

# $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric QCD with $1 \leq N_F < N_c$ light quark flavors : the phase transition at large $N_c$

Victor L. Chernyak <sup>a,b</sup>

(e-mail: v.l.chernyak@inp.nsk.su)

<sup>a</sup> Novosibirsk State University,  
630090 Novosibirsk, Pirogova str.2, Russia

<sup>b</sup> Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics SB RAS,  
630090 Novosibirsk, Lavrent'ev ave.11, Russia

## Abstract

Considered is  $\mathcal{N} = 1$   $SU(N_c)$  supersymmetric QCD (SQCD) with  $1 \leq N_F \leq N_c - 1$  flavors of quarks with small current masses  $m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q$ . It is argued that, with increased  $N_c$ , there is the phase transition from the phase of higgsed quarks to the phase (at sufficiently large  $N_c$ ) where quarks are not higgsed but confined.

Besides, it is shown in Appendix that, with fixed  $N_c$ ,  $N_F = N_c - 1$  and diminishing  $m_Q$ , there is the phase transition between the region  $m_Q \gg \Lambda_Q$  where quarks are confined to the region (at sufficiently small  $m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q$ ) where they are higgsed. This is a counterexample to a widely spread opinion, originating from the paper of E. Fradkin and S.H. Shenker [10], about absence of the phase transition between the confinement and higgs phases.

## 1 The Higgs phase

The purpose of this paper is to argue that, in the standard  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  SQCD with  $SU(N_c)$  colors and  $1 \leq N_F \leq N_c - 1$  flavors of light quarks with  $m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q$ , there is a phase transition from the region of not too large  $N_c$  in which all quarks are higgsed and  $\mu_{\text{gl}} \gg \Lambda_Q$  (1.5), to the region of sufficiently large  $N_c$  (2.1) where they are not higgsed but confined.

For this, let us recall first in short some properties of the standard  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  SQCD with  $SU(N_c)$  colors and  $1 \leq N_F < 3N_c$  flavors of light quarks, see e.g. section 2 in [1]. It is convenient to start e.g. with  $3N_c/2 < N_F < 3N_c$ ,  $m_Q \rightarrow 0$  and the scale  $\mu = \Lambda_Q$ . The Lagrangian looks as <sup>1</sup>

$$K = \text{Tr} \left( Q^\dagger Q + (Q \rightarrow \bar{Q}) \right), \quad \mathcal{W} = -\frac{2\pi}{\alpha(\mu = \Lambda_Q)} S + m_Q \text{Tr} (\bar{Q} Q). \quad (1.1)$$

Here:  $m_Q = m_Q(\mu = \Lambda_Q)$  is the mass parameter (it is taken as real positive),  $S = \sum_{A,\beta} W_\beta^A W^{A,\beta} / 32\pi^2$ , where  $W_\beta^A$  is the gauge field strength,  $A = 1 \dots N_c^2 - 1$ ,  $\beta = 1, 2$ ,  $a(\mu) = N_c g^2(\mu) / 8\pi^2 = N_c \alpha(\mu) / 2\pi$  is the gauge coupling with its scale factor  $\Lambda_Q$ . Let us evolve now to the UV Pauli-Villars (PV) scale  $\mu_{PV}$  to define the parent UV theory. The only change in comparison with (1.1) will be the appearance of the corresponding logarithmic renormalization factor  $z(\Lambda_Q, \mu_{PV}) \gg 1$  in the Kahler term for *massless* quarks and replacement of  $\alpha(\mu = \Lambda_Q)$  by  $\alpha(\mu = \mu_{PV}) \ll \alpha(\mu = \Lambda_Q)$ , while the scale factor  $\Lambda_Q$  of the gauge coupling remains the same. Now, we continue the parameter  $m_Q$  from zero to some nonzero value, e.g.  $0 < m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q$ . And this will be a *definition* of our parent UV theory.

The Konishi anomaly [2] for this theory looks as

$$m_Q(\mu) = z_Q^{-1}(\Lambda_Q, \mu) m_Q, \quad m_Q \equiv m_Q(\mu = \Lambda_Q), \quad M_j^i(\mu) = z_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu) M_j^i, \quad M_j^i \equiv M_j^i(\mu = \Lambda_Q). \quad (1.2)$$

<sup>1</sup> The gluon exponents are implied in Kahler terms.

$$m_Q(\mu)\langle M_j^i(\mu)\rangle = \delta_j^i\langle S\rangle, \quad i, j = 1\dots N_F, \quad \langle M_j^i\rangle = \sum_{a=1}^{N_c}\langle \bar{Q}_j^a Q_a^i\rangle = \delta_j^i\langle M\rangle.$$

Evolving now to lower energies, the regime is conformal at  $\mu < \Lambda_Q$  and the pole mass of quarks looks as <sup>2</sup>

$$m_Q^{\text{pole}} = \frac{m_Q}{z_Q(\Lambda_Q, m_Q^{\text{pole}})} \sim \Lambda_Q \left(\frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\right)^{\frac{N_F}{3N_c}} \ll \Lambda_Q, \quad z_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu \ll \Lambda_Q) \sim \left(\frac{\mu}{\Lambda_Q}\right)^{\frac{3N_c - N_F}{N_F}} \ll 1. \quad (1.3)$$

