

GAUGE DEPENDENCE OF MASS AND CONDENSATE IN CHIRALLY ASYMMETRIC PHASE OF QUENCHED QED3

A. Bashir, A. Huet and A. Raya

*Instituto de Física y Matemáticas, Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo
Apartado Postal 2-82, Morelia, Michoacán 58040, México.*

We study three dimensional quenched Quantum Electrodynamics in the bare vertex approximation. We investigate the gauge dependence of the dynamically generated Euclidean mass of the fermion and the chiral condensate for a wide range of values of the covariant gauge parameter ξ . We find that (i) away from $\xi = 0$, gauge dependence of the said quantities is considerably reduced without resorting to sophisticated vertex *ansatze*, (ii) wavefunction renormalization plays an important role in restoring gauge invariance and (iii) the Ward-Green-Takahashi identity seems to increase the gauge dependence when used in conjunction with some simplifying assumptions. In the Landau gauge, we also verify that our results are in agreement with those based upon dimensional regularization scheme within the numerical accuracy available.

PACS number(s): 11.10.Kk, 11.15.Tk, 12.20.-m

UMSNH-PHYS/02-1

I. INTRODUCTION

In a gauge field theory, Green functions transform in a specific manner under a variation of gauge. These transformations carry the name Landau-Khalatnikov-Fradkin (LKF) transformations, [1–3]. These were also derived by Johnson and Zumino through functional methods, [4,5]. As a consequence of gauge covariance, Green functions obey certain identities which relate one function to the other. These relations have been named Ward-Green-Takahashi identities (WGTI), [6–8]. At the level of physical observables, gauge symmetry reflects as the fact that they be independent of the gauge parameter. Perturbation theory respects these requirements at every level of approximation. However, this has not been achieved in general in the non-perturbative study of gauge field theories through Schwinger-Dyson equations (SDE) carried out so far although significant progress has been made. The gauge technique of Salam, Delbourgo and later collaborators, [9–14], was developed to incorporate the constraint imposed by WGTI. However, as pointed out in [15], gauge technique can become completely reliable only after incorporating transverse Green functions with correct analytic and gauge-covariance properties. Another method widely used to explore the non-perturbative structure of the SDE is to make an *ansatz* for the full fermion-boson vertex and then study the gauge dependence of the physical observables related to the phenomenon of dynamical chiral symmetry breaking (DCSB). This method has been quite popular in four dimensional Quantum Electrodynamics (QED). For example, the vertex *ansatz* proposed by Curtis and Pennington, [16], has been extensively used to study the gauge dependence of the fermion propagator and the dynamical generation of fermion mass in Quenched QED, e.g., [17–20]. Later on, the work of Bashir and Pennington, [21,22], proposed an improved vertex which achieves complete gauge independence of the critical coupling above which mass is dynamically generated. These methods use the cut-off regularization to study the gauge dependence of the physical observables. As the cut-off method in general does not respect gauge symmetry, a criticism of these works has been raised recently, [23–25]. They suggest dimensional regularization scheme to study the chirally asymmetric phase of QED so that the possible gauge dependence coming from the inappropriate regulator could be filtered out.

Three dimensional Quantum Electrodynamics (QED3) provides us with a neat laboratory to study DCSB as it is ultraviolet well-behaved and hence the source of gauge non-invariance finds its roots only in the simplifying assumptions employed and *not* in the choice of the regulator. Burden and Roberts, [26], studied the gauge dependence of the chiral condensate in quenched QED3 and proposed a vertex which appreciably reduces this gauge dependence in the range $0 - 1$ of the covariant gauge parameter ξ . Unfortunately, the choice of their vertex does not transform correctly under the operation of charge conjugation. Moreover, the selected range of values for ξ is very narrow, close to the vicinity of the Landau gauge. The studies of QED3 carried out by Bashir *et. al.*, [27,28], reveal that Landau gauge may not be a preferred gauge in QED3. In fact, it is seen that the LKF transformation of one loop fermion propagator remains insensitive to the inclusion of the LKF transformation of the second loop, provided we are away from the Landau gauge. Assuming similar behaviour for the higher loops, we may expect that for larger value of the gauge parameter, physical observables would also become insensitive to the value of this parameter. In this paper, we undertake the calculation of the Euclidean mass of the fermion (referred to as *mass* from now onwards) and the

condensate for a wide range of values of ξ . We find that indeed for larger values of the gauge parameter, both the quantities seem to become increasingly gauge invariant.

