

DEUTSCHES ELEKTRONEN-SYNCHROTRON **DESY**

LAMBDA SCALE FOR THE IMPROVED LATTICE  $O(N)$  NON-LINEAR SIGMA MODEL

by

B. Berg

*II. Institut für Theoretische Physik der Universität Hamburg*

ISSN 0418-9833

NOTKESTRASSE 85 · 2 HAMBURG 52

DESY behält sich alle Rechte für den Fall der Schutzrechtserteilung und für die wirtschaftliche Verwertung der in diesem Bericht enthaltenen Informationen vor.

DESY reserves all rights for commercial use of information included in this report, especially in case of filing application for or grant of patents.

To be sure that your preprints are promptly included in the  
HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS INDEX ,  
send them to the following address ( if possible by air mail ) :

DESY  
Bibliothek  
Notkestrasse 85  
2 Hamburg 52  
Germany

LAMBDA SCALE FOR THE IMPROVED LATTICE O(N) NON-LINEAR SIGMA MODEL \*)

by

B. Berg

II. Institut für Theoretische Physik der Universität Hamburg,  
2000 Hamburg 50, Luruper Chaussee 149

I. Introduction

Monte Carlo (MC) simulations of lattice spin and gauge theories try to extract information about the quantum continuum limit. As the same universality class allows infinitely many equivalent actions, the art would be to use an action which allows MC simulations close to the continuum limit. To construct such an action, Wilson / 1 / suggested block spin MC renormalization group calculations, but statistical noise seems to be a severe problem. A decisive advantage of Symanzik's / 2-4 / improvement program is that perturbative calculations allow an educated guess of a good action. Recent MC simulations / 5,6 / of the 2d O(3) non-linear  $\sigma$ -model have shown that the one-loop order improved action (= improved action henceforth) gives a considerably improved scaling behaviour.

Let us consider 2d O(N) non-linear sigma models and use the definition of  $\Lambda$ -scales

$$\Lambda = \alpha^{-1} \left( \frac{2\pi\beta}{N-2} \right)^{\frac{1}{N-2}} \cdot \lambda^{-\frac{2\pi\beta}{N-2}} \left( 1 + \mathcal{O}(\beta^2) \right), \quad (1)$$

where  $\beta = 1/g^2$  is the bare coupling of the corresponding (lattice) regularization scheme. Our mass gap result / 5 / for the O(3) improved action now reads

$$m \approx 16 \Lambda_L^I \quad (L = \text{lattice}, I = \text{improved}), \quad (2)$$

For the standard action our MC data were consistent with mass gap estimates of previous literature / 7-9 /

$$m \approx 100 \Lambda_L^S \quad (S = \text{standard}), \quad (3)$$

In the continuum limit the ratio of  $\Lambda$ -scales can be calculated by a one-loop computation / 10 /. For the O(N) models the ratio between  $\Lambda_L^S$  and  $\Lambda_{PV}$  (PV = Pauli-Villars) has been first calculated by Parisi / 11 /:

$$\Lambda_{PV} / \Lambda_L^S = 27.21 \quad (N = 3), \quad (4)$$

Abstract

Using the background field technique I compute  $\Lambda_L^I / \Lambda_L^S = e^{\frac{1}{N-2} (N-1) 0.5928 + 0.2044}$  in agreement with a calculation by Symanzik. Implications for Monte Carlo simulations are also discussed.

\*) Submitted to Z.Phys.C.

Using a similar method Symanzik /4/ obtains for the improved action

$$\Lambda_L^2 / \Lambda_L^S = 2.219 \quad (N = 3) \quad (5)$$

As the ratio (5) is rather catastrophic for the MC result (3)\*, an independent calculation of it is desirable. Using the background field method /12/ I obtain the same number.

The paper is organized as follows: Section II contains details of my calculation. This is also a pedagogical exercise for the calculation of  $\Lambda$ -scales by means of the background field method. For the  $O(N)$  models the background field method has been used previously in Ref. /13,14/. In the final section III some consequences of the result (5) for MC simulations are discussed.

\*) Assuming (2) to be the more reliable result.

