

Hedgehogs in Wilson loops and phase transition in SU(2) Yang-Mills theory

V. A. Belavin,¹ M. N. Chernodub,^{1,2} and I. E. Kozlov^{1,3}

¹*Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics,
 B.Chermushkinskaya 25, RU-117259, Moscow, Russia*

²*Department of Theoretical Physics, Uppsala University,
 P.O. Box 803, S-75108, Uppsala, Sweden*

³*Faculty of Physics, Moscow State University, RU-119992, Moscow, Russia*

We suggest that the gauge-invariant hedgehogs-like structures in the Wilson loops are physically interesting degrees of freedom in the Yang-Mills theory. The trajectories of these hedgehogs are closed curves which correspond to center-valued (untraced) Wilson loops and are characterized by the center charge and by the winding number. We show numerically in SU(2) Yang-Mills theory that the density of the hedgehogs in the thermal Wilson-Polyakov line is very sensitive to the finite temperature phase transition. The (additively normalized) hedgehog density behaves as an order parameter: the density is almost independent of the temperature in the confinement phase and changes substantially as the system gets into the deconfinement phase. Our results suggest in particular that the (static) hedgehogs may be relevant degrees of freedom around the deconfinement transition, and thus affect evolution of the quark-gluon plasma in high-energy heavy ion collisions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Singular structures in fields are as important as the fields themselves. The well known realization of this statement is the three-dimensional Georgi-Glashow (GG) model, which possesses topological defects called 't Hooft-Polyakov (HP) monopoles [1]. The presence of these defects – which are basically singularities in a compact Abelian gauge field – determine special features of the vacuum structure [2]: external electrically charged particles enjoy linear confinement at large separations while the magnetic fields are screened at large distances. Neither the confinement nor the mass gap generation are realized if the monopole singularities are absent in the vacuum (like, for example, in a case of the non-compact Abelian gauge theory).

Another textbook example is the conventional superconductivity: in the Ginzburg-Landau approach the density of the superconducting electrons is described by the order parameter field which corresponds to an effective field of the paired electrons (the Cooper pairs). The topological singularity in the Cooper pair field is the Abrikosov vortex which influences drastically conducting and thermodynamic properties of the conventional superconductors (for example, subjected to an external magnetic field).

The concept of topological defects (singularities) in fields was invoked to understand the color confinement. This phenomena – which is one of the most interesting issues in QCD – is governed by dynamics of gluons described by the pure Yang-Mills (YM) theory. The YM theories possess topological objects of zero dimension, instantons, which however cannot explain the color confinement [3] in a way similar to the GG model [2]. On the other hand the YM theories do not possess topologically stable monopole-like and vortex-like classical

configurations. Nevertheless, the confinement was suggested to be driven by condensation, or, equivalently, by proliferation, of the vortex-like [4] and monopole-like [5] non-classical structures. Unfortunately, these structures alone are not supported topologically by the $SU(N)$ color symmetry of the YM theory in the continuum space-time. Thus the current state of understanding of the color confinement phenomena is still unsatisfactory.

On the other hand, the YM theory can entirely be formulated [6] in the language of colorless composite fields, the Wilson loops, which are traces of the loop functionals of the gluon fields. Mathematically, these loops are as good as the gauge fields from the point of view of the description of (in particular, nonperturbative) properties of the YM theories [6]. Having in mind the importance of the order parameter (the Cooper pair) field in the Ginzburg–Landau model of the superconductivity, let us compare properties of this field with well-known properties of the Wilson loop variable in the YM theory:

- (i) Expectation values: The expectation value of the Cooper pair field corresponds to the density of the superconducting electrons, while the vacuum expectation value of the Wilson loop in the YM theory is related to the inter-quark interaction. Both expectation values are (non-local, in the case of the Wilson-loop) order parameters: the superconducting phase in the ordinary superconductors is determined by a non-zero value of the Cooper pair field while the confining phase in the YM theories is manifested by an area-like asymptotic behavior of the Wilson loop.
- (ii) Correlation functions: The correlation function of the Cooper pair fields determines the type and the spectrum of the superconducting material while correlators of the Wilson loops provide information on the glueball spectrum of the strongly interacting medium, the inter-meson interactions, *etc.*
- (iii) Singularities: the topological singularity in the Cooper pair field is the celebrated Abrikosov vortex. What is the singularity in the gluon fields of the YM theory in the language of the Wilson loop variable? The answer to this question may be important for understanding of the color confinement since the Wilson loop operator itself is intimately related to this important phenomenon. Moreover, the singularity in the Wilson loop must be a gauge-invariant quantity as the confinement phenomenon is.

In Ref. [7] general arguments were given to identify the trajectories of the loop singularities with the closed paths in space for which the (untraced) Wilson loop takes its value in the center of the color group. The main argument of Ref. [7] is that the gluon fields in the vicinity of such loops share similarity with the gauge-invariant hedgehogs-like structures, which resemble the HP monopoles in the GG model. Developing this idea further, we investigate in this paper these structures at finite temperature. In particular, the static (thermal) hedgehogs should definitely arise in an effective theory of the Polyakov loops [8] which is proposed to describe basic features of the finite-temperature QCD transition. Moreover, the thermalization properties of the Polyakov loop “condensate” [8] give a qualitatively encouraging insight on the particle production at the high-energy heavy ion collisions [9]. As we show below the density of the thermal (static) hedgehogs in the deconfinement phase grows rapidly as temperature increases. This observation suggests that the static hedgehogs – being singularities in the Polyakov loop variables – may be important degrees of freedom in quark-gluon states created at high-energy heavy ion collisions.

