

Ward identity in noncommutative QED

T. Mariz ^{*}, C. A. de S. Pires [†], and R. F. Ribeiro [‡]

Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, Caixa Postal 5008, 58051-970, João Pessoa PB, Brazil.
(April 30, 2019)

Although noncommutative QED presents a nonabelian structure, it does not present structure constants. In view of this we investigate how Ward identity is satisfied in pair annihilation process and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ scattering in noncommutative QED.

arXiv:hep-ph/0211416v2 28 Nov 2002

^{*}E-mail address: tiago@fisica.ufpb.br

[†]E-mail:cpires@fisica.ufpb.br

[‡]E-mail address: rfreire@fisica.ufpb.br

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1947 Snyder perceived that the introduction of a smallest unit of length in space-time forces the drop of the usual assumption of commutativity among the space-time coordinates [1]. Behind such idea was the attempt of solving divergence in matter-field interactions. The idea received few attention until 1999 when new developments in string theory revealed that noncommutative space-time is realized in string theory when open string propagates in the presence of constant background antisymmetric tensor field [2,3]. Motivated by such theoretical achievement the idea was soon extended to quantum field theory [4]. In noncommutative quantum field theory (NCQFT) much attention has been devoted to noncommutative QED (NCQED) [5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14]. The reason for this is found in the structure and in the questions raised in the NCQED. Even though NCQED is a gauge theory based on the symmetry $U(1)_{em}$, its structure presents a nonabelian character [4]. As a direct consequence of the noncommutativity among space-time coordinates, the theory is no longer Lorentz invariant [9] neither respect unitarity if time does not commute with space [10]. Other novelty is that there appears a connection among ultraviolet and infrared divergences [6,7,8,9,10].

From the phenomenological point of view, much attention has been given to the nonabelian character of NCQED [15,16,17]. It is well known that the unique interaction in ordinary QED is the current interaction. In NCQED this interaction changes by a momentum-dependent phase factor. Besides, it now disposes of 3 and 4 point interactions giving rise to the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ scattering at tree level [17]. Due to these changes, a re-analysis of all the basic processes in NCQED appears to be necessary [15,17]. In this regard, particular attention has been given to the processes $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ [17]. The reason for this is that the first process receives a new contribution and the other exist only due to the nonabelian character of NCQED.

In the works [15,17] attention has been called to the validity of the Ward identity. Differently from ordinary QED, where Ward identity is straightforward, in NCQED some care has to be taken due to the nonabelian structure of the theory. We think this is sufficient reason for a detailed analysis, and for an explicit checking of the Ward identity for the $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ processes.

The aim of this work is to check how the Ward identity comes about at tree level in NCQED in both processes $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ [18]. For pedagogical reasons we make analogy with QCD. In QCD the structure constants play crucial role in getting the Ward identity in $gg \rightarrow gg$ scattering. It is the Jacobi identity among the structure constants of the $SU(3)_C$ group that assures the Ward identity. Although NCQED presents a nonabelian structure it does not present a group structure, hence there are no structure constants. There in place of the structure constants we have momentum-dependent phase factors. Our main question here is if those phase factors will play the role of the structure constants through some equivalent Jacobi identity.

To achieve these goals, we organize this work in the following way. In Sec. II we begin discussing about the main aspects of NCQED, and after in Sec. III we check the validity of Ward identity in the pair annihilation process. In Sec. IV we check the identity in the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ scattering. We end our work in Sec. V where we introduce some comments and remarks.

II. NONCOMMUTATIVE QED

The idea behind noncommutative space-time is that in some very microscopic regime our common understanding of space-time is not applicable anymore. Such regime is marked by a patch of area θ where space-time loses its condition of continuum and passes to obey the relation

$$[\hat{x}_\mu, \hat{x}_\nu] = i\theta_{\mu\nu}, \quad (1)$$

where $\theta_{\mu\nu}$ is a real antisymmetric constant matrix. In the original idea $\theta_{\mu\nu}$ was an operator and then Lorentz invariance was preserved. Here $\theta_{\mu\nu}$ is an ordinary area. This gives a preferential direction to space-time thus leading to violation of Lorentz invariance.

