

Role of axial $U(1)$ anomaly in chiral susceptibility of QCD at high temperature

S. Aoki,¹ Y. Aoki,² H. Fukaya,³ S. Hashimoto,^{4,5} C. Rohrhofer,³ and K. Suzuki⁶

(JLQCD collaboration)

¹ *Center for Gravitational Physics, Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan*

² *RIKEN Center for Computational Science, 7-1-26 Minatojima-minami-machi, Chuo-ku, Kobe, Hyogo 650-0047, Japan*

³ *Department of Physics, Osaka University, Toyonaka 560-0043, Japan*

⁴ *High Energy Accelerator Research Organization (KEK), Tsukuba 305-0801, Japan*

⁵ *School of High Energy Accelerator Science, The Graduate University for Advanced Studies (Sokendai), Tsukuba 305-0801, Japan*

⁶ *Advanced Science Research Center, Japan Atomic Energy Agency (JAEA), Tokai 319-1195, Japan*

Abstract

The chiral susceptibility, or the first derivative of the chiral condensate with respect to the quark mass, is often used as a probe for the QCD phase transition since the chiral condensate is an order parameter of $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ symmetry breaking. However, the chiral condensate also breaks the axial $U(1)$ symmetry, which is usually not paid attention to as it is already broken by anomaly. We investigate the susceptibilities in the scalar and pseudoscalar channels in order to quantify how much the axial $U(1)$ anomaly contributes to the chiral phase transition. Employing a chirally symmetric lattice Dirac operator, and its eigenmode decomposition, we separate the axial $U(1)$ breaking effects from others. Our result in two-flavor QCD indicates that the chiral susceptibility is dominated by the axial $U(1)$ anomaly at temperatures $T \gtrsim 190$ MeV after the quadratically divergent constant is subtracted.

Introduction— Properties of phase transition are largely governed by symmetries that are broken/restored at the transition. In the finite temperature phase transition of Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) with two degenerate dynamical quarks (up and down), the relevant symmetry is that of flavor rotation of left- and right-handed quark fields, *i.e.* $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ as well as a flavor-singlet axial rotation $U(1)_A$. The relevance of the $U(1)_A$ symmetry is not immediately clear, since it is broken by quantum anomaly from the outset, but it may still affect the phase transition through the presence/absence of topological excitations of gauge field.

Close relationship between the two symmetries, $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ and $U(1)_A$, manifests itself in the fact that they share the order parameter, *i.e.* chiral condensate $-\sum_x \langle S^0(x) \rangle / V$, defined with a flavor singlet scalar quark bilinear operator $S^0(x)$ and the four-volume V . In order to discriminate the effect of individual symmetries, one has to investigate the susceptibilities, defined by derivatives of the chiral (or other related) condensate with respect to flavor (in)dependent masses and vacuum angle θ . They are also written as a space-time integral of scalar or pseudo-scalar correlators.

For instance, the $U(1)_A$ susceptibility may be defined as $\sum_x \langle P^a(x)P^a(0) - S^a(x)S^a(0) \rangle$, where $S^a(x)$ and $P^a(x)$ are iso-triplet scalar and pseudo-scalar operators, respectively. Similarly, one possible susceptibility to probe the $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ symmetry can be written as $\sum_x \langle S^0(x)S^0(0) - P^a(x)P^a(0) \rangle$. In this work, we study these (and other) susceptibilities using lattice chiral fermion and its Dirac eigenmode decomposition [1–4].

In the literature [5–13], the chiral susceptibility $\chi(m) = \sum_x \langle S^0(x)S^0(0) \rangle - V \langle S^0(0) \rangle^2$ has often been studied, in order to identify the transition temperature from its peak. In this work, we find that this quantity mostly probes the presence/absence of the $U(1)_A$ symmetry. In fact, many relevant susceptibilities effectively probe $U(1)_A$, while the $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ susceptibilities remain small in the high temperature phase even when the chiral condensate and $U(1)_A$ susceptibility become non-zero due to finite quark masses. This result suggests that the QCD phase transition is actually driven by the $U(1)_A$ anomaly contrary to what one expects.

