

Geometry of the Dirac and Reduced Phase Space Quantization of Systems Subject to First Class Constraints

A.O.Barvinsky

*Theory Department, Lebedev Physics Institute and Lebedev Research Center in Physics,
Leninsky Prospekt 53, Moscow 117924, Russia*

Abstract

Geometric properties of operators of quantum Dirac constraints and physical observables are studied in semiclassical theory of generic constrained systems. The invariance transformations of the classical theory – contact canonical transformations and arbitrary changes of constraint basis – are promoted to the quantum domain as unitary equivalence transformations. Geometry of the quantum reduction of the Dirac formalism to the physical sector of the theory is presented in the coordinate gauges and extended to unitary momentum-dependent gauges of a general type. The operators of physical observables are constructed satisfying one-loop quantum gauge invariance and Hermiticity with respect to a physical inner product. Abelianization procedure on Lagrangian constraint surfaces of phase space is discussed in the framework of the semiclassical expansion.

1. Introduction

In this paper we discuss geometric properties of the quantum dynamical systems subject to first class constraints [1, 2, 3]. An importance of this problem arises in view of the growing interest in quantization of the so-called zero modes or moduli in various contexts of high energy physics ranging from theory of gauge fields to quantum cosmology and nonperturbative D-brane aspects of superstrings. In contrast with oscillatory degrees of freedom, quantization of these modes is impossible in a conventional Fock space but, rather, demands the coordinate representation of canonical commutation relations [4]. Quantum operators represented on configuration space of the theory as differential operators have interesting geometric properties with respect to diffeomorphisms of configuration space and group manifolds and, thus, deserve careful analysis for the purpose of consistency, uniqueness of quantization, and other subtle issues.

At the classical level systems subject to first class constraints are described by the canonical action of generic form [3]

$$S = \int dt \{p_i \dot{q}^i - H_0(q, p) - \lambda^\mu T_\mu(q, p)\} \quad (1.1)$$

in the configuration space of coordinates and momenta $(q, p) = (q^i, p_i)$ and Lagrange multipliers λ^μ . The variation of the latter leads to the set of nondynamical equations – constraints

$$T_\mu(q, p) = 0. \quad (1.2)$$

The first class constraint functions $T_\mu(q, p)$ and the Hamiltonian $H_0(q, p)$ satisfy the Poisson-bracket algebra

$$\{T_\mu, T_\nu\} = U_{\mu\nu}^\lambda T_\lambda, \quad (1.3)$$

$$\{H_0, T_\nu\} = U_{0\nu}^\lambda T_\lambda, \quad (1.4)$$

with the structure functions $U_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = U_{\mu\nu}^\lambda(q, p)$ and $U_{0\nu}^\lambda = U_{0\nu}^\lambda(q, p)$ which can generally depend on phase-space variables of the theory.

The first class constraints indicate that the theory possesses a local gauge invariance generated in the sector of phase-space variables by constraints themselves $T_\mu(q, p)$ and by certain transformations of Lagrange multipliers [3]. The dimensionality of the gauge group coincides with the dimensionality of the space of constraints, the both being enumerated by the gauge index μ . If we denote the range of index i by n , $i = 1, \dots, n$, and that of μ by m , $\mu = 1, \dots, m$, then the number of the physical dynamically independent degrees of freedom equals $n - m$: $2(n - m)$ physical phase-space variables originate from the initial $2n$ variables (q^i, p_i) by restricting to $(2n - m)$ -dimensional constraint surface (1.2) and then factoring on this surface out the action of m gauge transformations generated by T_μ .

Dirac quantization of the theory (1.1) consists in promoting initial phase-space variables and constraint functions to the operator level $(q, p, T_\mu) \rightarrow (\hat{q}, \hat{p}, \hat{T}_\mu)$ and selecting the physical states $|\Psi\rangle$ in the representation space of $(\hat{q}, \hat{p}, \hat{T}_\mu)$ by the equation

$$\hat{T}_\mu |\Psi\rangle = 0. \quad (1.5)$$

Operators (\hat{q}, \hat{p}) satisfy canonical commutation relations $[\hat{q}^k, \hat{p}_l] = i\hbar\delta_l^k$ and the quantum constraints \hat{T}_μ as operator functions of (\hat{q}, \hat{p}) should satisfy the correspondence principle with classical c -number constraints and be subject to the commutator algebra

$$[\hat{T}_\mu, \hat{T}_\nu] = i\hbar\hat{U}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda \hat{T}_\lambda. \quad (1.6)$$

with some operator structure functions $\hat{U}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ standing to the left of operator constraints. This algebra generalizes (1.3) to the quantum level and serves as integrability conditions for equations (1.5).

Classically the theory (1.1) and this reduction to its physical sector has two types of invariances: the invariance with respect to canonical transformations of the initial phase-space variables and the geometric invariance with respect to the transformations of the basis of constraints. The latter property means that one and the same constraint surface

(1.2) is determined not just by one specific choice of the set of constraint functions $T_\mu(q, p)$, but by the equivalence class of those differing from one another by linear recombinations

$$T'_\mu = \Omega^\nu_\mu T_\nu, \quad \Omega^\nu_\mu = \Omega^\nu_\mu(q, p), \quad \det \Omega^\nu_\mu \neq 0 \quad (1.7)$$

with arbitrary invertible matrix function of (q, p) acting in the vector space of gauge indices. A natural question arises whether these invariances can be preserved also in the Dirac quantization procedure?

The program of finding such quantum constraints for a generic constrained system has been partly implemented in [5] in the lowest nontrivial order of semiclassical expansion in \hbar . The symbols of operators $(\hat{T}_\mu, \hat{U}^\lambda_{\mu\nu})$ with linear in \hbar quantum corrections have been found and a partial answer was given to the question of the above type: the obtained operators turned out to be covariant with respect to contact canonical transformations of the initial phase space, provided the Dirac wavefunctions $\langle q | \Psi \rangle = \Psi(q)$ in the coordinate representation of commutation relations for (\hat{q}, \hat{p}) transform as 1/2-weight densities on the configuration-space manifold of q^i .

It turned out, however, that the operator algorithms for $(\hat{T}_\mu, \hat{U}^\lambda_{\mu\nu})$ involve not only their classical counterparts featuring in (1.3) but also the higher-order structure functions of the canonical gauge algebra [6, 7]. Generally the gauge algebra involves the whole hierarchy of structure functions and relations which begin with $T_\mu(q, p)$ and (1.3)

$$G = \{T_\mu, U^\alpha_{\mu\nu}, U^{\alpha\beta}_{\mu\nu\lambda}, \dots\} \quad (1.8)$$

and at any new stage iteratively build up as consistency conditions for those of the previous stages. For example, the cyclic Jacobi identity $\{T_\mu, \{T_\sigma, T_\lambda\}\} + \text{cycle}(\mu, \sigma, \lambda) = 0$ applied to 1.3 results in the equation

$$\{T_\mu, U^\alpha_{\sigma\lambda}\} + U^\beta_{\sigma\lambda} U^\alpha_{\mu\beta} + \text{cycle}(\mu, \sigma, \lambda) = U^{\alpha\beta}_{\mu\nu\lambda} T_\beta, \quad (1.9)$$

multiplied by T_α , necessarily generating a new structure function $U^{\alpha\beta}_{\mu\nu\lambda}$ antisymmetric in upper (and lower) indices [7]. For constraints forming the closed Lie algebra all higher-order structure functions are vanishing, but this property depends on the choice of basis of constraints: the rotation of the constraint basis (1.7) can convert the Lie algebra (even Abelian one with $U^\alpha_{\sigma\lambda} = 0$) into an open algebra with the infinite set of structure functions. Thus the invariance of the theory with respect to transformations of the form (1.7) with arbitrary Ω^μ_ν necessitates considering higher-order structure functions (1.8) and their operator realization $G \rightarrow \hat{G} = \{\hat{T}_\mu, \hat{U}^\alpha_{\mu\nu}, \hat{U}^{\alpha\beta}_{\mu\nu\lambda}, \dots\}$.

In this paper we show that the operators constructed in [5] really possess the expected properties of invariance with respect to the transformation of the constraint basis (1.7) – the result briefly reported earlier in [8]. Since we restrict ourselves with the one-loop (linear in \hbar) approximation, we shall focus at the covariance of only the Dirac constraints \hat{T}_μ and Dirac equations on physical states (1.5): the higher-order structure functions

will not be important for us because they are responsible for multi-loop orders of the semiclassical expansion.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sect.2 we extend the operator realization of quantum constraints of [5] to physical observables. Sect. 3 contains the proof of the covariance of equations (1.5), which induces the weight properties of Dirac wavefunctions in the space of gauge indices. These properties guarantee the unitary equivalence of quantum theories starting with different choices of constraint bases, equipped with a correct physical inner product. Sect. 4 gives the the fundamental two-point solution of quantum Dirac constraints explicitly featuring the weight properties of the above type. The reduction of this solution to physical sector is performed in Sect. 5, where this reduction (previously known only for a narrow class of *coordinate* gauges [13, 5, 8]) is extended to unitary gauges of general type. In Sect.6 we consider a number of other issues omitted in paper [5]: operator gauge independence of matrix elements of physical observables and their Hermitian conjugation properties in the physical inner product. The concluding section contains a brief discussion of possible applications of these results, while two appendices give a number of technical details regarding the Hermiticity of observables and an abelianization procedure for semiclassical constrained systems on Lagrangian manifolds of phase space.

