

On plasmon contribution to the hot A_0 condensate

O. A. Borisenko *

N.N. Bogolubov Institute for Theoretical Physics, 252143 Kiev, Ukraine

V. V. Skalozub †

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, 49010 Dnipro, Ukraine

Abstract

In $SU(2)$ gluodynamics, the Debye gluon contribution $W_D(A_0)$ to the effective action of the temporal gauge field component, $A_0 = \text{const}$, at high temperature is calculated in the background R_ξ^{ext} gauge. It is shown that at $A_0 \neq 0$ the standard definition $k_0 = 0$, $|\vec{k}| \rightarrow 0$ corresponds to long distance correlations for the longitudinal in internal space gluons. The transversal gluons become screened by the A_0 background field. Therefore they give zero contributions and have to be excluded from the correlation corrections. The total effective action accounting for the one-loop, two-loop and correct $W_D(A_0)$ satisfies Nielsen's identity that proves gauge invariance of the A_0 condensation phenomenon.

1 Introduction

Investigation of QCD high temperature phase - quark-gluon plasma (QGP) - is a paramount problem nowadays. The order parameter of the phase transition here is Polyakov's loop. In the imaginary time formalism it is the integral of the gluon field component A_0 along an imaginary time direction contour. This integral observable is not a solution to gluon field equations. Therefore instead a related parameter, so-called A_0 condensate, $A_0 = \text{const}$, is also discussed. It is a constant part of the temporal gauge field component. In perturbation field theory, the $A_0 \neq 0$ has been determined in loop expansion of an effective potential in two loop order [1]-[2]. Different aspects of the condensation are discussed in the literature. Numerous references can be found, in particular, in review paper [3]. This classical field would be very essential for phenomenology. It is relatively simple to take it into account in actual calculations. It looks as an imaginary chemical potential in finite temperature field theory. Influence of A_0 on various processes has also been discussed (see references in recent papers [4], [5]).

In [6] - [7] the gauge fixing independence (and hence a gauge invariance) of $A_0 \neq 0$ has been called in question. In particular, it was stated that the contributions of the plasmon diagrams to the effective action $W_D(A_0)$, which describe the long-range correlation corrections to the one-loop effective potential $W^{(1)}(A_0)$, cancel the part of the two-loop one, $W^{(2)}(A_0)$, and the $A_0 = 0$ must be detected. However in contrast, in [8], [9], [10] it has been shown that for the sum of the one-loop plus two-loop effective action the result $A_0 \neq 0$ followed. Just for this case Nielsen's identity holds. This fact, in accordance with a general theory (see, for example [3]), means that the A_0 condensation is gauge invariant phenomenon which is realized at two-loop level. The contradiction of these conclusions is obvious.

In the present paper we investigate the role of plasmon diagrams in more details. To realize that, using the $SU(2)$ gluodynamics as an example, we calculate the plasmon contribution in a general relativistic R_ξ^{ext} gauge. We show that at $A_0 \neq 0$ the screening at low momenta of the transversal color field modes takes place. So that, they do not give contributions to the effective potential of correlation corrections. This is in contrast to the calculation procedures applied in the Feynman gauge in [6], [7]. Hence the cause for the discrepancy of the results [6], [7] and [3] becomes clear. We derive the correct expression for the plasmon contributions $W_D^{(3)}(A_0)$ (see (13)) which is gauge fixing independent. Nielsen's identity holds for the total effective action $W^{(tot)}(A_0) = W^{(1)}(A_0) + W_D^{(3)}(A_0) + W^{(2)}(A_0)$. That proves the gauge invariance of the A_0 condensate.

In next section, we present a general theory of investigations and some previous results necessary for what follows. In section 3, we carry out actual calculations. The discussion of the results obtained and the difference between the cases of the $SU(2)$ and $S(3)$ gluodynamics are given in the last section.