II. THE FERMION PROPAGATOR

In quenched QED3, the SDE for the fermion propagator in the Minkowski space can be written as :

$$S_F^{-1}(p) = S_F^{0-1}(p) - ie^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \Gamma^\nu(k, p) S_F(k) \gamma^\mu \Delta_{\mu\nu}^0(q) , \quad (2.1)$$

where $q = k - p$, e is the electromagnetic coupling, $\Gamma^\nu(k, p)$ is the full fermion-photon vertex, $S_F^0(p)$ and $\Delta_{\mu\nu}^0(q)$ are the bare fermion and photon propagators defined as

$$S_F^0(p) = 1/\not{p} , \quad \Delta_{\mu\nu}^0(q) = -\frac{g_{\mu\nu}}{q^2} + (1 - \xi) \frac{q_\mu q_\nu}{q^4} , \quad (2.2)$$

and $S_F(p)$ is the full fermion propagator, which we prefer to write in the following most general form :

$$S_F(p) = \frac{F(p)}{\not{p} - \mathcal{M}(p)} . \quad (2.3)$$

$F(p)$ is referred to as the wavefunction renormalization and $\mathcal{M}(p)$ as the mass function. ξ is the usual covariant gauge parameter. Eq. (2.1) is a matrix equation. It consists of two independent equations, which can be decoupled by taking its trace after multiplying it with 1 and \not{p} , respectively. Making use of Eqs. (2.2,2.3) and replacing the full vertex by its bare counterpart, these equations can be written as :

$$\frac{1}{F(p)} = 1 + \frac{\alpha}{2\pi^2 p^2} \int d^3k \frac{F(k)}{k^2 + \mathcal{M}^2(k)} \frac{1}{q^4} \left[-2(k \cdot p)^2 + (2 - \xi)(k^2 + p^2)k \cdot p - 2(1 - \xi)k^2 p^2 \right] , \quad (2.4)$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{M}(p)}{F(p)} = \frac{\alpha(2 + \xi)}{2\pi^2} \int d^3k \frac{F(k) \mathcal{M}(k)}{k^2 + \mathcal{M}^2(k)} \frac{1}{q^2} . \quad (2.5)$$

Carrying out angular integration after the Wick rotation to the Euclidean space, the above equations acquire the form :

$$\frac{1}{F(p)} = 1 - \frac{\alpha\xi}{\pi p^2} \int dk \frac{k^2 F(k)}{k^2 + \mathcal{M}^2(k)} \left[1 - \frac{k^2 + p^2}{2kp} \ln \left| \frac{k+p}{k-p} \right| \right] , \quad (2.6)$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{M}(p)}{F(p)} = \frac{\alpha(\xi + 2)}{\pi p} \int dk \frac{k F(k) \mathcal{M}(k)}{k^2 + \mathcal{M}^2(k)} \ln \left| \frac{k+p}{k-p} \right| . \quad (2.7)$$

A trivial solution to Eq. (2.7) is $\mathcal{M}(p) = 0$, which corresponds to the usual perturbative solution. We are interested in a non-trivial solution by solving Eqs. (2.6) and (2.7) simultaneously. Such a solution for $\mathcal{M}(p)$ is related to the mass m and the chiral condensate $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$ through the relations $m = \mathcal{M}(m)$ and $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle = 4p^2 \mathcal{M}(p)/(2 + \xi)$, respectively. We shall study the gauge dependence of these quantities in the next section for the fixed value of $\alpha = 1/4\pi$.

