arXiv:hep-lat/0409009v1 1 Sep 2004

SINGLET FREE ENERGIES OF A STATIC QUARK-ANTIQUARK PAIR

KONSTANTIN PETROV
Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11973

We study the singlet part of the free energy of a static quark anti-quark ($Q\bar{Q}$) pair at finite temperature in three flavor QCD with degenerate quark masses using $N_\tau = 4$ and 6 lattices with Asqtad staggered fermion action. We look at thermodynamics of the system around phase transition and study its scaling with lattice spacing and quark masses.

1. Simulations and Results

Static free energy of a quark-antiquark pair is a frequently used tool to study non-perturbatively the in-medium modification of inter-quark forces. It is calculated as the difference in the free energy of the system with static quarks and the same system without them, while the temperature remains constant. Due to colour symmetry such quantity contains the singlet and the octet contributions, and the usual definition of the free energy is thus referred to as the colour-averaged. This quantity has been extensively in $SU(2)$ and $SU(3)$ gauge theories e.g. [3] and full QCD [8]. However, singlet and octet channels were considered in detail only in pure gauge theory [2, 5, 6]. In the case of full QCD the first results for singlet and octet free energy for two flavor QCD have appeared only very recently [9]. Here we present our results for 3 flavor QCD using the so-called Asqtad staggered fermion action [10] with two different lattice spacings (corresponding to $N_t = 4$ and 6) at three different quark masses.

Our analysis is to a large extent based on the gauge configurations generated by the MILC collaboration using the Asqtad action. Therefore we adopt their strategy for fixing the parameters which is described in Ref. 11. We use the most recent value of r_1 extrapolated to continuum and to the physical value of the light quark masses $r_1 = 0.317$ fm to convert the lattice units to temperature.

The free energy of a static quark anti-quark pair contains a lattice spac-

ing dependent divergent piece, and thus needs to be renormalized. Following Ref. 5 we do so by normalizing it to the zero temperature potential at short distances where the temperature dependence of the free energy can be neglected. The static quark potential has been studied by the MILC collaboration at three different lattice spacings and various quark masses [11]. We use the following form of the zero temperature potential, which reproduces MILC data well in the whole range of masses and lattice spacings

$$r_1 V(x) = -\frac{0.44}{x} + 0.56 \cdot x + \frac{0.0125}{x^2},\ x = r/r_1 \tag{1}$$

In Fig. 1 we show that both the potential and effective coupling constant $\alpha_s(r)$ defined as $\alpha_s(r) = 3/4r^2 dV(r)/dr$ are reproduced well. Results pre-




Figure 1. Zero-temperature static potential (left) and the running coupling (right) [data points from MILC collaboration]

sented here come from MILC lattices as well as our simulation for quark masses $m_{light} = 0.2m_s, 0.4m_s, 0.6m_s$ on lattices $12^3 \times 4, 8^3 \times 4$ and $12^3 \times 6$. The temperature range was $135 - 412$ MeV for the first two lattice sizes and $145 - 310$ MeV for the last one.

Following Ref. 14 the free energy of static quark-antiquark ($Q\bar{Q}$) pair in the color singlet channels is defined as

$$\exp(-F_1(r,T)/T + C) = \frac{1}{3} Tr \langle W(\vec{r}) W^\dagger(0) \rangle \tag{2}$$

Here $W(\vec{x}) = \prod_{\tau=0}^{N_\tau - 1} U_0(\tau, \vec{x})$ is the temporal Wilson line, $L(\vec{x}) = TrW(\vec{x})$ is known as the Polyakov loop. As $W(\vec{x})$ is not gauge invariant one needs to fix a gauge. Here we will use the Coulomb gauge as advocated in [4]. This approach is exactly valid at zero temperature and is numerically true at finite temperature. One can also consider the color averaged free energy defined as

$$\exp(-F_{av}(r,T)/T + C) = \frac{1}{9} \langle L(\vec{r}) L^\dagger(0) \rangle \tag{3}$$

We start the discussion of our numerical results with the case of the quark of mass $0.4m_s$ on the $12^3 \times 4$ lattice. The corresponding numerical results for the singlet free energy are shown in Fig.2. The free energy approaches a finite value $F^i_\infty(T) = \lim_{r\to\infty} F_i(r,T), \quad i = 1, av$ at large distances which is usually interpreted as string breaking at low temperature and screening at high ones. Note that the distance where the free energy effectively flattens is temperature dependent, it becomes smaller at higher temperatures. At small distances the singlet free energy is temperature independent and coincides with the zero temperature potential, as at small distances medium effects are not important. The numerical results for other values of the quark masses are similar. The scaling with the lattice spacing is remarkably good.