The structure of this paper is as follows. In Section II we give the definition of the hedgehog singularity in the Wilson loop. Section III is devoted to a general discussion of

the properties of the hedgehogs. In Section IV we derive an expression for the density of the static hedgehogs as a function of the trace of the Polyakov line. The results of our numerical simulations are presented in Section V, and conclusions are given in the last Section.

II. CENTER-VALUED WILSON LOOPS AS SINGULAR HEDGEHOGS

The hedgehogs in the Wilson loops share similarity [7] with the 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles in the GG model [1]. The triplet Higgs field $\hat{\Phi} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\Phi^a\sigma^a$ of the GG model is vanishing in the center of the HP monopole $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_0$,

$$\hat{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}_0) = 0, \quad (1)$$

and has a generic hedgehog-like structure in the (spatial) vicinity of a (static) HP monopole [17]:

$$\hat{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\sigma^a}{2} Y^{ai}(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0)^i + O\left((\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)^2\right), \quad (2)$$

where the matrix Y is not degenerate, $\det Y \neq 0$. The hedgehog structure (2) inevitably implies the vanishing of the Higgs field (1), while the opposite is not correct. On the other hand, if the triplet field Φ vanishes at the point \mathbf{x}_0 then a general Taylor expansion of the field in the vicinity of this point starts from linear terms and therefore expansion (2) corresponds to a generic situation.

In the YM theory the definition of a hedgehog may entirely be done in terms of the Wilson-loop variables. Consider an untraced Wilson loop which starts and ends at the point x_0 of the closed loop \mathcal{C} ,

$$W_{\mathcal{C}}(x_0) = P \exp\left\{ig \oint_{\mathcal{C}} dx_{\mu} A_{\mu}(x)\right\}. \quad (3)$$

This quantity transforms locally as an adjoint operator with respect to the SU(2) color symmetry, $W_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{x}_0) \rightarrow \Omega^{\dagger}(\mathbf{x}_0)W_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{x}_0)\Omega(\mathbf{x}_0)$. In order to make an analogy with the triplet Higgs field $\hat{\Phi}$ closer, we subtract the singlet part from (3)

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{C}}(x_0) = W_{\mathcal{C}}(x_0) - \mathbb{1} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} W_{\mathcal{C}}(x_0). \quad (4)$$

This is a traceless adjoint operator similar to the field $\hat{\Phi}$.

The next step is to associate the triplet part $\hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{C}}$ of the Wilson loop (4) with the triplet Higgs field $\hat{\Phi}(x)$ in the GG model. To uncover a link between singularities in the fields of the GG model and in the loops of the YM theory we notice that [7]:

- (i) The Higgs field vanishes in all points x belonging to the HP monopole trajectory, Eq. (1). The Wilson loop evaluated at the hedgehog trajectory \mathcal{C} belongs to the center of the gauge group, $W_{\mathcal{C}} = \pm\mathbb{1}$. This, in turn, implies vanishing of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ the hedgehog trajectory \mathcal{C} :

$$W_{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}} = 0. \quad (5)$$

We intentionally omitted the argument x_0 in the loop variables of Eq. (5) since the condition (5) is independent of the choice of the reference point x_0 at the trajectory \mathcal{C} , Ref. [7]. In other words, if $W_{\mathcal{C}}(x_1) \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ for at least one point $x_1 \in \mathcal{C}$, then $W_{\mathcal{C}}(x_0) \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ for all points $x_0 \in \mathcal{C}$. This relation reflects a conservation of the central charge z which is defined in (iv) below.

- (ii) The triplet fields around the HP monopole have the structure of the hedgehog (2). To demonstrate that the center-valued Wilson loop variables are indeed the hedgehogs, let us deform infinitesimally the contour $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} + \delta\mathcal{C}$ in the vicinity of the point x_0 . This shift relocates also the reference point, $x_0 \rightarrow x = x_0 + \delta x$, Figure 1. Without loss of generality we assume that a tangent vector to the loop \mathcal{C} at the point x_0 is aimed at the time direction. Physically distinguishable shift δx should be tangential (space-like) to the contour \mathcal{C} since longitudinal (time-like) relocations of the point x_0 leave the functional $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ invariant. Then the deformed loop $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x)$ should have, in general




FIG. 1: The Wilson loop \mathcal{C} (solid line) and its variation (dotted line).

case, a spatial hedgehog-like structure in the vicinity of the zero-point x_0 ,

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(x) = \frac{\sigma^a}{2} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{C}}^{ai}(x_0) \cdot (x - x_0)^i + O\left((x - x_0)^2\right). \quad (6)$$

This structure is similar to that of Eq. (2) with the only exception: instead of the usual derivative, the definition of the matrix $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{C}}$ involves the path derivative

$$\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{C}}^{ai}(x) = \left. \frac{\delta \Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}^a(x)}{\delta x^i} \right|_{x \rightarrow x_0}, \quad a, i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (7)$$

which defines a change of the functional $\Gamma_{\mathcal{C}}$ under the infinitesimal change of the contour $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} + \delta\mathcal{C}$.

