Noncommutative Field Theories and Geometry

T R Govindarajan, The Inst of Mathematical Sciences, Chennai, India

trg@imsc.res.in

BRATISLAVA, June 2007





 Lecture 1: NC field theories: Lorentz symmetry breakdown; IR/UV mixing; Stripes phase; solitons; Unitarity; Fuzzy sphere.



- Lecture 1: NC field theories: Lorentz symmetry breakdown; IR/UV mixing; Stripes phase; solitons; Unitarity; Fuzzy sphere.
- Lecture 2. Q M with time-space noncommutativity; unitary evolution and discretisation of time.



- Lecture 1: NC field theories: Lorentz symmetry breakdown; IR/UV mixing; Stripes phase; solitons; Unitarity; Fuzzy sphere.
- Lecture 2. Q M with time-space noncommutativity; unitary evolution and discretisation of time.
- Lecture 3. Twisted Poincare symmetry and quantisation.



- Lecture 1: NC field theories: Lorentz symmetry breakdown; IR/UV mixing; Stripes phase; solitons; Unitarity; Fuzzy sphere.
- Lecture 2. Q M with time-space noncommutativity; unitary evolution and discretisation of time.
- Lecture 3. Twisted Poincare symmetry and quantisation.
- Lecture 4. Twisted Statistics; romoval of IR/UV mixing; new statistics.



- Lecture 1: NC field theories: Lorentz symmetry breakdown; IR/UV mixing; Stripes phase; solitons; Unitarity; Fuzzy sphere.
- Lecture 2. Q M with time-space noncommutativity; unitary evolution and discretisation of time.
- Lecture 3. Twisted Poincare symmetry and quantisation.
- Lecture 4. Twisted Statistics; romoval of IR/UV mixing; new statistics.
- Lecture 5.QED and Gauge theories; Spontaneous symmetry breakdown; Diffeos and gravity; Standard model.



- Lecture 1: NC field theories: Lorentz symmetry breakdown; IR/UV mixing; Stripes phase; solitons; Unitarity; Fuzzy sphere.
- Lecture 2. Q M with time-space noncommutativity; unitary evolution and discretisation of time.
- Lecture 3. Twisted Poincare symmetry and quantisation.
- Lecture 4. Twisted Statistics; romoval of IR/UV mixing; new statistics.
- Lecture 5.QED and Gauge theories; Spontaneous symmetry breakdown; Diffeos and gravity; Standard model.
- hep-th/0508002, 0508151, 0602265, 0604061, 0608138, 0608179 + on going .. Balachandran, Govindarajan, Sachin Vaidya, Giorgio Immirzi, Seckin, Kumar Gupta, Marco Panero, Gianpiero Mangano, Alexander Pinzul, Quereshi....



Quantum gravity -at Planck length - folklore- must have
noncommutative geometric structure - limit of
classical gravity - emerge - commutative geometry of
spacetime we know. Just like:

$$\lim_{\hbar \longrightarrow 0} Q.Physics = Cl.Physics$$



Quantum gravity -at Planck length - folklore- must have
noncommutative geometric structure - limit of
classical gravity - emerge - commutative geometry of
spacetime we know. Just like:

$$\lim_{\hbar \longrightarrow 0} Q.Physics = Cl.Physics$$

◊ Expectation:

 $\lim_{Planck \ length \longrightarrow 0} \ Non \ commutative \ geometry$

Commutative Geometry



 Any attempt to localise events to lengths close to Plancklength will bring in enormous energy and eventually lead to blackholes being created. This will distort the local geometry so much that quantum effects would be overwhelming.



- Any attempt to localise events to lengths close to Plancklength will bring in enormous energy and eventually lead to blackholes being created. This will distort the local geometry so much that quantum effects would be overwhelming.
- The above arguments have been posed in two independent places. (1) Sergio Doplicher's paper.
 (2)Podles lectures on quantum groups - where it is mentioned that Nahm has posed the questions and the need to go beyond conventional ideas of geometries.





 Infact remarkably difficulties were anticipated atleast a hundred and fifty years earliar.





Quote.....

