma,  $\Sigma$  takes the form :

$$\Sigma = a\gamma_0 + b\vec{p} \vec{\gamma} + c \quad , \quad (4)$$

which from eq. (2) leads to :

$$p_0 = a \pm \sqrt{(1+b)^2 \vec{p}^2 + (M+c)^2} \quad . \quad (5)$$

In eq. (5), a, b and c are functions of  $p_0$  so that eq. (5) is a transcendental equation, yielding the pole  $p_0 = E - i\Gamma$  as an implicit function of  $|\vec{p}|$ .

For a heavy fermion ( $M \gg T$ ),  $a \ll \sqrt{\vec{p}^2 + M^2}$  and  $\text{Re } p_0 \equiv E \simeq \sqrt{\vec{p}^2 + M^2}$ . We use the perturbative approximations  $b \ll 1$ ,  $c \ll M$ , and neglect quadratic terms in  $b$  and  $c$ . Then we show that :

---

\* In the imaginary time formalism, the euclidean Dirac algebra  $\{\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu\} = 2\delta^{\mu\nu}$  is used. We note  $\not{p} = p_4\gamma_0 + \vec{p} \vec{\gamma}$ , where  $p_4$  is the discrete euclidean coordinate  $p_4 = (2n+1)\pi T$ . The continuation for  $\gamma$ -matrices is achieved by  $i\vec{\gamma} \rightarrow -\vec{\gamma}$  ( $\gamma_0$  unchanged) to recover the algebra  $\{\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu\} = 2g^{\mu\nu}$ .

$$\Gamma = -\text{Im } p_0 \simeq -\frac{1}{4E} \text{Im } \text{Tr}(\not{p} + M)\Sigma(p_0, \vec{p}) \Big|_{p_0=E-i\Gamma} \quad (6)$$

where  $\not{p} = E\gamma_0 - \vec{p} \cdot \vec{\gamma}$ . Notice that  $\Gamma$  is determined by a functional equation since  $\Sigma$  is evaluated at  $p_0 = E - i\Gamma$ . In principle, going off the real energy axis requires the knowledge of the analytic structure of  $\Sigma$ , namely the existence and positions of cuts if any, as well as the different sheets, especially the one on which the pole is to be searched.

Since this analytic structure is largely unknown, it may be dangerous to explore the complex plane naively without any guidance, as will be discussed in sect. 3.

### 3. Calculation of Im $\Sigma$ for a complex external energy

The leading contribution to the hard fermion self-energy in the imaginary time formalism reads :

$$\Sigma(p) = -g^2 C_F \int_{\text{soft}} \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} T \sum_{q_4=2\pi nT} \{ \gamma_\mu S_0(p') \gamma_\nu {}^* \Delta^{\mu\nu}(q) \} \quad (7)$$

$C_F$  is the QCD Casimir which should be replaced by 1 in the case of QED.  $S_0(p')$  is the bare internal fermion propagator ( $p' = p - q$ ) :

$$S_0(p') = \frac{i \not{p}' + M}{p_4'^2 + E'^2} \quad \text{with} \quad E'^2 = \vec{p}'^2 + M^2 \quad (8)$$

${}^* \Delta^{\mu\nu}(q)$  is the resummed gauge boson propagator including hard thermal loops [11]. In the Coulomb gauge, it consists of two terms :

- the longitudinal part  ${}^* \Delta^{00} = {}^* \Delta_\ell(q)$ .
- the transverse part  ${}^* \Delta^{ij} = \widehat{Q}^{ij} {}^* \Delta_t(q)$ , where  $\widehat{Q}^{ij} = \delta^{ij} - \widehat{q}^i \widehat{q}^j$ , with  $\widehat{q}_i = \frac{q_i}{|q|}$ .