One way of implementing noncommutative coordinates in the context of field theory is through the Moyal product [2]

$$A(x) \star B(x) \equiv [e^{(i/2)\theta_{\mu\nu}\partial_{c\mu}\partial_{\eta\nu}} A(x + \zeta)B(x + \eta)]_{\zeta=\eta=0}. \quad (2)$$

The procedure with noncommutative coordinates goes like this. First the Lagrangian is formulated in terms of star \star product. After we must change the \star product by the Moyal expansion in (2) in order to leave the Lagrangian in terms of ordinary product.

In gauge theory first thing to do is to express the gauge transformation in terms of \star products

$$A_\mu \rightarrow U \star A_\mu \star U^{-1} + \frac{i}{g} U \star \partial_\mu U^{-1}. \quad (3)$$

In the case of NCQED the gauge symmetry is $U = e^{i\alpha q}$. With this symmetry the gauge invariance of the photon takes the form

$$A_\mu \rightarrow A_\mu + \partial_\mu \alpha + 2 \sin(p_1 \theta p_2 / 2) A_\mu \alpha. \quad (4)$$

Perceive that such transformation is similar to a nonabelian one. As immediate consequence the tensor $F^{\mu\nu}$ must change in order to the action of the NCQED preserves the gauge invariance

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu - ig[A_\mu, A_\nu]_\star = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu - ig(A_\mu \star A_\nu - A_\nu \star A_\mu). \quad (5)$$

Applying the Moyal product, the tensor above takes the form

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu + 2g \sin(p_1 \theta p_2 / 2) A_\mu A_\nu, \quad (6)$$

and this leads us to conclude that the nonabelian character of NCQED is a pure geometric effect.

In terms of ordinary product, the NCQED presents the following action

$$S = \int d^4x \left(-\frac{1}{4\pi} F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} + \bar{\psi} i \not{\partial} \psi - g e^{ip_1 \theta p_2 / 2} \bar{\psi} \not{A} \psi - m \bar{\psi} \psi \right). \quad (7)$$

The Feynman rules drew from this action are displayed in FIG. (1).

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Diagram 1: } \begin{array}{l} p_1 \\ \swarrow \\ \text{---} \mu \\ \searrow \\ p_2 \end{array} = ig \gamma^\mu \exp(ip_1 \theta p_2 / 2) \\
& \text{Diagram 2: } \begin{array}{l} \nu \\ \swarrow \\ p_2 \\ \text{---} \mu \\ \searrow \\ p_3 \\ \rho \end{array} = 2g \sin(p_1 \theta p_2 / 2) [(p_1 - p_2)^\rho g^{\mu\nu} + \\
& \quad (p_2 - p_3)^\mu g^{\nu\rho} + (p_3 - p_1)^\nu g^{\mu\rho}] \\
& \text{Diagram 3: } \begin{array}{l} \mu \quad p_1 \quad p_3 \quad \rho \\ \text{---} \quad \text{---} \quad \text{---} \quad \text{---} \\ \text{---} \quad \text{---} \quad \text{---} \quad \text{---} \\ \nu \quad p_2 \quad p_4 \quad \sigma \end{array} = 4ig^2 [(g^{\mu\sigma} g^{\nu\rho} - g^{\mu\rho} g^{\nu\sigma}) \sin(p_1 \theta p_2 / 2) \sin(p_3 \theta p_4 / 2) \\
& \quad + (g^{\mu\rho} g^{\nu\sigma} - g^{\mu\nu} g^{\rho\sigma}) \sin(p_3 \theta p_1 / 2) \sin(p_2 \theta p_4 / 2) \\
& \quad + (g^{\mu\nu} g^{\rho\sigma} - g^{\mu\sigma} g^{\nu\rho}) \sin(p_1 \theta p_4 / 2) \sin(p_2 \theta p_3 / 2)]
\end{aligned}$$

FIG. 1. Feynman rules of NCQED.

III. WARD IDENTITY IN PAIR ANNIHILATION PROCESS

In NCQED the $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ process gains a new contribution due to the 3 point interaction among the photons displayed in FIG. (2). The central issue of this section is to see how Ward identity is satisfied in this process in view of the new contribution.




