

Equilibration in an Interacting Field Theory

E. Vaz^a, M. E. Carrington^{b,c}, R. Kobes^{a,c}, and G. Kunstatter^{a,c}.

^a Department of Physics, University of Winnipeg, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3B 2E9 Canada

^b Department of Physics and Astronomy, Brandon University, Brandon, Manitoba, R7A 6A9 Canada

^c Winnipeg Institute for Theoretical Physics, Winnipeg, Manitoba

We use a combination of perturbation theory and numerical techniques to study the equilibration of two interacting fields which are initially at thermal equilibrium at different temperatures. Using standard rules of quantum field theory, we examine the master equations that describe the time evolution of the distribution functions for the two coupled systems. By making a few reasonable assumptions we reduce the resulting coupled integral/differential equations to a pair of differential equations that can be solved numerically. Our results show with good accuracy how these coupled systems approach a common equilibrium temperature.

Non-equilibrium physics is a topic of increasing interest in physics today. Such effects are expected to play an important role in many contexts, such as the formation of the quark gluon plasma [1] and electroweak baryogenesis [2]. Compared to the equilibrium case, the details of non-equilibrium processes are difficult to analyze, and a variety of different approaches have been used: analysis of the equations of motion [3], renormalization group techniques [4], kinetic [5] and transport [6] theory, and thermal field dynamics [7]. In this article we develop a new approach, and apply it to a simple interacting model of two fields initially each in thermal equilibrium but at different temperatures. We find we can reliably track the path towards equilibration of this system using perturbation theory applied to the master equation describing the distribution functions of these fields. The analysis allows us to obtain quantitative information about this non-equilibrium process directly from the microscopic field theoretic description of the physical system. The method can readily be generalized to more complicated, and physically relevant, systems.

The partition function describing the system we are considering is given by,

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\phi_a \mathcal{D}\phi_b \exp\left\{i \int d^4x \left[\frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \phi_a)^2 - m_a^2 \frac{\phi_a^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \phi_b)^2 - m_b^2 \frac{\phi_b^2}{2} - \frac{g}{4} (\phi_a \phi_b)^2 \right] \right\} \quad (1)$$

where a and b are the two field types. We will use the Keldysh representation of the closed time path formulation of finite temperature field theory [8], so that indices $f1;2g$ indicate the top/bottom branch of the time contour.

The Schwinger-Dyson equation for the two-point function for field a has the form [9],

$$[(\partial_x^2 - m_a^2) \delta(x-y)] S_{12}^a(x; y) = \int dz \left[S_{11}^a(x; z) S_{12}^a(z; y) - S_{22}^a(x; z) S_{21}^a(z; y) + S_{11}^a(x; z) S_{22}^a(z; y) \right] \quad (2)$$

and similarly for system b . Writing all functions in terms of an average $X = \frac{1}{2}(x+y)$ and a relative $s = x-y$; $s^0 = x-z$ coordinate, and dropping terms ($s \neq s^0$) and s^0 relative to X , taking the transform $\int ds e^{iks}$ of (2) yields

$$2ik \frac{\partial}{\partial X} S_{12}^a(X; k) = S_{21}^a(X; k) S_{12}^a(X; k) - S_{21}^a(X; k) S_{12}^a(X; k) \quad (3)$$

We now make the ansatz for the propagators,

$$S_{12}^a(X; k) = \frac{i}{!_k^a} \left[(k_0 - !_k^a) n^a(k_0; X) + (k_0 + !_k^a) (1 + n^a(k_0; X)) \right]$$

$$S_{21}^a(X; k) = \frac{i}{!_k^a} \left[(k_0 - !_k^a) (1 + n^a(k_0; X)) + (k_0 + !_k^a) n^a(k_0; X) \right]$$

where $!_a(k) = \sqrt{k^2 + m_a^2}$. Assuming now spatial homogeneity, equating the positive frequency parts in (3) gives

$$\frac{dn_a(!_k^a; t)}{dt} = -n_a(!_k^a; t) d(!_k^a) + [1 + n_a(!_k^a; t)] i(!_k^a) \quad (4)$$

where $n^a(!_k^a; X) = n_k^a$ and

$$i(!_k^a) = \frac{i}{2!_k^a} \frac{d!_k^a}{dX}; \quad d(!_k^a) = \frac{i}{2!_k^a} \frac{d!_k^a}{dX} \quad (5)$$

are, respectively, rates associated with processes which increase/decrease the number of particles present of that species. These rates are complicated functionals of the distribution functions, and so (4) is very difficult to solve in general. However, matters become simpler in the case that each distribution function is, at a given time, close to a thermalequilibrium distribution, as we will now describe.

We assume that the two fields start out in (different) thermalequilibrium states with initial conditions

$$n_x(k_0;0) = \frac{1}{e^{k_0 x} - 1}; \quad x = a;b \quad (6)$$

We further assume that the interactions are described by the two-loop sunset self-energy. For given thermalequilibrium distribution functions, a detailed calculation reveals that:

$$\begin{aligned} n_{21}^a(k_0;k) = & \frac{i}{16^2} \int_0^{Z_1} dp \frac{p^2}{!_p^a} \int_0^{Z_1} dx \\ & [(1 + n(!_p^a))L^b(k_0;k;!_p^a;P) + n(!_p^a)L^b(k_0;k;!_p^a;P)] \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} n_{12}^a(k_0;k) = & \frac{i}{16^2} \int_0^{Z_1} dp \frac{p^2}{!_p^a} \int_0^{Z_1} dx \\ & [n(!_p^a)L^b(!_p^a;P;k_0;k) + (1 + n(!_p^a))L^b(!_p^a;P;k_0;k)] \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $!_x(k) = \frac{P}{k^2 + m_x^2}$ and the function $L^b(K;P)$ is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} L^b(K;P) = & \frac{g^2 [1 + n^b f(k^0 - p^0) g]}{8 \mathfrak{K} \mathfrak{P} j_b} \left((K - P^2) \ln \frac{1 - \exp(-r_b)}{1 - \exp(-r)} \right) \\ & + (K - P^2) 4m_b^2 \ln \frac{\sinh(r_b=2)}{\sinh(r_b=2)}; \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} r = & \frac{1}{2} \mathfrak{K} \mathfrak{P} j_b \frac{q}{1 - 4m_b^2 = (K - P^2) - (k^0 - p^0)}; \\ \mathfrak{K} \mathfrak{P} j = & \frac{P}{k^2 + p^2 - 2kpx}; \quad P^2 = p_0^2 - p^2; \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

It is important to note that for the initial conditions (6), the KMS condition

$$d = e^{!_k^a - !_i^a}; \quad (11)$$

is satisfied if and only if $a = b$; i.e. the combined system is in thermalequilibrium.

We take the following approach to solving (4). We begin with initial conditions (6) which describe the two fields at two different (inverse) temperatures a and b . We assume that the equilibration time for each separate system is very small compared to the time scale of equilibration for the coupled system, so that the distribution function for each system remains close to a thermal one as the systems evolve. Now, near $t = 0$, the distribution functions which appear within the rates in (5) can be replaced by their thermal values, and (4) has the solution

$$n_a(!_k^a;t) = \frac{i}{d - i} + C(!_k^a) \exp(-[d - i]t) \quad (12)$$

with $C(!_k^a)$ determined from the initial condition. Note that if $a = b$, the KMS condition (11) is satisfied, and substituting into (12) we find $C(!_k^a) = 0$, so that $n_a(!_k^a;t) = n_a(!_k^a;0)$; this simply means that the combined system stays at equilibrium, as expected. Thus, for a suitably short time interval $t \ll [d - i]^{-1}$, (12) gives the approximate time evolution of each distribution function. To integrate (4) to finite time intervals, we first let the systems evolve according to (12) for a time t , and the subsystems are assumed to come separately to thermalequilibrium. We then insert the distribution functions resulting from (12) to equilibrium distribution functions of the form:

$$n_x(k_0;k) = \frac{1}{e^{k x} - 1} \frac{1}{k^2 + m_x^2} \quad (13)$$

by adjusting both the parameters characterizing the inverse temperature β_x and a (temperature dependent) mass m_x for each subsystem. The thermal distributions resulting from this best fit procedure are then used as the initial conditions for the next time iteration. This results in a second evolved set of distribution functions which again are fit to themal distributions. This process is continued until (hopefully) the best fit temperatures and masses, and hence the new distribution functions, change little from one time step to the next.

We present some results of this procedure for initial temperatures of 0.7 and 0.75 and initial masses of 0.6 and 0.65 for, respectively, the a and b fields. The resulting evolution, for time steps of 50 units, for the inverse temperature and masses appears Fig. (1) { note that in both cases a common equilibrium is reached.




FIG. 1: Evolution of the inverse temperature (left) and the mass (right). The crossed points represent the a field, and the boxed points represent the b field.

Using these distributions we can follow, for each species, the evolution of the particle number $N(t)$ and energy $E(t)$:

$$N(t) = \int_0^{Z_1} k^2 dk n(k; m)$$

$$E(t) = \frac{1}{N(t)} \int_0^{Z_1} k^2 dk \frac{p}{k^2 + m^2} n(k; m) \quad (14)$$

Again for time steps of 50 units, these results appear in Fig. (2) { to a good approximation the total particle number and the total energy remains constant, although small numerical deviations are observed.




FIG. 2: Evolution of the particle number (left) and the energy (right). The crossed points represent the a field, the boxed points represent the b field, and the triangulated points of the top line represent the sum.

The preceding results were obtained using a basic time step of 50 units. We can check the consistency of the results by following the evolution of the system for different basic time steps and then comparing the results at common times. Results are shown in the following table for the evolution of field a using basic time steps of 50, 100, 200, 400, and 800 units.

Time	50	100	200	400	800		Time	50	100	200	400	800
0	0.700	0.700	0.700	0.700	0.700		550	0.711				
50	0.701						600	0.712	0.712	0.712		
100	0.702	0.702					650	0.712				
150	0.704						700	0.713	0.713			
200	0.705	0.705	0.705				750	0.714				
250	0.706						800	0.714	0.714	0.715	0.715	0.716
300	0.707	0.707					1000	0.716	0.717	0.717		
350	0.708						1200	0.718	0.718	0.719	0.719	
400	0.708	0.709	0.709	0.709			1600	0.721	0.721	0.721	0.722	0.724
450	0.709						2000	0.722	0.722	0.722	0.723	
500	0.710	0.710					2400	0.723	0.723	0.723	0.724	0.725

TABLE I: Comparison of the evolution of the inverse temperature of a for basic time steps of 50, 100, 200, 400, and 800 units.

We see that the results amongst the different time steps agree to a good approximation at the corresponding times. However, as is expected, for larger time steps some disagreement starts to emerge.

In conclusion, we have shown that equilibrium is achieved in the simple model we have considered. Starting from two separate systems at temperatures that are close enough together so that the combined system is never very far from equilibrium, we get to a series of equilibrium distributions using time steps that are small compared with the equilibration time. The result is that the combined system reaches equilibrium at a temperature between the temperatures of the two original systems. In addition, we have shown that both particle number and energy are conserved. It would be interesting to try to relax the assumption that the initial temperatures of the two initial systems are close together. Allowing for a larger difference in initial temperatures would create a more highly non-equilibrium state in the early stages of the evolution. Such a situation might be handled by using a more complex ansatz for the distribution functions of the evolving system.

-
- [1] See, for example, D. Teaney and E. V. Shuryak, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 4951 (1999).
[2] V. A. Rubakov and M. E. Shaposhnikov, Usp. Fiz. Nauk 166, 493 (1996) [hep-ph/9603208].
[3] D. Boyanovsky and H. J. de Vega, to appear in the Proceedings of the V IIth. Erice Chabonge School on Astrophysical Physics, N. Sanchez ed., Kluwer, Series C, 2000 (astro-ph/0006446).
[4] S.-Y. Wang, D. Boyanovsky, H. J. de Vega, and D.-S. Lee, Phys. Rev. D 62, 105026 (2000).
[5] C. D. Roberts and S. M. Schmidt, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 45S1, 1 (2000).
[6] Yu. B. Ivanov, J. Kroll, H. Van Hees, and D. N. Voskresensky, "Kadanoff-Baym Equations - Progress and Perspectives for Many-Body Physics", ed. M. Bonitz, World Scientific (2000).
[7] A. Arimitsu, "Thermal field theories and their applications", edited by Y. X. Gui, F. C. Khanna, and Z. B. Su (World Scientific, 1996).
[8] L. V. Keldysh, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 47, 1515 (1964); K.-C. Chou, Z.-B. Su, B.-L. Hao, and L. Yu, Phys. Rep. 118, 1 (1985); N. P. Landsman and Ch. G. van Woeert, Phys. Rep. 145, 141 (1987).
[9] P. Arnold, D. T. Son, and L. G. Yafe, Phys. Rev. D 59, 065013 (1999).