Is the Effective Potential, Effective for Dynamics? The Effective Potential,

Fective for Dynamics?

Based on <u>PRD 109, 105021 (2024)</u>

By Nathan Herring

In collaboration with Shuyang Cao and Daniel Boyanovsky

DPF-Pheno Symposium 2024, May 13-17

Based on PRD 109, 105021 (2024)

By Nathan Herring DPF-Pheno Symposium 2024, May 13-17

Outline

❖ The Usual Effective Potential—Static Case

❖ The Adiabatic Effective Potential—Dynamical Case

Adiabatic Breakdown and Instabilities—Parametric Resonances

❖ Conclusions

The Effective Potential

- The effective potential origins: how do radiative corrections modify spontaneous symmetry breaking?
- Defined as the generating function of single particle irreducible Green's functions at zero momentum transfer.
- Useful in understanding phase transitions in quantum field theories.
- **The Effective Potential originally computed using Feynman diagrams or functions at zero**

 Defined as the generating function of single particle irreducible Green's functions at zero

 While originally computed using gave a more expedient and intuitive Hamiltonian derivation (for zero temperature):

- Consider a real scalar field Hamiltonian: $H=\int d^3x\Biggl\{\frac{\hat{\pi}^2}{2}+\frac{(\nabla\hat{\phi})^2}{2}+V(\hat{\phi})\Biggr\}$
- With the following conditions: $\varphi=\langle\Phi|\hat{\phi}(\vec{x},t)|\Phi\rangle$; $\langle\Phi|\hat{\pi}(\vec{x},t)|\Phi\rangle=0$
	- Therefore, the field is in a coherent state/condensate.
- Decompose into "classical"/mean field and fluctuation:

• Inserting into the Hamiltonian and expanding in δ , one readily obtains the effective potential:

$$
V_{eff} = V(\varphi) + \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}} \int d^3x \langle \Phi | \left\{ \frac{\hat{\pi}_{\delta}^2}{2} + \frac{(\nabla \hat{\delta})^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{M}^2(\varphi) \hat{\delta}^2 + \cdots \right\} | \Phi \rangle
$$

here the fluctuation itself behaves as a free real scalar field with mass: $\mathcal{M}^2(\varphi) =$
• Note this mass is *time-independent* since the mean field/classical field is constant.

- Where the fluctuation itself behaves as a free real scalar field with mass: $\;\;{\cal M}^2(\varphi)\equiv V''(\varphi)$
	- Note this mass is time-independent since the mean field/classical field is constant.

• Inserting into the Hamiltonian and expanding in δ , one readily obtains the effective potential:

$$
V_{eff} = V(\varphi) + \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}} \int d^3x \langle \Phi | \left\{ \frac{\hat{\pi}_{\delta}^2}{2} + \frac{(\nabla \hat{\delta})^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{M}^2(\varphi) \hat{\delta}^2 + \cdots \right\} | \Phi \rangle
$$

here the fluctuation itself behaves as a free real scalar field with mass: $\mathcal{M}^2(\varphi) \equiv$
• Note this mass is *time-independent* since the mean field/classical field is constant.
olving the equations of motion for the fluctuation simplifies the expression:

$$
V_{eff}(\varphi) = V(\varphi) + \frac{\hbar}{2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \omega_k(\varphi) + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^2) + \cdots
$$

• This is the familiar one-
potential.
• UV divergences handle
straightforward renormi parameters in the "clas

- Where the fluctuation itself behaves as a free real scalar field with mass: $\;\;\mathcal{M}^2(\varphi)\equiv V''(\varphi)$
	- Note this mass is time-independent since the mean field/classical field is constant.
- Solving the equations of motion for the fluctuation simplifies the expression:

$$
V_{eff} = V(\varphi) + \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}} \int d^3x \langle \Phi | \{ \frac{n_{\delta}}{2} + \frac{(v \vee v)}{2} +
$$

here the fluctuation itself behaves as a free real scalar field
• Note this mass is *time-independent* since the mean field/classical field
olving the equations of motion for the fluctuation simplifies

$$
V_{eff}(\varphi) = V(\varphi) + \frac{\hbar}{2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \omega_k(\varphi) + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^2) + \cdots
$$

- This is the familiar one-loop effective potential.
- UV divergences handled by straightforward renormalization of parameters in the "classical" potential.