III. EFFECT OF THE WAVEFUNCTION RENORMALIZATION

In studying DCSB, it has been a common practice to make the approximation $F(p) = 1$ so that we only have to solve Eq. (2.7). The justification for this approximation stems from the fact that perturbatively $F(p) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(\alpha\xi/\pi)$. If α is small and we are sufficiently close to the Landau gauge, one would naturally expect that $F(p) \approx 1$. Although, it has been quite customary to employ this approximation, there exist several works which include both the equations. We study the effects of neglecting the wavefunction renormalization quantitatively. Fig. (1) depicts the mass function $\mathcal{M}(p)$ for $F(p) = 1$ in various gauges. As expected, the mass function is roughly a constant for low values of p and falls as $1/p^2$ for large values of p . The integration region chosen is from 10^{-3} to 10^3 and we select 26 points per decade. The mass probes low momentum region of this graph, whereas, the condensate is extracted from its asymptotic behaviour. Obviously, the mass seems to vary in more or less equally spaced steps with the variation of

the gauge parameter. In order to obtain a quantitative value of the mass, we select neighbouring points p_a and p_b ($p_a > p_b$), such that $\mathcal{M}(p_a) < p_a$ and $\mathcal{M}(p_b) > p_b$. We then approximate the mass by the following relation :

$$m = \frac{\mathcal{M}(p_b) - \mathcal{M}(p_a)}{p_b - p_a}(m - p_a) + \mathcal{M}(p_a) . \quad (3.1)$$

As for the condensate, the figure does not distinguish between the results for various gauges. Therefore, we have to look at the numbers explicitly. Table (1) shows the value of the condensate for ξ ranging from 1 – 5. The point $p = 1000$ was chosen to calculate the condensate. This number seems sufficiently large as the $1/p^2$ behaviour seems to set in much earlier ($p \approx 300$), as noted also in [26]. In Figs. (2) and (3) we display the gauge dependence of the chiral condensate and the mass for $F(p) = 1$ in a wide range of values of the gauge parameter. The condensate varies heavily with the change of gauge, roughly twice per unit change in the value of ξ . Gauge dependence of the mass is not too different either.

ξ	p	$\frac{4}{2+\xi} p^2 M(p^2)$	ξ	p	$\frac{4}{2+\xi} p^2 M(p^2)$
0.0	1000	2.31109	2.5	1000	11.6992
	642.233	2.31117		642.233	11.7001
	316.228	2.31119		316.228	11.7003
0.5	1000	3.61103	3.0	1000	14.4432
	642.233	3.61119		642.233	14.4444
	316.228	3.61124		316.228	14.4448
1.0	1000	5.19982	3.5	1000	17.4761
	642.233	5.20009		642.233	17.4777
	316.228	5.20017		316.228	17.4782
1.2	1000	5.91622	4.0	1000	20.7977
	642.233	5.91654		642.233	20.7998
	316.228	5.91664		316.228	20.8005
1.5	1000	7.07745	4.5	1000	24.4081
	642.233	7.07787		642.233	24.4108
	316.228	7.07800		316.228	24.4117
2.0	1000	9.24390	5.0	1000	28.3073
	642.233	9.24452		642.233	28.3106
	316.228	9.24473		316.228	28.3117

TABLE 1. The condensate in various gauges for $F(p) = 1$

Repeating the exercise by taking both the equations, namely Eqs. (2.6) and (2.7), into account, we see similar qualitative behaviour of the mass function. It is roughly a constant for low values of p and falls as $1/p^2$ for large values of p , Fig. (4). The large p behaviour is also evident from the entries in Table (2). As for the wavefunction renormalization, it also is constant for small values of p . As p becomes large it goes to 1, Fig. (5). In Table (2) we also give a comparison with the work of Burden and Roberts, [26]. As mentioned earlier, they restrict themselves to the close vicinity of the Landau gauge, where our results are in excellent agreement. We investigate the gauge dependence

of the condensate as well as the mass far beyond the Landau gauge. A graphical description can be found in Figs. (6) and (7). The following points are important to note :

- The wavefunction renormalization plays an extremely important role in restoring the gauge invariance of the chiral condensate as well as the mass of the fermion. Although the qualitative behaviour of the mass function in various regimes of momenta remains largely unchanged, whether or not we employ the approximation $F(p) = 1$, quantitative dependence of the physical observables mentioned above on the covariant gauge parameter ξ reduces a great deal by including the wavefunction renormalization.
- As we move away from the Landau gauge towards large positive values of ξ , the gauge dependence of the condensate as well as the mass keeps diminishing, without resorting to any sophisticated *ansatze* for the fermion-boson interaction.

