

# Strong coupling from non-equilibrium Monte Carlo simulations

Olmo Francesconi,<sup>a,b\*</sup> Marco Panero,<sup>c,d†</sup> and David Preti<sup>d‡</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Physics Department, College of Science, Swansea University (Singleton Campus)  
Swansea SA2 8PP, United Kingdom*

<sup>b</sup>*Université Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, LPMMC  
38000 Grenoble, France*

<sup>c</sup>*Department of Physics, University of Turin and <sup>d</sup>INFN, Turin  
Via Pietro Giuria 1, I-10125 Turin, Italy*

## Abstract

We compute the running coupling of non-Abelian gauge theories in the Schrödinger-functional scheme, by means of non-equilibrium Monte Carlo simulations on the lattice.

---

\*o.francesconi.961603@swansea.ac.uk

†marco.panero@unito.it

‡david.preti@to.infn.it

# 1 Introduction

During the past few years there has been significant progress towards the understanding of quantum systems out of equilibrium and of the interplay between quantum and thermodynamics effects. Research combining theoretical tools from statistical mechanics, conformal field theory, the theory of integrable systems, and quantum information has led to a deeper comprehension of the connection between entanglement entropy and thermodynamic entropy in stationary states [1], as well as a clarification of the mechanism determining the time evolution of entanglement in many-body quantum systems out of equilibrium [2].

At the same time, powerful fluctuation theorems were discovered and extensively studied in classical statistical mechanics (see refs. [3] for reviews), that encode analytical relations among quantities characterizing systems driven out of thermodynamic equilibrium. These include the transient fluctuation theorem describing the probability of violations of the second law of thermodynamics in non-equilibrium steady states [4] and the Jarzynski identity, relating the free-energy difference between two equilibrium states of a system to the exponential average of the work done on the system to drive it out of equilibrium [5].

In the present work, we show how the latter theorem can be applied to study the renormalized coupling in non-Abelian, non supersymmetric gauge theory. This quantity is of major relevance in elementary particle theory: in particular, the gauge coupling  $g$  of quantum chromodynamics (QCD) is one of the fundamental parameters in the Standard Model and plays a central rôle in theoretical predictions relevant for the physics probed in high-energy experiments<sup>1</sup> like those at the CERN LHC [8].

Specifically, we study the scale dependence of the gauge coupling in a non-equilibrium generalization of a Monte Carlo calculation in the lattice regularization [9] by defining the theory in a four-dimensional box of finite linear extent  $L$ , with boundary conditions enforcing a non-zero minimal-Euclidean-action configuration, and monitoring the response of the system under a sequence of quantum quenches (in Monte Carlo time) that deform the boundary conditions driving the system out of equilibrium. The formalism rests directly on the definition of the definition of the coupling in the Schrödinger-functional scheme [10, 11], whereby the inverse squared physical coupling at distance  $L$  is defined to be proportional to the quantum effective action of the system with boundary conditions in Euclidean time. Here, we determine the strength of the coupling from the “stiffness” of the theory with respect to changes in the parameters that define the boundary field values, which is computed by means of Jarzynski’s equality. For the sake of simplicity, the calculation is carried out in the pure-gluon sector, for SU(2) and SU(3) gauge groups, and we show that the results obtained are fully compatible with previous calculations in the conventional (equilibrium) setting [12, 13]. We remark that the generalization to include

---

<sup>1</sup>The most striking feature of the physical QCD coupling is its dependence on the momentum scale  $\mu$ : the dimensionless parameter  $\alpha_s = g^2/(4\pi)$  is a *decreasing* function of  $\mu$  [6], so that QCD becomes a free theory at asymptotically high energies, while its behavior at low energies is non-perturbative. Note that the logarithmic running of the strong coupling is such that QCD remains a self-consistent theory for arbitrarily high energies [7]: a behavior remarkably different from other theories, like quantum electrodynamics, which break down at some high, but finite, energy scale.

dynamical matter fields and/or to other non-Abelian gauge groups is straightforward.

## 2 Numerical implementation

Jarzynski's theorem [5] states that when a thermodynamic system, initially in thermal equilibrium at temperature  $T$ , is driven out of equilibrium by a time-dependent variation protocol for the parameters  $\lambda$  (such as couplings, etc.) of its Hamiltonian during a finite time interval  $[t_{\text{in}}, t_{\text{fin}}]$ , the exponential average of the work  $W$  done on the system is equal to the ratio of the partition functions (denoted by  $Z$ ) for *equilibrium* states of the system with parameters  $\lambda(t_{\text{fin}})$  and  $\lambda(t_{\text{in}})$ :

$$\langle \exp(-W/T) \rangle = \frac{Z_{\lambda(t_{\text{fin}})}}{Z_{\lambda(t_{\text{in}})}}. \quad (1)$$

The quantity on the left-hand side of eq. (1) is a statistical average over all possible evolutions of the system, when its parameters are modified according to a protocol  $\lambda(t)$ , which is *fixed* and *arbitrary*.

In our calculations, we regularized the  $SU(N)$  Yang-Mills theory (with  $N = 2$  and  $3$ ) on a hypercubic lattice of spacing  $a$  and linear extent  $L$  in each direction. The degrees of freedom of the theory (matrices  $U$  in the defining representation of the gauge group) are associated with the oriented lattice bonds. Periodic boundary conditions are assumed along the three spatial directions, whereas fixed boundary conditions are imposed at the initial and final Euclidean time, where the fields are set to fixed, spatially uniform, Abelian matrices. The dynamics is governed by the action  $S = -(1/g_0^2) \sum_p w(p) \text{Re Tr } U_p$  [9], where  $g_0$  denotes the bare coupling,  $U_p$  is the path-ordered product of the matrices on the  $a \times a$  square (“plaquette”) labelled by  $p$ .  $w(p) = 1$  in the bulk of the system, while it equals  $1/2$  for spatial plaquettes on the three-dimensional slices at the initial ( $x_0 = 0$ ) and final ( $x_0 = L$ ) Euclidean time, and it equals  $c_t(g_0)$  for plaquettes parallel to the Euclidean-time direction and touching the boundaries. For consistency with previous works we compare our results with, we set the “improvement coefficient”  $c_t(g_0)$  to  $1$  for  $N = 2$  [12], whereas  $c_t(g_0) = 1 - 0.089g_0^2$  for  $N = 3$  [13]. For later convenience, we also define  $\beta = 2N/g_0^2$ .

The reformulation of eq. (1) in the Euclidean quantum-field-theory setting relevant for our Monte Carlo simulations is straightforward, with  $W/T$  replaced by the total Euclidean-action variation  $\Delta S$  during each non-equilibrium trajectory of the field configuration [14]. In our calculations,  $\lambda$  is identified with the angle  $\eta$  that defines the field configurations for spatial link matrices at the boundaries, *viz*  $U = \exp(iaC_{x_0})$  with

$$C_0 = \frac{1}{L} \text{diag}(-\eta, \eta), \quad C_L = \frac{1}{L} \text{diag}(\eta - \pi, \pi - \eta) \quad (2)$$

for  $N = 2$  and

$$\begin{aligned} C_0 &= \frac{1}{L} \text{diag} \left( \eta - \frac{\pi}{3}, \eta \left( \nu - \frac{1}{2} \right), -\eta \left( \nu + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{\pi}{3} \right), \\ C_L &= \frac{1}{L} \text{diag} \left( -\eta - \pi, \eta \left( \nu + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{\pi}{3}, -\eta \left( \nu - \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{2\pi}{3} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

for  $N = 3$  (in the following, we set  $\nu = 0$ ). Classically, this induces a spatially uniform Abelian gauge field configuration with Euclidean action

$$S_{\text{cl}} = \frac{24L^4}{g_0^2 a^4} \sin^2 \left[ \frac{a^2}{2L^2} (\pi - 2\eta) \right], \quad (4)$$

for  $N = 2$ , and

$$S_{\text{cl}} = \frac{12L^4}{g_0^2 a^4} \left\{ \sin^2 \left[ \frac{a^2}{L^2} \left( \eta + \frac{\pi}{3} \right) \right] + 2 \sin^2 \left[ \frac{a^2}{2L^2} \left( \eta + \frac{\pi}{3} \right) \right] \right\}, \quad (5)$$

for  $N = 3$ .