2. Operator realization of quantum constraints and physical observables

The operator realization of quantum Dirac constraints and lowest order structure functions was found in [5] in the form of the normal qp -ordering of their qp -symbols expanded up to the linear order in \hbar . This representation implies that for any operator $\hat{G} = \{\hat{T}_\mu, \hat{U}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha, \hat{U}_{\mu\nu\lambda}^{\alpha\beta}, \dots\}$ one can put into correspondence its normal symbol – a c -number function on phase space $\tilde{G}(q, p)$ – such that the operator \hat{G} can be obtained from $\tilde{G}(q, p)$ by replacing its arguments with noncommuting operators with all the momenta standing to the right of coordinates. For a symbol expandable in momentum series

$$\tilde{G}(q, p) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{G}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(q) p_{i_1} \dots p_{i_n} \quad (2.1)$$

this means that

$$\hat{G} = \mathcal{N}_{qp} \tilde{G}(q, p) \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{G}^{i_1 \dots i_n}(\hat{q}) \hat{p}_{i_1} \dots \hat{p}_{i_n}. \quad (2.2)$$

The one-loop (linear in \hbar) algorithms of [5] for two lowest-order operators \hat{G} have the form

$$\hat{T}_\mu = \mathcal{N}_{qp} \left\{ T_\mu - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \frac{\partial^2 T_\mu}{\partial q^i \partial p_i} + \frac{i\hbar}{2} U_{\mu\nu}^\nu + O(\hbar^2) \right\}, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\hat{U}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \mathcal{N}_{qp} \left\{ U_{\mu\nu}^\lambda - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \frac{\partial^2 U_{\mu\nu}^\lambda}{\partial q^i \partial p_i} - \frac{i\hbar}{2} U_{\mu\nu\sigma}^{\lambda\sigma} + O(\hbar^2) \right\} \quad (2.4)$$

involving, as it was mentioned in Introduction, the higher-order classical structure functions $U_{\mu\nu\sigma}^{\lambda\sigma}$. As shown in [5], these operators have two important properties. First, they are covariant under contact canonical transformations of (q, p)

$$q^i = q^i(q'), \quad p_i = p_{k'} \frac{\partial q^{k'}}{\partial q^i}, \quad G(q, p) = G'(q', p'), \quad (2.5)$$

under which the constraints and structure functions (1.8) (all quantities bearing only gauge indices) behave like scalars. In the coordinate representation of canonical commutation relations the covariance of operators (2.3)-(2.4) can be written down as

$$\left| \frac{\partial q'}{\partial q} \right|^{-1/2} \hat{G} \left| \frac{\partial q'}{\partial q} \right|^{1/2} = \hat{G}', \quad (2.6)$$

where the operators \hat{G}' are constructed by the above algorithms from their primed classical counterparts. This transformation law obviously implies that the Dirac wavefunction satisfying quantum constraints (1.5) should be regarded a scalar density of 1/2-weight

$$\Psi(q) = \left| \frac{\partial q'}{\partial q} \right|^{1/2} \Psi'(q') \quad (2.7)$$

in complete correspondence with the diffeomorphism invariance of the *auxiliary* inner product of *unphysical* states

$$\langle \Psi_1 | \Psi_2 \rangle = \int dq \Psi_1^*(q) \Psi_2(q). \quad (2.8)$$

This inner product diverges for physical states satisfying quantum Dirac constraints and, therefore, plays only an auxiliary role. It appears as a truncated inner product in the bosonic sector of the extended configuration space of the BFV (BRST) quantization [7, 5, 9, 10, 11] and also will be used below (in Sect.6) for the construction of the *physical* inner product by means of a special operator measure.

The second important property of these operators with respect to the inner product (2.8) is their anti-Hermitian part. It is given by the trace of the structure functions and for Dirac constraints has the form

$$\hat{T}_\mu - \hat{T}_\mu^\dagger = i\hbar (\hat{U}_{\mu\lambda}^\lambda)^\dagger + O(\hbar^2). \quad (2.9)$$

The algorithms (2.3)-(2.4) were derived in [5] solely as a solution of the commutator algebra (1.6). This helps to extend these algorithms for obtaining another class of operators – the operators of physical observables. Classically the physical observables \mathcal{O}_I (enumerated by some index I) are defined as a functions on phase space, invariant under

the action of canonical gauge algebra. This invariance generally holds in a weak sense, that is only on the constraint surface

$$\{\mathcal{O}_I, T_\mu\} = U_{I\mu}^\lambda T_\lambda, \quad (2.10)$$

the gauge transformation of \mathcal{O}_I being a linear combination of constraints with some coefficients $U_{I\mu}^\lambda = U_{I\mu}^\lambda(q, p)$. ($H_0(q, p)$ and $U_{0\mu}^\lambda$ with eq.(1.4) present the example of such an observable and its weak invariance.) Note that again due to the rotation of the constraint basis (1.7) we have to consider nonvanishing coefficients $U_{I\mu}^\lambda$ which can always be generated even for strongly invariant observables by a transition to another basis of constraints.

In addition to their weak invariance (2.10) we shall assume that the classical observables *commute* with one another or form a *closed Lie* algebra in a weak sense

$$\{\mathcal{O}_I, \mathcal{O}_J\} = U_{IJ}^L \mathcal{O}_L + U_{IJ}^\lambda T_\lambda, \quad U_{IJ}^L = \text{const.} \quad (2.11)$$

In this case, from the viewpoint of commutator algebra the physical observables do not differ from constraints. The only difference is that unlike constraints they are not constrained to vanish. Therefore, to promote the classical observables to the quantum level, $(\mathcal{O}_I, U_{I\mu}^\lambda) \rightarrow (\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I, \hat{U}_{I\mu}^\lambda)$, and enforce the quantum gauge invariance of their operators

$$[\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I, \hat{T}_\mu] = i\hbar \hat{U}_{I\mu}^\lambda \hat{T}_\lambda, \quad (2.12)$$

one can use the algorithm analogous to (2.3) solving this commutator algebra

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I = \mathcal{N}_{qp} \left\{ \mathcal{O}_I - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{O}_I}{\partial q^i \partial p_i} + \frac{i\hbar}{2} U_{I\lambda}^\lambda + \frac{i\hbar}{2} U_{IJ}^J + O(\hbar^2) \right\}, \quad (2.13)$$

$$\hat{U}_{I\mu}^\lambda = \mathcal{N}_{qp} \left\{ U_{I\mu}^\lambda - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \frac{\partial^2 U_{I\mu}^\lambda}{\partial q^i \partial p_i} - \frac{i\hbar}{2} U_{I\mu\sigma}^{\lambda\sigma} + O(\hbar^2) \right\} \quad (2.14)$$

with higher-order structure functions $U_{I\mu\sigma}^{\lambda\sigma}$ of the classical algebra (2.10) and (2.11) (derivable by the method mentioned in Introduction).

The quantum observables (2.13) solve the closed commutator algebra (2.12). The proof of this statement goes by collecting the observables together with constraints into one set and repeating the derivation of [5]. The only thing to check is if the resulting commutator algebra does not contain nonvanishing components $\hat{U}_{I\mu}^K$ of the operator structure functions (violating the weak quantum gauge invariance of observables (2.12)). This component can get a nonvanishing contribution only due to a higher-order structure functions $U_{I\mu\lambda}^{K\lambda} + U_{I\mu L}^{KL}$ of the classical algebra (2.10) and (2.11). But it is easy to show that for a *closed Lie* algebra (2.11) the nonvanishing components of the second-order structure functions cannot have *nongauge* upper indices ($U_{\dots}^{J\lambda} = 0$, $U_{\dots}^{JL} = 0$) and, therefore the quantum observables remain weakly invariant. For the same reason eq.(2.14) does not involve the contraction $U_{I\mu J}^{\lambda J}$.

The quantum observables like constraints have anti-Hermitian part with respect to the auxiliary inner product (2.8). It is given by two contractions of structure functions $U_{I\lambda}^\lambda$ and U_{IJ}^J . For all reasonable compact groups generating algebras of observables the latter is vanishing $U_{IJ}^J = 0$, but $U_{I\lambda}^\lambda$ is generally nontrivial, depends on the choice of constraint basis and violates Hermiticity of observables in the auxiliary inner product. It is however inessential, because only the physical inner product must generate real expectation values of observables, and this will be shown to be true below.

