The Dark Side of the Propagators

Analytical approach to QCD in the infrared of Minkowski space

Fabio Siringo

Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of Catania, Italy

LATTICE 2016 - Southampton, 25-30 July 2016

Overview: the whole talk in a slide

Overview: the whole talk in a slide

- The Dream:

Overview: the whole talk in a slide

- The Dream:
  Do all the work analytically and forget about Lattice People!

Overview: the whole talk in a slide

- The Dream:
  Do all the work analytically and forget about Lattice People!

  Change the expansion point $\rightarrow$ Massive Expansion
  also known as Optimized Perturbation Theory (OPT) and
  evaluate everything from first principles

Overview: the whole talk in a slide

- The Dream:
  Do all the work analytically and forget about Lattice People!

  Change the expansion point $\rightarrow$ Massive Expansion
  also known as Optimized Perturbation Theory (OPT) and evaluate everything from first principles

- Reality:
  Not self-consistent yet $\rightarrow$ Optimization by Lattice

Overview: the whole talk in a slide

- The Dream:
  Do all the work analytically and forget about Lattice People!

  Change the expansion point $\rightarrow$ Massive Expansion
  also known as Optimized Perturbation Theory (OPT) and evaluate everything from first principles

- Reality:
  Not self-consistent yet $\rightarrow$ Optimization by Lattice

  but

  we can analytically continue to Minkowski space!

Breaking the Dogma:

- Perturbation Theory (PT) works well in the IR (Tissier+Wschebor,2010,2011 - Landau Gauge)

Breaking the Dogma:

- Perturbation Theory (PT) works well in the IR (Tissier+Wschebor,2010,2011 - Landau Gauge)
- OPT is an old story: $(\mathcal{L}_0 + \delta\mathcal{L}_m) + (\mathcal{L}_{int} - \delta\mathcal{L}_m)$

Breaking the Dogma:

- Perturbation Theory (PT) works well in the IR (Tissier+Wschebor,2010,2011 - Landau Gauge)
- OPT is an old story: $(\mathcal{L}_0 + \delta\mathcal{L}_m) + (\mathcal{L}_{int} - \delta\mathcal{L}_m)$
- [Massive propagator] + [mass counterterm $\delta\Gamma = m^2$]

Breaking the Dogma:

- Perturbation Theory (PT) works well in the IR (Tissier+Wschebor,2010,2011 - Landau Gauge)
- OPT is an old story: $(\mathcal{L}_0 + \delta\mathcal{L}_m) + (\mathcal{L}_{int} - \delta\mathcal{L}_m)$
- [Massive propagator] + [mass counterterm $\delta\Gamma = m^2$]

Nice features:

Breaking the Dogma:

- Perturbation Theory (PT) works well in the IR (Tissier+Wschebor,2010,2011 - Landau Gauge)
- OPT is an old story: $(\mathcal{L}_0 + \delta\mathcal{L}_m) + (\mathcal{L}_{int} - \delta\mathcal{L}_m)$
- [Massive propagator] + [mass counterterm $\delta\Gamma = m^2$]

Nice features:

- The mass kills itself at tree-level:

$$\Sigma_{tree} = -\!\!\times\!\!- = \delta\Gamma = m^2 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad (-p^2 + m^2) - \Sigma = -p^2$$

Breaking the Dogma:

- Perturbation Theory (PT) works well in the IR (Tissier+Wschebor,2010,2011 - Landau Gauge)
- OPT is an old story: $(\mathcal{L}_0 + \delta\mathcal{L}_m) + (\mathcal{L}_{int} - \delta\mathcal{L}_m)$
- [Massive propagator] + [mass counterterm $\delta\Gamma = m^2$]

Nice features:

- The mass kills itself at tree-level:

$\Sigma_{tree} =$  $= \delta\Gamma = m^2 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad (-p^2 + m^2) - \Sigma = -p^2$

- Mass divergences cancel in loops:

 $=$ IR finite

Breaking the Dogma:

- Perturbation Theory (PT) works well in the IR (Tissier+Wschebor,2010,2011 - Landau Gauge)
- OPT is an old story: $(\mathcal{L}_0 + \delta\mathcal{L}_m) + (\mathcal{L}_{int} - \delta\mathcal{L}_m)$
- [Massive propagator] + [mass counterterm $\delta\Gamma = m^2$]

Nice features:

- The mass kills itself at tree-level:

$\Sigma_{tree} =$  $= \delta\Gamma = m^2 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad (-p^2 + m^2) - \Sigma = -p^2$

- Mass divergences cancel in loops:

 $+$  $=$ IR finite

- The original Lagrangian is not modified

Breaking the Dogma:

- Perturbation Theory (PT) works well in the IR (Tissier+Wschebor,2010,2011 - Landau Gauge)
- OPT is an old story: $(\mathcal{L}_0 + \delta\mathcal{L}_m) + (\mathcal{L}_{int} - \delta\mathcal{L}_m)$
- [Massive propagator] + [mass counterterm $\delta\Gamma = m^2$]

Nice features:

- The mass kills itself at tree-level:

$$\Sigma_{tree} = \text{(diagram)} = \delta\Gamma = m^2 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad (-p^2 + m^2) - \Sigma = -p^2$$

- Mass divergences cancel in loops:

$= $ IR finite

- The original Lagrangian is not modified
- Standard UV behavior

Breaking the Dogma:

- Perturbation Theory (PT) works well in the IR (Tissier+Wschebor,2010,2011 - Landau Gauge)
- OPT is an old story: $(\mathcal{L}_0 + \delta\mathcal{L}_m) + (\mathcal{L}_{int} - \delta\mathcal{L}_m)$
- [Massive propagator] + [mass counterterm $\delta\Gamma = m^2$]

Nice features:

- The mass kills itself at tree-level:

$\Sigma_{tree} =$  $= \delta\Gamma = m^2 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad (-p^2 + m^2) - \Sigma = -p^2$

- Mass divergences cancel in loops:

 $=$ IR finite

- The original Lagrangian is not modified
- Standard UV behavior
- From *first principles*

Do mass divergences cancel at any order?

A simple argument:

- Mass divergences arise from the massive propagator
- No mass divergences in the exact (scaleless) theory
- The Lagrangian is not modified

Do mass divergences cancel at any order?

A simple argument:

- Mass divergences arise from the massive propagator
- No mass divergences in the exact (scaleless) theory
- The Lagrangian is not modified

The counterterms $\delta\Gamma = m^2$ must cancel the divergences.
How many do we need?

Do mass divergences cancel at any order?

A simple argument:

- Mass divergences arise from the massive propagator
- No mass divergences in the exact (scaleless) theory
- The Lagrangian is not modified

The counterterms $\delta\Gamma = m^2$ must cancel the divergences.
How many do we need?



$$\frac{1}{-p^2+m^2} \Longrightarrow \frac{1}{-p^2+m^2}\, m^2\, \frac{1}{-p^2+m^2}$$

The integral is less divergent at each insertion.
A finite number of insertions makes any loop integral convergent:

Do mass divergences cancel at any order?

A simple argument:

- Mass divergences arise from the massive propagator
- No mass divergences in the exact (scaleless) theory
- The Lagrangian is not modified

The counterterms $\delta\Gamma = m^2$ must cancel the divergences.
How many do we need?



$$\frac{1}{-p^2+m^2} \Longrightarrow \frac{1}{-p^2+m^2}\, m^2\, \frac{1}{-p^2+m^2}$$

The integral is less divergent at each insertion.
A finite number of insertions makes any loop integral convergent: <u>divergences must cancel at a finite order</u>

One-Loop third-order double expansion
(Landau Gauge)

Yang-Mills $\rightarrow$ F.S., Nucl. Phys. B **907** 572 (2016)
QCD $\rightarrow$ F.S., arXiv:1607.02040



$$\Sigma(p) = \alpha\Sigma^{(1)}(p) + \alpha^2\Sigma^{(2)}(p,N) + \cdots \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{\Sigma(p)}{\alpha p^2} = -F(p^2/m^2) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha); \qquad F(p^2/m^2) = -\frac{\Sigma^{(1)}}{p^2} \tag{2}$$

$$\Delta(p) = \frac{Z}{p^2 - \Sigma(p)} = \frac{J(p)}{p^2} \tag{3}$$

Setting $\quad Z = z\,(1 + \alpha\delta Z) \quad$ (one-loop):

$$z\,J(p)^{-1} = 1 + \alpha\left[F(p^2/m^2) - \delta Z\right] + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2) \tag{4}$$

$$z\,J(p)^{-1} = 1 + \alpha\left[F(p^2/m^2) - F(\mu^2/m^2)\right] + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2) \tag{5}$$

