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The second-order equation in the $(1 / 2,0) \oplus(0,1 / 2)$ representation of the Lorentz group has been proposed by A. Barut in the 70s, ref. [1]. It permits to explain the mass splitting of leptons $(e, \mu, \tau)$. The interest is growing in this model (see, for instance, the papers by S. Kruglov [2] and J. P. Vigier et al. [3, 4]). We noted some additional points of this model.

The Barut main equation is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[i \gamma^{\mu} \partial_{\mu}+\alpha_{2} \partial^{\mu} \partial_{\mu}-\kappa\right] \Psi=0 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\alpha_{2}$ and $\kappa$ are the constants later related to the anomalous magnetic moment and mass, respectively. The matrices $\gamma^{\mu}$ are defined by the anticommutation relation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma^{\mu} \gamma^{v}+\gamma^{v} \gamma^{\mu}=2 g^{\mu v} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

$g^{\mu \nu}$ is the metrics of the Minkowski space, $\mu, v=0,1,2,3$. The equation represents a theory with the conserved current that is linear in 15 generators of the 4-dimensional representation of the $O(4,2)$ group, $N_{a b}=\frac{i}{2} \gamma_{a} \gamma_{b}, \gamma_{a}=\left\{\gamma_{\mu}, \gamma_{5}, i\right\}$. Instead of 4 solutions the equation (1) has 8 solutions with the correct relativistic relation $E= \pm \sqrt{\mathbf{p}^{2}+m_{i}^{2}}$. In fact, it describes states of different masses (the second one is $m_{2}=$ $1 / \alpha_{2}-m_{1}=m_{e}\left(1+\frac{3}{2 \alpha}\right), \alpha$ is the fine structure constant), provided that the certain physical condition is imposed on $\alpha_{2}=\left(1 / m_{1}\right)(2 \alpha / 3) /(1+4 \alpha / 3)$, the parameter (the anomalous magentic moment should be equal to $4 \alpha / 3$ ). One can also generalize the formalism to include the third state, the $\tau$ lepton [1b]. Barut has indicated at the possibility of including $\gamma_{5}$ terms (e.g., $\sim \gamma_{5} \kappa^{\prime}$ ).

The most general form of spinor relations in the $(1 / 2,0) \oplus$ $(0,1 / 2)$ representation has been given by Dvoeglazov [5]. It was possible to derive the Barut equation from the first principles [6]. Let us reveal the connections with other models. For instance, in refs. [3,7] the following equation has been studied:

$$
\begin{align*}
& {\left[(i \hat{\partial}-e \hat{A})(i \hat{\partial}-e \hat{A})-m^{2}\right] \Psi=\left[\left(i \partial_{\mu}-e A_{\mu}\right)\left(i \partial^{\mu}-e A^{\mu}\right)-\right.} \\
& \left.-\frac{1}{2} e \sigma^{\mu \nu} F_{\mu \nu}-m^{2}\right] \Psi=0 \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

for the 4-component spinor $\Psi . \hat{A}=\gamma^{\mu} A_{\mu} ; A_{\mu}$ is the 4-vector potential; $e$ is electric charge; $F_{\mu \nu}$ is the electromagnetic tensor. $\sigma^{\mu \nu}=\frac{i}{2}\left[\gamma^{\mu}, \gamma^{\nu}\right]_{-}$. This is the Feynman-Gell-Mann equation. In the free case we have the Lagrangian (see Eq. (9) of ref. [3c]):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{L}_{0}=(i \overline{\hat{\partial} \Psi})(i \hat{\partial} \Psi)-m^{2} \bar{\Psi} \Psi \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us re-write the equation (1) into the form:*

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[i \gamma^{\mu} \partial_{\mu}+a \partial^{\mu} \partial_{\mu}+b\right] \Psi=0 \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