3. Quantum transformation of the constraint basis

Under the linear transformation of the classical constraint basis (1.7) the structure functions transform as

$$U_{\mu\nu}'^\sigma = \Omega_\mu^\alpha \Omega_\nu^\beta U_{\alpha\beta}^\lambda \Omega_\lambda^{-1\sigma} + 2\{\Omega_{[\mu}^\alpha, T_{\beta]}\} \Omega_\nu^\beta \Omega_\alpha^{-1\sigma} + \{\Omega_\mu^\alpha, \Omega_\nu^\beta\} T_\alpha \Omega_\beta^{-1\sigma}, \quad (3.1)$$

so that

$$U_{\mu\lambda}'^\lambda = \Omega_\mu^\alpha U_{\alpha\lambda}^\lambda + \{\Omega_\mu^\alpha, T_\alpha\} - \{\ln \Omega, \Omega_\mu^\alpha T_\alpha\}, \quad (3.2)$$

$$\Omega \equiv \det \Omega_\beta^\alpha. \quad (3.3)$$

The quantum constraints \hat{T}'_μ based on the transformed basis of classical constraints (1.7) and structure functions (3.1) take on the use of the algorithm (2.3) (with primed quantities) the form

$$\hat{T}'_\mu = \mathcal{N}_{qp} \left[\tilde{\Omega}_\mu^\nu \tilde{T}_\nu - i\hbar \frac{\partial \tilde{\Omega}_\mu^\nu}{\partial p_k} \frac{\partial \tilde{T}_\nu}{\partial q^k} - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \{\ln \tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\Omega}_\mu^\nu \tilde{T}_\nu\} + O(\hbar^2) \right], \quad (3.4)$$

where \tilde{T}_ν is a normal qp -symbol of constraints in the original basis and

$$\tilde{\Omega}_\mu^\nu \equiv \Omega_\mu^\nu - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \Omega_\mu^\nu}{\partial q^k \partial p_k} + O(\hbar^2), \quad \tilde{\Omega} \equiv \det \tilde{\Omega}_\mu^\nu. \quad (3.5)$$

From the two simple identities for operators and their normal qp -symbols

$$\hat{F}_1 \hat{F}_2 = \mathcal{N}_{qp} \left[\tilde{F}_1 \tilde{F}_2 - i\hbar \frac{\partial \tilde{F}_1}{\partial p_k} \frac{\partial \tilde{F}_2}{\partial q^k} + O(\hbar^2) \right],$$

$$\hat{\Omega}^{-1/2} \hat{F} \hat{\Omega}^{1/2} = \mathcal{N}_{qp} \left[\tilde{F} - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \{\ln \tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{F}\} + O(\hbar^2) \right]$$

it is then easy to find the final form of the transformation law for quantum constraints under the transformation of their classical basis (1.7)

$$\hat{T}'_\mu = \hat{\Omega}^{-1/2} \hat{\Omega}_\mu^\nu \hat{T}_\nu \hat{\Omega}^{1/2}, \quad (3.6)$$

$$\hat{\Omega}_\mu^\nu = \mathcal{N}_{qp} \left\{ \Omega_\mu^\nu - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \Omega_\mu^\nu}{\partial q^k \partial p_k} + O(\hbar^2) \right\}, \quad \hat{\Omega} = \det \hat{\Omega}_\mu^\nu. \quad (3.7)$$

Similarly to (1.7) this transformation involves a linear recombination of constraint operators with operator-valued matrix $\hat{\Omega}_\mu^\nu$ (standing to the left of constraints). This matrix is obtained from its classical counterpart $\Omega_\nu^\mu(q, p)$ by the algorithm (3.7) similar to (2.3): its symbol involves analogous quantum corrections except the anti-Hermitian part. In addition to linear combinations the transformation (3.6) includes the canonical transformation generated by the square root of its determinant $\hat{\Omega}^{1/2}$. This canonical transformation implies that the physical states satisfying Dirac constraints (1.5) transform contragrediently to (3.6)

$$|\Psi\rangle' = \hat{\Omega}^{-1/2} |\Psi\rangle \quad (3.8)$$

and turn out to be scalar densities of weight $-1/2$ in the space of gauge indices. This property has been observed for systems subject to constraints linear in momenta in [12] and, as we see, turns out to be true for a generic case at least in the one-loop order of the semiclassical expansion.

It is easy to repeat now similar calculations for the operators of physical observables (2.13). In view of the transformation law for the trace of the observable structure function $U_{I\lambda}'^\lambda = U_{I\lambda}^\lambda - \{\ln \det \Omega, \mathcal{O}_I\}$ these calculations immediately show that the operators of observables also transform canonically

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I' = \hat{\Omega}^{-1/2} \hat{\mathcal{O}}_I \hat{\Omega}^{1/2}. \quad (3.9)$$

Obviously, the theories differing by the choice of constraint basis should be unitarily equivalent. This means that the physical inner product of states $|\Psi\rangle$ should contain a measure depending on this choice and transforming contragrediently to (3.8). In the next section we show that semiclassical states and their inner product really satisfy the properties compatible with the transformation law of the above type.

4. Semiclassical physical states

Semiclassical expansion of the operator symbols of the above type makes sense when the corresponding quantum states also have a semiclassical form. In the coordinate representation semiclassical wavefunctions

$$\Psi(q) = \mathbf{P}(q) \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \mathbf{S}(q) \right] \quad (4.1)$$

are characterized by the Hamilton-Jacobi function $\mathbf{S}(q)$ and preexponential factor $\mathbf{P}(q)$ expandable in \hbar -series beginning with the one-loop order¹ $O(\hbar^0)$. The action of the operator

¹This corresponds to the fact that the tree-level part is entirely contained in the exponential and is $O(\hbar^{-1})$. When the Hamiltonian H_0 in eq.(1.1) is nonvanishing the wavefunction (4.1), its Hamilton-Jacobi function, two-point kernel, etc. are time-dependent. In what follows we shall, however, omit the time label, because we will be mainly interested in constraint properties rather than the dynamical ones.

\hat{F} on such functions reads as

$$\hat{F}\Psi(q) = \left[\tilde{F}\left(q, \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}}{\partial q}\right) + O(\hbar) \right] \mathbf{P} \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \mathbf{S}(q) \right] \quad (4.2)$$

where, as in (2.2), \tilde{F} is a normal qp -symbol of \hat{F} .

The general semiclassical solution of quantum constraints (1.5) with operators (2.3) was found in [13, 5, 14] in the form of the two-point kernel $\mathbf{K}(q, q')$ "propagating" the initial data from the Cauchy surface throughout the whole superspace of q

$$\mathbf{K}(q, q') = \mathbf{P}(q, q') \exp \left[\frac{i}{\hbar} \mathbf{S}(q, q') \right]. \quad (4.3)$$

In both expressions (4.1) and (4.3) the phase in the exponential satisfies the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$T_\mu \left(q, \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}}{\partial q} \right) = 0, \quad (4.4)$$

while the one-loop preexponential factor is subject to continuity type equation originating from the full quantum constraint in the approximation linear in \hbar

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} (\nabla_\mu^i \mathbf{P}^2) = U_{\mu\lambda}^\lambda \mathbf{P}^2, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\nabla_\mu^i \equiv \frac{\partial T_\mu}{\partial p_i} \Big|_{p = \partial \mathbf{S} / \partial q}. \quad (4.6)$$

For a two-point kernel the Hamilton-Jacobi function coincides with the principal Hamilton function $\mathbf{S}(q, q')$ (action on the extremal joining points q and q') and the solution of the continuity equation can be found as a generalization of the Pauli-Van Vleck-Morette ansatz for the one-loop preexponential factor [15, 14] of the Schrodinger propagator. This generalization is nothing but a Faddeev-Popov gauge-fixing [16] procedure for a matrix of mixed second-order derivatives of the principal Hamilton function

$$\mathbf{S}_{ik'} = \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{S}(q, q')}{\partial q^i \partial q^{k'}} \quad (4.7)$$

which is degenerate in virtue of the Hamilton-Jacobi equations (4.4) giving rise to the left zero-value eigenvectors (4.6) and analogous right zero-vectors [13, 5]

$$\nabla_\mu^i \mathbf{S}_{ik'} = 0, \quad \mathbf{S}_{ik'} \nabla_\nu^{k'} = 0, \quad \nabla_\nu^{k'} \equiv \frac{\partial T_\nu(q', p')}{\partial p_k'} \Big|_{p' = -\partial \mathbf{S} / \partial q'}. \quad (4.8)$$

Another way to view this is to parametrize time and the conjugated Hamiltonian $H_0(q, p)$ among the phase-space variables and regard the Hamilton-Jacobi and Schrodinger equations as one extra classical and quantum constraint correspondingly [5, 14].

The preexponential factor reads

$$\mathbf{P} = \left[\frac{\det \mathbf{F}_{ik'}}{J(q)J(q') \det c_{\mu\nu}} \right]^{1/2}, \quad (4.9)$$

where $\mathbf{F}_{ik'}$ is a nondegenerate matrix of the initial action Hessian (4.7) supplied with a gauge-breaking term

$$\mathbf{F}_{ik'} = \mathbf{S}_{ik'} + \chi_i^\mu c_{\mu\nu} \chi_{k'}^\nu, \quad (4.10)$$

and $J(q)$ and $J(q')$ are the Feynman-DeWitt-Faddeev-Popov "ghost" determinants [17, 16] compensating for the inclusion of this term. The gauge-breaking term and ghost determinants are constructed with the aid of two sets of arbitrary covectors $(\chi_i^\mu, \chi_{k'}^\nu)$ ("gauge" conditions) satisfying the only requirement of the nondegeneracy of their ghost operators [13, 14, 5]

$$\begin{aligned} J_\nu^\mu(q) &= \chi_i^\mu \nabla_\nu^i, \quad J(q) \equiv \det J_\nu^\mu(q) \neq 0, \\ J_\nu^\mu(q') &= \chi_{i'}^\mu \nabla_\nu^{i'}, \quad J(q') \equiv \det J_\nu^\mu(q') \neq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

The invertible gauge-fixing matrix $c_{\mu\nu}$ and its determinant (contribution of Nielsen-Kallosh ghosts) are the last ingredients of the generalized Pauli-Van Vleck-Morette ansatz (4.9).

Notice now that under the transformation of the basis (1.7) the vectors (4.6) defined on the Lagrangian manifold of phase-space $p = \partial \mathbf{S} / \partial q$ transform covariantly with respect to their gauge indices $(\nabla_\mu^i)' = \Omega_\mu^\nu \nabla_\nu^i$. Therefore the ghost determinants transform as densities

$$J' = (\det \Omega_\nu^\mu) J, \quad (4.12)$$

whence it follows that the two-point kernel with respect to each of its arguments transforms in accordance with the law (3.8) in which the action of the operator $\hat{\Omega}^{-1/2}$ semi-classically boils down to the multiplication with $[\det \Omega_\nu^\mu(q, \partial \mathbf{S} / \partial q)]^{-1/2}$.