FIG. 2. The three tree level contributions to $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ in NCQED.

The total amplitude for the $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ process contains three contributions

$$i\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu} \epsilon_\mu^*(k_1) \epsilon_\nu^*(k_2) = i\mathcal{M}_1^{\mu\nu} \epsilon_\mu^*(k_1) \epsilon_\nu^*(k_2) + i\mathcal{M}_2^{\mu\nu} \epsilon_\mu^*(k_1) \epsilon_\nu^*(k_2) + i\mathcal{M}_3^{\mu\nu} \epsilon_\mu^*(k_1) \epsilon_\nu^*(k_2). \quad (8)$$

According to the Feynman rules in FIG. (1), the first two invariant amplitudes take the following form

$$\begin{aligned} i\mathcal{M}_{1,2}^{\mu\nu} \epsilon_\mu^*(k_1) \epsilon_\nu^*(k_2) &= i\mathcal{M}_1^{\mu\nu} \epsilon_\mu^*(k_1) \epsilon_\nu^*(k_2) + i\mathcal{M}_2^{\mu\nu} \epsilon_\mu^*(k_1) \epsilon_\nu^*(k_2) = \\ &(ig)^2 \bar{v}(p_2) \gamma^\mu e^{ip_1\theta(p_2-k_2)/2} \frac{i}{\not{p}_2 - \not{k}_2 - m} \gamma^\nu e^{ip_2\theta(p_2-k_2)/2} u(p_1) \epsilon_\mu^*(k_1) \epsilon_\nu^*(k_2) \\ &+ (ig)^2 \bar{v}(p_2) \gamma^\nu e^{ip_2\theta(k_2-p_1)/2} \frac{i}{\not{k}_2 - \not{p}_1 - m} \gamma^\mu e^{ip_1\theta(k_2-p_1)/2} u(p_1) \epsilon_\mu^*(k_1) \epsilon_\nu^*(k_2). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Differently from QED we need some assumptions for the validity of the Ward identity. In choosing the photon of momentum k_2 we ought to assume that the other is on shell, $k_1^2 = 0$, and transverse, $\epsilon \cdot k_1 = 0$.

In replacing $\epsilon_\nu^*(k_2)$ by $k_{2\nu}$, eliminating k_2 by momentum conservation, and also making use of the Dirac equations $(\not{p}_1 - m)u(p_1) = 0$, $\bar{v}(p_2)(-\not{p}_2 - m) = 0$, we are able to bring the contraction of the amplitude with the momentum k_2 to the following simple form

$$i\mathcal{M}_{1,2}^{\mu\nu} \epsilon_\mu^*(k_1) k_{2\nu} = 2g^2 e^{ip_1\theta p_2/2} \sin[(p_1 + p_2)\theta k_2/2] \bar{v}(p_2) \gamma^\mu u(p_1) \epsilon_\mu^*(k_1). \quad (10)$$

Let us now work out the third contribution. The amplitude of the third graphic in Fig. (2) is

$$\begin{aligned} i\mathcal{M}_3^{\mu\nu} \epsilon_\mu^*(k_1) \epsilon_\nu^*(k_2) &= ig \bar{v}(p_2) \gamma_\rho e^{ip_1\theta p_2/2} u(p_1) \frac{-i}{k_3^2} \epsilon_\mu^*(k_1) \epsilon_\nu^*(k_2) \\ &\times 2g \sin(k_2\theta k_1/2) [g^{\mu\nu} (k_2 - k_1)^\rho + g^{\nu\rho} (k_3 - k_2)^\mu + g^{\rho\mu} (k_1 - k_3)]. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

In replacing $\epsilon_\nu^*(k_2)$ by $k_{2\nu}$ and using the momentum conservation, $p_1 + p_2 = k_1 + k_2$, we obtain after some manipulation

$$i\mathcal{M}_3^{\mu\nu} \epsilon_\mu^*(k_1) k_{2\nu} = -2g^2 e^{ip_1\theta p_2/2} \sin[(p_1 + p_2)\theta k_2/2] \bar{v}(p_2) \gamma^\mu u(p_1) \epsilon_\mu^*(k_1). \quad (12)$$

From (10) and (12) we have that the Ward identity is satisfied

$$i\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu} \epsilon_\mu^*(k_1) k_{2\nu} = 0. \quad (13)$$

We think that this check is necessary once it is not trivial that the structure of the amplitudes in (9) and (11) leads to a cancellation when summed. It is interesting to see that the cancellation occurs without resort to any suppositions over the momentum-dependent phase factors.