- Infact remarkably difficulties were anticipated atleast a hundred and fifty years earliar.
-it seems that empirical notions on which the metrical determinations of space are founded, the notion of a solid body and a ray of light cease to be valid for the infinitely small. We are therefore quite at liberty to suppose that the metric relations of space in the infinitely small do not conform to hypotheses of geometry; and we ought in fact to suppose it, if we can thereby obtain a simpler explanation of phenomena....



Quote.....

- Infact remarkably difficulties were anticipated atleast a hundred and fifty years earliar.
-it seems that empirical notions on which the metrical determinations of space are founded, the notion of a solid body and a ray of light cease to be valid for the infinitely small. We are therefore quite at liberty to suppose that the metric relations of space in the infinitely small do not conform to hypotheses of geometry; and we ought in fact to suppose it, if we can thereby obtain a simpler explanation of phenomena....
- The above is from "On the hypotheses which lie at the bases of geometry", Bernhard Riemann, 1854 (from the translation by W K Clifford).



Moyal spacetimes are defined by:

 $\left[\hat{x}_{\mu}, \hat{x}_{\nu} \right] = i\theta_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{I}$





Moyal spacetimes are defined by:

 $[\hat{x}_{\mu}, \hat{x}_{\nu}] = i\theta_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{I}$

◇ This can be understood by the introduction of star product rule in the algebra of functions on R^4 . The multiplication map of algebra of functions (*on Moyal plane*) $\mathcal{A}_{\theta}(R^d)$ is $f * g = m_{\theta}(f \otimes g) = m_0(F_{\theta}(f \otimes g))$



Moyal spacetimes are defined by:

 $[\hat{x}_{\mu}, \hat{x}_{\nu}] = i\theta_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{I}$

◇ This can be understood by the introduction of star product rule in the algebra of functions on R^4 . The multiplication map of algebra of functions (*on Moyal plane*) $\mathcal{A}_{\theta}(R^d)$ is $f * g = m_{\theta}(f \otimes g) = m_0(F_{\theta}(f \otimes g))$

 $F_{0} = e^{-\frac{i}{2}(-i\partial_{\mu})\Theta^{\mu\nu}\otimes(-i\partial_{\nu})}$

◊ where



Moyal spacetimes are defined by:

 $[\hat{x}_{\mu}, \hat{x}_{\nu}] = i\theta_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{I}$

◇ This can be understood by the introduction of star product rule in the algebra of functions on \mathbb{R}^4 . The multiplication map of algebra of functions (*on Moyal plane*) $\mathcal{A}_{\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is $f * g = m_{\theta}(f \otimes g) = m_0(F_{\theta}(f \otimes g))$

 $F_{0} = e^{-\frac{i}{2}(-i\partial_{\mu})\Theta^{\mu\nu}\otimes(-i\partial_{\nu})}$



6

 \diamond where

In commutative spacetime we have pointwise

multiplication $m_0(F_{\theta=0}(f \otimes g))$.

◇ The algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of functions on a noncommutative space can be traced back to quantum mechanics. Many of the techinques of geometry of quantum spaces can be used with advantage. However we are not dealing with inherently quantum mechanical spaces, but only use the techniques to represent classical noncommutative spaces.



◇ The algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of functions on a noncommutative space can be traced back to quantum mechanics. Many of the techinques of geometry of quantum spaces can be used with advantage. However we are not dealing with inherently quantum mechanical spaces, but only use the techniques to represent classical noncommutative spaces.

 \diamond With the above in mind let us consider a scalar field theory in NC (R^d) space with the Lagrangian (density)

$$\mathcal{L}_* = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \Phi * \partial^\mu \Phi - \frac{1}{2} m^2 \Phi * \Phi - \frac{\lambda}{4!} \Phi * \Phi * \Phi * \Phi ,$$



◇ The algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ of functions on a noncommutative space can be traced back to quantum mechanics. Many of the techinques of geometry of quantum spaces can be used with advantage. However we are not dealing with inherently quantum mechanical spaces, but only use the techniques to represent classical noncommutative spaces.

◇ With the above in mind let us consider a scalar field theory in NC (\mathbb{R}^d) space with the Lagrangian (density)

$$\mathcal{L}_* = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \Phi * \partial^\mu \Phi - \frac{1}{2} m^2 \Phi * \Phi - \frac{\lambda}{4!} \Phi * \Phi * \Phi * \Phi ,$$

 We assume noncommutativity is restricted to space-space coordinates.