${}^* \Delta_\ell$  gives a finite contribution to  $\text{Im } \Sigma$ , whereas  ${}^* \Delta_t$  is responsible for infrared problems [2]. Therefore we shall focus on the contribution which comes from the transverse part :

$$\Sigma_t = -g^2 C_F \int_{soft} \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} T \sum_{q_4} {}^* \Delta_t(q_4, \vec{q}) \left\{ \gamma^i S_0(p') \gamma^j \widehat{Q}^{ij} \right\} . \quad (9)$$

In order to sum over  $q_4$ , we use the spectral density representation for the transverse propagator :

$${}^* \Delta_t(q_4, \vec{q}) = \int_0^\beta d\tau e^{iq_4 \tau} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \rho_t(\omega, q) (1 + n(\omega)) e^{-\omega \tau} , \quad (10)$$

where  $n$  denotes the Bose-Einstein statistical factor and the transverse spectral density  $\rho_t(\omega, q)$  given in [11] is proportional to the imaginary part of  ${}^* \Delta_t(q_4, \vec{q})$  after the continuation  $iq_4 \rightarrow \omega + i\varepsilon$  :

$$\rho_t(\omega, q) = \frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} {}^* \Delta_t(q_4 \rightarrow -i(\omega + i\varepsilon), \vec{q}) . \quad (11)$$

To calculate  $\text{Im } \Sigma$  for a complex external energy we may use a mixed representation for the bare fermion propagator :

$$S_0(p) = \int_0^\beta d\tau e^{ip_4 \tau} [\tilde{n}(-E) e^{-E\tau} P_+ + \tilde{n}(E) e^{E\tau} P_-] \quad (12)$$

$\tilde{n}$  refers to the Fermi-Dirac statistical factor and  $P_+(P_-)$  project on positive (negative) energy states :

$$P_\pm = \frac{1}{2E} [E\gamma_0 \pm (i\vec{p} \vec{\gamma} + M)] . \quad (13)$$

Instead of using eq. (12), Pisarski [7] proposes an ansatz for the fermion propagator in the spirit of eq. (10) : the fermion spectral density is taken as a Breit-Wigner distribution. This however does not allow exploring the pole position in the lower half complex plane. The analytic continuation which is used in [7] in order to go from the evaluation of  $\text{Im } \Sigma$  on the real axis to its value on the complex pole seems quite questionable to us as we shall argue in section 4.

We insert eqs. (10) and (12) in eq. (9) and find after the proper analytic continuation (keeping only the soft space-like region  $|q_0| < q \ll T$ ) :

$$\text{Im } \Sigma(p_0, \vec{p}) = 2g^2 C_F T \int_{soft} \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{-q}^{+q} \frac{dq_0}{q_0} \rho_t(q_0, q) \text{Im} \frac{p'_0 \gamma_0 - (\vec{p}' \cdot \hat{q})(\hat{q} \cdot \vec{\gamma}) - M}{p'^2_0 - E'^2} \quad (14)$$

which is the result found in [4] with the real time formalism. We have used  $|q_0| \ll T \ll E'$  and  $n(q_0) \simeq \frac{T}{q_0}$ . Moreover, as  $p_0$  is hard,  $|p_0| \sim E$ , we replace  $p'_0 = p_0 - q_0$  by  $E$  in the numerator of eq. (14). We also write :

$$\frac{1}{p'^2_0 - E'^2} = \frac{1}{2p'_0} \left( \frac{1}{p'_0 - E'} + \frac{1}{p'_0 + E'} \right) \simeq \frac{1}{2E} \frac{1}{p'_0 - E'} \quad , \quad (15)$$

as  $E$  and  $E'$  are hard energies. We get :

$$\text{Im } \Sigma(p_0, \vec{p}) = g^2 C_F \frac{T}{E} \int_{soft} \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{-q}^{+q} \frac{dq_0}{q_0} \rho_t(q_0, q) \left( E \gamma_0 - (\vec{p}' \cdot \hat{q})(\hat{q} \cdot \vec{\gamma}) - M \right) \text{Im} \frac{1}{p'_0 - E'} \quad (16)$$