Dirac eigenmode decomposition of susceptibilities— Let us start with the N_f -flavor QCD partition function with a nonzero vacuum angle θ ,

$$Z(m, \theta) = \int [dA] \det(D(A) + m)^{N_f} e^{-S_G(A) + i\theta Q(A)}, \quad (1)$$

where the path integral over the gauge field A is performed with a weight given by the gauge action $S_G(A)$, topological charge $Q(A)$, or equivalently the index of the Dirac operator $D(A)$, and the fermion determinant with a degenerate quark mass m . We have used a continuum notation for simplicity. The lattice formulas in terms of the overlap-Dirac operator [14] will be given later.

Denoting the eigenvalues of $D(A)$ by $i\lambda(A)$, among which every nonzero mode appears in a pair with its conjugate $-i\lambda(A)$, the chiral condensate at $\theta = 0$ is decomposed as

$$\Sigma(m) = \frac{1}{N_f V} \frac{\partial}{\partial m} \ln Z(m, 0) = \frac{1}{V} \left\langle \sum_{\lambda(A)} \frac{m}{\lambda(A)^2 + m^2} \right\rangle. \quad (2)$$

Here and in the following, the expectation value of a quantity $X(A)$ (with $\theta = 0$) is written as $\langle X(A) \rangle$. To remove the quadratic divergence in $\Sigma(m)$, we introduce a subtracted condensate $\Sigma_{\text{sub.}}(m)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Sigma_{\text{sub.}}(m)}{m} = & \left[\frac{\Sigma(m)}{m} - \frac{\langle |Q(A)| \rangle}{m^2 V} \right] \\ & - \left[\frac{\Sigma(m_{\text{ref}})}{m_{\text{ref}}} - \frac{\langle |Q(A)| \rangle|_{m=m_{\text{ref}}}}{m_{\text{ref}}^2 V} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

with a reference quark mass m_{ref} . The term with $|Q(A)|$ eliminates the contribution from chiral zero modes, which is expected to vanish in the large V limit.

The chiral susceptibility, defined as a derivative of $\Sigma(m)$ with respect to m , may be decomposed into two parts. The ‘‘connected’’ susceptibility $\chi^{\text{con.}}(m)$ is a derivative of the chiral condensate with respect to the valence quark mass m_v , while the ‘‘disconnected’’ part $\chi^{\text{dis.}}(m)$ is that with respect to the sea quark mass m_s , both with setting $m_v = m_s = m$ after all.

The connected susceptibility (defined with the subtracted chiral condensate), can be written as

$$\chi_{\text{sub.}}^{\text{con.}}(m) = -\Delta_{U(1)}^{\text{con.}}(m) + \frac{\Sigma_{\text{sub.}}(m)}{m} + \frac{\langle |Q(A)| \rangle}{m^2 V}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\Delta_{U(1)}^{\text{con.}}(m) = \frac{1}{V} \left\langle \sum_{\lambda(A)} \frac{2m^2}{(\lambda(A)^2 + m^2)^2} \right\rangle \quad (5)$$

is equivalent to the axial $U(1)$ susceptibility $\sum_x [\langle P^a(x)P^a(0) \rangle - \langle S^a(x)S^a(0) \rangle]$. (See [2, 3] for the details). On the other hand, the eigenvalue decomposition of the disconnected part

is

$$\chi^{\text{dis.}}(m) = \frac{N_f}{V} \left[\left\langle \left(\sum_{\lambda(A)} \frac{m}{\lambda(A)^2 + m^2} \right)^2 \right\rangle - (\Sigma(m)V)^2 \right]. \quad (6)$$

From the θ dependence of $Z(m, \theta)$, we obtain the topological susceptibility,

$$\chi_t(m) = -\frac{1}{V} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \ln Z(m, \theta) |_{\theta=0} = \frac{\langle Q(A)^2 \rangle - \langle Q(A) \rangle^2}{V}. \quad (7)$$

Absorbing the angle θ to the mass term $m \rightarrow m \exp(i\gamma_5 \theta / N_f)$, we can relate $\chi_t(m)$ to the chiral condensate and the pseudoscalar susceptibility $\sum_x \langle P^0(x) P^0(0) \rangle$.