*e-mail: Oleg@BITP.Kiev.ua

†e-mail: Skalozubv@daad-alumni.de

2 Consideration at two-loop order

Let us consider $SU(2)$ gluodynamics in the Euclidean space time embeded in the background field $\bar{A}_\mu^a = A_0 \delta_{\mu 0} \delta^{a3} = \text{const}$ described by the Lagrangian

$$L = \frac{1}{4}(G_{\mu\nu}^a)^2 + \frac{1}{2\xi}[(\bar{D}_\mu A_\mu)^a]^2 - \tilde{C} \bar{D}_\mu D_\mu C. \quad (1)$$

The gauge field potential $A_\mu^a = Q_\mu^a + \bar{A}_\mu^a$ is decomposed in quantum and classical parts. The covariant derivative in Eq. (1) is $(\bar{D}_\mu A_\mu)^{ab} = \partial_\mu \delta^{ab} - g\epsilon^{abc} \bar{A}_\mu^c$, $G_{\mu\nu}^a = \bar{D}_\mu Q_\nu^a - \bar{D}_\nu Q_\mu^a - Q_\mu^b Q_\nu^c$, g is a coupling constant, internal index $a = 1, 2, 3$. The Lagrangian of ghost fields \bar{C}, C is determined by the background covariant derivative $\bar{D}_\mu(\bar{A})$ and the total one $D_\mu(\bar{A} + Q)$. As in [2], [8] we introduce the "charged basis" of fields:

$$\begin{aligned} A_\mu^0 &= A_\mu^3, & A_\mu^\pm &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(A_\mu^1 \pm iA_\mu^2), \\ C^0 &= C^3, & C^\pm &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(C_\pm^1 \pm iC_\pm^2). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

In this basis a scalar product is $x^a y^a = x^+ y^- + x^- y^+ + x^0 y^0$, and the structure constants are: $\epsilon^{abc} = 1$ for $a = "+"$, $b = "-"$, $c = "0"$. Feynman rules are the usual ones for the theory at finite temperature with modification: in the background field \bar{A}_μ^a a sum over frequencies $\frac{1}{\beta} \Sigma(k_0 = 2\pi/\beta)$ should be replaced by $\frac{1}{\beta} \Sigma(k_0 = 2\pi/\beta \pm g\bar{A}_0^a)$ in all loops of the fields Q_μ^\pm, C^\pm . This frequency shift must be done not only in propagators but also three particle vertex [6]. The effective action $W(A_0)$ is given as a functional integral over fields with a compact imaginary time direction $0 \leq t \leq 1/T = \beta$:

$$\exp[-W(\bar{A}_0)VT] = N \int DQ DCD\tilde{C} \exp\left[-\int_0^\beta d\tau \int d^3x (L - QJ)\right], \quad (3)$$

where N is T -independent normalization factor, V is a space volume, J is an external source. The effective action up to two-loop order reads:

$$\begin{aligned} W(x) &= W^{(1)}(x) + W^{(2)}(x), \\ \beta^4 W^{(1)}(x) &= \frac{2}{3} \pi^2 [B_4(0) + 2B_4(x/2)]; \\ \beta^4 W^{(2)}(x) &= \frac{1}{2} g^2 [B_2^2(x/2) + 2B_2(x/2)B_2(0)] \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{3} g^2 (1 - \xi) B_3(x/2) B_1(x/2), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where we introduce the dimensionless variable $x = \frac{gA_0}{\pi T}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} B_1(x) &= x - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon(x), \\ B_2(x) &= x^2 - |x| + \frac{1}{6}, \\ B_3(x) &= x^3 - \frac{3}{2} \epsilon(x) x^2 + \frac{1}{2} x, \\ B_4(x) &= x^4 - 2|x|^3 + x^2 - \frac{1}{30}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

are the Bernoulli polynomials, $\epsilon(x) = x/|x|$. For $\xi = 1$ it has been calculated in [6] (for $SU(3)$ theory see [2], [8]).

As we see, $W(x)$ is ξ -dependent. This point served as an origin for doubts in the gauge invariance of the gluon field condensation phenomenon. As we mentioned in Introduction, this problem has been solved within the Nielsen identity method in [8] - [10]. So here we restrict ourselves to considering the plasmon contribution for ξ to be an arbitrary number.