5. Reduction to the physical sector: unitary gauge conditions of a general type

The interpretation of the semiclassical state (4.3), (4.9) is rather transparent in the physical sector of the theory [13, 5, 14]. The sector explicitly arises after the reduction to physical variables by disentangling them from the original phase space of (q^i, p_i) in a unitary gauge. Such a reduction in [13, 5, 14] was given for a special type of gauge conditions imposed only on phase space coordinates q^i . Here we generalize this reduction procedure to unitary gauges of a general type.

The theory with the action (1.1) is invariant under the set of canonical transformations of phase space variables generated by constraints and special (noncanonical) transformations of Lagrange multipliers [3, 14]

$$\delta^{\mathcal{F}} q^i = \{q^i, T_\mu\} \mathcal{F}^\mu, \quad \delta^{\mathcal{F}} q^i = \{q^i, T_\mu\} \mathcal{F}^\mu, \quad (5.1)$$

$$\delta^{\mathcal{F}} \lambda^\mu = \dot{\mathcal{F}}^\mu - U_{\nu\lambda}^\mu \lambda^\nu \mathcal{F}^\lambda - U_{0\lambda}^\mu \mathcal{F}^\lambda \quad (5.2)$$

with arbitrary infinitesimal gauge parameter $\mathcal{F}^\mu = \mathcal{F}^\mu(t)$. This invariance implies that the equivalence class of variables belonging to the orbit of these transformations corresponds to one and the same physical state. The description of this state in terms of physical variables rather than the equivalence classes of original degrees of freedom consists in singling out the unique representative of each such class and treating the independent labels of this representative as physical variables. This can be attained by imposing on original phase space variables the gauge conditions

$$\chi^\mu(q, p) = 0 \quad (5.3)$$

which determine in the $2n$ -dimensional phase space the $(2n - m)$ -dimensional surface (remember that n is the range of index i , while m is that of μ) having a unique intersection with the orbit of gauge transformations (5.1). At least locally, the latter condition means the invertibility of the Faddeev-Popov matrix with the nonvanishing determinant

$$J(q, p) = \det J_\nu^\mu(q, p), \quad J_\nu^\mu(q, p) = \{\chi^\mu, T_\nu\}. \quad (5.4)$$

Gauge conditions of the form (5.3) are called unitary. They impose restrictions only on phase space variables and, thus, locally in time single out the physical sector and allow one to formulate the gauge theory in a manifestly unitary form. In this respect they differ from nonunitary gauge conditions imposed on Lagrange multipliers λ^μ (together with (q, p)) and/or their time derivatives [3, 14].

5.1. Coordinate gauge conditions

Unitary gauge conditions take the simplest form when they are imposed only on phase space coordinates, $\chi^\mu(q) = 0$. Such *coordinate* gauge conditions determine the embedding of the $(n - m)$ -dimensional space Σ of physical *coordinates* directly into the space of original coordinates q^i – superspace. This fact strongly simplifies the reduction of the semiclassical kernel (4.3), (4.9) to the physical sector, because this reduction in the main boils down to the embedding of the arguments of $\mathbf{K}(q, q')$ into the physical subspace Σ . The geometry of this embedding, considered in much detail in [14], can be better described in special coordinates on superspace $\bar{q}^i = (\xi^A, \theta^\mu)$, in which ξ^A , $A = 1, \dots, n - m$, serve as intrinsic coordinates on Σ (physical configuration coordinates), and θ^μ is determined by gauge conditions:

$$q^i \rightarrow \bar{q}^i = (\xi^A, \theta^\mu), \quad q^i = e^i(\xi^A, \theta^\mu), \quad \theta^\mu = \chi^\mu(q). \quad (5.5)$$

The equation of the surface Σ in the new coordinates is $\theta^\mu = 0$, so that its embedding equations coincide with the above reparametrization equations at $\theta^\mu = 0$, $e^i(\xi) = e^i(\xi, 0)$

$$\Sigma : q^i = e^i(\xi), \quad \chi^\mu(e^i(\xi)) \equiv 0. \quad (5.6)$$

The relation between the integration measures on superspace $dq = d^n q$ and on Σ , $d\xi = d^{n-m}\xi$

$$d\xi = dq \delta(\chi) M, \quad M = (\det[e_A^i, e_\mu^i])^{-1}, \quad (5.7)$$

involves the Jacobian of this reparametrization, built of the basis of vectors tangential and normal to Σ :

$$e_A^i = \partial e^i / \partial \xi^A, \quad e_\mu^i = \partial e^i / \partial \theta^\mu. \quad (5.8)$$

Note that m covectors normal to the surface can be chosen as gradients of gauge conditions

$$\chi_i^\mu = \frac{\partial \chi^\mu}{\partial q^i}, \quad \chi_i^\mu e_\nu^i = \delta_\nu^\mu, \quad (5.9)$$

that can be identified with auxiliary covectors participating in the algorithm for the preexponential factor (4.9). With this identification the Faddeev-Popov operator $J_\nu^\mu(q, \partial \mathbf{S} / \partial q)$ coincides with the operator $J_\nu^\mu(q)$ of this algorithm (which explains the use of the same notation).

On the same footing with (e_A^i, e_μ^i) as a full local basis one can also choose the set (e_A^i, ∇_μ^i) with vectors ∇_μ^i transversal to Σ given by eq.(4.6). The normal vectors of the first basis when expanded in the new basis

$$e_\mu^i = J^{-1\mu}_\nu \nabla_\nu^i + \Omega_\mu^A e_A^i \quad (5.10)$$

have one expansion coefficient always determined by the inverse of the Faddeev-Popov matrix $J^{-1\mu}_\nu$ and, thus, independent of the particular parametrization of Σ by internal coordinates. The second coefficient is less universal and depends on a particular choice of this parametrization. Missing information about Ω_μ^A does not prevent, however, from finding the relation between the determinants of matrices of the old and new bases

$$\det[e_A^i, \nabla_\mu^i] = \frac{J}{M}. \quad (5.11)$$

The reduction to physical sector in coordinate gauges follows after identifying ξ^A with the physical coordinates. The corresponding conjugated momenta π_A can be found from the transformation of the symplectic form restricted to the physical subspace (5.6)

$$\int dt p_i \dot{q}^i = \int dt \left(p_i e_A^i \dot{\xi}^A + p_i \frac{\partial e^i(\xi, t)}{\partial t} \right), \quad (5.12)$$

$$\pi_A = p_i e_A^i, \quad (5.13)$$

as projections of the original momentum to the tangential components of the basis (5.8). The normal projections of p_i should be found from constraints (1.2), the local uniqueness of their solution being granted by the nondegeneracy of the Faddeev-Popov determinant. Together with (5.6) this solution yields all the original phase space variables (q^i, p_i) as known functions of the physical degrees of freedom (ξ^A, π_A) . The original action (1.1) reduced to physical sector (that is to the subspace of constraints and gauge conditions) acquires the usual canonical form with the physical Hamiltonian contributed by the second term of (5.12) and $H_0(q, p)$. Note that generically, especially for the so-called parametrized systems with $H_0(q, p) = 0$ in (1.1), canonical gauge conditions should explicitly depend on time, $\chi^\mu(q) = \chi^\mu(q, t)$, in order to generate the dynamical evolution in reduced phase space theory [14, 5]. Therefore, the reduced symplectic form generates a nontrivial contribution to the physical Hamiltonian, proportional to the time derivative of the embedding functions (5.6) explicitly depending on t , $q = e(\xi, t)$. The total physical Hamiltonian then takes the form

$$H_{\text{red}}(\xi, \pi) = \left[H_0(q, p) - p_i \frac{\partial e^i(\xi, t)}{\partial t} \right]_{q=e(\xi, \pi), p=p(\xi, \pi)}. \quad (5.14)$$

Canonical quantization of such a classical system runs as usual along the lines of a particular representation and operator realization in the Hilbert space of the theory. In the one-loop (linear in \hbar) approximation with the Weyl ordering of the above Hamiltonian this quantization is basically exhausted by the unitary evolution kernel $K(t, \xi|t', \xi')$ of the Schrodinger equation. In the coordinate representation it is given by the well-known Pauli-Van Vleck-Morette ansatz [15]

$$K(t, \xi|t', \xi') \equiv \left[\det \frac{i}{2\pi\hbar} \frac{\partial^2 S(t, \xi|t', \xi')}{\partial \xi^A \partial \xi^{B'}} \right]^{1/2} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} S(t, \xi|t', \xi')}, \quad (5.15)$$

which involves the principal Hamilton function of physical variables $S(t, \xi|t', \xi')$ – a classical action evaluated at the classical extremal passing the points ξ' and ξ respectively at initial t' and final t moments of time. The preexponential factor here is built of Van-Vleck determinant and guarantees in the approximation linear in \hbar the unitarity of the Schrodinger evolution of the physical states $\Psi(t, \xi)$

$$\Psi(t, \xi) = \int d\xi' K(t, \xi|t', \xi') \Psi(t', \xi') \quad (5.16)$$

in the Hilbert space with a simple L^2 inner product

$$(\Psi_1|\Psi_2)_{\text{red}} \equiv \int d\xi \Psi_1^*(\xi) \Psi_2(\xi). \quad (5.17)$$

The unitary map between the reduced phase space quantization of the above type and the Dirac quantization of Sects. 2 – 4 consists in a special relation between the two-point kernel (4.3) with prefactor (4.9) and the Schrodinger evolution operator (5.15) [13, 5, 14].

