

# Future of Chiral Extrapolations with Domain Wall Fermions\*

Stephen R. Sharpe<sup>†</sup>

*Physics Department, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-1560, USA*

(Dated: October 29, 2018)

## Abstract

I discuss the constraints on the lattice spacing,  $a$ , the quark masses,  $m$ , the box size,  $L$ , and particularly the residual mass,  $m_{\text{res}}$ , such that one can successfully calculate phenomenologically interesting quantities using Domain Wall fermions (DWF). The constraints on  $a$ ,  $m$ , and  $L$  are largely common with other improved fermion discretizations, and I emphasize that the improved chiral symmetry of DWF does not remove the need for simulations with a significant range of lattice parameters. Concerning  $m_{\text{res}}$ , I compare the analysis of chiral symmetry breaking to that with Wilson fermions, emphasizing that DWF are better than simply Wilson fermions with each chiral symmetry breaking effect reduced by a common factor. I then discuss the impact of non-zero  $m_{\text{res}}$  both on generic hadronic quantities, and on matrix elements which involve mixing with lower dimension operators.

arXiv:0706.0218v1 [hep-lat] 1 Jun 2007

---

\* Extended version of talk given at workshop on “Domain Wall Fermions at Ten Years”, Riken-BNL Research Center, March 15-17, 2007.

<sup>†</sup>sharpe@phys.washington.edu

## I. INTRODUCTION

Simulations with domain-wall fermions (DWF) [1, 2] have made impressive progress over the last few years. Algorithmic improvements (particularly the work of Ref. [3]) have allowed simulations with  $2 + 1$  flavors of dynamical fermions to begin in earnest. Precision results for important quantities have been obtained, e.g.  $B_K$  [4] and the  $K \rightarrow \pi$  form factor [5], albeit at a single lattice spacing. Thus it is a good time to look ahead a few years and study the strengths and limitations of the approach [6].

The key attraction of DWF compared to Wilson-like fermions is the reduction in the size of chiral symmetry breaking. This comes at the cost of adding an extra flavor-like dimension, with concomitant increase in computational cost. The length of the extra dimension,  $L_5$ , is chosen as a compromise between speeding up the simulations (by reducing  $L_5$ ) and decreasing the size of chiral symmetry breaking (by increasing  $L_5$ ). The main focus of this talk is to study the impact of the residual chiral symmetry breaking ( $\chi$ SB) on calculations of phenomenologically important quantities.

I cannot resist setting things up as a choice between three alternatives:

- **DARN GOOD**: No practical barrier to calculating **some** quantities of interest (spectrum,  $B_K$  ...) with desired precision in next 5 years.
- **WONDERFUL**: No practical barrier to calculating **many** quantities of interest (spectrum,  $B_K$ , some  $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$  matrix elements, ...) with desired precision in next 5 years.
- **FANTASTIC**: No practical barrier to calculating **most** quantities of interest (spectrum,  $B_K$ ,  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$ , condensate ...) with desired precision in next 5 years.

There are no bad (or ugly [7]) options here—i.e. it is expected that the theory has the correct continuum limit. The only theoretical concern is whether the effective four-dimensional action is local, and this can be checked numerically, as has been done for present simulations [8]. There is, however, the practical issue of how far calculations can be pushed given available computational resources. What is needed is an ensemble of lattice ensembles with a range of lattice parameters ( $a$ ,  $m_\ell$ ,  $m_s$ , and box size  $L$ ) comparable to that of the present MILC staggered-fermion ensemble. This would allow validation of the methods by comparing to experimentally measured quantities, independent predictions of those quantities which have been accurately calculated with staggered fermions,<sup>1</sup> and first controlled calculations of the quantities which are difficult to obtain using staggered or Wilson-like fermions. It is the latter quantities that are my focus here.

The outline of this talk is as follows. In the next section I briefly recall the range of simulation parameters, in particular the light quark masses, that will likely be needed to extract precision results. This is to emphasize the importance of creating the ensemble of ensembles mentioned above, and to bring out a couple of points that are sometimes forgotten. I then turn to the core of this talk, namely an analysis of the impact of the residual  $\chi$ SB on various important quantities: pion properties, the quark condensate, electroweak matrix elements with and without power divergences, and the pion electromagnetic mass splitting. I

---

<sup>1</sup> Here I am injecting my opinion that it is plausible that rooted-staggered fermions give rise to the correct continuum limit, based on the considerations and work of others summarized in Refs. [7, 9].

also discuss the extent to which one can think of DWF as “*Wilson-fermions-lite*,” i.e. Wilson fermions with the  $\chi$ SB reduced (very significantly) in magnitude. I close by attempting a choice from the three options given above.

I should stress that I am mainly pulling together work in the literature and attempting to provide a uniform discussion, although I am adding some new observations along the way.

## II. HOW SMALL DO $a$ , $m$ AND $1/L$ NEED TO BE?

In this section I make a few remarks on the range of simulation parameters that one should aim for.<sup>2</sup> This range obviously depends on the quantity under consideration and the desired precision. What I have in mind here are “basic” quantities (spectrum, decay constants, matrix elements without subtractions, ...) and percent-level accuracy. Nothing I say here is special to DWF, but conversely one needs to keep in mind that the positive features of DWF do not exempt them from these standard requirements.

### A. How small does $a$ need to be?

Although residual  $\chi$ SB introduces discretization errors linear in the lattice spacing  $a$  (at least for generic quantities, as discussed further below), the dominant such error for most quantities is of relative size  $\mathcal{O}(a\Lambda)^2$ . In other words, DWF are (almost) automatically  $O(a)$  improved. This puts DWF simulations in essentially the same situation as almost all the other large-scale simulations, i.e. those using overlap fermions, non-perturbatively  $O(a)$  improved Wilson fermions, twisted-mass fermions, or staggered fermions.

The scale characterizing discretization errors should be comparable to  $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \approx 0.3 \text{ GeV}$ , and I start by taking  $\Lambda = 0.1 - 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ . With this, the relative size of the leading discretization errors is

$$(a\Lambda)^2 = (0.003 - 0.06) \left( \frac{a}{0.1 \text{ fm}} \right)^2. \quad (1)$$

Since one has, or aims to have, two or more lattice spacings, this leading error should be largely removed by extrapolation to  $a = 0$ , leaving a significantly smaller residue. Thus it is not unreasonable to think that percent-level accuracy should be attainable with  $a_{\text{min}} \approx 0.1 \text{ fm}$ . This is consistent with the RBC/UKQCD plans described at this meeting, which involve moving from the present runs with  $a \approx 0.12 \text{ fm}$  to runs (already underway) at  $a \approx 0.09 \text{ fm}$ .

Is this assessment correct? Are simulations with  $a_{\text{min}} \approx 0.1 \text{ fm}$  sufficient? I raise this issue because there is evidence that smaller lattice spacings are needed for improved Wilson fermions, despite the fact that the leading discretization errors are of the same parametric size as for DWF.<sup>3</sup> Some of the evidence is collected in Sommer’s recent lectures [10]. He quotes the following examples, all using non-perturbatively improved Wilson fermions:

<sup>2</sup> I do not discuss constraints on  $L_5$  in this section—these will be discussed at length below. For the discussion in this section, and in particular for the “basic” quantities under consideration, I assume that  $L_5$  is fixed at a large enough value that residual  $\chi$ SB effects are smaller than other errors.

<sup>3</sup> Improved staggered fermions are also pushing to smaller lattice spacings— $a \approx 0.06 \text{ fm}$  at present, and possibly  $a \approx 0.045 \text{ fm}$  in the future. The need for smaller lattice spacings is greater for staggered fermions, however, because of the need to disentangle taste breaking from the chiral limit.

- 10-15% discretization errors at  $a = 0.1$  fm seen in quenched  $m_q$  and  $f_K$  [11]. These errors are larger than the range above, perhaps indicating that one should use scales as large as  $\Lambda = 750$  MeV.
- Similar effects seen for  $N_f = 2$  [12].
- Large differences between results using different definitions of  $Z_A$  (which should agree in the continuum limit) for  $a \gtrsim 0.1$  fm.[13].