We can now see that the $U(1)_A$ and $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ symmetries are intimately related [15, 16]. Two possible probes of the $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ symmetry given by

$$\Delta_{SU(2)}^{(1)}(m) \equiv \sum_x \langle S^0(x) S^0(0) - P^a(x) P^a(0) \rangle - V \langle S^0(0) \rangle^2 = \chi^{\text{dis.}}(m) - \Delta_{U(1)}^{\text{con.}}(m), \quad (8)$$

$$\Delta_{SU(2)}^{(2)}(m) \equiv \sum_x \langle S^a(x) S^a(0) - P^0(x) P^0(0) \rangle = \frac{N_f}{m^2} \chi_t(m) - \Delta_{U(1)}^{\text{con.}}(m), \quad (9)$$

are actually written using the $U(1)_A$ related quantities $\Delta_{U(1)}^{\text{con.}}(m)$, $\chi_t(m)$ and $\chi^{\text{dis.}}(m)$. When the axial $U(1)$ anomaly is active so that $\Delta_{U(1)}^{\text{con.}}(m)$ [17–23] is nonzero, the recovery of the $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ requires a fine tuning

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow 0} \chi^{\text{dis.}}(m) = \lim_{m \rightarrow 0} \Delta_{U(1)}^{\text{con.}}(m) = \lim_{m \rightarrow 0} \frac{N_f}{m^2} \chi_t(m), \quad (10)$$

which is highly nontrivial.

Using these formulas, we can separate the $U(1)_A$ anomaly contribution from the connected and disconnected parts of the chiral susceptibility as

$$\chi_A^{\text{con.}}(m) = -\Delta_{U(1)}^{\text{con.}}(m) + \frac{\langle |Q(A)| \rangle}{m^2 V}, \quad (11)$$

$$\chi_A^{\text{dis.}}(m) = \frac{N_f}{m^2} \chi_t(m). \quad (12)$$

Then the remnants are $\chi_{\text{sub.}}^{\text{con.}}(m) - \chi_A^{\text{con.}}(m) = \Sigma_{\text{sub.}}(m)/m$ and $\chi^{\text{dis.}}(m) - \chi_A^{\text{dis.}}(m) = \Delta_{SU(2)}^{(1)}(m) - \Delta_{SU(2)}^{(2)}(m)$, respectively.

These formulas can be promoted to those of lattice QCD with the overlap fermion [2]. Denoting the eigenvalue of massive overlap-Dirac operator $\gamma_5((1-m)D_{\text{ov}} + m)$ by λ_m , the eigenvalue decomposition can be obtained by replacing $\frac{1}{\lambda(A)^2 + m^2}$ by $\frac{(1-\lambda_m^2)}{(1-m^2)\lambda_m^2}$ (Here and in the following, we take the lattice spacing unity). In the following we numerically study how

much the $U(1)_A$ -related pieces $\chi_A^{\text{con./dis.}}(m)$ dominate the signal of the chiral susceptibility in $N_f = 2$ lattice QCD. We employ a lattice fermion formulation that precisely preserves chiral symmetry, which is essential in the above formulas with spectral decomposition.

Lattice simulation— We use the gauge field ensembles generated in [4]. We employ the tree-level improved Symanzik gauge action and the Möbius domain-wall fermion [24] action for the simulations. We include the overlap fermion determinant utilizing a reweighting technique in order to eliminate systematics due to any violation of the chiral symmetry, as well as those due to the mixed action. The lattice spacing is fixed to $a = 0.074$ fm, and four different temperatures are chosen taking a set of the temporal lattice extent $L_t = 8, 10, 12$ and 14, which covers $190 \leq T \leq 330$ MeV. We fix the lattice size to $L = 32$, which corresponds to 2.4 fm. At $T = 220$ MeV, three different lattice sizes $L = 24, 32, 40$ are taken in order to check if the finite volume effect is under control. The range of quark mass covers the physical up and down quark mass so that we can *interpolate* our data to the physical point. We use the $m = 0.005$ on $L = 32$ lattices as the reference point m_{ref} for the subtraction of the connected chiral susceptibility.

We compute 40 lowest eigenvalues of the massive overlap-Dirac operator, as well as those of four-dimensional effective operator of the Möbius domain-wall fermion. For both operators, we can identify the index $Q(A)$ as the number of isolated chiral zero modes. At the lowest temperature, the 40th eigenvalue is ~ 0.08 (~ 210 MeV).

Since the number of stored eigenvalues is limited, we truncate the summation in the spectral decomposition of the chiral susceptibilities. We find for $T \leq 260$ MeV, both $\chi_{\text{sub.}}^{\text{con.}}$ and $\chi^{\text{dis.}}$ with the reweighted overlap fermion show a good saturation already at $\lambda = 0.07$ in all the simulated ensembles. At $T = 260$ MeV, we also find a good agreement with a full measurement without the truncation computed with the Möbius domain-wall Dirac operator. At $T = 330$ MeV, on the other hand, the low-mode approximation does not reproduce the full result especially at heavier quark masses. In our previous study [4] we found that at this temperature the low-lying modes are almost absent and the observables are insensitive to the violation of the lattice chiral symmetry. Therefore, in the following analysis at $T = 330$ MeV, we take the full computation with the Möbius domain-wall Dirac operator and use the low-mode approximation of the overlap-Dirac fermion at $\lambda_{\text{cut}} = 0.07$ (~ 180 MeV) for other ensembles of $T \leq 260$ MeV.

The statistical uncertainty is estimated by the jackknife method after binning the data

in every 1000 trajectories with which the autocorrelation is negligible.

Numerical results— In Fig. 1, we present the results for the connected part $\chi_{\text{sub.}}^{\text{con.}}$ (top panel) and disconnected data $\chi^{\text{dis.}}$ (bottom) of the chiral susceptibility at $T=220$ MeV on the $L=32$ lattice (open squares). The filled symbols are those of $\chi_A^{\text{con.}}$ and $\chi_A^{\text{dis.}}$, which dominate the signals. The other contributions $\Sigma_{\text{sub.}}(m)/m$ (circles) and the $SU(2)$ susceptibilities $\Delta_{SU(2)}^{(1,2)}(m)$ (circles and triangles) are relatively small and actually consistent with zero, showing that the $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ symmetry is good even at $m=0.01$ (~ 26 MeV). This result indicates that the connected part of the subtracted chiral susceptibility is essentially described by the axial $U(1)$ susceptibility and the disconnected susceptibility is governed by the topological susceptibility¹. The axial $U(1)$ anomaly contributions $\chi_A^{\text{con.}}$ and $\chi_A^{\text{dis.}}$ become consistent with zero at the lightest quark mass. In the data with different lattice sizes $L=24$ (crosses) and 40 (stars), no significant volume dependence is seen. The data may indicate a peak at $m=0.005$.

These features are seen at all simulated temperatures and quark masses ranging from the physical point to $m \sim 100$ MeV. Figure 2 summarizes the quark mass dependence of the chiral susceptibility $\chi_{\text{sub.}} = \chi_{\text{sub.}}^{\text{con.}} + \chi^{\text{dis.}}$ at four different temperatures on the $L=32$ lattices. The open symbols with solid lines are the data obtained from the eigenmode decomposition of the reweighted overlap-Dirac operator, while those with dotted lines are direct measurement with the Möbius domain-wall fermion. The bottom panel shows the data at $T=330$ MeV. At each temperature, the axial $U(1)$ breaking effect $\chi_A^{\text{con./dis.}}$ (filled symbols with dashed lines), which vanishes before the chiral limit, dominates the signal of $\chi_{\text{sub.}}$. In fact, we find that the ratio of sum of $\chi_A^{\text{con.}} + \chi_A^{\text{dis.}}$ over 26 simulated data points and that of total $\chi_{\text{sub.}}$ is 0.954. Namely, 95.4% of the signal in $\chi_{\text{sub.}}$ originates from the $U(1)_A$ anomaly.