Integrating then all quarks as heavy at  $\mu < m_Q^{\text{pole}}$  (1.3),<sup>3</sup> there remains  $SU(N_c)$  SYM with the scale factor  $\Lambda_{SYM}$  (1.4) of its coupling. Integrating then all gluons via the Veneziano-Yankielowicz (VY) procedure [4], one obtains the gluino condensate, see (1.2)

$$\Lambda_{SYM} = \left(\Lambda_Q^{3N_c - N_F} m_Q^{N_F}\right)^{\frac{1}{3N_c}}, \quad \langle S\rangle = \Lambda_{SYM}^3 = \left(\Lambda_Q^{3N_c - N_F} m_Q^{N_F}\right)^{\frac{1}{N_c}} = m_Q\langle M\rangle, \quad \langle M\rangle = \Lambda_Q^2 \left(\frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q}\right)^{\frac{N_F - N_c}{N_c}}. \quad (1.4)$$

Another way, we can take the IR-free  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  SQCD with  $N_F > 3N_c$  and to start from  $\mu = \Lambda_Q$  with  $m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q$ . All quarks are not higgsed but confined and decouple as heavy at  $\mu = m_Q^{\text{pole}} = m_Q/z_Q(\Lambda_Q, m_Q^{\text{pole}}) \ll \Lambda_Q$  in the weak coupling regime, where  $z_Q(\Lambda_Q, m_Q^{\text{pole}}) \ll 1$  is the logarithmic renormalization factor. There remains  $\mathcal{N} = 1$   $SU(N_c)$  SYM with the scale factor  $\Lambda_{SYM}$  of its coupling. From matching the couplings  $a_+(m_Q^{\text{pole}}) = a_{SYM}(m_Q^{\text{pole}})$  one obtains the same  $\Lambda_{SYM}$  (1.4).

Now (1.4) can be continued to other values of  $N_F$ , in particular  $1 \leq N_F < N_c$  considered in this paper.

In this range of  $N_F$ , the weak coupling Higgs phase at  $\mu_{\text{gl}} \gg \Lambda_Q$  for light quarks with  $0 < m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q$  looks as follows, see e.g. section 2 in [1]. All light quarks are higgsed, i.e. form a constant coherent condensate in a vacuum state, at the high scale  $\mu \sim \mu_{\text{gl}} \gg \Lambda_Q$  in the weak coupling regime <sup>4</sup> and the perturbative pole masses of  $N_F(2N_c - N_F)$  massive gluons look as

$$\left(\frac{\mu_{\text{gl}}}{\Lambda_Q}\right)^2 \sim g^2(\mu = \mu_{\text{gl}}) z_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu = \mu_{\text{gl}}) \frac{\rho^2}{\Lambda_Q^2} \sim \frac{1}{N_c} \frac{\langle S\rangle}{m_Q \Lambda_Q^2} \sim \frac{1}{N_c} \left(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{m_Q}\right)^{\frac{N_c - N_F}{N_c}} \gg 1. \quad (1.5)$$

$$g^2(\mu = \mu_{\text{gl}}) \approx \frac{8\pi^2}{(3N_c - N_F) \ln(\mu_{\text{gl}}/\Lambda_Q)} \sim \frac{1}{N_c}, \quad z_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu = \mu_{\text{gl}}) \sim \left(\ln \frac{\mu_{\text{gl}}}{\Lambda_Q}\right)^{\frac{N_c}{3N_c - N_F}} \sim 1.$$

Higgsing of all  $N_F$  quarks with  $1 \leq N_F \leq N_c - 2$  flavors at  $\rho = \Lambda_Q \left(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{m_Q}\right)^{\frac{N_c - N_F}{2N_c}} \gg \Lambda_Q$  (1.4) breaks spontaneously separately the global  $SU(N_F)$  and global  $SU(N_c) \rightarrow SU(N_c - N_F)$ , but there remains unbroken diagonal  $SU(N_F)_{C+F}$  global symmetry. Besides, the gluons from  $SU(N_c - N_F)$  SYM do not receive large masses  $\sim \rho$  and remain (effectively) massless at scales  $\mu > \Lambda_{SYM}$ .

Dealing with higgsed quarks in a standard way, we first separate out Goldstone fields from quark fields (a part of them or all will be eaten by gluons when quarks are higgsed)

$$Q_\alpha^i(x) = \left(V_{\text{Goldst}}^{SU(N_c)}(x)\right)_\alpha^\beta \hat{Q}_\beta^i(x), \quad \hat{Q}_\beta^i(x) = \left(U_{\text{global}}^{SU(N_c)}\right)_\beta^\gamma \left(U_{\text{global}}^{SU(N_F)}\right)_j^i \tilde{Q}_\gamma^j(x), \quad \alpha, \beta, \gamma = 1\dots N_c, \quad i, j = 1\dots N_F. \quad (1.6)$$

<sup>2</sup> Here and below we use the perturbative NSVZ  $\beta$ -function [3]. In (1.3) and below  $A \sim B$  means equality up to a constant factor independent of  $m_Q$  and  $N_c$ .

<sup>3</sup> As well known, the global flavor symmetry  $SU(N_F)$  is not broken spontaneously in  $\mathcal{N} = 1$   $SU(N_c)$  SQCD for equal mass quarks, see (1.2). Therefore, due to the rank restriction at  $N_F > N_c$ , all quarks are not higgsed but confined.

<sup>4</sup> We ignore from now on for simplicity all logarithmic factors and trace only the power dependence on  $m_Q/\Lambda_Q$  and on  $N_c$ .

