# Effective string description of the interquark potential in the 3D U(1) Lattice Gauge Theory.<sup>1</sup>

Davide Vadacchino<sup>1</sup> Michele Caselle<sup>1</sup> Marco Panero<sup>2</sup> Roberto Pellegrini<sup>1</sup>

 $^{1}$ Università degli Studi di Torino/INFN Sezion di Torino

<sup>2</sup>Instituto de Física Teórica UAM/CSIC, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Lattice 2014 Columbia University, NYC

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Caselle, Panero, Pellegrini, and Vadacchino (2014)

#### OUTLINE

- ▶ The 3D U(1) lattice gauge model:
  - 1. Confinement.
  - 2. Dual formulation and gauge/string duality.
- Numerical results on the interquark potential: deviations with respect to Nambu-Goto.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

Conclusions and future directions.

$$S = \beta \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \sum_{1 \le \mu < \nu \le 3} \left[ 1 - \operatorname{Re} \, U_{x,\mu} U_{x+a\hat{\mu},\nu} U_{x+a\hat{\nu},\mu}^{\star} U_{x,\nu}^{\star} \right]$$

where  $\Lambda$  is a 3D euclidean spacetime lattice and

$$U_{\mathrm{x},\mu}=\exp\left[iaartheta_{\mu}\left(x+a\hat{\mu}/2
ight)
ight]\in U(1)$$

Since the model is abelian

$$\operatorname{Re} U_{x,\mu}U_{x+a\hat{\mu},\nu}U_{x+a\hat{\nu},\mu}^{\star}U_{x,\nu}^{\star} = \cos\left(\Delta_{\mu}\vartheta_{x,\nu} - \Delta_{\nu}\vartheta_{x,\mu}\right) = \cos\vartheta_{x,\mu\nu}$$

Adopting discrete differential forms notation

$$Z = \prod_{c_1} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \mathrm{d}(\vartheta) \, e^{-\beta \sum_{c_2} (1 - \cos \mathrm{d}\vartheta)}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

with  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  links and plaquettes on  $\Lambda$ .

The weak coupling approximation

Taking the periodicity of Z into account in the  $\beta \gg 1$  approximation

$$Z = Z_{\rm sw} Z_{\rm top} = Z_{\rm sw} \sum_{\{q\}} e^{-2\pi^2 \beta(q, \Delta^{-1}q)}$$

where  $Z_{\rm top}$  describes a coulomb like gas of topological excitations,  $Z_{\rm sw}$  describes spin-waves.

- The model is always confining in 3D<sup>2</sup>
- In the semiclassical approximation

$$m_0 = c_0 \sqrt{8\pi^2 eta} e^{-\pi^2 eta \, 
u(0)}, \quad \sigma \geq rac{c_\sigma}{\sqrt{2\pi^2 eta}} e^{-\pi^2 eta \, 
u(0)}, \quad {}_{
u(0) \, = \, 0.2527}$$

the bounds are saturated and  $c_\sigma=8, \ \ c_0=1.$ 

The ratio

$$\frac{m_0}{\sqrt{\sigma}} = \frac{2\pi c_0}{\sqrt{c_{\sigma}}} (2\pi\beta)^{3/4} e^{-\pi^2 v(0)\beta/2},$$

can be tuned at will by an appropriate choice of  $\beta,$  in contrast to the general Yang-Mills case.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>(Göpfert and Mack, 1981, Polyakov, 1977)

The dual formulation of the model

The dual model is a globally  ${\mathbb Z}$  symmetric spin model  $^3$ 

$$Z = \sum_{\{\star I = -\infty\}}^{\{\infty\}} \prod_{\star c_1} \mathrm{I}_{|\mathrm{d}^{\star}I|}(\beta),$$

where

- $I_{\alpha}$  Bessel functions of order  $\alpha$
- $*c_1$  are links of the dual lattice  $*\Lambda$ .

 $\blacktriangleright$  \*/ is an integer valued scalar field, and d\*/ differences at neighboring dual sites.

The advantage is twofold:

Physical insight into the confinement mechanism : dual superconductor scenario.

Ease in numerical computation.