From eqs. (6) and (16) we obtain :

$$\Gamma(p) = \frac{g^2 C_F T}{4\pi^2} v^2 \int_0^{q^*} dq \, q^2 \int_{-q}^{+q} \frac{dq_0}{q_0} \rho_t(q_0, q) \int_{-1}^1 dx \left( 1 + \frac{q}{p} x - x^2 \right) \text{Im} \frac{-1}{p'_0 - E'} \quad (17)$$

where  $v = \frac{p}{E}$  is the fermion velocity and  $x = \cos \theta$  with  $\theta$  the angle between  $\vec{q}$  and  $\vec{p}$ . The cut-off  $q^*$  determining the soft integration region is some arbitrary scale  $\ll T$  e.g.  $T\sqrt{g}$ .

#### 4. Calculation of the damping rate

In order to compute  $\Gamma(p)$ , the "narrow width" approximation was used as a first attempt ; as in the case of a fermion at rest, the external energy was taken to be real. But this led to an infrared logarithmic divergence [2]. In order to cure this pathology, Lebedev and Smilga [3] proposed a self-consistent approach according to which the non-zero value

of  $\Gamma$  itself would screen this divergence. The practical implementations of this philosophy differ however in the literature. Here we first follow the procedure of Baier, Nakkagawa and Niegawa [4] which allows us to deal with real or complex external energies. We now restrict ourselves to  $p \geq T$  and neglect the  $\frac{q}{p}x$  term in eq. (17).

The self-consistent approach amounts to introduce the rate  $\Gamma$  as a dissipative coefficient in the bare fermion propagator [12], so that in eq. (8),  $E'$  is replaced by  $\widehat{E}'$  :

$$\widehat{E}' = E' - i\Gamma(p') \quad . \quad (18)$$

In other words, the only singularity of the effective dissipative propagator is the complex pole at  $E - i\Gamma$ . With these modifications, eq. (17) becomes :

$$\Gamma(p) = \frac{g^2 C_F T}{4\pi^2} v^2 \int_0^{q^*} dq q^2 \int_{-q}^q \frac{dq_0}{q_0} \rho_t(q_0, q) J(q_0, q)$$

with

$$J(q_0, q) = \int_{-1}^1 dx (1-x^2) \text{Im} \left( \frac{-1}{p'_0 - \widehat{E}'} \right) \quad . \quad (19)$$

Approximating  $\Gamma(p') \simeq \Gamma(p)$ , one finds [4] :

$$\Gamma(p) = \frac{g^2 C_F T}{2\pi^2} v \int_0^{q^*} dq q \int_{-q}^q \frac{dq_0}{q_0} \rho_t(q_0, q) \left\{ \arctan \left( \frac{\text{Re } p_0 - E + vq - q_0}{\text{Im } p_0 + \Gamma(p)} \right) - \arctan \left( \frac{\text{Re } p_0 - E - vq - q_0}{\text{Im } p_0 + \Gamma(p)} \right) \right\} \quad . \quad (20)$$

To apprehend the infrared behaviour of the r.h.s. of eq. (20), it is sufficient to put  $q_0 = 0$  in the curly bracket, and to use the limiting form of  $\rho_t(q_0, q)$  in the space-like region [11]

$$\rho_t(q_0, q) \Big|_{q_0 \ll q \ll m_g} = \frac{1}{q^2} \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\left( \frac{3\pi}{4} m_g^2 \frac{q_0}{q^3} \right)}{1 + \left( \frac{3\pi}{4} m_g^2 \frac{q_0}{q^3} \right)^2} \quad , \quad (21)$$

where  $m_g$  is the thermal mass of the gauge boson. We get :



$$\Gamma(p) = \frac{g^2 C_F T}{2\pi^2} v \int_0^{q^*} \frac{dq}{q} \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan \left( \frac{3}{4} \pi \frac{m_g^2}{q^2} \right) \cdot \left\{ \arctan \frac{\text{Re } p_0 - E + vq}{\text{Im } p_0 + \Gamma(p)} - \arctan \frac{\text{Re } p_0 - E - vq}{\text{Im } p_0 + \Gamma(p)} \right\} . \quad (22)$$