But, in particular, the degrees of freedom of massive scalar superpartners of gluons remain in  $\hat{Q}_\beta^i(x)$ . (And similarly for  $\overline{Q}_i^a$ ). And then (with the standard choice of vacuum of spontaneously broken global symmetry) replace  $\hat{Q}_\beta^i(x)$  in (1.6), containing remained degrees of freedom, by its mean vacuum value

$$\langle \hat{Q}_\beta^i(x) \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_\beta^i(0) \rangle = \delta_\beta^i \rho, \quad \rho = \Lambda_Q \left( \frac{\Lambda_Q}{m_Q} \right)^{\frac{N_c - N_F}{2N_c}}, \quad i = 1 \dots N_F, \quad \beta = 1 \dots N_c. \quad (1.7)$$

Under pure gauge transformations, see (1.6):

$$Q_\alpha^i(x) \rightarrow \left( V_{\text{pure gauge}}^{SU(N_c)}(x) \right)_\alpha^\beta Q_\beta^i(x), \quad \text{i.e.} \quad V_{\text{Goldst}}^{SU(N_c)}(x) \rightarrow V_{\text{pure gauge}}^{SU(N_c)}(x) V_{\text{Goldst}}^{SU(N_c)}(x). \quad (1.8)$$

That is, these are Goldstone fields which are transformed, while  $\hat{Q}_\beta^i(x)$  in (1.6) stays intact under pure gauge transformations. and  $\rho$  in (1.7) is the *gauge invariant order parameter* for higgsed quarks, while  $\rho = 0$  if quarks are not higgsed. (And, in particular,  $V_{\text{pure gauge}}^{SU(N_c)}(x) V_{\text{Goldst}}^{SU(N_c)}(x) = I_{SU(N_c)}$  in the so called "unitary gauge" where  $I_{SU(N_c)}$  is the unity matrix). The perturbative pole masses of massive gluons are as in (1.5). .

At  $1 \leq N_F \leq N_c - 2$ , due to higgsed quarks,  $N_F(2N_c - N_F)$  gluons and the same number of their  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  scalar superpartners acquire masses  $\mu_{\text{gl}} \gg \Lambda_Q$  and decouple at  $\mu < \mu_{\text{gl}}$ . There remain at lower energies local  $\mathcal{N} = 1$   $SU(N_c - N_F)$  SYM and  $N_F^2$  light complex pion fields  $\Pi_j^i(x) : M_j^i(x) = \delta_j^i \langle M \rangle + \Pi_j^i(x)$ ,  $\langle \Pi_j^i(x) \rangle = 0$ ,  $i, j = 1 \dots N_F$ . After integrating out all heavy particles with masses  $\sim \mu_{\text{gl}}$ , the scale factor of  $SU(N_c - N_F)$  SYM looks as, see section 2 in [1] and (1.2)

$$\Lambda_{\text{SYM}}^3 = \left( \frac{\Lambda_Q^{3N_c - N_F}}{\det M} \right)^{\frac{1}{N_c - N_F}}, \quad M_j^i = \langle M_j^i \rangle(\mu = \Lambda_Q) + \Pi_j^i. \quad (1.9)$$

Lowering energy to  $\mu \sim \Lambda_{\text{SYM}}$  and integrating all  $SU(N_c - N_F)$  gluons via the VY procedure [4], the Lagrangian of  $N_F^2$  light pions  $\Pi_j^i$  looks as <sup>5</sup>

$$K_M = 2 z_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu = \mu_{\text{gl}}) \text{Tr} \sqrt{M^\dagger M}, \quad \mathcal{W}_\Pi = m_Q \text{Tr} M + (N_c - N_F) \left( \frac{\Lambda_Q^{3N_c - N_F}}{\det M} \right)^{\frac{1}{N_c - N_F}}, \quad (1.10)$$

where  $z_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu = \mu_{\text{gl}}) \gg 1$  is the quark logarithmic renormalization factor.

From this,  $\langle M_j^i \rangle$  and the pion masses are

$$\langle M_j^i \rangle = \delta_j^i \Lambda_Q^2 \left( \frac{\Lambda_Q}{m_Q} \right)^{\frac{N_c - N_F}{N_c}}, \quad \mu^{\text{pole}}(\Pi) = \frac{m_Q}{z_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu = \mu_{\text{gl}})} \ll \Lambda_{\text{SYM}} \ll \Lambda_Q. \quad (1.11)$$

On the whole, the mass spectrum at  $1 \leq N_F \leq N_c - 2$  looks as follows. All quarks are higgsed and there are: a)  $SU(N_F)_{\text{adj}}$   $\mathcal{N} = 1$  multiplet of heavy non-confined gluons with the mass (1.5); b) one heavy  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  multiplet of  $SU(N_F)_{\text{singl}}$  non-confined gluon with the mass (1.5); c)  $2N_F(N_c - N_F)$   $\mathcal{N} = 1$  multiplets of heavy  $SU(N_F) \times SU(N_c - N_F)$  bifundamentals (hybrids) with masses (1.5), which behave as quarks with  $N_F$  flavors with respect to confining them  $\mathcal{N} = 1$   $SU(N_c - N_F)$  SYM and are weakly coupled and weakly confined; d) a number of  $\mathcal{N} = 1$   $SU(N_c - N_F)$  SYM gluonia with the typical mass scale  $\sim \Lambda_{\text{SYM}} \ll \Lambda_Q$  (1.4) (except for the case  $N_f = N_c - 1$ ); e)  $N_F^2$  light colorless complex pions  $\Pi_j^i$  with masses  $\sim m_Q \ll \Lambda_{\text{SYM}}$  (1.11).

<sup>5</sup> The whole  $SU(N_c)$  group is higgsed at  $N_F = N_c - 1$  and all  $N_c^2 - 1$  gluons are heavy. There is no confinement. The last term in the superpotential (1.10) is then due to the instanton contribution [5]. For  $N_F \leq N_c - 2$  the instanton contribution to superpotential from the broken part of  $SU(N_c)$  is zero due to extra gluino zero modes. The nonperturbative term in the superpotential (1.10) originates from nonperturbative effects in the  $\mathcal{N} = 1$   $SU(N_c - N_F)$  SYM, see section 2 in [1] and [4].

