

QCD Critical Point : Marching towards continuum

*Rajiv V. Gai**

T. I. F. R., Mumbai, India

Introduction

Our Lattice Results

Summary

** Work done with Saumen Datta & Sourendu Gupta*

Introduction

- QCD defined on a space time lattice – Best and Most Reliable way to extract non-perturbative physics.
- Completely parameter-free : Λ_{QCD} and quark masses from hadron spectrum.

Introduction

- QCD defined on a space time lattice – Best and Most Reliable way to extract non-perturbative physics.
- Completely parameter-free : Λ_{QCD} and quark masses from hadron spectrum.
- Mostly staggered quarks used in these simulations. Broken flavour and spin symmetry on lattice.
- The expectation value of an observable \mathcal{O} computed by importance sampling :

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{\int DU \exp(-S_G) \mathcal{O} \prod_f \text{Det } M(m_f, \mu_f)}{\mathcal{Z}}.$$

Simulations can be done IF $\text{Det } M > 0$. However, $\det M$ is a complex number for any $\mu \neq 0$: The Phase/sign problem.

Lattice Approaches

Several Approaches proposed in the past two decades : None as satisfactory as the usual $T \neq 0$ simulations.

Lattice Approaches

Several Approaches proposed in the past two decades : None as satisfactory as the usual $T \neq 0$ simulations.

- Two parameter Re-weighting (Z. Fodor & S. Katz, JHEP 0203 (2002) 014).
- Imaginary Chemical Potential (Ph. de Forcrand & O. Philipsen, NP B642 (2002) 290; M.-P. Lombardo & M. D'Elia PR D67 (2003) 014505).
- Taylor Expansion (C. Allton et al., PR D68 (2003) 014507; R.V. Gavai and S. Gupta, PR D68 (2003) 034506).
- Canonical Ensemble (K. -F. Liu, IJMP B16 (2002) 2017, S. Kratochvila and P. de Forcrand, Pos LAT2005 (2006) 167.)
- Complex Langevin (G. Aarts and I. O. Stamatescu, arXiv:0809.5227 and its references for earlier work).

Detail of Expansion

Text-book definitions yield various number densities and susceptibilities :

$$n_i = \frac{T}{V} \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{Z}}{\partial \mu_i} \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_{ij} = \frac{T}{V} \frac{\partial^2 \ln \mathcal{Z}}{\partial \mu_i \partial \mu_j} \quad .$$

These are also useful by themselves both theoretically and for Heavy Ion Physics (Flavour correlations, $\lambda_s \dots$)

Denoting higher order susceptibilities by χ_{n_u, n_d} , the pressure P has the expansion in μ :

$$\frac{\Delta P}{T^4} \equiv \frac{P(\mu, T)}{T^4} - \frac{P(0, T)}{T^4} = \sum_{n_u, n_d} \chi_{n_u, n_d} \frac{1}{n_u!} \left(\frac{\mu_u}{T} \right)^{n_u} \frac{1}{n_d!} \left(\frac{\mu_d}{T} \right)^{n_d} \quad (1)$$

Detail of Expansion

Text-book definitions yield various number densities and susceptibilities :

$$n_i = \frac{T}{V} \frac{\partial \ln \mathcal{Z}}{\partial \mu_i} \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_{ij} = \frac{T}{V} \frac{\partial^2 \ln \mathcal{Z}}{\partial \mu_i \partial \mu_j} \quad .$$

These are also useful by themselves both theoretically and for Heavy Ion Physics (Flavour correlations, $\lambda_s \dots$)

Denoting higher order susceptibilities by χ_{n_u, n_d} , the pressure P has the expansion in μ :

$$\frac{\Delta P}{T^4} \equiv \frac{P(\mu, T)}{T^4} - \frac{P(0, T)}{T^4} = \sum_{n_u, n_d} \chi_{n_u, n_d} \frac{1}{n_u!} \left(\frac{\mu_u}{T} \right)^{n_u} \frac{1}{n_d!} \left(\frac{\mu_d}{T} \right)^{n_d} \quad (1)$$

- From this expansion, a series for baryonic susceptibility can be constructed. Its radius of convergence gives the nearest critical point.
- Successive estimates for the radius of convergence obtained from these using $\sqrt[n]{\frac{n(n+1)\chi_B^{(n+1)}}{\chi_B^{(n+3)}T^2}}$ or $\left(n!\frac{\chi_B^{(2)}}{\chi_B^{(n+2)}T^2}\right)^{1/n}$. We use both and terms up to 8th order in μ .
- All coefficients of the series must be POSITIVE for the critical point to be at real μ , and thus physical.
- We (Gavai-Gupta '05, '09) use up to 8th order. Bielefeld-RBC so far has up to 6th order.
- 10th & even 12th order may be possible : Ideas to extend to higher orders are emerging (Gavai-Sharma PRD 2012 & PRD 2010) which save up to 60 % computer time.