• Inserting into the Hamiltonian and expanding in δ , one readily obtains the effective potential:

$$
V_{eff} = V(\varphi) + \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}} \int d^3x \langle \Phi | \left\{ \frac{\hat{\pi}_{\delta}^2}{2} + \frac{(\nabla \hat{\delta})^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{M}^2(\varphi) \hat{\delta}^2 + \cdots \right\} | \Phi \rangle
$$

\nhere the fluctuation itself behaves as a free real scalar field with mass: $\mathcal{M}^2(\varphi) \equiv \cdots$
\n• Note this mass is *time-independent* since the mean field/classical field is constant.
\nolving the equations of motion for the fluctuation simplifies the expression:
\n
$$
V_{eff}(\varphi) = V(\varphi) + \frac{\hbar}{2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \omega_k(\varphi) + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^2) + \cdots
$$
\n• This is the familiar one-
\nbeotential.
\nthe assumption approach works to extract the effective potential.
\n2. The usual effective potential is a *static* quantity.
\n2. The usual effective potential is a *static* quantity.

- Where the fluctuation itself behaves as a free real scalar field with mass: $\mathcal{M}^2(\varphi)\equiv V''(\varphi)$
	- Note this mass is time-independent since the mean field/classical field is constant.
- Solving the equations of motion for the fluctuation simplifies the expression:

$$
V_{eff} = V(\varphi) + \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}} \int d^3x \langle \Phi | \{ \frac{n_{\delta}}{2} + \frac{(\nu \circ \varphi)}{2} +
$$

here the fluctuation itself behaves as a free real scalar field
• Note this mass is *time-independent* since the mean field/classical field
olving the equations of motion for the fluctuation simplifies

$$
V_{eff}(\varphi) = V(\varphi) + \frac{\hbar}{2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \omega_k(\varphi) + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^2) + \cdots
$$

keaways:
1. The Hamiltonian approach works to extract the effective potential.
2. The usual effective potential is a *static* quantity.

- Takeaways:
	-
	-
- This is the familiar one-loop effective potential.
- UV divergences handled by straightforward renormalization of parameters in the "classical" potential.

The Effective Potential—Dynamical Case

- Increasingly, phenomenologists have used the effective potential to describe the time evolution of the expectation values of homogeneous fields.
- The idea is to use the equation of motion:

$$
\ddot{\varphi}(t) + \frac{d}{d\varphi} V_{eff}(\varphi(t)) = 0
$$

- But is this ultimately justified?
- Consider the same Hamiltonian but with conditions: $\langle \Phi | \hat{\phi}(\vec{x},0) | \Phi \rangle = \varphi(0) \langle \Phi | \hat{\pi}(\vec{x},0) | \Phi \rangle = \dot{\varphi}(0)$

$$
\hat{\phi}(\vec{x},t) = \varphi(t) + \hat{\delta}(\vec{x},t) \quad ; \quad \hat{\pi}(\vec{x},t) = \dot{\varphi}(t) + \hat{\pi}_{\delta}(\vec{x},t)
$$
\n
$$
\text{Time-varying mean field}
$$
\nQuantum Fluctuation

8

The Effective Potential—Dynamical Case

• Inserting into the Hamiltonian one obtains the energy density:

$$
\mathcal{E} = \frac{\langle \Phi | \hat{H} | \Phi \rangle}{\mathcal{V}} = \frac{1}{2} \dot{\varphi}^2(t) + V(\varphi(t)) + \mathcal{E}_f(t)
$$

- **Kinetic**
- Classical Potential
- **Fluctuation**

• Where the one-loop fluctuation energy density:

$$
\mathcal{E}_f(t) = \frac{\hbar}{2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[|\dot{g}_k(t)|^2 + \omega^2(t) |g_k(t)|^2 \right]
$$

• The non-trivial time-dependence of $\varphi(t)$ means the fluctuation essentially has a time-dependent mass!

$$
\mathcal{M}^2(\varphi) \equiv V''(\varphi)
$$

• The best one can do is express the result in terms of the mode functions of the fluctuation which satisfy:

$$
\ddot{g}_k(t) + \omega_k^2(t) g_k(t) = 0 \; ; \; \omega_k^2(t) \equiv [k^2 + V''(\varphi(t))]
$$

Quasi-static/Adiabatic Approximation

• Often the dynamical situations of interest consider a slow evolution of the mean field.