The confinement mechanism and gauge/string duality

The dual superconductor scenario of confinement<sup>4</sup>:

- Condensation of magnetic monopoles drives confinement of electric charges.
- The dynamics of flux tubes should be described by string like degrees of freedom: no proven gauge/string duality in the general case.

In the U(1) LGT, however, an heuristic proof exists  $^{5}$ 

$$S_{\text{Pol}} = c_1 e^2 m_0 \int d^2 \xi \sqrt{g} + c_2 \frac{e^2}{m_0} \int d^2 \xi \sqrt{g} K^2$$

where  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  are two undetermined constants.

> At tree level, the rigidity term doens't contribute to the interquark potential.

• If 
$$c_1 = \sigma$$
 and  $c_2 = \alpha$  then

$$\sqrt{\sigma/lpha} = m \sim m_0$$
.

and the rigidity correction is dominant in the  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$  limit.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>(Polyakov, 1977)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>(Antonov, 1998, Polyakov, 1997)

INCLUSION OF POLYAKOV LINES IN THE PARTITION FUNCTION

The interquark potential V(R) can be extracted from

$$G(R) = \langle P^{\star}(R)P(0) \rangle = e^{-N_t V(R)} \propto \int [DX] e^{-S_{\text{eff}}[X]}$$

where  $S_{eff}$  is the effective string action and P(x) Polykakov lines.

In the dual formulation, Polyakov lines P(x) are easily included in Z



$$Z_{R} = e^{-\beta N_{l}} \sum_{\{\star' l = -\infty\}}^{\{\infty\}} \prod_{\star c_{1}} \mathrm{I}_{|\,\mathrm{d}^{\star} l + \star n|}(\beta)$$

where n is integer valued and nonvanishing only on links dual to a surface bounded by the lines.

Thus in the dual formulation

$$G(R)=\frac{Z_R}{Z}$$

which, however, is hard to measure because of an exponentially decaying signal-to-noise ratio.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ○□ のへで

## Simulation of the The U(1) LGT in 3D

SNAKE ALGORITHM AND HIERARCHICAL UPDATE

The problem can be circumvented using the snake algorithm<sup>6</sup>:



$$\frac{G(R+1)}{G(R)} = \frac{Z_{R+1}}{Z_R} = \frac{Z_{R+1}}{Z_R^{L_d-1}} \frac{Z_R^{L_d-1}}{Z_R^{L_d-2}} \cdots \frac{Z_R^1}{Z_R}$$

where



are  $L_d$  independent local observables.

And efficiency of the computation can be improved by updating the lattice hierarchically around the local observable



・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>(de Forcrand, D'Elia, and Pepe (2001))

## SIMULATION OF THE U(1) LGT IN 3D

THE GENERAL SETTING AND THE MEASURED QUANTITY

We obtained high precision estimates of

$$Q(R) = -\frac{1}{N_t} \log \frac{G(R+1)}{G(R)} = V(R+1) - V(R)$$

▶ The dual model was simulated at several values of  $\beta$  on lattices  $L^2 x N_t$  chosen to avoid finite size effects:

$$\mathsf{N}_t, \mathsf{L} = egin{cases} \mathsf{64a, for } eta < 2.4 \ 128\mathsf{a, for } eta \geq 2.4 \ 128\mathsf{a}, ext{ for } eta \geq 2.4 \end{cases}$$

- ▶ Q(R) was probed in the range  $1/\sqrt{\sigma} < R < L/2$
- A single site metropolis update algorithm was used with Jacknife error estimation.

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

## SIMULATION OF THE U(1) LGT IN 3D

PRELIMINARY MEASUREMENTS

The data was fitted asymptotically with

$$V_{NG}(R) = \sigma R \sqrt{1 - rac{\pi}{12\sigma R^2}}$$

using  $\sigma$  as free parameter in the range [ $R_{min}a$ , La/2].

β	$\sigma a^2$	$L, N_t$	$1/\sqrt{\sigma}$	$R_{min}\sqrt{\sigma}$
1.7	0.122764(2)	64	3a	11a
1.9	0.066824(6)	64	4 <i>a</i>	17 <i>a</i>
2.0	0.049364(2)	64	5 <i>a</i>	20 <i>a</i>
2.2	0.027322(2)	64	6 <i>a</i>	26 <i>a</i>
2.4	0.015456(7)	128	8 <i>a</i>	34 <i>a</i>

- At low  $\beta$ , NG describes the data for a wide range of Ra
- > As  $\beta$  grows, the deviations from NG grow: at  $\beta = 2.2$  only 6 degrees of freedom can be fitted!

