

Computation of the improvement coefficient c_{sw} to 1-loop with improved gluon actions *

S. Aoki^a, R. Frezzotti^a and P. Weisz^a

^aMax-Planck-Institut für Physik, Föhringer Ring 6, D-80805 München, Germany

The clover coefficient c_{sw} is computed at one loop order of perturbation theory for improved gluon actions including six-link loops. The $O(a)$ improvement coefficients for the dimension three isovector composite operators bilinear in the quark fields are also calculated.

1. Introduction

For the on-shell $O(a)$ improvement program with the clover action[1,2], it is important to adjust the clover coefficient c_{sw} , which is currently well-determined only for the Wilson plaquette gluon action[3–5]. Although this is enough for the $O(a)$ improvement, the so-called renormalization group (RG) improved gluon action[6], combined with the clover action, has been recently employed in full QCD simulations [7] to reduce possible $O(a^2)$ errors. The value of c_{sw} for the RG improved action, however, was known neither non-perturbatively nor at 1-loop order of perturbation theory. Instead a “perturbative mean field” value $c_{\text{sw}} = (1 - 0.8412\beta^{-1})^{-3/4}$ has been used up to now in actual simulations. Therefore it seems desirable to fully determine c_{sw} at 1-loop level, in order to be able to estimate how large the errors in this approximation are.

We sketch here the main points of our computation [8] of c_{sw} at 1-loop order of perturbation theory for gluon actions including six-link loops. We have also computed the mixing coefficients c_X as well as the coefficients b_Y of the mass dependent corrections (needed for $O(a)$ improvement) for quark bilinear operators of dimension 3. We follow the method of refs.[3,9] to compute these quantities and use their notations without further notices. More details can be found in ref. [8].




Figure 1. Elementary loops in \mathcal{S}_i , $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$

2. Gauge actions

In this section we specify the gauge actions, focusing on differences with respect to previous calculations[3,9].

The considered gauge action $S[U]$ belongs to a general class containing loops up to length 6

$$S[U] = \frac{2}{g_0^2} \sum_{i=0}^3 c_i \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{S}_i} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}) \quad (1)$$

where the \mathcal{S}_i denote sets of elementary loops \mathcal{C} on the lattice as given in fig. 1, and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}) = \text{ReTr}[I - U(\mathcal{C})]$ with $U(\mathcal{C})$ being the ordered product of the link variables $U_\mu(x)$ along \mathcal{C} . The coefficients c_i are normalized such that $c_0 + 8c_1 + 16c_2 + 8c_3 = 1$.

In our computations we have only considered actions with $c_2 = 0$. Apart from the Wilson ac-

*talk presented by S. Aoki

Table 1

Improvement coefficients at 1-loop for various gluon actions. The results for the standard plaquette action are taken from refs.[3,9]. Tadpole contributions for $c_{\text{sw}}^{(1)}$ are also listed.

gauge action	Plaq.	LW	RG1	RG2	RG3
c_1	0.0	-1/12	-0.331	-0.27	-0.252
c_3	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.04	-0.17
$c_{\text{sw}}^{(1)}$	0.267(1)	0.196(6)	0.113(3)	0.119(5)	0.109(5)
$c_{\text{sw}}^{\text{tad}}$	0.25	0.183	0.105	0.110	0.096
			$\times C_F$		
$c_A^{(1)}$	-0.005680(2)	-0.004525(25)	-0.002846(11)	-0.003017(12)	-0.002805(20)
$c_V^{(1)}$	-0.01225(1)	-0.0103(3)	-0.00730(20)	-0.00757(26)	-0.00709(20)
$c_T^{(1)}$	0.00896(1)	0.00743(7)	0.00505(10)	0.00526(15)	0.00496(12)
$b_m^{(1)}$	-0.07217(2)	-0.0576(11)	-0.0382(8)	-0.0395(15)	-0.0353(12)
$b_A^{(1)}$	0.11414(4)	0.0881(13)	0.0550(4)	0.0572(6)	0.0510(5)
$b_V^{(1)}$	0.11492(4)	0.0884(26)	0.0551(19)	0.0574(19)	0.0510(21)
$b_P^{(1)}$	0.11484(2)	0.0889(14)	0.0558(9)	0.0584(10)	0.0528(8)
$b_S^{(1)}$	0.14434(4)	0.1152(22)	0.0764(16)	0.0790(30)	0.0706(24)
$b_T^{(1)}$	0.10434(4)	0.0790(25)	0.0477(12)	0.0502(19)	0.0444(15)

tion ($c_1 = c_3 = 0$), we have studied 4 actions, which are specified in table 1.

To compute improvement coefficients we work in the framework of the Schrödinger functional (SF), where the theory is defined on hypercubic lattices of volume $L^3 \times T$ with cylindrical geometry, i.e. periodic-type boundary conditions in the spatial directions and Dirichlet boundary conditions in the time direction.

To ensure $O(a)$ improvement for all on-shell quantities in the SF framework, one needs in the gauge action a careful choice of weights for the loops that are located near the time boundaries. Following ref. [8], we rewrite the gauge action as

$$S[U] = \frac{2}{g_0^2} \sum_{i=0}^3 \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{S}_i} W_i(\mathcal{C}) \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}), \quad (2)$$

where the elements of the classes \mathcal{S}_i consist of all loops of the given shape which can be drawn on the cylindrical lattice. In particular rectangles protruding out of the cylinder are not included and hence we do not have to specify further boundary conditions for link variables outside the cylinder[10]. The weights $W_i(\mathcal{C})$ are set to c_i , for $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and for all loops excepted the plaquettes ($i = 0$) and the rectangles ($i = 1$)

near the time boundaries.