Must exist x, y, z:

$$\boxed{z\,J(p/x)^{-1} + y = F(p^2/m^2) + F_0 + \mathcal{O}(\alpha)} \tag{6}$$


100
10
1
0.1
0.1
1
p (GeV)
J(p) -1
Duarte et al., SU(3)
Cucchieri and Mendes, SU(2)
Bogolubsky et al., SU(3)
F(p^2/m^2)+F_0

UNIVERSAL SCALING
GLUON INVERSE DRESSING FUNCTION



Denoting by $G(s)$ the ghost universal function ($F(s) \to G(s)$)



The ghost universal function is just

$$G(s) = \frac{1}{12}\left[2 + \frac{1}{s} - 2s\log s + \frac{1}{s^2}(1+s)^2(2s-1)\log(1+s)\right]$$



The ghost universal function is just

$$G(s) = \frac{1}{12}\left[2 + \frac{1}{s} - 2s\log s + \frac{1}{s^2}(1+s)^2(2s-1)\log(1+s)\right]$$



TABLE of OPTIMIZED RENORMALIZATION CONSTANTS: $z\,J(p/x)^{-1} + y = F(p^2/m^2) + F_0$

arXiv:1607.02040

Data set	N	N_f	x	y	z	y'	z'
Bogolubsky et al.	3	0	1	0	3.33	0	1.57
Duarte et al.	3	0	1.1	-0.146	2.65	0.097	1.08
Cucchieri-Mendes	2	0	0.858	-0.254	1.69	0.196	1.09
Ayala et al.	3	0	0.933	-	-	0.045	1.17
Ayala et al.	3	2	1.04	-	-	0.045	1.28
Ayala et al.	3	4	1.04	-	-	0.045	1.28

Table: Scaling constants x, y, z (gluon) and y', z' (ghost). The constant shifts $F_0 = -1.05$, $G_0 = 0.24$ and the mass $m = 0.73$ GeV are optimized by requiring that $x = 1$ and $y = y' = 0$ for the lattice data of Bogolubsky et al. (2009)

RG invariant product (Landau Gauge – MOM-Taylor scheme):

$$\alpha_s(\mu) = \alpha_s(\mu_0)\frac{J(\mu)\chi(\mu)^2}{J(\mu_0)\chi(\mu_0)^2}$$

What if $\delta F_0 = \delta G_0 = \pm 25\%$?



$\mu_0 = 2$ GeV, $\alpha_s = 0.37$, data of Bogolubsky et al.(2009).

RG invariant product (Landau Gauge – MOM-Taylor scheme):

$$\alpha_s(\mu) = \alpha_s(\mu_0)\frac{J(\mu)\chi(\mu)^2}{J(\mu_0)\chi(\mu_0)^2}$$

What if $\delta F_0 = \delta G_0 = \pm 25\%$?



$\mu_0 = 0.15$ GeV, $\alpha_s = 0.2$, data of Bogolubsky et al.(2009).

RG invariant product (Landau Gauge – MOM-Taylor scheme):

$$\alpha_s(\mu) = \alpha_s(\mu_0)\frac{J(\mu)\chi(\mu)^2}{J(\mu_0)\chi(\mu_0)^2}$$

What if $\delta F_0 = \delta G_0 = \pm 25\%$?



$\mu_0 = 0.67$ GeV, $\alpha_s = 1.21$, data of Bogolubsky et al.(2009).

FAQ I

SILLY POINTS MADE BY THE REFEREES
(more serious list at the end)

FAQ I
SILLY POINTS MADE BY THE REFEREES
(more serious list at the end)

- Does the photon acquire a mass by the same method?

FAQ I
SILLY POINTS MADE BY THE REFEREES
(more serious list at the end)

- Does the photon acquire a mass by the same method?
- How can you get anything new by adding "zero" to the Lagrangian ? (without inserting any physical ansatz or any model for NP physics)

FAQ I

SILLY POINTS MADE BY THE REFEREES
(more serious list at the end)

- Does the photon acquire a mass by the same method?
- How can you get anything new by adding "zero" to the Lagrangian ? (without inserting any physical ansatz or any model for NP physics)
- The method must be wrong otherwise it would also explain Chiral Symmetry Breaking

SILLY POINTS MADE BY THE REFEREES
(more serious list at the end)