\n- WKB Ansatz:
$$
g_k(t) = \frac{e^{-i \int_0^t W_k(t') dt'}}{\sqrt{2W_k(t)}}
$$
\n- Adiabatic Expansion:
$$
W_k^2(t) = \omega_k^2(t) \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\ddot{\omega}_k}{\omega_k^3} + \frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{\dot{\omega}_k}{\omega_k^2} \right)^2 + \cdots \right]
$$
\n

Quasi-static/Adiabatic Approximation

- Often the dynamical situations of interest consider a slow evolution of the mean field.
- WKB Ansatz: $g_k(t) = \frac{e^{-i \int_0^t W_k(t') dt'}}{\sqrt{2W_k(t)}}$ • Adiabatic Expansion: $W_k^2(t) = \omega_k^2(t) \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\ddot{\omega}_k}{\omega_k^3} + \frac{3}{4} \Big(\frac{\dot{\omega}_k}{\omega_k^2}\Big)^2 + \cdots \right]$
- Insert into energy density; define the *adiabatic effective potential* (up to 2nd order adiabatic):

$$
V_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi) \equiv V(\varphi(t)) + \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \sqrt{k^2 + V''(\varphi(t))} + \frac{\dot{\varphi}^2(t)}{64} (V'''(\varphi(t)))^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{(k^2 + V''(\varphi(t)))^{5/2}}
$$

usual 1-loop effective potential
2nd order adiabatic correction

Energy Conservation and Equation of Motion

-
- Fnergy Conservation and Equation of Motion

 Energy is conserved for fields in Minkowski spacetime.

 Differentiating the energy density, one obtains the *true equation of motion* for the "classical"

Field: field:

Differentiating the energy density, one obtains the true equation of motion for the classical field:
\n
$$
\dot{\varepsilon} = 0 \longrightarrow \ddot{\varphi}(t) + V'(\varphi(t)) + \frac{\hbar}{2} V'''(\varphi(t)) \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} |g_k(t)|^2 = 0
$$

Energy Conservation and Equation of Motion

- Energy is conserved for fields in Minkowski spacetime.
- Differentiating the energy density, one obtains the *true equation of motion* for the "classical" field:

Differentiating the energy density, one obtains the true equation of motion for the classical field:
\n
$$
\dot{\varepsilon} = 0 \longrightarrow \ddot{\varphi}(t) + V'(\varphi(t)) + \frac{\hbar}{2} V'''(\varphi(t)) \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} |g_k(t)|^2 = 0 \longrightarrow U'(\varphi)
$$
\nCompare with the effective potential inspired equation:
$$
\ddot{\varphi}(t) + \frac{d}{d\varphi} V_{eff}(\varphi(t)) = 0
$$
\nDiscrepancy:
$$
U'(\varphi) - \frac{dV_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = \ddot{\varphi} \frac{(V'''(\varphi))^2}{16} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{2\omega_k^5} + \cdots = \ddot{\varphi} \frac{(V'''(\varphi))^2}{96 \pi^2 V''(\varphi)} + \cdots
$$

• Compare with the effective potential inspired equation: $\ddot{\varphi}(t)+\dfrac{d}{d\varphi}V_{eff}(\varphi(t))=0$

• **Discrepancy:**
$$
U'(\varphi) - \frac{dV_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = \ddot{\varphi} \frac{\left(V'''(\varphi)\right)^2}{16} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{2\omega_k^5} + \cdots = \ddot{\varphi} \frac{\left(V'''(\varphi)\right)^2}{96\pi^2 V''(\varphi)} + \cdots
$$

Energy Conservation and Equation of Motion

-
- Finergy Conservation and Equation of Motion

 Energy is conserved for fields in Minkowski spacetime.