ξ	p	$\frac{4}{2+\xi} p^2 M(p^2)$	$\frac{4}{2+\xi} p^2 M(p^2)$	ξ	p	$\frac{4}{2+\xi} p^2 M(p^2)$	$\frac{4}{2+\xi} p^2 M(p^2)$
		BHR	BR			BHR	BR
0.0	1000	2.31109	2.316	2.5	1000	0.98597	
	642.233	2.31117			642.233	0.98594	
	316.228	2.31119			316.228	0.98571	
0.5	1000	1.77309	1.775	3.0	1000	0.90941	
	642.233	1.77313			642.233	0.90938	
	316.228	1.77306			316.228	0.90912	
1.0	1000	1.44791	1.447	3.5	1000	0.85201	
	642.233	1.44793			642.233	0.85197	
	316.228	1.44780			316.228	0.85169	
1.2	1000	1.35288	1.352	4.0	1000	0.80839	
	642.233	1.35288			642.233	0.80833	
	316.228	1.35274			316.228	0.80803	
1.5	1000	1.23591		4.5	1000	0.77497	
	642.233	1.23591			642.233	0.77491	
	316.228	1.23574			316.228	0.77458	
2.0	1000	1.09014		5.0	1000	0.74933	
	642.233	1.09012			642.233	0.74927	
	316.228	1.08992			316.228	0.74891	

TABLE 2. The condensate in various gauges including wavefunction renormalization

IV. EFFECT OF THE WARD-GREEN-TAKAHASHI IDENTITY

The bare photon propagator which appears in Eq. (2.1) can be split up in longitudinal and transverse parts as follows :

$$\Delta_{\mu\nu}^0(q) = \Delta_{\mu\nu}^{0T} - \xi \frac{q_\mu q_\nu}{q^4}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\Delta_{\mu\nu}^{0T} = -g_{\mu\nu}/q^2 + q_\mu q_\nu/q^4$. Employing this decomposition, we can rewrite Eq. (2.1) as :

$$S_F^{-1}(p) = S_F^{0-1}(p) - ie^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \Gamma^\nu(k, p) S_F(k) \gamma^\mu \Delta_{\mu\nu}^{0T} + ie^2 \xi \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \Gamma^\nu(k, p) S_F(k) \gamma^\mu \frac{q_\mu q_\nu}{q^4}. \quad (4.2)$$

It is well known that the use of the WGTI, in the equivalent of the last term of Eq. (4.2) in QED4, filters out a spurious term which is an artifact of using the gauge dependent cut-off regulator. Therefore, one is naturally motivated to use this decomposition in dimensions other than four. Multiplying Eq. (4.2) by 1 and \not{p} respectively and Wick-rotating to the Euclidean space, we obtain the following equations :

$$\frac{1}{F(p)} = 1 + \frac{\alpha}{2\pi^2 p^2} \int d^3k \frac{F(k)}{k^2 + \mathcal{M}^2(k)} \frac{1}{q^4} \left[2(q \cdot p)(q \cdot k) + \frac{\xi}{F(p)} [p^2(q \cdot k) + \mathcal{M}(k)\mathcal{M}(p)(q \cdot p)] \right], \quad (4.3)$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{M}(p)}{F(p)} = \frac{\alpha}{2\pi^2} \int d^3k \frac{F(k)}{k^2 + \mathcal{M}^2(k)} \frac{1}{q^2} \left[2\mathcal{M}(k) - \frac{\xi}{q^2} \frac{1}{F(p)} [\mathcal{M}(k)(p \cdot q) - \mathcal{M}(p)(k \cdot q)] \right]. \quad (4.4)$$

On carrying out angular integration,

$$\frac{1}{F(p)} = 1 + \frac{\alpha\xi}{\pi p^2} \int_0^\infty dk \frac{k^2 F(k)/F(p)}{k^2 + \mathcal{M}^2(k)} \left[\frac{p^2}{k^2 - p^2} + \frac{p}{2k} \ln \left| \frac{k+p}{k-p} \right| + \mathcal{M}(k)\mathcal{M}(p) \left\{ \frac{1}{k^2 - p^2} - \frac{1}{2kp} \ln \left| \frac{k+p}{k-p} \right| \right\} \right], \quad (4.5)$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{M}(p)}{F(p)} = \frac{\alpha}{\pi} \int_0^\infty dk \frac{k^2 F(k)}{k^2 + \mathcal{M}^2(k)} \left[\frac{2\mathcal{M}(k)}{kp} \ln \left| \frac{k+p}{k-p} \right| - \frac{\xi}{F(p)} \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{M}(k) - \mathcal{M}(p)}{k^2 - p^2} - \frac{\mathcal{M}(k) + \mathcal{M}(p)}{2kp} \ln \left| \frac{k+p}{k-p} \right| \right\} \right]. \quad (4.6)$$