3 Plasmon contribution

To be consistent, first we calculate the plasmon contribution in a way developed in [6], [7] for the value of $\xi = 1$. As it is well known [11], [12], the plasmon contribution to the effective action W_D is to be properly accounted for by summing the ring diagrams with leading infrared singularities, which present in propagator $\sim 1/k^2$. To do that the difference between the infrared limit of the one-loop polarization tensors at finite temperature and the zero temperature ones for all the gluon fields, $\Delta\pi$, should be computed.

Now, let us calculate $W_D(A_0)$. By using the Feynman rules described above and taking into account the explicit form of the gluon propagator in the basis (2),

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\mu\nu}^{ab} &= \frac{\delta_{\mu\nu}\delta^{ab}}{(k^a)^2} - (1-\xi)\frac{k_\mu^a k_\nu^b}{(k^a k^a)^2}, \\ \frac{\delta^{ab}}{(k^a)^2} &= \left[\frac{\delta^{+-}}{(k^+)^2}, \frac{\delta^{-+}}{(k^-)^2}, \frac{\delta^{00}}{(k^0)^2} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $(k^\pm)^2 = (k_0 \pm g\bar{A}_0)^2 + \vec{k}^2$, we obtain:

$$W_D(\bar{A}_0, \xi) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k_0=2\pi nT} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{a,b=(+,-,0)} \frac{(\Pi^{ab}(0))^2 (D^{ba}(k))^2}{1 - (\Pi^{ab}(0))(D^{ba}(k))}, \quad (7)$$

where $\Pi^{ab}(0) = \Delta\pi_{00}^{ab}(\vec{k})|_{\vec{k} \rightarrow 0}$ is the asymptotic form of the one-loop polarization tensor and limit $|\vec{k}| \rightarrow 0$ is to be calculated in a way depending on the definition of "infrared mass shell" at $T \neq 0, A_0 \neq 0$.

Now, we are going to calculate Eq.(7) in three ways. First was proposed in [6],[7]. Let us consider the standard definition of Π^{ab} ,

$$\Pi^{ab} = \Delta\pi_{00}^{ab}(k)|_{k_0=0, |\vec{k}| \rightarrow 0} = -m_D^2, \quad (8)$$

where $m_D^2 = \frac{2}{3}g^2T^2$ is the Debye mass squared [6] and all x-dependent terms were omitted as in [6] - [7]. Substituting expressions (6) and performing integration we get

$$\begin{aligned} W_D^{(1)} &= \frac{g^2}{6\beta^4} \left[-\frac{g}{6\sqrt{\pi}\sigma} + \frac{1}{4\sigma} \lambda^- (1-\sigma)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{4\sigma} \lambda^+ (1+\sigma)^2 + \frac{x}{2} (3-\xi) \right] + f(n \neq 0), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where

$$\sigma = \left(1 + \frac{6(1-\xi)x^2\pi^2}{g^2} \right)^{1/2}; \quad \lambda^\pm = \left(x^2 + \frac{g^2}{3\pi^2} (1 \pm \sigma) \right)^{1/2} \quad (10)$$

and the explicit expression for Π_{00} was used. As usually (see [6],[7]) only the zero mode, $n = 0$, is picked out and the nonstatic mode contributions are denoted as $f(n \neq 0)$. As we see, $W_D^{(1)}$ is ξ -dependent and for $\xi = 1$ it coincides with the results of [6],[7]. In contrast to statements of these papers, one can conclude that the applied procedure results in the gauge variant expression. It is easy to verify using Eqs.(4),(9) that in the sum $W^{(2)} + W_D^{(1)} = W_{tot}^{(1)}$ the linear terms are cancelled, as in the Feynman gauge. So, following the idea of [6],[7], we would conclude that there is no A_0 condensation (in order $\sim g^2$).

However, the ξ -dependence of $W_D^{(1)}$ may call a doubt in reliability of the latter conclusion. From theoretical grounds, it is well known that the plasmon contributions are gauge invariant either in QED or QCD [11], [12]. Next, ξ dependent terms in $W_D^{(1)}$ have the order $\sim g^2$. So, this functional must be taken into account together with (4). But the Nielsen identity holds for the functional (4) alone [8]-[10]. Hence it immediately follows, the properties described by the sum $W_{tot}^{(1)}$ occur to be gauge dependent. In particular, this concerns the result $A_0 = 0$ of [6],[7].