 Differentiating the energy density, one obtains the *true equation of motion* for the "classical"

Figure 1998 field:

Differentiating the energy density, one obtains the true equation for motion for the classical field:
\n
$$
\dot{\varepsilon} = 0 \longrightarrow \tilde{\varphi}(t) + \frac{V'(\varphi(t)) + \frac{\hbar}{2}V'''(\varphi(t)) \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} |g_k(t)|^2}{\sqrt{2\pi})^3} = 0 \longrightarrow U'(\varphi)
$$
\nCompare with the effective potential inspired equation:
$$
\ddot{\varphi}(t) + \frac{d}{d\varphi} V_{eff}(\varphi(t)) = 0
$$
\nDiscrepancy:
$$
U'(\varphi) - \frac{dV_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = \ddot{\varphi} \frac{(V'''(\varphi))^2}{16} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{2\omega_k^5} + \cdots = \ddot{\varphi} \frac{(V'''(\varphi))^2}{96 \pi^2 V''(\varphi)} + \cdots
$$
\nTakeaways: 1. Beyond zeroth adiabatic order, the equation of motion does NOT go with the effective potential! 2. Insisting on using the effective potential entails violation of energy conservation!

• Compare with the effective potential inspired equation: $\ddot{\varphi}(t)+\dfrac{d}{d\varphi}V_{eff}(\varphi(t))=0$

• **Discrepancy:**
$$
U'(\varphi) - \frac{dV_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = \ddot{\varphi} \frac{\left(V'''(\varphi)\right)^2}{16} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{2\omega_k^5} + \cdots = \ddot{\varphi} \frac{\left(V'''(\varphi)\right)^2}{96\pi^2 V''(\varphi)} + \cdots
$$

- Takeaways:
	-
	-

How bad is this discrepancy really?

- Consider a simple tree level potential: $V(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2}$ **OW bad is this discrepancy ready**

ponsider a simple tree level potential: $V(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2}m^2\varphi^2 + \frac{1}{2}m^2\varphi^2$

this case the discrepancy becomes:
 $U'(\varphi) - \frac{dV_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = \ddot{\varphi}(t) \frac{\lambda}{\varphi} \left[\frac{3\lambda \varphi^2(t)/m}{\$
- In this case the discrepancy becomes:

a simple tree level potential:
$$
V(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2}m^2\varphi^2 + \frac{1}{4}\varphi^4
$$

\n $m^2 > 0$
\nsee the discrepancy becomes:
\n
$$
U'(\varphi) - \frac{dV_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = \ddot{\varphi}(t) \frac{\lambda}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{\left(3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2\right)}{1 + \left(3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2\right)} \right]
$$

How bad is this discrepancy really?

- Consider a simple tree level potential: $V(\varphi)=\frac{1}{2}m^2\varphi^2+\frac{\lambda}{4}\varphi^4$ **OW bad is this discrepancy ready**

ponsider a simple tree level potential: $V(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2}m^2\varphi^2 + \frac{1}{2}m^2\varphi^2$

this case the discrepancy becomes:
 $U'(\varphi) - \frac{dV_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = \ddot{\varphi}(t) \frac{\lambda}{\varphi} \left[\frac{(3\lambda \varphi^2(t)/m^2$
- In this case the discrepancy becomes:

a simple tree level potential:
$$
V(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2}m^2\varphi^2 + \frac{1}{4}\varphi^4
$$

\n $m^2 > 0$
\nsee the discrepancy becomes:
\n
$$
U'(\varphi) - \frac{dV_{eff}^{(adj)}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = \ddot{\varphi}(t) \frac{\lambda}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{(3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2)}{1 + (3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2)} \right]
$$

\nude Limit: $3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2 \gg 1$
\nkey seems
\nvely small.
\ng wavelengths $k^2 \ll 3\lambda\varphi^2(t)$.
\nty is violated!
\n $\frac{\ddot{\varphi}(t)}{3\lambda\varphi^3} \approx \sigma(1)$

Large Amplitude Limit: $3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2\gg 1$

- Discrepancy seems perturbatively small.
- But for long wavelengths $k^2 \ll 3\lambda\varphi^2(t)$ adiabaticity is violated!

$$
\frac{\ddot{\omega}_k(t)}{\omega_k^3(t)} \simeq \frac{\ddot{\varphi}(t)}{3\lambda\varphi^3} \simeq \sigma(1)
$$