## II. The improved lambda scale

Let us consider the improved action /4/ in the notation of Ref. /5/ (equation (3)). The order  $g^2$  coefficients  $c_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, 6$ ) will not contribute to the  $\Lambda$ -scale. Therefore it is for our purposes sufficient to calculate with the action

$$S = \sum_{\mu} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \Delta_{\mu} \pi \Delta_{\mu} \pi + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_{\mu} \sigma \Delta_{\mu} \sigma - \frac{H}{\Lambda} \sigma + c_{24} \left( \Delta_{\mu} \Delta_{\mu} \pi \Delta_{\mu} \pi + \Delta_{\mu} \Delta_{\mu} \sigma \Delta_{\mu} \sigma \right) \right\} \quad (6)$$

Here  $c_{24} = 1/24$  for the improved action /15,4,5/ and  $c_{24} = 0$  for the standard action. Further:

$$\Delta_{\mu} \phi(x) = \phi(x+\hat{\mu}) - \phi(x), \quad \sigma = (1 - \pi^2)^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{N-1}).$$

The Boltzmann factor is  $e^{-S/g^2}$  and  $\phi$  of Ref. /5/ is of course  $\phi = (\pi, \sigma)$ . A small magnetic field  $H$  has been introduced so that all the integrals encountered in perturbation calculations are infrared finite.

I now partly follow some unpublished notes of A. and P. Hasenfratz /13/. Let us write

$$\pi = W + g \alpha. \quad (7)$$

Here  $W$  is a smoothly varying classical background field and  $\alpha$  parametrizes the quantum fluctuations. We like to calculate the one-loop renormalization of the classical background field (see e.g. /14/). This means we have to calculate the terms of order  $W^2, g^2 \alpha^2$  of the action (6). Using the rules

\*) Order  $g$  in the notation of /5/.

$$\Delta_{\mu} (f \cdot g) = \Delta_{\mu} f \cdot \Delta_{\mu} g + \Delta_{\mu} f \cdot g + f \cdot \Delta_{\mu} g \quad (8a)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mu} \Delta_{\mu} (f \cdot g) &= \Delta_{\mu} \Delta_{\mu} f \cdot \Delta_{\mu} \Delta_{\mu} g \\ &+ 2 (\Delta_{\mu} \Delta_{\mu} f \cdot \Delta_{\mu} g + \Delta_{\mu} f \cdot \Delta_{\mu} \Delta_{\mu} g) \\ &+ \Delta_{\mu} \Delta_{\mu} f \cdot g + f \cdot \Delta_{\mu} \Delta_{\mu} g + 2 \Delta_{\mu} f \cdot \Delta_{\mu} g, \end{aligned} \quad (8b)$$

this is a straightforward algebraic calculation. Writing

$$S = S_{cl} + S_0 + S_{int} \quad (9)$$

the classical part of the action becomes

$$S_{cl} = \sum_{\mu} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \Delta_{\mu} W \Delta_{\mu} W + \frac{1}{4} H W^2 \right\} + C_{24} \text{higher derivatives} \quad (10a)$$

and the free part is

$$S_0 = g^2 \sum_{\mu} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \Delta_{\mu} \alpha \Delta_{\mu} \alpha + \frac{1}{4} H \alpha^2 + C_{24} \Delta_{\mu} \alpha \Delta_{\mu} \alpha \right\} \quad (10b)$$

The corresponding propagator reads

$$G(x) = \int_{\mathcal{K}} \frac{\lambda K_1 x_1 + \lambda K_2 x_2}{4 - 2 \cos K_1 - 2 \cos K_2 + 8 C_{24} \left[ (1 - \cos K_1)^2 + (1 - \cos K_2)^2 \right]} \quad (11)$$

where

$$\int_{\mathcal{K}} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{-\pi}^{+\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{+\pi} dx_1 dx_2$$

Note that

$$G(m\hat{n}) = G(m\hat{z}) = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathcal{K}} \frac{2 \cos m K_1 + 2 \cos m K_2}{4 - 2 \cos K_1 - 2 \cos K_2 + 8 C_{24} \left[ (1 - \cos K_1)^2 + (1 - \cos K_2)^2 \right]} \quad (12)$$

From the interaction part  $S_{int}$  we have to pick out quantum fluctuations with coefficients  $\frac{1}{2} \Delta_{\mu} W \Delta_{\mu} W$  and  $\frac{1}{4} H W^2$ . Recognize that after summation over the lattice sites (periodic boundary conditions assumed) one has

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}} W \cdot \Delta_{\mu} W = \sum_{\mathbf{x}} -\frac{1}{2} \Delta_{\mu} W \cdot \Delta_{\mu} W \quad (12a)$$

and

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}} W \cdot \Delta_{\mu} \Delta_{\mu} W = \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \left( -\Delta_{\mu} W \cdot \Delta_{\mu} W + \Delta_{\mu} W \cdot \Delta_{\mu} \Delta_{\mu} W \right). \quad (12b)$$

Derivatives of order like  $\Delta_{\mu} W \cdot \Delta_{\mu} \Delta_{\mu} W$  or higher do not contribute.

