

Study of the chiral behavior of $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$ in quenched QCD

Adrian Kaehler^a *

^a Department of Physics, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, USA

The QCD phase transition is studied on $32^3 \times 8$ quenched lattices. One expects from simple arguments that the quenched chiral condensate should diverge as the chiral limit is approached. Previous studies have not been able to observe this behavior, perhaps due to relatively large lattice spacings used. The topic is revisited here on $N_t = 8$ lattices, where the physical spacing is approximately $(2 \text{ GeV})^{-1}$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Quenched QCD provides an interesting opportunity to study the role of topological effects on the axial $U(1)_A$ symmetry above the chiral symmetry restoring phase transition. Because it will turn out that our results elucidate features of the full dynamical theory as well, they have bearing on a wide class of problems, in particular the order of the QCD phase transition itself[1].

We will begin by reviewing the role of small eigenvalues of the Dirac operator in producing a chiral condensate. We will then show that in the quenched approximation, where the fermion determinant is removed from the path integral, there is a possibility for a dramatic effect which would be seen at temperatures just above the deconfining transition. In this case, $U(1)_A$ breaking effects manifest themselves as a divergence in the condensate because they are not regulated by suppression from fermion loops. This situation is particularly easy to understand in an instanton gas picture, so we will explain it in some detail there.

We conclude by presenting results from our own investigations of $32^3 \times 8$ lattices on Columbia University's QCDSF parallel supercomputer, and analyzing them in this context.

2. THEORY

It is not difficult to show that the chiral condensate is just the trace of the the Euclidean fermion propagator $(i \not{D} + m)$. By looking at this trace in the representation of the eigenvectors of the Dirac operator itself, we can separate the contributions to the chiral condensate into two parts [2]:

$$\text{Tr} \left(\frac{i \not{D} - m}{D^2 - m^2} \right) = N_{\text{zm}} \times \frac{1}{m} + \sum_{n>0} \frac{2m}{\lambda_n^2 + m^2} \quad (1)$$

Here the first term represents the contribution of exact zero modes, N_{zm} in number, which are topological in nature while the second results from the continuum of Dirac eigenvalues.

2.1. Instantons

A simple picture which will make the role of these zero modes clear is one of dilute instantons. Though we will see below that more general considerations may apply, it is particularly instructive to think for a moment in terms of this simple concrete model.

To first approximation, we can take *dilute* to mean that there are no interactions of any kind between widely separated instantons or anti-instantons. In this case, the number of zero modes should go like N_i (the number of instantons) *plus* N_a (the number of anti-instantons). In such a picture, as the volume grows, so also does the number of zero modes, and the density of exact zero modes does not vanish in the infinite volume limit.

We can extend these ideas to include a more plausible situation in which there are weak in-

*This work was done in collaboration with Dong Chen, Ping Chen, Norman Christ, George Fleming, Chulwoo Jung, Yubing Luo, Catalin Malureanu, ChenZhong Sui, and Pavlos Vranas and was supported in part by the US Department of Energy.

teractions between the (anti-)instantons. Even though the presence of interactions will give a topological charge $\nu = N_i$ minus N_a , and thus only $|\nu|$ exact zero modes, there will still be *nearly* zero modes λ_{nzsm} shifted away from $\lambda = 0$ only slightly by the presence of the interactions. So, although the true zero modes in this case will be suppressed like $\frac{1}{\sqrt{V}}$ in the infinite volume limit, the nearly zero modes will persist.

2.2. Expectations

We might not expect such configurations to contribute significantly to an observable such as the chiral condensate. Even though the contribution appears to be divergent in the chiral limit, the fermion determinant $\det(i \not{D} + m)$ is suppressing the contribution of such configurations with a factor going like $m^{N_{\text{zsm}}}$. In a quenched simulation however, we effectively set $\det(i \not{D} + m) = 1$. This will eliminate the suppression of such configurations, amplifying their contribution to the chiral condensate, and thus manifesting the $1/m$ divergence which one would naively expect from (1).

The instanton gas model leads us to expect a finite density of instantons in enough configurations to have weight in the path integral. An immediate consequence is that the quenched approximation will result in a $1/m$ divergence in the chiral condensate. Even in the presence of weak interactions between the instantons, all of this will continue to hold true, so long as the masses being studied are greater than λ_{nzsm} .

We can see however, that the situation is based on a more general idea than the dilute instanton model alone. Though such a picture gives us a concrete way of thinking about the situation, it is possible that the $1/m$ behavior seen in that specific approximation is really telling us something about the general structure of the path integral itself. Namely, the lack of suppression of the fermion zero modes by the quark determinant may be itself sufficient to produce this divergence.