- (iii) The location x_0 of the HP monopole is a gauge invariant quantity. Similarly, the trajectory \mathcal{C} of the hedgehog singularity in the Wilson loop defined by the condition (5) is gauge invariant due to the gauge-invariant nature of the Wilson loop eigenvalues.
- (iv) The $SU(2)$ HP monopoles are classified by the integer-valued winding number $n \in \pi_2(S^2) \simeq \mathbb{Z}$ corresponding the number of times the vacuum manifold S^2 is covered by a single turn around two-dimensional boundary $\partial D_3 \simeq S^2$ of the three-dimensional volume D_3 containing the HP monopole. The hedgehog structure (2) with $Y^{ai} \propto \delta^{ai}$ corresponds to the $n = 1$ HP monopole in the GG model. In the YM theory the

Wilson loop hedgehog is classified by the *two* numbers (z, n) , where $z = \pm 1$ is the central element of the Wilson loop $W_C \in Z_2$ determined by Eq. (5), and n is the winding number associated with the hedgehogs structure (6). Below we call z as the “center charge” of the hedgehog. Note that the gluonic fields around in a static hedgehog share similarity with a field of a monopole in the Axial gauge studied in Ref. [10]. The static hedgehog – which is a particular case of a general YM hedgehog in the Wilson loop – is also classified by the two charges.

- (v) The closeness of the hedgehog trajectories assumes that the hedgehog charges should be conserved.

III. HEDGEHOGS AND COLOR CONFINEMENT

As we have noted in Introduction, a tight relation between the Wilson loop hedgehogs and the color confinement problem can intuitively be understood on general grounds since the vacuum expectation value of the Wilson loops recognizes the color confinement. The hedgehogs – being the singularities in the Wilson loops – should also be sensitive to the confinement of color. In this Section we give arguments supporting this suggestion.

In the conventional superconductivity, the Abrikosov vortices are singularities in the superconducting condensate (*i.e.*, in the Cooper pair field). In the core of the Abrikosov vortices the superconductivity is broken and the normal metal state is restored. It is well known that the weaker the Cooper pair condensate the less heavier (tenser) Abrikosov vortices are. As temperature increases, the condensate gets lower, and nucleation of the vortices due to thermal fluctuations becomes stronger. Thus, the higher temperature the denser (thermal) vortex ensemble should be.

One may expect in the YM theory that the density of the hedgehogs in the Wilson loops should be sensitive to the phase transition as well. In the Euclidean formulation of the field theory the temperature direction of the system volume is compactified to the circle the length of which is equal to the inverse temperature. The order parameter of the phase transition is the vacuum expectation value of the (trace of) Polyakov line,

$$\hat{L}(\mathbf{x}) = P \exp \left\{ ig \oint_0^{1/T} dx_4 A_4(\mathbf{x}, x_4) \right\}, \quad (8)$$

which is the static Wilson loop (3) closed through the boundary of the compactified (temperature) direction (here we define $L \equiv \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \hat{L}$). The functional (8) – which is also called as the thermal Wilson line – is a basic variable in an effective theory proposed in Ref. [8] to describe the properties of the finite-temperature QCD transition. In the confinement phase the expectation value of the Polyakov loop is zero, $\langle L \rangle \equiv e^{-TF_q} = 0$, indicating infiniteness of the free energy of a single quark, $F_q \rightarrow \infty$. In the deconfinement phase the Polyakov line has a non-zero expectation value, $\langle L \rangle \neq 0$, and the quarks are no more confined.

One can expect that the hedgehogs in the Polyakov lines are sensitive to the phase transition since the Polyakov line is the order parameter of this transition. In fact, the following analogy between the Cooper pair condensate and the Polyakov line can be established: both quantities are the order parameters and therefore the singularities in the Cooper pair condensate and in the Polyakov lines should be physically relevant degrees of freedom in the

corresponding theories. As we show in the next Sections, this suggestion is indeed correct. Note that this analogy is partial only since the core of the Abrikosov vortex corresponds to the unbroken vacuum while the vacuum in the core of the YM hedgehog is maximally broken.

A qualitative behavior of the hedgehogs in the Polyakov loops can be found with the help of the symmetry arguments. The confinement-deconfinement phase transition is accompanied by the breaking of the global center symmetry in the deconfinement phase. This center symmetry is realized in the case of the $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory by the transformations $L(x) \rightarrow z L(x)$, where the factor $z = \pm 1$ belongs to the center of the gauge group, $z \in \mathbb{Z}_2$. In the confinement phase the center symmetry is unbroken and the effective potential on the Polyakov variable, $V_{\text{eff}}(L) = b_2 L^2/2 + b_4 L^4/4 + \dots$ with $b_{2,4} > 0$, has a minimum at the symmetric vacuum $\langle L \rangle = 0$, which is far away from the central values $L_{\pm} = \pm 1$. Thus the density of the static hedgehogs should be small in the confinement phase.