The quantum fluctuations are calculated by contracting the  $\alpha^2$  terms according to

$$\alpha^a(x+m\hat{\mu}) \alpha^b(x) = \delta_{ab} G(m\hat{n}) \quad (13)$$

The results are

$$g^2 \sum_{\mu} \frac{1}{2} \Delta_{\mu} W \cdot \Delta_{\mu} W \cdot \lambda \quad \text{with} \quad \lambda = G(1) + 8 C_{24} (G(1) - G(2)) \quad (14a)$$

and

$$g^2 \frac{1}{2} H W^2 \cdot \kappa \quad \text{with} \quad \kappa = \frac{N-1}{2} G(0). \quad (14b)$$

III. Implications for Monte Carlo simulations

In units of  $\Lambda_{PV}$  (cf. equation (4)) various mass gap estimates are summarized in the table. The improved MC result /5/ is even lower than Lüscher's estimate /20/. To the extent that the improved MC calculation is reliable, the scaling curve for the standard action has to have a shape, which is qualitatively indicated in the figure. Politzer /21/ seems to like it. It should be emphasized that no clear scaling window for the standard action has been found. The scaling windows of Ref. /8,9/ are on a very fine scan, and Ref. /18/ now claims disagreement with scaling. Also there are large discrepancies in the final estimates.

A result of Ref. /6/ is that the order  $g^2$  coefficients  $c_i$  ( $c_i = 1, \dots, 6$ ) turn out to be important for the improved mass gap estimate /5/. In a MC simulation without these coefficients (they do not affect the asymptotic scale  $\Lambda_{I}^I$ ) we obtain results more close to the standard action.

For the magnetic susceptibility clear scaling deviations were observed in MC investigations with the standard action /22-24/ \*. Nevertheless an estimate of the continuum limit was tried /9/:

$$c^S = 0.008 - 0.013. \tag{18a}$$

The constant  $c^S, c^I$  are defined by  $\chi = c^S (\beta\pi\beta)^4 \lambda^4 \pi\beta$ . The improved action exhibits clear scaling properties for the magnetic susceptibility and yields /5/

$$c^I \approx 0.3 \tag{18b}$$

The discrepancy is similar as for the mass gap.

In summary the MC results /5,6/ for the improved  $O(3)$   $\sigma$ -model provide a severe warning against carelessly extracting numbers from lattice MC calculations. The magnitude of corrections may, however,

\*) In Ref. /24/ also non-standard actions were considered.

To K also  $\frac{1}{2}W^2$ -terms contributed via the identity

$$G(0) - G(1) + 2c_{24} (3G(0) - 4G(1) + G(2)) = \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4}HG(0) + O(H^2). \tag{15}$$

The  $\Lambda$ -ratio is given by

$$\frac{\Lambda_{I}^I}{\Lambda_{L}^S} = \lambda^{-1} \frac{1}{\beta_0} \left( \frac{1}{g_{LZ}^2} - \frac{1}{g_{LS}^2} \right) = \lambda^{\frac{2\pi}{N-2}} \left( 2(K^S - K^I) - (\lambda^S - \lambda^I) \right). \tag{16}$$

We have used  $\beta_0 = \frac{N-2}{2\pi}$  /16,17/ and  $\frac{g_{LS}^2}{g_{LZ}^2} = \frac{Z_4^S}{Z_4^I}$  with  $Z_4 = (1-2g^2K+g^2\lambda)$ . ( $Z_4$  as defined in Ref. /17/). The index S corresponds to the standard propagator  $G^S(x) = G(x)$  with  $c_{24} = 0$ , and the index I corresponds to the improved propagator  $G^I(x) = G(x)$  with  $c_{24} = \frac{1}{24}$ . Numerical integration gives

$$2\pi (\lambda^S - \lambda^I) = -0.2044 \tag{17a}$$

$$4\pi (G^S(0) - G^I(0)) = 0.5928 \tag{17b}$$

Thus equation (16) yields the result of the abstract (equation (5) of the introduction for  $N = 3$ ).

be strongly model dependent. For instance the author would conjecture standard MC estimates in  $O(4)$  and  $O(5)$   $\sigma$ -models  $/9/$  to be less effected. In 4d  $SU(2)$  and  $SU(3)$  lattice gauge theories scaling properties for the string tension  $/25/$  and the mass gap  $/26/$  are more clear than any "scaling" in the standard  $O(3)$   $\sigma$ -model. But there is no scaling  $/27/$  in lattice MC calculations of hadron masses. Fortunately the computation of the one-loop improved action for 4d  $SU(N)$  lattice gauge theories is on the way  $/28/$ .

