

DESY 03-150, SFB/CPP-03-41  
September 2003

hep-lat/0309169

# Exploring two non-perturbative definitions of $c_A^{*\dagger}$

S. Dürr<sup>a</sup>, M. Della Morte<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>DESY, Platanenallee 6, 15738 Zeuthen, Germany

We present two determinations of the coefficient  $c_A$  in quenched QCD, needed to build the  $O(a)$  improved axial current. The first condition used is the requirement that the PCAC quark mass, as a function of  $x_0$ , stays flat for a non-trivial spatial phase for the fermions in the Schrödinger functional. The second condition is that the PCAC relation for the ground-state and the first excited state at finite  $L$  give the same quark mass. Our results confirm previous findings that in the quenched theory the intrinsic  $O(a)$  ambiguity of  $c_A$  gets relevant around  $\beta \simeq 6.0$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The improved axial current

$$A_0^I(x) \equiv A_0(x) + a c_A \frac{\partial_0 + \partial_0^*}{2} P(x) \quad (1)$$

with  $A_0(x) = \bar{\psi}_j \gamma_0 \gamma_5 \psi_i$  and  $P(x) = \bar{\psi}_j \gamma_5 \psi_i$  is designed to modify the scaling behavior of on-shell quantities from  $O(a)$  to  $O(a^2)$ , if  $c_A$  and  $c_{\text{SW}}$  are chosen appropriately. Therefore, an accurate determination of the coefficient  $c_A$  is an important ingredient in the improvement programme à la Symanzik. Here, we present results in the quenched theory, but the real motivation is to find a criterion which is practical in a dynamical setting, where large cut-off effects have been found [1].

Our data have been generated in the Schrödinger functional (SF) setup: we use a  $T \times L^3$  box, applying some Dirichlet type boundary conditions in the time direction (i.e. at  $x_0=0, T$ ) while keeping the gauge-field periodic in space and the fermions periodic up to a phase:  $U_\mu(x_0, \mathbf{x} + L\mathbf{e}_\mu) = U_\mu(x)$ ,  $\psi_\mu(x_0, \mathbf{x} + L\mathbf{e}_\mu) = \exp(i\theta)\psi_\mu(x)$ . The initial pion with flavor content  $ij$  is created at  $x_0=0$  through the boundary operator

$$O_{ij} = \frac{a^6}{L^3} \sum_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} \bar{\zeta}_i(\mathbf{u}) \gamma_5 \zeta_j(\mathbf{v}) \omega(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}) \quad (2)$$

introducing the wavefunction  $\omega$  w.r.t. the relative position of the boundary fields  $\bar{\zeta}_i, \zeta_j$ , and absorbed by the local current  $A_0(x)$  in the bulk or

by the analogous operator  $O'_{ij}$  at  $x_0 = T$ . This means that we consider the SF correlators

$$f_X(x_0, T, L) = -\frac{L^3}{2} \langle X(x) O \rangle \quad (3)$$

$$f_1(T, L) = -\frac{1}{2} \langle O' O \rangle \quad (4)$$

with  $X$  either  $A_0$  or  $P$  to get the PCAC mass  $m = r + a c_A s$  with

$$r(x_0) = \frac{\frac{1}{2}(\partial_0 + \partial_0^*) f_A(x_0)}{2 f_P(x_0)} \quad (5)$$

$$s(x_0) = \frac{\partial_0 \partial_0^* f_P(x_0)}{2 f_P(x_0)}. \quad (6)$$

Requiring  $m$  constant at fixed  $\beta$  leads to a definition of the improvement coefficient through  $c_A \equiv \Delta r / \Delta s$ , where the difference may be w.r.t.

(0)  $\theta$  at fixed  $x_0 = T/2$  (ALPHA [2])

(1)  $x_0$  at fixed  $\theta$  (LANL [3], “slope criterion”)

(2) state in  $O[\omega]$  (UKQCD [4], “gap criterion”)

and depending on the choice, physical quantities differ by  $O(a^2)$  effects. This means that there is an intrinsic  $O(a)$  ambiguity in  $c_A$  itself which, already for  $\beta \simeq 6$ , is not such a small effect [3,4].

Here we investigate (in a quenched setting) which one, out of (0)-(2), might be a promising criterion for  $N_f=2$ , with a view on the following wishlist: (i) no high-energy state involved, i.e. no  $x_0 < r_0$  (say) used, (ii) large “sensitivity”, i.e. not too small value of  $\Delta s$ , (iii) affordable numerical effort, i.e. not requiring large volume, (iv) “scalability”, i.e. allowing to move to another  $\beta$  while

<sup>\*</sup>presented by S. Dürr at Lattice 03, Tsukuba, Japan.

<sup>†</sup>We thank DFG for support in SFB/TR-9.




Figure 1.  $r(x_0)$  and  $s(x_0)$  from a SF wall source with four  $\theta$ -values at  $\beta=6.2, \kappa=0.13485$ .

keeping physics in units of  $r_0$  constant. Both the ambiguity of improvement coefficients and how to deal with it have been discussed in [5].

We emphasize that the SF states generated by the boundary operator (2) are multiplicatively renormalizable. The associate  $Z$ -factor cancels in the ratios (5, 6), and everything is scalable.

## 2. THETA CRITERION

The old ALPHA criterion [2] resulted in rather small  $\Delta s$  values. Furthermore, for  $N_f=2$  several  $\theta$ -angles mean several simulations. Therefore, we didn't investigate (0) further.