## 2 The heavy quark (HQ) phase

It is seen from (1.5) that at  $\mu \gg \Lambda_Q$  the value of the running gluon mass  $\mu_{\text{gl}}(\mu)$  decreases with increasing  $N_c$ . And at sufficiently large number of colors,

$$\frac{N_c}{N_c - N_F} \ln(N_c) \gg \ln\left(\frac{\Lambda_Q}{m_Q}\right) \gg 1 \quad (2.1)$$

it would be much smaller than  $\Lambda_Q$ . This means that quarks are not higgsed then in the weak coupling regime at  $\mu \gg \Lambda_Q$ . And now, at such  $N_c$  (2.1), *all quarks and gluons will remain effectively massless in some interval of scales  $\mu_H < \mu < \Lambda_Q$* . Recall also that considered  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  SQCD is outside the conformal window at  $N_F < 3N_c/2$  [6]. Therefore, to see whether quarks are really able to give by higgsing such a mass to gluons which will stop the massless RG-evolution, we have to consider the region  $\mu \ll \Lambda_Q$  where the theory entered into a *perturbative strong coupling regime* with  $a(\mu \ll \Lambda_Q) = N_c \alpha(\mu)/2\pi \gg 1$ .

Let us recall a similar situation at  $N_c < N_F < 3N_c/2$  considered in section 7 of [1] (only pages 18 - 21, including the footnote 18). As pointed out therein, when decreasing scale  $\mu$  crosses  $\mu \sim \Lambda_Q$  from above, the increasing perturbative coupling  $a(\mu)$  crosses unity from below. But for (effectively) massless quarks and gluons the perturbatively exact NSVZ  $\beta$ -function [3]

$$\frac{da(\mu)}{d \ln \mu} = \beta(a) = -\frac{a^2}{1-a} \frac{(3N_c - N_F) - N_F \gamma_Q(a)}{N_c}, \quad a(\mu) = N_c g^2(\mu)/8\pi^2 = N_c \alpha(\mu)/2\pi \quad (2.2)$$

*can't change its sign by itself (and can't become frozen at zero outside the conformal window) and behaves smoothly*. I.e., when increased  $a(\mu)$  crosses unity from below and denominator in (2.2) crosses zero, the increased quark anomalous dimension  $\gamma_Q(\mu)$  crosses  $(3N_c - N_F)/N_F$  from below, so that the  $\beta$ -function behaves smoothly and remains negative at  $\mu < \Lambda_Q$ . The coupling  $a(\mu \ll \Lambda_Q)$  continues to increase with decreasing  $\mu$

$$\frac{da(\mu)}{d \ln \mu} = \beta(a) \rightarrow -\nu a < 0, \quad \nu = \left[ \frac{N_F}{N_c} (1 + \gamma_Q^{\text{str}}) - 3 \right] = \text{const} > 0, \quad a(\mu \ll \Lambda_Q) \sim \left( \frac{\Lambda_Q}{\mu} \right)^{\nu > 0} \gg 1. \quad (2.3)$$

In section 7 of [1] (see also [7],[8]) the values  $\gamma_Q^{\text{str}} = (2N_c - N_F)/(N_F - N_c) > 1$ ,  $\nu = (3N_c - 2N_F)/(N_F - N_c) > 0$  at  $\mu \ll \Lambda_Q$  and  $N_c < N_F < 3N_c/2$  have been found from matching of definite two point correlators in the direct  $SU(N_c)$  theory and in  $SU(N_F - N_c)$  Seiberg's dual [6]. In our case here with  $1 \leq N_F < N_c$  the dual theory does not exist. So that, unfortunately, we can't find the concrete value  $\gamma_Q^{\text{str}}$ . But, as will be shown below, for our purposes it will be sufficient to have the only condition  $\nu > 0$  in (2.3).

Let us look now whether a potentially possible higgsing of quarks at large  $N_c$  (2.1) with  $\rho = \Lambda_Q \left( \frac{\Lambda_Q}{m_Q} \right)^{\frac{N_c - N_F}{2N_c}}$  can give gluons such a mass which will stop the perturbative massless RG-evolution. At large  $N_c$  (2.1) such running gluon mass would look at  $\mu \ll \Lambda_Q$  as, see (1.5),(2.3),(2.6),(2.7)

$$\frac{\mu_{\text{gl}}^2(\mu \ll \Lambda_Q, N_c)}{\mu^2} \sim \frac{a(\mu \ll \Lambda_Q)}{N_c} z_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu \ll \Lambda_Q) \frac{\rho^2}{\mu^2} \sim \left( \frac{\mu}{\Lambda_Q} \ll 1 \right)^{\Delta > 0} \left[ \frac{1}{N_c} \left( \frac{\Lambda_Q}{m_Q} \right)^{\frac{N_c - N_F}{N_c}} \ll 1 \right] \ll 1, \quad (2.4)$$

$$\Delta = \frac{N_c - N_F}{N_c} (1 + \gamma_Q^{\text{str}}) > 0, \quad z_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu \ll \Lambda_Q) \sim \left( \frac{\mu}{\Lambda_Q} \right)^{\gamma_Q^{\text{str}} > 2} \ll 1, \quad \text{at } m_Q^{\text{pole}} < \mu \ll \Lambda_Q,$$

$$\frac{\mu_{\text{gl}}^2(\mu < m_Q^{\text{pole}}, N_c)}{\mu^2} \sim \frac{a_{SYM}^{(\text{str.pert})}(\mu < m_Q^{\text{pole}})}{N_c} z_Q(\Lambda_Q, m_Q^{\text{pole}}) \frac{\rho^2}{\mu^2} \sim \frac{1}{N_c} \frac{\mu}{m_Q^{\text{pole}}} \ll 1, \quad \text{at } \Lambda_{SYM} < \mu < m_Q^{\text{pole}}. \quad (2.5)$$