Perhaps because of this, recent high-precision calculations with Wilson-like fermions have worked with lattice spacings down to  $a_{\min} \approx 0.05$  fm [14, 15].

One should also note, however, that improved Wilson fermions do differ from DWF. In particular, the leading sub-dominant error for improved Wilson fermions is proportional to  $a^3$ , an error which is much suppressed for DWF because it is proportional to the residual  $\chi$ SB. It could be, therefore, that discretization errors are smaller with DWF, as has been observed for some quantities using overlap fermions [16, 17]. Nevertheless, it seems prudent to expect larger discretization errors than the estimate in (1) suggests, at least for some quantities, and thus that one may need to work at significantly smaller lattice spacings than 0.1 fm.

### B. How small does $m_q$ need to be?

Concerning the light quark masses, it probably bears repeating that extrapolations to the physical value of the average light quark mass,  $m_\ell \equiv (m_u + m_d)/2 \approx m_s^{\text{phys}}/27$ , require that one work at small enough  $m_\ell$  to be able to see and fit the non-analytic contributions. Examples of such “chiral logarithms” (taken from Ref. [18], where further discussion may be found) are shown in Fig. 1. Here I have plotted the results of continuum  $\chi$ Pt taking  $m_s^{\text{phys}} = 0.08$  GeV,  $f \approx 0.09$  GeV, and, for the Gasser-Leutwyler coefficients,  $L_5 = 1.45 \times 10^{-3}$ ,  $L_8 = 10^{-3}$  and  $L_4 = L_6 = 0$  at a scale  $\mu = m_\rho$  [19]. These curves are indicative of what one should find when doing unquenched chiral extrapolations (and not precise predictions).




FIG. 1: Examples of curvature due to the presence of chiral logarithms.  $m_s$  is held fixed, while  $m_\ell$  is varied down to its physical value. See text for more discussion.

My conclusion is that one needs to have accurate results down to  $m_\ell/m_s^{\text{phys}} \approx 0.1$  for precision extrapolations. This is of course a generic conclusion—individual quantities or ratios may have smaller non-analytic terms and be more easily extrapolated [20]. It is also “old news”—the MILC collaboration has worked down to such masses and found that they

do allow precision extrapolations [21], and other simulations are aiming at, or have already attained, such small masses. But perhaps it is good to keep being reminded of it!

### C. How large does $L$ need to be?

Given the cost of simulating with DWF, work to date has been on relatively small lattices with a physical size of about 2 fm. Here I want to emphasize the importance of using larger lattices, given that finite volume effects can be substantial. I illustrate this in Fig. 2, which shows that at  $m_\ell/m_s = 0.1$ , finite volume shifts are at the few percent level. This is well-known, and indeed generation of  $L = 3$  fm DWF lattices at  $a \approx 0.12$  fm is underway in order to study, and reduce, finite volume effects.




FIG. 2: Example of finite volume effects, as predicted by one-loop  $\chi$ PT, assuming  $a = 0.1$  fm, and taking  $L = 2.4$  fm (thick line—at bottom),  $3.2$  fm (medium line—middle) and  $\infty$  (thin line—top). Parameters as for other figures, except that  $f = 0.08$  GeV. See text for more discussion.

What is perhaps less well-known is that one-loop  $\chi$ PT does not, in general, give an accurate estimate of volume corrections—one needs to include (at least the dominant part of) the two-loop contributions [22]. To say it differently, one-loop results give, in general, a good indication of the magnitude of the effect but are not accurate enough to do a correction accurate at the percent level. Since two-loop calculations are hard, and are likely to be available for only a few quantities, a conservative conclusion is that one must work in volumes large enough so that the one-loop correction is smaller than the desired accuracy. This pushes one to even larger volumes, although how large depends on the quantity and the desired precision.

### III. IMPLICATIONS OF RESIDUAL CHIRAL SYMMETRY BREAKING

Domain-wall fermions work by having left- and right-handed quarks (with small four-dimensional momentum) bound to different defects, in this case the two walls at either end of the fifth dimension. Chiral symmetry—the separate rotation of left- and right-handed quark fields—is broken by the overlap of the bound-state “wavefunctions”. This rough description can be made more precise using a transfer-matrix formalism to describe propagation in the

fifth dimension [23, 24]. The result is that, for the interactions of the low-momentum four-dimensional quark fields (i.e. those with  $p \ll 1/a$ ), the size of  $\chi$ SB can be parameterized by the residual mass (the various definitions of will be discussed below) whose dependence on  $L_5$  is schematically [8, 25]:

$$m_{\text{res}} \sim \frac{e^{-\alpha L_5}}{L_5} + \frac{\rho(0)}{L_5}. \quad (2)$$

I take  $m_{\text{res}}$  to be *dimensionless* in this talk, primarily because it simplifies the comparison with Wilson-like fermions. Some intuition concerning the form of  $m_{\text{res}}$  will be useful in the following, so I give a brief discussion.

The first term on the r.h.s. corresponds to the picture of modes exponentially localized on the walls, which thus have an overlap falling exponentially with  $L_5$ . In the transfer matrix language, this term arises from delocalized eigenmodes, which occur for eigenvalues above the “mobility-edge”  $\alpha$ . In perturbation theory  $\alpha \sim O(1)$ , and depends on the negative mass used in the fifth dimension and on the choice of action [26, 27].

The power-law term in (2) is not visible in perturbation theory, but arises in the transfer-matrix analysis from near-zero modes of the corresponding Hamiltonian, of which  $\rho(0)$  is the density per unit four-volume. A key observation is that the corresponding (four-dimensional) eigenfunctions are localized at the scale of the lattice spacing [28]. Crudely speaking, a left-handed quark propagating on one wall has, generically, only an exponentially damped amplitude to “tunnel” to the other wall (and thus become right-handed), but occasionally encounters a near-zero mode, which can transport it to the other wall with an essentially unsuppressed amplitude. There are, however, constraints on simultaneous “transports” of multiple fermions which will be important later [29]. As for  $\alpha$ , the zero-mode density  $\rho(0)$  can be altered, and in particular reduced, by tuning the gauge and DWF actions.

It is important to keep in mind that both delocalized and localized eigenmodes of the transfer matrix lead to a local effect in the long-distance four-dimensional effective theory, and in particular to a local mass term at leading order in the Symanzik expansion. Here local means exponentially localized at the lattice scale. For the localized eigenmodes, this is automatic. For the delocalized eigenmodes, however, this must arise from the collective effect of the modes in the vicinity of the mobility edge. Heuristically, the argument for locality is that, if the mobility edge is of  $O(1/a)$ , i.e. of order its perturbative value, then, in the viewpoint in which the fifth dimension is a flavor index, one has  $L_5$  four-dimensional flavors coupled with a mass matrix with generic entries of  $O(1/a)$ . Diagonalizing this matrix leads to the single light Dirac fermion and  $L_5 - 1$  heavy fermions with masses of  $O(1/a)$ . Integrating the latter out will lead to a local four dimensional theory.<sup>4</sup> For discussion of the locality of the residual mass term in the transfer-matrix formalism see Refs. [8, 29]. It can also be seen in perturbation theory [26, 27].

I will use the label  $m_{\text{res}}$  in various ways in this talk. It has a fundamental, theoretical

---

<sup>4</sup> The locality of the effective four-dimensional Dirac operator for DWF has been shown to hold (independent of  $L_5$ ), under the assumption of sufficiently small lattice field strengths (which forbids zero modes of the Wilson kernel), or in the presence of an isolated zero-mode [30]. These are the same conditions under which locality of the overlap Dirac operator has been established [31]. As for overlap fermions, the result is not directly applicable to actual DWF simulations, in which no constraint on lattice field strengths is applied, and which have a non-zero density of near-zero modes. Thus in practice one must rely on the mobility-edge discussion of Ref. [28], and check numerically for locality, as in Ref. [8].

definition, as a coefficient in the Symanzik effective Lagrangian [eq. (11) below], but with this definition it is not directly calculable. It is defined in practice using eq. (8) below, but this includes discretization errors (absent in the fundamental  $m_{\text{res}}$ ) which make it (weakly) quark-mass dependent rather than a constant. I follow recent usage and call the calculable quantity  $m'_{\text{res}}(m)$  [32, 33]. Finally, I will also use  $m_{\text{res}}$  generically to mean “a chiral symmetry breaking quantity with similar magnitude to the fundamental value”. In this generic usage the dependence on  $L_5$  has the same form as in eq. (2), but the coefficients of the two terms differ from those for the fundamental  $m_{\text{res}}$ .<sup>5</sup> The main reason for this generic usage is that the Symanzik Lagrangian is invalid inside UV divergent loop integrals—such loops give rise to quantities with a similar magnitude and form to the fundamental  $m_{\text{res}}$ , but which are numerically different. Furthermore, I will be making order-of-magnitude estimates, involving unknown coefficients, so a precise numerical value for  $m_{\text{res}}$  will not be needed.