This relation is based on the equality of the principal Hamilton functions in the original constrained theory and the reduced one and its corollary – the relation between their Van-Vleck matrices

$$S(t, \xi|t', \xi') = \mathbf{S}(q, q') \Big|_{q=e(\xi, t), q'=e(\xi', t')}, \quad (5.18)$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{ik'} e_A^i e_{B'}^{k'} = \frac{\partial^2 S(t, \xi|t', \xi')}{\partial \xi^A \partial \xi^{B'}}. \quad (5.19)$$

Decomposing the gauge-fixed matrix (4.10) in the basis of vectors (e_A^i, ∇_μ^i) and using (5.11) one then easily finds the needed relation [13, 5, 14]

$$K(t, \xi|t', \xi') = \text{const} \left(\frac{J}{M} \right)^{1/2} \mathbf{K}(q, q') \left(\frac{J'}{M'} \right)^{1/2} \Big|_{q=e(\xi, t), q'=e(\xi', t')}. \quad (5.20)$$

This relation implies that the kernel $\mathbf{K}(q, q')$ similarly to the Schrodinger propagator $K(t, \xi|t', \xi')$ can be regarded as a propagator of the Dirac wavefunction $\Psi(q)$ in superspace. Indeed, introducing the following map between $\Psi(q)$ and $\Psi(t, \xi)$

$$\Psi(\xi, t) = \left(\frac{J}{M} \right)^{1/2} \Psi(q) \Big|_{q=e(\xi, t)} \quad (5.21)$$

and taking into account the relation (5.7) between the integration measures on superspace and the physical space Σ , one finds that the propagation law (5.16) in ξ -space can be regarded as a projection onto $\Sigma(t)$ of the following propagation of the Dirac wavefunction $\Psi(q)$ from the initial Cauchy surface $\Sigma(t')$ in q -space to the entire superspace

$$\Psi(q) = \int dq' \mathbf{K}(q, q') \delta(\chi(q', t')) J(q', -\partial \mathbf{S}(q, q')/\partial q') \Psi(q') + O(\hbar). \quad (5.22)$$

Here the actual integration runs over the initial physical space $\Sigma(t')$. However, the integration measure involves not just local quantities at this surface, but also the normal derivatives of the kernel (or the wavefunction $\Psi(q')$ itself) arising in the one-loop approximation as a Hamilton-Jacobi argument $-\partial \mathbf{S}(q, q')/\partial q'$ of $J(q, p)$.

5.2. General gauge conditions

Quantum reduction of the above type has been built in [13, 5, 14] for a particular case of coordinate gauge conditions, $\chi^\mu(q, t) = 0$, independent of momenta. The extension to general unitary gauges of the form (5.3) is less obvious, because such gauges no longer determine the coordinate physical space, but rather a $(2n - m)$ -dimensional subspace in the entire phase space of (q^i, p_i) . Therefore, the additional reduction of its dimensionality to $2(n - m)$ due to solving the constraints (1.2) leaves us with the physical phase space without a natural decomposition into coordinates and momenta. On the other hand, we need such a decomposition (choice of polarization) for sake of quantization in coordinate

representation. This decomposition can, however, be built if we model the p -dependent gauges by the coordinate ones and then repeat the construction of the above type. The idea is that semiclassically, the momenta equal the Hamilton-Jacobi values up to quantum fluctuations, $p = \partial \mathbf{S} / \partial q + O(\hbar)$, so that the coordinate gauges can be obtained from the general unitary gauges by the replacement

$$\chi^\mu(q, p, t) \rightarrow \chi^\mu(q, t) = \chi^\mu\left(q, \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}}{\partial q}, t\right). \quad (5.23)$$

Then the reduction procedure is rather straightforward, although it involves an additional step of the unitary transformation from the physical variables in the initial gauge $\chi^\mu(q, p) = 0$ to those of its coordinate version (5.23).

The peculiarity of the reduction in p -dependent gauges is that, in contrast with (5.12), the canonical transformation of the original symplectic form $p_i dq^i$ to the physical one $\pi_A d\xi^A$ is not contact. It involves a nontrivial generating function $\mathbf{F}(q, \xi, t)$

$$\left(p_i dq^i - H_0 dt\right)_{\chi^\mu, T_\mu=0} = \pi_A d\xi^A - H_{\text{red}} dt + d\mathbf{F}(q, \xi, t), \quad (5.24)$$

so that the original action (1.1) in terms of physical variables acquires extra surface terms at the final and initial moments of time t_\pm ²

$$S[q, p] \Big|_{\chi^\mu, T_\mu=0} = \int_{t_-}^{t_+} dt (\pi_A \dot{\xi}^A - H_{\text{red}}) + \mathbf{F}(q_+, \xi_+, t_+) - \mathbf{F}(q_-, \xi_-, t_-). \quad (5.25)$$

The actual form of the generating function $\mathbf{F}(q, \xi, t)$ depends on the choice of gauge conditions and the choice of physical variables (ξ^A, π_A) . It can be rather complicated, but, fortunately, we do not need it explicitly.

Important property of the surface terms in (5.25) is that they take care of the boundary conditions on the histories $(q(t), p(t))$ at t_\pm . Natural boundary conditions for the variational problem with the action (1.1) – left-hand side of eq.(5.25) – correspond to fixed coordinates

$$q^i(t_\pm) = q_\pm^i \quad (5.26)$$

and arbitrarily varied momenta. On the contrary, the variational problem for the reduced phase-space action – the integral term in the right-hand side of (5.25) – assumes fixed physical coordinates

$$\xi^A(t_\pm) = \xi_\pm^A, \quad (5.27)$$

but the reduction from (q, p) to (ξ, π) intertwines coordinates with momenta, $q = q(\xi, \pi)$. Generating functions in the surface terms of the right-hand side of (5.25) reconcile these two different boundary value problems.

²For notational reasons in this section we supply the arguments of two-point quantities by \pm instead of primed and unprimed labels above.

Another important aspect of the boundary conditions (5.26) is that the values q_{\pm} cannot be arbitrary. In complete analogy with eq.(5.18) they should belong to the physical subspace of the full phase space, that is to satisfy both the constraints and gauge conditions. This property was obvious in coordinate gauges which directly restricted possible values of q_{\pm} to the surface (5.6) of gauge conditions. For p -dependent gauges one could think that the flexibility of choosing the momenta at t_{\pm} completely releases the values q_{\pm} to be arbitrary. This is, however, not the case. One way to see this is to calculate the action at the extremal satisfying classical equations of motion and boundary conditions (5.26). The resulting principal Hamilton function $\mathcal{S}(q_+, q_-)$ uniquely determines the end-point momenta, $p_{\pm} = \pm \partial \mathcal{S} / \partial q_{\pm}$, and the end-point gauge conditions take the form of the *coordinate* gauges of the form (5.23)

$$\chi_{\pm}^{\mu}(q_{\pm}) \equiv \chi^{\mu}(q_{\pm}, \pm \partial \mathcal{S} / \partial q_{\pm}, t_{\pm}) = 0, \quad (5.28)$$

that determine the embedding of the following two subspaces into the *coordinate* space

$$\Sigma_{\pm} : q_{\pm}^i = e^i(\eta_{\pm}^A, t_{\pm}), \quad \chi_{\pm}^{\mu}(e^i(\eta, t_{\pm})) \equiv 0. \quad (5.29)$$

Here the internal coordinates η^A no longer coincide with the physical coordinates ξ^A of the reduced action.

Thus, the principal Hamilton function reduced to subspaces (5.29) takes the form

$$\mathcal{S}(q_+, q_-) \Big|_{q_{\pm} = e(\eta_{\pm}, t_{\pm})} = \mathcal{S}(t_+, \eta_+ | t_-, \eta_-), \quad (5.30)$$

$$\mathcal{S}(t_+, \eta_+ | t_-, \eta_-) = S(t_+, \xi_+ | t_-, \xi_-) + F(\eta_+, \xi_+, t_+) - F(\eta_-, \xi_-, t_-), \quad (5.31)$$

where $S(t_+, \xi_+ | t_-, \xi_-)$ is the principle Hamilton function of the reduced system in the p -dependent gauge with fixed end-point coordinates (5.27) and

$$F(\eta_{\pm}, \xi_{\pm}, t_{\pm}) = \mathbf{F}(e(\eta_{\pm}, t_{\pm}), \xi_{\pm}, t_{\pm}) \quad (5.32)$$

represent the generating functions of canonical transformations from ξ_{\pm} to η_{\pm} at t_{\pm} . The whole expression on the right-hand side is a function of η_{\pm} , the coordinates ξ_{\pm} being expressed in terms of η_{\pm} as solution of equations

$$\frac{\partial S(t_+, \xi_+ | t_-, \xi_-)}{\partial \xi_{\pm}} \pm \frac{\partial F(\eta_{\pm}, \xi_{\pm}, t_{\pm})}{\partial \xi_{\pm}} = 0, \quad (5.33)$$

(these in turn follow from the corollary of eq.(5.24), $\pi_A = -\partial F(q, \xi, t) / \partial \xi^A$, and the Hamilton-Jacobi value of the physical momentum, $\pi_{\pm} = \pm \partial S(t_+, \xi_+ | t_-, \xi_-) / \partial \xi_{\pm}$).