In the deconfinement phase the center symmetry is broken by the vacuum, and (as the temperature passes the critical value, $T = T_c$) the single minimum of the effective potential splits into two ground states, $L_{\text{min}} = \pm \sqrt{-b_2/b_4}$ with $b_2 < 0$, one of which is picked up by the vacuum, $\langle L \rangle$. As temperature increases further the vacuum state approaches one of the central values $L_{\text{min}} \rightarrow L_{\pm} = \pm 1$. Therefore we expect to observe an increase of the density of the static hedgehogs characterized by the central z -number which is closest to the vacuum state, $\langle L \rangle$. The density of the static hedgehogs with the larger value of $|\langle L \rangle - z|$, should decrease in the deconfinement phase. The density of such intolerable hedgehogs at $T > T_c$ should be lower compared to the density in the confinement phase. It is clear that at the critical temperature the hedgehog density should split into two branches.

The qualitative behavior of the spatial Wilson loops is known to be rather insensitive to the deconfinement transition: the area law for the spatial Wilson loops is observed both in the confinement and in the deconfinement phases. Therefore we do not expect a drastic change in the density of the spatial hedgehogs as the YM system goes through the phase transition.

IV. DENSITY OF STATIC HEDGEHOGS

In order to go beyond the qualitative analysis presented in the previous Section we would like to use numerical simulations of the YM theory on the lattice. However, one notices immediately that the definition of the hedgehog (5,6) is rather inconvenient from the point of view of the numerical simulations. Indeed, the trajectory of the hedgehog structure in the Wilson loops can not be determined locally as it can be done in the case of the Abrikosov vortices in the Ginzburg-Landau model of superconductivity or as it can be realized in the case of the HP monopoles in the GG model. In order to check if a hedgehog is going through the particular point x in the space-time for one particular gauge-field configuration one should analyze the Wilson loops $W_{\mathcal{C}}$ corresponding to *all* closed loops \mathcal{C} which are passing through the point $x \ni \mathcal{C}$. Obviously, it is difficult to realize this definition in the numerical simulations of the lattice YM theory.

However, a finite temperature the most interesting hedgehogs are the static ones, since their density should show a noticeable change (compared to the spatial hedgehogs) at the phase transition. In a continuum limit it is easy to check whether a static hedgehog goes through the particular point x of the space. To this end one should evaluate the (untraced) Polyakov loop (8) and then check if it belongs to the center of the group or not. In the $SU(2)$

YM model the normalized trace of the Polyakov loop at the static hedgehog trajectory should be equal to ± 1 . In this Section we derive an analytical expression for the (absolute value of) density of the static hedgehog as the function of the *traced* Polyakov loop $\rho = \rho[L]$.

Before proceeding further we would like to point out that in the static limit the hedgehogs are similar to Abelian monopoles in the Polyakov and the Axial Abelian gauges of the SU(2) YM theory [10, 11, 12]. Since the Abelian monopoles in the Abelian Polyakov gauge are always static in the continuum limit, they are not related to the confinement of the static quarks but they still may be responsible for the spatial string tension at high temperatures [13]. Moreover, such monopoles are related to the topological charge in the YM theory [10, 12]. The Polyakov-loop variable can also be used to find (static) monopole constituents in physically interesting topologically non-trivial configurations [14]. Note that the density of the static hedgehogs (as well as the Polyakov loop expectation value) is in a sense dual to the Abelian monopole condensate since the hedgehog density is expected to be an order parameter of the finite-temperature phase transition while the monopole condensate is a disorder parameter [15].

A. Density of static hedgehogs in continuum

In general, the untraced Polyakov loop can be expanded in the quaternion basis:

$$\hat{L}(\mathbf{x}, x_4) = L(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbb{1} + i(\vec{\Gamma}(\mathbf{x}, x_4) \cdot \vec{\sigma}), \quad (9)$$

where the singlet part of L is independent of x_4 and the components of the vector $\vec{\Gamma}$ describe the gauge-variant triplet part. If a hedgehog passes through the point \mathbf{x}_0 then $L(\mathbf{x}) = \pm 1$ and $\vec{\Gamma}(\mathbf{x}_0) = 0$. Therefore one can expand the triplet part in a neighborhood of the point \vec{x}_0 as follows

$$\Gamma^a(\mathbf{x}) = Y^{ai}(\mathbf{x}_0) \cdot (x - x_0)^i + O\left((\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0)^2\right), \quad (10)$$

where in general case $\det Y^{ab}(\mathbf{x}_0) \neq 0$. Here we do not consider the rare degenerate case $\det Y^{ab}(\mathbf{x}_0) = 0$. Note that Eq. (10) shares similarity with Eqs. (2) and (6).

The density of the hedgehogs should be expressed as follows:

$$\rho = \gamma \delta(\vec{\Gamma}^2) \equiv \frac{\gamma}{2|\vec{\Gamma}|} \cdot \delta(|\vec{\Gamma}|), \quad (11)$$

where γ is a factor to be determined below. Since the quantity $\vec{\Gamma}$ is dimensionless the dimension of the factor γ should be $[mass^3]$.