We define the evolution of  $\lambda(t)$  as a sequence of  $n_{\text{qq}}$  quantum quenches in Monte Carlo time, in which  $\eta$  is varied from an initial value  $\eta(t_{\text{in}})$  (equal to  $\pi/4$  for  $N = 2$ , or to 0, for  $N = 3$ ) to a final value  $\eta(t_{\text{fin}}) = \eta(t_{\text{in}}) + \Delta\eta$ ; for simplicity, the amplitude of these quenches is taken to be constant,  $\Delta\eta/n_{\text{qq}}$ . After each quench, the field configuration is changed by a Monte Carlo step (which consists of one heat-bath [15] and three to ten over-relaxation updates [16] on SU(2) subgroups [17] for all  $U$  matrices): this is done *without* allowing the field to thermalize, thus driving the configuration progressively out of equilibrium. We verified that a “reverse” implementation of this non-equilibrium evolution, from  $\eta(t_{\text{fin}})$  to  $\eta(t_{\text{in}})$ , always yield consistent results: in view of the non-symmetric rôles of the initial and final states, this is a non-trivial check of the robustness of our calculation. We compute the  $Z_{\lambda(t_{\text{fin}})}/Z_{\lambda(t_{\text{in}})}$  ratio using eq. (1). Setting  $\Gamma = -\ln Z$ , the physical coupling at the length scale  $L$  is then defined as

$$g^2(L) = - \lim_{\Delta\eta \rightarrow 0} \frac{24\Delta\eta}{\Delta\Gamma} \left( \frac{L}{a} \right)^2 \sin \left[ \frac{\pi}{2} \left( \frac{a}{L} \right)^2 \right], \quad (6)$$

for the SU(2) theory and

$$g^2(L) = \lim_{\Delta\eta \rightarrow 0} \frac{12\Delta\eta}{\Delta\Gamma} \left( \frac{L}{a} \right)^2 \left\{ \sin \left[ \frac{2\pi}{3} \left( \frac{a}{L} \right)^2 \right] + \sin \left[ \frac{\pi}{3} \left( \frac{a}{L} \right)^2 \right] \right\}, \quad (7)$$

in the SU(3) theory.

It is worth remarking that the quality of the numerical estimate of the average on the left-hand side of eq. (1) depends crucially on how far from equilibrium the field configurations are driven during the Monte Carlo trajectories, and on the statistics of trajectories that are sampled. In a nutshell, the exponential average in eq. (1) implies that arbitrarily large deviations from equilibrium would require prohibitively large statistics to probe the tail of the  $\Delta S$  distribution. The present calculation, however, does not require to probe deep out-of-equilibrium dynamics, as the physical coupling is obtained in the limit of small  $\Delta\eta$  (and, consequently, small deviations from equilibrium). The bounds on the number of trajectories required to achieve a given level of precision in experimental or numerical sampling of out-of-equilibrium distributions are mathematically well understood [18] and are always satisfied in our Monte Carlo simulations.

Following the procedure outlined in refs. [12, 13], the evolution of the physical coupling as a function of the momentum scale  $O(1/L)$  is then defined in an iterative way, in terms of the

continuum-extrapolated step-scaling function  $\sigma(s, g^2(L)) = g^2(sL)$ . Note that  $\sigma$  can be thought of as an integrated version of the  $\beta$  function of the theory, as it describes the evolution of the coupling between the length scales  $L$  and  $sL$ . We used  $s = 2$  and  $s = 3/2$ .

## 3 Results and analysis

### 3.1 Results for the SU(2) theory

We first discuss the SU(2) theory. The first step in the analysis of our numerical results consists in studying the distribution of Euclidean-action variations along the non-equilibrium trajectories. As an example, figure shows the results obtained from simulations with  $N = 2$ ,  $L = 5a$  at  $\beta = 4/g_0^2 = 2.7124$ , for different values of  $\Delta\eta$  and  $n_{\text{qq}} = 200$  quenches. We note that the numerical results can be approximately modelled by Gaussian distributions centered at  $-0.156800(39)$  (for  $\Delta\eta = 0.015$ ), at  $-0.104812(26)$  (for  $\Delta\eta = 0.01$ ), at  $-0.052544(13)$  (for  $\Delta\eta = 0.005$ ), at  $-0.021054(5)$  (for  $\Delta\eta = 0.002$ ), and at  $-0.0105310(26)$  (for  $\Delta\eta = 0.001$ ). The width of these distributions decreases to zero with  $\Delta\eta$ , as expected at fixed  $n_{\text{qq}}$ . This is simply a consequence of the fact that, for very small values of  $\Delta\eta/n_{\text{qq}}$ , the field configurations remain close to equilibrium in every trajectory: for  $\Delta\eta/n_{\text{qq}} = 0$ , the simulation would reduce to a conventional equilibrium Monte Carlo. We also note that the distributions of Euclidean-action variations in reverse trajectories, from  $\eta(t_{\text{in}}) = \pi/4 + \Delta\eta$  to  $\eta(t_{\text{fin}}) = \pi/4$ , are approximately symmetric with respect to those observed in direct trajectories.

A summary of a larger sample of our data for the SU(2) gauge theory, for different values of  $\Delta\eta$ , and from direct and reverse implementations of our non-equilibrium Monte Carlo simulations, is reported in table 1. Here, the values of the bare coupling and system size are those in the last series of ref. [12, table 2], and the table shows the effective action difference  $\Delta\Gamma = -\ln[Z_{\eta(t_{\text{fin}})}/Z_{\eta(t_{\text{in}})}]$ . The table reveals clearly that direct and reverse simulations yield compatible results, and that  $\Delta\Gamma$  scales linearly with  $\Delta\eta$ . This makes the evaluation of  $g^2(L)$  from eq. (6) robust and unambiguous. In view of these results, in order to reduce the computational cost of several statistically independent computations at different values of  $\Delta\eta$ , we then proceeded to the calculation of  $g^2(L)$  from the results for  $\Delta\Gamma$  obtained at  $\Delta\eta = 0.0001$ , increasing  $n_{\text{qq}}$  to 1000.

The results of this computation are reported in tables 2 and 3. The bare couplings and system sizes reproduce those that were analyzed in ref. [12] and the results obtained from our non-equilibrium Monte Carlo calculations are fully compatible with those reported in that work. We observe that results obtained from “direct” and “reverse” implementations of our algorithm are consistent with each other: a non-trivial check that our algorithm is correctly sampling the distribution of Euclidean action differences along the non-equilibrium trajectories. Our final results for the squared coupling at different lattice spacings are then obtained from the average of the two.

In figure 2 we show our results for  $g^2(2L)$  at different values of the lattice spacing. The data, displayed by red squares, fall on four nearly horizontal bands, corresponding to four values<sup>2</sup> of

---

<sup>2</sup>These values are obtained from the averages reported in the fifth column of tables 2 and 3 after extrapolation

$$N = 2, L = 5a, \beta = 2.7124, n_{\text{qq}} = 200$$




Figure 1: Distribution of the Euclidean action difference  $\Delta S$  in non-equilibrium simulations of the SU(2) gauge theory in a hypercubic box of linear size  $L = 5a$  at  $\beta = 2.7124$ , with the boundary fields specified in eq. (2). The histograms show the distribution of  $\Delta S$  induced by a “direct” non-equilibrium transformation in which  $\eta$  is varied from  $\eta = \pi/4$  to  $\eta = \pi/4 + \Delta\eta$  through a sequence of  $n_{\text{qq}} = 200$  quenches, for different values of  $\Delta\eta$ . The larger inset shows the same distributions using a logarithmic scale for the vertical axis. In the smaller inset, the results from “reverse” transformations, from  $\eta = \pi/4 + \Delta\eta$  to  $\eta = \pi/4$ .