Deviations should be detectable in the range  $\left[a/\sqrt{\sigma}, R_{\min}a\right]$ 

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

## SIMULATION OF THE U(1) LGT IN 3D

DEVIATIONS WITH RESPECT TO NG

Deviations  $(Q(R) - Q_{NG}(R))a$  with respect to NG at  $\beta = 2.2$  on a  $(64a)^3$  lattice.



The best fit value of  $\sigma a^2 = 0.027322(2)$  was obtained with  $R_{min}\sqrt{\sigma} = 4.3$ .

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ ─臣 ─のへで

## DEVIATIONS WITH RESPECT TO NG

HOW TO EXPLAIN THEM?

In general

$$S_{eff} = S_{NG} + S_b + S_{2,K}$$

Up to the resolution of our data

$$\begin{split} S_{NG} &\simeq S_{cl.} + \frac{\sigma}{2} \int \mathrm{d}^2 \xi \left[ \partial_\alpha X \cdot \partial^\alpha X - \frac{1}{4} \left( \partial_\alpha X \cdot \partial^\alpha X \right)^2 \right], \\ S_b &\simeq b_2 \int d\xi_0 \left[ \partial_1 \partial_0 X \cdot \partial_1 \partial_0 X \right], \\ S_{2,K} &\simeq \alpha \int (\Delta X)^2 \end{split}$$

For each we can compute the L.O. contribution to V(R) perturbatively<sup>7</sup>

$$V_b(R) = -b_2 \frac{\pi^3}{60} \frac{1}{R^4}, \quad V_r(R) = -\frac{m}{2\pi} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{K_1(2nmR)}{n}, \quad m = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma}{2\alpha}}$$

<sup>7 (</sup>Aharony and Field, 2011, Billó et al., 2012, Klassen and Melzer, 1991, Nesterenko and Pirozhenko 1997) 🚊 🛷 🔍

#### DEVIATIONS WITH RESPECT TO NG

RIGIDITY AND BOUNDARY AT LO

The boundary correction  $V_b$  alone can't describe the deviations:

- $\chi^2_R \sim 1$  only for very large values of  $R_{\min}\sqrt{\sigma}$ .
- ▶ The best fit values of *b*<sub>2</sub> have the wrong scaling behaviour:

$$b_2 \sigma^{3/2} = 0.033(3), \ \beta = 1.7$$
  
 $b_2 \sigma^{3/2} = 0.62(6), \ \beta = 2.4$ 

A complementary test with the potential

$$V(R) = \frac{A}{R^{E}}$$

with A, B free parameters shows that  $b \neq 4$ . Fitting with the rigidity correction  $V_r$  works much better:

Good fits are obtained already at small distances:

$$ma = 0.112(2), \ \chi_r^2 = 1.03, \ R_{min}\sqrt{\sigma} = 2.15$$

to be compared with  $R_{min}\sqrt{\sigma} = 4.3$  for NG.

▶ The best fit value of *m* scales with *m*<sub>0</sub>.

## DEVIATIONS WITH RESPECT TO NG RIGIDITY AT NLO

The NLO correction due to the rigidity contribution can be computed in the large D limit<sup>8</sup>

$$V_2(R) = -\left(\frac{\pi D}{24}\right)^2 \frac{3}{20m\sigma R^4}$$

and in the general case<sup>9</sup>

$$V_2'(R) = -(D-2)(D-10)\left(\frac{\pi}{24}\right)^2 \frac{3}{20m\sigma R^4}$$

This contribution is detected within the precision of our data and contributes to the best fit value of ma.

It is entangled to the boundary correction, which then cannot be neglected!

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>(Braaten et al., 1987)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>(German and Kleinert, 1989)

#### DEVIATIONS WITH RESPECT TO NG

3 parameters fit of the data

$$V(R) = V_{NG}(R) + V_r(R) + V'_2(R) + V_b(R)$$

using  $\sigma$ , m and  $b_2$  as free parameters results in the best fit values

$$\sigma a^2 = 0.027318(2), ma = 0.11(1), b_2 \sigma^{3/2} = 0.005(1),$$

with  $\chi^2_r = 1.2$  and  $R_{min}\sqrt{\sigma} = 1.65$ .