Using the identity $\delta(r) = 4\pi r^2 \delta^{(3)}(\vec{r})$ and Eq. (11) one has $\rho[L] = 2\pi\gamma|\vec{\Gamma}| \delta^{(3)}(\vec{\Gamma})$. Integration of this identity in the infinitesimally small volume $v_{\mathbf{x}_0}$ with $\mathbf{x}_0 \ni v_{\mathbf{x}_0}$, gives

$$1 = \int_{v_{\mathbf{x}_0}} d\mathbf{x} \rho(\mathbf{x}) = 2\pi \int_{v_{\mathbf{x}_0}} d\mathbf{x} \gamma(\mathbf{x}) |\vec{\Phi}(\mathbf{x})| \delta^{(3)}(\vec{\Phi}(\mathbf{x})). \quad (12)$$

Changing the integration variables from $d\mathbf{x}$ to $d\vec{\Gamma}$ one gets the Jacobean factor,

$$d\mathbf{x} = \frac{1}{|\det \frac{\partial \Gamma^a}{\partial x^b}|} d\vec{\Gamma} = \frac{1}{|\det Y^{ab}(\mathbf{x}_0)|} d\vec{\Gamma}. \quad (13)$$

Substituting Eq. (13) into Eq. (12) we obtain

$$\gamma = \frac{\det |Y^{ab}|}{2\pi |\vec{\Gamma}|} \equiv \frac{1}{4\pi \sqrt{2(1-L^2)}} \sqrt{\det \frac{\partial^2 L^2}{\partial x^i \partial x^j}}, \quad (14)$$

where we used the identity $|\vec{\Gamma}| = \sqrt{1-L^2}$, and the relation,

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2 L^2(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} \right|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}_0} = 2 Y^{ai}(\mathbf{x}_0) Y^{aj}(\mathbf{x}_0), \quad (15)$$

which follows from Eq. (10). Noticing that $\det[2Y^T(\mathbf{x}_0)Y(\mathbf{x}_0)] \equiv 8(\det Y)^2$, one gets Eq. (14). Substituting Eq. (14) into Eq. (11) we finally write down the following expression for the monopole density:

$$\rho[L(\mathbf{x})] = \frac{1}{16} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(1-L^2(\mathbf{x}))}} \sqrt{\det \left\| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^i \partial x^j} L^2(\mathbf{x}) \right\|_{i,j}} \delta(1-L^2(\mathbf{x})), \quad (16)$$

where $L(\mathbf{x})$ is the Polyakov loop evaluated at the point \mathbf{x} . The determinant is taken over the three spatial indices $i, j = 1, 2, 3$.

There are three important properties of formula (16). First, this expression depends only on the singlet part (trace) of the Polyakov loop, and is independent on the triplet part.

Second, Eq. (16) corresponds to the absolute density of the hedgehogs with particular value of the central charge z . As we have mentioned, the hedgehogs are described by the winding number n and by the center charge z . Equation (16) treats hedgehogs with $\pm n$ winding numbers on equal footing while discriminating between different center charges z . Knowledge of the absolute density is enough for our exploratory study reported below. The information about the sign of the hedgehog charge is given by the sign of the determinant of the Y -matrix which can be computed explicitly if one calculates the triplet part of the (untraced) Polyakov loop.

Third, one notices that Eq. (16) treats the loop variations (7) as ordinary variations since the object of our interest is static by definition. Equation (16) can be generalized to the non-static case by a proper treatment of the loop variation discussed in Section II.

B. Density of static hedgehogs on the lattice

The density of the Polyakov loop hedgehogs in the continuum space-time is given by Eq. (16). In order to get the corresponding equation on the lattice we discretize the double derivatives in Eq. (16) in the straightforward way:

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^\mu \partial x^\mu} f(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \Delta_\mu \Delta_\mu f(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mu}) - 2f(\mathbf{x}) + f(\mathbf{x} + \hat{\mu}), \quad [\text{no sum over } \mu], \quad (17)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^\mu \partial x^\nu} f(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \Delta_\mu \Delta_\nu f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{P_\mu=\pm 1} \sum_{P_\nu=\pm 1} P_\mu P_\nu f(\mathbf{x} + P_\mu \cdot \hat{\mu} + P_\nu \cdot \hat{\nu}). \quad (18)$$

An illustration of the double derivatives is provided in Figure 2.

The lattice version of the density (16) can be expressed in the form:

$$\rho[L(\mathbf{x})] = \rho_+[L(\mathbf{x})] + \rho_-[L(\mathbf{x})], \quad (19)$$




FIG. 2: The lattice double derivatives $f''_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \Delta_\mu \Delta_\nu f(\mathbf{x})$ at the point \mathbf{x} .

where the contributions of the positive and negative center loops to the total density can be written as

$$\rho_\pm [L(\mathbf{x})] = d_\pm [L(\mathbf{x})] \delta\left(1 \mp L(\mathbf{x})\right). \quad (20)$$

The weights of the separate contributions of the positive and negative central loops are

$$d_\pm [L(\mathbf{x})] = \frac{1}{64 \sqrt{1 \mp L(\mathbf{x})}} \sqrt{\det \left\| \Delta_i \Delta_j L^2(\mathbf{x}) \right\|_{i,j}}, \quad (21)$$

