QCD-like Theories on R₃ S_1 : a Sm ooth Journey from Sm all to Large r (S₁) with D ouble-Trace D eform ations

M.Shifm an^a and Mithat Unsal^{b;c}

^a W illiam I.Fine Theoretical Physics Institute, University of M innesota, M inneapolis, M N 55455, USA

^b SLAC, Stanford University, M en b Park, CA 94025, USA ^c Physics D epartment, Stanford University, Stanford, CA,94305, USA

Abstract

W e consider QCD-like theories with one massless ferm ion in various representations of the gauge group SU (N). The theories are formulated on $R_3 = S_1$. In the decompactication limit of large r(S₁) all these theories are characterized by con nem ent, m ass gap and spontaneous breaking of a (discrete) chiral sym metry (SB). At smallr (S_1), in order to stabilize the vacua of these theories at a center-sym m etric point, we suggest to perform a double trace deform ation. W ith these deform ation, the theories at hand are at weak coupling at sm all $r(S_1)$ and yet exhibit basic features of the large-r (S1) limit: con nem ent and SB.W e calculate the string tension, m ass gap, biferm ion condensates and dependence. The double-trace deform ation becom es dynam ically irrelevant at large $r(S_1)$. Despite the fact that at sm all r(S1) con nem ent is Abelian, while it is expected to be non-Abelian at large $r(S_1)$, we argue that sm all and large $r(S_1)$ physics are continuously connected. If so, one can use sm all-r (S_1) laboratory to extract lessons about QCD and QCD -like theories on R_4 .

C ontents

1	Introduction				
2	QCD and QCD -like theories on R ₄ and R ₃ S_1 : general aspects	8			
3	QCD with one fundam ental ferm ion 3.1 Nonperturbative e ects and the low-energy	15			
	Lagrangian	18 21			
4	 QCD with one bifundam ental ferm ion 4.1 Deform ed orbifold QCD	22 23 24 29 30			
5	QCD with one AS ferm ion 5.1 Deformed orientifold QCD	31 32 33			
6	dependence	38			
7	Remarks on planar equivalence	40			
8	Conclusions and prospects: Abelian vs.non-Abelian con nem ent				
Aj	Appendix: Center stabilization				
Re	References				

1 Introduction

A nalyzing QCD and QCD-like theories on R_3 S_1 provides new insights in gauge dynam ics at strong coupling and o ers a new fram ework for discussing various ideas on con nem ent. The radius of the compact dimension $r(S_1)$ plays a role of an adjustable parameter, an obvious bonus and a welcom e addition to a rather scarce theoretical toolkit available in strongly coupled gauge theories. As the circum ference L of the circle S_1 varies, so does the dynam ical pattern of the theory. For instance, at L 1 in some instances the theory becomes weakly coupled. On the other hand, in the decompaction limit, L 1 , we recover conventional four-dimensional QCD, with its most salient feature, non-Abelian con nem ent.

A qualitative picture of con nem ent in terms of the Polyakov line was suggested by Polyakov and Susskind long ago [1, 2]. A sum e that the com – pacti ed dimension is z. The Polyakov line (som etimes called the Polyakov loop) is de ned as a path-ordered holonom y of the W ilson line in the com – pacti ed dimension,

$$U = P \exp i \underset{0}{\operatorname{a_z}} \operatorname{dz} \quad V \cup V^{\operatorname{Y}}$$
(1)

where L is the size of the compact dimension while V is a matrix diagonalizing U ,

$$U = diagfv_1; v_2; ...; v_N g:$$
 (2)

A coording to Polyakov, non-Abelian con nem ent in plies that the eigenvalues v_i are random ized: the phases of v_i wildly uctuate over the entire interval [0;2] so that

$$hTrUi = 0: (3)$$

The exact vanishing of hTrU i in pure Yang{M ills is the consequence of the unbroken Z_N center symmetry in the non-Abelian connement regime. Introduction of dynamical fermions (quarks) generally speaking breaks the Z_N center symmetry at the Lagrangian level.¹ However, the picture of wild uctuations of the phases of v_i 's remains intact. Therefore, it is generally expected that $h_N^{\frac{1}{2}}$ TrU i is strongly suppressed even with the dynam ical fermion

¹ It is still an em ergent dynam ical sym m etry in the multicolor lim it [3, 4]; how ever, we lim it ourselves to sm all N. In this paper param etrically N is of order one.



Figure 1: Quantum chromodynamics as a function of compacti ed direction circum ference before and after surgery (QCD and QCD , respectively). L_c is the point of a phase transition.

elds that respect no center sym m etry, $h_{N}^{\frac{1}{N}}$ TrU i 0. This expectation is supported by lattice simulations at nite temperatures [5] demonstrating that hTrU i is very close to zero at large L (low temperatures).

On the other hand, in QCD and QCD-like theories² at small L (high temperatures) the center-symmetric eld con guration is dynamically disfavored. In many instances the vacuum is attained at $h_N^{\frac{1}{N}}$ TrU i = 1. In this case, the elective low energy theory is at strong coupling, and it is as hard to dealw ith it as with QCD on R₄. Typically, the small and large-L domains are separated by a phase transition (or phase transitions). For instance, for S/AS with even N this is a Z₂ phase transition. Numerical studies show that for N = 3 there is a therm alphase transition between con nement and decon nement phases. Similar numerical studies detect a temperature T at which the broken chiral symmetry of T = 0 QCD gives place to restored chiral symmetry restoration (the lower plot in Fig. (1)).

In this case small physics says little, if at all, about large L physics, our desired goal. We would like to create a dierent situation. We would like to design a theory which (i) in the decompactication large L limit tends to conventional QCD and its QCD -like sisters; (ii) at small L is analytically tractable and has both con nement and chiral symmetry breaking; and (iii)

 $^{^{2}}$ By Q C D -like theories w em ean non-A belian gauge theories w ithout elementary scalars, e.g., Y ang {M ills w ith ferm ions in the two-index sym m etric or antisym m etric representation, to be referred to as S/A S, see below .

has as smooth transition between the small and large-L domains as possible (the upper plot in Fig. (1)). If this endeavor | rendering small and large-L physics continuously connected | is successful, we could try to use small-L laboratory to extract lessons about QCD and QCD-like theories on R₄.

W e will argue below that the goal can be achieved by performing a socalled double-trace deformation of QCD and QCD-like theories.³ To this end we add a non-local operator

7

$$P[U(x)] = \frac{2}{{}^{2}L^{4}} \int_{n=1}^{\frac{N}{2}} d_{n} jTrU^{n}(x) j^{2} \text{ for SU(N);}$$
(4)

to the QCD action,

$$S = d^{3}x L P [U(x)];$$
 (5)

were d_n are numerical parameters to be judiciously chosen. The theories obtained in this way will be labeled by asterisk. In minimizing S + S the e ect due to deform ation (4) is two-fold. First, it tends to minimize JTrU(x)j. Second it tends to maximize the distance between the eigenvalues of U. It is necessary to have a polynomial of order N=2 to force the eigenvalues of the Polyakov line to be maximally apart from one another, i.e. to push the theory towards the center-symmetric point depicted in Fig. 2. Here [x]stands for the integer part of x. To stabilize the vacuum su ciently close to the center-symmetric con guration the coe cients d_n must be large enough, presumably, $d_n = 1$. Some technical details are discussed in Appendix.

At large L, the deform ation switches o and has no in pact on the theory, i.e. QCD QCD. However, at small L the in pact is drastic. G iven an appropriate choice of d_n 's the deform ation (5) forces the theory to pick up the following set⁴ of the vacuum expectation values (VEVs):

$$v_k = e^{\frac{2 ik}{N}}; \quad k = 1; ...; N;$$
 (6)

(or permutations), see Fig. 2. If we de ne

$$e^{iaL}$$
 U; (7)

 $^{^{3}}$ T he double trace deform ations were previously discussed in the context of gauge/string theory dualities in [6, 7, 8, 9], as well as in eld theory [10, 11, 12].

 $^{^{4}}$ M ore exactly, the set of VEV s will be very close to (6).



Figure 2: Z_N symmetric vacuum elds v_k .

$$a = \begin{array}{c} X \\ a_{c}T^{c} \\ Cartan gen \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} X^{N} \\ diagfa_{1};a_{2}; \dots; a_{N} g; \\ k=1 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} X^{N} \\ a_{k} = 0; \\ k=1 \end{array} \qquad (8)$$

it is obvious that Eq. (6) in plies

$$fLa_{i}g = f \quad iL \ln \gamma \pmod{2} g$$

$$= \frac{2 \ \mathbb{N}=2}{N}; \quad \frac{2 \ (\mathbb{N}=2] \ 1}{N}; \dots; \frac{2 \ \mathbb{N}=2}{N} : \qquad (9)$$

This means, in turn, that the theory is maxim ally Higgsed,

$$SU(N) ! U(1)^{N-1}$$
 (10)

and weakly coupled at L¹. The gauge bosons from the Cartan subalgebra (to be referred to as photons) remain classically massless, while the o diagonal gauge bosons (to be referred to as W bosons) acquire large masses. The e ective low-energy dynamics is that of compact QED. (See footnote 12, though.) It is not trivial. Dual photons acquire exponentially small masses nonperturbatively through the instanton-monopole mechanism [13, 14]. The mass gap generation in the dual description amounts to linear Abelian connem ent (at exponentially large distances). Chiral biferm ion condensates are generated too [15, 16]. Thus, the dynam ical patterns in the small and large-L domains do not seem to be that di erent from each other. D etails are di erent (e.g. Abelian vs. non-Abelian connem ent), but gross features appear to be similar. It is not unreasonable to expect that there is no phase transition in L.

W hat is meant when we speak of A belian/non-A belian con nement [17, 4]? In the former case the gauge group acting in the infrared (IR) and responsible for the ux tube formation is A belian (i.e. U (1) U (1) ...). In the latter case we deal with a non-A belian group in the infrared.

The best-known example exhibiting both regimes is the Seiberg $\{W \text{ itten solution [18] of a deform ed N = 2 super-Y ang }\{M \text{ ills theory. If the deform a-tion parameter is small,}$

jj ;

the SU (N) gauge group is spontaneously broken down to U $(1)^{N-1}$, and the con ning string is a generalization of the Abrikosov vortex [19]. In the opposite lim it

jj ;

the breaking of SU (N) down to U $(1)^{N-1}$ does not occur. The infrared dynamics is determined by SU (N); the corresponding ux tubes should be non-Abelian. Since the theory is holom orphic in , the Abelian and non-Abelian con nement regimes are expected to be smoothly connected.

A nother example which should be mentioned (and which is close in formulation to what will be presented below) where it is believed that no phase transition in L takes place is N = 1 supersymmetric Yang{Mills (SYM) theory on $R_3 = S_1$ [20, 21, 22, 15, 16].

We expect that QCD and QCD -like theories are of this type | there is no phase transition between the Abelian con nement smallL and non-Abelian con nement large-L domains.

C on jecture: The deformed one-avor QCD-like theories interpolate from smallr(S_1) to large r(S_1) without phase transitions.

Since the theories under consideration are non-supersymmetric we cannot back up this statement by holomorphy. Thus, the smoothness conjecture is on a somewhat weaker basis than in the Seiberg {W itten problem. However, arguments to be presented below can be viewed as at least some evidence in favor of the absence of the phase transition in L. More evidence can (and should) be provided by lattice studies.

In QCD-like theories with more than one avor, chiral symmetry breaking (SB) occurring on R $_4$ at strong coupling produces N $_f^2$ 1 G oldstone

m esons. Needless to say, it is impossible to get such Goldstones at weak coupling at small L. However, if one considers theories with one ferm ion avor in the center-symmetric regime, there are no obvious reasons for a chiral phase transition. The chiral symmetry in such theories is discrete, and its spontaneous breaking results in dom ain walls rather than Goldstones. This phenomenon can show up both at strong and weak couplings. In this paper we will limit ourselves to QCD -like theories with a single avor.

To be more exact, we will discuss in some detail SU (N) Yang{M ills theory with one ferm ion in the fundam ental and two-index AS representations. A nalysis of the two-index S ferm ion essentially runs parallel to that of the AS case. We will also dwell on SU (N) SU (N) Yang{M ills with the bifundam ental ferm ion. The number of colors N is not assumed to be large. The large-N limit and the case of ferm ions in the adjoint representation were treated elsewhere [4, 14].