$\beta$	$L/a$	$\Delta\eta$	$n_{\text{traj}}$	$\Delta\Gamma$	type	$\beta$	$L/a$	$\Delta\eta$	$n_{\text{traj}}$	$\Delta\Gamma$	type				
2.7124	5	0.015	36428	-0.15683(39)	direct	2.9115	8	0.015	22620	-0.15667(7)	direct				
			36448	0.15679(39)	reverse				22627	0.15676(7)	reverse				
		0.01	36433	-0.10482(26)	direct			0.01	22625	-0.10483(5)	direct				
			35209	0.10486(26)	reverse				22626	0.10475(5)	reverse				
		0.005	36479	-0.05255(13)	direct			0.005	22519	-0.052490(24)	direct				
			35885	0.05254(13)	reverse				22634	0.052495(23)	reverse				
		0.002	36116	-0.021055(5)	direct			0.002	22628	-0.021064(10)	direct				
			36325	0.021055(5)	reverse				22628	0.021039(10)	reverse				
		0.001	36394	-0.0105312(26)	direct			0.001	22626	-0.010526(5)	direct				
			36356	0.0105310(26)	reverse				22638	0.010526(5)	reverse				
		2.7938	6	0.015	17534			-0.15734(7)	direct	3.0071	10	0.015	25000	-0.15722(8)	direct
					17479			0.15740(7)	reverse				25000	0.15742(8)	reverse
0.01	17531			-0.10516(4)	direct	0.01	25000	-0.10521(5)	direct						
	17490			0.10520(4)	reverse		25000	0.10530(6)	reverse						
0.005	17555			-0.052709(22)	direct	0.005	25000	-0.052755(28)	direct						
	17488			0.052748(22)	reverse		25000	0.052761(28)	reverse						
0.002	16998			-0.021137(9)	direct	0.002	25000	-0.021132(11)	direct						
	17001			0.021123(9)	reverse		25000	0.021153(11)	reverse						
0.001	17008			-0.010578(4)	direct	0.001	25000	-0.010574(5)	direct						
	16966			0.010569(4)	reverse		25000	0.010569(5)	reverse						
2.8598	7			0.015	13303	-0.15740(8)	direct								
					13312	0.15747(8)	reverse								
		0.01	13302	-0.10534(6)	direct										
			13289	0.10520(6)	reverse										
		0.005	13267	-0.052771(28)	direct										
			13299	0.052833(27)	reverse										
		0.002	13292	-0.021139(11)	direct										
			13285	0.021146(11)	reverse										
		0.001	13297	-0.010574(6)	direct										
			13293	0.010585(6)	reverse										

Table 1: Results for the effective-action variation  $\Delta\Gamma$  in SU(2) gauge theory at five different combinations of  $\beta$  and  $L$  (corresponding to the last series reported in ref. [12, table 2]) and for different values of  $\Delta\eta$ , in direct and in reverse non-equilibrium trajectories. These simulations were run with  $n_{\text{qq}} = 200$ , with the number of trajectories denoted by  $n_{\text{traj}}$ .

$\beta$	type	$L/a$	$n_{\text{traj}}(L)$	$g^2(L)$	$n_{\text{traj}}(2L)$	$g^2(2L)$
3.4564	direct	5	3955408	2.037933(14)	358184	2.43944(11)
	reverse		3956061	2.037935(14)	358304	2.43936(11)
	average			2.037934(10)		2.43940(8)
3.5408	direct	6	1858173	2.032527(23)	169536	2.42440(19)
	reverse		1858013	2.032524(23)	169625	2.42457(19)
	average			2.032526(16)		2.42449(13)
3.6045	direct	7	980672	2.03587(4)	90172	2.42370(30)
	reverse		980802	2.03579(4)	90164	2.42308(29)
	average			2.03583(3)		2.42339(21)
3.6566	direct	8	553830	2.04160(5)	50613	2.4335(5)
	reverse		553712	2.04146(5)	50613	2.4343(5)
	average			2.04153(4)		2.4339(4)
3.7425	direct	10	225668	2.05093(11)	3671	2.4277(21)
	reverse		225744	2.05064(10)	3347	2.4279(21)
	average			2.05079(7)		2.4274(15)
3.1898	direct	5	3954338	2.390473(18)	358200	2.98316(16)
	reverse		3954034	2.390471(18)	358241	2.98290(16)
	average			2.390472(13)		2.98303(11)
3.2751	direct	6	1857890	2.381599(30)	169518	2.95573(27)
	reverse		1857241	2.381580(30)	169508	2.95597(27)
	average			2.381590(22)		2.95585(19)
3.3428	direct	7	980305	2.37987(5)	90119	2.9425(4)
	reverse		980485	2.37988(5)	90135	2.9431(4)
	average			2.37988(3)		2.94281(29)
3.4009	direct	8	553957	2.37832(7)	50588	2.9343(6)
	reverse		553637	2.37824(7)	50588	2.9356(6)
	average			2.37828(5)		2.9350(5)
3.5000	direct	10	223507	2.37030(13)	2843	2.901(3)
	reverse		225641	2.36994(13)	2844	2.903(3)
	average			2.37012(9)		2.9019(22)

Table 2: Results for  $g^2$  from the average of direct and reverse transformations with  $\Delta\eta = 0.0001$  and  $n_{\text{qq}} = 1000$  in SU(2) Yang-Mills theory.



$\beta$	type	$L/a$	$n_{\text{traj}}(L)$	$g^2(L)$	$n_{\text{traj}}(2L)$	$g^2(2L)$
2.9568	direct	5	3952787	2.831998(25)	358004	3.75275(24)
	reverse		3953921	2.831992(25)	358027	3.75288(24)
	average			2.831995(18)		3.75282(17)
3.0379	direct	6	1857290	2.82828(4)	169500	3.7203(4)
	reverse		1857523	2.82824(4)	169509	3.7199(4)
	average			2.82826(3)		3.7201(3)
3.0961	direct	7	980138	2.84678(7)	90110	3.7332(6)
	reverse		980150	2.84693(7)	87625	3.7343(7)
	average			2.84686(5)		3.7337(5)
3.1564	direct	8	553403	2.83855(10)	50545	3.7025(9)
	reverse		553398	2.83851(10)	50530	3.7014(10)
	average			2.83853(7)		3.7019(7)
3.2433	direct	10	225644	2.85329(18)	3672	3.704(4)
	reverse		225598	2.85303(18)	3060	3.704(5)
	average			2.85316(13)		3.704(3)
2.7124	direct	5	3622193	3.56093(4)	376481	5.4102(5)
	reverse		3622242	3.56093(4)	376559	5.4102(5)
	average			3.560933(28)		5.4102(4)
2.7938	direct	6	1701517	3.54971(7)	178344	5.2909(8)
	reverse		1701666	3.54968(7)	178278	5.2910(8)
	average			3.54969(5)		5.2909(6)
2.8598	direct	7	898009	3.54728(10)	90119	5.2233(13)
	reverse		898069	3.54754(10)	90128	5.2216(13)
	average			3.54741(7)		5.2225(9)
2.9115	direct	8	507066	3.56344(15)	50521	5.2190(19)
	reverse		483016	3.56370(16)	50529	5.2191(19)
	average			3.56357(11)		5.2191(14)
3.0071	direct	10	206723	3.54904(29)	3058	5.118(9)
	reverse		196902	3.54877(29)	3383	5.127(9)
	average			3.54890(20)		5.122(6)

Table 3: Table 2, continued.

$g^2(L) = 2.059(11), 2.353(4), 2.871(14)$  and  $3.546(16)$ , i.e. to four values of  $L$ , and are plotted as a function of the lattice spacing. For comparison, the figure also shows the results reported in ref. [12] as black circles. Since leading discretization effects in the lattice formulation of the Schrödinger functional are expected to be of order  $a$ , we fit each of the four data sets to an affine function of the lattice spacing, obtaining the continuum-extrapolated results displayed by the red squares on the vertical axis of the plot: all of them are very close to the two-loop perturbative predictions (blue diamonds).




Figure 2: Squared SU(2) couplings evaluated at  $2L$  (red squares), for four different values of  $g^2(L)$ , as a function of  $a/(2L)$ , and the corresponding continuum-extrapolated values, in comparison with the two-loop predictions (blue diamonds). The plot also shows the results from ref. [12] (black circles).

Continuum extrapolation of the results in tables 2 and 3 reveals that the value of the squared coupling in the Schrödinger-functional scheme evaluated on the largest lattices is  $g^2 = 4.85(4)$ , to the continuum limit by a constant-plus-linear-term fit in  $a/L$ , and are compatible with those reported in ref. [12].

and that the values of  $g^2(2L)$  obtained in the  $a \rightarrow 0$  limit from each of the four data sets are close to the value of  $g^2(L)$  in the next set. As a consequence, the ratio of the corresponding length scales is close to unity, and can be reliably estimated using the perturbative  $\beta$  function truncated at two loops. This procedure allows one to determine the evolution of the coupling from the “hadronic” scale down to the microscopic scale, where perturbation theory becomes reliable, using the step-scaling function defined as

$$\sigma(s, g^2(L)) = g^2(sL) \quad (8)$$

and constructing the  $\beta$  function of the theory in a recursive way. This procedure allows one to follow the evolution of the coupling in the Schrödinger-functional scheme non-perturbatively over a wide range of scales, without having to perform simulations on lattices with a prohibitively large number of sites.