It is seen from (1.5),(2.4),(2.5) that at large  $N_c$  (2.1) the potentially possible gluon mass becomes too small. I.e., potentially higgsed quarks become unable to give such masses to gluons which will stop the

perturbative massless RG-evolution (and there is no pole in the gluon propagator). Although the mean value  $\langle M \rangle = \sum_{a=1}^{N_c} \langle \widehat{Q}_1^a Q_a^1 \rangle (\mu = \Lambda_Q) = \langle S \rangle / m_Q \gg \Lambda_Q^2$  (1.4) remains numerically the same, *it becomes non-factorizable because gluons become (effectively) massless. The values of  $\langle \widehat{Q}_j^b \rangle$  and  $\langle \widehat{Q}_a^i \rangle$  drop then to zero due to freely fluctuating physical (i.e. path dependent) quark phases from interaction with (effectively) massless at  $\mu \sim m_Q^{\text{pole}}$  gluons. And this shows that the assumption about higgsed quarks becomes not self-consistent at sufficiently large  $N_c$*  (2.1).

This regime is qualitatively similar to those for heavy quarks with  $m_Q \gg \Lambda_Q$ . They are also not higgsed, i.e.  $\langle \widehat{Q}_j^b \rangle = \langle \widehat{Q}_a^i \rangle = 0$ , but confined and decouple as heavy at  $\mu < m_Q^{\text{pole}}$ , in the region where gluons are (effectively) massless. And nonzero value of  $\langle M \rangle = \sum_{a=1}^{N_c} \langle \widehat{Q}_1^a Q_a^1 \rangle (\mu = \Lambda_Q) = \langle S \rangle / m_Q$  (1.4) is also not due to higgsed quarks but arises from the one loop Konishi anomaly for heavy quarks.

The meaning and properties of the operator  $M_j^i$  are very different for higgsed or non-higgsed at large  $N_c$  (2.1) quarks. While  $M_j^i = [\delta_j^i \rho^2 = \delta_j^i \Lambda_Q^2 (\Lambda_Q / m_Q)^{(N_c - N_F) / N_c}] + \Pi_j^i$ ,  $\langle \Pi_j^i \rangle = 0$ , where  $\Pi_j^i$  is the one-particle operator of the light pion for higgsed quarks, for non-higgsed quarks with  $\rho = 0$   $M_j^i$  is the two-particle quark operator, its mean value  $\langle M_j^i \rangle$  becomes *non-factorizable* and originates from the one-loop Konishi anomaly, see (1.2),(1.4).

Therefore, let us look in this case of non-higgsed quarks on the increasing with decreasing  $\mu < \Lambda_Q$  running quark mass  $m_Q(\mu < \Lambda_Q)$  and on possible value of the quark pole mass. It looks as, see (2.3)

$$m_Q(\mu \ll \Lambda_Q) = \frac{m_Q}{z_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu \ll \Lambda_Q)}, \quad z_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu \ll \Lambda_Q) \sim \left( \frac{\mu}{\Lambda_Q} \right)^{\gamma_Q^{\text{str}} > 2} \ll 1,$$

$$m_Q^{\text{pole}} = \frac{m_Q}{z_Q(\Lambda_Q, m_Q^{\text{pole}})} \rightarrow m_Q^{\text{pole}} \sim \Lambda_Q \left( \frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q} \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma_Q^{\text{str}}} > 0} \ll \Lambda_Q. \quad (2.6)$$

As a result, *the quarks are not higgsed and decouple as heavy at  $\mu < m_Q^{\text{pole}}$ . There remains at lower energies the  $\mathcal{N} = 1$   $SU(N_c)$  SYM in the perturbative strong coupling branch.* From the NSVZ  $\beta$ -function [3]

$$\frac{da_{SYM}^{(str, pert)}(\mu \gg \Lambda_{SYM})}{d \ln \mu} = - \frac{3 \left( a_{SYM}^{(str, pert)}(\mu \gg \Lambda_{SYM}) \right)^2}{1 - a_{SYM}^{(str, pert)}(\mu \gg \Lambda_{SYM})} \rightarrow 3 a_{SYM}^{(str, pert)}(\mu),$$

$$a_{SYM}^{(str, pert)}(\mu \gg \Lambda_{SYM}) \sim \left( \frac{\mu}{\Lambda_{SYM}} \right)^3 \gg 1, \quad a_{SYM}^{(str, pert)}(\mu \sim \Lambda_{SYM}) = \mathcal{O}(1). \quad (2.7)$$

The scale factor of  $\Lambda_{SYM}$  of the gauge coupling is determined from matching, see (2.3),(2.6),(2.7)

$$a_+(\mu = m_Q^{\text{pole}}) = \left( \frac{\Lambda_Q}{m_Q^{\text{pole}}} \right)^\nu = a_{SYM}^{(str, pert)}(\mu = m_Q^{\text{pole}}) = \left( \frac{m_Q^{\text{pole}}}{\Lambda_{SYM}} \right)^3 \rightarrow \Lambda_{SYM} = \left( \Lambda_Q^{3N_c - N_F} m_Q^{N_F} \right)^{1/3N_c}, \quad (2.8)$$

as it should be, see (1.4). Besides, as a check of self-consistency, see (2.3),(2.6),(2.8)

$$\left( \frac{\Lambda_{SYM}}{m_Q^{\text{pole}}} \right)^3 \sim \left( \frac{m_Q}{\Lambda_Q} \right)^{\omega > 0} \ll 1, \quad \omega = \frac{\nu > 0}{(1 + \gamma_Q^{\text{str}})} > 0. \quad (2.9)$$

as it should be. At  $\mu < \Lambda_{SYM}$  the perturbative RG evolution stops due to nonperturbative effects  $\sim \Lambda_{SYM}$  in the pure  $\mathcal{N} = 1$   $SU(N_c)$  SYM.