How bad is this discrepancy really? **OW bad is this discrepancy ready**

ponsider a simple tree level potential: $V(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2}m^2\varphi^2 + \frac{1}{2}m^2\varphi^2$

this case the discrepancy becomes:
 $U'(\varphi) - \frac{dV_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = \ddot{\varphi}(t) \frac{\lambda}{\varphi} \left[\frac{3\lambda \varphi^2(t)/m}{\$

- Consider a simple tree level potential: $V(\varphi)=\frac{1}{2}m^2\varphi^2+\frac{\lambda}{4}\varphi^4$
- In this case the discrepancy becomes:

$$
m^2 > 0
$$

\n $U'(\varphi) - \frac{dV_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = \ddot{\varphi}(t) \frac{\lambda}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{(3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2)}{1 + (3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2)} \right]$
\nude Limit: $3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2 \gg 1$
\n $U'(\varphi) - \frac{dV_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = \ddot{\varphi}(t) \frac{\lambda}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{(3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2)}{1 + (3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2)} \right]$
\n $U'(\varphi) - \frac{dV_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = \ddot{\varphi}(t) \frac{\lambda}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{(3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2)}{1 + (3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2)} \right]$
\n $U'(\varphi) - \frac{dV_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = \ddot{\varphi}(t) \frac{\lambda}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{(3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2)}{1 + (3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2)} \right]$
\n $U'(\varphi) - \frac{dV_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = \ddot{\varphi}(t) \frac{\lambda}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{(3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2)}{1 + (3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2)} \right]$
\n $U'(\varphi) - \frac{dV_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = \ddot{\varphi}(t) \frac{\lambda}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{(3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2)}{1 + (3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2)} \right]$
\n $U'(\varphi) - \frac{dV_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi)}{d\varphi} = \ddot{\varphi}(t) \frac{\lambda}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{(3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2)}{1 + (3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2)} \right]$
\n $U'(\varphi) = \frac{dV_{eff}^{(ad)}(\varphi)}{d\$

Large Amplitude Limit: $3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2\gg 1$

- Discrepancy seems perturbatively small.
- But for long wavelengths $k^2 \ll 3\lambda\varphi^2(t)$ adiabaticity is violated!

$$
\frac{\ddot{\omega}_k(t)}{\omega_k^3(t)} \simeq \frac{\ddot{\varphi}(t)}{3\lambda \varphi^3} \simeq \varphi(1)
$$

Small Amplitude Limit: $3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2\ll 1$

- Discrepancy again seems perturbatively small.
- However, the classical potential will be mass dominated and $\left(\frac{3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2}{4}\right)^2$
 $\left(\frac{3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2}{8}\right)^3$

Small Amplitude Limit: $3\lambda\varphi^2(t)/m^2 \ll 1$

• Discrepancy again seems

perturbatively small.

• However, the classical potential

will be mass dominated and

feature
- resonance! 17

Parametric Resonances

• Consider mean field oscillations around minimum.

solutions have form:

complex for certain ranges wavevectors \rightarrow unstable modes!

Mode Function ODE \rightarrow Mathieu's Equation

$$
\frac{d^2}{d\tau^2} g_k(\tau) + \left[\eta_k - 2\alpha \cos(2\tau)\right] g_k(\tau) = 0
$$

$$
\alpha = 3\lambda \frac{\varphi^2(0)}{4m^2} \; ; \; \; \eta = 1 + \kappa^2 + 2\alpha \; ; \; \; \kappa = \frac{k}{m}
$$

Parametric Resonances

-
- -
	-
	-

• Adiabatic modes are bounded in time. Unstable (growing) modes represent adiabatic breakdown!

What do these instabilities represent?

What do these instabilities represent?