From the practical point of view it is convenient to evaluate the distributions

$$\varrho_\pm(L_0) = \left\langle d_\pm [L(\mathbf{x})] \delta\left(L_0 - L(\mathbf{x})\right) \right\rangle. \quad (22)$$

Then the expectation values of the monopole densities (19) are given by the limits

$$\langle \rho_\pm \rangle = \lim_{L_0 \rightarrow \pm 1} \varrho_\pm(L_0). \quad (23)$$

V. STATIC HEDGEHOGS FROM LATTICE SIMULATIONS

In order to investigate the static hedgehogs numerically we simulate the SU(2) gauge theory with the standard Wilson action on the asymmetric, $L_s^3 \times L_t = 20^3 \times 4$, lattice with periodic boundary conditions in all directions. We used 100 independent configurations for each value of the gauge coupling which ranges from $\beta = 2.2$ to $\beta = 2.5$. The SU(2) gauge theory possesses the second order phase transition at $\beta \approx 2.30$ for this lattice geometry [16].

Before going into presentation of the results for the center-valued loops let us first discuss some well-known properties of the Polyakov lines. The lattice Polyakov line is

$$P_{\mathbf{x}}[U] = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \prod_{x_4=0}^{L_t-1} U_4(\mathbf{x}, x_4), \quad (24)$$

where $U_{x,\mu}$ is the lattice gauge field. The distribution of the Polyakov lines,

$$D(L) = \langle \delta(P_{\mathbf{x}}[U] - L) \rangle, \quad (25)$$

is symmetric in the confinement phase and is asymmetric in the deconfinement phase in the large enough system volume with periodic boundary conditions. These properties reflect unbroken and broken \mathbb{Z}_2 central symmetry, $L \rightarrow -L$, in the confinement and, respectively, in the deconfinement phase. Examples of typical distributions obtained at our gluon configurations [18] are shown in Figure 3. We also show the distribution which is symmetrized under the discrete transformation $L \rightarrow -L$ which may be associated with jumps of the system from one \mathbb{Z}_2 minimum to the other. In deconfinement phase the symmetric distribution possesses two maxima which are known to become more pronounced as the volume of the system grows up. These maxima in distributions corresponds to minima of the effective potential for the Polyakov variables discussed in Section III.




FIG. 3: Typical distributions (25) of the Polyakov loops (24) in the confinement (a) and the deconfinement (b) phase are shown by open circles. The filled circles correspond to $L \leftrightarrow -L$ symmetrized distributions.

In the confinement phase the fluctuations of the Polyakov loop are random and therefore they are basically given by the symmetric Haar measure $D_{\text{Haar}}(L)dL = (2/\pi)\sqrt{1-L^2} dL$. In the deconfinement phase the distribution is not symmetric, and, consequently, is far from flat. The distributions normalized by the Haar measure are shown in Figures 4(a) and (b).

The qualitative behavior of the normalized distributions of the Polyakov loop are of great interest for us since the Haar factor explicitly enters the definition of the static hedgehog density (16). Thus, the density of the hedgehogs explicitly excludes the effect of the Haar measure. Examples of Figures 4 show that the normalized distribution of the Polyakov loop is finite at the “singular” end $L \rightarrow \pm 1$. To get an insight on the behavior of the singular ends we fit the Polyakov distributions by the simple linear function

$$\bar{D}^{\text{fit}}(L) = D_z + C_z(1 - zL), \quad \text{as } L \rightarrow z = \pm 1, \quad (26)$$

where D_z and C_z are the fitting parameters labeled by the center element z . The examples of the fits (26) are shown in Figures 5(a) and (b). We also show the fits of the symmetrized distributions. As it is seen from these Figures, the fits work very well. The asymptotic values of the distributions $D_{-1} \neq D_{+1}$ are clearly asymmetric in the deconfinement phase, $D_{\pm 1} \neq D_{\text{sym}} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(D_{-1} + D_{+1})$ and are symmetric, $D_{\pm 1} = D_{\text{sym}}$, in the confinement phase.

The asymptotic values D_z of the normalized distributions $\bar{D}(L)$ are shown in Figure 6(a) as functions of the lattice coupling β . In the confinement phase ($\beta < \beta_c$) the quantities $D_z(\beta)$




FIG. 4: The same as in Fig. 3 but for normalized distributions $\bar{D}(L) = D(L)/\sqrt{1-L^2}$.




FIG. 5: Fits (26) of the normalized distributions $\bar{D}(L) = D(L)/\sqrt{1-L^2}$ in the confinement (a) and the deconfinement (b) phase at both $L \rightarrow \pm 1$ sides of the distributions.

are barely dependent on temperature (β). However, as the temperature increases further the system goes through the second order phase transition and the asymptotic quantities $D_z(\beta)$ with $z = \pm 1$ show a rapid change at the deconfinement point $\beta \approx \beta_c$. One can clearly see that the values D_{-1} get enhanced while the quantity D_{+1} becomes suppressed in the deconfinement phase. This corresponds the system residing in the $z = -1$ vacuum [19]. For comparison, the expectation value of the Polyakov loop *vs.* β is shown in Figure 6(b).