**a) Absence of magnetic screening (QED case)**

As noticed in [4], with  $p_0 = E - i\Gamma$ , which is required in principle by eq. (6), the r.h.s. of eq. (22) presents a singularity. Thus the self-consistent approach alone does not achieve the initial aim which was to screen the logarithmic divergence. In fact the origin of this divergence is well-known : it is due to the  $\frac{1}{q^2}$  factor in eq. (21) which reflects the absence of magnetic screening in the static limit at this order. It may seem surprising to try to cure a bosonic disease by acting on the fermionic sector, as in the self-consistent approach, and the success of such a treatment in the screening of the divergence would have been somewhat miraculous.

Let us stress that the results found in [5] and [7] for the non-relativistic fermion by putting  $\text{Im } p_0 = 0$  in the r.h.s. of eq. (22) do not in principle give the damping rate, since this procedure deviates from the prescription of eq. (6). Although a dissipative coefficient is introduced, the choice  $\text{Im } p^0 = 0$  is a kind of reminiscence of the narrow width approximation, the validity of which is precisely questioned by the divergence at the pole : thus the link with the damping rate is unclear and the finiteness of the resulting expressions may be misleading.

Strictly speaking, the r.h.s. of eqs. (20), (22) rely on the replacement  $\Gamma(p') \rightarrow \Gamma(p)$  in eq. (19). Since  $\Gamma$  is not independent of  $p$ , this approximation is correct as long as  $|\Gamma(p') - \Gamma(p)| \ll |\text{Im } p^0 + \Gamma(p)|$ , but it fails at  $\text{Im } p^0 = -\Gamma(p)$ , so that the conclusion of [4] is not rigorously stated. Since  $\Gamma(p') - \Gamma(p) \sim O(q)$  the crude replacement of  $\text{Im } p_0 + \Gamma(p)$  by this  $O(q)$  term in eq. (22) still does not cure the divergence at the pole : the conclusions of [4] are expected to remain unaltered.

We will show however that the situation worsens : we obtain a functional equation for  $\Gamma(p)$  which has no solution even in presence of magnetic screening (at least in the non relativistic case) ! Using

$$\Gamma(p') \simeq \Gamma(p) - q \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial p} x \quad , \quad (23)$$

which holds\* if  $\left| \frac{q}{\Gamma} \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial p} \right| \ll 1$ , and with  $EE' = E + \frac{q^2}{2E} - vqx$ , the function  $J$  in Eq. (19) is given by :

$$J(q_0, q) = \int_{-1}^1 dx \frac{(1-x^2)(\text{Im } p_0 + \Gamma(p) - q \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial p} x)}{[\text{Re } p_0 - q_0 - E - \frac{q^2}{2E} + vqx]^2 + [\text{Im } p_0 + \Gamma(p) - q \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial p} x]^2} \quad . \quad (24)$$

Putting  $p_0 = E - i\Gamma$ , and after some simple manipulations we find (in the perturbative approximation  $\frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial p} \ll v$ ) that  $J$  may be safely approximated by :

$$J = -\text{sgn} \left( \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial p} \right) \text{sgn} \left( \frac{q_0}{q} + \frac{q}{2E} \right) \frac{1}{qv} \pi \theta \left( v - \left| \frac{q_0}{q} + \frac{q}{2E} \right| \right) \quad . \quad (25)$$