So, one should calculate $\left(p^{2}=p_{0}^{2}-\mathbf{p}^{2}\right)$

$$
\operatorname{Det}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
b-a p^{2} & p_{0}+\sigma \cdot \mathbf{p}  \tag{6}\\
p_{0}-\sigma \cdot \mathbf{p} & b-a p^{2}
\end{array}\right)=0
$$

in order to find energy-momentum-mass relations. Thus, $\left[\left(b-a p^{2}\right)^{2}-p^{2}\right]^{2}=0$ and if $a=0, b= \pm m$ we come to the well-known relation $p^{2}=p_{0}^{2}-\mathbf{p}^{2}=m^{2}$ with four Dirac solutions. However, in the general case $a \neq 0$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
p^{2}=\frac{(2 a b+1) \pm \sqrt{4 a b+1}}{2 a^{2}}>0 \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

that signifies that we do not have tachyons. However, the above result implies that we cannot just put $a=0$ in the solutions, while it was formally possible in the equation (5). When $a \rightarrow 0$ then $^{\dagger} p^{2} \rightarrow \infty$; when $a \rightarrow \pm \infty$ then $p^{2} \rightarrow 0$. It should be stressed that the limit in the equation does not always coincide with the limit in the solutions. So, the questions arise when we consider limits, such as Dirac $\rightarrow$ Weyl, and Proca $\rightarrow$ Maxwell. The similar method has also been presented by S. Kruglov for bosons [8]. Other fact should be mentioned: when $4 a b=-1$ we have only the solutions with $p^{2}=4 b^{2}$. For instance, $b=m / 2, a=-1 / 2 m, p^{2}=m^{2}$. Next, I just want to mention one Barut omission. While we can write

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\sqrt{4 a b+1}}{a^{2}}=m_{2}^{2}-m_{1}^{2}, \text { and } \quad \frac{2 a b+1}{a^{2}}=m_{2}^{2}+m_{1}^{2} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

but $m_{2}$ and $m_{1}$ not necessarily should be associated with $m_{\mu, e}$ (or $m_{\tau, \mu}$ ). They may be associated with their superpositions, and applied to neutrino mixing, or quark mixing.

The lepton mass splitting has also been studied by Markov [9] on using the concept of both positive and negative masses in the Dirac equation. Next, obviously we can calculate anomalous magnetic moments in this scheme (on using, for instance, methods of $[10,11]$ ).

We previously noted:

[^0]- The Barut equation is a sum of the Dirac equation and the Feynman-Gell-Mann equation.
- Recently, it was suggested to associate an analogue of Eq. (4) with the dark matter, provided that $\Psi$ is composed of the self/anti-self charge conjugate spinors, and it has the dimension [energy] ${ }^{1}$ in the unit system $c=$ $\hbar=1$. The interaction Lagrangian is $\mathcal{L}^{H} \sim g \bar{\Psi} \Psi \phi^{2}, \phi$ is a acalar field.
- The term $\sim \bar{\Psi} \sigma^{\mu \nu} \Psi F_{\mu \nu}$ will affect the photon propagation, and non-local terms will appear in higher orders.
- However, it was shown in [3b, c] that a) the Mott crosssection formula (which represents the Coulomb scattering up to the order $\sim e^{2}$ ) is still valid; b) the hydrogen spectrum is not much disturbed; if the electromagnetic field is weak the corrections are small.
- The solutions are the eigenstates of $\gamma^{5}$ operator.
- In general, the current $J_{0}$ is not the positive-defined quantity, since the general solution $\Psi=c_{1} \Psi_{+}+c_{2} \Psi_{-}$, where $\left[i \gamma^{\mu} \partial_{\mu} \pm m\right] \Psi_{ \pm}=0$, see also [9].
- We obtained the Barut-like equations of the 2 nd order and 3 rd order in derivatives.
- We obtained dynamical invariants for the free Barut field on the classical and quantum level.
- We found relations with other models (such as the Feynman-Gell-Mann equation).
- As a result of analysis of dynamical invariants, we can state that at the free level the term $\sim \partial_{\mu} \bar{\Psi} \sigma_{\mu \nu} \partial_{\nu} \Psi$ in the Lagrangian does not contribute.
- However, the interaction terms $\sim \bar{\Psi} \sigma_{\mu \nu} \partial_{\nu} \Psi A_{\mu}$ will contribute when we construct the Feynman diagrams and the $S$-matrix. In the curved space (the 4-momentum Lobachevsky space) the influence of such terms has been investigated in the Skachkov works [10, 11]. Briefly, the contribution will be such as if the 4-potential were interact with some "renormalized" spin. Perhaps, this explains, why did Barut use the classical anomalous magnetic moment $g \sim 4 \alpha / 3$ instead of $\frac{\alpha}{2 \pi}$.
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[^0]:    *Of course, one could admit $p^{4}, p^{6}$ etc. in the Dirac equation too. The dispersion relations will be more complicated [6].
    ${ }^{\dagger} a$ has dimensionality $[1 / m], b$ has dimensionality $[m]$.