In this gauge we can now repeat the construction of the Dirac two-point kernel of Sect.4. We identify the covectors $(\chi_i^{\mu}, \chi_{i'}^{\mu})$ with gradients of coordinate gauge conditions, $\partial \chi_{\pm}^{\mu}(q) / \partial q^i$. Then we use (5.30) and again have the relation (5.20) with the kernel $K(t, \xi | t', \xi')$ replaced by

$$\mathcal{K}(t_+, \eta_+ | t_-, \eta_-) \equiv \left[\det \frac{i}{2\pi\hbar} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{S}(t_+, \eta_+ | t_-, \eta_-)}{\partial \eta_+ \partial \eta_-} \right]^{1/2} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} \mathcal{S}(t_+, \eta_+ | t_-, \eta_-)} \quad (5.34)$$

and the factors $(J, J') = J_{\pm}$ (4.11) calculated in the coordinate gauges of the above type (5.28). Apriori, they differ from the Faddeev-Popov determinants corresponding to p -dependent gauges, but as shown in Appendix A, eq. (A.7),

$$\nabla_{\nu}^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \left[\chi^{\mu}(q, \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}}{\partial q}) \right] \equiv \left\{ \chi^{\mu}(q, p), T_{\nu}(q, p) \right\} \Big|_{p = \partial \mathbf{S} / \partial q}, \quad (5.35)$$

and all the J_{ν}^{μ} -factors coincide with true Faddeev-Popov matrices in generic unitary gauges.

The interpretation of the kernel (5.34) is obvious. It is built of the principal Hamilton function (5.31) corresponding to fixed boundary values of η -variables at t_{\pm} . As discussed above, it contains as total derivative terms the generating function $F(\eta, \xi, t)$ of the canonical transformation from ξ_{\pm} to η_{\pm} . At the quantum level, in the semiclassical approximation linear in \hbar , the kernel of the corresponding unitary transformation reads

$$U(t, \eta | \xi) \equiv \left[\det \frac{i}{2\pi\hbar} \frac{\partial^2 F(\eta, \xi, t)}{\partial \eta \partial \xi} \right]^{1/2} e^{\frac{i}{\hbar} F(\eta, \xi, t)}. \quad (5.36)$$

If we represent the kernels of the above type as matrix elements of the corresponding unitary operators in the coordinate (ξ and η) representations

$$\mathcal{K}(t_+, \eta_+ | t_-, \eta_-) = \langle \eta_+ | \hat{\mathcal{K}}(t_+, t_-) | \eta_- \rangle, \quad (5.37)$$

$$U(t, \eta | \xi) = \langle \eta | \hat{U}(t) | \xi \rangle, \quad (5.38)$$

$$K(t_+, \xi_+ | t_-, \xi_-) = \langle \xi_+ | \hat{K}(t_+, t_-) | \xi_- \rangle, \quad (5.39)$$

then the kernel in question (5.34) reads as follows. It is nothing but the unitary evolution operator of the reduced theory in generic p -dependent gauge $\hat{K}(t_+, t_-)$ (whose kernel is defined by eq.(5.10) with the principal Hamilton function subject to fixed $(\xi, \xi') = \xi_{\pm}$) unitarily transformed to the representation of η -variables

$$\hat{\mathcal{K}}(t_+, t_-) = \hat{U}(t_+) \hat{K}(t_+, t_-) \hat{U}^{\dagger}(t_-). \quad (5.40)$$

This unitary equivalence relation can be directly checked by the composition of kernels (5.36) and (5.15) and calculating the corresponding integrals over ξ_{\pm} by stationary phase technique³.

This reveals the role of extra unitary transformation arising in the reduction to physical sector in generic momentum-dependent unitary gauges (5.5). A similar mechanism of modelling the non-unitary (relativistic) gauges, which involve the Lagrange multipliers and their derivatives, by unitary ones was recently proposed in [22] where the Dirac two-point kernel was obtained by a direct calculation of the one-loop path integral in gauge theory. The construction of such gauges is based on the knowledge of solutions of linearized wave equations in a corresponding relativistic gauge.

³The contribution of stationary points – solutions of eqs.(5.33) – yields the preexponential factor of (5.34), while its phase is achieved as a linear combination of Hamilton-Jacobi phases (5.31).

6. The physical inner product: Hermiticity and gauge independence

The auxiliary inner product (2.8) cannot serve as an inner product for physical states because it is not well defined. In view of quantum constraints the physical states have a distributional nature $|\Psi\rangle = \delta(\hat{T})|\Psi_{\text{aux}}\rangle$ with somehow determined m -dimensional delta-function of non-abelian operators \hat{T}_μ , and their naive bilinear combinations are divergent because $[\delta(\hat{T})]^2 \sim \delta(0)\delta(\hat{T})$. At most the auxiliary vectors $|\Psi_{\text{aux}}\rangle$ participating in the construction of the physical states can be required to be square-integrable in L^2 sense and thus induce a finite inner product for $|\Psi\rangle$ (which is the idea of the so-called refined algebraic quantization of constrained systems [18, 19]). Another approach consists in the unitary map from the Dirac to the reduced phase space quantization of the previous section. Reduced theory has a trivial inner product (5.17) which induces a correct physical product in the Dirac quantization scheme

$$(\Psi_2|\Psi_1) = (\Psi_2|\Psi_1)_{\text{red}} \quad (6.1)$$

on account of the relation (5.21) and the change of integration variables (5.9). The result for semiclassical states of the form (4.1) looks like [20, 13, 5]

$$(\Psi_2|\Psi_1) = \int dq \Psi_2^*(q) \delta(\chi(q)) J(q, \partial\mathbf{S}/\partial q) \Psi_1(q) + O(\hbar). \quad (6.2)$$

Here $\chi(q) = \chi^\mu(q)$ is a set of gauge conditions delta-function of which

$$\delta(\chi) = \prod_\mu \delta(\chi^\mu(q)), \quad (6.3)$$

determines the $(n - m)$ -dimensional physical subspace Σ embedded in superspace and $J(q, \partial\mathbf{S}/\partial q)$ is a corresponding Faddeev-Popov determinant⁴.

This explains the nature of the physical inner product in the Dirac quantization. Its measure contains the Faddeev-Popov determinant which depends on the choice of the constraint basis and transforms under the transition (1.7) to another basis as a density of weight 1 in the space of gauge indices (4.12) as compared to -1/2 weight of the Dirac wavefunctions (3.8). This proves the invariance of the physical inner product under this transformation and shows that at the quantum level it is not only canonical but also unitary. Our purpose now, till the end of this section, will be to discuss the Hermiticity properties of physical observables relative to this inner product and the gauge independence of their matrix elements.

⁴In eq.(6.2) the product $\Psi_2^*\Psi_1 = P_2^*P_1 \exp[i(\mathbf{S}_1 - \mathbf{S}_2)/\hbar]$ involves two different Hamilton-Jacobi functions, so that it seems ambiguous on which Lagrangian manifold ($p = \partial\mathbf{S}_1/\partial q$ or $p = \partial\mathbf{S}_2/\partial q$) the relevant momentum argument of $J(q, p)$ should be constructed. One should remember, however, that in semiclassical expansion the integral is calculated by the stationary phase method in which a dominant contribution comes from the stationary point satisfying $\partial\mathbf{S}_1/\partial q = \partial\mathbf{S}_2/\partial q$. This makes these Lagrangian surfaces to coincide in the leading order, their difference being treated perturbatively as expansion in \hbar .

The semiclassical physical inner product (6.2) can be rewritten as an auxiliary inner product of physical states with a nontrivial *operatorial* measure

$$(\Psi_1|\Psi_2) = \langle \Psi_1 | \hat{J}\delta(\hat{\chi}) | \Psi_2 \rangle + O(\hbar). \quad (6.4)$$

Here the operator ordering in operators of the ghost determinant and gauge conditions is unimportant because it effects the multiloop orders $O(\hbar)$ that go beyond the scope of this paper. The matrix element of the physical observable $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I$ is therefore

$$(\Psi_1|\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I|\Psi_2) \equiv (\Psi_1|\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I\Psi_2) = \langle \Psi_1 | \hat{J}\delta(\hat{\chi})\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I | \Psi_2 \rangle. \quad (6.5)$$

To check the Hermiticity of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I$ we have to show that the expression

$$(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I\Psi_1|\Psi_2) - (\Psi_1|\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I\Psi_2) = \langle \Psi_1 | \hat{\mathcal{O}}_I^\dagger \hat{J}\delta(\hat{\chi}) | \Psi_2 \rangle - \langle \Psi_1 | \hat{J}\delta(\hat{\chi})\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I | \Psi_2 \rangle, \quad (6.6)$$

where a dagger denotes Hermitian conjugation with respect to the auxiliary inner product, is vanishing. From (2.13) it follows that $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I^\dagger = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_I - i\hbar U_{IJ}^\lambda + O(\hbar^2)$ (we consider the algebras of observables with $U_{IJ}^J = 0$), and the expression above takes the form

$$\langle \Psi_1 | [\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I, \hat{J}\delta(\hat{\chi})] - i\hbar U_{IJ}^\lambda | \Psi_2 \rangle = O(\hbar^2), \quad (6.7)$$

which, as shown in Appendix A, is vanishing in the one-loop approximation. Thus, the physical observables are semiclassically Hermitian with respect to the physical inner product (6.2).