The distributions (22) corresponding to contributions $\varrho_{\pm}(L)$ of the negative and positive hedgehogs (20) to the total hedgehog density (19) are shown in Figures 7(a) and (b) in the confinement and deconfinement phases. These Figures indicate that the averaged quantities $\varrho_{\pm}(L)$ are not symmetric functions of L both in the confinement and in the deconfinement phases: $\varrho_{\pm}(L) \neq \varrho_{\pm}(-L)$. This observation stresses the importance of the d_{\pm} factors (20) in the definition of the hedgehog density. One also notices that in the confinement phase the density distributions are cross-symmetric in the sense that $\rho_{\pm}(L) = \varrho_{\mp}(-L)$. This cross-symmetry – which is a direct consequence of the \mathbb{Z}_2 center symmetry – is violated in the deconfinement phase.




FIG. 6: (a) The asymptotic values D_z of the normalized distributions of the Polyakov loop and (b) the expectation value of the Polyakov loop $\langle L \rangle$ vs. the coupling β . The critical temperature T_c corresponds to $\beta_c \approx 2.30$ and the deconfinement phase is realized at $\beta > \beta_c$ (equivalent to $T > T_c$).




FIG. 7: The distributions (22) vs. the Polyakov loop L in the confinement (a) and in the deconfinement (b) phases.

Finally, the density of the static hedgehogs is given by the extreme values $L \rightarrow \pm 1$, Eq. (23), of the distributions (22). To get these densities we used the linear fit function similar to Eq. (26). The densities ρ_- and ρ_+ of the hedgehogs with $z = -1$ and $z = +1$ center charges, respectively, are shown in Figure 8 as the function of the gauge coupling β . One can clearly observe a rapid increase of the density of the $z = -1$ hedgehogs which correspond to the value of the center group closest the broken vacuum state. The hedgehogs with the center charges $z = +1$ are far from the broken vacuum and are, consequently, suppressed in the infinitely high temperature limit. The symmetrized density, $\rho_0 = \frac{1}{2}(\rho_- + \rho_+)$ shows less pronounced but still noticeable increase with rising temperature in the deconfinement phase. In the confinement phase all densities take the same value, $\rho_{\text{conf}} \approx \text{const.}$, and are independent of temperature (β) within error bars. Thus our results indicate that the additively normalized density

$$\delta\rho_z(T) = \rho_z(T) - \rho(T=0), \quad z = \pm 1, \quad (27)$$

(as well as the corresponding symmetrized quantity $\delta\rho_0$) are the order parameters of the deconfinement phase transition.




FIG. 8: The densities of the static hedgehogs ρ_z corresponding to the positive, $z = +1$, and negative, $z = -1$ central elements *vs.* β . The vacuum resides at the negative center value, $z = -1$. The dotted horizontal line marks the value ρ_{conf} of the densities in the confinement phase.

We have also made sure that the dependence of our results on the bin size of the distributions – shown in Figure 7 – is very weak. For example, at $\beta = 2.33$ corresponding to the deconfinement phase, we get the following values for one of the densities, $\rho_+ = 0.0427(17)$, $0.0455(29)$, $0.0468(41)$, corresponding to the number of bins $N_L = 100$, 200 and 300 , respectively. A similar weak dependence on the number of bins is observed for the ρ_- quantity. The densities at other values of β show the same behavior.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We provide analytical and numerical arguments in favor of suggestion [7] that the gauge-invariant hedgehogs-like structures in the Wilson loops are physically interesting degrees of freedom in the Yang-Mills theory. The hedgehogs can be defined self-consistently as singularities in the Wilson loop variables. The trajectories of the hedgehogs are associated with the (untraced) Wilson loops which take values in the center of the gauge group, $z \in \mathbb{Z}_N$. In the $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory the hedgehogs are characterized by two quantized numbers: the center charge $z = \pm 1 \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ and the winding number $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since the hedgehog trajectories are closed by construction it seems natural to suggest that the corresponding charges z and n are conserved. The conservation of the center charge z is in fact proven in Ref. [7] and is discussed in this paper. The conservation of the winding number n along the trajectory of the hedgehog and a stability analysis of the hedgehog configurations in particular models the may require an additional analysis.

From a general point of view it is clear that the hedgehogs should be related to the confinement properties of the system since they are formulated in terms of the Wilson loops, which, in turn, are intimately related to the property of the Yang-Mills theory to confine colored charges. The gauge-invariant nature of the hedgehogs provides an additional

argument in favor of their importance for the gauge-invariant phenomena like the color confinement. Unfortunately, the non-local formulation of the hedgehogs makes it difficult to locate these objects directly in separate configurations of the gluon fields. On the other hand one can go around this difficulty by noticing that the statistical properties of the hedgehogs may be studied with the help of particular distributions corresponding to these objects with trajectories of predefined shapes. These distributions should provide information on density, correlation properties *etc.* of these objects.

