

# High-accuracy two-loop computation of the critical mass for Wilson fermions

Sergio Caracciolo<sup>a</sup>, Andrea Pelissetto<sup>b</sup>, and Antonio Rago<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Dipartimento di Fisica, Università degli Studi di Milano, via Celoria 16, I-20133 Milano, INFN, Sezione di Pisa and NEST-INFM, Italy

<sup>b</sup>Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN – Sezione di Roma I, Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”, P.le Aldo Moro 2, I-00185 Roma, Italy

<sup>c</sup>Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN – Sezione di Torino, Università degli Studi di Torino, Via Pietro Giuria 1, I-10125 Torino, Italy

We test an algebraic algorithm based on the coordinate-space method, evaluating with high accuracy the critical mass for Wilson fermions in lattice QCD at two loops. We test the results by using different types of infrared regularization.

We have already presented at a Lattice conference [1] an algebraic algorithm that allows to apply the coordinate-space method by Lüscher and Weisz [2] to two-loop lattice integrals with gluon and Wilson-fermion propagators. In order to test the method, we have recently redone [3] a two-loop computation of the critical mass for Wilson fermions [4].

For Wilson fermions, the dressed inverse fermion propagator has the form

$$\begin{aligned} S^{-1}(p, m_B) &= \\ &= i \bar{p} + m_B + M_W(p) - \Sigma^L(p, m_B, g_0), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where, setting the lattice spacing equal to one,

$$\bar{p}_\mu = \sin p_\mu, \quad (2)$$

$$\hat{p}^2 = \sum_\mu \left( 2 \sin \frac{p_\mu}{2} \right)^2, \quad (3)$$

$$M_W(p) = \frac{r_W}{2} \hat{p}^2. \quad (4)$$

The additive mass renormalization  $\delta m_B$  is obtained by requiring  $S^{-1}(0, \delta m_B) = 0$ , i.e.

$$\Sigma^L(0, \delta m_B, g_0) = \delta m_B. \quad (5)$$

This equation can be solved in perturbation the-

ory by expanding

$$\Sigma^L(0, m_B, g_0) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g_0^{2n} \Sigma^{(n)}. \quad (6)$$

We have computed  $\Sigma^{(1)}$  and  $\Sigma^{(2)}$  for  $r_W = 1$ , gauge group  $SU(N)$ , and  $N_f$  fermionic flavour species, in the Feynman gauge.

In Ref. [5] we already reported the analytic one-loop expression for the fermionic self-energy  $\Sigma^L$ . Our result was expressed in terms of three purely bosonic constants  $Z_0$ ,  $Z_1$  and  $F_0$  and of 12 numerical constants that appear in the presence of Wilson fermions. The numerical values of these constant are obtained by using a powerful recursive method that gives very precise results [5,6]. This algorithm generalizes the method we introduced for purely bosonic integrals in [7]. In practice, we have computed all constants but  $F_0$  with 60-digit precision.

At one-loop order

$$\Sigma^{(1)} = \frac{N^2 - 1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^2 c_i^{(1)}, \quad (7)$$

where  $c_i^{(1)}$  are the contributions of the two contributing diagrams. In terms of the basic integrals

they are given by

$$\begin{aligned} c_1^{(1)} &= -Z_0 \\ c_2^{(1)} &= \frac{Z_0}{2} - \mathcal{F}(1, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Summing up the two contributions we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^2 c_i^{(1)} &= -[Z_0 + 2\mathcal{F}(1, 0)] \\ &\approx -0.16285705871085078618. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The constant is in excellent agreement with the result of Ref. [4],

$$\sum_i c_i^{(1)} = -0.162857058711(2).$$

At two loops there are 26 diagrams. They are numbered as in Ref. [4] in order to simplify the comparison. The  $i$ -th diagram gives a contribution of the form

$$D_i \equiv (N^2 - 1) \left[ c_{1,i}^{(2)} + \frac{1}{N^2} c_{2,i}^{(2)} + \frac{N_f}{N} c_{3,i}^{(2)} \right]. \quad (9)$$

In Table 1 we report the results given in Ref. [4] and those obtained here by using the configuration-space method. When we have not reported an error, the precision we achieve is much higher than the reported digits. This occurs in general when the diagram is the product of one-loop integrals. All results are in agreement with those presented in Ref. [4]. Only for diagram 6 there is apparently a (very) small underestimation of the error, which is negligible in the sum of all contributions. In Table 1 diagrams are grouped together in order to obtain infrared-convergent results, but this is not necessary in our method. Indeed, we can compute each of them separately, by introducing an infrared regularization. To test the results, we have used four different infrared regularizations:

- (a) We add a mass in the denominators of the propagators. Explicitly, for the gluon ( $\Delta_B(k)$ ) and for the fermion ( $\Delta_F(k)$ ) propagator we use:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_B(k) &= \frac{1}{\bar{k}^2 + m^2} \\ \Delta_F(k) &= \frac{-i\bar{k}_\mu \gamma_\mu + M_W(k)}{\bar{k}^2 + M_W(k)^2 + m^2} \end{aligned}$$

- (b) We regularize the gluon propagator as in (a), but use instead the correct Wilson-fermion propagator

$$\Delta_F(k) = \frac{-i\bar{k}_\mu \gamma_\mu + M_W(k) + m}{\bar{k}^2 + (M_W(k) + m)^2}$$

- (c) We regularize the Wilson fermion as in (a), but use the massless propagator for the gluon.
- (d) We regularize the Wilson fermion as in (b) and the massless propagator for the gluon.