The last step of the analysis consists, then, in the explicit construction of the  $\beta$  function of the theory. To this purpose, we focus on the low-energy regime. We run an additional set of simulations for  $(\beta, L/a)$  combinations yielding a value of  $g^2(L)$  sufficiently close to the one extrapolated from the largest lattices listed in table 3 i.e.  $g^2 = 4.85(4)$ : the results are shown in table 4. From these values, we obtain the  $(\beta, L/a)$  combinations corresponding to  $g^2 = 4.85(4)$  that are listed in table 5. They can be fitted to the functional form  $\beta = 1.866(22) + 0.3928(9) \cdot \ln(L/a)$ , with reduced  $\chi^2 \simeq 0.15$ , as shown in figure 3.

We can then make contact with a physical low-energy scale of the theory, such as the string tension  $\sigma_0$ , i.e. the asymptotic force between fundamental probe charges at large distance,<sup>3</sup> using the data reported in refs. [12, 20–22] in the range  $\beta \in [2.2, 2.85]$ . In particular, using the value  $\sigma_0 a^2 = 0.00830(6)$  at  $\beta = 2.74$  from ref. [21], one obtains that the length at which  $g^2$  equals 4.85 is  $L = 0.843(3)/\sqrt{\sigma_0}$ , or 0.3781(14) fm. Thus, taking the momentum scale to be defined as  $\mu = 1/L$  and using the continuum extrapolations of the results listed in tables 2 and 3, one obtains the results for  $\alpha_s = g^2/(4\pi)$  plotted in figure 4. Also shown are the analytical predictions from perturbation theory at one and two loops [6, 23]:

$$\frac{d\alpha_s}{d(\ln \mu)} = -\frac{11N}{6\pi}\alpha_s^2 - \frac{17N^2}{12\pi^2}\alpha_s^3 + O(\alpha_s^4), \quad (9)$$

which yields

$$\ln \frac{\mu_2}{\mu_1} \simeq f(\alpha_s(\mu_2)) - f(\alpha_s(\mu_1)), \quad \text{with } f(x) = \frac{6\pi}{11Nx} - \frac{51}{121} \ln \left( \frac{17N}{22\pi} + \frac{1}{x} \right). \quad (10)$$

Our numerical results are in very good agreement with those reported in ref. [12], and confirm the accuracy of the two-loop perturbative  $\beta$  function down to  $\mu \sim 1$  GeV. At the three lowest energy scales the two-loop perturbative prediction systematically underestimates the non-perturbative Monte Carlo results. As a curiosity, extrapolating our results to high energies using the two-loop perturbative  $\beta$  function, at the pole mass of the physical  $Z^0$  boson of the Standard Model we obtain  $\alpha_s(m_{Z^0}) = 0.1081(6)$  in the Schrödinger functional scheme for the SU(2) purely gluonic Yang-Mills theory.

---

<sup>3</sup>The phenomenological value of the string tension, extracted from Regge trajectories obtained from experimental

$\beta$	type	$L/a$	$n_{\text{traj}}(L)$	$g^2(L)$
2.68334	direct	8	136484	4.8393(5)
	reverse		136391	4.8388(5)
	average			4.8390(4)
2.72976	direct	9	86648	4.8414(8)
	reverse		86652	4.8417(8)
	average			4.8416(5)
2.77090	direct	10	55718	4.8462(10)
	reverse		55704	4.8452(10)
	average			4.8457(7)
2.80780	direct	11	37328	4.8464(14)
	reverse		37358	4.8515(14)
	average			4.8489(10)
2.84210	direct	12	26313	4.8471(17)
	reverse		26329	4.8464(17)
	average			4.8468(12)

Table 4: Results from the set of simulations on the largest lattice (corresponding to  $g^2 \simeq 4.85(4)$ ) from direct and reverse transformations with  $\Delta\eta = 0.0001$  and  $n_{\text{q}} = 1000$ , and their average, in SU(2) Yang-Mills theory.

$L/a$	$\beta$
8	2.6820(13)
9	2.7287(10)
10	2.7704(5)
11	2.80767(13)
12	2.8417(4)

Table 5: Couplings corresponding to  $g^2 = 4.85$  in the SU(2) theory, as a function of  $L/a$ .




Figure 3: The inverse-squared-bare-coupling parameter  $\beta = 2N/g_0^2$  corresponding to  $g^2 = 4.85$  (red circles), as a function of  $L/a$ , in SU(2) Yang-Mills theory and the corresponding fitted curve  $\beta = 1.866(22) + 0.3928(9) \cdot \ln(L/a)$ , with the associated uncertainty (gray band).

## Running coupling in SU(2) Yang-Mills theory




Figure 4: The running coupling  $\alpha_s = g^2/(4\pi)$  of SU(2) Yang-Mills theory, as a function of the momentum scale  $\mu = 1/L$ . For comparison, the one- (dashed curve) and two-loop (dotted curve) perturbative predictions are also shown.

### 3.2 Results for the SU(3) theory

Our study of the SU(3) theory follows closely the one presented in subsection 3.1 for the  $N = 2$  case. In this case, we compare our results with those reported in ref. [13]. The main difference with respect to the SU(2) case is that the rank of the algebra of group generators is 2 (instead of 1) and the fundamental domain is specified by the two parameters  $\eta$  and  $\nu$  (instead of just  $\eta$ ). We run our non-equilibrium simulations around  $\eta = 0$  (instead of  $\eta = \pi/4$ ), at fixed  $\nu = 0$ . In addition, as mentioned earlier, for the SU(3) theory we set  $c_t$ , the improvement coefficient for plaquettes parallel to the Euclidean-time direction touching the boundaries, to  $1 - 0.089g_0^2$  (instead of 1).

The results reported in tables 6, 7, and 8 are plotted against  $sL/a$  in figure 5, which also shows their extrapolation to the continuum limit, and the comparison with the two-loop perturbative predictions.

As for the analysis of the  $N = 2$  theory, we note that the value of the squared coupling on the largest system that we simulated is  $g^2 = 3.467(15)$ . We therefore run an additional set of simulations that approximately correspond to this value of the squared coupling, for the  $(\beta, L/a)$  combinations listed in table 9. Then, we estimate the actual values of  $\beta$  that would yield  $g^2 = 3.467$  using the two-loop approximation in eq. (10) and the parametrization of the lattice spacing as a function of  $\beta$  reported in ref. [24, eq. (2.6)], which holds in the whole range of  $\beta$  values reported in table 9, and take the difference with respect to the simulated values of  $\beta$  as an estimate of the uncertainty on the results. This leads to the values listed in table 10, which can be fitted to the functional form  $\beta = 4.797(6) + 0.798(4) \cdot \ln(L/a)$ ; both the data points and the fitted curve are plotted in figure 6.

Finally, we can then match our low-energy results with a physical scale of the theory. In this case, we choose Sommer's parameter  $r_0$ , defined as the distance  $r$  at which the force  $F$  between fundamental probe charges satisfies  $r^2 F(r) = 1.65$  [25]. Using the high-precision parametrization of the lattice spacing in units of  $r_0$  that was reported in ref. [24]:

$$\ln \frac{a}{r_0} = -1.6804 - 1.7331 \cdot (\beta - 6) + 0.7849 \cdot (\beta - 6)^2 - 0.4428 \cdot (\beta - 6)^3, \quad \text{for } 5.7 \leq \beta \leq 6.92, \quad (11)$$

we deduce that the value of the lattice spacing at  $\beta = 6.08169$  equals  $a = 0.1625157 \cdot r_0$ , and that, as a consequence,  $L = 5a = 0.8125786 \cdot r_0$ . We can convert this into physical units by taking the estimate for the physical value of  $r_0$  in QCD  $r_0 = 0.468(4)$  fm from ref. [26]<sup>4</sup>, which leads to  $L = 0.3803(33)$  fm and  $q = 1/L = 0.519(4)$  GeV. Proceeding as for the SU(2) theory, we finally obtain the results plotted in figure 7.