It is not difficult to find the origin of the gauge dependence of $W_D^{(1)}$. It comes out from the definition of the infrared mass shell in the case of $A_0 \neq 0$ used in these papers. Really, as it is well known, the plasmon corrections sum up the singular infrared contributions of the tree-level propagators and have the order g^3 in coupling constant. However, from Eq.(6) it follows that only for the longitudinal modes in the internal space ($a = b = 0$) the standard definition: $k_0 = 0, |\vec{k}| \rightarrow 0$ reproduces the infrared divergency of $D^{00}(k)$. At arbitrary $A_0 \neq 0$ for transversal modes ($a, b = \pm$) this limit is a regular one.

To have a singular infrared contribution a slightly modified definition of infrared mass shell for transversal modes should be introduced: $(k_0 \pm gA_0) = 0, |\vec{k}| \rightarrow 0$. With this definition used the infrared singularity of the $D_{00}^{+-} \sim 1/|\vec{k}|^2$

is reproduced and its gauge invariance is obvious. To incorporate this definition in Eq.(7) it is necessary to calculate the components $\Pi_{00}^{+-}(A_0 \neq 0, k)$ of the one-loop polarization tensor.

Omitting standard one-loop calculations let us write down the final result,

$$\begin{aligned} - \Pi_{00}^{+-}|_{(k_0 \pm gA_0)=0, |\vec{k}| \rightarrow 0} &= 2g^2 T^2 \cdot (B_2(0) + B_2(x/2)) \\ - \Pi_{00}^{00}|_{k_0=0, |\vec{k}| \rightarrow 0} &= 4g^2 T^2 B_2(x/2). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Substituting expressions (11) in Eq.(7) and integrating over momentum space, we obtain

$$W_D^{(2)}(A_0) = -\frac{2g^3 T^4}{3\pi} \left[B_2^{3/2}(x/2) + 2 \left[\frac{1}{2} (B_2(x/2) + B_2(0)) \right]^{3/2} \right]. \quad (12)$$

This nonanalytic term has the order $\sim g^3$ and is gauge invariant, as it should be for plasmon diagram corrections [11].

Now, another question arises: How the condition $(k_0 \pm gA_0) = 0$ could be implemented in the imaginary time formalism? In fact, it is not possible at arbitrary values of A_0 because of the $k_0 = 2\pi T n, n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$. The only way is $gA_0 = 0$ for $n = 0$, $gA_0 = 2\pi T$ for $n = -1$, $gA_0 = -2\pi T$ for $n = +1$. These are the values corresponding to the $Z(2)$ symmetry which takes place for $SU(2)$ gauge fields for unbroken symmetry of the Lagrangian (1) at finite temperature. For these values of A_0 the values of $B_2(x/2) = 1/6$ and the squared bracket in Eq. (12) is the fixed number. This case corresponds to the effective action including the one-loop plus $W_D^{(2)}(A_0)$ which describes the $Z(2)$ phases without symmetry breaking. This is the exact meaning of the second considered definition of the infrared mass shell.

However, to investigate the spontaneous symmetry breaking we have to put A_0 value to be arbitrary and determine it from the minimum condition of the effective action. Since for this case the symmetry is broken, no infrared singularities present for the transversal propagators in Eq.(6). So that we have to drop the contribution of these modes in Eq.(12), which comes from polarization tensor (11). Thus, the correct expression for the plasmon contribution is

$$W_D^{(3)}(A_0) = -\frac{2g^3 T^4}{3\pi} B_2^{3/2}(x/2). \quad (13)$$

It comes from neutral gluon components of the internal space and obviously is gauge invariant. For this case the Nielsen identity holds and the effective action $W_{tot} = W^{(1)}(A_0) + W^{(2)}(A_0) + W_D^{(3)}(A_0)$ has a non-trivial minimum $A_0 \neq 0$. Thus, in accordance with general principles of this approach (see [8], [3]), one has to conclude that the A_0 condensation takes place at two-loop level and is a gauge invariant phenomenon.