As the terms of the type $1/(k^2 - p^2)$ are harder to deal with numerically, we use the approximation $F(p) = 1$ to analyze the effect of the WGTI. Under this simplification, we only have to solve

$$\mathcal{M}(p) = \frac{\alpha}{\pi} \int_0^\infty dk \frac{k^2}{k^2 + \mathcal{M}^2(k)} \left[\frac{2\mathcal{M}(k)}{kp} \ln \left| \frac{k+p}{k-p} \right| - \xi \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{M}(k) - \mathcal{M}(p)}{k^2 - p^2} - \frac{\mathcal{M}(k) + \mathcal{M}(p)}{2kp} \ln \left| \frac{k+p}{k-p} \right| \right\} \right]. \quad (4.7)$$

The mass function obtained on solving Eq. (4.7) is depicted in Fig. (8), which, along with Table (3), reveals that its qualitative behaviour remains unchanged both for small and large values of p . In Figs. (9) and (10), we compare the gauge dependence of the condensate and the mass with and without the usage of the WGTI. As in QED4, we find that the gauge dependence of these quantities seems to increase by incorporating the said identity.

ξ	p	$\frac{4}{2+\xi} p^2 M(p^2)$	ξ	p	$\frac{4}{2+\xi} p^2 M(p^2)$
0.0	1000	2.31109	2.5	1000	18.7057
	642.233	2.31117		642.233	18.7085
	316.228	2.31119		316.228	18.7136
0.5	1000	4.30196	3.0	1000	23.9226
	642.233	4.30221		642.233	23.9268
	316.228	4.30248		316.228	23.9345
1.0	1000	6.93473	3.5	1000	29.7865
	642.233	6.93529		642.233	29.7924
	316.228	6.93609		316.228	29.8037
1.2	1000	8.16826	4.0	1000	36.2975
	642.233	8.16900		642.233	36.3056
	316.228	8.17011		316.228	36.3212
1.5	1000	10.2122	4.5	1000	43.4556
	642.233	10.2133		642.233	43.4663
	316.228	10.2150		316.228	43.4872
2.0	1000	14.1356	5.0	1000	51.2608
	642.233	14.1375		642.233	51.2746
	316.228	14.1406		316.228	51.3020

TABLE 3. The condensate in various gauges for $F(p) = 1$ making use of WGTI

V. DIMENSIONAL REGULARIZATION METHOD

In this section we compare our numerical results with those obtained by employing the dimensional regularization scheme, [23–25]. For simplicity, we restrict ourselves only to the Landau gauge without incorporating the WGTI. In this case, the equation for the mass function acquires the following form in Euclidean space in arbitrary dimensions :

$$\mathcal{M}(p) = 4\pi\alpha(d-1) \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{\mathcal{M}(k)}{k^2 + \mathcal{M}^2(k)} \frac{1}{q^2}, \quad (5.1)$$

where α is a dimensionful coupling except in four dimensions. We define $d = 4 - 2\epsilon$ and

$$\alpha = \alpha_d \mu^{2\epsilon}, \quad (5.2)$$

α_d being dimensionless. We now use the identity $d^d k = k^{d-1} dk d\Omega_d$, where $d\Omega_d$ is the d -dimensional solid angle defined as $d\Omega_d = \prod_{l=1}^{d-1} \sin^{d-1-l} \theta_l d\theta_l$. The angle θ_{d-1} varies from 0 to 2π , whereas all other angles vary from 0 to π . Choosing θ_1 to be the angle between k and p , we can easily carry out the remaining angular integrations to arrive at :

$$\mathcal{M}(p) = \frac{2(d-1)\alpha}{(4\pi)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} \Gamma(\frac{d-1}{2})} \int_0^\infty dk^2 \frac{k^{d-2} \mathcal{M}(p)}{k^2 + \mathcal{M}^2(p)} \int_0^\pi d\theta_1 \frac{\sin^{d-2} \theta_1}{q^2}. \quad (5.3)$$