Since a non-vanishing background field is required for the calculation of $c_{\text{sw}}^{(1)}$, we adopt the following choice for the remaining weights: $W_1(\mathcal{C}) = \frac{3}{2}c_1$ if the rectangle \mathcal{C} has exactly 2 links on a time boundary, $W_1(\mathcal{C}) = c_1$ if it has only 1 link on a time boundary and $W_{1,2,3}(\mathcal{C}) = 0$ if it completely lies on one of the time boundaries; $W_0(\mathcal{C}) = c_0$ if the plaquette \mathcal{C} touches a time boundary and $W_0(\mathcal{C}) = \frac{1}{2}$ if it completely lies on a time boundary. An advantage of this choice is that the classical background field, induced by the SF boundary conditions, is analytically known.

Since no background field is necessary for the calculation of $c_X^{(1)}$ and $b_Y^{(1)}$, we have used in this case a simpler choice of weights: $W_1(\mathcal{C}) = c_1$ if the rectangle \mathcal{C} just touches one of the boundaries and $W_{1,2,3}(\mathcal{C}) = 0$ if it completely lies on one of the time boundaries; $W_0(\mathcal{C}) = c_0 + 2c_1$ if the plaquette \mathcal{C} touches a time boundary and $W_0(\mathcal{C}) = \frac{1}{2}$ if it completely lies on a time boundary.

3. Results and Conclusion

We present in table 1 a synthesis of all our 1-loop results, including a comparison with the case

of the standard plaquette action.

We first notice that tadpole contributions to the $c_{\text{sw}}^{(1)}$, denoted $c_{\text{sw}}^{\text{tad}}$ in the table, give about 90% of the complete 1-loop contributions for all actions considered here. Therefore the value of c_{sw} taken by the CP-PACS collaboration for their full QCD simulation with RG1 gauge action[7] is very close to the full one-loop value up to order g_0^4 : $c_{\text{sw}}^{\text{pert.}} = c_{\text{sw}}^{\text{CP-PACS}} + 0.008g_0^2 + O(g_0^4)$.

Although only 3 choices of RG improved gauge actions are considered, it seems that RG improved gauge actions generally give a $c_{\text{sw}}^{(1)}$ which is a factor 2 to 2.5 smaller than that of the plaquette action, while for the perturbative improved action (LW) the reduction factor is only about 1.35. This tendency has already been found in the finite part of 1-loop renormalization factors for various quantities [11], and it is also observed in table 1 for other improvement coefficients, the $c_X^{(1)}$'s and $b_Y^{(1)}$'s. Recently the coefficients $c_X^{(1)}$ and $b_Y^{(1)}$ have been calculated by Taniguchi and Ukawa [12] using a completely different method. The two sets of results agree well.

The smallness of 1-loop improvement coefficients for the RG improved actions does not imply the smallness of the lattice artifacts for the same actions. To get some impression of these, following ref. [3], we consider the unrenormalized current quark mass m , defined through the PCAC relation (see eq.(6.13) of ref. [2]), which is expected to vanish up to terms of order a^2 at $m_0 = m_c$. In the perturbative expansion of m , $am = r_0 + r_1 C_F g_0^2 + O(g_0^4)$, the value of r_1 at $m_0 = m_c$ and $x_0 = T/2$ represents the magnitude of the remaining cutoff effect for the particular gauge action at 1-loop order, since the tree-level contribution r_0 is independent of the pure gauge action. In fig. 2 we have plotted r_1 for various actions as a function of a/L , taking $T = 2L$, $\theta = 0$ and vanishing boundary gauge field (in which case the tree-level contribution actually vanishes). At large values of a/L it is observed that this 1-loop lattice artifact is indeed smaller for the RG improved gauge actions than for the LW action, for which it is still smaller than for the plaquette action.




Figure 2. Remaining cutoff effect at 1-loop in the PCAC mass at $x_0 = T/2$ and $m_0 = m_c$ for various actions.

REFERENCES

1. B. Sheikholeslami and R. Wohlert, Nucl. Phys. B259 (1985) 572
2. M. Lüscher, S. Sint, R. Sommer and P. Weisz, Nucl. Phys. B478 (1996) 365
3. M. Lüscher and P. Weisz, Nucl. Phys. B479 (1996) 429
4. M. Lüscher, S. Sint, R. Sommer, P. Weisz and U. Wolff, Nucl. Phys. B491 (1997) 323
5. K. Jansen and R. Sommer, Nucl. Phys. B (proc. Suppl. 63A-C (1998) 853 CERN preprint, CERN-TH/98-84, hep-lat/9803017.
6. Iwasaki, Nucl. Phys. B258 (1985) 141; UTHEP-118 (1983), unpublished.
7. S. Aoki et al. , Nucl. Phys. B (proc. Suppl.) 63A-C (1998) 221
8. S. Aoki, R. Frezzotti and P. Weisz, MPI preprint, MPI-PhT/98-48, hep-lat/9808007
9. S. Sint and P. Weisz, Nucl. Phys. B502 (1997)

- 251; Nucl. Phys. B (proc. Suppl.) 63A-C
(1998) 856
10. T. Klassen, Nucl. Phys. B509 (1998) 391
 11. S. Aoki, K. Nagai, Y. Taniguchi, and A.
Ukawa, hep-lat/9802034
 12. Y. Taniguchi and A. Ukawa, hep-lat/9806015