4 Discussion

In the present paper we analyzed the role of the plasmon contributions to the effective action of the gluon condensate $A_0 = \text{const}$ at high temperature. Our main result is two-fold. First we have shown explicitly that the conclusion of [6], [7] derived from the effective action $W_{tot}^{(1)}(A_0, \xi = 1)$ (Eqs.(4), (9)) is inconsistent with the Nielsen identity and so occurs to be gauge non-invariant. We have calculated the gauge independent plasmon contribution $W_D^{(2)}$ (12) which takes into consideration the special definition of the infrared mass shell $k_0 \pm gA_0 = 0, |\vec{k}| \rightarrow 0$ for the transversal internal space gluons, which corresponds to the $Z(2)$ unbroken symmetry. This possibility has also been mentioned in [2]. But for broken symmetry at high temperature these modes become massive and should be excluded from the long range corrections. As a result, the only longitudinal in color space gluon modes occur to be long range and contribute to the plasmon effective action. It is gauge fixing independent and satisfies the Nielsen identity. This effective action has a nontrivial minimum that means the gauge invariance of the gluon condensation phenomenon as a whole. In this approach the ξ -dependence of the minimum position simply means that there is a set of special unknown this moment diagrams which contribution cancels the non-invariant terms. The cancelation does not change the minimum value of the effective action as well as other characteristics of particles.

One of applications of the results obtained is the early Universe before the electroweak phase transition. At high temperatures, the $SU(2)_{EW} \times U(1)_Y$ symmetry is restored and the W and Z bosons as well as photons convert into charged and neutral non-Abelian and Abelian gauge fields belonging to the initial gauge groups. For the former fields, all the results obtained are relevant. That means the presence of the $A_0^w \neq 0$ condensate generated in the weak sector of the Standard Model. The details on this phenomenon will be present in other publication. The description of the plasmon contributions was not given in the review [3] or elsewhere else. So, the present paper removes this shortcoming.

To complete we would like to note that considered SU(2) gluodynamics differs a little from the SU(3) case. In the latter one, two background fields A_0^3 and A_0^8 corresponding to the commuting generators $\frac{\lambda^3}{2}$ and $\frac{\lambda^8}{2}$ are expected to be generated. In principle, some combinations of these fields could become massless. It may happen after the diagonalization of the non-diagonal matrix of charged gluon fields appearing from the one-loop polarization tensors entering Eq.(7). This possibility is accepted in [2]. It is realized in case when both of condensed fields are nonzero. However, as it is shown in [8], [9], [10], [3], at two-loop level only the condensate $A_0^3 \neq 0$ is generated. Again, the one- plus two- loop effective action satisfies the Nielsen identity. There are no massless (or unstable) charged modes at high temperature and the situation in SU(3) gluodynamics is similar to the investigated case.

References

- [1] R. Anishetti, Journ. Phys. G - 1984. - Vol. 10. - P. 423.
- [2] K. Enqvist and K. Kajantie, Z. Phys. C - Particles and Fields - 1990.- Vol. 47. - P. 291.
- [3] O. A. Borisenko, Yu. Bohacik and V.V. Skalozub, Fortschritt. Phys. - 1995.- Vol. 43. - P. 301.
- [4] M. Bordag and V. Skalozub, Eur. Phys. J. Plus. - 2019 - Vol. 134. - P. 289 (12 pages).
- [5] V. Skalozub, Ukr. J. Phys. - 2019 - Vol. 64. - No. 8. - P. 754.
- [6] V. M. Belyaev, Phys. Lett. B - 1991. - Vol. 254. - P. 153.
- [7] H. Sawayanagi, Phys. Rev. D - 1992. - Vol. 45. - P. 3823.
- [8] V. V. Skalozub, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A - 1994.- Vol. 9 , No 27. - P. 4747.
- [9] V. V. Skalozub, Phys. Rev. D - 1994. - Vol. 50. - P. 1150.
- [10] V. V. Skalozub and I. V. Chub, Yad. Fiz. - 1994.- Vol. 57. - P. 344.
- [11] O. K. Kalashnikov, Fortschr. Phys. - 1984.- Vol. 88, No. 10, - P. 525.
- [12] M. Le Bellac, M. Thermal field theory, Cambridge Univ. Press (Cambridge 1996).