- Does the photon acquire a mass by the same method?
- How can you get anything new by adding "zero" to the Lagrangian ? (without inserting any physical ansatz or any model for NP physics)
- The method must be wrong otherwise it would also explain Chiral Symmetry Breaking
- The method must be wrong otherwise the propagator could be analytically continued to Minkowski space where the gluon would get a physical dynamical pole



Lattice data are from Bogolubsky et al. (2009)



Lattice data are from Bogolubsky et al. (2009)



GLUON PROPAGATAOR - SU(3)
Real Part
Imaginary Part
m²= (0.16 ± i 0.60) GeV²
0.08
0.06
0.04
0.02
0
-0.02
-0.04
-0.06
-0.08
0
0.5
1
1.5
2
2.5
3
3.5
4
p² (GeV²)

If $G(p)$ has complex poles then

$$G(p^2) = G^R(p^2) + \delta G(p^2)$$

where the *rational* function G^R just contains the poles

$$G^R(z) = \frac{R}{z - \alpha - i\beta} + \frac{R^\star}{z - \alpha + i\beta}$$

and the finite part δG satisfies usual dispersion relations

$$\mathrm{Re}\,\delta G(p^2) = PV \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{\rho(\omega)}{p^2 - \omega}\,\mathrm{d}\omega$$

$$\rho(\omega) = -\frac{1}{\pi}\,\mathrm{Im}\,\delta G(\omega + i\epsilon) = -\frac{1}{\pi}\,\mathrm{Im}\,G(\omega + i\epsilon)$$

$G^R(p^2)$ cannot be reconstructed from $\mathrm{Im}\,G$



Lattice data are from Bogolubsky et al. (2009)

$$G^R(z) = \frac{R}{z-\alpha-i\beta} + \frac{R^\star}{z-\alpha+i\beta} \Longrightarrow \frac{p_E^2 + (\alpha + t\beta)}{p_E^4 + 2\alpha p_E^2 + (\alpha^2+\beta^2)}$$

where $t = (\operatorname{Im} R)/(\operatorname{Re} R) = \tan[\arg(R)]$

RGZ model!



$$\rho(p^2) = -\frac{1}{\pi}\,\mathrm{Im}\,\mathcal{G}(p^2 + i\varepsilon) = \chi(0)\,\delta(p^2) - \frac{1}{\pi}\,\frac{\mathrm{Im}\,\chi(p^2)}{p^2}$$



ANALYTIC CONTINUATION

Ghost dressing function: $\mathcal{G}(p^2) = \frac{\chi(p^2)}{p^2}$



Lattice data are from Bogolubsky et al. (2009)

Optimized by the Lattice $N_f = 2$, $m = 0.8$ GeV M = ?



Lattice data are for two light quarks, from Ayala et al. (2012)

What about poles ?

2 pairs of compex conjugated poles

Optimized by the Lattice:

$m = 0.8$ GeV, $M = 0.65$ GeV

$m_1^2 = (0.54 \pm 0.52i)$ GeV^2, $m_2^2 = (1.69 \pm 0.1i)$ GeV^2





$\Sigma_q =$ 

- The counterterm $\delta\Gamma = -M$ cancels the mass at tree-level
- A massive propagator from *loops* $\rightarrow S(p) = \frac{Z(p)}{\not{p} - M(p)}$
- A new parameter $x = M/m$

but



$\Sigma_q =$ 

- The counterterm $\delta\Gamma = -M$ cancels the mass at tree-level
- A massive propagator from *loops* $\to S(p) = \frac{Z(p)}{\not p - M(p)}$
- A new parameter $x = M/m$

but

- Agreement not as good as for pure YM theory ($Z(p)$ is decreasing)
- $M(p)$ depends on α_s
- Optimization is not easy without RG corrections!



α_s = 0.9
α_s = 0.6
α_s = 0.3
1.4
1.2
1
0.8
0.6
Z (p)
m = 0.7 GeV
M = 0.65 GeV
0
0.5
1
1.5
2
2.5
3
3.5
4
p_E (GeV)



Lattice data are: *unquenched*, $N_f = 2$, in the CHIRAL limit
Bowman et al. (2005)



Lattice data are: *unquenched*, $N_f = 2$, in the CHIRAL limit
Bowman et al. (2005)



Lattice data are: *unquenched*, $N_f = 2$, in the CHIRAL limit
Bowman et al. (2005)