 The Feynmann diagrams and the conventional rules are:





The Feynmann diagrams and the conventional rules are:





 The Feynmann diagrams and the conventional rules are:





 One loop propagator with the conventional rules of QFT comes from the following diagrams.

 The Feynmann diagrams and the conventional rules are:





 One loop propagator with the conventional rules of QFT comes from the following diagrams.



◊ The above diagrams contribute to:

$$I_{\rm planar} \; = \; \frac{\lambda}{(2\pi)^4} \int d^4k \; \frac{1}{k^2 + m^2} \, ,$$



◊ The above diagrams contribute to:

$$I_{\text{planar}} \;=\; rac{\lambda}{(2\pi)^4} \int d^4k \; rac{1}{k^2 + m^2} \,,$$



$$I_{\rm planar} \;=\; \frac{\lambda}{(2\pi)^4} \int d^4k \; \frac{1}{k^2 + m^2} \; e^{i \; p \cdot \theta \cdot k} \label{eq:planar}$$

◊ The above diagrams contribute to:





 The IR/UV mixing is understood from the following: The spectral representation for consistency with perturbative unitarity will modify the dispersion relation with the appearance of new modes. Unless this is taken into account the divergence will appear in the infrared.



- The IR/UV mixing is understood from the following: The spectral representation for consistency with perturbative unitarity will modify the dispersion relation with the appearance of new modes. Unless this is taken into account the divergence will appear in the infrared.
- But it is also troublesome because, Wilsonian renormalisation cannot be performed. That is momenta in the UV cannot be consistently integrated out and absorbed in the parameters of the theory (like mass and coupling constant).



- The IR/UV mixing is understood from the following: The spectral representation for consistency with perturbative unitarity will modify the dispersion relation with the appearance of new modes. Unless this is taken into account the divergence will appear in the infrared.
- But it is also troublesome because, Wilsonian renormalisation cannot be performed. That is momenta in the UV cannot be consistently integrated out and absorbed in the parameters of the theory (like mass and coupling constant).
- It leads to a new phase for the theory known sometimes as stripe phase or nonuniform phase in addition to order and disorder phases.



 In supersymmetric theories the IR/UV mixing is weak. This is because there is absence of quadratic divergence.



- In supersymmetric theories the IR/UV mixing is weak. This is because there is absence of quadratic divergence.
- Even otherwise one can regularise the theory in a nonlocal framework and eliminate the IR/UV mixing_{trg,}

panero, seckin.



- In supersymmetric theories the IR/UV mixing is weak. This is because there is absence of quadratic divergence.
- Even otherwise one can regularise the theory in a nonlocal framework and eliminate the IR/UV mixing_{trg,}

panero, seckin.

 \diamond Since the $\theta_{\mu\nu}$ is not invariant under Lorentz transformation we lose Poincare symmetry.



- In supersymmetric theories the IR/UV mixing is weak. This is because there is absence of quadratic divergence.
- Even otherwise one can regularise the theory in a nonlocal framework and eliminate the IR/UV mixing_{trg,}

panero, seckin.

- \diamond Since the $\theta_{\mu\nu}$ is not invariant under Lorentz transformation we lose Poincare symmetry.
- It is also claimed that Unitarity will be violated (again attributed to IR/UV mixing) in space-time noncommutativity.



- In supersymmetric theories the IR/UV mixing is weak. This is because there is absence of quadratic divergence.
- Even otherwise one can regularise the theory in a nonlocal framework and eliminate the IR/UV mixing_{trg,}

panero, seckin.

- \diamond Since the $\theta_{\mu\nu}$ is not invariant under Lorentz transformation we lose Poincare symmetry.
- It is also claimed that Unitarity will be violated (again attributed to IR/UV mixing) in space-time noncommutativity.
- Gauge transformations get modified to take into account new multiplication law.