- From this expansion, a series for baryonic susceptibility can be constructed. Its radius of convergence gives the nearest critical point.
- Successive estimates for the radius of convergence obtained from these using $\sqrt[n]{\frac{n(n+1)\chi_B^{(n+1)}}{\chi_B^{(n+3)}T^2}}$ or $\left(n!\frac{\chi_B^{(2)}}{\chi_B^{(n+2)}T^2}\right)^{1/n}$. We use both and terms up to 8th order in μ .
- All coefficients of the series must be POSITIVE for the critical point to be at real μ , and thus physical.
- We (Gavai-Gupta '05, '09) use up to 8th order. Bielefeld-RBC so far has up to 6th order.
- 10th & even 12th order may be possible : Ideas to extend to higher orders are emerging (Gavai-Sharma PRD 2012 & PRD 2010) which save up to 60 % computer time.

- From this expansion, a series for baryonic susceptibility can be constructed. Its radius of convergence gives the nearest critical point.
- Successive estimates for the radius of convergence obtained from these using $\sqrt[n]{\frac{n(n+1)\chi_B^{(n+1)}}{\chi_B^{(n+3)}T^2}}$ or $\left(n!\frac{\chi_B^{(2)}}{\chi_B^{(n+2)}T^2}\right)^{1/n}$. We use both and terms up to 8th order in μ .
- All coefficients of the series must be POSITIVE for the critical point to be at real μ , and thus physical.
- We (Gavai-Gupta '05, '09) use up to 8th order. Bielefeld-RBC so far has up to 6th order.
- 10th & even 12th order may be possible : Ideas to extend to higher orders are emerging (Gavai-Sharma PRD 2012 & PRD 2010) which save up to 60 % computer time.

Our Simulations & Results

- Staggered fermions with $N_f = 2$ of $m/T_c = 0.1$; R-algorithm used.
- $m_\pi/m_\rho = 0.31 \pm 0.01$; Kept the same as $a \rightarrow 0$ (on all N_t).
- Earlier Lattice : $4 \times N_s^3$, $N_s = 8, 10, 12, 16, 24$ (Gavai-Gupta, PRD 2005)
Finer Lattice : $6 \times N_s^3$, $N_s = 12, 18, 24$ (Gavai-Gupta, PRD 2009).


Our Simulations & Results

- Staggered fermions with $N_f = 2$ of $m/T_c = 0.1$; R-algorithm used.
- $m_\pi/m_\rho = 0.31 \pm 0.01$; Kept the same as $a \rightarrow 0$ (on all N_t).
- Earlier Lattice : $4 \times N_s^3$, $N_s = 8, 10, 12, 16, 24$ (Gavai-Gupta, PRD 2005)
Finer Lattice : $6 \times N_s^3$, $N_s = 12, 18, 24$ (Gavai-Gupta, PRD 2009).
- $\frac{T^E}{T_c} = 0.94 \pm 0.01$, and $\frac{\mu_B^E}{T^E} = 1.8 \pm 0.1$ for finer lattice: Our earlier coarser lattice result was $\mu_B^E/T^E = 1.3 \pm 0.3$. Infinite volume result: \downarrow to 1.1(1)

Our Simulations & Results

- Staggered fermions with $N_f = 2$ of $m/T_c = 0.1$; R-algorithm used.
- $m_\pi/m_\rho = 0.31 \pm 0.01$; Kept the same as $a \rightarrow 0$ (on all N_t).
- Earlier Lattice : $4 \times N_s^3$, $N_s = 8, 10, 12, 16, 24$ (Gavai-Gupta, PRD 2005)
Finer Lattice : $6 \times N_s^3$, $N_s = 12, 18, 24$ (Gavai-Gupta, PRD 2009).
- $\frac{T^E}{T_c} = 0.94 \pm 0.01$, and $\frac{\mu_B^E}{T^E} = 1.8 \pm 0.1$ for finer lattice: Our earlier coarser lattice result was $\mu_B^E/T^E = 1.3 \pm 0.3$. Infinite volume result: \downarrow to 1.1(1)
- T_c — defined by the peak of Polyakov loop susceptibility.
- Even finer Lattice : 8×32^3 — This Talk
Aspect ratio, N_s/N_t , maintained four to reduce finite volume effects.