Figure 2. Singlet free energies and the effective screening radius

To characterize the range of interaction in the medium it is convenient to introduce the effective screening radius r_{scr} defined as: $F_1(r = r_{scr}, T) = 0.9F^1_\infty(T)$. Here $F^1_\infty(T)$ is the asymptotic value of the singlet free energy at infinite separation. In Fig.2. we show the values of r_{scr} for three different quark masses and $12^3 \times 4$ lattices. Certainly as $F_1(r,T)$ has statistical errors it is difficult to determine at exactly which distance r the equation $F_1(r = r_{scr}, T) = 0.9F^1_\infty(T)$ holds. We have tried to estimate this uncertainty in the values of r_{scr} and show them in Fig.2 as errors bars. At small temperatures the value of the screening radius is about $0.9fm$ and is temperature independent. As we increase the temperature r_{scr} decreases reaching the value of $0.5fm$ at the highest temperature. Note that the temperature dependence of r_{scr} is roughly the same for all quark masses. On Fig.3 (left) we plot the asymptotic value of the free energies; the quark mass dependence likely vanishes at small temperatures ($T < 150MeV$) and definitely negligible at high temperatures ($T > 250MeV$). It is however




Figure 3. Infinite separation free energies for various quark masses (left) and internal energy at 0.4ms

significant in the transition region.

In the limit of very small temperatures we expect $F_\infty(T)$ to be temperature independent and related to twice the binding energy of a heavy-light ($D-$ or $B-$) meson

$$2E_{bin} = 2M_{D,B} - 2m_{c,b}. \tag{4}$$

Based on this observation in Ref. 15 it has been argued that the decrease of $F_\infty(T)$ with the temperature close to T_c implies the decrease of the $M_{D,B}$ leading to quarkonium suppression. However, $F_\infty(T)$ also contains an entropy contribution due to the presence of a static $Q\bar{Q}$ pair:

$$S_\infty(T) = -\frac{\partial F_\infty(T)}{\partial T}. \tag{5}$$

Then we can calculate the energy induced by a static quark-anti-quark pair

$$U_\infty = F_\infty + TS_\infty \tag{6}$$

Numerically the derivative with respect to the temperature in Eq. (5) was estimated using forward differences.

On the right side of Fig.3 we show the energy U_∞ as function of temperature. Both the entropy and the energy show a strong increase near T_c. This large increase in entropy and energy is probably due to many-body effects and makes the interpretation of U_∞ as the binding energy of heavy-light meson not very plausible.

2. Conclusions

The free energy gets screened beyond some distance for all temperatures as expected. For small temperature this distance, the effective screening radius, does not depend on the temperature and is about $0.9fm$. As the

temperature increases the effective screening radius decreases. Light quark mass dependence of the screening radius is negligible within our statistical accuracy. We have also identified the entropy contribution to the free energy as well as the internal energy at large distances and found that they show strong increase at T_c. We have found substantial quark mass dependence of the free energy in the vicinity of the transition.

Acknowledgment

This work has been supported by the US Department of Energy under the contract DE-AC02-98CH10886 and by the SciDAC project. It was largely based on the gauge configurations from MILC collaboration; I personally would like to thank Robert Sugar, Doug Toissant, Carleton de Tar and Urs Heller for their help.

References

1. P. Petreczky and K. Petrov, arXiv:hep-lat/0405009. Please refer to it for the full list of references.
2. N. Attig et al., Phys. Lett. B209, 65 (1988)
3. O. Kaczmarek, F. Karsch, E. Laermann, M. Lütgemeier, Phys. Rev. D62, 034021, (2000)
4. O. Philipsen, Phys. Lett. B535, 138 (2002)
5. O. Kaczmarek, F. Karsch, P. Petreczky and F. Zantow, Phys. Lett. B543, 41 (2002)
6. S. Digal, S. Fortunato and P. Petreczky, Phys. Rev. D68, 034008 (2003)
7. O. Kaczmarek, F. Karsch, P. Petreczky and F. Zantow, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 129-130, 745 (2004), hep-lat/0309121
8. F. Karsch, E. Laermann and A. Peikert, Nucl. Phys. B605, 579 (2001)
9. O. Kaczmarek et al., hep-lat/0312015
10. T. Blum et al, Phys. Rev. D55, 1133 (1997); J. F. Lagae and D.K. Sinclair, Phys. Rev. D59, 014511 (1999); K. Orginos, D. Toussaint and R.L. Sugar, Phys. Rev. D60, 054503 (1999)
11. C. Bernard *et al.* [MILC Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 129-130, 626 (2004), hep-lat/0309118
12. C. Bernard *et al.* [MILC Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **119**, 523 (2003), hep-lat/0209079
13. C. Bernard *et al.* [MILC Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. **A702**, 140 (2002)
14. L.D. McLerran and B. Svetitsky, Phys. Rev. D24, 450 (1981)
15. S. Digal, P. Petreczky and H.Satz, Phys. Lett. B514, 57 (2001)