Then eq. (19) gives :

$$\Gamma(p) = -\text{sgn} \left( \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial p} \right) \frac{g^2 C_F T}{4\pi} v \int_0^{q^*} dq q \int_{-q}^q \frac{dq_0}{q_0} \rho_t(q_0, q) \text{sgn} \left( \frac{q_0}{q} + \frac{q}{2E} \right) \theta \left( v - \left| \frac{q_0}{q} + \frac{q}{2E} \right| \right) \quad (26)$$

---

\* Eq. (23) assumes the differentiability of  $\Gamma(p)$  with respect to  $p$ . This assumption may seem quite restrictive and not founded. Let us notice however that :

- 1 - it is natural in the framework of the pole ansatz which supposes that the pole is isolated from other singularities.
- 2 - it is less stringent than assuming  $\Gamma(p') = \Gamma(p)$ .
- 3 - Finally it is more consistent than the hypothesis of constant behaviour, which eventually leads [5, 7] to  $\Gamma(p)$  being a differentiable function of  $v(p) = p/E(p)$ .

As far as the QED case is concerned (absence of magnetic mass) the behaviour of  $\rho_t(q_0, q)$  in the space-like static limit (cf. eq. (21)) still generates a logarithmic singularity.

### b) Presence of magnetic screening (QCD case)

The unexpected novelty is that the occurrence of magnetic screening does not seem to solve the fermion damping puzzle, at least in the non-relativistic regime !

Unfortunately we do not know the spectral function  $\rho_t(q_0, q)$  in presence of a magnetic mass, except in the static limit. In order to explore the effect of magnetic screening, we propose a simple parametrization which interpolates smoothly between :

- the static limit, where we expect the magnetic "mass"  $\mu$  to screen the infrared singularity :  $\text{Re } \Pi_t(q_0, q) \xrightarrow[|q_0, q \rightarrow 0]{|q_0| \ll q} \mu^2$  so that  $\rho_t(q_0, q) \xrightarrow[q \ll m_g]{q_0 \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{q^2 + \mu^2}$ , instead of  $\frac{1}{q^2}$  as in eq.222222221).

- the region away from the static limit, where the hard-loop approximation of  $\rho_t(q_0, q)$  certainly holds. Hence we take :

$$\rho_t^{model}(q_0, q) = \frac{\frac{3}{4}m_g^2 \frac{q_0}{q}}{(q^2 + \mu^2)^2 + \left(\frac{3}{4}\pi m_g^2\right)^2 \left(\frac{q_0}{q}\right)^2} . \quad (27)$$

This leads to :

$$\Gamma(p) = -sgn\left(\frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial p}\right) \frac{g^2 C_F T}{4\pi^2} v \int_0^{q^*} dq \frac{q}{q^2 + \mu^2} \cdot \left\{ 2 \arctan\left(\frac{\frac{q}{2E}\nu}{q^2 + \mu^2}\right) + \arctan\left(\frac{(v - \frac{q}{2E})\nu}{q^2 + \mu^2}\right) - \arctan\left(\frac{(v + \frac{q}{2E})\nu}{q^2 + \mu^2}\right) \right\} \quad (28)$$

where  $\nu = \frac{3}{4}\pi m_g^2$ .

One can show that the curly bracket in eq. (28) is dominated by the first term yielding:

$$\Gamma(p) = -sgn\left(\frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial p}\right) \frac{g^2 C_F T}{2\pi^2} v \int_0^\infty dr \frac{r}{r^2 + 1} \arctan\left(K \frac{r}{r^2 + 1}\right) , \quad (29)$$

where we have set  $r = \frac{q}{\mu}$  and  $K = \frac{3}{8}\pi \frac{m_g^2}{E\mu}$ . The  $q^*$  dependence of eq. (28) is subleading in  $g$  and can be dropped.