Another important property of this product and matrix elements of observables is their independence of the choice of gauge conditions $\chi^\mu(q)$ participating in their construction. The gauge independence of the inner product itself is based, as shown in [5, 21], on the fact that it can be rewritten as an integral over $(n-m)$ -dimensional surface Σ of certain $(n-m)$ -form which is closed in virtue of the Dirac constraints on physical states

$$(\Psi_2|\Psi_1) = \int_\Sigma \omega^{(n-m)}, \quad d\omega^{(n-m)} = 0. \quad (6.8)$$

It follows then from the Stokes theorem that this integral is independent of the choice of Σ or equivalently of the choice of gauge conditions specifying the physical subspace. The form $\omega^{(n-m)}$ in the one-loop approximation equals

$$\omega^{(n-m)} = \frac{dq^{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dq^{i_{n-m}}}{(n-m)!} \epsilon_{i_1 \dots i_n} \Psi_2^* \nabla_1^{i_{n-m+1}} \dots \nabla_m^{i_n} \Psi_1, \quad (6.9)$$

and its closure is a corollary of the continuity equation (4.5) for $\Psi_2^*\Psi_1$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} (\nabla_\mu^i \Psi_2^* \Psi_1) = U_{\mu\lambda}^\lambda \Psi_2^* \Psi_1. \quad (6.10)$$

The evaluation of the matrix element of the observable $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ semiclassically involves the evaluation of the quantity

$$(\Psi_2|\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I\Psi_1) = \int_\Sigma \omega^{(n-m)} \mathcal{O}_I(q, \partial \mathbf{S}_1 / \partial q) + O(\hbar), \quad (6.11)$$

which will be also gauge independent provided the continuity equation holds for the quantity $\Psi_2^*(q)\Psi_1(q)\mathcal{O}_I(q,\partial\mathbf{S}_1/\partial q)$. But this equation will also be a corollary of (6.10) because, as shown in Appendix A, on the Lagrangian manifold of phase space

$$\nabla_\mu^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \left[\mathcal{O} \left(q, \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}}{\partial q} \right) \right] \equiv \{ \mathcal{O}, T_\mu \} \Big|_{p = \partial \mathbf{S} / \partial q} = 0 \quad (6.12)$$

in view of gauge invariance (2.10) of observables⁵. Thus, as it should have been expected from the theory of gauge fields [17, 16] the gauge independence of the physical matrix elements or expectation values of observables follows from the gauge invariance of the latter. This is true not only at the formal path-integral quantization level, but also in the operatorial Dirac quantization scheme.

7. Conclusions

Thus we see that, despite a complicated non-abelian nature of the formalism, Dirac quantization of generic constrained systems is remarkably consistent and reveals rich geometrical structures beyond the lowest order semiclassical approximation. Geometrical covariance of operators and physical states takes place not only in the coordinate configuration space of the theory, but also in the space of gauge transformations. The quantum formalism turns out to be covariant in the sense of unitary equivalence with respect to generic symmetries of a classical theory including arbitrary change of the constraint basis. The operators of physical observables turn out to be Hermitian with respect to a physical inner product and their matrix elements are gauge independent in full correspondence with similar properties in the classical domain. All these properties were obtained perturbatively in the one-loop approximation of semiclassical expansion but, no doubt, they can be extended to multi-loop orders, though, apparently by the price of growing technical complexity.

It should be emphasized that this remarkably general picture of quantum invariances was obtained in the *Dirac* quantization of constrained systems, when *all* quantum constraints are imposed on physical states. These states can be regarded a quantum truncation of the BFV(BRST) quantization with \mathcal{CP} -ordered form of the nilpotent BRS operator in the extended relativistic phase space of original (q, p) and ghost canonical variables $(\mathcal{C}, \bar{\mathcal{P}})$ [14, 5, 11]. As mentioned in Introduction, the main motivation for such a setting is the quantization of zero modes of extended objects for which another (unitary inequivalent) quantization in the Fock space based on the normal Wick ordering in the ghost sector is not applicable. The latter is usually applied to oscillatory modes of field theoretical

⁵In eqs.(6.9)-(6.11) the difference between the momentum arguments related to different Hamilton-Jacobi functions $p = \partial\mathbf{S}_1/\partial q$ and $p = \partial\mathbf{S}_2/\partial q$ should also be treated perturbatively in \hbar and, thus, goes beyond the one-loop approximation (see the footnote to eqs.(6.2)-(6.3)).

models, including strings and low-dimensional CFT [4]. This quantization after truncation to (q, p) -sector results only in a half of the initial constraints imposed on physical states [7] (and in view of this admitting the central extension of quantum algebra). For them the geometric properties of the above type are much less known if at all available at such a general level not resorting to a concrete harmonic oscillator decomposition of fields. Thus it seems interesting to try extending the above geometric methods to this quantization scheme, although it is very hard to expect that the general coordinate invariance in curved configuration space of the theory can be fruitfully combined with the Fock space representation. (The latter, as is well known, is basically applicable to linearized fields belonging to the tangent vector space rather than to the configuration space manifold.)

Another difficulty with the field theoretical (infinite dimensional) extension of the above technique consists in ultraviolet infinities and the accompanying them anomalies that would generally violate gauge symmetries at the quantum level. As is well known, this problem cannot be analyzed at the level of generality adopted in this paper, that is for gauge theories of general type. A usual approach would consist in applying the above formalism to a given field model within a particular regularization scheme that would render all the quantities finite, singling out the potential anomalies of gauge symmetries and using the results as selection criteria for viable systems. Like in string models this might lead to restrictions on the number of fields (dimensionality of target spacetime) or other parameters of quantized model. More detailed discussion of this issue can be found in [5, 21].

As far as it concerns the present results, their direct implications can be expected in quantization of zero modes in various field theoretical models or extended objects. In quantum cosmological context the Dirac quantization scheme is implemented in the system of Wheeler-DeWitt equations. The minisuperspace (zero) mode of the full superspace of quantum cosmology cannot be quantized in the Fock representation, because it has a ghost nature [25, 26, 27], so only the coordinate representation and relevant methods of this paper can be used for the studies of the quantum Cauchy problem for the early inflationary Universe [14, 23]. The gauge invariant observables in early cosmology, the theory of which is very important for understanding the formation of structure [28] and back reaction phenomena, should be analyzed by the technique of the above type. In this respect, especially important becomes the reduction technique in generic unitary gauges that should be applied in the theory of cosmological perturbations of [26] in order to study the quantum back reaction effects in effective equations of inflationary dynamics [29]. The potential range of applications is even wider in D-brane dynamics of string theory [30] and brane cosmology [31]. Zero modes of D and p-branes in nonperturbative string theory or brane-worlds in cosmology [32], separation of their dynamical from purely gauge properties, description of brane dynamics in the bulk in the formalism of quantum Dirac constraints and many other issues are subject to the methods of this paper.

A. Hermiticity of observables

To prove eq.(6.7) note that

$$\langle \Psi_1 | [\hat{\mathcal{O}}_I, \hat{J} \delta(\hat{\chi})] | \Psi_2 \rangle = i\hbar \int dq \{ \mathcal{O}_I, J \delta(\chi) \} \Psi_1^* \Psi_2 + O(\hbar^2). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The Poisson bracket commutator here can be transformed by using the cyclic Jacobi identity and the weak gauge invariance of constraints (2.10)

$$\begin{aligned} \int dq \{ \mathcal{O}_I, J \delta(\chi) \} \Psi_1^* \Psi_2 &= \int dq \delta(\chi) J \left[U_{I\mu}^\mu + J^{-1\mu}_\nu \{ T_\mu, \{ \chi^\nu, \mathcal{O}_I \} \} \right] \Psi_1^* \Psi_2 \\ &+ \int dq \frac{\partial \delta(\chi)}{\partial \chi^\mu} J \{ \mathcal{O}_I, \chi^\mu \} \Psi_1^* \Psi_2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The last term here can be integrated in a special coordinate system on superspace defined by eqs.(5.5) and (5.7)

$$\int dq \frac{\partial \delta(\chi)}{\partial \chi^\mu} J \{ \mathcal{O}_I, \chi^\mu \} \Psi_1^* \Psi_2 = - \int dq \delta(\chi) M \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^\mu} \left[\frac{J}{M} \{ \mathcal{O}_I, \chi^\mu \} \Psi_1^* \Psi_2 \right]. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

To transform this expression further let us derive several useful identities. First of all, note that any function of phase space variables $f(q, p)$ when restricted to the Lagrangian manifold defined by the Hamilton-Jacobi function \mathbf{S} becomes a function on superspace $f(q, \partial \mathbf{S} / \partial q)$. Its derivative with respect to coordinate θ^μ (of the new coordinate system)

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^\mu} \left[f \left(q, \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}}{\partial q} \right) \right] = e_\mu^i \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial q^i} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_k} \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{S}}{\partial q^k \partial q^i} \right), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

can be simplified to

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^\mu} \left[f \left(q, \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}}{\partial q} \right) \right] = J^{-1\mu}_\nu \{ f, T_\nu \} + \Omega_\mu^A \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^A} \left[f \left(q, \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}}{\partial q} \right) \right]. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

in view of eq.(5.10) and the differentiated version of the Hamilton-Jacobi form of constraints

$$\nabla_\mu^i \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{S}}{\partial q^i \partial q^k} = - \frac{\partial T_\mu}{\partial q^k}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Similar derivation shows that the gauge transformation of this function on the Lagrangian manifold, generated by the vector flow ∇_μ^i , coincides with the Poisson bracket of $f(q, p)$ with the constraint

$$\nabla_\mu^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \left[f \left(q, \frac{\partial \mathbf{S}}{\partial q} \right) \right] = \{ f, T_\mu \}, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

evaluated certainly at $p = \partial \mathbf{S} / \partial q$. With these identities and using the derivatives of the measure M (5.7)

$$\frac{\partial M}{\partial \theta^\mu} = -M \frac{\partial e_\mu^i}{\partial q^i}, \quad \frac{\partial M}{\partial \xi^A} = -M \frac{\partial e_A^i}{\partial q^i} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