What matters, then, is the approximate magnitude of  $m_{\text{res}}$  in present and upcoming simulations. A lot of work has clarified that if the coupling is too strong (i.e. if  $a$  is too large) then  $\alpha$  becomes too small and chiral symmetry is lost. Happily, one can avoid this problem by moving towards weak coupling, and further mitigate it by tuning the action. It is also noteworthy that  $\rho(0)$ , the coefficient of the power-law term in  $m_{\text{res}}$ , is expected to drop very rapidly as  $a \rightarrow 0$  [34]. For present  $2 + 1$  flavor dynamical simulations at  $a \approx 0.12$  fm ( $1/a \approx 1.6$  GeV), with  $L_5 = 16$ , and the Iwasaki gauge action, one has  $m_{\text{res}} = 0.003$  [35]. In physical units this is  $m_{\text{res}}/a \approx 5$  MeV, i.e. slightly larger than  $m_\ell^{\text{phys}}$ . Moving to  $a \approx 0.09$  fm ( $1/a \approx 2.2$  GeV) at the same  $L_5$ , one finds a further reduction, with  $m_{\text{res}} \lesssim 0.001$  ( $m_{\text{res}}/a \lesssim 2$  MeV) [36], although the precise value is not yet known.<sup>6</sup> Eventually, as  $a$  decreases at fixed  $L_5$ , one expects from perturbation theory that the dimensionless  $m_{\text{res}}$  asymptotes to a constant up to logarithms, so that  $m_{\text{res}}/a$  will start to increase. Fortunately, simulations have not yet entered this asymptotic regime.

The bottom line is that in the next couple of years one will have  $m_{\text{res}} \approx am_\ell^{\text{phys}}$ , and the question is whether this is small enough to calculate various quantities of interest.

### A. Comparing Wilson and DW fermion analyses of chiral symmetry breaking

I begin by recalling the classic analysis of  $\chi$ SB for (unimproved) Wilson fermions [37], since it will serve as the template for the subsequent discussion of DWF. Explicit breaking of chiral symmetry leads to a violation of the PCAC relation

$$\partial_\mu A_\mu^b = 2mP^b + aX^b, \quad (3)$$

where  $A_\mu^b$  is a particular discretization of the flavor non-singlet axial current,  $P^b$  the ultra-local pseudoscalar density, and  $m$  the quark mass (taking degenerate quarks for simplicity).  $aX^b$  arises from the Wilson-term in the fermion action, and thus at tree level has the explicit factor of  $a$  as shown. This is canceled in matrix elements by factors of  $1/a$  from UV divergences, corresponding to the dimension-5 operator  $X^b$  mixing with lower-dimensional

<sup>5</sup> Note, however, that the coefficient of the exponential,  $\alpha$ , does not change (for a given action), since it is determined by the mobility edge. I am grateful to Yigal Shamir for emphasizing this to me.

<sup>6</sup> The very recent study of Ref. [8] allows one to determine the relative contribution of the exponential and power-law contributions to  $m'_{\text{res}}$  [see eq. (2)]. One finds that, for  $L_5 = 16$ , these terms are close to equal at  $1/a \approx 1.6$  GeV, while at  $1/a \approx 2.2$  GeV the exponential term is larger by a factor of about 6.

operators. To understand the impact of the extra term, then, one must determine the operators of dimension four or less with which  $X^b$  can mix. The answer is that the lattice symmetries allow

$$aX^b \sim -2\frac{m_c}{a}P^b - (Z_A - 1)\partial_\mu A_\mu^b + O(a), \quad (4)$$

where  $\sim$  indicates equivalence in on-shell matrix elements (so that  $X^b$  does not come into contact with other operators) with  $p \ll 1/a$  (so that  $O(ap)$  corrections are small).

The first term on the r.h.s. of (4) can be absorbed by an additive renormalization of the quark mass, with  $m_q^{\text{phys}} \propto m - m_c/a$ , while the second leads to a renormalization of the axial current. After these renormalizations one regains the PCAC relation up to corrections which are truly of  $O(a)$ , i.e.  $\partial_\mu(Z_A A_\mu^b) - 2(m - m_c/a)P^b \sim O(a)$ . To implement this, however, one needs two conditions to determine the two constants  $m_c$  and  $Z_A$ . One approach is to use the vacuum to pion matrix element of eq. (4),

$$\langle 0|aX^b|\pi\rangle = -2(m_c/a)\langle 0|P^b|\pi\rangle - (Z_A - 1)\langle 0|\partial_\mu A_\mu^b|\pi\rangle, \quad (5)$$

which determines one linear combination of the two constants,<sup>7</sup> while the second condition is obtained by enforcing the normalization of Ward identities relating 2-point and 3-point functions [37]. The details are not important here—what matters is that there are two constants to determine so one needs two conditions.

Now consider the corresponding analysis for DWF. The axial current is that generated by dividing the fifth dimension into two halves and doing opposite flavor rotations in each, and has a lattice divergence [24]

$$\partial_\mu A_\mu^b = 2mJ_5^b + 2J_{5q}^b. \quad (6)$$

Here  $J_5$  is the pseudoscalar density built out of fields on the two walls, while  $J_{5q}$  is similar in form to  $J_5$  but “lives” half-way across the fifth dimension. The  $J_{5q}$  term is due to the explicit  $\chi$ SB caused by using finite  $L_5$ . Thus the situation is formally similar to that with Wilson fermions, with  $J_5$  corresponding to  $P$  (up to differences in normalization), and  $J_{5q}$  to  $aX$ .<sup>8</sup>

In the standard analysis [38] one now argues that, for low-energy matrix elements, the symmetry breaking term can mix only with the pseudoscalar density:

$$J_{5q}^b \sim \frac{m_{\text{res}}}{a}J_5^b + O(a). \quad (7)$$

Furthermore, because  $J_{5q}$  resides in the middle of the fifth dimension, this mixing is suppressed by the decay of the physical modes attached to the walls, so that, unlike the Wilson

<sup>7</sup> The condition is usually written in the equivalent way  $\langle 0|Z_A\partial_\mu A_\mu^b - 2(m - m_c/a)P^b|\pi\rangle = 0$ , which determines  $Z_A^{-1}(m - m_c/a)$ . This form makes clear that it is not necessary to determine  $X^b$  explicitly, and that one can implement the procedure for any desired forms of  $A_\mu^b$  and  $P^b$  [e.g. with the ultra-local axial current rather than the simply local form appearing in eq. (3)]. I write the condition as given in the text, eq. (5), as it makes the connection to the subsequent DWF analysis more transparent.