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank K. Symanzik for usefull discussions and P. Hasenfratz for unpublished notes  $/13/$ .

Note added

After completing this paper I received a preprint by Falcioni, Martinelli, Paciello, Parisi and Taglienti  $/29/$ , where the  $\Lambda$ -ratio (5) is also reported. Further the authors perform MC calculations with the tree-level improved action  $/15/$ .

References:

- 1 K.G. Wilson, Cargèse lectures 1979, edited by G. 't Hooft et al., Plenum Press, New York, 1980
- 2 K. Symanzik, in: "Mathematical Problems in Theoretical Physics", Eds. R. Schrader et al. (Springer, Berlin, 1982) (Lecture Notes in Physics 153)
- 3 K. Symanzik, "Continuum limit and improved action in lattice theories I: Principles and  $\phi^4$  theory", Preprint, DESY 83-016
- 4 K. Symanzik, "Continuum limit and improved action in lattice theories II:  $O(N)$  non-linear sigma model in perturbation theory", Preprint, DESY 83-026
- 5 B. Berg, S. Meyer, I. Montvay and K. Symanzik, Preprint, DESY 83-015, submitted to Phys. Lett. B
- 6 B. Berg, S. Meyer and I. Montvay, in preparation
- 7 S.H. Shenker, J. Tobochnik, Phys. Rev. B22 (1980) 4462
- 8 G. Fox, R. Gupta, O. Martin, S. Otto, Nucl. Phys. B205 [FS5] (1982) 188
- 9 M. Fukugita, Y. Oyanagi, National Lab. for High Energy Physics Tsukuba, Ibaraki preprint, KEK-TH 56 (1982)
- 10 A. Hasenfratz and P. Hasenfratz, Phys. Lett. 93B (1980) 165
- 11 G. Parisi, Phys. Lett. 92B (1980) 133
- 12 R. Dashen and D.J. Gross, Phys. Rev. D23 (1981) 2340
- 13 A. Hasenfratz and P. Hasenfratz (unpublished)
- 14 J. Shigemitsu and J.B. Kogut, Nucl. Phys. B190 [FS3] (1981) 365
- 15 G. Martinelli, G. Parisi and R. Petronzio, Phys. Lett. 100B (1981) 485. The action of this reference does not improve the 4-point functions to one-loop order.
- 16 M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. 59B (1975) 79
- 17 E. Brezin and J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Rev. D14 (1976) 3110
- 18 R. Gupta, Preprint, CALT-68-1010 (1983)

- 19 R. Musto, F. Nicodemi and R. Pettorino, Nucl. Phys. B210 [FS6] (1982) 263.  
For previous work see: D.N. Lambeth and H.E. Stanley, Phys. Rev. B12 (1975) 5302.
- 20 M. Lüscher, Phys. Lett. 118B (1982) 391
- 21 H.D. Politzer, Proceedings of the 21th international conference on high energy physics, Paris 1982, edited by P. Petiau and M. Porneuf, p. c3 - 659
- 22 G. Martinelli, G. Parisi, R. Petronzio, Phys. Lett. 100B (1981) 485
- 23 B. Berg and M. Lüscher, Nucl. Phys. B190 [FS3] (1981) 412
- 24 Y. Iwasaki and T. Yoshie, University of Tsukuba, Ibaraki preprint, UTHEP-105 (1982)
- 25 M. Creutz and K.J.M. Moriarty, Phys. Rev. D26 (1983) 43, and references given there
- 26 B. Berg and A. Billoire, "Gluon spectroscopy in 4-d SU(3) lattice gauge theory I + II", Nucl. Phys. B, to appear, and references given there
- 27 A. Hasenfratz, P. Hasenfratz, Z. Kunszt and C.B. Lang, Phys. Lett. 110B (1982) 283
- 28 P. Weisz, Nucl. Phys. B212 (1983) 1
- 29 M. Falcioni, G. Martinelli, M.L. Paciello, B. Taglienti and G. Parisi, Preprint (1983)

m	Method
4.1 ± 1.2	MC, standard action, block spin renormalization group /7/.
4.8 ± 0.2	MC, standard action /8/.
3.5 ± 0.2	MC, standard action /9/.
5.7 ± 0.5	MC, standard action /18/.
≈ 3.4	Strong coupling, Hamiltonian /14/.
≈ 3.2	Strong coupling, Euclidean /19/.
≈ 1.7	Spin wave (continuum $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^1$ ) /20/.
≈ 1.3	MC, improved action /5/.

TABLE

Mass gap estimates in units  $\Lambda_{\text{PV}}$






fig.