Quark propagator:

$$S(p) = S_p(p^2)\not{p} + S_M(p^2)$$

NO COMPLEX POLES $\Longrightarrow$ Standard Dispersion Relations

Quark propagator:

$$S(p) = S_p(p^2)\not{p} + S_M(p^2)$$

NO COMPLEX POLES $\Longrightarrow$ Standard Dispersion Relations

$$\rho_M(p^2) = -\frac{1}{\pi}\,\mathrm{Im}\, S_M(p^2)$$
$$\rho_p(p^2) = -\frac{1}{\pi}\,\mathrm{Im}\, S_p(p^2)$$

$$S(p) = \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}q^2\, \frac{\rho_p(q^2)\not{p} + \rho_M(q^2)}{p^2 - q^2 + i\varepsilon}.$$

Quark propagator:

$$S(p) = S_p(p^2)\not{p} + S_M(p^2)$$

NO COMPLEX POLES $\Longrightarrow$ Standard Dispersion Relations

$$\rho_M(p^2) = -\frac{1}{\pi}\,\mathrm{Im}\,S_M(p^2)$$
$$\rho_p(p^2) = -\frac{1}{\pi}\,\mathrm{Im}\,S_p(p^2)$$

$$S(p) = \int_0^\infty \mathrm{d}q^2\,\frac{\rho_p(q^2)\not{p} + \rho_M(q^2)}{p^2 - q^2 + i\varepsilon}.$$

Positivity Conditions:

$\rho_p(p^2) \geq 0,$ $\qquad p\,\rho_p(p^2) - \rho_M(p^2) \geq 0$

CHIRAL QCD

Quark sector – $N_f = 2$





ρp
ρM
Re[Sp]
Re[SM]
m = 0.7 GeV
M = 0.65 GeV
αs = 0.9
ρp, Re[Sp] (GeV-2); ρM, Re[SM] (GeV-1)
p2 (GeV2)
2
1.5
1
0.5
0
-0.5
-1
-1.5
-2
-4
-2
0
2
4


ρ_p
ρ_M
$Re[S_p]$
$Re[S_M]$
m = 0.7 GeV
M = 0.94 GeV
$\alpha_s = 0.6$
ρ_p, $Re[S_p]$ (GeV^{-2}); ρ_M, $Re[S_M]$ (GeV^{-1})
p^2 (GeV^2)
2
1.5
1
0.5
0
-0.5
-1
-1.5
-2
-4
-2
0
2
4

CHIRAL QCD

Quark sector: $N_f = 2$, $M = 0.65$ GeV, $m = 0.7$ GeV



Positivity Conditions:

$$\rho_p(p^2) \geq 0, \qquad p\,\rho_p(p^2) - \rho_M(p^2) \geq 0$$

CHIRAL QCD

Quark sector: $N_f = 2$, $M = 0.65$ GeV, $m = 0.7$ GeV



Positivity Conditions:

$$\rho_p(p^2) \geq 0, \qquad\qquad p\,\rho_p(p^2) - \rho_M(p^2) \geq 0$$

FAQ II.

MORE SERIOUS LIST (that the Referees did not raise)

FAQ II.
MORE SERIOUS LIST (that the Referees did not raise)

- What about the *Longitudinal Polarization* ?
  The Landau gauge is very special!

FAQ II.

MORE SERIOUS LIST (that the Referees did not raise)

- What about the *Longitudinal Polarization* ?
  The Landau gauge is very special!
- Can we *Optimize* the expansion (without Lattice Data) ?
  May be by real observables, like glueball masses

FAQ II.
MORE SERIOUS LIST (that the Referees did not raise)

- What about the *Longitudinal Polarization* ?
  The Landau gauge is very special!
- Can we *Optimize* the expansion (without Lattice Data) ?
  May be by real observables, like glueball masses
- Is there any proof of renormalizability ?

- What about the *Longitudinal Polarization* ?
  The Landau gauge is very special!
- Can we *Optimize* the expansion (without Lattice Data) ?
  May be by real observables, like glueball masses
- Is there any proof of renormalizability ?
- What about improving the expansion by RG ?

FAQ II.
MORE SERIOUS LIST (that the Referees did not raise)

- What about the *Longitudinal Polarization* ?
  The Landau gauge is very special!
- Can we *Optimize* the expansion (without Lattice Data) ?
  May be by real observables, like glueball masses
- Is there any proof of renormalizability ?
- What about improving the expansion by RG ?
- More questions and remarks are welcome!

THANK YOU