On the whole, the mass spectrum at  $1 \leq N_F \leq N_c - 1$  and large  $N_c$  (2.1) looks as follows. a) All quarks are not higgsed (i.e.  $\rho = 0$  and their color charges are not screened due to  $\rho \neq 0$ ) but decouple as heavy at  $\mu < m_Q^{\text{pole}}$  and are weakly confined. There is a number of quarkonia with the mass scale

$\mathcal{O}(m_Q^{\text{pole}}) \ll \Lambda_Q$  (2.6)(2.9), with different spins and other quantum numbers. The confinement originates from the  $\mathcal{N} = 1$   $SU(N_c)$  SYM and so the typical string tension is  $\sigma_{SYM}^{1/2} \sim \Lambda_{SYM} \ll m_Q^{\text{pole}} \ll \Lambda_Q$ .<sup>6</sup> b) There is a number of  $SU(N_c)$  gluonia with the typical mass scale  $\sim \Lambda_{SYM}$  (2.8). It is seen from the above that the mass spectra at  $\mu_{\text{gl}} \gg \Lambda_Q$  (1.5) or  $\mu_{\text{gl}} \sim \Lambda_{SYM} \ll \Lambda_Q$  at large  $N_c$  (2.1) are qualitatively different.

Now, about a qualitative difference between the analytic crossover and not analytic phase transition. The order parameter for quark higgsing is  $\rho$  (1.7). As pointed out below (2.5),  $\rho = 0$  at large  $N_c$  (2.1) due to freely fluctuating physical (i.e. path dependent) quark field phases from interaction with (effectively) massless at  $\mu \sim m_Q^{\text{pole}}$  gluons. This shows that quarks become unhiggsed at such  $N_c$ . While  $\rho \neq 0$  and large at  $N_c$  from (1.5) because the corresponding gluons are heavy,  $\mu_{\text{gl}} \gg \Lambda_Q$ . There is the phase transition at  $\mu_{\text{gl}} \sim \Lambda_Q$ .

The additional arguments for a phase transition between these two regions of  $N_c$  (as opposite to an analytic crossover) look as follows.

Let us suppose now that, for the analytical crossover instead of the phase transition, the quarks would remain higgsed at large  $N_c$  (2.1), with still  $\rho = \Lambda_Q^2 (\Lambda_Q/m_Q)^{(N_c-N_F)/N_c}$  (i.e. ignoring all given above arguments for  $\rho = 0$ ). As can be seen from (2.4),(2.5),(2.7),  $(\mu_0^2 = z_Q(\Lambda_Q, m_Q^{\text{pole}})\rho^2 \ll \Lambda_{SYM}^2)$ , and even  $N_c \mu_{\text{gl}}^2 (\mu \sim \Lambda_{SYM}) / \Lambda_{SYM}^2 \sim \Lambda_{SYM} / m_Q^{\text{pole}} \ll 1$ , the *additional* effects from supposedly still higgsed quarks will be then parametrically small and dynamically irrelevant for the RG-evolution from  $\mu = \Lambda_Q$ /(several) down to  $\mu \sim \Lambda_{SYM}$ . So, the RG-evolution in (2.4),(2.6) will remain valid in the range  $m_Q^{\text{pole}} < \mu < \Lambda_Q$  where all quarks and gluons are (effectively) massless. And the RG-evolution in (2.5),(2.7) (after quarks decoupled as heavy) will also remain valid in the range  $\Lambda_{SYM} < \mu < m_Q^{\text{pole}}$  where all gluons remain (effectively) massless. At  $\mu \sim \Lambda_{SYM}$  the larger nonperturbative effects  $\sim \Lambda_{SYM}$  from  $\mathcal{N} = 1$   $SU(N_c)$  SYM come into a game and stop the perturbative RG-evolution with (effectively) massless gluons.

For the case of decoupled as heavy non-higgsed quarks with  $\rho = 0$  (as described above), a widely spread opinion (supported by lattice calculations) is that the confinement of quarks *originates from higgsing of magnetically charged solitons in  $SU(N_c)$  (S)YM*. But then, for heavy but still higgsed quarks, the regime would be self-contradictory. Regardless of *non-zero* numerical values of their vacuum condensates, there would be then in the whole  $\mathcal{N} = 1$   $SU(N_c)$  SYM *simultaneously* higgsed quarks and higgsed magnetically charged solitons. But these magnetically charged solitons and quarks are mutually nonlocal and *can not be higgsed simultaneously*.

On the whole, we presented a number of arguments that, for quarks with fixed  $m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q$ ,  $1 \leq N_F \leq N_c - 1$ , there is not the analytical crossover but the phase transition at sufficiently large  $N_c$  between the phases with higgsed or confined quarks. Besides, as was argued above, the perturbative gluon mass  $\mu_{\text{gl}}$  proportional to the order parameter  $\rho$  of quark higgsing (1.6) is nonzero and large at  $\mu_{\text{gl}} \gg \Lambda_Q$  (1.5) and becomes not simply small but zero at sufficiently large  $N_c$  (2.1) because the order parameter  $\rho$  jumps to zero and quarks become unhiggsed. The nonzero gluon masses  $\sim \Lambda_{SYM}$  are of nonperturbative origin, not due to higgsed quarks.

Another types of phase transitions in considered here theories and in  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD are described in Appendix and in sections 6.1, 6.2, 7, 8 of [9].

I'm grateful to R.N. Lee for useful discussions about the gauge invariance.