3. DESCRIPTION OF CALCULATION

Previous quenched calculations in this temperature region by the Columbia group[3], found that

chiral symmetry remains broken when the configurations take on either of the complex phases of the Wilson line. Because we are ultimately interested in an investigation relevant to unquenched physics, we restrict our attention to the purely real phase, in which chiral symmetry is restored above the deconfining transition.

If we hope to resolve topological effects such as instantons, we must insure that the lattice spacing is sufficiently fine that these features are accurately represented. If the features we are looking at are indeed instantons, we would expect that the small ones would begin to decouple as a result of asymptotic freedom. Taking the rho Compton wavelength as an approximate intrinsic scale of QCD, it is objects of this size that we might expect to need to be able to resolve. $N_t=4$ for $\beta \approx \beta_c$ gives only $a_{\text{lattice}} \approx (1 \text{ GeV})^{-1}$. Cutting the spacing in half by going to $N_t = 8$, gives us a lattice spacing closer to $(2 \text{ GeV})^{-1}$, and increasing confidence that we are probing the interesting physical region.

In a quenched simulation, we are free to measure a variety of valance masses on the same ensemble of configurations because the mass plays no role in the generation of the ensemble. We do not however choose to measure extremely light masses, because the lattice itself provides a cutoff for the smallest available eigenvalues for $i \not{D}$. Masses below this cutoff are in effect all identical for the purposes of computing the chiral condensate. For confined physics, we know that the smallest eigenvalues have size set by the inverse total volume. This is the basis of the appearance of nonzero eigenvalue density around the origin and nonzero chiral condensate. This represents a severe compression due to QCD dynamics relative to the free Dirac eigenvalues, for which λ_{min} is of order $\frac{\pi}{L}$ where L is just the extent of the physical volume along its longest side. This density decreases sharply as we increase β through the transition, and continues to be slowly suppressed as we continue to yet higher temperatures. For this reason, $\frac{1}{V}$ is a lower bound on λ_{min} . For a volume of $32^3 \times 8 = 2^{18}$, we expect masses less than or equal to about $m_q = 10^{-6}$ to be uninteresting for this reason.

The $N_t=4$ Columbia study mentioned above

was performed at $\beta = 5.71^2$. It is clear that running at unnecessarily high temperatures will suppress the signal we are looking to observe, while running too close to the transition introduces the new difficulty of tunnelings into the confined phase. For $N_t = 8$, taking the critical coupling to be $\beta_{c_{N_t=8}} = 6.06$ [5], the corresponding coupling would be $\beta_{c_{N_t=8}} + \Delta\beta = 6.08$. We chose to run here also to make comparison with this existing $N_t = 8$ data as meaningful as possible.

3.1. Simulation Details

This simulation was run on a 512-node prototype of the Columbia University 8192-node QCDSF supercomputer[6]. The prototype sustains a peak performance of 25 Gigafllops. The evolutions were generated by a simple heat bath algorithm for pure gauge SU(3) [7,8]. The spectrum data represents 50 measurements, separated by 250 sweeps of the pure gauge evolution, using a conjugate-gradient inverter to calculate the chiral condensate with a staggered fermion Dirac operator. The source vectors for the CG inverter are generated randomly to produce a noisy estimator for the fermion propagator trace. All masses are measured using the same fermion source vector. This calculation was done on a $32^3 \times 8$ volume at $\beta = 6.08$.

4. RESULTS

We observe no signal for the expected $1/m$ divergence. In fact for the mass range $10^{-5} \leq m \leq 5 \times 10^{-2}$ the curve is fit very nicely by a power law with an exponent of 0.91 ($\chi^2/dof = 2.0$). This can be compared to the $N_t = 4$ data, where a similar fit was found to well accommodate the data, with a power of 0.74 ($\chi^2/dof = 1.9$).

5. CONCLUSIONS

We see no evidence for the divergence predicted by the simple instanton model. Two possible conclusions are reasonable. It is possible that the simulation is in some way insufficient to probe the physics from which this divergence derives it's ori-

² $\beta_{c_{N_t=4}}$ was taken to be 5.69 [4]




Figure 1. For $N_t = 4$ and $N_t = 8$, we see a power law fits the available data over a wide range of masses.

gin. On the other hand, it is quite possible, that the opinion that there is validity to the prediction of this divergence beyond the dilute instanton approximation, is itself severely misplaced.

REFERENCES

1. Pizarski, Wilczek, Phys. Rev. D29 (1984) 338
2. Banks, Casher, Nucl. Phys. B169 (1980) 103
3. S. Chandrasekharan, N.H. Christ Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 47 (1996) 527
4. Brown, Christ, Deng, Gao,, Woch, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61 (1988) 2058
5. Boyd et al. Nucl. Phys. B469 (1996) 419
6. George Fleming, the Columbia Group Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 48 (1997)
7. Cabbibo, Marinari Phys. Lett. 119B (1982) 387
8. Kennedy, Pendleton Phys. Lett. 156B (1985) 393