Using the standard formula, [29],

$$\int_0^\pi dx \frac{\sin^{2\sigma-1} x}{[1 + 2a \cos x + a^2]^\lambda} = B(\sigma, 1/2) F(\lambda, \lambda - \sigma + 1/2, \mu + 1/2; a^2) \quad |a| < 1 ,$$

integration over θ_1 yields :

$$\mathcal{M}(p) = \frac{(3-2\epsilon)\alpha}{(4\pi)^{1-\epsilon}\Gamma(2-\epsilon)} \int_0^\infty dk^2 \frac{(k^2)^{1-\epsilon} \mathcal{M}(k)}{k^2 + \mathcal{M}^2(k)} \left[\frac{1}{k^2} F\left(1, \epsilon; 2-\epsilon; \frac{p^2}{k^2}\right) \theta(k^2 - p^2) + \frac{1}{p^2} F\left(1, \epsilon; 2-\epsilon; \frac{k^2}{p^2}\right) \theta(k^2 - p^2) \right]. \quad (5.4)$$

This equation was studied in detail in [23] in four dimensions, taking ϵ to be a small positive number. The factor $(k^2)^{-\epsilon}$ in the numerator regulates the otherwise divergent behaviour of the integrand for large momenta. As noted in [23], the hypergeometric function does not play any role in regularization and hence can simply be replaced by $F(1, 0; 2, z) = 1$. In case of three dimensions, the hypergeometric function develops a pole for $k^2 = p^2$, as is obvious from the following identity :

$$F(1, \epsilon; 2-\epsilon; 1) = \frac{1-\epsilon}{1-2\epsilon} . \quad (5.5)$$

As was pointed out earlier, such terms are hard to deal with numerically. Due to increasing computational time and memory, we go only up to $\epsilon = 0.48$, starting from $\epsilon = 0.4$. To obtain satisfying results, we need to use increasingly more points per decade as we approach closer to $\epsilon = 0.5$. For instance, we use 100 points per decade for $\epsilon = 0.46$. The problems of ever increasing computational time and memory limited us to use 140 points per decade for the case of $\epsilon = 0.48$. Despite this large number, we believe that the corresponding result falls short of the desired accuracy. As a result, there is a slight rise at the end of the flat region of the mass function, and the final descent begins rather late, Fig. (11). The problematic pole for $\epsilon = 0.5$ in Eq. (5.5) corresponds to the relatively well-controlled singularity in the following expression

$$F\left(1, \frac{1}{2}; \frac{3}{2}; z^2\right) = \frac{1}{2z} \ln \frac{1+z}{1-z} \quad (5.6)$$

for $z \rightarrow 1$. A comparison between the mass function obtained from techniques based upon the dimensional regularization scheme and the one computed in Section III is also depicted in Fig. (11). Taking the numerical limitation for $\epsilon = 0.48$ into account, we note that as ϵ approaches the value of 0.5, we get closer and closer to the result obtained in Section III, where we work in 3-dimensions to start with.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The sources of gauge non-invariance in the study of SDE in QED can arise from (i) the use of the approximation $F(p) = 1$, (ii) the violation of WGTI and the LKF transformations, (iii) the flawed *ansatz* for the vertex and (iv) the inadequate choice of the regulator. In case of 3 dimensions, QED becomes neater because of the absence of ultraviolet divergences. The regulator dependence does not pose a threat any longer. In this paper, we have studied the quantitative effect of the approximation $F(p) = 1$ and the violation of the WGTI on the gauge dependence of the mass and the condensate in QED3 for a wide range of values of the covariant gauge parameter ξ . Lifting the approximation $F(p) = 1$ seems to reinstate gauge invariance to an impressive extent. Partial use of the WGTI seems to increase the gauge dependence, an effect noted also in 4 dimensions in [23]. As an advantage of using a broad range of values of ξ , we find that when they are large, the gauge dependence of the said quantities diminishes without resorting to improved *ansatz* for the vertex. Currently, work is underway to explore the role played by various elaborate choices of the vertex in this context.