Am ong other results, we will, in particular, argue that m any dynam ical features of SU (N) SU (N) orbifold QCD are remarkably close to those of SYM theory. The pattern of the chiral symmetry breaking, the m ass gap, the nonperturbative spectrum, the k-string tensions | all of the above are demonstrated to coincide in these two theories.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sect. 2 we outline our formulation of the problem and brie y review general aspects of one- avor QCD-like theories on R_4 and R_3 S_1 . We also review dual description of three-dimensional Y ang{M ills (the Georgi{G lashow model), and Polyakov's con nement. In Sect. 3 we consider the case of one fermion in the fundamental representation and solve the theory at small $r(S_1)$. In Sect. 4 we carry out the same analysis in the SU(N) SU(N) theory with one bifundamental fermion in the two-index antisymmetric representation of SU(N). Section 6 is devoted to dependence. In Sect. 7 we discuss how our results are related to planar equivalence. Finally, Section 8 summarizes our results and outlines some problems for future investigation.

2 QCD and QCD-like theories on R_4 and R_3 S_1 : general aspects

W e will consider one- avor QCD -like theories with the SU (N) gauge group and ferm ions in the following representations:

$$R = fF; AS; S; Adj; BFg;$$
(11)

where F stands for fundam ental, AS and S are two-index antisym m etric and sym m etric representations, A djstands for adjoint, while BF for bifundam ental. In all cases except A djwe deal with the D irac ferm ion eld, while in the adjoint case with the M ajorana (W eyl) spinor. This is nothing but supersym m etric Yang{M ills (SYM) theory. In the BF case the gauge group is SU (N) SU (N), with the ferm ion eld being fundam ental with respect to the rst SU (N) and antifundam ental with respect to the second SU (N). For the adjoint ferm ions we will use the following nom enclature. The theory with one M ajorana avor will be referred to as SYM, while in the case of two or m ore avors we will speak of QCD (A dj).

The boundary conditions for ferm ions can be either periodic (S^+) or antiperiodic (S^-) in the compacti ed dimension. Yang{M ills theories with two-index ferm ions received much attention lately in connection with planar equivalence between such theories and SYM theory (see [23] and references therein). At N = 3 the AS theory is equivalent to F.

Theoretically the most informative is N = 1 SYM theory. For periodic spin connection S^+ this theory has unbroken center symmetry and broken discrete chiral symmetry for any $r(S_1)$. In fact, the chiral condensate hTr i was exactly calculated long ago [24, 15], both on R_4 and R_3 S_{l} , and was shown to be totally independent of the value of $r(S_1)$. More recently, this theory was demonstrated [16] to possess Abelian con nement at small L. Therefore, there is no obvious obstruction for the L evolution to be sm ooth. We know that at L larger than the strong scale $^{-1}$, the neutral sector observables in N = 1 SYM theory and QCD (AS/S/BF) are remarkably close and only dierby mild 0 (1=N) e ects. However, the complex representation ferm ions break center symmetry at small $r(S^1)$ implying that these theories become drastically dierent from N = 1 SYM theory. The double-trace deform ation (5) is designed to maintain this similarity at smallr (S_1) too. One of the most intriguing ndings of this paper is that the analytical tractability

of N = 1 SYM theory in the small-r(S₁) lim it is not necessarily a consequence of supersymmetry. The unbroken center symmetry is equally important.

Brie y sum marizing our know ledge of other one-avor Q C D -like theories ⁵ on R₄ we can say the following. All these theories are expected to exhibit:

(i) M ass gap: there are no m assless particles in the physical spectrum;

(ii) Non-Abelian con nem ent: the gauge group is not Higgsed, chrom oelectric ux tubes are form ed between quarks and antiquarks, these ux tubes are not stable, generally speaking, since the dynam ical quark pair production can break them. No color-charged objects are present in the physical spectrum;

(iii) D iscrete chiral sym m etry breaking⁶ for R = fAS;S;BF;SYM g: The one-avor QCD-like theories on R_4 possess an axial U (1) sym m etry at the classical level. Only a discrete subgroup of it, Z_{2h} , is the sym m etry of the quantum theory,

$$Z_{2h} = fZ_2; Z_{2N} + 4; Z_{2N} + 4; Z_{2N}; Z_{2N} g \text{ for } R = fF; AS; S; BF; SYM g; (12)$$

respectively. Here 2h is the number of the ferm ion zero modes in the instanton background. In all cases but F the axial Z_{2h} is spontaneously broken down to Z_2 . D iscrete symmetry breaking, unlike that of the continuous symmetries, does not lead to G oldstone bosons. Instead, the theory must possess h isolated vacua.

The above picture follows from multiple lattice calculations, and supersym – metry-based and large-N methods.

In this work the double-trace deform ation of QCD (R) on $S_1 = R_3$ with sm all $r(S_1)$ is used to stabilize the theories under consideration at (or, m ore exactly, very close to) a center-symmetric point. At sm all $r(S_1)$ the non-Abelian gauge group is Higgsed down to the maximal Abelian subgroup, but neither con nement nor the above chiral properties are lost. We will explicitly demonstrate con nement, the discrete chiral symmetry breaking, and m ass gap generation.

 $On S_1$ R₃ the Yang {M ills Lagrangian with one ferm ion avor in the

⁵A part of this know ledge is folk lore.

 $^{^6{\}rm For}\;{\rm F}$ representation, the anomaly-free Z_2 is the ferm ion number and can not be spontaneously broken. The theory has a unique vacuum .

representation R takes the form

$$S = \sum_{R_3 S_1}^{Z} \frac{1}{g^2} \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{TrF}_{MN}^2(\mathbf{x}) + i \mathfrak{F}$$
(13)

where is the four-dimensional D irac spinor in the representation R = fF;AS;Sg of the gauge group SU (N), $F_{M N}$ is the non-Abelian gauge eld strength,⁷ and D= $_{M} D_{M} = _{M} (@_{M} + iA_{M})$ is the covariant derivative acting on representation R. For QCD (BF), the gauge group is SU (N) SU (N) and gauge eld part of the action must be replaced by

$$F_{M N}^{2}$$
 (x) ! $F_{1,M N}^{2}$ (x) + $F_{2,M N}^{2}$ (x) :

In this theory the ferm ion is in the bifundam ental representation. In terms of its W eyl components, the D irac ferm ions are decomposed as

where ; are two-component (complex) W eyl spinors. In three dimensions ; represent two D irac spinors.

W e m ust use the K aluza-K lein (KK) m ode decom position for all elds in the Lagrangian. If we discard all m odes other than zero we will arrive at a three-dimensional theory with a gauge eld, a scalar eld in the adjoint and two three-dimensional spinors. The S₁ R₃ reduction of R₄ Yang {M ills does not quite lead to three-dimensional Yang {M ills, but at rst, we will ignore this nuance, to be discussed in detail later, and will brie y review the phenomena that occur in three-dimensional Yang {M ills with a scalar eld in the adjoint (discarding fermions for the time being).

Long ago Polyakov considered three-dimensional SU (2) Georgi{G lashow model (a Yang-M ills + adjoint Higgs system) in the Higgs regime [13]. In this regime SU (2) is broken down to U (1), so that at low energies the theory reduces to compact electrodynamics. The dual photon is a scalar eld of the phase type (i.e. it is de ned on the interval [0;2]):

$$F = \frac{g_3^2}{4} \, " \quad (0 \) ; \tag{15}$$

⁷Throughout the paper we use the following notation: M ; N = 1; :::; 4 are fourdimensional Lorentz indices while and ; = 1;2;3 are three-dimensional indices. We norm alize the Lie algebra generators as $Trt^{A}t^{B} = \frac{1}{2}A^{B}$.

where g_3^2 is the three-dimensional gauge coupling with mass dimension $[g_3^2] =$ +1. In perturbation theory the dual photon is massless. However, it acquires a mass due to instantons (technically, the latter are identical to the 't Hooft{Polyakov monopoles, after the substitution of one spatial dimension by in aginary time; that's why below we will refer to them as to the instantons monopoles). In the vacuum of the theory, one deals with a gas of instantons interacting according to the C oulom b law. The dual photon mass is due to the D ebye screening. In fact, the dual photon mass is determined by the one-instanton vertex,

$$m_{W}^{5=2}g_{3}^{3}e^{S_{0}=2}$$
 (16)

where S_0 is the one-instanton action,

m

$$S_0 = 4 \frac{m_W}{g_3^2};$$
 (17)

 m_W is the lightest W boson mass, see below. In terms of four-dimensional quantities $S_0 = 8^{-2} = (N g^2)$. As a result, the low-energy theory is described by a three-dimensional sine-G ordon model,

$$L = \frac{g_3^2}{32^2} (0)^2 + c_1 m_W^5 g_3^4 e^{S_0} \cos :$$
 (18)

where c_1 is an undeterm ined prefactor. The coe cient in front of e $\ ^{S_0}$ cos ,

$$\operatorname{qm}_{W}^{5} \operatorname{g}_{3}^{4}$$
;

has mass dimension is [] = +3. The combination e^{S_0} is the monopole fugacity.

This model supports a domain line⁸ (with eld vortices at the endpoints) which in 1+2 dimensions must be interpreted as a string. Since the

eld dualizes three-dimensional photon, the eld vortices in fact represent electric probe charges in the original formulation, connected by the electric ux tubes which look like domain lines in the dual formulation.

Now, if we switch on massless adjoint ferm ions, as in [25], the mass gap generation does not occur in the Polyakov model per se. This is due to the fact that the instanton-monopoles acquire ferm ion zero modes which preclude the potential term as in Eq. (18). Correspondingly, the dual photons

⁸Sim ilar to the axion dom ain wall.

rem ain m assless and the m odel no longer supports dom ain lines. The linear con nem ent is gone.

This situation, changes, however, if three-dimensional Yang{M ills theory is obtained as a low-energy reduction of a four-dimensional gauge theory on $S_1 = R_3$ with small $r(S_1)$. When the adjoint Higgs eld is compact, as in Fig. 2, in addition to N = 1 't Hooft{Polyakov monopole-instantons there is one extra monopole (whose existence is tied up to $_1(S_1) \notin 0$). It can be referred to as the Kaluza{K lein (KK) monopole-instanton.⁹ Each of these monopoles carries ferm ion zero modes, hence they cannot contribute to the bosonic potential at the level e S_0 . They can and do contribute at the level e 2S_0 .

Indeed, the bound state of the 't Hooft{Polyakov monopole-instanton with magnetic charge $_{i}$ and anti-monopole with charge $_{i+1}$ has no ferm ion zero modes: its topological charge coincides with that of the perturbative vacuum. Hence, such a bound state can contribute to the bosonic potential. Let

$$a^{0} = f_{1}; 2; ...; N g$$
 (19)

denote the extended (a ne) root system of SU (N) Lie algebra. If we normalize the magnetic and topological charges of the monopoles as

$$\sum_{s^{2}}^{Z} \mathbf{F}; \quad \frac{g^{2}}{32^{2}} \mathbf{F}^{a} \mathbf{F}^{a} = \frac{4}{g} \text{ }_{i}; \quad \frac{1}{N} ; \text{ for }_{i} 2 \quad a^{0} \quad (20)$$

where i stands for the simple roots of the a ne Lie algebra then the fol-

⁹The eigenvalues shown in Fig. 2 may be viewed as Euclidean D2-branes. N split branes support a spontaneously broken U (1)^N gauge theory, whose U (1) center of mass decouples, and the resulting theory is U (1)^N¹. The N 1't Hooff(Polyakov monopoles may be viewed as Euclidean D0 branes connecting the eigenvalues (a₁ ! a₂); (a₂ ! a₃); :::; (a_{N 1} ! a_N). Clearly, we can also have a monopole which connects (a_N ! a₁) which owes its existence to the periodicity of the adjoint Higgs eld, or equivalently, to the fact that the underlying theory is on S₁ R₃. Usually it is called the KK monopole. The Euclidean D0 branes with the opposite orientation, connecting (a_j = a_{j+1}); j = 1;:::N, are the antim onopoles. This view point makes manifest the fact that the KK and 't Hooff(Polyakov monopoles are all on the same footing. The magnetic and topological charges of the monopoles connecting (a_j \$ a_{j+1}) is (4 = g) $_{j}$; $\frac{1}{N}$ where the direction of the arrow is correlated with the sign of the charges.

lowing bound states are relevant:

$$\frac{4}{g}_{i};\frac{1}{N} + \frac{4}{g}_{i+1};\frac{1}{N} = \frac{4}{g}(i_{i}, i_{i+1});0:$$
 (21)

This pair is stable, as was shown in Ref. [14], where it is referred to as a magnetic bion. Thus, we can borrow Polyakov's discussion of magnetic monopoles and apply directly to these objects. The magnetic bions will induce a mass term for the dual photons via the Debye screening, the essence of Polyakov's mechanism.

The vacuum eld (9) of the deform ed SU (N) theory respects the (approximate) center symmetry Z_N . This eld con guration breaks the gauge symmetry as indicated in (10). Due to the gauge symmetry breaking, electrically charged particles acquire masses. (By electric charges we mean charges with regards to N 1 \photons" of the low energy theory.) The set of N 1 electric charges and masses of N lightest W bosons are

$$q_{W} = g ; m_{W} = \frac{2}{N L};$$
 (22)

where $_i$ (i = 1; :::; N) are the simple and a nervots of the SU (N) Lie algebra (see Eq. (27)). Note that N lightest W bosons are degenerate in the center-symmetric vacuum. The remaining N² N charged W bosons can be viewed as composites of the above.

The stabilizing double-trace term (4) contributes to the self-interaction of the physical (neutral) Higgs elds. A ssum ing that all coe cients d are of order one, the masses of these elds are O(g=L). For instance, for SU (2) and SU (3) the physical Higgs masses are $(g \ d_1)=L$. These masses are much lighter than those of the W bosons but much heavier than those of the elds in the elds energy Lagrangian (dual photons, see Eq. (24) below). The stabilizing double-trace term (4) also contributes to corrections to the W boson masses. They are expandable in g^2 , i.e.

$$m_W = \frac{2}{NL} 1 + O(g^2)$$
:

In the SU (N) gauge theory with an adjoint ferm ion on R_3 S_1 , which is Higgsed according to (10), the bosonic part of the elective low-energy

Lagrangian is generated by the pairs (21), and hence the potential is proportional to e 2S_0 , rather than e S_0 of the Polyakov problem. If we introduce an (N 1)-component vector ,

$$(_1; ::::; _N _1);$$
 (23)

representing N 1 dual photons of the U $(1)^{N-1}$ theory, the bosonic part of the elective Lagrangian can be written as

L
$$(_1; \dots; _{N-1}) = \frac{g_3^2}{32^2} (0)^2 + cm_W^6 g_3^6 e^{2S_0} \sum_{i=1}^{X^N} cos(_i i^{+1}); (24)$$

where c is an undeterm ined coe cient and g $_{\rm 3}$ is the three-dimensional coupling constant,

$$g_3^2 = g^2 L^{-1}$$
: (25)

In term s of four dimensional variables, the magnetic bion fugacity is

$$m_{W}^{6} g_{3}^{6} e^{2S_{0}} m_{W}^{3} g^{6} e^{2S_{0}}$$
 (26)

We rem ind that i (i = 1; :::; N = 1) represent the magnetic charges of (N = 1) types of the 't Hooft{Polyakov monopoles while the a neroot

$$N_{N} = \sum_{\substack{i=1\\i=1}}^{N} (27)$$

is the magnetic charge of the KK monopole. Note that the bion con gurations that contribute to the elective Lagrangian have magnetic charges $_{i}$ $_{i+1}$ and vertices $e^{i(i + i+1)}$, corresponding to a product of a monopole vertex e^{i} with charge $_{i}$, and antim onopole vertex $e^{i + i+1}$ with charge $_{i+1}$ (without the zero mode insertions). With the Z_N -symmetric vacuum eld (9) all fugacities are equal.

Equation (24) in plies that nonvanishing m asses proportional to e^{S_0} are generated for all 's. They are much sm aller than the m asses in the Polyakov m odel in which they are $e^{S_0=2}$.

There are N 1 types of A belian strings (dom ain lines). Their tensions are equal to each other and proportional to e S_0 . Linear con nem ent develops at distances larger than e^{S_0} .

N excless to say, the physical spectrum in the Higgs/A belian con nement regime is richer than that in the non-A belian con nement regime. If in the latter case only color singlets act as asymptotic states, in the A belian con nement regime all systems that have vanishing N 1 electric charges have nite m ass and represent asymptotic states.

N ote 1: For SU (2) and SU (3) Yang {M ills theories, the double-trace deformation is a particularly simple monom ial

$$P[U(x)] = \frac{2}{^{2}L^{4}} d_{1} frU(x) f \text{ for SU (2); SU (3):}$$
(28)

N ote 2: 0 ne can be concerned that the deform ation potential is given in term s of multi-winding line operators, and boks nonlocal. In the L 1 region where the deform ation is crucial, there is no harm in viewing the deforming operator as \almost local" since we are concerned with physics at scales much larger than the compactication scale. In the decompactication limit where the deform ation is indeed nonlocal, it is not needed since its dynamical role is negligible. If one wants to be absolutely certain, one can insert a liter function as the coe cient of the double-trace operator which shuts it o exponentially e^{L^2} at large L in order not to deal with a non-local theory.

3 QCD with one fundam ental ferm ion

QCD (F) on R $_4$ possesses a U (1) $_V$ $\,$ U (1), symmetry, at the classical level acting as

! eⁱ ; ! e^{i 5} :

Due to nonperturbative e ects, only the anomaly-free Z₂ subgroup of the U (1)_A is the genuine axial symmetry of the theory, the ferm ion number mod two. This symmetry is already a part of the vector U (1)_V symmetry, and, hence, cannot be spontaneously broken. However, a biferm ion condensate (which does not break any chiral symmetry) is believed to exist on R₄ as well as on S₁ R₃ with su ciently large r (S₁).

The microscopic QCD Lagrangian also possesses the discrete symmetries C; P; T, and continuous three-dimensional Euclidean Lorentz symmetry SO (3). Thus, the symmetries of the original theory are

The double-trace deform ation respects all these symmetries. (O therw ise this would explicitly contradict the claim made in Sect. 1.) Below, we will construct a low energy elective theory Q C D (F)* assuming that the double-trace terms stabilize the theory in the center-symmetric vacuum. A susual, the set of all possible operators that can appear in the elective low energy theory is restricted by the underlying symmetries (29).

Integrating out weakly coupled KK modes with nonvanishing frequencies

and adding the stabilizing deform ation term (4) to the QCD (F) Lagrangian, we obtain the QCD (F)* theory. This is the Yang{M ills + compact adjoint Higgs system with fundam ental ferm ions on R_3 .

The action is^{10}

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} Z & L & h \\ R_3 & g^2 & Tr & \frac{1}{2}F^2 + (D &)^2 + g^2V [] \\ +i & (& (0 + iA) + i_4) \\ +i & (& (0 + iA) + i_4) & i_4 \end{bmatrix}$$
(30)

where and are the two-component three-dimensionalD irac spinors which arise upon reduction of the four-dimensionalD irac spinor . Note that and has opposite gauge charges, where and are fundamental and and

are anti-fundam ental. As usual, in Euclidean space, there is no relation between barred and unbarred variables, and they are not related to each other by conjugations.

The potential V [] which is the sum of the one-bop potential and deform ation potential has its minimum located at (6) (or (9)). The ferm ion contribution to the elective one-bop potential involves term s such as TrU + TrU.

¹⁰Our four-dimensional Dirac matrix conventions are

M = f; $_4g$; $= _1$; $_4 = _2$ I:

W ith this choice, the D irac algebras in four and three dimensions are f $_{\rm M}$; $_{\rm N}$ g = 2 $_{\rm M}$ N and f ; g = 2 . It will be convenient to de ne $_{\rm M}$ = (; iI) (; 4) and $_{\rm M}$ = (; iI) (; 4).

These terms explicitly break the Z_N center symmetry and slightly shift the position of the eigenvalues of HU i from the minimum (6). However, this is a negligible O (g=d_n) e ect suppressed by a judicious choice of the deformation parameters. Hence, we neglect this e ect below .¹¹

There are N 1 distinct U (1)'s in this model, corresponding to N 1 distinct electric charges. If we introduce a quark in the fundam ental representation of SU (N) each component $_i$ (i = 1; ...; N) will be characterized by a set of N 1 charges, which we will denote by q ,

$$q_{i} = gH_{ii}; i = 1; ...; N;$$
 (31)

where H is the set of N 1 Cartan generators.

All fundamental fermions, but two (one of each type and), acquire m asses due to gauge sym metry breaking. These masses are of order of 2 = L and depend on whether periodic or antiperiodic boundary conditions are imposed. The fermions that remain massless in perturbation theory are the ones corresponding to the vanishing (mod 2) eigenvalue of the algebra-valued compact Higgs eld , see Eq. (9) (equivalently, v = 1, see Eq. (6)).

Thus, the low-energy e ective Lagrangian includes N 1 photons and two ferm ions. Their interactions (in particular, an induced mass gap) must arise due to nonperturbative e ects.¹²

 $^{^{11}}$ If the eigenvalues are separated not equidistantly, yet the separations are nonvanishing for any pair, the gauge symmetry breaking SU (N) ! U (1) $^{\rm N}$ 1 still takes place. In the nonperturbative analysis below, this fact manifests itself as an unequalaction (or fugacity) for di erent types of monopoles. The analysis in this latter case will not be qualitatively di erent.

¹² It is important to distinguish this theory from the case of the noncompact adjoint Higgs eld, which is the Polyakov model with massless (complex representation) fermions. Both theories have identical gauge symmetry breaking patterns: SU(N) ! U(1)^N¹. In perturbation theory, both theories reduce (by necessity) to compact QED₃ with fermions. However, it is possible to prove that the latter theory lacks connement since photons remain massless nonperturbatively. This implies that if the symmetries at the cut-o scale are not specified, the question of connement in compact QED₃ with massless fermions is ambiguous. The issue will be further discussed in a separate publication.

3.1 Nonperturbative e ects and the low -energy Lagrangian

N onperturbatively, there exist topologically stable, sem iclassical eld con gurations | instantons m onopoles. If the adjoint H iggs eld were noncom – pact, there would be (N 1) types of fundam ental m onopoles. There is, however, an extra K K m onopole which arises due to the fact that the underlying theory is form ulated on a cylinder, R_3 S_1 , or simply speaking, (x) is compact. The m agnetic and topological charges of the (anti)m onopoles associated with root i are given Eq. (20).

As follows from the explicit zero mode constructions of Jackiw and Rebbi [26] and the Callias index theorem [27], there are two ferm ion zero modes localized on one of the N constituent monopoles. Van Baalet al. dem onstrated [28, 29, 30, 31] that as the boundary conditions of ferm ions vary in the background with nontrivial holonomy, the zero modes hop from a monopole to the next one. With xed boundary conditions, they are localized, generally speaking, on a particular monopole.¹³

The above implies that one of the monopole-induced vertices has two ferm ion insertions (the one on which the ferm ion zero modes are localized) and other N 1 elem entary monopoles have no ferm ion insertions (at the level e S_0). The set of the instanton-monopole induced vertices can be sum marized as follow s:

$$e^{S_0}e^{i_1}$$
; $e^{S_0}e^{i_j}$; $j = 2; ... ;$ (32)

plus complex conjugate for antim onopoles. Thus, the leading nonperturbatively induced interaction terms in the elective Lagrangian are

$$S^{QCD(F)} = \frac{Z}{R_3} \frac{h}{32^2} (Q)^2 + \frac{1}{g_3^2} i \quad (Q + iq A)$$

+ e^{S_0} ~ e^{i_1} + \frac{X}{g_3^2(Q)^2 + Hrci; ; (33)}

 $^{^{13}\}text{M}$ one precisely, the Callias index applies to R₃. We need an index theorem for the D irac operators in the background ofm onopoles on R₃ S₁. Such a generalization of the Callias index theorem was carried out in the work of N ye and Singer [32]. For a clear-cut lattice realization of the ferm ion zero modes explicitly showing on which monopole they are localized, see R ef. [28].

where ~ is dimensionless constant. Note the non-canonical normalization of the bosonic and fermionic terms. This choice for fermions will ease the derivations of certain four physical quantities. It is clearly seen that in the infrared description of QCD (F)*, we must deal not only with the dual photons, but also with electrically charged fermions.

The three-dimensional elective Lagrangian respects the symmetries (29) of the microscopic (four-dimensional) theory. In particular, the ferm ion bilinears such as (allowed by U (1)_v and the Lorentz symmetry of the threedimensional theory) are noninvariant under parity (see Appendix in Ref. [25]) and, hence, cannot be generated. On the other hand, h i \notin 0 can and is generated. One can check that up to order e ^{2S₀}, the Lagrangian (33) includes all possible operators allowed by the symmetries (29).

In the above Lagrangian, all operators are relevant in the renorm alizationgroup sense. The fugacity has mass dimension +3. If the kinetic term for ferm ion is canonically normalized, the covariant photon-ferm ion interaction and instanton-monopole-induced term with the ferm ion insertion has dimension +1. Which operators will dominate the IR physics? The answer to this question requires a full renormalization-group analysis of all couplings. A preliminary investigation (along the lines of Ref.[33]) shows that quantum corrections in the running of the couplings are tarm e and do not alter the fact that the instanton-monopole vertex terms are the most relevant in the IR of QCD (F)*.

The N 1 linearly independent instanton-monopole vertices render all the N 1 dual photons massive, with masses proportional to $e^{S_0=2}$. Thus, the dual scalars are pinned at the bottom of the potential

$$e^{S_0} \cos_j : \qquad (34)$$

As a result, the would-be massless ferm ions will also acquire a mass term of the type

$$\sim e^{s_0}$$
 : (35)

The ferm ion mass is proportional to e^{S_0} . Hence it is exponentially smaller than the dual photon mass $e^{S_0=2}$. Note that the ferm ion mass term is not associated with the spontaneous breaking of chiral symmetry. This circum stance, as well as the hierarchy of mass between the photon and ferm ion,

is specic to one fundamental ferm ion and will change in the case of the two-index ferm ions.

Since all N 1 dual photons become massive, a probe quark Q_i of every type (i = 1; :::; N) will be connected to its antiquark by a domain line/string with the tension ¹⁴

$$\Gamma q = {}^{1=2} e {}^{S_0=2}$$
: (36)

The string between Q_1 and $\overline{Q_1}$ is easily breakable due to pair production of

's and 's. In other words, the external charge Q_1 will be screened by the dynam ical ferm ions with charge q_1 . The strings between Q_1 and $\overline{Q_1}$ (with i = 2; ...N) can break with an exponentially small probability due to pair creation of the KK modes of i. This amounts, of course, to the conventional statem ent about large W ilson loops C,

where is the coe cient of the perimeter law, P (C) is the perimeter of the loop C , the boundary of a surface $\ .$

R em ark: The product of the instanton-m onopole-induced vertices is proportional to the Belyavin {Polyakov {Schwarz {Tyupkin (BPST) four-dimensional instanton vertex [34],

$$e^{S_{0}}e^{i_{1}} e^{S_{0}}e^{i_{j}}$$

$$e^{\frac{8}{g^{2}}}(1+_{5}) e^{i_{j}}e^{i_{j}}$$

$$i_{j=1} = e^{\frac{8}{g^{2}}}(1+_{5}) : (38)$$

This is consistent with the fact that the instanton-m onopoles can be viewed as the BPST instanton constituents. In Eq. (38) we used the fact that the sum of the N constituent instanton-m onopole actions is in fact the BPST

¹⁴This is also sim ilar to the axion dom ain wall.

instanton action, and the sum of the magnetic and topological charges of the constituent monopoles gives the correct quantum numbers of the BPST $\rm R_4$ instanton,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{X^{N}} F_{i} \frac{g^{2}}{32^{2}} F^{a} F^{a} = (0;1);$$
 (39)

see Eq. (20).

3.2 Biferm ion condensate

As stated earlier, one- avor QCD form ulated on R₄ has no chiral sym m etry whatsoever. The axial anom aly reduces the classical U (1)_A sym m etry to Z₂. A biferm ion condensate exists and breaks no chiral sym m etry. We can evaluate the value of the chiral condensate in QCD (F)* in the small r(S₁) regime. At large r(S₁) (strong coupling) we know, from volume independence, that the condensate m ust get a value independent of the radius. Let b₀ denote the leading coe cient of the function divided by N,

$$b_0 = \frac{1}{N} \quad \frac{11N}{3} \quad \frac{2N_f}{3} \quad \sum_{N_f = 1}^{n} = \frac{11}{3} \quad \frac{2}{3N} :$$
(40)

At weak coupling, L 1, the biferm ion condensate in QCD (F)* receives its dom inant contribution from the instanton-m onopole with the ferm ion zero modes insertion, the rst term in the second line in Eq. (33). The condensate is proportional to

h i
$$e^{S_0} e^{\frac{8}{g^2 N}}$$
: (41)

Above the scale L 1 we expect the biferm ion condensate to be L-independent and saturate its value on R_4 ,

$$\begin{array}{c} 8 \\ < & ^{3}(L)^{b_{0}} & ^{3} = & ^{3}(L)^{(2=3)(1 N^{-1})}; \quad L \quad 1; \\ h i \\ \vdots & ^{3} & 1+O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right); \quad L \quad > 1: \end{array}$$

$$(42)$$

The above form ula is testable on lattices.

It is natural to believe the saturation scale is associated with the transition from weak to strong coupling and restoration of the spontaneously broken gauge symmetry U $(1)^{N-1}$! SU (N). This is the regime where the theory passes from the Abelian to non-Abelian connement. The elective theory (33) which is only valid at L 1 looses its validity when this parameter becomes of order one. Nonetheless, we do not expect phase transitions (or rapid crossovers) in the parameter L. We expect physics of the two regimes to be continuously connected.

It would be immensely useful to study this passage on lattices. In the strong coupling regime, the volume dependent factors enter in observables only via subleading 0 (1=(L)) term s.

4 QCD with one bifundam ental ferm ion

Consider orbifold QCD, a gauge theory with the SU(N)₁ SU(N)₂ gauge group, and one bifundam ental D irac ferm ion, de ned on R₃ S₁,

$$S^{QCD(BF)} = \int_{R_3 S_1}^{2} \frac{1}{g^2} \operatorname{Tr} \frac{1}{2} F_{1,MN}^2(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2} F_{2,MN}^2(\mathbf{x}) + i D = ; \quad (43)$$

where

$$D_M = Q_M + iA_{1,M}$$
 $iA_{2,M}$:

The theory possesses a U $(1)_V$ $(Z_{2N})_A$ $(Z_2)_I$ symmetry which acts on the elementary elds as

$$U(1)_{V} : ! e^{1} ; ! e^{1} ; (Z_{2N})_{A} : ! e^{i\frac{2}{2N}} ; ! e^{i\frac{2}{2N}} ; (Z_{2})_{I} : $; A ; 1 $ A ; 2 : (44)$$

The $(Z_{2N})_A$ symmetry is the anomaly-free subgroup of the axialU $(1)_A$. It is a folklore statement that with su ciently large r(S₁), the chiral symmetry is broken down to Z_2 by the formation of the bifermion condensate,

h i = 4N
$$^{3}\cos\frac{2 k}{N}$$
; k = 0; 1; ...N 1; (45)

marking N isolated vacua in the same manner as in N = 1 SYM theory.

QCD (BF) on R_4 is believed con ne in the same way as N = 1 SYM theory, possesses a mass gap, and N isolated vacua. We would like to shed some light on these issues by studying QCD (BF)* with smallr(S_1).

4.1 Deformed orbifold QCD

On S₁ R₃ we can deform original QCD (BF)

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ R_3 \end{bmatrix} \frac{L}{g^2} Tr \frac{h_1}{2} F_{1;}^2 + \frac{1}{2} F_{2;}^2 + (D_{-1})^2 + (D_{-2})^2 + g^2 V \begin{bmatrix} 1; 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$+i \quad (@ + iA_{1;} + iA_{2;}) + i_4 (1_{-2})$$

$$i = \frac{i}{2} Ir \frac{h_1}{2} F_{1;}^2 + \frac{h_2}{2} F_{2;}^2 + (D_{-1})^2 + (D_{-2})^2 + g^2 V \begin{bmatrix} 1; 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

by adding double-trace term s (4) in such a way that the center sym m etry is not broken in the vacuum. The center sym m etry stability at weak coupling im plies that the vacuum of the theory is located at

Lh _1i = Lh _2i = diag
$$\frac{2 [N=2]}{N}$$
; $\frac{2 (N=2] 1}{N}$;; $\frac{2 [N=2]}{N}$;
(m od 2); (47)

cf. Eq. (9). Consequently, in the weak coupling regime, the gauge symmetry is broken,

$$[SU(N)]_{L} [SU(N)]_{L} ! [U(1)^{N-1}]_{L} [U(1)^{N-1}]_{L} :$$
(48)

In perturbation theory 2 (N = 1) photons remain massless while all $o = diagonal gauge elds acquire masses in the range <math>\frac{2}{L}; \frac{2}{L}$. The three-dimensional mass term s of the bifundam ental ferm ions are determined by

$$X^{N} \qquad (a_{i}^{1} \qquad a_{k}^{2})^{-\frac{k}{i}} \qquad k \\ i \neq k \\ i \neq k \\ k = 1$$

where $a_k^1; a_k^2$ are the eigenvalues of $_1$ and $_2$, see Eq. (47). The diagonal components of the bifundam ental ferm ions

$$i k k$$

k i $i = k$

remain massless to all orders in perturbation theory; we will refer to them as $_{i}$; $_{i}$ (i = 1; ...; N). O ther components get masses 2 (i k)=L, and decouple in the low-energy limit, and so do the W bosons.

The bifundam ental ferm ions are electrically charged under the unbroken $[U(1)^{N-1}]_1$ $[U(1)^{N-1}]_2$ in a correlated fashion. If in Sect. 3 the electric charges of each ferm ion were characterized by an (N-1)-dimensional vector q₁, now they are characterized by concatenation of two such N = 1 dimensional electric charge vectors

$$q_{i} = g(+H_{ii}; H_{ii}); q_{i} = g(H_{ii};+H_{ii}); i = 1;...;N;$$
 (49)

Thus, the low-energy e ective Lagrangian in perturbation theory is

$$S^{\text{pert th}} = \frac{Z}{R_3} \frac{1}{g_3^2} \frac{h X^1}{a=1} \frac{1}{4} F_{1;}^{a;2} + \frac{1}{4} F_{2;}^{a;2}$$
$$+ \frac{X^N}{i} \frac{i}{i} (0 + iH_{ii}A^1 - iH_{ii}A^2 - i) : (50)$$

The mass gap must arise due to nonperturbative e ects, as in Sect. 3. We will identify and classify nonperturbative e ects induced by topologically nontrivial eld con gurations momentarily.

4.2 Nonperturbative low -energy e ective Lagrangian

N onperturbatively, the gauge symmetry breaking pattern (47) implies the existence of N types of instantons monopoles associated with each gauge group. The magnetic and topological charges of these objects are

$$\sum_{i=1}^{Z} \sum_{j=1}^{Z} \frac{g^{2}}{32^{-2}} F^{a} F^{aa}; \sum_{j=1}^{Z} F^{j}; \sum_{j=1}^{Z} \frac{g^{2}}{32^{-2}} F^{a} F^{aa} = \begin{cases} 8 \\ 2 \\ 32^{-2} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{cases} \frac{4}{g} \\ \frac{1}{g} \end{cases}; \frac{1}{N}; 0; 0; 0; \\ \frac{4}{g} \\ \frac{1}{g} \end{cases}; \frac{1}{N}; 0; 0; 0; (51) \end{cases}$$

Consequently, each monopole generates two ferm ion zero modes, and the instanton-monopole vertices are

$$M_{i}^{1}:\left(+\frac{4}{g}_{i};+\frac{1}{N};0;0\right):e^{+i_{i-1}}\left(_{i_{i}}+_{i+1_{i+1}};\right);$$

$$\overline{M}_{i}^{1}:\left(\frac{4}{g}_{i};\frac{1}{N};0;0\right):e^{-i_{i-1}}\left(_{i_{i}}+_{i+1_{i+1}};\right);$$

$$M_{i}^{2}:(0;0;+\frac{4}{g}_{i};+\frac{1}{N}):e^{+i_{i}_{2}}(_{i_{i}}+_{i+1_{i+1}});$$

$$\overline{M}_{i}^{2}:(0;0;\frac{4}{g}_{i};\frac{1}{N}):e^{-i_{i}_{2}}(_{i_{i}}+_{i+1_{i+1}});$$
(52)

where $_1$ is the set of dual photons for $[U(1)^{N-1}]_1$ while $_2$ is the set of dual photons for $[U(1)^{N-1}]_2$. In full analogy with the SYM theory, the 2N ferm ion zero m odes of the BPST instanton split into N pairs: each instanton-m onopole supports two ferm ion zero m odes. This is a natural consequence of the Callias index theorem. (The same conclusion was also reached by Tong [35]).

As a result, the instanton-m on opole contributions give rise to the follow-ing term s in the elective Lagrangian:

$$L^{QCD (BF)} = const: g^{6} e^{S_{0}} e^{i i 1} + e^{i i 2}$$

$${}_{i^{2} a}^{0} e^{i i 1} + e^{i i 2} e^{i i 3} e^{i i 3} + e^{i i 3} e$$

At the levele S_0 the instanton-m onopole e ects in QCD (BF)* cannot provide m ass terms for the dual photons. This situation is completely analogous to that in QCD (Adj)* where all instanton-m onopoles have ferm ion zero m odes and, hence, are unable to contribute to the bosonic potential for the dual photons 1 and 2.

The situation drastically changes at order e 2S_0 . There are nontrivial e ects which render the long-distance three-dimensional elds massive, im – plying con nement. An easy way to see that this is the case is to exam ine the symmetries of the theory.

Since U $(1)_V$ $(Z_{2N})_A$ $(Z_2)_I$ is the sym m etry of the m icroscopic theory, it must be manifest in the low-energy e ective theory in three dimensions. The invariance of the instanton-monopole vertex under U $(1)_V$ and $(Z_2)_I$ is manifest. At the same time, the $(Z_{2N})_A$ invariance requires combining the axial chiral symmetry with the discrete shift symmetry of the dual photon,

$$(\mathbb{Z}_{2N})_{A}$$
: ! $e^{\frac{i^{2}}{N}}$;
 $_{1;2}$! $_{1;2}$ $\frac{2}{N}$ (54)

where is the W eylvector de ned by

$$= \bigvee_{\substack{k = 1 \\ j=1}}^{k} i$$
 (55)

and k stand for the N 1 fundam entalweights of the associated Lie algebra, de ned through the reciprocity relation,

$$\frac{2}{2} \frac{i}{j} = i = i = i$$
(56)

U sing the identities

$$N = (N 1); i = 1; i = 1; ... 1;$$
 (57)

the vertex operator

$$e^{i_{1} i_{1}} e^{i_{1} i_{1}} e^{i_{1} i_{1}} e^{i_{1}} e^{i_{$$

rotates in the opposite direction compared with the ferm ion bilinear, by the sam e am ount. Hence, the instanton-m onopole induced vertex

$$(e^{i_{i_{1}}} + e^{i_{i_{2}}})(i_{i_{1}} + i_{i+1_{1}})$$

is invariant under the discrete chiral sym m etry.

The discrete shift symmetry, (54) as opposed to the continuous shift symmetry, cannot prohibit mass term for the dual photons. At best, it can postpone its appearance in the e^{S_0} expansion. Hence, such a mass term must be, and is, generated.

As in SYM theory, at level e 2S_0 there exist m agnetically charged bound m onopole antim onopole pairs with no ferm ion zero m odes. These stable pairs were referred to as m agnetic bions in [16]. In QCD (BF)*, the bions come in a wider variety than in SYM theory. The analogs of the m agnetic bions that appear in SYM theory are the pairs of the type M $_{i}^{1}$ and \overline{M}_{i-1}^{1} (and 1 \$ 2). D expite the repulsive C oulomb interactions between these two m onopoles they form bound states due to the ferm ion exchange between them, with the com bined e ect

$$\frac{1}{r}$$
 + logr:

The corresponding bound state is stable.

Since the ferm ion zero m odes in QCD (BF)* communicate with the m onopoles in both gauge groups, the ferm ion zero m ode exchange also generates logarithm ic attractive interactions between the m onopoles M $_{1}^{1}$ in the rst gauge group and the antim onopoles M $_{i,i 1}^{2}$ in the second. Note that there is no C oulom b interaction between these two since the rst instanton-m onopole is charged under the [U (1) ^N $_{1}^{1}$] gauge subgroup of [U (1) ^N $_{1}^{1}$]. [U (1) ^N $_{1}^{1}$] while the second is charged under [U (1) ^N $_{1}^{1}$]. Thus, the stable m agnetic bions in QCD (BF)*, their m agnetic and topological charges, and the vertices they generate are

$$B_{i}^{1}: \frac{4}{g} (_{i} _{i} _{i}); 0; 0; 0 : c_{l} e^{2S_{0}} e^{i(_{i} _{i} _{i})}$$

$$B_{i}^{2}: 0; 0; \frac{4}{g} (_{i} _{i} _{i}); 0 : c_{l} e^{2S_{0}} e^{i(_{i} _{i} _{i})}$$

$$B_{i;i}^{12}: \frac{4}{g} _{i}; \frac{1}{N}; \frac{4}{g} _{i}; \frac{1}{N} : c_{2} e^{2S_{0}} e^{i(_{i} _{i} _{i})}$$

$$B_{i;i}^{12}: \frac{4}{g} _{i}; \frac{1}{N}; \frac{4}{g} _{i} ; \frac{1}{N} : c_{2} e^{2S_{0}} e^{i(_{i} _{i} _{i})}$$

$$B_{i;i}^{12}: \frac{4}{g} _{i}; \frac{1}{N}; \frac{4}{g} _{i} ; 1; \frac{1}{N} : c_{2} e^{2S_{0}} e^{i(_{i} _{i} _{i})}$$

$$B_{i;i+1}^{12}: \frac{4}{g} _{i}; \frac{1}{N}; \frac{4}{g} _{i+1}; \frac{1}{N} : c_{2} e^{2S_{0}} e^{i(_{i} _{i} _{i})}$$

$$E_{i;i+1}^{12}: \frac{4}{g} _{i}; \frac{1}{N}; \frac{4}{g} _{i+1}; \frac{1}{N} : c_{2} e^{2S_{0}} e^{i(_{i} _{i} _{i})}$$

$$E_{i;i+1}^{12}: \frac{4}{g} _{i}; \frac{1}{N}; \frac{4}{g} _{i+1}; \frac{1}{N} : c_{2} e^{2S_{0}} e^{i(_{i} _{i} _{i})}$$

The vertices for antibions (such as \overline{B}_{i}^{-1}) are the complex conjugates of the ones given above. The above bions are stable due to the attractive ferm ion pair exchange between their constituents. Note that the constituents of the bions B_{i}^{1} and B_{i}^{2} , unlike the ones of B_{iji}^{12} ; B_{iji+1}^{12} ; B_{iji-1}^{12} need to complete with the C oulom b repulsion for stability. Thus, in principle, there are no (symmetry or m icroscopic) reasons for the prefactor of the rst two to be the equal to the ones of the latter. Therefore, we assume they are not.

As a result, we obtain the bion-induced bosonic potential in QCD (BF)* in the form

$$V_{\text{bion}}(_{1};_{2}) = m_{W}^{3} g^{6} e^{2S_{0}} C_{1} e^{i(_{i} i_{1})_{1}} + e^{i(_{i} i_{1})_{2}}$$

$$+ c_2 2e^{i(i_1 i_2)} + e^{i(i_1 i_1 i_2)} + e^{i(i_1 i_1 i_2)} + e^{i(i_1 i_1 i_1 i_2)} + H c:$$
(60)

In full analogy with the superpotential in SYM * theory, it is convenient to de ne a prepotential in QCD (BF)*. To this end we introduce the function

$$W (_{1}; _{2}) = m_{W} g^{4} e^{S_{0}} e^{i_{1} + e^{i_{1} + 2}};$$
(61)

to be referred to as prepotential. Note that the prepotential, as well as its derivatives, transform hom ogeneously under the Z_{2N} shift symmetry (54),

$$Z_{2N}$$
 : W ($_{1}$; $_{2}$) ! $e^{\frac{i^{2}}{N}}$ W ($_{1}$; $_{2}$):

Now, it is easy to express the bion-induced potential in terms of the prepotential in the form which is manifestly invariant under the Z_{2N} shift and $(Z_2)_1$ interchange symmetries,

$$V(_{1};_{2}) = g_{3}^{2} \sum_{a=1}^{N-1} c_{+} \frac{\partial W}{\partial_{1;a}} + \frac{\partial W}{\partial_{2;a}}^{2} + c_{-} \frac{\partial W}{\partial_{1;a}} - \frac{\partial W}{\partial_{2;a}}^{2} : (62)$$

We are nally ready to present the low-energy e ective theory for QCD (BF)*,

$$L^{QCD (BF)} = \frac{g_3^2}{32^2} (@_1)^2 + (@_2)^2 + V_{bion} (_1;_2)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{g_3^2} \frac{X^N}{_{i=1}} i - @_{i=1} (@_{i=1})^2 + iH_{ii}A^2 i + (@_{i=1})^2 + ($$

Like in other QCD-like theories with complex-representation ferm ions (such as QCD (F/AS/S)*), but unlike the ones with real-representation ferm ions (such as SYM theory or QCD (adj), we have both the electric and

m agnetic couplings. The Lagrangian (63) includes all relevant term s allowed by symmetries up to 0 (e 3S_0).

The important question at this stage is which operators in our e ective Lagrangian (33) arem ost important at large distances in the renorm alizationgroup sense. Apparently, the fugacity (the coe cient in front of the bion vertices) has dimension + 3 and is dominant in the IR. The quantum -m echanical corrections are negligible. This suggests that in the IR the e ects produced by m agnetically charged bions are most relevant.

4.3 Vacuum structure and chiral sym metry realization

The low-energy e ective theory respects all symmetries of the underlying gauge theory U $(1)_V$ $(Z_{2N})_A$ $(Z_2)_I$ and C; P; T. These symmetries may be spontaneously broken. By studying dynamics of the elective theory we demonstrate that the breaking pattern is

$$U(1)_{V}$$
 $(Z_{2N})_{A}$ $(Z_{2})_{I}$! $U(1)_{V}$ $(Z_{2})_{A}$ $(Z_{2})_{I}$ (64)

leading to the occurrence of N isolated vacua.

In Eq. (63) the Z_{2N} chiral symmetry is entangled with the shift symmetry of the dual photon (54), just like in SYM theory. There are N isolated vacua in the $(Z_2)_I$ invariant subspace related to each other by the action of the Z_N shift symmetry. These vacua are located at

$$_{1} = _{2} = 0; \frac{2}{N}; \frac{4}{N}; \dots; \frac{2(N-1)}{N}$$
 (65)

in the eld space. The choice of a given vacuum spontaneously breaks the $\rm Z_N\,$ shift symmetry, and, hence, the chiral symmetry.

Let j $_k$ i denote one of the N vacuum states (k = 1; :::; N). Following the techniques of [22, 15], we observe that the chiral condensate is proportional to the monopole-induced term e S_0 . The renorm alization-group function of QCD (BF)* is identical to that of SYM theory up to O (1=N²) corrections. The rst coe cients are just identical. Thus,

$$e^{S_0} e^{\frac{8}{g^2N}} = {}^3 (L)^{b_0 3}$$
 (66)

where b_0 denotes the leading coe cient of the function divided by N . At one-loop order in QCD (BF)*

$$b_0 = 3$$
:

Thus, the chiral condensate in QCD (BF)* is

h_kjTr j_ki = 2N
$${}^{3}e^{i\frac{2}{N}}$$
 + H c:: (67)

There is no L dependence in the condensate in $QCD (BF)^*$ at one-loop level, just like in SYM theory.

4.4 M ass gap and con nem ent

The small uctuation analysis around any of the N minima is su cient to see that there are no massless modes in the infrared description of the QCD (BF)*. The choice of the vacuum breaks the discrete chiral symmetry rendering all fermionsmassive. The bion-induced potential makes all 2 (N 1) photons massive. This shows that every particle-like excitation must have a nite mass m e^{S₀}. There are no physical states in the mass range [0;m) in the physical H ilbert space of the theory. Since the global Z_N center group symmetry and $(Z_2)_I$ interchange symmetry are unbroken, the physical states can be expressed as the mutual eigenstates of these symmetries. The Fourier transform

$$_{jk} = (_{1jk} _{2jk}) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{k} e^{j\frac{2-jk}{N}} H_{jj} (_{1} _{2})$$
(68)

diagonalizes the mass matrix. The masses of the dual photons are proportional to exp(S_0). More exactly,¹⁵

m
$$_{,k} = \frac{p}{c}$$
 (L)² $2\sin\frac{k}{N}^{2}$; L 1: (69)

Any probe charge one might consider is coupled to a number of elds. The thickness of the domain line (string) attached to the probe charge is determined by the inverse mass of the lightest eld (k = 1). It is worth noting that the string has a substructure corresponding to the contribution of the next-to-lightest, next-to-next-to-lightest and so on 's. The ferm ion m asses are of the same order of magnitude in the same regime, as seen from Eq. (53),

$$m_{i} = C (L)^{2}$$
: (70)

 $^{^{15}\}mathrm{P}\,\mathrm{ow}\,\mathrm{ers}\,\mathrm{of}\,\mathrm{g}$ and num erical factors are om itted here and in sim ilar expressions below .

Now we are ready to discuss strings in QCD (BF)* at small L. Let us consider a heavy probe quark $Q_{j_1 \dots j_n}^{i_1 \dots i_m}$ and its antiquark $\overline{Q_{j_1 \dots j_n}^{i_1 \dots i_m}}$ in a cobrsinglet state at an exponentially large distance from each other. If $m \notin n$ the string (dom ain line) form ing between these probe objects is unbreakable. Light dynam ical ferm ions of the low -energy theory cannot screen the electric charges of the probe quarks. However, if m = n some strings (i.e. those attached to the probes for which every index i is equal to some j) will break through pair creation of light dynam ical ferm ions. A ssume jn m j k $\notin 0$. Then the tensions of these unbreakable k strings can be found by calculating the tensions of the dom ain lines supported by the theory (63). These tensions are of the order of 2 (L) in the L 1 A belian con nem ent regime while at L $^>$ 1, in the non-A belian con nem ent regime, they tend to 2 times a num erical coe cient.

To the best of our know ledge, this is the rst analytic demonstration of SB, m ass gap generation and linear con nem ent in QCD (BF)*. This theory exhibits all expected nontrivial features of QCD (BF) on R_4 .

5 QCD with one AS ferm ion

Now we will discuss QCD with one antisymmetric D irac ferm ion 16 on R₃ S₁. The theory possesses a U (1)_V Z_{2N 4} symmetry, Z_{2N 4} being the anomaly-free subgroup of the axial U (1)_A. The action of the symmetry on the elementary elds is as follows:

$$U(1)_{V}: ! e^{i}; ! e^{i}; (Z_{2N}_{4})_{A}: ! e^{i\frac{2}{2N}4}; ! e^{i\frac{2}{2N}4}: (71)$$

It is believed that for su ciently large $r(S_1)$, the chiral symmetry is broken down to Z_2 by the biferm ion condensate $h = i \in 0$,

h i N
$${}^{3}e^{i\frac{2\kappa}{N-2}} + H$$
 ::

resulting in N 2 isolated vacua. The QCD (AS) theory on R_4 must con ne the same way as N = 1 SYM theory and possess a mass gap. Since the discussion is quite similar to the case of QCD (BF)*, we will be brief.

 $^{^{16}}$ D iscussion of QCD with the symmetric representation ferm ion is parallel.

5.1 Deformed orientifold QCD

In the smallr(S_1) regime, the gauge symmetry is broken, SU(N)! U(1)^N¹. W ithout loss of generality we can take N = 2m + 1. The case N = 2m can be dealt with in a similar manner.

In perturbation theory the massless elds are N 1 diagonal photons and N 2 charged ferm ions. The N² N o -diagonal W bosons and N² 2N + 2 ferm ions acquire masses in the range $\left[\frac{2}{LN};\frac{2}{L}\right]$ and decouple from infrared physics.

The AS ferm ions ij acquire three-dimensional mass terms given by

$$X^{N}$$

(a_i + a_j) ^[ij] 4 [ij]
i_j = 1

where a_k 's are given in Eq, (9). Hence,

$$m_{ij} = \frac{2}{LN} ([i+j] \mod N)$$
:

Thus, the ferm ion components $_{i,N}$ i remain massless to all orders in perturbation theory. Let us label

$$i_{iN}$$
 i_{i} i_{i} $i_{i} = 1; \dots; N$ 1:

The electric charges of these degrees of freedom under the unbroken gauge group is

$$q_{i} = g(H_{ii} + H_{N_{iN_{iN}}}); \quad i = 1; ...; N;$$
 (72)

Since the ferm ion is antisymmetric in its indices, we may parameterize the set of the massless ferm ions as

$$= f_{1}; \dots f_{m} = f_{1}; \dots f_{m}; m + 1; m + 2; \dots f_{2m} = f_{1}; \dots f_{m}; m + 1; m; m; m + 1; \dots f_{2m}; \dots f_{2m}; m + 1; \dots f_{2m}; \dots f_{2m}; m + 1; \dots f_{2m}; \dots f_{2m}; m + 1; \dots f_{2m}; \dots$$

The IR action in perturbation theory is

$$S = \frac{Z}{R_{3}} \frac{1}{g_{3}^{2}} \frac{h}{4} \frac{1}{a} \sum_{a=1}^{N} (F^{a})^{2} + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} i_{i} \quad (e + i(H_{ii} + H_{N}_{iN}_{i}))A) \qquad i :$$
(74)

5.2 Nonperturbative e ects

In QCD (AS)* on small S_1 R_3 there are N types of instanton-m onopoles because of the pattern of the gauge symmetry breaking SU (N) ! U (1)^N ¹ via a compact adjoint Higgs eld. The 2N 4 fermion zero modes of the BPST R_4 instanton split into N 2 pairs of the instanton-m onopole zero modes in a slightly di erent way than that in SYM * theory and QCD (BF)*. The N 2 instanton-m onopoles have two fermion zero modes each, while the remaining two m onopoles have no zero modes. It is useful to present the m onopole-instanton vertices in QCD (AS)* due to a nontrivial structure of their zero modes,

$$M_{1} = e^{S_{0}}e^{i_{1}} (1_{1} + 2_{2});$$

$$M_{2} = e^{S_{0}}e^{i_{2}} (2_{2} + 3_{3});$$

$$\dots;$$

$$M_{m} = e^{S_{0}}e^{i_{m}-1} (m_{1} + m_{m});$$

$$M_{m} = e^{S_{0}}e^{i_{m}-1} (2_{m} + m_{1});$$

$$M_{m+1} = e^{S_{0}}e^{i_{m+1}} (m_{m} + m_{1} + m_{1});$$

$$\dots;$$

$$M_{2m} = e^{S_{0}}e^{i_{2m-2}} (3_{3} + 2_{2});$$

$$M_{2m} = e^{S_{0}}e^{i_{2m-1}} (2_{2} + 1_{1});$$

$$M_{2m} = e^{S_{0}}e^{i_{2m-1}};$$

$$M_{2m+1} = e^{S_{0}}e^{i_{2m+1}} :$$

$$(75)$$

Consequently, the contribution to the QCD (AS)* Lagrangian induced by monopole-instantons takes the form

$$L \qquad M_{i=1}^{2m+1} M_{i} + \overline{M_{i}} : \qquad (76)$$

Since N 2 the m onopoles carry com pulsory ferm ionic zero m ode insertions, they can not induce a mass term for all the dual photons if N 4. As seen from Eq. (76), two of the m onopole-instantons do contribute to the bosonic potential, but this is insu cient to render all photons massive for N 4. (At N = 3, QCD (AS)* and QCD (F)* are the same theories.) Thus, in order to render all the photons massive, we need to incorporate e ects of order e 2S_0 , and introduce the magnetic bions. Before doing so let us show that the underlying symmetries of QCD (AS)* allow mass terms for all dual photons to be generated.

Since U $(1)_V$ $(Z_{2N-4})_A$ is the symmetry of them icroscopic theory, it must be a symmetry of the long distance theory. The invariance under U $(1)_V$ is manifest. The invariance under the $(Z_{2N-4})_A$ necessitates intertwining the axial chiral symmetry with a discrete shift symmetry of the dual photon,

$$(\mathbb{Z}_{2N} \ _{4})_{A}$$
: ! $e^{\frac{i^{2}}{N} \frac{2}{2}}$;
! $\frac{2}{N} \frac{2}{2}_{AS}$; (77)

where

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N_{k}^{2}} k$$

$$j=1$$

$$(78)$$

and $_{k}$ are the N 1 fundamental weights of the associated Lie algebra. Note that the parameter $_{AS}$ is not exactly the W eyl vector, which appears in SYM * theory and QCD (BF)*. Rather, it can be represented as

$$_{AS} = _{N 1} :$$
 (79)

U sing the identities

$$N_{\rm AS} = 0;$$
 $N_{\rm AS} = (N 2)_{\rm iAS} = 1;$ i= 1; ::: N 2 (80)

we observe that the vertex operators $e^{i\ i}$ transform under the discrete shift sym m etry

$$\frac{2}{N}$$
 2 AS

!

as

$$Z_{N 2}: e^{i_{2m}} ! e^{i_{2m}}; e^{i_{2m+1}} ! e^{i_{2m+1}};$$

$$e^{i} \cdot e^{i} e^{i} e^{i} \cdot e^{i} \cdot$$

Hence, the monopole-induced interactions (76) are invariant under (Z_{2N 4})_A given in (77). The discrete shift symmetry allows mass terms for all dual photons at order e 2S_0 .

In QCD $(AS)^*$, there are novel topological excitations as is the case in QCD $(BF)^*$. The zero m ode structure of m onopole-instantons suggests that other than the m agnetic bions com m on with SYM * theory, there are m agnetic bions of a m ore exotic variety,

$$B_{i}^{1}: \frac{4}{g} (i_{i} i_{1}); 0: c_{l}e^{2S_{0}}e^{i(i_{i} i_{1})};$$

$$B_{ij}^{12}: \frac{4}{g} (i_{2m i}); 0: c_{2}e^{2S_{0}}e^{i(i_{2m i})};$$

$$B_{ij}^{12}: \frac{4}{g} (i_{2m i+1}); 0: c_{2}e^{2S_{0}}e^{i(i_{2m i+1})};$$

$$B_{ij}^{12}: \frac{4}{g} (i_{2m i+1}); 0: c_{2}e^{2S_{0}}e^{i(i_{2m i+1})};$$

$$B_{ij}^{12}: \frac{4}{g} (i_{2m i+1}); 0: c_{2}e^{2S_{0}}e^{i(i_{2m i+1})};$$
(82)

Here in the rst line summation runs over i = 1; :::; 2m = 1 while in the second, third and fourth lines over i = 1; :::; m = 1. The pairing of the constituent m onopoles follows from the structure of the ferm ion zero m odes. The m agnetic bion B_i^1 is held together due to the attractive ferm ionic pair exchanges which overcomes the C oulom b repulsion between its constituents. The constituents of the latter bions $B_{i;i}^{12}$ and $B_{i;i}^{12}$ do not interact via the C oulom b law, rather they experience just the ferm ion pair exchange. C onsequently, the combined e ect of the magnetic bions (which is order e 250),

$$V_{\text{bion}} () = m_{W}^{3} g^{6} \qquad B_{i}^{1} + (B_{iji}^{12} + B_{iji+1}^{12} + B_{iji-1}^{12}) + H \text{ c:} (83)$$

and two monopole-instantons M $_{2m}$; M $_{2m+1}$ gives rise to the bosonic potential which renders all N 1 dual photons massive, which, in turn, leads to

string (dom ain line) form ation. A ssem bling perturbative and nonperturbative e ects we get

$$L^{Q CD (AS)} = \frac{g_3^2}{32^2} (@)^2 + V_{bion} () + \frac{2X^{+1}}{i^2 2m} (M_i + \overline{M_i}) + \frac{2X^{-1}}{g_3^2} (M_i + \overline{M_i}) + \frac{2X^{-1}}{i^2 2m} (M_i + \overline{M_i}) + \frac{2X^{-1}}{i^2 2m} (M_i + \overline{M_i}) = \frac{2X^{-1}}{i$$

In QCD (F/BF)* we had both electric couplings and monopole and bioninduced magnetic interactions. By the same token in QCD (AS)* interactions of the electric and magnetic type are present. (This is unlike what we have in SYM * theory.) The monopole and bion-induced elects are dominant.

In the elective low-energy theory (84), the $(Z_{2N-4})_A$ chiral symmetry is entangled with the shift symmetry of the dual photon. Examination of the bosonic potential in QCD (AS)* reveals N 2 gauge inequivalent isolated vacua located at

$$= 0; \frac{2}{N-2}; \frac{4}{N-2}; \dots; \frac{2(N-3)}{N-2} \qquad (85)$$

As usual, we label these N 2 vacuum states by $j_k i_k (k = 1; ...; N 2)$. Choosing a vacuum we spontaneously break the Z_{N-2} symmetry.

The chiral condensate in the vacuum $j_k i$ can be calculated along the same lines as in QCD (BF)*,

$$\begin{array}{c} \begin{pmatrix} & 3 \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{4=3N}; & L & 1; \end{pmatrix} \\ h_{k} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{r} \mathbf{j}_{k} \mathbf{i} = 2 \begin{pmatrix} N \\ & 2 \end{pmatrix}^{3}; & L > 1; \end{pmatrix} \\ \begin{array}{c} \infty \mathbf{s} & \frac{2 \mathbf{k}}{N + 2}; \\ & \mathbf{k} \end{pmatrix} \\ (86)$$

where there is a weak L dependence at smallL. This follows from the O (1=N) dimension b_0 , the st -function coe cient of QCD (AS) and SYM theories divided by N. In QCD (AS)

$$b_0 = 3 + \frac{4}{3N}$$
:

R em ark on the C allias and A tiyah {Singer index theorem s: On R₄, the global aspect of the chiral anom aly is expressed by the A tiyah {Singer index theorem . BPST instanton is associated with 2h ferm ionic zero m odes, where 2h = f2;2N;2N;2N = 4;2N + 4g for QCD (F/adj/BF/AS/S), respectively. In QCD (R)* at sm all r(S₁), due to the gauge symmetry breaking, the four-dimensional instanton splits into N monopoles. In the sm all r(S₁) (weak coupling) regime, the instanton should be viewed as a composite object, with the magnetic and topological charges as in Eq. (39), built of N types of elementary monopoles with charges $\frac{4}{g}(1; 2; :::; N)$. The 2h ferm ion zero modes split into groups which associate them selves with the above N monopoles as follows:

QCD	(F):2	!	f2;0;:::;0;0;0g;	
SYM	:2N	!	f2;2;:::;2;2;2g;	
QCD	(BF):2N	!	f2;2;:::;2;2;2g;	
QCD	(AS):2N	4 !	f2;2;:::;2;0;0g;	
QCD	(S):2N + 4	!	f2;2;:::;2;4;4g:	(87)

The numbers on the right-hand side are the Callias indices for the corresponding monopoles. Strictly speaking, the Callias index theorem is formulated for the Yang{Mills + noncompact adjoint Higgs system on R³ [27]. Its generalization to R³ S¹ is carried out by N ye and Singer, [32]. To study the index theorem s we need to nd the kernels of the D irac operators \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{P}^{Y} in the background of the appropriate topological excitation. The kernel is the set of zero eigenstates of the D irac operator. The di erence of the dimensions of the kernels gives the number of zero mode attached to a given topological excitation. Thus, we observe the following relation between the A tiyah{Singer index I_{inst} and the Callias index I_i,

$$I_{inst} = \begin{bmatrix} X \\ I \\ i^2 \end{bmatrix} (88)$$

or

$$\dim \ker \mathbb{P}_{inst} \quad \dim \ker \mathbb{P}_{inst}^{Y} = \dim \ker \mathbb{P}_{i} \quad \dim \ker \mathbb{P}_{i}^{Y} : (89)$$

6 dependence

There is one more interesting aspect of the theory which has not yet been discussed, namely, dependence. It is well-known that in pure Yang{M ills theory on R_4 physical quantities, e.g. string tensions, do depend on , and physical periodicity in is 2. Introduction of one massless quark in representation R eliminates dependence of physical quantities since one can eliminate the term through an appropriate chiral rotation of the ferm ion eld, as a result of the chiral anomaly. This does not mean that various order parameters, e.g. the biferm ion condensate, are independent. If a sm all ferm ion mass term is added, physical quantities acquire dependence; all -dependent e ects are proportional to the ferm ion mass m.

Let us ask ourselves what happens on R_3 S_1 , in deformed theories. At rst, let us consider pure Yang{Mills, assuming that \bigcirc 0. Then the instanton-monopole induced vertices at level e S_0 are

$$L = e^{S_0} \int_{j=1}^{X^N} e^{i + i = N} + H$$
 c:: (90)

By globally shifting

$$! \qquad \frac{1}{N}$$
 (91)

where is the W eyl vector, and using the identities (57), we can rewrite the instanton-m onopole vertices in the form

$$L = e^{S_0} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j=1}}^{N_1} e^{i_j} + \sum_{N_1} e^{S_0} e^{i_{N_1} + i_j} + H x;; \qquad (92)$$

where the 2 periodicity is more transparent. In both Eqs. (90) and (92) the vacuum angle dependence is explicit.

Introducing one fundam ental ferm ion, and localizing the ferm ionic zero mode into the monopole with charge $_N$ without loss of generality, we get, instead of (90) and (92)

$$L = \sim_{N} e^{S_{0}} e^{i_{N} + i_{N}} + e^{S_{0}} \int_{j=1}^{N} e^{i_{j} + i_{N}} + H c::$$

$$= \sim_{N} e^{S_{0}} e^{i_{N} + i} + e^{S_{0}} j e^{i_{j}} + H c::$$
(93)

where we used (91) in passing to the second step. It is clear in the latter form that the dependence can be completely absorbed in the ferm ion elds,

$$f; g! e^{i=2}; e^{i=2}:$$
 (94)

If the ferm ion m ass term m is added, the dependence can no longer be absorbed in the de nition of the ferm ion eld. Perform ing (94) we change the phase of the m ass parameter. Correspondingly, one can expect physical dependent e ects proportional to m, such as the vacuum energy density

in parallel with the behavior of the undeform ed theory on R $_4$.

A nalysis of the dependence in QCD (BF)* is even easier technically. The magnetic bion vertices have no dependence because each of them represent the product of a monopole and antimonopole vertex in which the dependence cancels. Moreover, the monopole-induced vertices are

$$L^{QCD(BF)} = e^{S_0} \qquad e^{i_{i_1} + i_{i_1}} + e^{i_{i_2} + i_{i_1}}$$
$$(_{i_1} + _{i_{1}+1}) + H c: : \qquad (96)$$

The dependence can be readily absorbed in the ferm ion elds with the following redenition:

$$f_{i}; ig! e^{i = (2N)} f_{i}; ig:$$
 (97)

If we introduce very small mass terms for the fermion elds, m (L), then it is obvious that the dependence reappears in the vacuum energy density,

E() =
$$\min_{k} E_{k}$$
() $\min_{k} m^{3} \cos \frac{1}{N} + \frac{2 k}{N}$; $k = 1; ...; N$: (98)

Turning on a nonvanishing mass term lifts the N -fold degeneracy of the vacua j $_k$ i. The vacuum labeled by the integer k turns into a state with energy

 E_k (). Each one of the N branches is 2 N periodic in $% A_k$. Consequently, the vacuum energy density is physically 2 $% A_k$ periodic,

$$E_{vac}(+ 2) = E_{vac}()$$
:

This is precisely the expected behavior of undeform ed QCD (BF) on R_4 .

In the case of QCD (AS)* the overall picture emerging from our analysis is quite similar (albeit there are some minor di erences subleading in 1=N) and also matches the known dependence of QCD (AS) on R_4 .

7 Remarks on planar equivalence

Similarity of the dynamical aspects of QCD (BF/AS/S)* (with fermions in the two-index representation) and N = 1 SYM * theory is evident. Given that they are quantum theories with distinct matter content and distinct microscopic symmetries, this similarity is remarkable. We explicitly showed that in the small $r(S_1)$ regime, QCD (BF/AS/S)* con ne through the magnetic bion mechanism in the same way as N = 1 SYM * theory. Moreover, spontaneous breaking of the discrete chiral symmetries is similar in these two cases too. The biferm ion condensate is saturated by a monopole-instanton with appropriate fermion zero mode structure. The calculated mass gaps are quite alike in both cases. C learly, our analysis makes it manifest that solvability of N = 1 SYM * theory at weak coupling is due to the unbroken center symmetry. Supersymmetry is secondary in this regime.

In fact, an intim ate relation between SYM theory and its orientifoldorbifold daughters exists not only at small $r(S_1)$ but also in the decompacti cation lim it of large $r(S_1)$. If the number of colors N ! 1, there is a well de ned equivalence between N = 1 SYM and QCD (BF/AS/S) which goes under the name of planar equivalence [37, 38, 39, 40, 41]. The necessary conditions for planar equivalence to be valid nonperturbatively are (i) interchange (Z_2)_I symmetry is unbroken in QCD (BF), ii) C conjugation symmetry is unbroken in QCD (AS/S). It is generally believed that these conditions are met [3].

The large N equivalence is a useful tool to translate nonperturbative data of SYM theory to its daughters (and vice versa) on R_4 . P lanar equivalence is valid also on R_3 S_1 . The equivalence establishes an isom orphism on a subspace of the H ilbert space of these theories. Let us grade the H ilbert space of SYM theory with respect to $(1)^F$ where F is the ferm ion number, as

$$H^{SYM} = H^{SYM} + H^{SYM}$$
 (99)

Sim ilarly, the Hilbert spaces of QCD (BF) and QCD (AS/S) can be graded respect to the 1 \$ 2 interchange symmetry in the rst case and charge conjugation in the second. Planar equivalence is an isomorphism between the even subspaces of the Hilbert spaces

$$H^{SYM +} H^{QCD (BF)+} H^{QCD (AS)+}$$
(100)

(The full H ilbert spaces are by no means isom orphic.)

If one perform speriodic com pacti cations¹⁷ of QCD (BF/AS/S) on R_3 S₁, with small r(S₁), the 1 \$ 2 interchange symmetry of QCD (BF)* and C invariance of QCD (AS/S)* do break spontaneously, along with the spatial center symmetry [35, 45]. (For related lattice studies showing the breaking and restoration of C see [43, 44].)

Certain order parameters which probe the interchange symmetry and C invariance are topologically nontrivial [42], e.g.

 $Tr(U_1^k)$ $Tr(U_2^k)$; QCD (BF) and $Tr(U^k)$ $Tr(U^k)$ QCD (AS) : (101)

T here operators are charged under the center sym m etry and odd under $(Z_2)_I$ and C. In QCD (BF/AS/S)* stabilization of the center sym m etry autom atically implies vanishing of the expectation values of the order parameters (101).

There are also order parameters which are neutral under the center symmetry, yet charged under $(Z_2)_I$ and C. For example, the odd combination of the W ilson loops $W_1(C) = W_2(C)$ or $\operatorname{Tr}F_1^2 = \operatorname{Tr}F_2^2$ in QCD (BF)* and W (C) W (C) in QCD (AS)* are of this type. The unbroken center symmetry does not restrict the expectation value of such operators. Our dynamical analysis in Sects. (4) and (5) shows that spontaneous breaking of $(Z_2)_I$ and C symmetry de nitely does not take place at small $r(S_1)$. A rguments why this must be the case also on R_4 are summarized in Ref. [3].

 $^{^{17}}$ In therm al compactication, only the center symmetry breaks spontaneously; the interchange symmetry and C invariance remain unbroken [45]. Thus, planar equivalence for orbifold and orientifold daughters remains valid in the high temperature decon ned phase.

8 Conclusions and prospects: Abelian vs. non-Abelian con nem ent

The aspects of QCD * theories that we studied are valid in the limit L 1, where the weak coupling regime sets in. We presented arguments that oneavor QCD (R)* theories are continuously connected to one-avor QCD (R) on R₄. We demonstrated, through an explicit calculation at small $r(S_1)$, existence of the mass gap, linear connected, and discrete SB. These are indeed the most salient features of QCD -like theories on R₄.

In the small $r(S_1)$ domain, the QCD * theories are characterized by the fact that the gauge symmetry is Higgsed down to a maximal Abelian subgroup U $(1)^{N-1}$. Thus, at small $r(S_1)$ we deal with Abelian con nement, while it is expected to give place to non-Abelian con nement in the decom – pactication limit.

W hat happens as we increase L gradually, all the way to L! 1? At a scale of the order L 1, we loose the separation of scale between the W - bosons and the nonperturbatively gapped photons. Thus, our e ective low - energy description (which includes only light bosonic and ferm ionic degrees of freedom) ceases to be valid. At and above 1=L the theory is strongly coupled in the IR, and the full non-A belian gauge group is operative. Thus, the con nem ent mechanism in this regime must be non-A belian.

This situation is completely analogous to the Seiberg {W itten solution [18] of four-dimensional N = 2 SYM theory exhibiting mass gap and linear connement upon a deformation breaking N = 2 down to N = 1. If = 1, the Seiberg {W itten theory in the IR is in the regime of broken gauge symmetry, i.e. SU (N) ! U (1)^{N 1}, where it is solvable. For = > 1, one looses the separation of scales between the W bosons and nonperturbatively gapped photons. The full gauge symmetry is restored. In this regime, the low -energy theory approaches pure N = 1 SYM theory. The conning strings must be non-Abelian. Currently no controllable analytical approaches allowing one to continue the Seiberg {W itten solution to the domain = 1 are known, and yet there are good reasons to believe that this continuation is smooth.

Conceptually the relation between -deform ed N = 2 and N = 1 SYMtheories on R_4 is parallel to that between one- avor QCD * on R_3 S_1 and QCD on R_4 . Both theories realize con nem ent via the following pattern

SU (N) $\stackrel{\text{Higgsing}}{!}$ [U (1)] $\stackrel{\text{nonperturbative}}{!}$ no massless modes: (102)

Existence of an intermediate Abelian gauge theory in the IR is the key to analytical calculability in both cases.

In both cases by tuning the relevant parameter, = or L, respectively, from small to large values, we can remove the intermediate step of A belianization." In this paper we presented a number of arguments in favor of no phase transitions separating the Abelian and non-Abelian con nement regimes. It is desirable to develop a special technique allowing one to perform integrating in" of the W bosons (and their partners) gradually. If this task can be achieved this could provide a direct route to QCD and QCD-like theories on R_4 .

If we are right and the transition from QCD * to QCD-like theories is smooth, this smoothness could explain a long-standing puzzle. The point is that a rather vaguely de ned method which goes under the name of the maxim alAbelian projection seems to give sensible results in the lattice calculations. The reason might be the proximity of the Abelian con nement regime we discussed in the body of this paper.

The status of QCD -like theories with massless or very light fermions with exact or approximate chiral symmetry significantly improved in the recent years [46, 47]. It is highly desirable to implement QCD * theories on lattices, and then carry out an in-depth study of the transition from Abelian to non-Abelian con nement.

A cknow ledgm ents

M J. thanks E. Silverstein for discussions on double trace deform ations, and D.T. Son for discussions on Polyakov's model. M S. is grateful to A. Yung for endless discussions of A belian vs. non-A belian con nem ent. We would like to thank A di A m oni for stimulating questions and fruitful correspondence. The work of M S. is supported in part by DOE grant DE+FG 02-94ER 408. The work of M J. is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy G rant DE+AC 02-76SF 00515.

A ppendix: C enter stabilization

Let U (x) be the path-ordered holonomy of the W ilson line wrapping S_1 at the point x 2 R₃. It is known that for complex representation ferm ions (F/AS/S/BF), the center symmetry is broken down at su ciently smallr (S¹) regardless of the spin connections of ferm ions. For adjoint ferm ions with periodic spin connection, the spatial center symmetry is not broken at small r (S₁), whereas for antiperiodic (thermal) boundary conditions the temporal center symmetry is broken at su ciently high temperatures.

An easy way to see this is to evaluate the one-bop Colem an {W einberg e ective potential induced by quantum uctuations by using the background eld m ethod (e.g. [48, 45]). The m inim um of the classical action is achieved at the vanishing value of the gauge eld strength, and constant but arbitrary values of the U (x). Q uantum corrections lift the degeneracy.

O ne can evaluate the one loop-potentials for one avor QCD -like theories. In the gauge in which the Polyakov line is represented by a constant and diagonalmatrix one obtains¹⁸

$$V_{e}$$
 [U] = $\frac{2}{{}^{2}L^{4}} \prod_{n=1}^{X^{4}} \frac{1}{n^{4}} T_{n}$; (A.1)

where

$$I_{n} = \int TrU^{n} f + a_{n} (TrU^{n} + TrU^{n}); \quad (F);$$

$$I_{n} = (1 + a_{n}) \int TrU^{n} f; \quad (adj); \quad (A 2)$$

$$T_{n} = \frac{1}{2} (1 + a_{h}) \operatorname{Tr} U_{1}^{n} + \operatorname{Tr} U_{2}^{n} \operatorname{f}^{2}$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2} (1 + a_{h}) \operatorname{Tr} U_{1}^{n} \operatorname{Tr} U_{2}^{n} \operatorname{f}^{2}; \quad (BF); \quad (A.3)$$

$$T_{n} = \frac{1}{4} (1 + a_{n}) JTrU^{n} + TrU^{n} J + \frac{1}{4} (1 - a_{n}) JTrU^{n} TrU^{n} J^{2}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}a_n TrU^{2n} + TrU^{2n}; \qquad (A S=S): (A .4)$$

 18 In the multi avor generalization (with N $_{\rm f}$ ferm ions) one must replace $a_{\rm n}$! $a_{\rm n}$ N $_{\rm f}$:

Here an are prefactors which depend on the ferm ion boundary conditions,

$$((1)^n \text{ for S }; a_n = (A.5)$$

1 for S⁺:

Note that

C
$$(TrU^{n} Tr(U)^{n}) = (TrU^{n} Tr(U)^{n});$$

I $(TrU_{1}^{n} Tr(U_{2})^{n}) = (TrU_{1}^{n} Tr(U_{2})^{n}):$ (A.6)

The minimum of the e ective potential presented above is located at

U Diag(1;1;:::;1) all R with S and F=BF=AS=S with S⁺;
U = Diag 1;
$$e^{i\frac{2}{N}}$$
;:::; $e^{i\frac{2(N-1)}{N}}$ adjwith S⁺: (A.7)

Thus, the (spatial or temporal) center symmetry is broken in all theories, except QCD (adj) with the periodic spin connection S^+ . In the cases of broken center symmetry the small and large radius physics on $S_1 = R_3$ are separated by a phase transition. In all these cases the fermions essentially decouple from infrared physics, and the theory at small $r(S_1)$ has not much in common with the theory at large $r(S_1)$.

The center symmetry breaking is induced by destabilizing double trace operators such as e.g. $\int T r U_{j}^{2}$ and their multiwinding counterparts. One can stabilize the center symmetry while respecting the underlying symmetries of the theories at hand by adding a stabilizing polynomial in the appropriate variable up to the winding number $\mathbb{N} = 2$ with judiciously chosen coecients. This will overwhelm the one-loop elect, and make the center-symmetric point a stable vacuum in the small $r(S_{1})$ regime.

References

- [1] A.M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. B 72, 477 (1978).
- [2] L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. D 20, 2610 (1979).
- [3] M .Shifm an, Som e Theoretical Developments in SUSY, arX iv:0708.0632 [hep-th].
- [4] A.Amoni, M.Shifm an and M.Unsal, Planar Lim it of Orientifold Field Theories and Emergent Center Symmetry, arX iv:0712.0672 [hep-th].
- [5] M. Cheng et al., The QCD Equation of State with alm ost PhysicalQuark M asses, arX iv:0710.0354 [hep-lat].
- [6] O. Aharony, M. Berkooz and E. Silverstein, JHEP 0108, 006 (2001) [arX iv hep-th/0105309].
- [7] E.W itten, Multi-trace operators, boundary conditions, and AdS/CFT correspondence, arX iv hep-th/0112258.
- [8] M. Berkooz, A. Sever and A. Shomer, JHEP 0205, 034 (2002) [arX iv:hep-th/0112264].
- [9] J.L.F.Barbon, Phys. Lett. B 543, 283 (2002) [arX iv hep-th/0206207].
- [10] M. Schaden, Phys. Rev. D 71, 105012 (2005) [arX iv:hep-th/0410254].
- [11] R.D.Pisarski, Phys.Rev.D 74, 121703 (2006) [arXivhep-ph/0608242].
- [12] J.C.Myers and M.C.Ogilvie, New Phases of SU (3) and SU (4) at Finite Temperature, arXiv:0707.1869 [hep-lat].
- [13] A.M. Polyakov, Nucl. Phys. B 120, 429 (1977).
- [14] M. Unsal, Abelian duality, con nement, and chiral symmetry breaking in QCD (adj) arX iv:0708.1772 [hep-th].
- [15] N.M. Davies, T.J. Hollowood and V.V.Khoze, J.Math. Phys. 44, 3640 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0006011].

- [16] M. Unsal, Magnetic bion condensation: A new mechanism of con nement and mass gap in four dimensions, arX iv:0709.3269 [hep-th].
- [17] M. Shifm an and A. Yung, Non-Abelian Strings and the Luscher Term, arX iv:0712.3512 [hep-th].
- [18] N. Seiberg and E.W itten, Nucl. Phys. B 426, 19 (1994) Erratum ibid.
 B 430, 485 (1994)] [arX iv:hep-th/9407087].
- [19] A. Abrikosov, Sov. Phys. JETP 32 1442 (1957) Reprinted in Solitons and Particles, Eds.C. Rebbiand G. Soliani (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1984), p. 356];
 H. Nielsen and P. Olesen, Nucl. Phys. B 61 45 (1973) Reprinted in Solitons and Particles, Eds.C. Rebbiand G. Soliani (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1984), p. 365].
- [20] E.Cohen and C.Gom ez, Phys. Rev. Lett. 52, 237 (1984).
- [21] S. H. Katz and C. Vafa, Nucl. Phys. B 497, 196 (1997) [arXiv:hepth/9611090].
- [22] N.M. Davies, T.J. Hollowood, V.V. Khoze and M.P.Mattis, Nucl. Phys. B 559, 123 (1999) [arX iv:hep-th/9905015].
- [23] A. Armoni and M. Shifman, Planar Equivalence 2006, in String Theory and Fundam ental Interactions, Eds. M. Gasperini and J. Maharana (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2007), p. 287 [arXiv:hep-th/0702045].
- [24] M.A.Shifm an and A.I.Vainshtein, Nucl. Phys. B 296, 445 (1988)
- [25] I.A eck, J.A. Harvey and E.W itten, Nucl. Phys. B 206, 413 (1982).
- [26] R. Jackiw and C. Rebbi, Phys. Rev. D 13, 3398 (1976).
- [27] C.Callias, Commun.Math.Phys. 62, 213 (1978).
- [28] F. Bruckmann, D. Nogradi and P. van Baal, Nucl. Phys. B 666, 197 (2003) [arX iv hep-th/0305063].
- [29] M. N. Chemodub, T. C. Kraan and P. van Baal, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 83, 556 (2000) [arX iv:hep-lat/9907001].

- [30] M. Garcia Perez, A. Gonzalez-Arroyo, C. Pena and P. van Baal, Phys. Rev. D 60, 031901 (1999) [arX iv hep-th/9905016].
- [31] F.Bruckmann, Topological objects in QCD, arX iv:0706.2269 [hep-th].
- [32] T.M.W.Nye and M.A.Singer, An L^2 -Index Theorem for Dirac Operators on S¹ R³, arX iv m ath/0009144.
- [33] M. Hermele, T. Senthil, M. P. A. Fisher, P. A. Lee, N. Nagaosa, Xiao-Gang Wen, Phys. Rev. B 70, 214437 (2004)
- [34] A.A.Belavin, A.M.Polyakov, A.S.Shvarts and Yu.S.Tyupkin, Phys. Lett. B 59, 85 (1975). [Reprinted in M.Shifman, Instantons in Gauge Theories (World Scientic, Singapore, 1994], p. 22; G. 't Hooff, Phys. Rev.D 14, 3432 (1976) [Erratum -ibid.D 18, 2199 (1978)]. [Reprinted in M.Shifman, Instantons in Gauge Theories (World Scientic, Singapore, 1994], p. 70.
- [35] D. Tong, JHEP 0303, 022 (2003) [arX iv:hep-th/0212235].
- [36] M.A.Shifm an and A.I.Vainshtein, Nucl. Phys. B 359, 571 (1991).
- [37] A. Armoni, M. Shifm an and G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. B 667, 170 (2003) [arX iv hep-th/0302163]; Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 191601 (2003) [arX iv hep-th/0307097]; Phys. Lett. B 579, 384 (2004) [arX iv hep-th/0309013].
- [38] A. Armoni, M. Shiffman and G. Veneziano, From super-Yang-Mills theory to QCD: Planar equivalence and its implications, in From Fields to Strings: C incum navigating Theoretical Physics, Ed. M. Shiffman, A. Vainshtein, and J. W heater (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 2005), Vol. 1, p. 353, [arX iv hep-th/0403071].
- [39] A. Armoni, M. Shifm an and G. Veneziano, Phys. Rev. D 71, 045015 (2005) [arX iv hep-th/0412203].
- [40] P. Kovtun, M. Unsal, and L. G. Ya e, JHEP 0312, 034 (2003) [arX iv hep-th/0311098].
- [41] P. Kovtun, M. Unsal, and L. G. Ya e, JHEP 0507, 008 (2005) [arX iv hep-th/0411177].

- [42] M.Unsal, Phys. Rev. D 76, 025015 (2007) [arX iv hep-th/0703025].
- [43] T. DeG rand and R. Ho mann, JHEP 0702, 022 (2007) [arXiv:hep-lat/0612012].
- [44] B. Lucini, A. Patella and C. Pica, Phys. Rev. D 75, 121701 (2007) [arX iv hep-th/0702167].
- [45] M. Unsaland L.G. Ya e, Phys. Rev. D 74, 105019 (2006) [arX iv hepth/0608180].
- [46] D.B.Kaplan, Phys. Lett. B 288, 342 (1992) [arX iv hep-lat/9206013].
- [47] R. Narayanan and H. Neuberger, Nucl. Phys. B 443, 305 (1995) [arX iv hep-th/9411108].
- [48] D. J. Gross, R. D. Pisarski and L. G. Ya e, Rev. Mod. Phys. 53, 43 (1981).