We also plot the result obtained in our previous work with $\beta=4.24$ on a coarser lattice ($a=0.084$ fm) at $T=195$ MeV (cross symbols). The result is consistent with our new data at a similar temperature $T=190$ MeV, which indicates that the cut-off effect is not significant.

In Fig. 2 the position of the peak moves towards heavier quark masses as temperature increases. It may indicate that the pseudo-critical temperature becomes higher for larger

¹ It was pointed out in [19, 22] that $\chi^{\text{dis.}}$ is dominated by the $U(1)_A$ breaking in the $m=0$ limit, but the concrete form (in terms of the topological susceptibility) at finite m was not discussed.

quark masses.

We conclude that the chiral susceptibility is dominated by the axial $U(1)$ anomaly at high temperatures $T \gtrsim 190$ MeV. The connected part is described by the axial $U(1)$ susceptibility other than the m -independent quadratically divergent part, and the disconnected part is governed by the topological susceptibility. The chiral limit of the $U(1)_A$ contributions is consistent with zero. The picture of QCD phase diagram [25], based on the spontaneous $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ breaking alone, needs to be reconsidered. The numerical data imply that the axial $U(1)$ anomaly does play a crucial role.

Acknowledgments— We thank H.-T. Ding, C. Gatttringer, L. Glozman, for useful discussions. We thank P. Boyle for correspondence for starting simulation with Grid and I. Kanamori for helping us on the simulations on K computer with Bridge++. We also thank the members of JLQCD collaboration for their encouragement and support. We thank the Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics at Kyoto University. Discussions during the YITP workshop YITP-W-20-08 on "Progress in Particle Physics 2020" were useful to complete this work. Numerical simulations were performed using the QCD software packages Iroiro++ [26], Grid [27], and Bridge++ [28] on IBM System Blue Gene Solution at KEK under a support of its Large Scale Simulation Program (No. 16/17-14) and Oakforest-PACS at JCAHPC under a support of the HPCI System Research Projects (Project IDs: hp170061, hp180061, hp190090, and hp200086), Multidisciplinary Cooperative Research Program in CCS, University of Tsukuba (Project IDs: xg17i032 and xg18i023) and K computer provided by the RIKEN Center for Computational Science. We used Japan Lattice Data Grid (JLDG) [29] for storing a part of the numerical data generated for this work. This work is supported in part by the Japanese Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (No. JP26247043, JP16H03978, JP18H01216, JP18H03710, JP18H04484, JP18H05236), and by MEXT as "Priority Issue on Post-K computer" (Elucidation of the Fundamental Laws and Evolution of the Universe) and by Joint Institute for Computational Fundamental Science (JICFuS).




FIG. 1: Quark mass dependence of the connected (top panel) and disconnected (bottom) chiral susceptibilities on the $L = 32$ lattice (open squares). The contribution from the axial $U(1)$ anomaly (filled squares) saturates the signal, while the remaining $\Sigma_{\text{sub.}}(m)/m$ and $\Delta_{SU(2)}^{(1,2)}(m)$ plotted by open circles and triangles are small. The $L = 24$ (crosses) and $L = 40$ (stars) data show no significant volume dependence. Note that the sign of the connected part is flipped.




FIG. 2: Chiral susceptibility at four different temperatures on the $L = 32$ lattices (open symbols). The filled symbols are those from the axial $U(1)$ anomaly. The bottom panel is the same plot as the top but the result at $T = 330$ MeV is shown in a fine scale.

[1] S. Aoki, H. Fukaya and Y. Taniguchi, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 114512 (2012)
doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.114512 [arXiv:1209.2061 [hep-lat]].

- [2] G. Cossu *et al.* [JLQCD Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 3, 034507 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.034507 [arXiv:1510.07395 [hep-lat]].
- [3] A. Tomiya *et al.* [JLQCD Collaboration] Phys. Rev. D **96**, no. 3, 034509 (2017) Addendum: [Phys. Rev. D **96**, no. 7, 079902 (2017)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.034509, 10.1103/PhysRevD.96.079902 [arXiv:1612.01908 [hep-lat]].
- [4] S. Aoki *et al.* [JLQCD Collaboration], [arXiv:2011.01499 [hep-lat]].
- [5] F. Karsch and E. Laermann, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 6954-6962 (1994) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.50.6954 [arXiv:hep-lat/9406008 [hep-lat]].
- [6] Y. Aoki, G. Endrodi, Z. Fodor, S. D. Katz and K. K. Szabo, Nature **443**, 675-678 (2006) doi:10.1038/nature05120 [arXiv:hep-lat/0611014 [hep-lat]].
- [7] M. Cheng *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 054507 (2006) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.054507 [arXiv:hep-lat/0608013 [hep-lat]].
- [8] A. Bazavov *et al.* [HotQCD Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **85**, 054503 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.054503 [arXiv:1111.1710 [hep-lat]].
- [9] T. Bhattacharya *et al.* [HotQCD Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, no.8, 082001 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.082001 [arXiv:1402.5175 [hep-lat]].
- [10] C. Bonati, M. D'Elia, M. Mariti, M. Mesiti, F. Negro and F. Sanfilippo, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no.5, 054503 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.054503.
- [11] B. B. Brandt, A. Francis, H. B. Meyer, O. Philipsen, D. Robaina and H. Wittig, JHEP **12**, 158 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2016)158 [arXiv:1608.06882 [hep-lat]].
- [12] Y. Taniguchi *et al.* [WHOT-QCD Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **96**, no.1, 014509 (2017) [erratum: Phys. Rev. D **99**, no.5, 059904 (2019)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.014509 [arXiv:1609.01417 [hep-lat]].
- [13] H. T. Ding *et al.* [HotQCD Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, no.6, 062002 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.123.062002 [arXiv:1903.04801 [hep-lat]].
- [14] H. Neuberger, Phys. Lett. B **417**, 141 (1998) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(97)01368-3 [hep-lat/9707022].
- [15] A. Gómez Nicola and J. Ruiz De Elvira, Phys. Rev. D **98**, no.1, 014020 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.014020 [arXiv:1803.08517 [hep-ph]].
- [16] A. G. Nicola, [arXiv:2012.13809 [hep-ph]].
- [17] A. Bazavov *et al.* [HotQCD Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **86**, 094503 (2012)

- doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.094503 [arXiv:1205.3535 [hep-lat]].
- [18] G. Cossu, S. Aoki, H. Fukaya, S. Hashimoto, T. Kaneko, H. Matsufuru and J.-I. Noaki, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 11, 114514 (2013) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **88**, no. 1, 019901 (2013)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.019901, 10.1103/PhysRevD.87.114514 [arXiv:1304.6145 [hep-lat]].
- [19] M. I. Buchoff *et al.* [LLNL/RBC Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **89**, no.5, 054514 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.054514 [arXiv:1309.4149 [hep-lat]].
- [20] V. Dick, F. Karsch, E. Laermann, S. Mukherjee and S. Sharma, Phys. Rev. D **91**, no. 9, 094504 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.91.094504. [arXiv:1502.06190 [hep-lat]].
- [21] K.-I. Ishikawa, Y. Iwasaki, Y. Nakayama and T. Yoshie, “Nature of chiral phase transition in two-flavor QCD,” arXiv:1706.08872 [hep-lat].
- [22] H. T. Ding, S. T. Li, S. Mukherjee, A. Tomiya, X. D. Wang and Y. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, no.8, 082001 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.082001 [arXiv:2010.14836 [hep-lat]].
- [23] O. Kaczmarek, L. Mazur and S. Sharma, [arXiv:2102.06136 [hep-lat]].
- [24] R. C. Brower, H. Neff and K. Orginos, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **153**, 191 (2006) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysbps.2006.01.047 [hep-lat/0511031]; Comput. Phys. Commun. **220**, 1 (2017) doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2017.01.024 [arXiv:1206.5214 [hep-lat]].
- [25] R. D. Pisarski and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. D **29**, 338 (1984) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.29.338.
- [26] G. Cossu, J. Noaki, S. Hashimoto, T. Kaneko, H. Fukaya, P. A. Boyle and J. Doi, [arXiv:1311.0084 [hep-lat]].
- [27] P. Boyle, A. Yamaguchi, G. Cossu and A. Portelli, [arXiv:1512.03487 [hep-lat]].
- [28] S. Ueda, S. Aoki, T. Aoyama, K. Kanaya, H. Matsufuru, S. Motoki, Y. Namekawa, H. Nemura, Y. Taniguchi and N. Ukita, “Development of an object oriented lattice QCD code ‘Bridge++’,” J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **523**, 012046 (2014) doi:10.1088/1742-6596/523/1/012046
- [29] T. Amagasa, S. Aoki, Y. Aoki, T. Aoyama, T. Doi, K. Fukumura, N. Ishii, K. I. Ishikawa, H. Jitsumoto and H. Kamano, *et al.* J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **664**, no.4, 042058 (2015) doi:10.1088/1742-6596/664/4/042058

Supplemental materials

Simulation details

We summarize our numerical results in Tab. I.

In Fig.3, we plot the cut-off dependence of the the (subtracted) chiral susceptibilities. We find that the data at $T \leq 260$ MeV are well described with 40 eigenvalues, while the saturation is not good at $T = 330$ MeV. Since we find a good agreement with the direct inversion of the Möbius domain-wall operator at $T = 260$ MeV, we use the spectral decomposition of the overlap Dirac operator for the data at $T \leq 260$ MeV and the direct inversion of the Möbius domain-wall operator for those at $T = 330$ MeV.

Comparison with Ding *et al.* [22]

Recently, Ding *et al.* [22] investigated the disconnected part of chiral susceptibility in $N_f = 2 + 1$ QCD using eigenvalues of the Dirac operator of highly improved staggered quark (HISQ) action. At $T = 207$ MeV they obtained a non-zero continuum limit, which suggests that the axial $U(1)$ symmetry is still broken by anomaly at $1.6 T_c$. As their conclusion qualitatively differs from ours, which becomes consistent with zero at the lightest simulated quark mass, here we would like to compare the two.

In Fig. 4 we present the data of [22] with open symbols and that of this work with the filled symbols. Since the strange quark is quenched in our simulations, we simply use the physical value of the strange quark mass for m_s . Note that the critical temperature is estimated to be ~ 130 MeV for $N_f = 2 + 1$ QCD while it is ~ 170 MeV for $N_f = 2$. Interestingly, a qualitative feature of sharp drops towards the chiral limit is similar. However, a significant cutoff $1/a$ dependence is seen in [22]: the data at $a = 0.06$ fm are twice larger than those at $a = 0.08$ fm, while our data at $a = 0.08$ fm ($T = 195$ MeV) and those at $a = 0.07$ fm ($T = 190$ MeV) are consistent, and do not show any sign of significant discretization effects.

In [22] they obtained a continuum limit with a global fit with 6 parameters, which is shown by the dashed curve in Fig. 4. It is clearly higher than the raw data at finite lattice spacings. Specifically, the one at the second lightest quark mass at $a = 0.12$ fm is extrapolated to a continuum limit that is 40 times larger, which suggests that their lattice data are not on a proper scaling trajectory that allows continuum extrapolation assuming an expansion in a^2 .

$T(\text{MeV})$	$L^3 \times L_t$	m	$\chi_{\text{sub.}}^{\text{con.}}$	$\chi_A^{\text{con.}}$	$\chi^{\text{dis.}}$	$\chi_A^{\text{dis.}}$
190	$32^3 \times 14$	0.005	-0.074(07)	-0.074(12)	0.090(12)	0.077(17)
		0.00375	-0.101(20)	-0.106(26)	0.144(39)	0.189(49)
		0.0025	-0.058(12)	-0.056(11)	0.087(15)	0.079(21)
		0.001	-0.0188(64)	-0.00130(45)	0.0020(06)	1.6(16)e-7
220	$24^3 \times 12$	0.01	-0.0224(23)	-0.0202(34)	0.0399(75)	0.0338(68)
		0.005	-0.0367(87)	-0.0332(88)	0.066(20)	0.072(24)
		0.00375	-0.0081(28)	-0.0041(27)	0.0079(52)	0.0070(53)
		0.0025	-0.0125(55)	-0.0095(54)	0.019(11)	0.018(11)
		0.001	-0.0033(25)	-0.0002(01)	0.00033(24)	0(0)
	$32^3 \times 12$	0.01	-0.0284(25)	-0.0325(38)	0.044(07)	0.049(11)
		0.005	-0.0311(42)	-0.0311(48)	0.065(11)	0.068(14)
		0.00375	-0.00682(83)	-0.00270(70)	0.0050(13)	0.0038(13)
		0.0025	-0.0073(49)	-0.0062(48)	0.0121(94)	0.0112(95)
		0.001	-0.0016(12)	-0.00016(06)	0.00030(12)	1.8(18)e-5
$40^3 \times 12$	0.01	-0.0270(15)	-0.0349(28)	0.0417(56)	0.0397(49)	
	0.005	-0.0305(31)	-0.0371(56)	0.0526(65)	0.0433(54)	
260	$32^3 \times 10$	0.015	-0.0039(13)	-0.0038(14)	0.0060(19)	0.0061(24)
		0.01	-0.0070(18)	-0.0077(24)	0.0148(48)	0.0141(43)
		0.008	-0.0064(20)	-0.0089(32)	0.0152(47)	0.0117(38)
		0.005	-0.0054(24)	-0.0054(24)	0.0100(43)	0.0103(45)
330	$32^3 \times 8$	0.040	-0.00378(17)	-0.00306(21)	0.00328(70)	0.00219(40)
		0.020	-0.00150(29)	-0.00145(30)	0.00195(57)	0.00148(49)
		0.015	-0.00145(65)	-0.00151(82)	0.0027(19)	0.0017(11)
		0.01	-0.000386(95)	-0.000183(62)	0.00012(03)	0.00044(31)
		0.005	-0.000222(87)	-0.000222(77)	2.33(53)e-5	0(0)
		0.001	-0.00010(10)	-2.81(58)e-5	8.6(14)e-7	0(0)

TABLE I: Summary of results




FIG. 3: Cut-off λ_{cut} dependence of the chiral susceptibility at $T = 260$ MeV (top panel) and $T = 330$ MeV (bottom). The result for $\chi^{\text{dis.}}$ is plotted by open symbols, while that for $-\chi_{\text{sub.}}^{\text{con.}}$ is shown by filled symbols. The thick symbols plotted at the lattice cut-off = 2 denote those obtained from the direct inversion of the Möbius domain-wall operator.




FIG. 4: Comparison of $\chi^{\text{dis.}}(m)$ between Ding *et al.* [22] (open symbols) and this work (filled). A qualitative feature of the sharp drop towards the chiral limit is similar. But the large scaling violation in [22] leads to a continuum limit much larger than the raw values as shown in the dashed curve.

Since the $U(1)_A$ anomaly does not correctly couple to the taste singlet component of the staggered fermion that [22] employed, the quantities which are highly affected by the chiral anomaly and index theorem may receive large discretization effects in their simulation.