<sup>8</sup> That  $J_{5q}$  does not contain an overall factor of  $a$ , unlike  $aX$ , is technically correct, but perhaps misleading. For finite  $L_5$ ,  $J_{5q}$  does not vanish in the classical continuum limit, whereas  $aX$  does. On the other hand, as noted above, UV divergences imply that matrix elements of  $aX$  do not have an overall factor of  $a$ , but rather vanish logarithmically (as powers of  $g(a)^2$ ) in the continuum limit. In practice this amounts to very little suppression of  $aX$ , and is a much smaller effect than the exponential suppression of  $J_{5q}$ .



case,  $m_{\text{res}} \ll 1$ . The result of this discussion is that one has only an additive renormalization of the quark mass. The single renormalization constant can be determined by a single condition, with the standard choice being [38, 39, 40, 41, 42]:

$$\frac{m'_{\text{res}}}{a} \equiv \frac{\langle 0 | J_{5q}^b | \pi \rangle}{\langle 0 | J_5^b | \pi \rangle}. \quad (8)$$

In other words, one enforces (7) as an exact relation in the vacuum to pion matrix element, including  $O(a)$  terms. The inclusion of these terms causes  $m'_{\text{res}}$  to depend on  $m$  (as we will see in more detail below), so it now picks up a prime to indicate that it is not a constant [32, 33]. It is natural to define a shifted quark mass

$$m_q(m) = m + m'_{\text{res}}(m)/a = \frac{\langle 0 | \partial_\mu A_\mu^b | \pi \rangle}{2 \langle 0 | J_5^b | \pi \rangle}, \quad (9)$$

which in Wilson-fermion parlance is the ‘‘Ward identity mass’’. Since the r.h.s. is proportional to  $m_\pi^2$ , it follows that the pion mass necessarily vanishes when  $m_q = 0$ . This occurs when  $m = -m'_{\text{res}}(m)/a$ .

Comparing the Wilson and DWF analyses, one immediately wonders why the latter is more simple, involving one parameter rather than two. Should eq. (7) not be replaced by

$$J_{5q}^b \sim \frac{m_{\text{res}}}{a} J_5^b - \frac{(Z_A - 1)}{2} \partial_\mu A_\mu^b + O(a)? \quad (10)$$

The answer is yes—the enumeration of operators is just as for Wilson fermions and eq. (10) is the correct form. In practice, however, the standard analysis, and eq. (7) in particular, are not invalidated. This is because the  $\partial_\mu A_\mu$  term is highly suppressed,  $Z_A - 1 \propto m_{\text{res}}^2 \lesssim 10^{-5}$ , and can be ignored in practice.

Why is  $Z_A - 1$  suppressed by two powers of  $m_{\text{res}}$ ? The answer can be deduced from work in the literature. Since  $Z_V = 1$  for any  $L_5$ ,  $Z_A - 1 = Z_A - Z_V$  can be calculated in perturbation theory (or using non-perturbative renormalization) by determining the size of the matrix elements of the left-handed current (which is associated with one wall) between right-handed quarks (attached to the other wall). Thus one needs *two* crossings of the fifth-dimension, one in each direction, to obtain a contribution to  $Z_A - 1$ . (This is the analog of the result with Wilson fermions that  $Z_A - 1$  is proportional to  $r^2$ , with  $r$  the coefficient of the Wilson term.) In perturbation theory each crossing is exponentially suppressed and proportional to  $m_{\text{res}}$  [26]. Using the transfer matrix argument one reaches the same conclusion in a non-perturbative context [29]—in particular, the structure of the near-zero modes does not allow one such mode to cause two simultaneous crossings of the type required for  $Z_A - 1$ .<sup>9</sup>

In summary, the fact that some of the terms which enter into a Wilson fermion analysis (here  $Z_A - 1$ ) receive an extra suppression is an example of how DWF are better than ‘‘Wilson fermions with an overall suppression of  $\chi$ SB effects’’.

---

<sup>9</sup> The argument of Ref. [29] is made in the context of mixing of left-left four-fermion operators, but it applies also to  $Z_A - Z_V$ . The observation that the interaction induced by near zero-modes is ‘‘t Hooft-like’’, and thus highly constrained, was made in Ref. [43].

## B. Implications of $m_{\text{res}} \neq 0$ in pseudo-Goldstone boson sector

The analysis so far has absorbed the leading effect of  $\chi\text{SB}$  into a shift in the quark mass. In this section I recall how this can be seen directly in the Symanzik effective Lagrangian, and extend the discussion to sub-leading effects suppressed by powers of  $a$ . I consider the application to the pseudo-Goldstone boson (PGB) sector, and investigate the relative size of errors resulting from  $\chi\text{SB}$  (which turn out to be linear in  $a$ ) compared to (chirally unsuppressed) errors of  $\mathcal{O}(a^2)$ . For simplicity of presentation I assume degenerate quarks—the generalization to non-degenerate quarks is straightforward.

The Symanzik effective Lagrangian [44] for DWF has exactly the same form as for Wilson fermions [45], since the symmetries are the same. For on-shell quantities one has [46]

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Sym.}} = \bar{q}(\not{D} + Z_m m)q + \frac{Z_m m_{\text{res}}}{a} \bar{q}q + ac_5 \bar{q}(\sigma \cdot F)q + \mathcal{O}(a^2), \quad (11)$$

where  $q$  are quark fields in a regularized continuum theory in which factors of the lattice spacing are now explicit.<sup>10</sup> Thus  $q$  are proportional (at leading order in  $a$ ) to the usual boundary quark fields of DWF. The factor of  $Z_m$  is needed since  $m$  is the standard lattice quark mass [i.e. the same quantity as in eq. (6)] and thus must be matched to continuum quantities.  $\chi\text{SB}$  allows the extra, UV divergent mass term, whose coefficient provides the fundamental definition of  $m_{\text{res}}$ .  $\chi\text{SB}$  also allows the Pauli-term, the coefficient of which has the same form as  $m_{\text{res}}$ , eq. (2), and is thus also highly suppressed. Note, however, that this is only a correspondence of magnitudes, and that the detailed dependence of  $m_{\text{res}}$  and  $c_5$  on  $L_5$  will differ, because the ratio of the coefficients of the exponential and power-law terms differ.

We are now in a position to determine the form of the relationship between  $m_{\text{res}}$  as defined in (11) and  $m'_{\text{res}}$  from (8). To do this we first match  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Sym.}}$  onto the chiral effective theory, following the method of Ref. [47]. This leads to

$$\mathcal{L}_\chi = \frac{f^2}{4} \text{tr}(\partial_\mu \Sigma \partial_\mu \Sigma^\dagger) - \frac{f^2 B}{2} \text{tr}(M_q \Sigma + \Sigma^\dagger M_q) + \dots \quad (12)$$

$$M_q = m + \frac{m_{\text{res}}}{a} + ac_5 \Lambda^2, \quad (13)$$

---

<sup>10</sup> This description hides a technical difference between the Wilson and DWF analyses related to the dependence on  $a$ . This point was discussed at the workshop, and here I offer my opinion. The Symanzik action for Wilson fermions is of the standard form, with the dependence on  $a$  given by the explicit factors of  $a^n$  together with an implicit logarithmic dependence contained in the coefficients of the terms. In the DWF case, there is an additional, more complicated,  $a$  dependence contained in  $m_{\text{res}}$ , eq. (2). In particular, as noted above,  $\rho(0)$  has a rapid, possibly exponential, dependence on  $a$ , and is a non-perturbative quantity. Does this invalidate the application of the Symanzik expansion to DWF? I think not, for two reasons—one general and one specific to DWF. First, although the Symanzik expansion was originally derived in perturbation theory, where one finds powers of  $a$  up to logarithms, it can be thought of as an effective field theory (EFT), a concept which is not tied to perturbation theory. There is no need for the parameters in the EFT to have a simple dependence on  $a$ . Second, the presence of the additional parameter  $L_5$  allows for the appearance of a more complicated  $a$  dependence. Indeed, when studying DWF in perturbation theory one is effectively constructing terms in the EFT, and one finds a complicated dependence on  $a$ , with, for example, the exponent  $\alpha$  in eq. (2) being a power series in  $\alpha_S(a)$  [27].

where  $\Sigma$  is the usual non-linear PGB field,  $f$  the leading order pion decay constant (normalized so that  $f_\pi = 93 \text{ MeV}$ ,  $B$  is proportional to the condensate (and absorbs  $Z_m$ ), and the dots in (12) indicate terms of higher order in  $m$ ,  $m_{\text{res}}$ ,  $a$  and derivatives. The important result contained in eqs. (12,13) is that the PGB masses come not only from the quark masses in  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Sym.}}$ , but also receive a contribution from the Pauli term. This is because the Pauli term has the same chiral transformation properties as the quark mass terms. The size of the Pauli-term contribution is not, however, known precisely—both because  $c_5$  is unknown and because the mapping to  $\chi PT$  introduces the scale  $\Lambda$  which, while of  $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\text{QCD}})$ , is not known otherwise.<sup>11</sup>