As in the  $N = 2$  case, one can see that our numerical results reproduce those obtained from “conventional” (equilibrium) Monte Carlo calculations [13]. Our results are in very good quantitative agreement with the analytical prediction from the two-loop perturbative  $\beta$  function, eq. (10): this holds for all values of  $\mu$ , down to  $\mu \sim 1$  GeV. In this theory, an extrapolation

---

results for mesons [19], is approximately  $(440 \text{ MeV})^2$ .

<sup>4</sup>This value is consistent with other estimates, such as  $r_0 = 0.469(7)$  fm from ref. [27], or  $r_0 = 0.462(11)(4)$  fm from ref. [28].

$\beta$	type	$L/a$	$n_{\text{traj}}(L)$	$g^2(L)$	$sL/a$	$n_{\text{traj}}(sL)$	$g^2(sL)$
8.7522	direct	5	186628	1.24538(4)	10	65614	1.42973(9)
	reverse		186709	1.24532(4)		65612	1.42974(9)
	average			1.245352(26)			1.42974(7)
8.8997	direct	6	86973	1.24744(11)	12	31061	1.43280(16)
	reverse		86955	1.24809(12)		31064	1.43316(16)
	average			1.24777(8)			1.43298(11)
9.035	direct	7	45757	1.24720(21)	14	16127	1.43212(26)
	reverse		45737	1.2516(3)		16127	1.43190(26)
	average			1.24938(20)			1.43201(18)
9.1544	direct	8	26186	1.2475(4)	16	9214	1.4296(4)
	reverse		26195	1.2464(3)		9214	1.4298(4)
	average			1.24692(26)			1.42972(27)
8.1555	direct	5	186736	1.43513(3)	10	65609	1.69371(13)
	reverse		186641	1.43514(3)		65622	1.69371(13)
	average			1.435138(23)			1.69371(9)
8.3124	direct	6	86990	1.43280(5)	12	31051	1.69354(22)
	reverse		87013	1.43284(5)		31063	1.69341(22)
	average			1.43282(4)			1.69348(15)
8.4442	direct	7	45748	1.43285(11)	14	16126	1.6934(4)
	reverse		45756	1.43291(12)		16127	1.6933(3)
	average			1.43288(8)			1.69334(25)
8.5598	direct	8	26178	1.43418(28)	16	9215	1.6925(5)
	reverse		26177	1.43705(36)		9214	1.6932(5)
	average			1.43561(23)			1.6929(4)

Table 6: Results for  $g^2(L)$  and  $g^2(sL)$  from direct and reverse transformations with  $\Delta\eta = 0.0001$  and  $n_{\text{qq}} = 1000$  in SU(3) Yang-Mills theory, and their average.



$\beta$	type	$L/a$	$n_{\text{traj}}(L)$	$g^2(L)$	$sL/a$	$n_{\text{traj}}(sL)$	$g^2(sL)$
7.5687	direct	5	186698	1.69576(4)	10	65614	2.08488(19)
	reverse		186669	1.69575(4)		65610	2.08457(19)
	average			1.69576(3)			2.08473(13)
7.717	direct	6	86884	1.69729(7)	12	31059	2.0899(3)
	reverse		86954	1.69727(7)		31055	2.0897(3)
	average			1.69728(5)			2.08978(23)
7.8521	direct	7	45754	1.69457(11)	14	16128	2.0864(5)
	reverse		45750	1.69471(11)		16128	2.0861(5)
	average			1.69464(8)			2.0862(4)
7.9741	direct	8	26170	1.69156(22)	16	9215	2.0797(8)
	reverse		26179	1.69174(22)		9215	2.0794(8)
	average			1.69165(16)			2.0795(5)
8.165	direct	10	10358	1.6934(4)	20	3456	2.0776(15)
	reverse		10360	1.6944(5)		3456	2.0801(15)
	average			1.6939(3)			2.0788(11)
6.9671	direct	5	186610	2.10173(6)	10	65604	2.7815(3)
	reverse		186666	2.10174(6)		65597	2.7819(3)
	average			2.10174(4)			2.78173(23)
7.1214	direct	6	86898	2.09911(11)	12	31045	2.7779(5)
	reverse		86962	2.09915(11)		31054	2.7784(6)
	average			2.09913(8)			2.7781(4)
7.2549	direct	7	45756	2.09585(17)	14	16128	2.7723(9)
	reverse		45735	2.09610(17)		16128	2.7694(9)
	average			2.09597(12)			2.7708(6)
7.3632	direct	8	26141	2.10007(25)	16	9215	2.7754(13)
	reverse		26176	2.10032(25)		9215	2.7764(13)
	average			2.10020(17)			2.7759(9)
7.5525	direct	10	10355	2.1052(6)	20	3456	2.7654(26)
	reverse		10357	2.1016(5)		3456	2.7726(28)
	average			2.1034(4)			2.7690(19)

Table 7: Table 6, continued.




Figure 5: Squared SU(3) couplings evaluated at  $sL$  (green squares) for five different values of  $g^2(L)$  (from bottom to top:  $g^2(L) = 1.2571(32)$ ,  $1.4252(34)$ ,  $1.6943(47)$ ,  $2.0902(51)$ , and  $2.793(17)$ ) and for  $s = 2$  in all cases except for  $g^2(L) = 2.793(17)$ , for which  $s = 3/2$ . The data are plotted against  $a/(sL)$ . On the vertical axis, the continuum-extrapolated values (green symbols) are compared with the two-loop predictions (blue diamonds). The figure also displays the results from ref. [13] as black circles.




Figure 6: The inverse-squared-bare-coupling parameter  $\beta = 2N/g_0^2$  corresponding to  $g^2 = 3.467$  (green circles), as a function of  $L/a$ , in SU(3) Yang-Mills theory and the corresponding fitted curve  $\beta = 4.797(6) + 0.798(4) \cdot \ln(L/a)$ , with the associated uncertainty (gray band).

## Running coupling in SU(3) Yang-Mills theory




Figure 7: Running coupling  $\alpha_s = g^2/(4\pi)$  in SU(3) Yang-Mills theory, plotted against the momentum scale  $\mu = 1/L$ . The dashed and dotted curves represent the perturbative predictions at one and two loops, respectively.

$\beta$	type	$L/a$	$n_{\text{traj}}(L)$	$g^2(L)$	$sL/a$	$n_{\text{traj}}(sL)$	$g^2(sL)$
6.5512	direct	6	86884	2.76996(18)	9	101295	3.4801(4)
	reverse		86862	2.76947(18)		101282	3.4803(4)
	average			2.76971(13)			3.48020(27)
6.786	direct	8	26176	2.7766(4)	12	31053	3.4812(9)
	reverse		26166	2.7756(4)		31049	3.4808(9)
	average			2.77609(30)			3.4810(6)
6.9748	direct	10	10362	2.7728(8)	15	12096	3.4646(18)
	reverse		10359	2.7719(8)		12096	3.4637(17)
	average			2.7723(6)			3.4641(12)
7.119	direct	12	4894	2.8201(25)	18	5751	3.477(3)
	reverse		4894	2.8238(27)		5753	3.478(3)
	average			2.8219(18)			3.4774(22)

Table 8: Table 7, continued.

of  $\alpha_s$  to the pole mass of the  $Z^0$  boson of the Standard Model yields  $\alpha_s(m_{Z^0}) = 0.07297(19)$ . When converted to the modified minimal-subtraction ( $\overline{\text{MS}}$ ) scheme via the one-loop relation  $\alpha_s^{\overline{\text{MS}}} = \alpha_s + 1.25563(4)\alpha_s^2$  [13], this corresponds to approximately 0.07966(22). For comparison, note that at this scale the value of  $\alpha_s$  in the modified minimal-subtraction scheme recently reported in ref. [29] for QCD with five quark flavors is  $\alpha_s^{\overline{\text{MS}}} = 0.11852(84)$  (for further technical details, see also refs. [30] and the references therein).

Finally, a comparison of the results for  $\alpha_s(m_{Z^0})$  that we obtained in the theories with  $N = 2$  and  $N = 3$  shows that  $N\alpha_s(m_{Z^0})$  is independent of  $N$ , to a sub-percent level of precision. This relation has a natural interpretation in terms of the 't Hooft coupling in the large- $N$  limit of QCD [31] (see also refs. [32]), and it is unsurprising that it holds even for values of  $N$  as small as  $N = 2$  [33].