In this paper we demonstrate the success of the proposed numerical approach by studying the properties of the static hedgehogs in the finite temperature SU(2) gauge theory. The static hedgehogs are, by definition, singularities in the Polyakov loop variables, which should naturally arise in an effective model of the Polyakov loops [8]. This model is used to describe features of the finite-temperature QCD transition expected to be realized in the high-energy heavy ion collisions [8, 9]. We show numerically that in the deconfinement phase the density of the thermal hedgehogs changes rapidly as the temperature increases. We observe a substantial increase (decrease) of the density of the hedgehogs possessing the central charge z closest to (furthest from) the value of the Polyakov loop in the centrally broken vacuum of the deconfinement phase. Thus we find an evidence that the hedgehogs density (additively normalized to zero at zero temperature) is an order parameter of the deconfinement phase transition. We conclude that the hedgehogs in the Wilson lines may be relevant degrees of freedom of the Yang-Mills vacuum.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to M.I. Polikarpov for participation in an early stage of this project. M.N.Ch. is grateful to F. Bruckmann and G. Burgio for useful discussions and suggestions. The authors are supported by a STINT Institutional grant IG2004-2 025, by the grants RFBR 04-02-16079, RFBR 05-02-16306, DFG 436 RUS 113/739/0, MK-4019.2004.2., by the “Dynasty” foundation and ICFPM. M.N.Ch. is thankful to the members of Department of Theoretical Physics of Uppsala University for kind hospitality and stimulating environment.

-
- [1] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B **79**, 276 (1974); A. M. Polyakov, JETP Lett. **20**, 194 (1974); for a review see Yakov M. Shnir, “Magnetic Monopoles” (Springer, 2005).
 - [2] A. M. Polyakov, Nucl. Phys. B **120**, 429 (1977).
 - [3] D. Diakonov, V. Y. Petrov and P. V. Pobylitsa, Phys. Lett. B **226**, 372 (1989).
 - [4] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B **153**, 141 (1979); J. Ambjorn and P. Olesen, Nucl. Phys. B **170**, 265 (1980); G. Mack, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 1378 (1980); J. Greensite, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **51**, 1 (2003).
 - [5] Y. Nambu, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 4262 (1974); S. Mandelstam, Phys. Rept. **23**, 245 (1976); G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B **190**, 455 (1981).
 - [6] S. Mandelstam, Phys. Rev. **175**, 1580 (1968); K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 2445 (1974); Y. Makeenko and A. A. Migdal, Nucl. Phys. B **188**, 269 (1981).
 - [7] M. N. Chernodub, “A gauge-invariant object in non-Abelian gauge theory”, hep-lat/0503018.
 - [8] R. D. Pisarski, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 111501(R) (2000).

- [9] A. Dumitru and R. D. Pisarski, Phys. Lett. B **504**, 282 (2001).
- [10] O. Jahn and F. Lenz, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 085006 (1998);
- [11] T. Suzuki, S. Ilyar, Y. Matsubara, T. Okude and K. Yotsuji, Phys. Lett. B **347**, 375 (1995) [Erratum-ibid. B **351**, 603 (1995)]; S. Ejiri, S. i. Kitahara, Y. Matsubara, T. Okude, T. Suzuki and K. Yasuta, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **47**, 322 (1996); M. N. Chernodub, F. V. Gubarev, M. I. Polikarpov and A. I. Veselov, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **131**, 309 (1998).
- [12] H. Reinhardt, Nucl. Phys. B **503**, 505 (1997); C. Ford, U. G. Mitreuter, T. Tok, A. Wipf and J. M. Pawłowski, Annals Phys. **269**, 26 (1998); O. Jahn, J. Phys. A **33**, 2997 (2000).
- [13] M. N. Chernodub, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 094504 (2004).
- [14] M. Garcia Perez, A. Gonzalez-Arroyo, A. Montero and P. van Baal, JHEP **9906**, 001 (1999); F. Bruckmann, D. Nogradi and P. van Baal, Acta Phys. Polon. B **34**, 5717 (2003); F. Bruckmann, E. M. Ilgenfritz, B. V. Martemyanov and P. van Baal, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 105013 (2004).
- [15] M. N. Chernodub, M. I. Polikarpov and A. I. Veselov, Phys. Lett. B **399**, 267 (1997); A. Di Giacomo and G. Paffuti, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 6816 (1997); V. A. Belavin, M. N. Chernodub and M. I. Polikarpov, JETP Lett. **79**, 245 (2004); hep-lat/0403013.
- [16] J. Engels, J. Fingberg and M. Weber, Nucl. Phys. B **332**, 737 (1990).
- [17] For a sake of simplicity we consider the HP monopole in a gauge with a regular gauge field A_μ .
- [18] Note that the Polyakov loop distributions can be modified by specific (for example, twisted) boundary conditions in a finite volume. Properties of the Polyakov loops on the torus with twisted boundary conditions are discussed in A. Gonzalez-Arroyo, “*Yang-Mills fields on the 4-dimensional torus. (Classical theory)*”, hep-th/9807108; A. Barresi, G. Burgio and M. Muller-Preussker, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **119**, 571 (2003); Phys. Rev. D **69**, 094503 (2004); P. de Forcrand and O. Jahn, Nucl. Phys. B **651**, 125 (2003).
- [19] For illustrative purposes we always show the cases $D_{-1}(\beta) > D_{+1}(\beta)$ in the deconfinement phase. In a finite vacuum the system jumps from the $z = +1$ vacuum to the $z = -1$ vacuum and back. As the volume of the system increases these jumps get suppressed.