## A      The phase transition between the regions $m_Q \gg \Lambda_Q$ and $m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q$ at $N_F = N_c - 1$

---

<sup>6</sup> There is no confinement in Yukawa-like theories without gauge interactions. Confinement originates only from (S)YM sector. The  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  SYM is the theory with only one dimensional parameter  $\Lambda_{SYM}$ . Therefore, it can't give a string tension  $\sigma^{1/2} \sim \Lambda_Q$  but only  $\sigma^{1/2} \sim \Lambda_{SYM} \ll \Lambda_Q$ .

## 1. Confined quarks at large $m_Q \gg \Lambda_Q$ .

Heavy quarks have large masses and small mean vacuum value  $\langle M \rangle = \Lambda_Q^2 (\Lambda_Q/m_Q)^{(N_c - N_F = 1)/N_c} \ll \Lambda_Q^2 \ll \Lambda_{SYM}^2 \ll m_Q^2$ , see (1.2),(1.4). For this reason they are not higgsed, i.e.  $\langle \overline{Q}_i^a \rangle = \langle Q_a^i \rangle = 0$  due to freely fluctuating physical (i.e. path dependent) quark phases from interaction with (effectively) massless gluons at  $\mu \sim m_Q^{\text{pole}}$ . *They are confined* and decouple as heavy in the weak coupling regime at  $\mu < m_Q^{\text{pole}} = m_Q/z_Q(\Lambda_Q, m_Q^{\text{pole}}) \gg \Lambda_Q$ , where  $z_Q(\Lambda_Q, m_Q^{\text{pole}}) \gg 1$  is the logarithmic renormalization factor. The scale factor  $\Lambda_{SYM}$  (1.4) of remained  $\mathcal{N} = 1$   $SU(N_c)$  SYM is determined from matching of logarithmically small couplings  $a_+(\mu = m_Q^{\text{pole}}) = a_{SYM}(\mu = m_Q^{\text{pole}})$ .<sup>7</sup> The small nonzero value of  $\langle M \rangle$  originates from the one loop Konishi anomaly (1.4) for heavy quarks.

*The global  $SU(N_F)$  is unbroken.* There is in the spectrum a number of heavy flavored quarkonia with masses  $\mathcal{O}(m_Q) \gg \Lambda_{SYM}$  and different quantum numbers. For instance, the quark-antiquark bound states with different spins and other quantum numbers are in the adjoint or singlet representations of unbroken global  $SU(N_F)$ . It is important that, due to a confinement, *there are no particles in the spectrum in the  $SU(N_F)$  (anti)fundamental representation of dimensionality  $N_F$ .* Besides, there are in the spectrum a number  $SU(N_F)$  singlet gluonia with typical masses  $\sim \Lambda_{SYM} = \Lambda_Q(m_Q/\Lambda_Q)^{N_F/3N_c}$ ,  $\Lambda_Q \ll \Lambda_{SYM} \ll m_Q$ . This is all.

## 2. Higgsed quarks at small $m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q$ and $\mu_{\text{gl}} \gg \Lambda_Q$ .

All such quarks with their  $4N_F N_c$  real degrees of freedom have small current masses  $m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q$  and large mean vacuum values  $\langle M_j^i \rangle = \sum_{a=1}^{N_c} \langle \overline{Q}_j^a Q_a^i \rangle = \delta_j^i \Lambda_Q^2 (\Lambda_Q/m_Q)^{\frac{1}{N_c}} \gg \Lambda_Q^2 \gg \Lambda_{SYM}^2$ ,  $\mu_{\text{gl}} \gg \Lambda_Q$ , see (1.5). They all are higgsed in this case in the weak coupling region and the global color group  $SU(N_c)$  is broken. The quark mean vacuum values of  $\langle \hat{Q}_a^i \rangle$  and  $\langle \hat{\overline{Q}}_i^a \rangle$  look as, see (1.6),(1.7):

$$\langle \hat{Q}_a^i \rangle = \delta_a^i \omega, \quad \langle \hat{\overline{Q}}_i^a \rangle = \delta_j^a \omega, \quad \omega = \Lambda_Q (\Lambda_Q/m_Q)^{1/2N_c} \gg 1, \quad i = 1 \dots N_F, \quad a = 1 \dots N_c. \quad (\text{A1})$$

From (A1), the unbroken global symmetry looks now as:  $SU(N_F) \times SU(N_c) \times U(1)_B \rightarrow SU(N_F)_{F+C} \times U(1)_{\hat{B}}$ , i.e. the color-flavor locking. *There is no confinement.* All  $N_c^2 - 1 = N_F^2 + 2N_F$  heavy gluons (which "ate"  $N_F^2 + 2N_F$  massless Goldstone degrees of freedom from quarks) and the same number of their scalar superpartners acquired large masses (1.5). They form 2 adjoint representations of  $SU(N_F)$  plus two  $SU(N_F)$  singlets. Plus, and this is most important, else  $2N_F$  heavy gluons  $(A_\mu)_{a=N_c}^i$ ,  $(A_\mu)_i^{a=N_c}$ ,  $i = 1 \dots N_F$  and  $2N_F$  their scalar superpartners. These  $4N_f$  form *two fundamental and two antifundamental representations of  $SU(N_F)$  with dimensionality  $N_F$  each.* And finally, there are  $N_F^2$  light complex pions  $\Pi_j^i$ ,  $i, j = 1 \dots N_F$  with small masses  $\sim m_Q$  (1.11) which form the adjoint and singlet representations of  $SU(N_F)$ . *Therefore, there are only fixed numbers of particles with fixed quantum numbers in the spectrum.*