## 4 Conclusions

In this work, we presented the results of a non-perturbative study of the running coupling of non-Abelian gauge theories, by means of a non-equilibrium Monte Carlo algorithm that implements a numerical realization of Jarzynski's theorem. Specifically, we evaluated the response in effective action induced by a deformation of the boundary conditions at the initial and final Euclidean time, and extracted the running coupling in the Schrödinger-functional scheme [11].

The latter scheme provides a well-defined formulation of the theory in a finite system, with Dirichlet boundary conditions along Euclidean time and periodic (or periodic up to a constant phase, for fermionic fields) boundary conditions along the three spatial directions, and allows one

$\beta$	type	$L/a$	$n_{\text{traj}}(L)$	$g^2(L)$
5.90603	direct	4	136959	3.46816(17)
	reverse		136974	3.46808(17)
	average			3.46812(12)
6.0818	direct	5	53615	3.4661(3)
	reverse		53534	3.4671(3)
	average			3.46664(22)
6.2274	direct	6	24926	3.4661(5)
	reverse		24931	3.4658(5)
	average			3.4659(4)
6.35198	direct	7	13140	3.4658(8)
	reverse		13146	3.4666(8)
	average			3.4662(6)
6.46093	direct	8	7474	3.4662(13)
	reverse		7475	3.4647(12)
	average			3.4655(9)

Table 9: Results of our simulations on the largest lattice (corresponding to  $g^2 \simeq 3.467(15)$ ) from direct and reverse transformations with  $\Delta\eta = 0.0001$  and  $n_{\text{qq}} = 1000$ , and their average, in SU(3) Yang-Mills theory.

$L/a$	$\beta$
4	5.90632(28)
5	6.08169(11)
6	6.22702(38)
7	6.35168(30)
8	6.46035(58)

Table 10: Couplings corresponding to  $g^2 = 3.467$  in the SU(3) theory, as a function of  $L/a$ .

to define the renormalized coupling at a momentum scale defined as the inverse of the linear extent of the system in each direction,  $\mu = 1/L$ . This formulation is amenable to lattice regularization and, through the iterative procedure that we discussed in section 3, it allows one to study the evolution of a renormalized quantity when the momentum scale varies by orders of magnitude, by recursively matching the (continuum-extrapolated) value of the coupling obtained on lattices of the same physical extent, but different lattice spacing. The formalism has been successfully applied to study the renormalized gauge coupling and a number of other physical quantities in QCD [34] and, more recently, has also been used to investigate the dynamics of other strongly coupled non-supersymmetric gauge theories coupled to fermionic fields [35].

The goal of this work consisted in showing that the Schrödinger-functional formalism can be directly implemented in Monte Carlo calculations *out of equilibrium*, using the powerful fluctuation theorems that have been recently developed in statistical mechanics. As discussed in section 2, the central idea is to drive the system out of equilibrium through a sequence of “quantum quenches in Monte Carlo time”: Jarzynski’s theorem [5] implies that the *exponential average* of the Euclidean-action variation induced in this process is directly related to the exponential of the difference in effective action between the initial and the final states of the system.

We emphasize that, while in our computation we evaluate a quantity (the discretized derivative of the effective action with respect to  $\eta$ , the parameter that specifies the Dirichlet boundary conditions of the system at the initial and final Euclidean times) which is directly related, and can be made arbitrarily close, to the one that is evaluated in conventional simulations of the Schrödinger functional, the approach is intrinsically radically different, as our calculation does not rest on the standard formalism of equilibrium equilibrium-Monte Carlo. In particular, our approach closely “mimics” the non-trivial dynamics that is induced in physical statistical systems that are experimentally driven out of equilibrium and the corresponding measurements that can be performed on them. Experimental applications of this type are diverse, and include, for example, irreversible mechanical stretching of ribonucleic acid molecules [36].

We focused on SU(2) and SU(3) Yang-Mills theories, and showed that the results obtained in our non-equilibrium Monte Carlo simulations are fully compatible with those from standard (equilibrium) lattice simulations [12, 13]. While we presented results for purely bosonic theories, the generalization of this calculation to include dynamical fermions poses no additional computational challenge, and could be easily carried out with the same techniques common to lattice QCD, e.g. through (a non-equilibrium version of) the hybrid Monte Carlo algorithm [37].

Finally, we mention some other recent, and very interesting, articles that present applications of non-equilibrium statistical-mechanics theorems in a context relevant for quantum field theory [38–41]; in particular, refs. [38, 41] focus on the calculation of the entanglement entropy from Jarzynski’s equality, whereas refs. [40, 41] discuss the implications of non-equilibrium theorems for quantum field theories. We expect that many more such studies, at the interface between modern statistical mechanics and quantum field theory, will appear in the near future, and that they may lead to new insights into open problems both in condensed matter theory and in elementary particle theory.

## Acknowledgements

The work of O.F. is partially supported by the ANR Project No. ANR-15-IDEX-02. The numerical simulations were run on machines of the Consorzio Interuniversitario per il Calcolo Automatico dell'Italia Nord Orientale (CINECA).

## References

- [1] J. M. D. Deutsch, H. Li and A. Sharma, *Microscopic origin of thermodynamic entropy in isolated systems*, *Phys. Rev.* **E87** (2013) 042135, [1202.2403]. A. M. Kaufman, M. E. Tai, A. Lukin, M. Rispoli, R. Schittko, P. M. Preiss et al., *Quantum thermalization through entanglement in an isolated many-body system*, *Science* **353** (2016) 794, [1603.04409].
- [2] V. Alba and P. Calabrese, *Entanglement dynamics after quantum quenches in generic integrable systems*, *SciPost Phys.* **4** (2018) 017, [1712.07529].
- [3] F. Ritort, *Work fluctuations, transient violations of the second law and free-energy recovery methods: Perspectives in Theory and Experiments*, *Poincaré Seminar* **2** (2003) 195–229, [cond-mat/0401311]. U. Marini Bettolo Marconi, A. Puglisi, L. Rondoni and A. Vulpiani, *Fluctuation dissipation: Response theory in statistical physics*, *Phys. Rept.* **461** (2008) 111–195, [0803.0719]. M. Esposito, U. Harbola and S. Mukamel, *Nonequilibrium fluctuations, fluctuation theorems, and counting statistics in quantum systems*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81** (2009) 1665–1702, [0811.3717].
- [4] D. J. Evans, E. G. D. Cohen and G. P. Morriss, *Probability of second law violations in shearing steady states*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71** (1993) 2401–2404. D. J. Evans and D. J. Searles, *Equilibrium microstates which generate second law violating steady states*, *Phys. Rev.* **E50** (1994) 1645–1648. G. Gallavotti and E. G. D. Cohen, *Dynamical ensembles in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74** (1995) 2694–2697, [chao-dyn/9410007]. G. Gallavotti and E. G. D. Cohen, *Dynamical ensembles in stationary states*, *J. Stat. Phys.* **80** (1995) 931–970, [chao-dyn/9501015].
- [5] C. Jarzynski, *Nonequilibrium Equality for Free Energy Differences*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78** (1997) 2690–2693, [cond-mat/9610209]. C. Jarzynski, *Equilibrium free-energy differences from nonequilibrium measurements: A master-equation approach*, *Phys. Rev.* **E56** (1997) 5018–5035, [cond-mat/9707325].
- [6] D. Gross and F. Wilczek, *Ultraviolet Behavior of Nonabelian Gauge Theories*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **30** (1973) 1343–1346. H. Politzer, *Reliable Perturbative Results for Strong Interactions?*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **30** (1973) 1346–1349.
- [7] N. Brambilla, S. Eidelman, P. Foka, S. Gardner, A. Kronfeld et al., *QCD and Strongly Coupled Gauge Theories: Challenges and Perspectives*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C74** (2014) 2981, [1404.3723].