IV. WARD IDENTITY IN $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ SCATTERING

It is very well known that photons do not carry any kind of charge. Then they do not present self interactions. This is no longer true in scenarios involving noncommutative space-time. In NCQED photons present 3 and 4 point interactions. This gives rise to $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ scattering at tree level. The analysis of such scattering has been carried out by many authors [17]. However the checking of the Ward identity of such scattering was not done yet. In those works the Ward identity is assumed to be valid. In view of this, it turns useful to check the Ward identity in $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ scattering in NCQED. Also we find interesting to make some analogy with QCD since there the structure constants play an important role, through the Jacobi identity, in getting the Ward identity in $gg \rightarrow gg$ scattering.




FIG. 3. The tree level contributions to $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ in NCQED.

The four contributions for the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ scattering is presented in FIG. (3). The first three graphics compose the channels s , t and u . The respective amplitudes are

$$\begin{aligned}
 i\mathcal{M}_s^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)\epsilon_\sigma^*(k_2) &= -4ig^2 \sin(p_1\theta p_2/2) \sin(k_1\theta k_2/2) \epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)\epsilon_\sigma^*(k_2) \\
 &\quad \times C^{\alpha\mu\nu}(-p_1, -p_2, q_1) \frac{g_{\alpha\beta}}{q_1^2} C^{\beta\rho\sigma}(-k_1, -k_2, q_1), \\
 i\mathcal{M}_t^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)\epsilon_\sigma^*(k_2) &= -ig^2 \sin(p_1\theta k_1/2) \sin(p_2\theta k_2/2) \epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)\epsilon_\sigma^*(k_2) \\
 &\quad \times C^{\mu\alpha\rho}(q_2, k_1, -p_1) \frac{g_{\alpha\beta}}{q_2^2} C^{\sigma\nu\beta}(p_2, q_2, -k_2), \\
 i\mathcal{M}_u^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)\epsilon_\sigma^*(k_2) &= -ig^2 \sin(p_1\theta k_2/2) \sin(p_2\theta k_1/2) \epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)\epsilon_\sigma^*(k_2) \\
 &\quad \times C^{\mu\alpha\sigma}(q_3, k_2, -p_1) \frac{g_{\alpha\beta}}{q_3^2} C^{\rho\nu\beta}(p_2, q_3, -k_1),
 \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where

$$C^{\theta\phi\gamma}(P_1, P_2, P_3) = (P_1 - P_2)^\theta g^{\phi\gamma} + (P_2 - P_3)^\phi g^{\gamma\theta} + (P_3 - P_1)^\gamma g^{\theta\phi}. \tag{15}$$

To go further we choose one photon for the checking. Let us take the photon of momentum k_2 , and then suppose that all the other three are transverses, $\epsilon(k_1) \cdot k_1 = \epsilon(p_1) \cdot p_1 = \epsilon(p_2) \cdot p_2 = 0$ and on shell, $p_1^2 = 0$, $p_2^2 = 0$, $k_1^2 = 0$. After this we replace $\epsilon_\sigma(k_2)$ by $k_{2\sigma}$ in the above amplitudes. First thing to note here is that