• Energy is conserved, so these instabilities represent a "draining of energy" from "classical"
 $\epsilon = \frac{\langle \Phi | \hat{H} | \Phi \rangle}{\mathcal{V}} = \frac{1}{2} \dot{\varphi}^2(t) + V(\varphi(t)) + \mathcal{E}_f(t)$

• Classical Potent energy density to the fluctuation term. **What do these instabilities represent a** "draining of energy" from "classical"

energy density to the fluctuation term.
 $\boxed{\mathcal{E} = \frac{\langle \Phi | \hat{H} | \Phi \rangle}{\mathcal{V}} = \frac{1}{2} \dot{\varphi}^2(t) + V(\varphi(t)) + \mathcal{E}_f(t)}$

• This accumulation of ener

$$
\mathcal{E} = \frac{\langle \Phi | \hat{H} | \Phi \rangle}{\mathcal{V}} = \frac{1}{2} \dot{\varphi}^2(t) + V(\varphi(t)) + \mathcal{E}_f(t)
$$

• Kinetic • Classical Potential • Fluctuation

- This accumulation of energy in the fluctuation term can be viewed as a spontaneous production of adiabatic particles. of these instabilities represent a draming of energy from Conductuation term.
 $\frac{1}{2}\dot{\varphi}^2(t) + V(\varphi(t)) + \mathcal{E}_f(t)$
 $\left[\begin{array}{c}\n\cdot \text{ Kinetic} \\
\cdot \text{Classical Potential} \\
\cdot \text{Fluctuation}\n\end{array}\right]$
 $\text{energy in the fluctuation term can be viewed as a spontaneous particles.}\n\text{A-symmetries.}$
 A-symmetries.
 $\text{A-symmet$ Figures of the fluctuation ferm.
 $\mathcal{E} = \frac{\langle \Phi | \hat{H} | \Phi \rangle}{\mathcal{V}} = \frac{1}{2} \dot{\varphi}^2(t) + V(\varphi(t)) + \mathcal{E}_f(t)$
 \cdot Kinetic Classical Potential

is accumulation of energy in the fluctuation term can be viewed as a spontaneous

o
	-
	-
- -
	-
	-

Conclusions

- The usual effective potential **does not** correctly capture the dynamics of a *dynamical mean field*.
- The usual effective potential **does not** correctly capture the dynamics of a *dynamical mean field*.
• Extending the effective potential concept to these situations via a *quasi-static/adiabatic*
 energy conservation i Conclusions

The usual effective potential does not correctly capture the dynamics of a *dynamical mean*

Extending the effective potential concept to these situations via a *quasi-static/adiabatic*

approximation to be im
	-
	-
- The usual effective potential **does not** correctly capture the dynamics of a *dynamical mean field.*
• Extending the effective potential concept to these situations via a *quasi-static/adiabatic* approximation to be impl particle production. **•** The usual effective potential does not correctly capture the dynamics of a dynamical mean field.
• Extending the effective potential concept to these situations via a *quasi-static/adiabatic* approximation to be implem a a quasi-static/adiabatic
highly dubious:
sities can be viewed through lens of

Conclusions

- The usual effective potential **does not** correctly capture the dynamics of a *dynamical mean field*.
- The usual effective potential **does not** correctly capture the dynamics of a *dynamical mean field*.
• Extending the effective potential concept to these situations via a *quasi-static/adiabatic*
 energy conservation i Conclusions

The usual effective potential does not correctly capture the dynamics of a *dynamical mean*

Extending the effective potential concept to these situations via a *quasi-static/adiabatic*

approximation to be im
	-
	-
- The usual effective potential **does not** correctly capture the dynamics of a *dynamical mean field.*
• Extending the effective potential concept to these situations via a *quasi-static/adiabatic* approximation to be imp particle production. **CONCLUSIONS**

• The usual effective potential does not correctly capture the dynamics of a dynamical mean field.

• Extending the effective potential concept to these situations via a *quasi-static/adiabatic*

• *Comprom*
-

$$
\ddot{\varphi}(t) + V'(\varphi(t)) + \frac{\hbar}{2} V'''(\varphi(t)) \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} |g_k(t)|^2 = 0
$$

$$
\ddot{g}_k(t) + \omega_k^2(t) g_k(t) = 0 \; ; \; \omega_k^2(t) \equiv [k^2 + V''(\varphi(t))]
$$

-
-
- a a *quasi-staticial abdution*
highly dubious:
s
ties can be viewed through lens of
onserving equations of motion:
Closed set of equations.
Can renormalize away UV divergences.
Can be solved numerically via
appropriate in φ , $\dot{\varphi}$, g_k , \dot{g}_k 22