The result is :

$$\Gamma(p) = -sgn\left(\frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial p}\right) \frac{g^2 C_F T}{4\pi} v \sinh^{-1} \left[ \frac{3\pi m_g^2}{16 E\mu} \right] . \quad (30)$$

Consequently  $\Gamma(p)$  should satisfy the condition :

$$\left| \frac{\partial\Gamma}{\partial p} \right| = -\frac{g^2 C_F T}{4\pi} \frac{\partial}{\partial p} \left\{ \frac{p}{\sqrt{p^2 + M^2}} \sinh^{-1} \left( \frac{3\pi m_g^2}{16 \mu \sqrt{p^2 + M^2}} \right) \right\} . \quad (31)$$

When the expression between brackets is an increasing function of  $p$ , eq. (31) has no solution. This happens when  $p < M$ . Thus there is no solution for a non-relativistic fermion: the corresponding propagator has no pole. In the case where  $v \ll 1$ , the  $q_0$  integration range is restricted to the static limit region  $q_0 \ll q$  where the parametrization (27) is certainly reliable. When  $p \geq M$ , eq. (31) has a solution. Namely, in the ultrarelativistic case we get :

$$\Gamma(p)|_{v=1} = \frac{g^2 C_F T}{4\pi} \sinh^{-1} \left[ \frac{3\pi m_g^2}{16 E\mu} \right] . \quad (32)$$

Assuming  $\mu \sim g^2 T$ ,  $\frac{m_g^2}{E\mu} \sim \frac{T}{E} \ll 1$ , we thus have :

$$\Gamma(p)|_{v=1} = \frac{3g^2 C_F T}{64} \frac{m_g^2}{E\mu} \quad (33)$$

Surprisingly, we do not find the logarithmic dependence in  $\mu$  naively expected since  $\mu$  screens the logarithmic divergence. We may first question the reliability of the parametrization (27) used in the whole  $q_0$  integration range. However, due to the sign flip of  $J(q_0, q)$  and the odd property of  $\rho_t(q_0, q)$  under the change  $q_0 \rightarrow -q_0$ , the essential part of the  $q_0$

integral in eq. (26) comes from the narrow window  $[-\frac{q}{2E}; \frac{q}{2E}]$  where the ansatz (27) is expected to hold \*. Then the nature of the  $\mu$ -dependence of  $\Gamma(p)$  (for  $p \geq M$ ) is controlled by the ratio of the width of the window ( $\frac{q}{E}$ ) to the width of the spectral density  $\rho_t^{model}$  considered as a function of  $\frac{q_0}{q}$  which is  $(\frac{q^2 + \mu^2}{\frac{3}{4}\pi m_g^2})$ . The magnitude of this ratio  $R$  given by :

$$R = K \frac{2r}{r^2 + 1} \quad , \quad (34)$$

with  $r = \frac{q}{\mu}$ , is controlled by the parameter  $K$  defined in eq. (29).

If  $\mu$  is arbitrarily small, namely  $\mu \ll \frac{m_g^2}{E} \ll O(g^2T)$  the spectral density  $\rho_t$  is sharply peaked. It is then legitimate to replace as done in previous works [4],  $q_0$  by 0 in the integrand of eq. (26), except in  $\frac{1}{q_0} \rho_t(q_0, q)$ . In this case, instead of (33), eq. (32) yields indeed the logarithmic dependence on  $\mu$  :

$$\Gamma(p) \Big|_{\substack{v=1 \\ \mu \rightarrow 0}} = \frac{g^2 C_F T}{4\pi} \ell n \left( \frac{3\pi m_g^2}{8 E \mu} \right) \quad (35)$$

But on the other hand, for the physically sensible value  $\mu \sim O(g^2T)$ ,  $K \ll 1$  and the density  $\rho_t$  has a broader support than the window  $-\frac{q}{2E} \leq \frac{q_0}{q} \leq \frac{q}{2E}$ . This forbids the appearance of the logarithmic dependence and leads to eq. (33).