Critical Point : Story thus far



♠ $N_f = 2$ (magenta) and $2+1$ (blue) (Fodor-Katz, JHEP '04).

♡ $N_t = 4$ Circles (GG '05 & Fodor-Katz JHEP '02), $N_t = 6$ Box (GG '09).


χ_2 for $N_t = 8, 6,$ and 4 lattices



♠ $N_t = 8$ and 6 results agree

♡ $\beta_c(N_t = 8)$ agrees with Gottlieb et al. PR D47,1993.


χ_B^n for $N_t = 8$ lattice



♠ 100 configurations & 1000 vectors at each point employed.


♡ More statistics coming in critical region. Window of positivity in anticipated region.

Radius of Convergence result



- ♠ At our (T_E, μ_E) for $N_t = 6$, the ratios display constancy for $N_t = 8$ as well.
- ♡ Currently : Similar results at neighbouring $T/T_c \implies$ a larger ΔT at same μ_B^E .

Consistency check for critical point



♠ Ideally, all coefficients of the series must be the same at the critical point for both $N_t = 8$ and 6.


♡ Too far from checking this as errors have to be reduced. Encouraging signs none the less.

Summary

- The method we advocated, and employed for $N_t = 4$ and 6, works for $N_t = 8$ as well, yielding similar qualitative picture.
- Our new results for $N_t = 8$ are first to begin the march towards continuum limit.

Summary

- The method we advocated, and employed for $N_t = 4$ and 6, works for $N_t = 8$ as well, yielding similar qualitative picture.
- Our new results for $N_t = 8$ are first to begin the march towards continuum limit.



Critical Point location appears the same for $N_t = 8$ and 6 at $\mu_B/T \sim 1.8(1)$. Slight shift in temperature to $\frac{T^E}{T_c} = 0.96 \pm 0.02$; Agrees with $N_t = 6$ within errors.

Why Taylor series expansion?


- Ease of taking continuum and thermodynamic limit.
- E.g., $\exp[\Delta S]$ factor makes this exponentially tough for re-weighting.

Why Taylor series expansion?

- Ease of taking continuum and thermodynamic limit.
- E.g., $\exp[\Delta S]$ factor makes this exponentially tough for re-weighting.
- Discretization errors propagate in an unknown manner in re-weighting.
- Better control of systematic errors.

Why Taylor series expansion?

- Ease of taking continuum and thermodynamic limit.
- E.g., $\exp[\Delta S]$ factor makes this exponentially tough for re-weighting.
- Discretization errors propagate in an unknown manner in re-weighting.
- Better control of systematic errors.




We study volume dependence at several T to i) bracket the critical region and then to ii) track its change as a function of volume.



method for locating of the CEP:


- determine largest temperature where all coefficients are positive $\rightarrow T^{CEP}$
- determine the radius of convergence at this temperature $\rightarrow \mu^{CEP}$



first non-trivial estimate of T^{CEP} by c_8
 second non-trivial estimate of T^{CEP} by c_{10}

$$p = c_0 + c_2 (\mu_B/T)^2 + c_4 (\mu_B/T)^4 + \dots$$

$$\chi_B = 2c_2 + 12c_4 (\mu_B/T)^2 + 30c_6 (\mu_B/T)^4 + \dots$$





$$\rho_n(p) = \sqrt{c_n/c_{n+2}}$$

$$\rho = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n$$

(Ch. Schmidt FAIR Lattice QCD Days, Nov 23-24, 2009.)

Imaginary Chemical Potential


deForcrand-Philpsen JHEP 0811



For $N_f = 3$, they find $\frac{m_c(\mu)}{m_c(0)} = 1 - 3.3(3) \left(\frac{\mu}{\pi T_c}\right)^2 - 47(20) \left(\frac{\mu}{\pi T_c}\right)^4$, i.e., m_c shrinks with μ .

Imaginary Chemical Potential

deForcrand-Philpsen JHEP 0811



For $N_f = 3$, they find $\frac{m_c(\mu)}{m_c(0)} = 1 - 3.3(3) \left(\frac{\mu}{\pi T_c}\right)^2 - 47(20) \left(\frac{\mu}{\pi T_c}\right)^4$, i.e., m_c shrinks with μ .

Problems : i) Positive coefficient for finer lattice (Philpsen, CPOD 2009), ii) Known examples where shapes are different in real/imaginary μ ,

“The Critical line from imaginary to real baryonic chemical potentials in two-color QCD”, P. Cea, L. Cosmai, M. D’Elia, A. Papa, PR D77, 2008