## 3. SLOPE CRITERION

The slope criterion (1) requires only one  $\theta$ -value, but for completeness we decided to test it for  $\theta=0, \pi/3, 2\pi/3, \pi$ .

Fig.1 shows  $r(x_0)$  and  $s(x_0)$  in the SF. For




Figure 2.  $-c_A$  via slope in Fig. 1 with  $x_{\text{ref}}=15$ .

$\theta=\pi$  there is a good sensitivity. Using  $\Delta r(x_0) = r(x_0) - r(x_{\text{ref}})$  with  $x_{\text{ref}}$  around the extremum (and ditto for  $\Delta s$ ) the recipe  $c_A = \Delta r / \Delta s$  yields a local  $c_A(x_0)$ . The remnant dependence on  $x_{\text{ref}}$  was checked to be small. This and the dependence on  $\theta, L, T, \kappa, \omega$  represent genuine  $O(a)$  effects on  $c_A$ .

Fig.2 displays  $-c_A(x_0)$  determined via this “slope criterion”. For  $\theta = \pi$  and small enough  $L$  there is an early plateau which is a sign that all states but the lowest two have disappeared. The corresponding value for  $c_A$  seems consistent with the old ALPHA determination [2].

## 4. GAP CRITERION

From a transfer matrix analysis one gets

$$\begin{aligned} f_X &\simeq \frac{L^3}{2} \rho \xi e^{-M_\pi x_0} \{1 + \eta_X^\pi e^{-\Delta x_0} + \eta_X^0 e^{-M_G(T-x_0)}\} \\ f_1 &\simeq \frac{1}{2} \rho^2 e^{-M_\pi T} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

with the matrix element  $\xi \equiv \langle 0, 0 | \mathbb{X} | \pi, 0 \rangle$  and known representations of  $\rho, \eta_X^{\pi,0}$  in terms of states  $|Q, n\rangle$  with a given set of quantum numbers and excitation level. In (7)  $\Delta$  denotes the gap in the corresponding (here: pseudoscalar) channel and  $M_G$  the mass of the lowest  $(0^{++})$  glueball state. The important point is that the coefficients  $\rho, \eta_X^\pi$  depend on the initial state  $|i_\pi\rangle$  and hence on the wave function  $\omega$ , while  $\xi, \eta_X^0$  do not. This creates the possibility to linearly combine the correlators (7) over several  $\omega$  to build one which is clearly dominated by either the ground-state or the first excited state. After checking that the




Figure 3.  $r(x_0)$  and  $s(x_0)$  from the ground-state and the first excited state at  $\beta=6.0, \kappa=0.13415, \theta=0$ .

corresponding effective masses are indeed distinct (i.e.  $M_\pi < M_\pi^*$ ), one may define  $\Delta r$  as the difference of the expressions (5) w.r.t. these two linear combinations (at a given  $x_0, \theta$ ) and ditto for  $\Delta s$ . This amounts to an operational definition – time slice by time-slice – of  $c_A$  according to the “gap criterion” (2).

Fig. 3 shows  $r$  and  $s$  at  $\theta=0$  for the ground- and excited state, built (a posteriori) from the four hydrogen-type wave functions used in the simulation. It seems this method yields a rather good sensitivity  $\Delta s$ . In the supposed ground-state both  $r(x_0)$  and  $s(x_0)$  happen to be almost flat from a rather early time on.

Fig. 4 shows  $-c_A(x_0)$  determined via this “gap criterion”. The plateau is reached at  $x_0 \simeq 0.75$  fm, and typical values are somewhat smaller than the original ALPHA value at  $\beta=6.0$  [2]. The absolute value  $|c_A| = -c_A$  that we get decreases with  $L$ , but for  $L > 3r_0$  this effect seems not particularly

pronounced any more. We take this as a sign that there is good hope to determine  $c_A$  in a  $(1.5 \text{ fm})^4$  box in the  $N_f=2$  theory.

## 5. SUMMARY

We have tested several improvement conditions that might be used to determine  $c_A$  non-perturbatively in an unquenched setting. The  $O(a)$  ambiguity of  $c_A$  that has been pointed out previously [3,4] has been confirmed via, (a) extension of (1) to several  $\theta$  and, (b) refinement of (2) with a wave function projection technique which achieves dominance by ground- or 1st excited state in the region  $0.5 \text{ fm} \dots 1.0 \text{ fm}$ . We hope this proves sufficient to determine  $c_A$  with  $N_f=2$ .

## REFERENCES

1. R. Sommer, these proceedings.
2. M. Lüscher, S. Sint, R. Sommer, P. Weisz and U. Wolff, Nucl. Phys. B **491**, 323 (1997) [hep-lat/9609035].
3. T.Bhattacharya, S.Chandrasekharan, R.Gupta, W.J.Lee and S.R.Sharpe, Phys. Lett. B **461**, 79 (1999) [hep-lat/9904011].
4. S. Collins, C.T. Davies, G.P. Lepage and J. Shigemitsu [UKQCD collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **67**, 014504 (2003) [hep-lat/0110159].
5. M. Guagnelli, R. Petronzio, J. Rolf, S. Sint, R. Sommer and U. Wolff [ALPHA Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. B **595**, 44 (2001) [hep-lat/0009021].




Figure 4.  $-c_A$  via gap in Fig. 3; ditto at  $L=16, 24$ .