Conventional Gauge transformations will not close with the new multiplication map given as star product. For this one introduces star gauge transformations: Under star gauge transformation

 $A_{\mu}(x) \longrightarrow g(x) * A_{\mu}(x) * g^{\dagger}(x) - g(x) * \partial_{\mu}g(x)^{\dagger}.$



 Conventional Gauge transformations will not close with the new multiplication map given as star product. For this one introduces star gauge transformations: Under star gauge transformation

 $A_{\mu}(x) \longrightarrow g(x) * A_{\mu}(x) * g^{\dagger}(x) - g(x) * \partial_{\mu}g(x)^{\dagger}.$

◊ The NC field strength

 $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_{\mu}A_{\nu} - \partial_{\nu}A_{\mu} - i(A_{\mu} * A_{\nu} - A_{\nu} * A_{\mu})$ transforms covariantly viz.,

$$F_{\mu\nu} \longrightarrow g(x) * F_{\mu\nu} * g^{\dagger}(x)$$

under the star gauge transformation.



 Conventional Gauge transformations will not close with the new multiplication map given as star product. For this one introduces star gauge transformations: Under star gauge transformation

 $A_{\mu}(x) \longrightarrow g(x) * A_{\mu}(x) * g^{\dagger}(x) - g(x) * \partial_{\mu}g(x)^{\dagger}.$

◊ The NC field strength

 $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_{\mu}A_{\nu} - \partial_{\nu}A_{\mu} - i(A_{\mu} * A_{\nu} - A_{\nu} * A_{\mu})$ transforms covariantly viz.,

$$F_{\mu\nu} \longrightarrow g(x) * F_{\mu\nu} * g^{\dagger}(x)$$

under the star gauge transformation.

 \diamond Since gauge transformations are introduced in this way there is no way to get gauge groups other than U(N). Infact there is no standard model unless we extend to include U(1).



 \diamond In addition when you couple to matter, arbitrary charges cannot be assigned and only ± 1 can be given to the fermions.



- \diamond In addition when you couple to matter, arbitrary charges cannot be assigned and only ± 1 can be given to the fermions.
- Inspite of the above difficulties lot of papers have been written by expanding the star products and keeping to $O(\theta)$ terms alone.



- \diamond In addition when you couple to matter, arbitrary charges cannot be assigned and only ± 1 can be given to the fermions.
- Inspite of the above difficulties lot of papers have been written by expanding the star products and keeping to $O(\theta)$ terms alone.



$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_{\mu}A_{\nu} - \partial_{\nu}A_{\mu} - i[A_{\mu}, A_{\nu}] - \frac{1}{2}\theta^{\rho\gamma}(\partial_{\rho}A_{\mu}\partial_{\gamma}A_{\nu} - \partial_{\rho}A_{\nu}\partial_{\gamma}A_{\mu}) + \mathcal{O}(\theta^{2})$$



- \diamond In addition when you couple to matter, arbitrary charges cannot be assigned and only ± 1 can be given to the fermions.
- Inspite of the above difficulties lot of papers have been written by expanding the star products and keeping to $O(\theta)$ terms alone.



13

 \diamond For example the field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ is expanded as:

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_{\mu}A_{\nu} - \partial_{\nu}A_{\mu} - i[A_{\mu}, A_{\nu}] - \frac{1}{2}\theta^{\rho\gamma}(\partial_{\rho}A_{\mu}\partial_{\gamma}A_{\nu} - \partial_{\rho}A_{\nu}\partial_{\gamma}A_{\mu}) + \mathcal{O}(\theta^{2})$$

 Phenomenological consequences have been worked out.

Derrick's theorem prohibits solitons in dimensions
 D > 2. But this can be evaded if there are higher
 dervative terms in the action or Hamiltonian. Since
 QFT's in noncommutative spaces have naturally higher
 derivatives they also possess solitons which is an
 interesting outcome of these theories.



- Derrick's theorem prohibits solitons in dimensions
 D > 2. But this can be evaded if there are higher
 dervative terms in the action or Hamiltonian. Since
 QFT's in noncommutative spaces have naturally higher
 derivatives they also possess solitons which is an
 interesting outcome of these theories.
- \diamond We consider for example D = 2 + 1 with space directions noncommuting. Consider the action:

$$S = \int d^3x \,\partial_\mu \phi \, * \,\partial^\mu \phi \, + \, V(\phi)$$



- Derrick's theorem prohibits solitons in dimensions
 D > 2. But this can be evaded if there are higher
 dervative terms in the action or Hamiltonian. Since
 QFT's in noncommutative spaces have naturally higher
 derivatives they also possess solitons which is an
 interesting outcome of these theories.
- \diamond We consider for example D = 2 + 1 with space directions noncommuting. Consider the action:

$$S = \int d^3x \,\partial_\mu \phi \, * \,\partial^\mu \phi \, + \, V(\phi)$$

The static solitons are obtained by minimising the energy:

$$E = \int d^2x \left[(\partial \phi)^2 + V(\phi) \right]$$



7 (1

◊ It is advantangeous to define $z = \frac{x + iy}{\sqrt{\theta}}$. The energy becomes

$$\mathcal{E} = \int d^2 x \left[(\partial \phi)^2 + \theta V(\phi) \right]$$



◊ It is advantangeous to define $z = \frac{x + iy}{\sqrt{\theta}}$. The energy becomes

$$\mathcal{E} = \int d^2 x \left[(\partial \phi)^2 + \theta V(\phi) \right]$$



15

 $\circ \ln \theta \longrightarrow \infty$ we solve for $V'(\phi) = 0$. In the commutative theory we have only $\phi = constant$, but the story is different in NC theory.

◊ It is advantangeous to define $z = \frac{x + iy}{\sqrt{\theta}}$. The energy becomes

$$\mathcal{E} = \int d^2 x \left[(\partial \phi)^2 + \theta V(\phi) \right]$$

- $\circ \ln \theta \longrightarrow \infty$ we solve for $V'(\phi) = 0$. In the commutative theory we have only $\phi = constant$, but the story is different in NC theory.
- ◇ The solution is given by φ = ∑_i λ_iP_i where λ_i are solutions of V(λ) = 0 and P_i² = P_i are the orthogonal rank-1 projectors. For example the simplest solution will use the projector P = | 0⟩⟨0 |. These solutions are harmonic oscillator wavefunctions whose width is determined by the θ parameter.



• While these solutions are true only in the infinite θ limit the gradient term in the energy contributes for finite θ .



- While these solutions are true only in the infinite θ limit the gradient term in the energy contributes for finite θ .
- ◇ The exisitence of solutions can be demonstrated for large θ by having a series expansion in $\frac{1}{\theta}$

gopakumar, minwalla, strominger



- While these solutions are true only in the infinite θ limit the gradient term in the energy contributes for finite θ .
- ◇ The exisitence of solutions can be demonstrated for large θ by having a series expansion in $\frac{1}{\theta}$

gopakumar, minwalla, strominger

 Derrick's theorem does not hold in gauge theories and in Higgs gauge field coupling we have the well known vortex solution. The NC theory is even richer.



- While these solutions are true only in the infinite θ limit the gradient term in the energy contributes for finite θ .
- ◇ The exisitence of solutions can be demonstrated for large θ by having a series expansion in $\frac{1}{\theta}$

gopakumar, minwalla, strominger .

- Derrick's theorem does not hold in gauge theories and in Higgs gauge field coupling we have the well known vortex solution. The NC theory is even richer.
- ◊ Consider the energy functional:

$$\mathcal{E} = \int d^2x \left(\frac{1}{2} F^2 + (D\phi) * (D\phi)^{\dagger} + V(\phi) \right)$$



- While these solutions are true only in the infinite θ limit the gradient term in the energy contributes for finite θ .
- ◇ The exisitence of solutions can be demonstrated for large θ by having a series expansion in $\frac{1}{\theta}$

gopakumar,minwalla,strominger.

 Derrick's theorem does not hold in gauge theories and in Higgs gauge field coupling we have the well known vortex solution. The NC theory is even richer.

◊ Consider the energy functional:

$$\mathcal{E} = \int d^2x \left(\frac{1}{2} F^2 + (D\phi) * (D\phi)^{\dagger} + V(\phi) \right)$$

♦ We have vortex solutions given by $D\phi = 0$ and $V'(\phi) = 0$.



The exact solutions can be obtained by solution generating technique: harvey For example exact soln is:

$$\phi = \lambda(1 - P); \quad A = \frac{-i}{\theta} \left(\sqrt{\frac{N+1}{N+2}} - 1 \right) a^{\dagger}$$



The exact solutions can be obtained by solution generating technique: harvey For example exact soln is:

$$\phi = \lambda(1 - P); \quad A = \frac{-i}{\theta} \left(\sqrt{\frac{N+1}{N+2}} - 1 \right) a^{\dagger}.$$

◇ The above analysis can be extended to any 2d + 1 dimensions. Interestingly we can look at the possibility in 3 + 1 dimensions where noncommutativity is limited to x - y planetry.