- [8] WORKING GROUP ON RADIATIVE CORRECTIONS AND MONTE CARLO GENERATORS FOR LOW ENERGIES collaboration, S. Actis et al., *Quest for precision in hadronic cross sections at low energy: Monte Carlo tools vs. experimental data*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C66** (2010) 585–686, [0912.0749]. LHC HIGGS CROSS SECTION WORKING GROUP collaboration, S. Dittmaier et al., *Handbook of LHC Higgs Cross Sections: 1. Inclusive Observables*, 1101.0593. LHC HIGGS CROSS SECTION WORKING GROUP collaboration, J. R. Andersen et al., *Handbook of LHC Higgs Cross Sections: 3. Higgs Properties*, 1307.1347. S. Dawson et al., *Working Group Report: Higgs Boson*, in *Proceedings, 2013 Community Summer Study on the Future of U.S. Particle Physics: Snowmass on the Mississippi (CSS2013): Minneapolis, MN, USA, July 29-August 6, 2013*, 2013, 1310.8361, <http://inspirehep.net/record/1262795/files/arXiv:1310.8361.pdf>. LBNE collaboration, C. Adams et al., *The Long-Baseline Neutrino Experiment: Exploring Fundamental Symmetries of the Universe*, 1307.7335.
- [9] K. G. Wilson, *Confinement of Quarks*, *Phys. Rev.* **D10** (1974) 2445–2459.
- [10] K. Symanzik, *Schrödinger Representation and Casimir Effect in Renormalizable Quantum Field Theory*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B190** (1981) 1.
- [11] M. Lüscher, R. Narayanan, P. Weisz and U. Wolff, *The Schrödinger functional: A Renormalizable probe for non-Abelian gauge theories*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B384** (1992) 168–228, [hep-lat/9207009].
- [12] M. Lüscher, R. Sommer, U. Wolff and P. Weisz, *Computation of the running coupling in the  $SU(2)$  Yang-Mills theory*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B389** (1993) 247–264, [hep-lat/9207010].
- [13] M. Lüscher, R. Sommer, P. Weisz and U. Wolff, *A Precise determination of the running coupling in the  $SU(3)$  Yang-Mills theory*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B413** (1994) 481–502, [hep-lat/9309005].
- [14] M. Caselle, G. Costagliola, A. Nada, M. Panero and A. Toniato, *Jarzynski’s theorem for lattice gauge theory*, *Phys. Rev.* **D94** (2016) 034503, [1604.05544]. M. Caselle, A. Nada and M. Panero, *QCD thermodynamics from lattice calculations with non-equilibrium methods: The  $SU(3)$  equation of state*, *Phys. Rev.* **D98** (2018) 054513, [1801.03110].
- [15] M. Creutz, *Monte Carlo Study of Quantized  $SU(2)$  Gauge Theory*, *Phys. Rev.* **D21** (1980) 2308–2315. A. Kennedy and B. Pendleton, *Improved Heat Bath Method for Monte Carlo Calculations in Lattice Gauge Theories*, *Phys. Lett.* **B156** (1985) 393–399.
- [16] S. L. Adler, *An Overrelaxation Method for the Monte Carlo Evaluation of the Partition Function for Multiquadratic Actions*, *Phys. Rev.* **D23** (1981) 2901. F. R. Brown and T. J. Woch, *Overrelaxed Heat Bath and Metropolis Algorithms for Accelerating Pure Gauge Monte Carlo Calculations*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58** (1987) 2394.
- [17] N. Cabibbo and E. Marinari, *A New Method for Updating  $SU(N)$  Matrices in Computer Simulations of Gauge Theories*, *Phys. Lett.* **B119** (1982) 387–390.

- [18] D. M. Zuckerman and T. B. Woolf, *Theory of a Systematic Computational Error in Free Energy Differences*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89** (2002) 180602, [physics/0201046]. C. Jarzynski, *Rare events and the convergence of exponentially averaged work values*, *Phys. Rev.* **E73** (2006) 046105, [cond-mat/0603185]. A. Pohorille, C. Jarzynski and C. Chipot, *Good Practices in Free-Energy Calculations*, *J. Phys. Chem.* **B114** (2010) 10235–10253. N. Yunger Halpern and C. Jarzynski, *Number of trials required to estimate a free-energy difference, using fluctuation relations*, *Phys. Rev.* **E93** (2016) 052144, [1601.02637]. M. Arrar, F. M. Boubeta, M. E. Szretter, M. Sued, L. Boechi and D. Rodriguez, *On the accurate estimation of free energies using the Jarzynski equality*, *J. Comput. Chem.* **40** (2019) 688–696.
- [19] G. S. Bali, *QCD forces and heavy quark bound states*, *Phys. Rept.* **343** (2001) 1–136, [hep-ph/0001312].
- [20] J. Fingberg, U. M. Heller and F. Karsch, *Scaling and asymptotic scaling in the SU(2) gauge theory*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B392** (1993) 493–517, [hep-lat/9208012].
- [21] G. Bali, K. Schilling and C. Schlichter, *Observing long color flux tubes in SU(2) lattice gauge theory*, *Phys. Rev.* **D51** (1995) 5165–5198, [hep-lat/9409005].
- [22] M. Caselle, A. Nada and M. Panero, *Hagedorn spectrum and thermodynamics of SU(2) and SU(3) Yang-Mills theories*, *JHEP* **07** (2015) 143, [1505.01106]. [Erratum: *JHEP* **11**, 016 (2017)].
- [23] W. E. Caswell, *Asymptotic Behavior of Nonabelian Gauge Theories to Two Loop Order*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **33** (1974) 244. D. R. T. Jones, *Two Loop Diagrams in Yang-Mills Theory*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B75** (1974) 531.
- [24] S. Necco and R. Sommer, *The  $N(f) = 0$  heavy quark potential from short to intermediate distances*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B622** (2002) 328–346, [hep-lat/0108008].
- [25] R. Sommer, *A New way to set the energy scale in lattice gauge theories and its applications to the static force and alpha-s in SU(2) Yang-Mills theory*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B411** (1994) 839–854, [hep-lat/9310022].
- [26] A. Bazavov, T. Bhattacharya, M. Cheng, C. DeTar, H. Ding et al., *The chiral and deconfinement aspects of the QCD transition*, *Phys. Rev.* **D85** (2012) 054503, [1111.1710].
- [27] A. Gray, I. Allison, C. T. H. Davies, E. Dalgic, G. P. Lepage, J. Shigemitsu et al., *The Upsilon spectrum and  $m(b)$  from full lattice QCD*, *Phys. Rev.* **D72** (2005) 094507, [hep-lat/0507013].
- [28] C. Aubin, C. Bernard, C. DeTar, J. Osborn, S. Gottlieb, E. B. Gregory et al., *Light hadrons with improved staggered quarks: Approaching the continuum limit*, *Phys. Rev.* **D70** (2004) 094505, [hep-lat/0402030].