The net result is that the  $O(a)$  term from  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{Sym.}}$  is completely absorbed into  $M_q$ , at leading order in  $\chi PT$ . Since  $m_\pi^2 \propto M_q$ , and recalling from above that  $m_\pi$  vanishes when  $m_q = m + m'_{\text{res}}/a = 0$ , one finds

$$M_q = m_q \quad \Rightarrow \quad m'_{\text{res}}/a = m_{\text{res}}/a + c_5 a \Lambda^2, \quad (14)$$

up to higher order chiral corrections, and terms of size  $m_{\text{res}}^2$ . In other words, when we use the standard definition of  $m'_{\text{res}}$  we are automatically including the contribution to the pion masses (and scattering amplitudes, etc.) from the Pauli-term. We do not need to introduce an additional  $\chi SB$  term of size  $c_5 a \Lambda^2 \sim m_{\text{res}} a \Lambda^2$  into the leading order  $\mathcal{L}_\chi$ .<sup>12</sup>

This automatic improvement does not work for higher order terms in the chiral expansion. The operators  $\bar{q}\sigma \cdot Fq$  and  $\bar{q}q$  are different, and their matrix elements not in general proportional. The impact of this difference has been worked out to next-to-leading order for Wilson fermions [48], and can be carried over to DWF with appropriate extra suppressions of  $\chi SB$  terms. A mnemonic which allows one to see the size of the resulting discretization errors is to take the continuum result and make the substitution  $m_q \rightarrow m_q + m_{\text{res}} a \Lambda^2$  (except in the leading order chiral Lagrangian as discussed above). Two examples are

$$\frac{m_\pi^2}{m_q} \sim f_\pi \sim \text{const.} \left[ 1 + \mathcal{O}(m_q/\Lambda) + \mathcal{O}(m_{\text{res}} a \Lambda) + \mathcal{O}(a^2 \Lambda^2) + \dots \right]. \quad (15)$$

Thus  $\chi SB$  gives rise to multiplicative discretization errors of relative size  $m_{\text{res}} a \Lambda$ —i.e. suppressed by  $m_{\text{res}}$  compared to the size expected for unimproved Wilson fermions. Similar corrections are present in all hadronic quantities.

Are these errors important in practice, given present values of  $m_{\text{res}}$ ? I think the answer is clearly no. They are numerically tiny and much smaller than the chirally unsuppressed  $O(a^2)$  terms. To make this concrete, consider the situation with present DWF simulations at  $1/a = 1.6 \text{ GeV}$ , and use  $\Lambda = 0.1 - 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ . Then

$$m_{\text{res}} a \Lambda \approx 0.003 \left( \frac{0.1 - 0.5 \text{ GeV}}{1.6 \text{ GeV}} \right) \approx (2 - 9) \times 10^{-4} \ll (a\Lambda)^2 \approx 0.004 - 0.1. \quad (16)$$

For percent-level accuracy, the  $\chi SB$ -induced errors can be ignored.

<sup>11</sup> While it is redundant in practice to have the product of two unknown quantities,  $c_5$  and  $\Lambda^2$ , I keep both since they originate from different steps in the matching of the lattice theory onto  $\chi PT$ .

<sup>12</sup> As noted in Ref. [47], the same automatic  $O(a)$  improvement of the leading order chiral Lagrangian holds for Wilson fermions. The difference here is that the term which is excluded is already suppressed.

### C. Mass dependence of $m'_{\text{res}}$

Numerical results for  $m'_{\text{res}}$  show a weak linear dependence on the bare quark mass  $m$  (see, e.g., Refs. [32, 33]). This is understood in the literature to be a discretization error, but here I want to determine more precisely its origin and form. Since  $m'_{\text{res}}$  is defined by the ratio of the matrix elements of  $J_{5q}$  and  $J_q$ , one needs to compare the Symanzik expansions of these two operators. Combining these, I find (as usual for on-shell matrix elements)<sup>13</sup>

$$J_{5q}^b = \frac{m_{\text{res}}}{a} J_5^b [1 + \mathcal{O}(a^2 m^2)] + ac_5 \bar{q} \sigma \cdot F \gamma_5 T^b q + \dots \quad (17)$$

I have kept operators up to dimension 5, and dropped all contributions proportional to  $m_{\text{res}}^2$ . This is just eq. (7) with the  $O(a)$  term included. Note that  $m_{\text{res}}$  and  $c_5$  are the same quantities as in eq. (11)—this is required in order to reproduce the result (14) for  $m'_{\text{res}}$ .

The dominant contribution to  $m'_{\text{res}}$  linear in  $m_q$  (or, equivalently, linear in  $m$ ) arises from the different mass dependences of  $\langle 0 | J_5^b | \pi \rangle$  and  $\langle 0 | \bar{q} \sigma \cdot F \gamma_5 T^b q | \pi \rangle$ . The result is a contribution quadratic in  $a$ , whose relative size is not suppressed by  $m_{\text{res}}$ :

$$m'_{\text{res}}(m) = m'_{\text{res}}(m=0) [1 + \mathcal{O}(ma^2 \Lambda)] \quad (18)$$

Another way of stating this is to consider the derivative of  $\log(m'_{\text{res}})$  with respect to the dimensionless bare quark mass:

$$\left. \frac{1}{m'_{\text{res}}} \frac{dm'_{\text{res}}}{d(am)} \right|_{m \approx -m'_{\text{res}}/a} \approx \left. \frac{1}{m'_{\text{res}}} \frac{dm'_{\text{res}}}{d(am)} \right|_{m \approx 0} = \mathcal{O}(a\Lambda) \quad (19)$$

(Note that the derivative can equally well be evaluated at  $m_q = 0$  or  $m = 0$  at the order I am working.) Crudely evaluating this derivative from the plots in Refs. [32, 33] I find that for  $1/a = 1.6$  GeV, the l.h.s. is  $\approx 1.7$  for both  $L_5 = 8$  and  $L_5 = 16$ . This implies a scale  $\Lambda \approx 3$  GeV, which, while very large, is not unheard of. For example,  $dm_\pi^2/dm_q \approx 5$  GeV, and this large scale leads to enhanced discretization errors in improvement coefficients for improved Wilson fermions [49]. Nevertheless, the large scale does make one worry that something is missing from the analysis given here.

Although the slope is larger than expected, it only produces a small “uncertainty” in the value to use for  $m'_{\text{res}}(m)$ . A natural choice is to use  $m'_{\text{res}}(-m'_{\text{res}}/a)$ , i.e. the value at  $m_q = 0$ . Another commonly used option is  $m'_{\text{res}}(0)$ . The difference between these two is of relative size  $\mathcal{O}(m'_{\text{res}} a \Lambda)$ , a correction of less than a percent even if  $a\Lambda \approx 2$ . Because of this, in the following I will treat  $m'_{\text{res}}$  as a mass-independent constant.

A striking feature of numerical results for  $m'_{\text{res}}$  is that the slope with respect to the valence quark mass is significantly larger (by a factor of  $\approx -2.5$ ) than that with respect to the sea quark mass [32, 33]. The corresponding scale,  $\Lambda$ , approaches 10 GeV. Why such a large scale enters is an unresolved puzzle that bears further thought.

<sup>13</sup> This equation is a hybrid expression in which  $J_{5q}^b$  and  $J_5^b$  are lattice operators, rather than operators in a continuum effective theory, while  $\bar{q} \sigma \cdot F \gamma_5 T^b q$  is a continuum operator, in which the regularization and renormalization is such that no mixing with lower dimension operators is allowed. This equation can be obtained by rearranging the Symanzik expansions for the two operators.

#### D. Enhanced $m_{\text{res}}$ effects: condensate

The small size of the generic  $\chi$ SB effects exemplified by eq. (15) implies that problems can only occur if such effects are enhanced. Two enhancement mechanisms are power divergences, i.e. mixing with operators of lower dimension, and “chiral enhancement”, i.e. mixing with operators with less suppressed chiral behavior. It turns out that the former is much more effective.