The exact solutions can be obtained by solution generating technique: harvey For example exact soln is:

$$\phi = \lambda(1 - P); \quad A = \frac{-i}{\theta} \left(\sqrt{\frac{N+1}{N+2}} - 1 \right) a^{\dagger}.$$

- ◇ The above analysis can be extended to any 2d + 1 dimensions. Interestingly we can look at the possibility in 3 + 1 dimensions where noncommutativity is limited to x y planetrg.
- Consider the action:

$$\mathcal{S} = \int dt dz d^2 x \left((D\phi) * (D\phi)^{\dagger} + \lambda (\phi * \phi^{\dagger} - 1)^2 + \frac{1}{4} F * F \right).$$



◊ we will combine the kink solution along *z* axis and nc soliton in the *x* − *y* plane. In the $θ \longrightarrow ∞$ we minimise the energy functional:

$$\mathcal{E} = \int dz d^2 x \left((D\phi) * (D\phi)^{\dagger} + \theta \lambda (\phi * \phi^{\dagger} - 1)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (B * B) \right) \underbrace{}_{\mathbb{F}_{\phi}} \underbrace{}_{\mathbb{F}_{\phi$$

◊ we will combine the kink solution along *z* axis and nc soliton in the *x* − *y* plane. In the $θ \longrightarrow ∞$ we minimise the energy functional:

$$\mathcal{E} = \int dz d^2 x \left((D\phi) * (D\phi)^{\dagger} + \theta \lambda (\phi * \phi^{\dagger} - 1)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (B * B) \right) \overset{\text{stitute}}{\underset{\text{restruction}}{\overset{\text{stitute}}{\overset{stitute}}{\overset{stitute}}}}}}$$

18

♦ The solution for $\theta = \infty$ and gauge potential zero is:

 $\phi = a(P\phi_0(z) + iQ), P^2 = P, Q = 1 - P$

where $\phi_0(z)$ is the kink solution of 1+1 dimensional theory.

◊ we will combine the kink solution along *z* axis and nc soliton in the *x* − *y* plane. In the $θ \longrightarrow ∞$ we minimise the energy functional:

$$\mathcal{E} = \int dz d^2 x \left((D\phi) * (D\phi)^{\dagger} + \theta \lambda (\phi * \phi^{\dagger} - 1)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (B * B) \right)$$

♦ The solution for $\theta = \infty$ and gauge potential zero is:

 $\phi = a(P\phi_0(z) + iQ), P^2 = P, Q = 1 - P$

where $\phi_0(z)$ is the kink solution of 1+1 dimensional theory.

◇ The above solution leads to soliton mass characterised by the rank of the projector *P*. It has the correct behaviour at ∞. One can order by order in $\frac{1}{\theta}$ solve for the solutions for finite and large θ supervision of the second

◇ We can also get vortex like solution combining the 2+1 D vortex solution and the kink solution. To demonstrate this solution: let us define: $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} + \partial$. Then



 \diamond

◊ We can also get vortex like solution combining the 2+1 D vortex solution and the kink solution. To demonstrate this solution: let us define: $\mathcal{A} = A + \partial$. Then

$$\mathcal{A} = S \ a \ S^{\dagger}; \quad \phi = 2P \ -1$$



◊ We can also get vortex like solution combining the 2+1 D vortex solution and the kink solution. To demonstrate this solution: let us define: $\mathcal{A} = A + \partial$. Then

$$\mathcal{A} = S \ a \ S^{\dagger}; \quad \phi = 2P \ -1$$



◊ where

 \diamond

$$S^{\dagger} S = I; S S^{\dagger} = I - P$$

◊ We can also get vortex like solution combining the 2+1 D vortex solution and the kink solution. To demonstrate this solution: let us define: $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} + \partial$. Then

$$\mathcal{A} = S \ a \ S^{\dagger}; \quad \phi = 2P \ -1$$



◊ where

 \diamond

$$S^{\dagger} S = I; S S^{\dagger} = I - P$$

 \diamond For the case of $P = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ we have

 $S = \sum |n\rangle \langle n+1|$

♦ Since in Moyal plane in 3 + 1D the algebra is not homomorphic under Poincare group it will break the symmetry to a subgroup which leaves $\theta_{\mu\nu}$ invariant.