We point out that the sign flip in  $J$ , hence the narrowness of the window  $\frac{q}{E}$  instead of  $O(1)$ , are a direct consequence of the self-consistent approach associated with the pole prescription of eq. (6), through eqs. (23)-(24). If one would instead use a nondissipative fermion and work with a real energy  $p^0$  - as usual in the narrow width approximation -,  $J$  would be replaced by the integral over  $\cos \theta$  of a  $\delta$ -function, which would not produce such a sign flip. In such a case the corresponding ratio  $R$  would be controlled by  $m_g^2/\mu^2$ , much larger than 1. One would then get the standard  $\ell n(m_g/\mu)$  dependence in  $\Gamma$ . This

---

\* The second window let open by  $J$  and the odd behaviour of  $\rho_t$ , which is  $v - \frac{q}{2E} \leq \frac{q_0}{q} \leq v + \frac{q}{2E}$ , gives only a negligible contribution with respect to the one we discuss.

remark leads to the conclusion that even in presence of magnetic screening and when the pole exists, the narrow width approximation and the self-consistent approach disagree.

This unconventional conclusion, associated with the qualitative difference between the nonrelativistic and ultrarelativistic regimes without any apparent physical reason make us feel uneasy. Hence we wonder about the correctness of the self-consistent procedure, i.e. the pole ansatz of the dissipative propagator together with the exploration of the lower half complex energy plane, irrespectively of the true analytic structure of the complete fermion propagator.

In ref. [7], arguments are given to obtain informations about the singularity structure of the propagator and discuss the possibility of ignoring this structure, keeping only the pole. We do not, however, think that these arguments are well founded. In fact, the analytic continuation which is used in ref. [7], in order to explore the lower half-plane of the energy, is performed on the self-energy imaginary part evaluated for real external energies. But, clearly :

$$\text{Im } \Sigma(\text{real } p_0 \rightarrow \text{complex } p_0) \neq \text{Im } (\Sigma(\text{real } p_0 \rightarrow \text{complex } p_0))$$

and it is only the latter quantity which is of interest and which we actually study in the present work.

In fact, instead of eq. (12), ref. [7] uses a spectral density representation for the internal fermion propagator, which is correct only for a real external energy  $p_0$ . To take into account the width of the fermion, a Breit-Wigner form for the fermion spectral density is introduced by hand. To make contact with this method, we write the imaginary part of eq. (15) with a dissipative energy  $\widehat{E}'$  as :

$$\text{Im } \frac{1}{p'_0 - \widehat{E}'} = - \frac{\Gamma(p') + \text{Im } p_0}{(E - E' - q_0)^2 + (\Gamma(p') + \text{Im } p_0)^2} \quad (36)$$

We recover the same Breit-Wigner form as ref. [7] only for  $\text{Im } p_0 = 0$ . The ad hoc analytic

continuation which is proposed in order to go to  $\text{Im } p_0 = -\Gamma$  leads to results contradicted by our treatment, which enables us to go directly to the pole. In particular, this is flagrant for the case of a non-relativistic fermion for which ref. [7] states that no magnetic screening is needed. Also when going to the complex pole in eq. (36), one finds as a consequence that the final answer for  $\Gamma(p)$  cannot depend on itself as appears in [7] but only on  $\Gamma(p') - \Gamma(p)$  which is what we have dealt with.

## 5. Conclusion

By a careful exploration of the location of the pole of the fermion propagator, we have shown that the self-consistent approach using a dissipative fermion is of marginal relevance to solve the heavy moving fermion damping puzzle :

- it does not provide any screening for the infrared divergence, which has to be cured by magnetic screening.

- In presence of magnetic screening, the situation depends on the kinematical regime.