As a first example of enhanced  $\chi$ SB contributions I consider the quark condensate,  $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle$ . Note that one can also calculate the condensate indirectly, using  $\chi$ PT and results for  $f_\pi$ ,  $m_\pi^2$  and quark masses, but it is also of interest to do a direct,  $\chi$ PT independent, calculation.

To calculate the condensate one needs, in principle, to first take the infinite volume limit and then the chiral limit. Both present significant practical challenges, but I assume here that these have been overcome. The question I address is whether, after taking these limits, and in particular after taking  $m_q \rightarrow 0$ , the result has significant contamination due to the lack of exact chiral symmetry.

This contamination has been considered in Ref. [38], and I recall and recast the theoretical analysis given in that work. Consider the Symanzik expansion of the scalar bilinear, which is schematically of the form

$$(\bar{q}q)\Big|_{\text{DWF}} \sim \frac{m + xm_{\text{res}}/a}{a^2} + (\bar{q}q)\Big|_{\text{cont.}} + \dots, \quad (20)$$

where I am using  $m_{\text{res}}$  as defined by the Symanzik expansion, eq. (11). Here I keep only the leading two operators (the identity operator and the condensate itself), and identify schematically only the leading terms in the coefficients of these operators. Chiral symmetry requires that the coefficient of the identity operator is proportional to the quark mass, and thus quadratically divergent, but  $\chi$ SB allows a  $1/a^3$  divergence proportional to  $m_{\text{res}}$ . Note that since UV momenta dominate the mixing, one cannot use the Symanzik action eq. (11) inside loops. Thus  $m$  and  $m_{\text{res}}/a$  do not appear in the linear combination which gives  $m_q$ . In other words, instead of  $x = 1$ , one expects  $x = \mathcal{O}(1)$ .<sup>14</sup> Thus, if one extrapolates to  $m_q = m + m_{\text{res}}/a = 0$  one finds

$$\lim_{m_q \rightarrow 0} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_{\text{DWF}} = \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_{\text{cont.}} + (x - 1) \frac{m_{\text{res}}}{a^3} + \dots \quad (21)$$

The second term is the result of the finiteness of  $L_5$ . Since  $x$  is not known, this term gives an uncontrolled error in the condensate. It can be studied and reduced only by increasing  $L_5$ —a very expensive proposition.

How large is the resulting error in the condensate for present simulations? Since  $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_{\text{cont.}} \approx \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^3$  (with a numerical factor not far from unity), the relative error is

$$\frac{\delta \langle \bar{q}q \rangle}{\langle \bar{q}q \rangle} \sim \frac{m_{\text{res}}}{a^3 \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^3}. \quad (22)$$

<sup>14</sup> A heuristic discussion of why this arises goes as follows. In the quark loop which gives the condensate, higher order terms in the Symanzik expansion (11), i.e. the Pauli term, etc., are not suppressed—overall factors of  $a$  are canceled by factors of momenta  $k \sim 1/a$ . These higher order terms are not removed by adjusting the bare mass to cancel the contribution from the leading ( $m_{\text{res}}$ ) term. One reaches the same conclusion by comparing expressions for the condensate and for  $m_{\text{res}}$  using the transfer matrix formalism [8, 29].

This is enhanced by *four* powers of  $a\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$  compared to the generic correction exemplified by eq. (15). Numerically,

$$\frac{\delta\langle\bar{q}q\rangle}{\langle\bar{q}q\rangle} \approx \frac{3 \times 10^{-3}}{(0.3/1.6)^3} \approx 0.5 \quad (23)$$

for the present 0.12 fm simulations, and only slightly smaller for those at 0.09 fm ( $\approx 0.4$  if  $m_{\text{res}} \approx 10^{-3}$ ). I conclude that one cannot directly calculate the condensate with present and planned DWF simulations, except to check the order of magnitude.

I stress that these considerations do not apply to the calculations using overlap fermions, using which several groups have studied the condensate in small volumes and compared to the  $\epsilon$ -regime predictions of  $\chi PT$ . The chiral symmetry breaking term is absent or negligible with overlap fermions.

### E. Enhanced $m_{\text{res}}$ effects: $\epsilon'/\epsilon$

I now turn to a much more important example: the matrix elements which must be calculated to determine whether the Standard Model predicts the measured value of  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$ . One needs to calculate the  $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$  matrix elements of the operators in the  $\Delta S = 1$  electroweak Hamiltonian, the most important of which is

$$\mathcal{O}_6 = \bar{s}_a \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) d_b \sum_{q=u,d,s} \bar{q}_b \gamma_\mu (1 + \gamma_5) q_a, \quad (24)$$

(where  $a$  and  $b$  are color indices). While ultimately a high precision calculation would be desirable, even a result with 10-30% precision would be very interesting.

As is well known, many challenges must be overcome to calculate these matrix elements. One is the difficulty of a direct calculation involving a two pion final state with physical (or near physical) kinematics—the method is known in principle, but involves very large lattices and the need to pick out excited states [50]. This can be circumvented, at the cost of a loss of some precision, by using  $\chi PT$  to relate the physical matrix elements to unphysical ones which are easier to calculate:

- At leading order (LO), one can use  $K \rightarrow 0$  ( $m_d \neq m_s$ ) and  $K \rightarrow \pi$  ( $m_d = m_s$ ) matrix elements [51];
- At next-to-leading order (NLO), one must add further matrix elements to determine all the needed low-energy constants. One scheme uses  $K \rightarrow \pi$  with  $m_d \neq m_s$ ,  $K \rightarrow \bar{K}$  matrix elements of the  $\Delta S = 2$  Hamiltonian, and unphysical  $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$  matrix elements with the pions at rest [52].<sup>15</sup> Another uses  $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$  matrix elements involving particles with non-vanishing momenta [53].

The precision that one can obtain using these two methods is unclear. Naively, for kaon matrix elements, the relative errors in the LO calculation are of size  $(m_K/\Lambda_\chi)^2 \approx 0.2$ , where  $\Lambda_\chi = 4\pi f$ , while those in the NLO calculation are  $\sim (m_K/\Lambda_\chi)^4 \approx 0.04$ . There is considerable evidence, however, that these errors are larger for  $\epsilon'$ , and it may require a NLO calculation

<sup>15</sup> One can also use partially quenched matrix elements to provide further information and cross-checks. This is discussed in Refs. [43, 52]. For simplicity, I do not discuss this extension here.

to achieve the desired 10-30% precision. In practice, the LO calculation will be done first (and is indeed underway now), with the NLO refinements added subsequently [54]. The LO methodology has been worked out and tested in quenched calculations [46, 55].

This brings me to the point I want to address here—how is this calculation affected by the lack of exact chiral symmetry? This has been discussed in part by Refs. [46, 55], and more extensively in Ref. [43], but here, based on considerations with Wilson-like fermions [56, 57], I extend the discussion.

Even with exact chiral symmetry, as soon as one considers unphysical matrix elements one must account for mixing with the lower-dimension operator [51]<sup>16</sup>

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub1}} = \frac{1}{a^2} \{ (m_d - m_s) \bar{s} \gamma_5 d + (m_s + m_d) \bar{s} d \} . \quad (25)$$

In the  $\chi PT$ -based methods discussed above this is subtracted using the  $K \rightarrow 0$  matrix element. This only works, however, if the positive and negative parity parts of the operator are related as in  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub1}}$ , which requires chiral symmetry. The breaking of chiral symmetry with DWF leads to additional operators to subtract. I list here those of dimension less than 6 (which thus have power divergent coefficients and give enhanced contributions) which are linear in  $m_{\text{res}}$  (as opposed to quadratic or higher order)

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub2}} = \frac{m_{\text{res}}}{a^3} \bar{s} d , \quad (26)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub3}} = \frac{m_{\text{res}}}{a} \bar{s} \sigma \cdot F d , \quad (27)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub4}}^{\pm} = \frac{m_{\text{res}} (m_s \pm m_d)^2}{a} \bar{s} d , \quad (28)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub5}} = \frac{m_{\text{res}} (m_s^2 - m_d^2)}{a} \bar{s} \gamma_5 d . \quad (29)$$

Because of the presence of UV divergences, it is the generic  $m_{\text{res}}$  that appears in these operators. This list is almost the same as for Wilson fermions [56], except that here each occurrence of a “ $L \leftrightarrow R$  flip” is always suppressed, either by a factor of  $m_{\text{res}}$  or of  $m_q$ .<sup>17</sup> Note that the operators  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub4}}^{\pm}$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub5}}$  are usually subsumed into mass-dependent coefficients of  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub1}}$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub2}}$ . I prefer to keep the new operators explicit, since the factors of  $m_q$  impact the fits to  $\chi PT$ .