As an example, we report in Table 2 the divergent and the finite contribution of three diagrams whose sum is infrared finite. If we write

$$D_i^{(x)} = D_i^{(a)} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{N^2}\right) \Delta_i^{(x)},$$

where  $(x)$  refers to the chosen infrared regularization, we get the results reported in Table 3. Individual diagrams depend on the regularization but their sum does not.

## REFERENCES

1. S. Capitani, S. Caracciolo, A. Pelissetto, and G. C. Rossi, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **63**, 802 (1998), e-print hep-lat/9710074.
2. M. Lüscher and P. Weisz, Nucl. Phys. B **445**, 429 (1995), e-print hep-lat/9502017.
3. S. Caracciolo, A. Pelissetto and A. Rago, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 094506 (2001), e-print hep-lat/0106013.
4. E. Follana and H. Panagopoulos, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 017501 (2001), e-print hep-lat/0006001.
5. G. Burgio, S. Caracciolo, and A. Pelissetto, Nucl. Phys. B **478**, 687 (1996), e-print hep-lat/9607010.
6. G. Burgio, S. Caracciolo, and A. Pelissetto, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **53**, 794 (1997), e-print hep-lat/9607012.
7. S. Caracciolo, P. Menotti, and A. Pelissetto, Nucl. Phys. B **375**, 195 (1992).

$i$	$c_{1,i}^{(2)}$	$c_{2,i}^{(2)}$	$c_{3,i}^{(2)}$
3	0.002000362950707492 0.0020003629507074987148	-0.0030005444260612375 -0.0030005444260612480722	0 0
4	0.00040921361(1) 0.0004092136068803147865	-0.00061382041(2) -0.0006138204103204721798	0 0
5	0 0	0 0	0 0
6	-0.0000488891(8) -0.0000488853119(2)	0.000097778(2) 0.00009770623(5)	0 0
7+8+9+10+11	-0.013927(3) -0.01392647740 (2)	0.014525(2) 0.0145250053341618950704	0 0
12+13	0 0	0 0	0.00079263(8) 0.000792647(2)
14+15+16+17+18	-0.005753(1) -0.00575248584(1)	0.0058323(7) 0.005832127004694453	0 0
19+20	0 0	0 0	0.000393556(7) 0.000393556(4)
21+22+23	0.000096768(4) 0.0000967648(2)	-0.000096768(4) -0.0000967648(2)	0 0
24	0 0	0 0	0 0
25	0.00007762(1) 0.000077613106(4)	-0.00015524(3) -0.000155226212(8)	0 0
26	-0.00040000(5) -0.00039997586(1)	0 0	0 0
27	0 0	-0.000006522(1) -0.0000065203(1)	0 0
28	0.0000078482(5) 0.0000078480652722033294	-0.000015696(1) -0.0000156961305444066589	0 0
Total	-0.017537(3) -0.0175360218(2)	0.016567(2) 0.0165663304(2)	0.00118618(8) 0.001186203(6)

Table 1

Coefficients  $c_{1,i}^{(2)}$ ,  $c_{2,i}^{(2)}$  and  $c_{3,i}^{(2)}$ . For each of them we report in the first line the result of Ref. [4], obtained by means of a momentum-space integration, and in the second line our result, obtained by means of the coordinate-space method.

$i$	Divergent Part	$c_{1,i}^{(2)}$	$c_{2,i}^{(2)}$	$c_{3,i}^{(2)}$
21	$\left(1 - \frac{1}{N^2}\right) \frac{Z_0}{8\pi^2} \log m^2$	0.001606284825541242	-0.001606284825541242	0
22	$\left(1 - \frac{1}{N^2}\right) \left(\frac{-Z_0}{16\pi^2} + \frac{\mathcal{F}(1,0)}{8\pi^2}\right) \log m^2$	0.0005015205(2)	-0.0005015205(2)	0
23	$\left(1 - \frac{1}{N^2}\right) \left(\frac{-Z_0}{16\pi^2} - \frac{\mathcal{F}(1,0)}{8\pi^2}\right) \log m^2$	-0.002011040454066014	0.002011040454066014	0

Table 2

Divergent and finite contribution of three diagrams whose sum is infrared finite.

$i$	$\Delta_i^{(b)}$	$\Delta_i^{(c)}$	$\Delta_i^{(d)}$
21	$+\frac{Z_0}{16\pi^2}$	$+\frac{11Z_0}{96\pi^2}$	$+\frac{16Z_0}{96\pi^2}$
22	$-\frac{Z_0}{32\pi^2} + \frac{\mathcal{F}(1,0)}{16\pi^2}$	$-\frac{11Z_0}{192\pi^2} + \frac{11\mathcal{F}(1,0)}{96\pi^2}$	$-\frac{16Z_0}{192\pi^2} + \frac{16\mathcal{F}(1,0)}{96\pi^2}$
23	$-\frac{Z_0}{32\pi^2} - \frac{\mathcal{F}(1,0)}{16\pi^2}$	$-\frac{11Z_0}{192\pi^2} - \frac{11\mathcal{F}(1,0)}{96\pi^2}$	$-\frac{16Z_0}{192\pi^2} - \frac{16\mathcal{F}(1,0)}{96\pi^2}$

Table 3

Contribution from different regularizations.