In the non relativistic regime the functional equation obtained for  $\Gamma$  has no solution. The situation changes dramatically in the relativistic regime, but without any apparent physical reason : we do find a pole in this case, hence a value for  $\Gamma$ . However we got a rather unusual result, especially concerning the dependence of  $\Gamma$  on the magnetic mass  $\mu$ , as compared to the commonly expected  $\ell n \mu$ . The  $\mu$ -dependence which we get in  $\Gamma$  is logarithmic only if  $\mu$  is very small with respect to the standard scale  $O(g^2T)$  and this is a direct and specific consequence of the use of a dissipative fermion. This disagreement with the result obtained in the narrow width approximation (which is naively expected to work since  $\Gamma \sim g^2T \ll gT \ll M$ ) suggests that the self-consistent approach is not a safe procedure and may lead to question the validity of the simple hypothesis of a leading pole singularity. The complete singularity of the propagator is unknown : there are no physical requirements to determine it and in particular no way to define a physical sheet as for the  $T = 0$   $S$ -matrix element.

Notice that the absence of a pole in the fermion propagator does not jeopardize, in principle, the quasi-particle interpretation of plasma excitations. Indeed, a quasi-particle shows up in the large time asymptotic behaviour of the mixed time/momentum representation of the (retarded) fermion Green's function as :

$$G(t, p) \underset{t \rightarrow +\infty}{\sim} A(t, p) \exp[-i\omega_0(p)t - \Gamma(p)t]$$

where  $\omega_0(p)$  gives the dispersion relation and  $\Gamma(p)$  is the damping rate. In the complex energy plane,  $p_0 = \omega_0(p) - i\Gamma(p)$  is the nearest singularity of the propagator with respect to the real axis, as can be shown, e.g. by a saddle point approximation, and this singularity need not be a pole, but e.g. a branch point as claimed by Smilga [13] in the QED case. The prefactor A is non exponential in time and depends on the nature of this singularity (for example it is a constant for a pole). In practice however, locating any singularity off the real energy axis (a pole, a branch point or an essential singularity) involves the knowledge of the analytic structure of the finite temperature propagator which is out of reach at present.

### Acknowledgments

We wish to thank R. Baier and A. Smilga for useful discussions, as well as T. Altherr and R. Pisarski for stimulating correspondence.



## References

- [1] V. V. Klimov, *Yad. Fiz.* 33 (1981) 1734 ; [*Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* 33 (1981) 934].  
H. A. Weldon, *Phys. Rev.* D26 (1982) 2789.
- [2] R. Pisarski, Fermilab-Pub-88/123-T (09/88) ; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 63 (1989) 1129.
- [3] V. V. Lebedev and A. V. Smilga, *Ann. Phys. (N. Y.)* 202, 229 (1990) *Phys. Lett.* 253B, 231 (1991) ; *Physica* A181, 187 (1992).
- [4] R. Baier, H. Nakkagawa, A. Niegawa, Osaka University preprint OCU-PHYS-145 to be published in the *Canadian Journal of Physics*.
- [5] T. Altherr, E. Petitgirard and T. del Rio Gaztellurutia, *Phys. Rev.* D47 (1993) 703.
- [6] R. Kobes, G. Kunstatter and K. Mak, *Phys. Rev.* D45 (1992) 4632.
- [7] R. D. Pisarski, preprint BNL-P-1/92.
- [8] E. Braaten, R. D. Pisarski, *Phys. Rev.* D42 (1990) 2156.
- [9] R. Baier, G. Kunstatter and D. Schiff, *Phys. Rev.* 45 (1992) 4381 ; *Nucl. Phys.* B388 (1992) 287 ; A. Rebhan, CERN preprint, CERN-TH/6434/92.
- [10] E. Braaten, R. D. Pisarski, *Nucl. Phys.* B337 (1990) 569 ; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 64 (1990) 1338.
- [11] R. D. Pisarski, *Physica* A158 (1989) 146.
- [12] See for instance : I. Hardman, H. Umezawa and Y. Yamanaka, *J. Math. Phys.* 28 (1987) 2925.
- [13] A. V. Smilga, Bern University preprint BUTP-92/39.