- ♦ Since in Moyal plane in 3 + 1D the algebra is not homomorphic under Poincare group it will break the symmetry to a subgroup which leaves $\theta_{\mu\nu}$ invariant.
- \diamond This is $SO(1,1) \otimes SO(2)$ and the conventional quantisation has this feature.



- ♦ Since in Moyal plane in 3 + 1D the algebra is not homomorphic under Poincare group it will break the symmetry to a subgroup which leaves $\theta_{\mu\nu}$ invariant.
- \diamond This is $SO(1,1)\otimes SO(2)$ and the conventional quantisation has this feature.
- ♦ More important when $\theta_{0i} \neq 0$ it is shown that perturbative Unitarity will be violated. The reason is the star product will bring higher time derivatives and this will have new modes of solutions. This can be avoided for light like noncommutativity! i.e $\theta_{\mu\nu}\theta^{\mu\nu} = 0$.



- ♦ Since in Moyal plane in 3 + 1D the algebra is not homomorphic under Poincare group it will break the symmetry to a subgroup which leaves $\theta_{\mu\nu}$ invariant.
- \diamond This is $SO(1,1)\otimes SO(2)$ and the conventional quantisation has this feature.
- ♦ More important when $\theta_{0i} \neq 0$ it is shown that perturbative Unitarity will be violated. The reason is the star product will bring higher time derivatives and this will have new modes of solutions. This can be avoided for light like noncommutativity! i.e $\theta_{\mu\nu}\theta^{\mu\nu} = 0$.
- But there is a way out for preserving Poincare symmetry in NC theories. Also Unitarity issue is more subtle than the above arguments.



 Fuzzy torus and sphere are more interesting examples of NC spaces with lot of applications. They appear naturally if we look for alternatives to lattice regularisation.



- Fuzzy torus and sphere are more interesting examples of NC spaces with lot of applications. They appear naturally if we look for alternatives to lattice regularisation.
- ◊ Fuzzy torus is defined by the unitary elements X and Y with the condition:

 $X Y = e^{i\theta} Y X$

These appear naturally in certain string theory compactifications, showing possibly the consistancy of these backgrounds.



- Fuzzy torus and sphere are more interesting examples of NC spaces with lot of applications. They appear naturally if we look for alternatives to lattice regularisation.
- ◊ Fuzzy torus is defined by the unitary elements X and Y with the condition:

 $X Y = e^{i\theta} Y X$

These appear naturally in certain string theory compactifications, showing possibly the consistancy of these backgrounds.

◇ The algebra has finite dimensional representations if θ is a root of unity. But for irrational multiples of 2π representations are infinite dimensional. For QFT's on torus one can consider these tori as regularisation.



◇ One can obtain commutatative algebra by appropriate limiting procedure. In addition the algebra with θ and $\frac{1}{\theta}$ are related by duality.


- ◇ One can obtain commutatative algebra by appropriate limiting procedure. In addition the algebra with θ and $\frac{1}{\theta}$ are related by duality.
- ◇ Another interesting algebra is discretisation for S^2 obtained from the condition: $\sum x_i^2 = R^2$. Commutative algebra of functions on S^2 are obtained by homogeneous polynomials of x_i with the above condition. Fuzzy spheres S_F^2 are obtained by:

$$[x_i, x_j] = i\theta \epsilon_{ijk} x_k$$

and the condition as above.



♦ Using the representation theory of SU(2) one can consider field theory on S_F^2 as regularised version of continuum theory. This has the major advantage of consitently having full SU(2) symmetry at the regularised level. In addition it nicely avoids Fermion doubling problem by naturally incorporating Ginsparg-Wilson mechanism.



- ♦ Using the representation theory of SU(2) one can consider field theory on S_F^2 as regularised version of continuum theory. This has the major advantage of consitently having full SU(2) symmetry at the regularised level. In addition it nicely avoids Fermion doubling problem by naturally incorporating Ginsparg-Wilson mechanism.
- Fuzzy spheres have nice limits to sphere, plane and Moyal plane. Analytical and numerical studies have been done extensively on these and explicite demonstration of existance of three phases, viz., ordered, disordered and nonuniform phases have been done.