- [29] ALPHA collaboration, M. Bruno, M. Dalla Brida, P. Fritzsche, T. Korzec, A. Ramos, S. Schaefer et al., *QCD Coupling from a Nonperturbative Determination of the Three-Flavor  $\Lambda$  Parameter*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** (2017) 102001, [1706.03821].
- [30] ALPHA collaboration, M. Dalla Brida, P. Fritzsche, T. Korzec, A. Ramos, S. Sint and R. Sommer, *Determination of the QCD  $\Lambda$ -parameter and the accuracy of perturbation theory at high energies*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117** (2016) 182001, [1604.06193]. ALPHA collaboration, M. Dalla Brida, P. Fritzsche, T. Korzec, A. Ramos, S. Sint and R. Sommer, *Slow running of the Gradient Flow coupling from 200 MeV to 4 GeV in  $N_f = 3$  QCD*, *Phys. Rev.* **D95** (2017) 014507, [1607.06423].
- [31] G. 't Hooft, *A Planar Diagram Theory for Strong Interactions*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B72** (1974) 461.
- [32] C. Allton, M. Teper and A. Trivini, *On the running of the bare coupling in  $SU(N)$  lattice gauge theories*, *JHEP* **0807** (2008) 021, [0803.1092]. B. Lucini and G. Moraitis, *The running of the coupling in  $SU(N)$  pure gauge theories*, *Phys. Lett.* **B668** (2008) 226–232, [0805.2913].
- [33] B. Lucini and M. Panero,  *$SU(N)$  gauge theories at large  $N$* , *Phys. Rept.* **526** (2013) 93–163, [1210.4997].
- [34] ALPHA collaboration, S. Sint and P. Weisz, *The Running quark mass in the  $SF$  scheme and its two loop anomalous dimension*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B545** (1999) 529–542, [hep-lat/9808013]. M. Guagnelli, K. Jansen and R. Petronzio, *Nonperturbative running of the average momentum of nonsinglet parton densities*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B542** (1999) 395–409, [hep-lat/9809009]. M. Guagnelli, K. Jansen and R. Petronzio, *Renormalization group invariant average momentum of nonsinglet parton densities*, *Phys. Lett.* **B459** (1999) 594–598, [hep-lat/9903012]. ALPHA collaboration, M. Kurth and R. Sommer, *Renormalization and  $O(a)$  improvement of the static axial current*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B597** (2001) 488–518, [hep-lat/0007002]. ALPHA collaboration, M. Guagnelli, J. Heitger, C. Pena, S. Sint and A. Vladikas, *Non-perturbative renormalization of left-left four-fermion operators in quenched lattice QCD*, *JHEP* **03** (2006) 088, [hep-lat/0505002]. F. Palombi, C. Pena and S. Sint, *A Perturbative study of two four-quark operators in finite volume renormalization schemes*, *JHEP* **03** (2006) 089, [hep-lat/0505003]. ALPHA collaboration, M. Della Morte, R. Hoffmann, F. Knechtli, J. Rolf, R. Sommer, I. Wetzorke et al., *Non-perturbative quark mass renormalization in two-flavor QCD*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B729** (2005) 117–134, [hep-lat/0507035]. CP-PACS, JLQCD collaboration, S. Aoki et al., *Nonperturbative  $O(a)$  improvement of the Wilson quark action with the RG-improved gauge action using the Schrödinger functional method*, *Phys. Rev.* **D73** (2006) 034501, [hep-lat/0508031]. F. Palombi, M. Papinutto, C. Pena and H. Wittig, *Non-perturbative renormalization of static-light four-fermion operators in quenched lattice QCD*, *JHEP* **09** (2007) 062, [0706.4153]. ALPHA collaboration, P. Dimopoulos, G. Herdoíza, F. Palombi, M. Papinutto, C. Pena, A. Vladikas et al., *Non-perturbative renormalisation of  $\Delta F = 2$  four-fermion operators in two-flavour QCD*, *JHEP* **05** (2008) 065, [0712.2429]. C. Pena and D. Preti, *Non-perturbative renormalization of tensor currents: strategy and results for  $N_f = 0$  and  $N_f = 2$  QCD*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C78** (2018) 575, [1706.06674].

- [35] T. Appelquist, G. T. Fleming and E. T. Neil, *Lattice study of the conformal window in QCD-like theories*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** (2008) 171607, [0712.0609]. [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 149902 (2009)]. Y. Shamir, B. Svetitsky and T. DeGrand, *Zero of the discrete beta function in  $SU(3)$  lattice gauge theory with color sextet fermions*, *Phys. Rev.* **D78** (2008) 031502, [0803.1707]. L. Del Debbio, A. Patella and C. Pica, *Higher representations on the lattice: Numerical simulations.  $SU(2)$  with adjoint fermions*, *Phys. Rev.* **D81** (2010) 094503, [0805.2058]. T. Appelquist, G. T. Fleming and E. T. Neil, *Lattice Study of Conformal Behavior in  $SU(3)$  Yang-Mills Theories*, *Phys. Rev.* **D79** (2009) 076010, [0901.3766]. A. J. Hietanen, K. Rummukainen and K. Tuominen, *Evolution of the coupling constant in  $SU(2)$  lattice gauge theory with two adjoint fermions*, *Phys. Rev.* **D80** (2009) 094504, [0904.0864]. T. DeGrand, Y. Shamir and B. Svetitsky, *Running coupling and mass anomalous dimension of  $SU(3)$  gauge theory with two flavors of symmetric-representation fermions*, *Phys. Rev.* **D82** (2010) 054503, [1006.0707]. F. Bursa, L. Del Debbio, L. Keegan, C. Pica and T. Pickup, *Mass anomalous dimension in  $SU(2)$  with two adjoint fermions*, *Phys. Rev.* **D81** (2010) 014505, [0910.4535]. F. Bursa, L. Del Debbio, L. Keegan, C. Pica and T. Pickup, *Mass anomalous dimension in  $SU(2)$  with six fundamental fermions*, *Phys. Lett.* **B696** (2011) 374–379, [1007.3067]. M. Hayakawa, K. I. Ishikawa, Y. Osaki, S. Takeda, S. Uno and N. Yamada, *Running coupling constant of ten-flavor QCD with the Schrödinger functional method*, *Phys. Rev.* **D83** (2011) 074509, [1011.2577]. T. Karavirta, J. Rantaharju, K. Rummukainen and K. Tuominen, *Determining the conformal window:  $SU(2)$  gauge theory with  $N_f = 4, 6$  and 10 fermion flavours*, *JHEP* **05** (2012) 003, [1111.4104]. T. DeGrand, Y. Shamir and B. Svetitsky, *Infrared fixed point in  $SU(2)$  gauge theory with adjoint fermions*, *Phys. Rev.* **D83** (2011) 074507, [1102.2843]. T. DeGrand, Y. Shamir and B. Svetitsky, *Mass anomalous dimension in sextet QCD*, *Phys. Rev.* **D87** (2013) 074507, [1201.0935]. T. DeGrand, Y. Shamir and B. Svetitsky,  *$SU(4)$  lattice gauge theory with decuplet fermions: Schrödinger functional analysis*, *Phys. Rev.* **D85** (2012) 074506, [1202.2675]. T. DeGrand, Y. Shamir and B. Svetitsky, *Near the sill of the conformal window: gauge theories with fermions in two-index representations*, *Phys. Rev.* **D88** (2013) 054505, [1307.2425]. T. Appelquist et al., *Two-Color Gauge Theory with Novel Infrared Behavior*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** (2014) 111601, [1311.4889]. M. Hayakawa, K. I. Ishikawa, S. Takeda and N. Yamada, *Running coupling constant and mass anomalous dimension of six-flavor  $SU(2)$  gauge theory*, *Phys. Rev.* **D88** (2013) 094504, [1307.6997]. Z. Fodor, K. Holland, J. Kuti, S. Mondal, D. Nógrádi and C. H. Wong, *The running coupling of the minimal sextet composite Higgs model*, *JHEP* **09** (2015) 039, [1506.06599]. J. Rantaharju, T. Rantalaiho, K. Rummukainen and K. Tuominen, *Running coupling in  $SU(2)$  gauge theory with two adjoint fermions*, *Phys. Rev.* **D93** (2016) 094509, [1510.03335]. Z. Fodor, K. Holland, J. Kuti, S. Mondal, D. Nógrádi and C. H. Wong, *Fate of the conformal fixed point with twelve massless fermions and  $SU(3)$  gauge group*, *Phys. Rev.* **D94** (2016) 091501, [1607.06121].
- [36] J. Liphardt, S. Dumont, S. B. Smith, I. Tinoco and C. Bustamante, *Equilibrium Information from Nonequilibrium Measurements in an Experimental Test of Jarzynski’s Equality*, *Science* **296** (2002) 1832–1835.

- [37] D. J. E. Callaway and A. Rahman, *The Microcanonical Ensemble: A New Formulation of Lattice Gauge Theory*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49** (1982) 613. D. J. E. Callaway and A. Rahman, *Lattice Gauge Theory in Microcanonical Ensemble*, *Phys. Rev.* **D28** (1983) 1506. J. Polonyi and H. W. Wyld, *Microcanonical Simulation of Fermionic Systems*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51** (1983) 2257. [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 52,401(1984)]. S. Duane and J. B. Kogut, *Hybrid Stochastic Differential Equations Applied to Quantum Chromodynamics*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55** (1985) 2774. S. Duane and J. B. Kogut, *The Theory of Hybrid Stochastic Algorithms*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B275** (1986) 398–420.
- [38] V. Alba, *Measuring the Rényi entropies: An out-of-equilibrium protocol via the Jarzynski equality*, *Phys. Rev.* **E95** (2017) 062132, [1609.02157].
- [39] A. Bartolotta and S. Deffner, *Jarzynski Equality for Driven Quantum Field Theories*, *Phys. Rev. X* **8** (2018) 011033, [1710.00829].
- [40] A. Ortega, E. McKay, Á. M. Alhambra and E. Martín-Martínez, *Work distributions on quantum fields*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** (2019) 240604, [1902.03258].
- [41] J. D’Emidio, *Entanglement entropy from nonequilibrium work*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124** (2020) 110602, [1904.05918].