$$\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)k_{2\sigma}C^{\beta\rho\sigma}(-k_1, -k_2, q_1) = \epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)(q_1^2 g^{\rho\beta} - q_1^\beta q_1^\rho),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_\nu(p_2)k_{2\sigma}C^{\sigma\nu\beta}(p_2, q_2, -k_2) &= -\epsilon_\nu(p_2)(q_2^2g^{\nu\beta} - q_2^\beta q_2^\nu), \\
\epsilon_\mu(p_1)k_{2\sigma}C^{\mu\alpha\sigma}(q_3, k_2, -p_1) &= \epsilon_\mu(p_1)(q_3^2g^{\mu\alpha} - q_3^\mu q_3^\alpha).
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Substituting (16) in (14) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
i\mathcal{M}_s^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)k_{2\sigma} &= -4ig^2\sin(p_1\theta p_2/2)\sin(k_1\theta k_2/2)\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1) \\
&\quad \times g_{\alpha\beta}(g^{\rho\beta} - \frac{q_1^\beta q_1^\rho}{q_1^2})C^{\alpha\mu\nu}(-p_1, -p_2, q_1), \\
i\mathcal{M}_t^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)k_{2\sigma} &= 4ig^2\sin(p_1\theta k_1/2)\sin(p_2\theta k_2/2)\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1) \\
&\quad \times g_{\alpha\beta}(g^{\nu\beta} - \frac{q_2^\beta q_2^\nu}{q_2^2})C^{\mu\alpha\rho}(q_2, k_1, -p_1), \\
i\mathcal{M}_u^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)k_{2\sigma} &= -4ig^2\sin(p_1\theta k_2/2)\sin(p_2\theta k_1/2)\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1) \\
&\quad \times g_{\alpha\beta}(g^{\mu\alpha} - \frac{q_3^\mu q_3^\alpha}{q_3^2})C^{\rho\nu\beta}(p_2, q_3, -k_1),
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

The following products vanish:

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)g_{\alpha\beta}q_1^\rho q_1^\beta C^{\alpha\mu\nu}(-p_1, -p_2, q_1) &= 0, \\
\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)g_{\alpha\beta}q_2^\nu q_2^\beta C^{\mu\alpha\rho}(q_2, k_1, -p_1) &= 0, \\
\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)g_{\alpha\beta}q_3^\mu q_3^\alpha C^{\rho\nu\beta}(p_2, q_3, -k_1) &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

With this the amplitudes in (17) take the following expressions

$$\begin{aligned}
i\mathcal{M}_s^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)k_{2\sigma} &= -4ig^2\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)\sin(p_1\theta p_2/2)\sin(k_1\theta k_2/2)C^{\rho\mu\nu}(-p_1, -p_2, q_1), \\
i\mathcal{M}_t^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)k_{2\sigma} &= 4ig^2\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)\sin(p_1\theta k_1/2)\sin(p_2\theta k_2/2)C^{\mu\nu\rho}(q_2, k_1, -p_1), \\
i\mathcal{M}_u^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)k_{2\sigma} &= -4ig^2\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)\sin(p_1\theta k_2/2)\sin(p_2\theta k_1/2)C^{\rho\nu\mu}(p_2, q_3, -k_1).
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Now let us consider the fourth contribution. According to the Feynman rules in FIG. (3), the invariant amplitude for such contribution takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}
i\mathcal{M}_c^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)\epsilon_\sigma(k_2) &= 4ig^2\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)\epsilon_\sigma(k_2) \\
&\quad \times [\sin(p_1\theta p_2/2)\sin(k_1\theta k_2/2)(g^{\sigma\nu}g^{\mu\rho} - g^{\sigma\mu}g^{\rho\nu}) \\
&\quad + \sin(p_1\theta k_1/2)\sin(p_2\theta k_2/2)(g^{\sigma\rho}g^{\mu\nu} - g^{\sigma\mu}g^{\nu\rho}) \\
&\quad + \sin(p_1\theta k_2/2)\sin(p_2\theta k_1/2)(g^{\sigma\rho}g^{\mu\nu} - g^{\sigma\nu}g^{\mu\rho})].
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Replacing $\epsilon_\sigma(k_2)$ by $k_{2\sigma}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
i\mathcal{M}_c^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)k_{2\sigma} &= 4ig^2\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1) \\
&\quad \times [\sin(p_1\theta p_2/2)\sin(k_1\theta k_2/2)(k_{2\nu}g^{\mu\rho} - k_{2\nu}g^{\rho\nu}) \\
&\quad + \sin(p_1\theta k_1/2)\sin(p_2\theta k_2/2)(k_{2\rho}g^{\mu\nu} - k_{2\mu}g^{\nu\rho}) \\
&\quad + \sin(p_1\theta k_2/2)\sin(p_2\theta k_1/2)(k_{2\rho}g^{\mu\nu} - k_{2\nu}g^{\mu\rho})].
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Now we have to sum the four contributions. Using momentum conservation, we can eliminate q_1 , q_2 and q_3 in favor of p_1 , p_2 , k_1 and k_2 . Then after some manipulation we are able to write the total amplitude in the following simple form

