arXiv:hep-lat/0409038v1 10 Sep 2004

Non-compact QED$_3$ coupled to a four-fermi interaction

J.B. Kogut [a], C.G. Strouthos [b] and I.N. Tziligakis [a]

[a]Physics Department, University of Illinois, 1110 West Green Street, Urbana, IL 61801-3080, USA.

[b]Division of Science and Engineering, Frederick Institute of Technology, Nicosia 1303, Cyprus.

We present preliminary numerical results for the three dimensional non-compact QED (QED$_3$) with a weak four-fermion term in the lattice action. Approaches based on Schwinger-Dyson studies, arguments based on thermodynamic inequalities and numerical simulations lead to estimates of the critical number of fermion flavors (below which chiral symmetry is broken) ranging from $N_{fc} = 1$ to $N_{fc} = 4$. The weak four-fermion coupling provides the framework for an improved algorithm, which allows us to simulate the chiral limit of massless fermions and expose delicate effects.

Three dimensional QED is an interesting and challenging field theory which serves as a laboratory to study dynamical mass generation. It is confining and it is believed to exhibit chiral symmetry breaking when the number of fermion flavors N_f is smaller than a critical value N_{fc}. The model is super-renormalizable, because the gauge coupling has dimension $\frac{1}{2}$ and so provides an intrinsic scale of the theory. Interest in this theory has recently been revived by suggestions that QED$_3$ may be an effective theory for the underdoped and non-superconducting region of the phase diagram of high-T_c superconducting cuprate compounds [1]. Preliminary numerical results of QED$_3$ with Fermi and gap anisotropies were presented at this conference [2].

The principal analytical approach to study dynamical symmetry breaking in QED$_3$ is the self-consistent solution of truncated Schwinger-Dyson equations for the fermion propagator. Most recent attempts yielded $N_{fc} \simeq 4$ [3]. An argument based on a thermodynamic inequality yields the prediction $N_{fc} \leq \frac{3}{2}$ [4]. Recent attempts to decide the issue by numerical simulations placed an upper bound on the dimensionless condensate $\beta^2\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle$ of $O(10^{-4})$ for $N_f = 2$ [5]. It was also shown that for $N_f = 1$ the $\beta^2\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle$ is of $O(10^{-3})$ but it appeared difficult to determine whether $N_f = 4$ lies above or below N_{fc} [6].

Our purpose is to develop firmer control over the computer simulation studies of chiral symmetry breaking by studying the theory with massless fermions. Dealing with almost massless fermions, as must be done in the search of continuum and chiral limits of lattice models is very difficult with the standard algorithms. However, it has been shown that when one introduces in (3+1)d QED a four-fermion interaction in a semi-bosonized fashion the performance of the algorithm improves dramatically [7]. The auxiliary field $\sigma(x)$ acts as a site dependent dynamical mass term in the fermion propagator. In the broken phase, the Dirac operator is now non-singular for fermions with zero bare mass and its inversion is accurate and very fast.

We have chosen to add to the QED$_3$ lagrangian a discrete Z_2 chiral invariant four-fermion term, which is preferable over four-fermion terms with continuous chiral symmetry because the latter are not as efficiently simulated due to massless modes in the strongly cut-off theory. The lattice action using staggered lattice fermion fields $\chi, \bar{\chi}$ is given by the formulas below:

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{\beta}{2}\sum_{x,\mu<\nu} F_{\mu\nu}(x)F^{\mu\nu}(x) \\ &+ \sum_{x,x'} \bar{\chi}(x)Q(x,x')\chi(x') + \frac{N_f\beta_s}{4}\sum_{\tilde{x}} \sigma^2(\tilde{x}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F_{\mu\nu}(x) \equiv \alpha_\mu(x) + \alpha_\nu(x+\hat{\mu}) - \alpha_\mu(x+\hat{\nu}) - \alpha_\nu(x),$$



Figure 1. Order parameter for $N_f = 4$ versus β_s at fixed $\beta = 0.2$. The lattice size is 12^3.



Figure 2. Dimensionless condensate for $N_f = 4$ versus β_s at fixed $\beta = 0.2$.

$$Q(x,x') \equiv \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\mu}\eta_\mu(x)[\delta_{x',x+\hat{\mu}}U_{x\mu} - \delta_{x',x-\hat{\mu}}U^\dagger_{x-\hat{\mu},\mu}] + \delta_{xx'}\frac{1}{8}\sum_{\langle\tilde{x},x\rangle}\sigma(\tilde{x}).$$

The indices $x,\ x'$ consist of three integers $(x_1,\ x_2,\ x_3)$ labelling the lattice sites, where the third direction is now considered to be timelike. The symbol $\langle\tilde{x},x\rangle$ denotes the set of the 8 dual lattice sites $\tilde{x}$ surrounding the direct lattice site x. Since the gauge action F^2 is unbounded from above, this action defines the *non-compact* formulation of lattice QED. The $\eta_\mu(x)$ are the Kawamoto-Smit staggered fermion phases $(-1)^{x_1+\cdots+x_{\mu-1}}$, designed to ensure relativistic covariance of the Dirac equation in the continuum limit. Antiperiodic boundary conditions are used in the timelike direction and periodic boundary conditions in the spatial directions for the fermion fields. The phase factors in the fermion bilinear are defined by $U_{x\mu} \equiv \exp(i\alpha_{x\mu})$, where $\alpha_{x\mu}$ is the gauge potential. In terms of continuum quantities, $\alpha_{x\mu} = agA_\mu(x)$, $\beta \equiv \frac{1}{g^2 a}$, $\beta_s \equiv \frac{a}{g_s^2}$ where a is the physical lattice spacing, g_s^2 is the four-fermion coupling and g^2 is the gauge coupling. The numerical results presented here were obtained by simulating the QED_3 action using a standard Hybrid Molecular Dynamics algorithm.

The vacuum expectation value of the auxiliary field σ is the chiral order parameter. In the strong gauge coupling limit $\beta \to 0$, it is known rigorously that chiral symmetry is broken [8]. Therefore, as β increases, for $N_f > N_{fc}$ there must be a chiral symmetry restoring phase transition for some finite β_c. A mean field form fitting the data would indicate that our data are compatible with the hypothesis that the continuum limit of the theory at the critical point describes a free field. Finding evidence for an interacting continuum model would be very puzzling indeed. For $N_f < N_{fc}$, since we believe the order parameter is exponentially small in the continuum limit, the relic of the transition may persist as a crossover between weak and strong coupling behavior with a tail in $\bar{\psi}\psi$ extending to weak gauge coupling.

First, we performed simulations with $N_f = 4$. In Fig. 1 we plot $\langle|\sigma|\rangle$ versus β_s at fixed $\beta = 0.2$. The simulations were performed on 12^3 lattices. We should note that in the zero gauge coupling limit the $N_f = 4$ three-dimensional four-fermion model undergoes a phase transition at $\beta_s = 0.86(1)$ [9]. In the weak four-fermi coupling limit all the dynamics are expected to reside in the gauge and fermion fields and the extra four-fermion term just provides the framework for an improved algorithm. This becomes clearer in Fig. 2 where we see that the dimensionless condensate $\beta^2\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle$ at $\beta = 0.2$ in the weak four-fermion coupling limit saturates to a nonzero value ≈ 0.0055. This result is consistent with results reported in [6] which were obtained using standard chiral extrapolations. In Fig. 3 we show data generated on 24^3 and 32^3 lattices for $\langle\sigma\rangle$ versus β at fixed $\beta_s = 4.0$. The difference between the 24^3 and the 32^3 data is small, implying that the 32^3 data are close to the thermodynamic limit. The 32^3 data can be fit to the standard scaling relation $\langle\sigma\rangle = \text{const.}(\beta_c - \beta)^{\beta_{\rm mag}}$. For $0.12 \le \beta \le 0.16$ we get



Figure 3. Order parameter for $N_f = 4$ versus β at fixed $\beta_s = 4.0$.



Figure 4. Order parameter for $N_f = 8$ versus β at fixed $\beta_s = 2.0$.

$\beta_{\rm mag} = 0.46(3)$ which is consistent with mean field theory. For $0.15 \leq \beta \leq 0.18$ we get $\beta_{\rm mag} = 0.92(11)$ and $\beta_c = 0.211(6)$. If this value of $\beta_{\rm mag}$ persists for couplings arbitrarily close to β_c it will become clear that the theory has an interacting fixed point. A detailed finite size scaling analysis is required to clarify this issue. However, we should note that this value of $\beta_{\rm mag}$ is close to its value ($\beta_{\rm mag} = 1.1(1)$ at the UV fixed point of the $(2+1)d$ four-fermion model [9]. Although $\beta_s = 4.0$ is deep in the symmetric phase of the "pure" four-fermion model, we still have to study in detail the interplay of the QED_3 and the four-fermion fixed points before we reach a conclusion. The fact that QED_3 is super-renormalizable may imply that the four-fermion fixed point has a much larger domain of attraction than the QED_3 fixed point. Therefore, we may need to perform simulations with smaller β_s before we are certain that the simulations lie in the vicinity of attraction of the QED_3 fixed point.

We also performed simulations with $N_f = 8$. With fixed $\beta_s = 2.0$ we have the following results from 24^3 lattices: For $\beta = 0.11, 0.13, 0.15$ we get $\beta_{\rm mag} = 0.49(4)$ which is consistent with mean field theory. However, for $\beta = 0.17, ..., 0.24$ we get $\beta_{\rm mag} = 1.15(8)$ and $\beta_c = 0.272(5)$. This value of $\beta_{\rm mag}$ is close to its value in the $(2+1)d$ four-fermion model. We are currently performing simulations with $\beta_s = 4.0$. Although our results are very preliminary, the data provide some evidence that mean field theory scaling is valid in a region where the values of $\langle\sigma\rangle$ are smaller than in the mean field theory region of the $\beta_s = 2.0$ case. In the mean field region $\langle\sigma\rangle$ is equal to the fermion mass. It will be interesting to check whether this scenario persists at values of β arbitrarilly close to the transition or whether a crossover to a non-trivial scaling region occurs at smaller values of $\langle\sigma\rangle$.

REFERENCES

1. M. Franz, Z. Tesanovic and O. Vafek, Phys. Rev. B66 (2002) 054535; I.F. Herburt, Phys. Rev. B66 (2002) 094504.
2. I.O. Thomas and S. Hands, arXiv:hep-lat/0407029.
3. T. Appelquist, D. Nash and L.C.R. Wijewardhana, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60 (1988) 2575; M.R. Pennington and S.R. Webb, Brookhaven preprint BNL-40886; M.R. Pennington and D. Walsh, Phys. Lett. B253 (1991) 246; P. Maris, Phys. Rev. D54 (1996) 4049; C.S. Fischer, R. Alkofer, T. Dahm and P. Maris, arXiv:hep-ph/0407104.
4. T.W. Appelquist, A.G. Cohen and M. Schmaltz, Phys. Rev. D60 (1999) 045003.
5. J.B. Kogut, S.J. Hands and C.G. Strouthos, Nucl. Phys. B645 (2002) 321.
6. J.B. Kogut, S.J. Hands, L. Scorzato and C.G. Strouthos arXiv:hep-lat/0404013.
7. S. Kim, J.B. Kogut and M-P. Lombardo, Phys. Rev. D65 (2002) 054015; J.B. Kogut and C.G. Strouthos, Phys. Rev. D67 (2003) 034504.
8. M. Salmhofer and E. Seiler, Commun. Math. Phys. 139 (1991) 395.
9. S.J. Hands, J.B. Kogut and C.G. Strouthos, Phys. Lett B515 (2001) 407.