 $\mathbf{23}$

- ♦ Using the representation theory of SU(2) one can consider field theory on S_F^2 as regularised version of continuum theory. This has the major advantage of consitently having full SU(2) symmetry at the regularised level. In addition it nicely avoids Fermion doubling problem by naturally incorporating Ginsparg-Wilson mechanism.
- Fuzzy spheres have nice limits to sphere, plane and Moyal plane. Analytical and numerical studies have been done extensively on these and explicite demonstration of existance of three phases, viz., ordered, disordered and nonuniform phases have been done.
- \diamond In addition QFT's on $S_F^2 \otimes R_1$ exhibit solitons too_{vaidya}.



 $\mathbf{23}$

Fuzzy sphere,...

 \diamond The action for scalar field on Fuzzy sphere S_F^2 is

$$S(\Phi) = \frac{4\pi}{N} \operatorname{Tr} \left[\Phi \left[L_i, \left[L_i, \Phi \right] \right] + R^2 \left(r \Phi^2 + \lambda \Phi^4 \right) \right].$$





Fuzzy sphere,...

 $_{\diamond}$ The action for scalar field on Fuzzy sphere S_{F}^{2} is

 $S(\Phi) = \frac{4\pi}{N} \operatorname{Tr} \left[\Phi \left[L_i, \left[L_i, \Phi \right] \right] + R^2 \left(r \Phi^2 + \lambda \Phi^4 \right) \right].$

 The above is a matrix model and is amenable to simulations easily. The fields on fuzzy spaces are explicitly finite and do not have the IR/UV mixing vaidya,madore. But there is an anomaly in the finite case which reveals itself as generating the IR/UV mixing in the continuum.



Fuzzy sphere,...

 \diamond The action for scalar field on Fuzzy sphere S_F^2 is

 $S(\Phi) = \frac{4\pi}{N} \operatorname{Tr} \left[\Phi \left[L_i, \left[L_i, \Phi \right] \right] + R^2 \left(r \Phi^2 + \lambda \Phi^4 \right) \right].$

- The above is a matrix model and is amenable to simulations easily. The fields on fuzzy spaces are explicitly finite and do not have the IR/UV mixing vaidya,madore. But there is an anomaly in the finite case which reveals itself as generating the IR/UV mixing in the continuum.
- There is lot of confusion about taking the limit of continuum in these models and it has been pointed out various possibilities do exist.



QFT on Fuzzy sphere-Phase structure.

 \diamond We have the conventional ordered and disordered phases characterized by $\langle \Phi \rangle \propto I$ or 0.



QFT on Fuzzy sphere-Phase structure.

- \diamond We have the conventional ordered and disordered phases characterized by $\langle\Phi\rangle\propto I$ or 0.
- \diamond We find appearance of new phase called nonuniform phase where $\langle Tr\Phi \rangle = 0$.



QFT on Fuzzy sphere-Phase structure.

- \diamond We have the conventional ordered and disordered phases characterized by $\langle\Phi\rangle\propto I$ or 0.
- \diamond We find appearance of new phase called nonuniform phase where $\langle Tr\Phi \rangle = 0$.
- ◇ The phase diagram is shown below_{crdas,digal,trg}.





Fuzzy CP²

◇ The fuzzy sphere can be generalised to other coadjoint orbits like CP² Infact any CPⁿ can be fuzzified using the naturally defined symplectic structure of these spaces.



Fuzzy CP²

- ◇ The fuzzy sphere can be generalised to other coadjoint orbits like CP² Infact any CPⁿ can be fuzzified using the naturally defined symplectic structure of these spaces.
- These fuzzy spaces have all been put to use for characterising quantum hall droplets as well as higher dimensional QH statesnair etal.,.



Fuzzy CP²

- ◇ The fuzzy sphere can be generalised to other coadjoint orbits like CP² Infact any CPⁿ can be fuzzified using the naturally defined symplectic structure of these spaces.
- These fuzzy spaces have all been put to use for characterising quantum hall droplets as well as higher dimensional QH statesnair etal.,.