$$i\mathcal{M}_{total}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)k_{2\sigma} = -4ig^2\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)C^{\rho\mu\nu}(-p_1, -p_2, k_1) \\ \times (\sin(p_1\theta p_2/2)\sin(k_1\theta k_2/2) + \sin(k_1\theta p_1/2)\sin(p_2\theta k_2/2) + \sin(p_1\theta k_2/2)\sin(p_2\theta k_1/2)). \quad (22)$$

It will be very instructive if we consider in this point of our checking the Ward identity in the $gg \rightarrow gg$ scattering in QCD. This scattering is very similar to our scattering above both in number of contributions and in their Feynman rules. However there is the subtle difference that gluons carry color. The Feynman rules used here can be found, for instance, in [19]. Making the same assumptions and taking the same steps as done in the case of NCQED above, and also making the same distribution of momenta and polarization vectors for the four external gluons, we get the following expression for the contraction of the momentum $k_{2\sigma}$ with the total amplitude of the scattering

$$i\mathcal{M}_{QCD}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)k_{2\sigma} = -ig^2\epsilon_\nu(p_1)\epsilon_\mu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)C^{\rho\mu\nu}(-p_1, -p_2, k_1) \\ \times (f^{abc}f^{cfg} + f^{gac}f^{cfb} + f^{fac}f^{cbg}). \quad (23)$$

We can see from (23) that it is the Jacobi identity

$$f^{abc}f^{cfg} + f^{gac}f^{cfb} + f^{fac}f^{cbg} = 0, \quad (24)$$

that guarantees the Ward identity

$$i\mathcal{M}_{QCD}^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\epsilon_\mu(p_1)\epsilon_\nu(p_2)\epsilon_\rho^*(k_1)k_{2\sigma} = 0. \quad (25)$$

This express how important are the structure constants, through the Jacobi identity, in getting the Ward identity in QCD.

It is interesting to see if the momentum-dependent phase factors engender an analogous identity. To see that this in fact happens we notice that the expression in (22) goes to zero if and only if

$$\sin(p_1\theta p_2/2)\sin(k_1\theta k_2/2) + \sin(k_1\theta p_1/2)\sin(p_2\theta k_2/2) + \sin(p_1\theta k_2/2)\sin(p_2\theta k_1/2) = 0. \quad (26)$$

Let us suppose that this is really true. Then we can map the structure constants of QCD in the moment-dependent phase factors of NCQED as follows

$$f^{abc} \leftrightarrow 2\sin(p_1\theta p_2/2) \quad , \quad f^{cfg} \leftrightarrow 2\sin(k_1\theta k_2/2), \\ f^{fac} \leftrightarrow 2\sin(p_1\theta k_2/2) \quad , \quad f^{cbg} \leftrightarrow 2\sin(p_2\theta k_1/2), \\ f^{gac} \leftrightarrow 2\sin(k_1\theta p_1/2) \quad , \quad f^{cbf} \leftrightarrow 2\sin(k_2\theta p_2/2). \quad (27)$$

The antisymmetry among two indices of the structure constant f^{abc} is equivalent to the antisymmetry among the two indices of $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ which translates in the property

$$\sin(p\theta q/2) = -\sin(q\theta p/2). \quad (28)$$

For checking that such mapping really works, we notice that in substituting all the momentum-dependent phase factors by the structure constants in the calculations of the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ scattering, we reproduce all the steps of the $gg \rightarrow gg$ scattering in QCD. The usefulness of this mapping is that, with some care, we can obtain the amplitude for any process in NCQED from its similar amplitude in QCD, or vice-versa. For example, we could soon arrive in (23) from (22) through the mapping suggested above.