(e_μ^i and e_A^i are defined by (5.8)), the relation (5.10) and the Jacobi identity for Poisson brackets one can obtain the following gauge derivative

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^\mu} \left(\frac{J}{M} \right) = \frac{J}{M} J^{-1\mu}{}_\nu \left(\frac{\partial \nabla_\nu^i}{\partial q^i} - U_{\nu\lambda}^\lambda \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^A} \left(\frac{J}{M} \Omega_\mu^A \right). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Using this equation for J/M and applying (A.6) and (A.7) to other quantities in (A.3) we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int dq \delta(\chi) M \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^\mu} \left[\frac{J}{M} \{ \mathcal{O}_I, \chi^\mu \} \Psi_1^* \Psi_2 \right] &= \int dq \delta(\chi) J J^{-1\mu}{}_\nu \{ T_\mu, \{ \chi^\nu, \mathcal{O}_I \} \} \Psi_1^* \Psi_2 \\ &+ \int dq \delta(\chi) J J^{-1\mu}{}_\nu \{ \mathcal{O}_I, \chi^\nu \} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} (\nabla_\mu^i \Psi_1^* \Psi_2) - U_{\mu\lambda}^\lambda \Psi_1^* \Psi_2 \right] \\ &+ \int_\Sigma d\xi \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi^A} \left[\frac{J}{M} \Omega_\mu^A \{ \mathcal{O}_I, \chi^\mu \} \Psi_1^* \Psi_2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

The second term here is vanishing in view of the continuity equation (or more precisely $O(\hbar)$ for different Ψ_1 and Ψ_2). The third total derivative term is vanishing in view of zero boundary conditions for physical wavefunctions at the infinity of the physical space Σ . Collecting equations (A.2), (A.3) and (A.10) together we see that the matrix element of the commutator reduces to the one term containing the trace of the structure function $U_{I\mu}^\mu$ which exactly cancels out in the equation (6.7). This proves the Hermiticity of observables in the physical inner product.

B. Abelianization procedure on Lagrangian manifolds

It is well known that when the structure functions of the Poisson-bracket algebra of constraints (1.3) are not constants this algebra is open [6]: the commutator of two consecutive transformations $\delta_\mu f \equiv \{f, T_\mu\}$ of any function on phase space

$$\{\{f, T_\mu\}, T_\nu\} - \{\{f, T_\nu\}, T_\mu\} = U_{\mu\nu}^\lambda \{f, T_\lambda\} + \{f, U_{\mu\nu}^\lambda\} T_\lambda \quad (\text{B.1})$$

is a linear combination of these transformations only on the constraint surface $T_\lambda(q, p) = 0$. Semiclassically, the restriction to this surface takes place on the Lagrangian manifold of phase space

$$p_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}}{\partial q^i} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

defined by the Hamilton-Jacobi function of a semiclassical state, satisfying the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (4.4). As was shown in Appendix A, the action of the constraint generators on $f(q, p)$ (in the sense of Poisson brackets) on this surface (A.7) can be generated by directional derivatives along a special set of vectors ∇_μ^i (4.6). Therefore these vectors

can be regarded as gauge generators on the Lagrangian manifold of phase space. They have a closed Lie-bracket algebra [5]

$$\nabla_\mu^i \frac{\partial \nabla_\nu^k}{\partial q^i} - \nabla_\nu^i \frac{\partial \nabla_\mu^k}{\partial q^i} = U_{\mu\nu}^\lambda \nabla_\lambda^k \quad (\text{B.3})$$

and, therefore, can be abelianized [24] by recombining these vectors with the aid of the matrix of the inverse Faddeev-Popov operator constructed out of some admissible gauge conditions $J_\nu^\mu \equiv \nabla_\nu^i \partial \chi^\mu / \partial q^i$

$$\mathcal{R}_\mu^i = J^{-1\ \nu}_\mu \nabla_\nu^i, \quad \left[\mathcal{R}_\mu^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i}, \mathcal{R}_\nu^i \frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \right] = 0. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Abelian generators allow one to construct preferred parametrization of the coordinate manifold (5.5) with a special internal coordinates on a physical space Σ . Note that the new coordinates ξ^A in (5.5) as functions of the original coordinates are not necessarily gauge invariant. Abelianization procedure can render them invariant as follows. Demand that the reparametrization functions in (5.5) satisfy the equations

$$\frac{\partial e^i(\xi, \theta^\mu)}{\partial \theta^\mu} = \mathcal{R}_\mu^i, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

which are integrable in view of the abelian nature of \mathcal{R}_μ^i . Then the identity $e_\mu^i \partial \xi^A / \partial q^i = 0$ implies the gauge invariance of $\xi^A(q)$

$$\nabla_\mu^i \frac{\partial \xi^A}{\partial q^i} = 0. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Many equations above simplify with this preferred parametrization of physical space Σ . Indeed, eq.(B.5) implies that $\Omega_\mu^A = 0$ in the equation (5.10) and the equation (A.9) for the factor J/M performing the map from the Dirac quantization to the reduced phase space quantization takes the form of the continuity equation for a one-loop prefactor

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \left(\nabla_\mu^i J/M \right) = U_{\mu\lambda}^\lambda J/M, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

which means that this factor with the measure M constructed in this parametrization represents a *kinematical* solution of the continuity equation.

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to the participants of the workshop “Mathematical Problems in Quantum Gravity” for helpful stimulating discussions and for a financial support by the Erwin Schrodinger International Institute for Mathematical Physics where an early stage of this work has been accomplished. This work was also supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research under grants 99-02-16122 and the European Community Grant INTAS-93-493-ext. Partly this work has been made possible also due to the support by the Russian Research Project “Cosmomicrophysics” and the grant for support of leading scientific schools 00-15-96699.

References

- [1] P.A.M.Dirac, Lectures on Quantum Mechanics (Yeshiva University, New York, 1964)
- [2] B.S.DeWitt, Phys.Rev. **160** (1967) 1113
- [3] E.S.Fradkin and G.A.Vilkovisky, Phys.Lett. **B55** (1977) 224; CERN report TH-2332 (1977)
- [4] L.Brink and M.Henneaux, *Principles of String Theory* (New York: Plenum, 1988)
- [5] A.O.Barvinsky and V.Krykhtin, Class. Quantum Grav. **10** (1993) 1957
- [6] I.A.Batalin and G.A.Vilkovisky, Phys.Lett. **B69** (1977) 309; E.S.Fradkin and T.E.Fradkina, Phys.Lett. **B72** (1978) 343
- [7] I.A.Batalin and E.S.Fradkin, Riv.Nuovo Cim. **9** (1986) 1; Ann. Inst. Henri Poincare **49** (1988) 145
- [8] A.O.Barvinsky, Geometry of the Dirac Quantization of Constrained Systems, gr-qc/9612003
- [9] R.Marnelius, Nucl. Phys. **B395** (1993) 647
- [10] R.Marnelius, Nucl. Phys. **B412** (1994) 817
- [11] I.A.Batalin and R.Marnelius, Nucl. Phys. **B442** (1995) 669
- [12] R.Ferraro, M.Henneaux and M.Puchin, J.Math.Phys. **34** (1993) 2757
- [13] A.O. Barvinsky, Phys. Lett. B241 (1990) 201
- [14] A.O.Barvinsky, Phys. Rep. **230** (1993) 237
- [15] C.DeWitt-Morette, Ann.Phys. **97** (1976) 367
- [16] L.D.Faddeev and V.N.Popov, Phys.Lett. **B25** (1967) 29
- [17] B.S. DeWitt, Dynamical Theory of Groups and Fields (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1965).
- [18] A.Ashtekar, J.Lewandowski, D.Marolf, J.Mourao and T.Thieman, J.Math.Phys. **36** (1995) 6456.
- [19] N.P.Landsman, J.Geom.Phys. 15 (1995) 285
- [20] A.O. Barvinsky and V.N. Ponomariov, Phys. Lett. **B167** (1986) 289.

- [21] A.O.Barvinsky, Class.Quantum Grav. **10** (1993) 1985
- [22] A.O.Barvinsky, Nucl. Phys. **B520** (1998) 533
- [23] A.O.Barvinsky, A.Yu.Kamenshchik and I.V.Mishakov, Nucl. Phys. **B491** (1997) 387
- [24] I.A.Batalin and G.A.Vilkovisky, Nucl.Phys. **B234** (1984) 106
- [25] V.A.Rubakov and O.Yu.Shvedov, Phys. Lett. **B383** (1996) 258
- [26] J.Garriga, X.Montes, M.Sasaki and T.Tanaka, Nucl. Phys. **b513** (1998) 343
- [27] S.Gratton and N.Turok, Cosmological Perturbations from the No Boundary Euclidean Path Integral, astro-ph/9902265
- [28] V.F.Mukhanov, H.A.Feldman and R.H.Brandenberger, Phys. Rep. **215** (1992) 203
- [29] A.O.Barvinsky, work in progress
- [30] J.Polchinski, String Theory I&II (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,1998)
- [31] I.Antoniadis, N.Arkani-Hamed, S.Dimopoulos and G.Dvali, Phys. Lett. **B436** (1998) 257; J.Lykken and L.Randall, The Shape of Gravity, hep-th/9908076
- [32] J.Garriga and T.Tanaka, Gravity in the brane-world, hep-th/9911055; J.Garriga and M.Sasaki, Brane-World Creation and Black Holes, hep-th/9912118