The mass matrix of  $N_c^2 - 1$  heavy massive gluons look as, see (A1):

$$M^2 = 2g^2(\mu_{\text{gl}}) z_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu = \mu_{\text{gl}}) \sum_{i=1}^{N_F} \sum_{a,c=1}^{N_c} \langle (\hat{Q}^\dagger)_i^a \rangle \left\{ \sum_{b=1}^{N_c} (A_\mu)_a^b (A_\mu)_b^c \right\} \langle \hat{Q}_c^i \rangle =$$

$$K \sum_{i=1}^{N_F} \sum_{b=1}^{N_c} (A_\mu)_i^b (A_\mu)_b^i, \quad K = 2g^2(\mu_{\text{gl}}) z_Q(\Lambda_Q, \mu = \mu_{\text{gl}}) \left( \omega^2 = \Lambda_Q^2 (\Lambda_Q/m_Q)^{1/N_c} \right). \quad (\text{A2})$$

From (A2), the masses of gluons in different representations of unbroken global  $SU(N_F)$  are *different*:

$$\mu_{\text{gl}}^2(SU(N_F)_{\text{adj}}) = K, \quad \mu_{\text{gl}}^2(SU(N_F)_{\text{singl}}) = \frac{1}{N_c} K, \quad \mu_{\text{gl}}^2(SU(N_F)_{\text{fund}}) = \mu_{\text{gl}}^2(SU(N_F)_{\text{anti-fund}}) = \frac{1}{2} K, \quad (\text{A3})$$

<sup>7</sup>The nonzero gluon masses originate only in  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  SYM due to nonperturbative effects, their typical scale is  $\sim \Lambda_{SYM}$ .

(and the same for their scalar superpartners). It is seen from (A3) that  $N_c^2 - 1$  heavy gluons have different masses and do not form one adjoint representation of global  $SU(N_c)$  at  $N_c > 2$ .

From comparison of mass spectra properties in regions  $m_Q \gg \Lambda_Q$  and  $m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q, \mu_{\text{gl}} \gg \Lambda_Q$  (1.5) it is seen that, although the unbroken global symmetry  $SU(N_F)$  is the same, but *realized are its different representations*. In the case of heavy confined quarks there are no particles in the spectrum in the (anti)fundamental representation of  $SU(N_F)$ , while in the case of light higgsed quarks such representations are present. E.g., for fixed  $N_c$ , we can start with the case of heavy quarks with  $m_Q \gg \Lambda_Q$  and to diminish continuously  $m_Q$  until  $m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q$ . And when reaching the appropriately small value of  $m_Q$ , such that  $\mu_{\text{gl}} \gtrsim \Lambda_Q$  (A3), all quarks become higgsed and the behavior of the mass spectrum under unbroken global  $SU(N_F)$  transformations changes discontinuously (because the dimensions of representations can not change continuously). *This jump is impossible in the case of crossover (which is analytic), this means the phase transition between the confinement and higgs phases.*

And this shows that a widely spread opinion, originating from the paper of E. Fradkin and S.H. Shenker [10], about absence of the phase transition between the confinement and higgs phases is not correct.

At the same time, the bilinear mean vacuum value  $\langle M_j^i \rangle = \delta_j^i \langle M \rangle$  (1.2) ,(1.4) behaves smoothly with diminished  $m_Q$ , but this does not mean that there can not be the phase transition. The qualitative difference is that  $\langle M_j^i \rangle = \sum_{a=1}^{N_c} \langle \widehat{Q}_j^a \rangle \langle \widehat{Q}_a^i \rangle = \delta_j^i \omega^2 \neq 0$ , see (A1), (1.7), *i.e. factorizes* for higgsed quarks with  $m_Q \ll \Lambda_Q, \mu_{\text{gl}} > \Lambda_Q$  (the order parameter is  $\omega = \Lambda_Q (\Lambda_Q/m_Q)^{\frac{1}{2N_c}} \gg \Lambda_Q$ , see (A1)). While for heavy non-higgsed but weakly confined quarks with  $m_Q \gg \Lambda_Q$  (the string tension originates from  $\mathcal{N} = 1$   $SU(N_c)$  SYM unbroken by heavy non-higgsed quarks and is typically  $\sigma^{1/2} \sim \Lambda_{\text{SYM}} \ll m_Q$ ) this bilinear  $\langle M_j^i \rangle$  *becomes non-factorizable (it originates then from the one-loop Konishi anomaly, see (1.4))* and all  $\langle \widehat{Q}_i^a \rangle = \langle \widehat{Q}_a^i \rangle = 0$ , see the text under (2.5).

## References

- [1] V.L. Chernyak, JETP 110, 383 (2010) (sections 2 and 7 only), arXiv:0712.3167 [hep-th]
- [2] K. Konishi, Phys. Lett. B135, 439 (1984)
- [3] V. Novikov, M. Shifman, A. Vainshtein, V. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B229, 381 (1983)  
M. Shifman, A. Vainshtein, Nucl. Phys. B277, 456 (1986)
- [4] G. Veneziano, S. Yankielowicz, Phys. Lett. B113, 321 (1982)
- [5] I. Affleck, M. Dine, N. Seiberg, Nucl.Phys. B241, 493 (1984), Nucl.Phys. B256, 557 (1985)
- [6] N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. B435, 129 (1995), hep-th/9411149
- [7] V.L. Chernyak, JETP 114, 61 (2012), arXiv:0811.4283 [hep-th]
- [8] V.L. Chernyak, Physics of Atomic Nuclei, 83, 794 (2020), arXiv:2003.10160 [hep-th]
- [9] V.L. Chernyak, Softly broken  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD: mass spectra in vacua with unbroken  $Z_{2N_c - N_F}$  symmetry, arXiv:1711.01169 [hep-th]
- [10] E. Fradkin, S.H. Shenker, Phase diagrams of lattice gauge theories with higgs fields, Phys. Rev. D19, 3682 (1979)