The presence of these operators invalidates the  $\chi PT$ -based methods, and if not subtracted, they lead to errors in matrix elements that can only be reduced by increasing  $L_5$ . Clearly the greater the power of the UV divergence, the larger the potential error.

The presence of the most divergent operator,  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub2}}$ , was noted in the quenched studies [46, 55], and a method was proposed and implemented to subtract it within the LO  $\chi PT$  approach. I recall this method briefly here as I will build on it below. In order to determine  $\langle K | \mathcal{O}_6 | \pi \pi \rangle$  at LO in  $\chi PT$  one needs to calculate, for  $m_s = m_d$ ,

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}} = \langle K | \mathcal{O}_6 - c_1 \mathcal{O}_{\text{sub1}} - c_2 \mathcal{O}_{\text{sub2}} | \pi \rangle , \quad (30)$$

<sup>16</sup> Here and in the following I will assume for definiteness that the quark masses include the shift due to  $m'_{\text{res}}$ , i.e. are given by eq. (9), although one could equally well use bare lattice quark masses for this analysis.

<sup>17</sup> In fact, this is not quite correct: near-zero modes allow multiple flips at the cost of a single  $m_{\text{res}}$  suppression [43]. As explained in the talk by Christ [58], this allows an operator of the form  $(m_{\text{res}}/a^2) m_q \bar{s} d$ , which would naively require an additional factor of  $m_{\text{res}}$ . I discuss this operator further below.

where I have dropped  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub3}}$  etc. for now. The subtraction coefficient  $c_1$  is to be determined from the  $K \rightarrow 0$  matrix element, and I assume that this can be done with sufficient accuracy, as seems likely from the quenched studies. The problem then arises because the coefficient  $c_2$  is not known. Without a determination of  $c_2$ , the matrix element will have an unacceptably large error

$$\frac{\delta\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}}{\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}} \sim \frac{c_2 m_{\text{res}} B/a^3}{m_K^2 \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2} \sim \frac{m_{\text{res}}}{(a\Lambda_{\text{QCD}})^3} \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_s} \sim 1. \quad (31)$$

Here I use the estimate  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}} \approx m_K^2 \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2$ , which incorporates the chiral suppression and is consistent with numerical results from quenched simulations and continuum estimates. I also use the LO  $\chi PT$  result  $\langle K|\bar{s}d|\pi\rangle \approx B \approx m_K^2/m_s$ , and take  $c_2 \approx 1$ ,  $m_s \approx 90$  MeV,  $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} = 300$  MeV, and, finally,  $m_{\text{res}} = 0.003$  for  $1/a = 1.6$  GeV, as above. Note that the errors are of the same form as the condensate, eq. (22), except for the additional chiral enhancement.

This error due to  $c_2 \neq 0$  can be removed, however, with a second subtraction condition. One approach is to enforce that  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}$  vanishes in the chiral limit, since this holds in a chirally symmetric theory. The idea is then to adjust  $c_2$  until this vanishing holds. If one works at LO in  $\chi PT$  it is then the slope versus  $m_s = m_d$  that gives the required information [46, 55]. At NLO a more sophisticated fit to the data is required, including quadratic terms and  $m_s \neq m_d$ , but the same subtraction condition works.<sup>18</sup>

If  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub2}}$  can be subtracted, then the largest uncertainty is likely due to the next-most divergent operator  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub3}}$ . The presence of this operator is well known to Wilson and DWF practitioners, but it is only now, with the advent of realistic DWF simulations, that it becomes relevant to estimate its contribution. Since its  $K \rightarrow \pi$  matrix element does not vanish in the chiral limit, it contaminates the subtraction method for  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub2}}$ —a single condition (vanishing in the chiral limit) cannot determine both unknowns  $c_2$  and  $c_3$ . One must either accept the resulting error or determine another subtraction method. The former approach may, in fact, be sufficient. One expects that the ratio of matrix elements of  $\bar{s}\sigma \cdot Fd$  and  $\bar{s}d$  is approximately  $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2$ . Using this, and the parameters given above, one finds

$$\frac{\delta\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}}{\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}} \sim \frac{c_3 m_{\text{res}}}{a\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}} \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_s} \sim \frac{m_{\text{res}}}{am_s} \sim 0.05 \quad (33)$$

for the  $a = 0.12$  fm simulations. At  $a = 0.09$  fm, the result is 2-3 times smaller. Thus the error one makes by ignoring this term is comparable to, or smaller than, that due to the missing next-to-next-to-leading (NNLO) contributions in the  $\chi PT$  analysis. It seems to me that one can, at this stage, proceed by ignoring this operator.

It should also be possible to subtract the contributions of this operator. One idea (which I have not thought through in detail) is to use the fact that  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}$  is proportional to  $m_\pi m_K$ ,

<sup>18</sup> One can avoid the need to rely on accurate fitting of the matrix element by using the ratio

$$\frac{\langle K|\mathcal{O}_6 - c_1\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub1}}|\pi\rangle}{\langle K|\bar{s}d|\pi\rangle} = \frac{\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}}{\langle K|\bar{s}d|\pi\rangle} + c_2 \frac{m_{\text{res}}}{a^3}, \quad (32)$$

The first term on the r.h.s. has a chiral expansion beginning at linear order in  $m_q$ , so it should be straightforward to determine and remove the  $c_2$  term, which is a constant. One can then reconstruct  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}$  by multiplying by the separately measured scalar matrix element  $\langle K|\bar{s}d|\pi\rangle$ . This method is due to the RBC collaboration.



whereas the matrix element of  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub3}}$  also has terms of the form  $m_\pi^2$  and  $m_K^2$  (which are non-leading for this operator but will contribute to the putative  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}$  if  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub3}}$  is not subtracted). The idea would then be to adjust  $c_3/c_2$  so as to remove these terms. Another approach is suggested in Ref. [56]. Both ideas are valid only at LO in  $\chi PT$  and would need to be elaborated in order to work at NLO.

I now return to the remaining operators in the list,  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub4}\pm}$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub5}}$ . Given the explicit factors of quark mass, these do not affect the LO  $\chi PT$  analysis, but do contaminate the NLO analysis. They lead to an error which is suppressed by  $(am_s)^2$  relative to that which would be present if  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub2}}$  were not subtracted [see eq. (31)], and thus of size

$$\frac{\delta\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}}{\mathcal{M}_{\text{phys}}} \sim \frac{c_{4,5}m_{\text{res}}}{(a\Lambda_{\text{QCD}})^3} \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_s} (am_s)^2 \sim \frac{m_{\text{res}}}{am_s} \frac{m_s^2}{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2} \sim 0.005. \quad (34)$$

It appears, therefore, that one can safely ignore these operators for a long time to come.