Let us show that in fact (26) vanishes. For this we make use of the momentum conservation $p_1 + p_2 = k_1 + k_2$ for eliminating k_2 in favor of the other momenta. Doing this and using (28), we have that

$$\sin(k_1\theta k_2/2) = \sin(k_1\theta p_1/2)\cos(p_2\theta k_1/2) - \cos(p_1\theta k_1/2)\sin(p_2\theta k_1/2), \\ \sin(p_2\theta k_2/2) = -\sin(p_1\theta p_2/2)\cos(p_2\theta k_1/2) - \cos(p_1\theta p_2/2)\sin(p_2\theta k_1/2), \\ \sin(p_2\theta k_1/2) = \sin(p_1\theta p_2/2)\cos(p_1\theta k_1/2) + \cos(p_1\theta p_2/2)\sin(k_1\theta p_1/2). \quad (29)$$

Substituting (29) in (26) we easily see that (26) is really true. Then like the structure constants in QCD, the momentum-dependent phase factors in NCQED are crucials in the validity of the Ward identity.

V. FINAL REMARKS

In this work we checked the Ward identity in pair annihilation process and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ scattering in the context of NCQED. As expected, in both processes the Ward identity is satisfied. We emphasize that our check is general, valid for $\theta^{\mu\nu}$ arbitrary.

In regard to the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ scattering, we found a kind of identity among the momentum-dependent phase factors which played a role similar to the Jacobi identity in QCD. Due to those similarities we have been able to make a mapping among QCD and NCQED. With such mapping we can write all the Feynman rules and also invariant amplitudes in NCQED from similar processes in QCD. Finally

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank D. Bazeia for encouragement, and for reading of the manuscript. The work of T.M. is supported by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico(CNPq).

APPENDIX: WARD IDENTITY

The Ward identity is a constraint that appears in processes that present external photons. In those processes the invariant amplitude takes the form

$$\mathcal{M} = \epsilon_\alpha(k_1)\epsilon_\beta(k_2)\cdots\mathcal{M}^{\alpha\beta\cdots}(k_1, k_2, \cdots). \quad (\text{A1})$$

The Ward identity states that for all the external photons we must have

$$k_{1\alpha}\mathcal{M}^{\alpha\beta\cdots} = k_{2\beta}\mathcal{M}^{\alpha\beta\cdots} = \cdots = 0. \quad (\text{A2})$$

There are other ways of stating the Ward identity, as for example in terms of renormalization factors. Since we restrict our analysis to tree level processes, the above statement is more useful for us. In practical terms (A2) demands the on shell photons to be transverse. For sake of completeness we present a short demonstration of (A2).

Ward identity is strictly connected to gauge invariance. In ordinary QED the gauge field transforms as

$$A_\mu \rightarrow A_\mu + \partial_\mu\alpha. \quad (\text{A3})$$

We can describe the gauge field, in a Lorentz gauge, by the following plane wave

$$A_\mu \sim \epsilon_\mu(k)e^{\pm ik\cdot x}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Taking $\alpha \sim \tilde{\alpha}(k)e^{\pm ik\cdot x}$ the gauge invariance in (A3) translates in the following transformation of the polarization vector

$$\epsilon_\mu(k) \rightarrow \epsilon_\mu(k) \pm k_\mu\tilde{\alpha}(k). \quad (\text{A5})$$

In view of this transformation for the polarization vectors the invariance of the amplitude \mathcal{M} in (A1) leads to the constraint in (A2). The procedure in nonabelian symmetry is similar.

- [1] H. S. Snyder, Phys. Rep. **71**, 38 (1947).
- [2] A. Connes, J. High Energy Phys. **9802**, 003 (1998).
- [3] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, J. High Energy Phys. **9909**, 032 (1999).
- [4] M. R. Douglas and N. A. Nekrasov, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 977 (2001).
- [5] M. V. Raamsdonk and N. Seiberg, J. High Energy Phys. **03**, 035 (2000), H. Grosse, C. Klimcik, and P. Presnajder, Commun. Math. Phys., 180, 429 (1996) , I. ya. Aref'eva, D. M. Belov and A. S. Koshelev, Phys. Lett. B **476**, 431 (2000).
- [6] Ihab. F. Riad and M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari, J. High Energy Phys. **08**, 045 (2000).

- [7] M. Hayakama, Phys. Lett. B **478**, 394 (2000).
- [8] A. Matusis, L. Susskind and N. Toumbas, J. High Energy Phys. **0012**, 002 (2000).
- [9] S. M. Carroll, J. A. Harvey, V. A. Kostelecky, C. D. Lane and T. Okamoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 141601 (2001).
- [10] Gomis and T. Mehen, Nucl. Phys. **B591**, 265 (2000); C-S Chu, J. Lukierski and W. J. Zakrzewski, Nucl. Phys. **B632**, 219 (2002); Y. Liao and K. Sibold Eur. Phys. J. C **25**, 479 (2002).
- [11] F. T. Brandt, J. Frenkel and D. G. C. McKeon, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 125029 (2002), F. T. Brandt, Ashok Das and J. Frenkel, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 085017 (2002.)
- [12] T. Krajewski and R. Wulkenhaar, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **15**, 1011 (2000), A. Armoni, Nucl. Phys. **B593**, 229 (2001); F. T. Brandt, Ashok Das, J. Frenke, D. G. C. McKeon and J. C. Taylor, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 045011 (2002).
- [13] For an incomplete list of works on NCQFT see: T. Filk, Phys. Lett. B **376**, 53 (1996); I. Mociou, M. Pospelov and R. Roiban, Phys. Lett. B **489**, 390 (2000); H. O. Girotti, M. Gomes, V. O. Rivelles and A. J. da Silva, Nucl. Phys. **B587**, 299 (2000); M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5265 (200); L. Alvarez-Gaumé and S. Wadia, Phys. Lett. B **501**, 319 (2001); C. P. Martin and F. Ruiz, Nucl. Phys. **B597**, 197 (2001); C. E. Carlson, C. D. Carone and R.F. Lebed, Phys. Lett. B **518**, 201 (2001); A. Bichl, J. Grimstrup, H. Grosse, L. Popp, M. Schweda and R. Wulkenhaar J. High Energy Phys. **0106**, 013 (2001); Z. Guralnik, R. Jackiw, S.Y. Pi and A. P. Polychronakos, Phys. Lett. B **517**, 450 (2001); J. Gamboa, M. Loewe and J. C. Rojas, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 067901 (2001); C. E. Carlson, C. D. Carone and N. Zobin, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 075001-1 (2002); P-M Ho and H-C Kao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 151602-1 (2002); H. Falomir, J. Gamboa, M. Loewe, F. Mendez and J. C. Rojas, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 045018-1 (2002); M. Lubo, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 066003 (2002); H. O. Girotti, M. Gomes, A. Y. Petrov, V. O. Rivelles and A. J. da Silva, hep-th/0207220 ; K. Morita, hep-th/0209234; C. E. Carlson and C. D. Carone, hep-ph/0209077; C. P. Martin, hep-th/0211164.
- [14] For an excelente review on the subject see: I. Hinchliffe and N. Kersting, hep-ph/0205040.
- [15] P. Mathews, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 075007-1 (2001); T. Rizzo, hep-ph/0203240; S. Godfrey and M. A. Doncheski, hep-ph/0111147; A. Anisimov, T. Banks, M. Dine, and M. Graesser, H. Grosse and Y. Liao Phys. Rev. D **64**, 115007 (2001).
- [16] N. Chair, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, Phys. Lett. B **504**, 146 (2001).
- [17] J. L. Hewett, F. J. Petriello and T. G. Rizzo, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 075012 (2001), *ibid* Phys. Rev. D **64**, 075012 (2001), S. Godfrey, and M. A. Doncheski, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 015005 (2002), S-W Baek, D. K. Ghosh, X-G He and W.Y.P. Hwang, PRD **64** 056001 2001 . N. Mahajan, hep-ph/0110148.
- [18] The works [6] and [11] have checked the Ward identity at loop level for two point functions.
- [19] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory (Addison-Wesley, 1995).