

Exercise 9.1: The Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff (BCH) theorem states,

$$e^A B e^{-A} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} B_n \quad (1)$$

where $B_n = [A, B_{n-1}]$ and $B_0 = B$.

- (a) Define $C(\tau) = e^{\tau A} B e^{-\tau A}$, and by computing the Taylor expansion of C prove the BCH theorem.
- (b) Consider $C(\tau) = e^{-\tau A} e^{-\tau B} e^{\tau(A+B)}$. Show that,

$$\partial_{\tau} C = - \left(B - \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-\tau)^{n+m}}{n!m!} B_{n,m} \right) C \quad (2)$$

where $B_{n,m} = (B_n)_m$. Using this result, compare the Taylor expansion of $C(\tau)$ with the ansatz $C(\tau) = e^{\tau D_1} e^{\tau^2 D_2/2} e^{\tau^3 D_3/3!} \dots$ and find an expression for D_1 , D_2 and D_3 .

Exercise 9.2: Consider the Wilson line defined by,

$$W_C(z(s), y) = P \left[\exp \left(i \int_0^s ds \frac{dx^{\mu}}{ds} A_{\mu}(x(s)) \right) \right], \quad (3)$$

where C is a path from y to z and P denotes the matrices are path-ordered.

- (a) By differentiating the expression for the Wilson line show that it satisfies the equation,

$$\frac{dx^{\mu}}{ds} \mathcal{D}_{\mu} W_C(z(s), y) = 0, \quad (4)$$

where the covariant derivative $\mathcal{D}_{\mu} \equiv \partial_{\mu} - i A_{\mu}$ acts on the variable z .

- (b) By multiplying the left side of (4) by $U(z)$ and the right by $U^{-1}(y)$ and using the fact that the solution of a first order differential equation is unique show that the Wilson line transforms under a gauge transformation as,

$$W_C(x, y) \rightarrow U(x) W_C(x, y) U^{-1}(y). \quad (5)$$

Hence deduce that the trace of a Wilson loop is gauge invariant.

Exercise 9.3: By considering the expansion of the exponential in the expression for W_C , show that,

- (a) $W_C(y, x) = 1 + \int_x^y dw^{\mu} A_{\mu} + \int_x^y dw^{\mu} \int_x^w dz^{\nu} A_{\mu} A_{\nu} + \dots$
- (b) Consider the Wilson lines $W_{C_1}(y, x)$ and $W_{C_2}(z, y)$, where C_1 and C_2 are two curves smoothly joined at y . Show, to second order, that $W_{C_1+C_2}(z, x) = W_{C_2}(z, y) W_{C_1}(y, x)$.
- (c) Explain in general why $P[A]P[B] \neq P[AB]$, where P is the path-ordering operator.