-
- [1] L.D. Landau and I.M. Khalatnikov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **29** 89 (1956).
 - [2] L.D. Landau and I.M. Khalatnikov, Sov. Phys. JETP **2** 69 (1956).
 - [3] E.S. Fradkin, Sov. Phys. JETP **2** 361 (1956).
 - [4] K. Johnson and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **3** 351 (1959).
 - [5] B. Zumino, J. Math. Phys. **1** 1 (1960).
 - [6] J.C. Ward, Phys. Rev. **78** (1950).
 - [7] H.S. Green, Proc. Phys. Soc. (London) **A66** 873 (1953).
 - [8] Y. Takahashi, Nuovo Cimento **6** 371 (1957).
 - [9] A. Salam, Phys. Rev. **130** 1287 (1963).
 - [10] A. Salam and R. Delbourgo, Phys. Rev. **135** 1398 (1964).
 - [11] J. Strathdee, Phys. Rev. **135** 1428 (1964).
 - [12] R. Delbourgo and P. West, J. Phys. **A10** 1049 (1977).
 - [13] R. Delbourgo and P. West, Phys. Lett. **B72** 96 (1977).
 - [14] R. Delbourgo, Nuovo Cimento **A49** 484 (1979).
 - [15] R. Delbourgo, Austral. J. Phys. **52** 681 (1999).
 - [16] D.C. Curtis and M.R. Pennington, Phys. Rev. **D42** 4165 (1990).
 - [17] D.C. Curtis and M.R. Pennington, Phys. Rev. **D44** 536 (1991).
 - [18] D.C. Curtis and M.R. Pennington, Phys. Rev. **D48** 4933 (1993).
 - [19] D. Atkinson, J.C.R. Bloch, V.P. Gusynin, M.R. Pennington and M. Reenders, Phys. Lett. **B329** 117 (1994).
 - [20] D. Atkinson, V.P. Gusynin and P. Maris, Phys. Lett. **B303** 157 (1993).
 - [21] A. Bashir and M.R. Pennington, Phys. Rev. **D50** 7679 (1994).
 - [22] A. Bashir and M.R. Pennington, Phys. Rev. **D53** 4694 (1996).
 - [23] V.P. Gusynin, A.W. Schreiber, T. Sizer and A.G. Williams, Phys. Rev. **D60** 065007 (1999).
 - [24] A.W. Schreiber, T. Sizer and A.G. Williams, Phys. Rev. **D58** 125014 (1998).
 - [25] A. Kızılersü, A.W. Schreiber and A.G. Williams, Phys. Lett **B499** 261 (2001).
 - [26] C.J. Burden and C.D. Roberts, Phys. Rev. **D44** 540 (1991).
 - [27] A. Bashir, A. Kızılersü and M.R. Pennington, Phys. Rev. **D57** 1242 (1998).
 - [28] A. Bashir, Phys. Lett. **B491** 280 (2000).
 - [29] I.S. Gradshteyn and I.M. Ryzhik, *Table of Integrals, Series and Products*, sixth edition (Academic Press, USA), 2000.




FIG. 1. The mass function $\mathcal{M}(p)$ in the approximation $F(p) = 1$.




FIG. 2. The condensate $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$ in the approximation $F(p) = 1$.




FIG. 3. The mass in the approximation $F(p) = 1$.




FIG. 4. The mass function including the equation for the wavefunction renormalization.




FIG. 5. The wavefunction renormalization.




FIG. 6. The condensate: a comparison between the cases with and without the use of $F(p) = 1$.




FIG. 7. The mass: a comparison between the cases with and without the use of $F(p) = 1$.




FIG. 8. The mass function including the effect of the WGTI for $F(p) = 1$.




FIG. 9. Effect of the WGTI on the gauge dependence of the condensate for $F(p) = 1$.




FIG. 10. Effect of the WGTI on the gauge dependence of the mass for $F(p) = 1$.




FIG. 11. The mass function for various values of ϵ . Note that $\epsilon = 0.5$ would correspond to 3 dimensions. The result for $\epsilon = 0.48$ could not be achieved up to the desired accuracy because of the ever increasing computational time and memory involved.