In the plot: The deviations  $(Q(R) - Q_{NG}(R))a$  and the curve  $Q_r(R) + Q'_2(R) + Q_b(R)$  calculated with the best fit values for  $\sigma$ , m and  $b_2$ .

#### DETERMINATION OF *ma*

β	ma	m <sub>0</sub> a	$m/m_0$
1.7	0.28(9)	0.88(1)	0.32(10)
1.9	0.25(4)	0.56(1)	0.45(7)
2.0	0.17(2)	0.44(1)	0.39(4)
2.2	0.11(1)	0.27(1)	0.41(4)
2.4	0.06(2)	0.20(1)	0.30(10)

The same analysis for the other couplings leads to:

- Takes into account the interplay between  $\sigma$ , m, and  $b_2$  in the error.
- ▶ *m* scales with *m*<sup>0</sup> as predicted by Polyakov.

Our estimate of the rigidity parameter is

 $m/m_0 = 0.35(10)$  .

#### CONCLUSIONS

- ▶ The strong deviations with respect to NG observed in the U(1) LGT in 3D can be explained by the addition of a rigidity term to the effective string action, as predicted by Polyakov. This contribution becomes dominant in the limit  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ .
- Future directions:
  - 1. Try to disentangle the NLO rigidity contribution from the boundary correction.
  - Study the behaviour intrinsic width of the string and compare with predictions of the string with rigidity.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

3. Finite temperature behaviour of the interquark potential.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY I

- Ofer Aharony and Matan Field. On the effective theory of long open strings. *JHEP*, 1101:065, 2011. doi: 10.1007/JHEP01(2011)065.
- D.V. Antonov. Various properties of compact QED and confining strings. *Phys. Lett.*, B428:346–351, 1998. doi: 10.1016/S0370-2693(98)00419-5.
- M. Billó, M. Caselle, F. Gliozzi, M. Meineri, and R. Pellegrini. The Lorentz-invariant boundary action of the confining string and its universal contribution to the inter-quark potential. *JHEP*, 1205:130, 2012. doi: 10.1007/JHEP05(2012)130.
- Eric Braaten, Robert D. Pisarski, and Sze-Man Tse. The Static Potential for Smooth Strings. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 58:93, 1987. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.58.93.
- Michele Caselle, Marco Panero, Roberto Pellegrini, and Davide Vadacchino. A different kind of string. 2014.
- Philippe de Forcrand, Massimo D'Elia, and Michele Pepe. A Study of the 't Hooft loop in SU(2) Yang-Mills theory. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 86:1438, 2001. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.1438.
- G. German and H. Kleinert. Perturbative Two Loop Quark Potential of Stiff Strings in Any Dimension. *Phys. Rev.*, D40:1108–1119, 1989. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.40.1108.
- Markus Göpfert and Gerhard Mack. Proof of Confinement of Static Quarks in Three-Dimensional U(1) Lattice Gauge Theory for All Values of the Coupling Constant. Commun. Math. Phys., 82:545, 1981. doi: 10.1007/BF01961240.

#### Bibliography II

- Timothy R. Klassen and Ezer Melzer. The Thermodynamics of purely elastic scattering theories and conformal perturbation theory. *Nucl. Phys.*, B350:635–689, 1991. doi: 10.1016/0550-3213(91)90159-U.
- V.V. Nesterenko and I.G. Pirozhenko. Justification of the zeta function renormalization in rigid string model. J. Math. Phys., 38:6265–6280, 1997. doi: 10.1063/1.532211.
- Alexander M. Polyakov. Quark Confinement and Topology of Gauge Groups. *Nucl. Phys.*, B120:429–458, 1977. doi: 10.1016/0550-3213(77)90086-4.
- Alexander M. Polyakov. Confining strings. Nucl. Phys., B486:23–33, 1997. doi: 10.1016/S0550-3213(96)00601-3.
- Robert Savit. Duality in field theory and statistical systems. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 52: 453–487, Apr 1980. doi: 10.1103/RevModPhys.52.453. URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.52.453.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <