arXiv:1102.5629v1 [hep-ph] 28 Feb 2011

Non-particle statistical physics

A. Jakovác*
Dept. of Theoretical Physics, BME Technical University, H-1111 Budapest, Hungary
(Dated: February 24, 2024)

Consistent statistical physical description is given for systems where the elementary excitations are composite objects. Explicit calculational scheme is constructed for the energy density and the total number of thermodynamical degrees of freedom, based on the spectral function of the system. One demonstrates through characteristic examples that single quasiparticle contributions combine non-linearly in these quantities. Relation to the Gibbs paradox is also discussed.

QCD thermodynamics shows paradoxical faces in the crossover region connecting the hadronic and the quark phases. Variants of the perturbative approach, which provide a reasonable interpretation of the numerical simulations in restricted temperature ranges, work with perturbed ideal gas systems where the mean free path (ξ) is very large. On the other hand, as for example the interpretation of recent RHIC measurements suggest [1, 2], hadronic matter near T_c behaves as an almost ideal fluid where $\xi \to 0$. Enforcing a free gas description to an ideal fluid, however, is possible only with strong interactions.

But what seems to be strongly interacting in one way, can be weakly interacting in terms of the adequate degrees of freedom. In PT one uses resummation to find them; and indeed, perturbative series are improved considerably eg. for entropy with HTL resummation [3], thermodynamics with screened PT [4] or with 2PI resummation [5]. In effective approaches like the hadron resonance gas model or massive gluon picture, also *non-interacting* particles can give an account for complicated behavior in QCD like charm hadronization [6], equation of state [7–9], or interaction measure [10]. The success of these approaches suggests that probably most part of the strong interactions between free particles is incorporated in the *spectrum*, and the residual interactions of the so-dressed excitations are small.

We therefore may assume that the adequate description is based on a model which contains weakly interacting excitations with nontrivial spectrum (not necessarily quasiparticles). In this paper we consider the most simple effective theory described by a single real bosonic excitation, and omit all interactions. We primarily interested in the questions of how finite lifetime or multiparticle (threshold) effects can modify the thermodynamics, and how can different degrees of freedom show up in or vanish from the statistical ensemble dynamically.

The treatment of an effective field theory with a quite general spectrum, however, requires to rethink some relevant questions concerning the foundations of statistical physics. The problem is the following: the partition function


$$Z = \sum_n g_n e^{-\beta E_n} \tag{1}$$

requires the knowledge of the energy levels E_n as well as the multiplicities g_n (for simplicity we assume no conserved charge, ie. no chemical potential here). In a fundamental theory the basic excitations are elementary, therefore their multiplicities are fixed permanently, while in an effective theory the thermodynamic degrees of freedom might change dynamically. To have a cleaner characterization of the multiplicities, and also to approach the question of appearance/disappearance of modes in the ensemble, let us define the total number of (internal) degrees of freedom as the sum of degeneracies in a 1-particle case at zero spatial momentum

$$N_{dof} = \sum_n g_n \Big|_{1-particle,\mathbf{k}=0}. \tag{2}$$

The value of N_{dof} is always an integer in the fundamental theory and it appears directly in physical quantities: for example the pressure of bosonic gases at high temperature is $P = N_{dof} P_{SB}$, where P_{SB} is the Stefan-Boltzmann (SB) limit $P_{SB} = \pi T^4/90$.

In an effective theory, however, elementary excitations are in fact multiparticle states from the point of view of the underlying fundamental theory. Fig. 1/a shows three characteristic cases how the multiparticle nature manifests itself in the spectral function ϱ. In case A the two



a.) b.)

FIG. 1. a.) spectral function for: A.) well separated peaks, B.) merging peaks and C.) threshold. Figure b.) shows the behavior of the degrees of freedom from (11) as we go from case A to case B (and beyond).

well-separated peaks each represent independent quasiparticles: they can be treated as a fundamental particles, and so $N_{dof} = 2$ here. In case B we should avoid the double-counting of the states in the overlap region, so we

expect $N_{dof} < 2$. If the widths $\Gamma \to \infty$, finally we get one peak and we expect $N_{dof} \to 1$. The behavior of N_{dof} as a function of the widths should be something like Fig. 1/b – which results actually from an explicit evaluation (cf. below (11)). Case C is even more difficult, since there is no quasiparticle-like excitation at all; but we have to determine also its contribution to the thermodynamics.

The problem of determining the correct degeneracies is in close connection with the old problem of indistinguishability of particles in gases and the Gibbs paradox. Consider two energy levels with separation ΔE, then $N_{dof} = 2$ for $\Delta E > 0$, even for $\Delta E \to 0$, but $N_{dof} = 1$ if $\Delta E = 0$ (since then we have only one level). Therefore N_{dof}, and so the SB limit of the energy density is a non-analytic function of ΔE. However, according to the argumentation of the previous paragraph, for real gases with finite (eg. thermal) width, for $\Delta E < \Gamma$ the number of degrees of freedom N_{dof} goes smoothly to one. A similar conclusion was drawn in [11]. By a better description of the degeneracies in effective theories we may hope to have a deeper understanding of the Gibbs paradox in general.

The key observation for the correct description is that statistical physics is determined by the dynamics, so we shall start with the Lagrangian of the effective theory. In case of a quadratic model the spectral function fixes completely the dynamics, and so the thermodynamics and also N_{dof}. Below the spectral function will be the input of the analysis and the consequence of a few physically appealing non-trivial choices will be explored.

The most general quadratic, spacetime translation invariant action reads

$$S[\varphi] = \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x d^4y \, \varphi(x) K(x-y) \, \varphi(y). \tag{3}$$

The kernel K is to be constructed to represent the given spectral function. If it is continuous, K should be time-nonlocal. This immediately poses the question of causality; but causality in this system simply means that the spectral function is zero for spacelike separation. This requirement is granted by construction, since the spectral function serves as input here.

We should note that because of time-nonlocality some standard techniques will not work. First of all we do not have canonical formalism (or at least we would need infinitely many fields). Also there is no direct connection between the imaginary time formalism and the thermodynamics: indeed, the standard derivation is based on the fact that the Hamiltonian density depends on the canonical momentum as $\Pi^2/2$ [12]. In order to define thermodynamics we have to define the energy through the Noether current belonging to the time translation invariance, and then we should compute its expectation value at finite temperatures. We note that the formal correspondence between the time translation e^{-iHt} and statistical operator $e^{-\beta H}$ is still valid, and so KMS condition remains true: this will help us to take expectation values. Once we know the temperature dependent energy $E(T)$, we can define the complete thermodynamics from that.

To connect the kernel to the spectral function we compute the analytic continuation of the retarded/advanced propagator from the spectral function by the Kramers-Kronig relation

$$G_R(p) = \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \, \frac{\varrho(\omega, \mathbf{p})}{p_0 - \omega + i\epsilon}. \tag{4}$$

The kernel in Fourier space (denoted by $\mathcal{K}$), can be obtained from the relation: $G_R(p) = \mathcal{K}^{-1}(p_0 + i\epsilon, \mathbf{p})$. Using the hermiticity of the action (3), there remains

$$\mathcal{K}(p) = \, \mathrm{Re}\, G_R^{-1}(p). \tag{5}$$

If the spectral function is relativistic invariant, then the same holds for G_R and for the kernel, too. From now on we assume relativistic invariance (although for the applicability of the approach it is not necessary).

The next step is the construction of the energy-momentum tensor: it is the conserved current belonging to the spacetime translation symmetry. Using standard techniques [13] we obtain

$$\hat{T}_{\mu\nu}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \varphi(x) \, D_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{K}(i\partial) \, \varphi(x), \tag{6}$$

where

$$D_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{K}(p) = p_\mu \frac{\partial \mathcal{K}}{\partial p^\nu} \, - g_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{K} = 2 p_\mu p_\nu \frac{d\mathcal{K}}{dp^2} \, - g_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{K}. \tag{7}$$

The latter, relativistic form is explicitly symmetric.

Expectation value of this form can be taken using the KMS condition $iG^{12}(p) = n(p_0)\varrho(p)$, where n is the Bose-Einstein distribution. We find

$$\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle = \int_p^+ D_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{K}(p) \, \left(\frac{1}{2} + n(p_0) \right) \varrho(p), \tag{8}$$

where $\int_p^+ = \int_0^\infty \frac{dp_0}{2\pi} \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3}$. This is already position independent.

The leading 1/2 represents the vacuum energy. To obtain a finite expression we subtract the expectation value at zero temperature.

$$\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle_{ren} = \int_p^+ D_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{K}(p) \, \left[n(p_0)\varrho(p) + \frac{1}{2} \delta\varrho(p) \right], \tag{9}$$

where $\delta\varrho(p) = \varrho(p) - \varrho_0(p)$, and ϱ_0 is the zero temperature spectral function.

In a rotationally invariant system only the diagonal elements survive. The 00 component is the energy density

$$\varepsilon = \int_p^+ D\mathcal{K}(p) \, \left[n(p_0)\varrho(p) + \frac{1}{2} \delta\varrho(p) \right], \tag{10}$$

where $D\mathcal{K}(p) \equiv D_{00}\mathcal{K}(p)$.

We note that ε is independent on the normalization of the spectral function (if $\varrho \to Z\varrho$ then $G_R \to ZG_R$ and $\mathcal{K} \to \mathcal{K}/Z$, so Z drops out). This means that only the energy levels count, not the normalization (which is the consequence of the definition of the fields).

Having $\varepsilon(T)$ we can obtain the free energy from the relation $\varepsilon = \frac{\partial \beta f}{\partial \beta}$, the pressure from $p = -f$ and the entropy density from $s = \beta(\varepsilon + p)$. From ε we can define also a quantity which can be interpreted as the number of internal degrees of freedom. At high temperatures $n(p_0) \sim T/p_0$, and the average energy per mode is T. Therefore the number of modes for a given momentum is

$$N_{dof} = \int_0^\infty \frac{dp_0}{2\pi} \frac{1}{p_0} D\mathcal{K}(p)\, \varrho(p). \tag{11}$$

This is similar to the "equivalent photon number" introduced by Weizsäcker and Williams. N_{dof} is dimensionless, temperature independent quantity which, as we will see below, in case of the discrete spectrum yields indeed the number of energy levels.

After we have derived the relevant formulae we can apply them for some particular spectral functions. First of all one easily verifies that for a relativistic free particle (with spectral function $\varrho(p) = 2\pi \operatorname{sgn} p_0 \delta(p^2 - m^2)$) one obtains one degree of freedom ($N_{dof} = 1$) from (11), and the energy density from (10) yields the standard formula

$$\varepsilon_1(m,T) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int_m^\infty dp_0 n(p_0)\, p_0^2 \sqrt{p_0^2 - m^2}. \tag{12}$$

Consider now two stable particles with masses $m_{1,2}$ and wave function renormalizations $Z_{1,2}$. Since the result is independent on the global normalization of ϱ, we can choose $Z_1 + Z_2 = 1$ and consider

$$\varrho(p) = (2\pi) \operatorname{sgn} p_0 \left[Z_1 \delta(p^2 - m_1^2) + Z_2 \delta(p^2 - m_2^2) \right]. \tag{13}$$

This yields $G_R(p) = Z_1(p^2 - m_1^2)^{-1} + Z_2(p^2 - m_2^2)^{-1}$ with Landau prescription, and $\mathcal{K}(p) = (p^2 - m_1^2)(p^2 - m_2^2)/(p^2 - \bar{m}^2)$ where $\bar{m}^2 = Z_2 m_1^2 + Z_1 m_2^2$. Then we find

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{K}}{\partial p^2} = \frac{p^4 - 2p^2\bar{m}^2 + Z_2 m_1^4 + Z_1 m_2^4}{(p^2 - \bar{m}^2)^2}. \tag{14}$$

If we evaluate the internal degrees of freedom, we obtain $N_{dof} = 2$ independently on the details, in particular on the weights of the Dirac-deltas. If, however, $m_1 = m_2$ at the beginning, then (like in the previous case), we have $N_{dof} = 1$. Therefore we indeed count the number of the particle species, which is discontinuous: this is the manifestation of the Gibbs paradox in our expression.

Similarly, the energy density reads

$$\varepsilon_2 = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_1(m_1,T) + \varepsilon_1(m_2,T) & \text{if } m_1 \neq m_2 \\ \varepsilon_1(m,T), & \text{if } m_1 = m_2 = m, \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

where ε_1 comes from (12). This formula is also non-analytic for $m_2 \to m_1$, and independent on $Z_{1,2}$.

To have a deeper insight into the calculations, we remark that in the energy density (11) we have the combination $D\mathcal{K}\varrho$. Since $\mathcal{K} = 0$ on the mass shells, we have to consider the $\partial\mathcal{K}/\partial p^2$ term. Near the mass shell it has the following property:

$$\lim_{p^2 \to m_1^2} \left[\lim_{m_2 \to m_1} \frac{\partial \mathcal{K}}{\partial p^2} \right] = 1, \quad \lim_{m_2 \to m_1} \left[\lim_{p^2 \to m_1^2} \frac{\partial \mathcal{K}}{\partial p^2} \right] = \frac{1}{Z_1}. \tag{16}$$

It is this non-interchangeability of the limits which lies behind the Gibbs paradox. A physical interpretation of these limits is that a finite width gives finite resolution of the spectra; if the peaks are closer than their widths, than then one cannot resolve them, and we are in the first limiting case. If they are farther, than we see two peaks, and the second limiting procedure has to be applied.

The above observation generalizes to any number (N) of Dirac-deltas. Let us take in general

$$\varrho(p_0) = \sum_i Z_i (2\pi) \delta(p_0 - \omega_i), \quad G_R = \sum_i \frac{Z_i}{p_0 - \omega_i + i\epsilon}. \tag{17}$$

The kernel is its inverse, the derivative of the kernel reads

$$p_0 \frac{\partial \mathcal{K}}{\partial p_0} = -\frac{p_0}{G_R^2} \frac{\partial G_R}{\partial p_0} = \frac{p_0}{G_R^2} \sum_i \frac{Z_i}{(p_0 - \omega_i)^2}. \tag{18}$$

Since at $p_0 \to \omega_i$ for any i the retarded Greens function diverges, its inverse is zero: ie. $\mathcal{K}(p) = 0$ on any mass shell. On the other hand, if $Z_i \neq 0$

$$\lim_{p_0 \to \omega_i} p_0 \frac{\partial \mathcal{K}}{\partial p_0} = \lim_{p_0 \to \omega_i} \frac{\omega_i}{Z_i^2/(p_0 - \omega_i)^2 + \text{finite}} \times \\ \times \left[\frac{Z_i}{(p_0 - \omega_i)^2} + \text{finite} \right] = \frac{\omega_i}{Z_i}, \tag{19}$$


and so the Z_i factors drop out from the result. The number of degrees of freedom from (11) is $N_{dof} = N$, and the energy density is $\varepsilon_N = \sum_n \varepsilon_1(m_n, T)$, both are independent on the normalization.

After the infinite lifetime examples we consider the case of realistic gases. First let us consider a single degree of freedom with finite lifetime, represented by a spectral function of Breit-Wigner type

$$\varrho_1(p,\Gamma) = \frac{4p_0\Gamma}{(p_0^2 - \omega_p^2 - \Gamma^2)^2 + 4p_0^2\Gamma^2}, \tag{20}$$

where $\omega_p^2 = \mathbf{p}^2 + m^2$. The corresponding retarded Greens function and the kernel are $G_R^{-1}(p) = (p_0 + i\Gamma)^2 - \omega_p^2$ and $\mathcal{K}(p) = p^2 - m^2 - \Gamma^2$. We can easily compute the number of degrees of freedom from (11) to obtain $N_{dof} = 1$! This means that, independently on the lifetime of the excitations, we always have a single degree of freedom.

For the energy density we evaluate (10), the result can be seen on Fig. 2/a. One can see that for Γ/m as large



a.) b.)

FIG. 2. a.) Energy density coming from a single Lorentzian for $\Gamma = 0$ (ie. infinite lifetime) and $\Gamma/m = 0.2$. SB limit denotes the Stefan-Boltzmann limit. b.) Energy density for two Lorentzians with $m_1 = 1$ and $m_2 = 2$ masses and $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2 = \Gamma$ width. 2SB means double of the SB limit. 1-delta is a *single* Dirac delta case. 50*thr shows the 50-times energy density coming from a threshold.

as 0.2, the energy density is close to the one for a stable particle. This observation makes possible to neglect the width for independent real quasiparticles in thermodynamical calculations.

Although a single Lorentzian yields $N_{dof} = 1$, this does not mean – because of nonlinearity of the expressions (10) and (11) – that for N Lorentzians we obtain N degrees of freedom. To see this, let us take the linear combination of two such Lorentzians:

$$\varrho_2(p) = Z_1\varrho_1(p,\Gamma_1) + Z_2\varrho_1(p,\Gamma_2). \qquad (21)$$

Then, for N_{dof} we obtain Fig. 1/b which we also discussed in the introduction. If the width is small as compared to the distance of the peaks then we get $N_{dof} = 2$: in fact the $\Gamma \to 0$ limit is the case of two Dirac-deltas seen above. If the width gets larger, the two Lorentzians start to overlap, and we *continuously* arrive to the case of one broad Lorentzian seen above with $N_{dof} = 1$. The phenomena seen on Fig. 1/b. is nothing else than the Gibbs-paradox, smeared out for real gases.

The energy density can be seen on Fig. 2/b. What we see is that for $m_1 = 1$ and $m_2 = 2$ a particle width $\Gamma = 0.2$ is already very close to the 1-particle case. We therefore see the reduction of degrees of freedom also in the energy density.

Finally we can take a pure threshold with $\varrho(p) = \sqrt{1 - m^2/p^2}$. With $m = 1$ we see the result for the energy density on Fig. 2/b. In order to see something at all, we multiplied the result by 50 – this suggests that thresholds have very tiny contribution to the energy density. This result can be interpreted as the fate of multiple bound states: when they are melted to a broad continuum, then their contribution vanishes from the EoS.

As a conclusion we stress that one has to be cautious in treating effective quasiparticle models, even in the weakly interacting case. Since quasiparticles are composite objects, they do not represent independent degrees of freedom, only in the limit when their mass difference is much larger than their width. As a consequence their contribution to different physical quantities like energy density do not simply add up: we observe nonlinear behavior, when two finite width quasiparticles can melt into a single one, or multiparticle states can give vanishing contribution (cf. Fig. 2). We expect that this nonlinear behavior may play important role also in other physical effects, like charm suppression or transport phenomena in fluids. Our method can also be used to identify other currents and compute transport coefficients from the effective theory. This is the subject of ongoing projects.

The author thanks useful discussions with T.S. Bíró, G. Györgyi, I. Nagy, A. Patkós, Z. Rácz and Zs. Szép. This work is supported by the Hungarian Research Fund (OTKA) under contract No. K68108.

* jakovac@phy.bme.hu

[1] E. Shuryak, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **53**, 273 (2004), hep-ph/0312227
[2] D. Teaney, Phys. Rev. **C68** 034913 (2003), nucl-th/0301099
[3] J. P. Blaizot, E. Iancu and A. Rebhan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2906 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9906340].
[4] F. Karsch, A. Patkos and P. Petreczky, Phys. Lett. B **401**, 69 (1997) [arXiv:hep-ph/9702376].
[5] J. Berges, S. Borsanyi, U. Reinosa and J. Serreau, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 105004 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0409123].
[6] A. Andronic, P. Braun-Munzinger, K. Redlich and J. Stachel, Phys. Lett. B571, 36(2003) nucl-th/0303036
[7] F. Karsch, K. Redlichand and A. Tawfik, Eur. Phys. J. C29, 549(2003) hep-ph/0303108
[8] P. Huovinen and P. Petreczky, Nucl. Phys. A **837**, 26 (2010) [arXiv:0912.2541 [hep-ph]].
[9] S. Borsanyi *et al.*, JHEP **1011**, 077 (2010) [arXiv:1007.2580 [hep-lat]].
[10] P. Castorina, D. E. Miller and H. Satz, arXiv:1101.1255 [hep-ph].
[11] A.E. Allahverdyan, Th.M. Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. E 73, 066119 (2006)
[12] M. Le Bellac, *Thermal Field Theory* (Cambridge Univ. Press 1996)
[13] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory*, (Westview Press, New York, 1995).