The discussion thus far turns out to be incomplete—there is an additional contribution noted by Norman Christ in his talk here [58]. This arises from an operator which is naively be suppressed by  $m_{\text{res}}^2 m_q$ , but is in fact suppressed only by  $m_{\text{res}} m_q$  because a single near-zero mode can simultaneously flip the chirality of two quarks as long as they have different flavors (and the chirality flips are in the “same direction”). The fact that the zero-modes are localized causes no suppression because the initial operator itself is local.<sup>19</sup> Christ shows that one obtains the operator

$$\frac{m_{\text{res}}}{a^2} \{ (m_s - m_d) \bar{s} \gamma_5 d + (m_s + m_d + 2m_u) \bar{s} d \}. \quad (35)$$

Part of this operator is removed by the subtraction for  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub1}}$ , allowing one to rewrite it as

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub6}} = \frac{m_{\text{res}}}{a^2} 2(m_s + m_d + m_u) \bar{s} d. \quad (36)$$

How does the error due to this operator compare with that from  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub3}}$ ? There are competing factors here. On the one hand  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub6}}$  is enhanced by one power of  $1/a$ , but, on the other hand, it is chirally suppressed by one factor of  $m_s$ . Naively combining these factors one obtains an enhancement of  $m_s/(a\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2) \approx 2$ . There is another suppression factor, however, namely that it is only the near-zero mode part of  $m_{\text{res}}$ , i.e. the second term in eq. (2), which contributes. As noted above (footnote 5) the near-zero mode contribution to  $m'_{\text{res}}$  is, for present simulations, at most comparable to that from the extended modes. Thus it seems plausible that the  $m_{\text{res}}$  appearing in (36) is smaller by at least by a factor of 2 than that appearing in the error estimate due to  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub3}}$ . All in all, I expect that  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub3}}$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub6}}$  give comparable errors, and thus, based on the estimates given above, that both can probably be ignored at this stage of the numerical calculations.

Eventually, however, one will want to subtract  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{sub6}}$  as well. As noted in Ref. [58], this is possible, in principle, by varying  $m_u$  independently from  $m_d$  and  $m_s$ .

In conclusion, as long as one implements a method to subtract the most divergent operator mixing caused by  $\chi SB$ , DWF can probably be used to study  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$  using  $\chi PT$ -based methods (particularly the NLO method) with sufficient accuracy to make significant progress.

---

<sup>19</sup> This is in distinction to the generic contributions from the near-zero modes, which, as explained in Ref. [43], are suppressed by additional factors of  $a$  due to the localized nature of the eigenmodes.

## F. Implications of $m_{\text{res}}$ for $B_K$

I now turn to another phenomenologically important matrix element,  $B_K$ . This is an example where there is no mixing with lower dimension operators, but mixing with chirally enhanced operators can occur. Thus one might expect a “chiral enhancement” of  $\chi\text{SB}$  effects. It is also a quantity where percent level precision is highly desirable, since the better we can calculate  $B_K$ , the more precisely we can test the Standard Model.

Chiral enhancement can occur through mixing of the original  $B_K$  operator,  $\mathcal{O}_K = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu d_L \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu d_L$ , with “L-R” operators exemplified by  $\bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu d_L \bar{s}_R \gamma_\mu d_R$ . The L-L operators have  $K - \bar{K}$  matrix elements which are chirally suppressed, and thus proportional to  $m_s$ , while the L-R operators are unsuppressed. Since two quarks must have their chirality flipped, mixing at the perturbative level is proportional to  $m_{\text{res}}^2$  (the argument being identical to that for  $Z_A - 1$  discussed above).<sup>20</sup> Even with a chiral enhancement of size  $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}/m_s$ , this contribution is numerically insignificant. Including discretization errors [i.e. working out the Symanzik expansion for  $\mathcal{O}_K$  and keeping terms analogous to the Pauli-term in (11)] I find that there is a mixing proportional to  $m_{\text{res}} a m_s$ . The factor of  $m_s$  is needed because of chirality—one flip requires  $a m_{\text{res}}$  and the other  $m_s$ . Here  $m_{\text{res}}$  is meant generically, since the contribution involves logarithmically divergent integrals and thus UV momenta. The extra factor of  $m_s$  in the mixing cancels the chiral enhancement in the matrix element, so one finds in the end an error which has the same size as those in generic hadronic quantities, i.e.

$$\frac{\delta B_K}{B_K} \sim m_{\text{res}} a m_s \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_s} \sim m_{\text{res}} a \Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \approx (2 - 9) \times 10^{-4}. \quad (37)$$

Here the numerical estimate is from eq. (16). Errors of this same size also arise directly from the Pauli-term in the Symanzik Lagrangian.

I conclude that  $\chi\text{SB}$  is not a concern for percent level calculations of  $B_K$  with DWF. Indeed, such precision is already being attained at a single lattice spacing [4], with a second lattice spacing underway [54].

## G. Pion EM splitting

I close with a final example which is both of phenomenological interest, and has particular resonance in this meeting as it was based on a suggestion (long ago) by David Kaplan. The idea is to calculate the pion EM mass splitting using  $\chi\text{PT}$  to relate it to a simpler quantity:

$$\Delta_\pi \equiv \frac{m_{\pi^+}^2 - m_{\pi^0}^2}{2e^2/f_\pi^2} = - \int d^4x \frac{1}{4\pi^2 x^2} \langle \bar{u}_L \gamma_\mu d_L(x) \bar{d}_R \gamma_\mu u_R(0) \rangle, \quad (38)$$

where the r.h.s. should be extrapolated to the chiral limit. The r.h.s. is part of the vacuum energy due to electromagnetism, with the  $1/x^2$  arising from the photon propagator. This application of (what was then called) current algebra and PCAC was suggested in 1967 by Ref. [59], and they evaluated the correlation function using resonance saturation constrained by the Weinberg sum rules. For an updated discussion incorporating large  $N_c$  input, see, e.g., Ref. [60]

<sup>20</sup> Note that near-zero modes do not give a contribution proportional to  $m_{\text{res}}$  here, just as for  $Z_A - 1$  [29].

Of course one can also do a direct calculation of EM splittings, using a background EM field, and indeed such calculations are underway using DWF [61]. But it would be interesting to have a result using a different method, and also to study correlation functions like this so as to make contact with large- $N_c$  based approaches discussed here by Golterman [62].

A first lattice calculation (which happens also to be my first lattice calculation) was attempted long ago, using Wilson fermions on a lattice of size too small to mention [63]. We understood at the time that chiral symmetry was essential for evaluating the r.h.s. of (38)—it is a chiral order parameter, like the condensate, since its L-R structure means that it vanishes in perturbation theory to all orders for massless quarks. It quickly became clear that the  $\chi$ SB inherent to Wilson fermions introduced an intolerable error. Given the much improved chiral symmetry of DWF, I thought it interesting to revisit this quantity and see how well one can do.

To study this, I note that, if  $m_{\text{res}} = 0$ , one expects, schematically, that

$$\Delta_\pi \approx f_\pi^4 + \frac{m_q^2}{a^2} + m_q \langle \bar{q}q \rangle \ln a + \dots, \quad (39)$$

where the first term is the desired result coming from long-distance contributions to the integral over  $x$  (with  $f_\pi^4$  being a good estimate of its magnitude using the experimental pion splitting), while subsequent terms are UV divergent and can be determined using the operator product expansion. (In doing so, I have not kept track of factors of  $\alpha_S$  in coefficient factors, since I am making rough estimates.) As in the case of the condensate, one can determine the order of magnitude of the contribution due to  $m_{\text{res}}$  by substituting  $m_q \rightarrow m_{\text{res}}/a$ . In this way one finds that, after chiral extrapolation, the relative error is

$$\frac{\delta \Delta_\pi}{\Delta_\pi} \sim \frac{m_{\text{res}}^2}{(af_\pi)^4} + \frac{m_{\text{res}}}{af_\pi} \times \frac{\langle \bar{q}q \rangle}{f_\pi^3} \sim \mathcal{O}(1) + \mathcal{O}(1). \quad (40)$$

In words, both contributions quadratic and linear in  $m_{\text{res}}$  turn out, for present and near-future DWF simulations, to give errors of order 100%. I conclude that it is probably not practical to calculate  $\Delta_\pi$  in this way, but it is perhaps worth a more detailed look.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

It appears that the residual breaking of chiral symmetry is problematic only for highly UV divergent quantities: in the examples I have considered, these are the condensate and the pion EM mass splitting. Thus I take the middle path and conclude that DWF are **WONDERFUL**: there is no practical barrier to calculating **many** quantities of interest (spectrum,  $B_K$  and related matrix elements, nucleon properties,  $\dots$ , and possibly  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$ ) with desired precision in the next five years. This will require, however, simulations with parameters extending to at least  $m_\ell/m_s \approx 0.1$  and  $L \approx 4$  fm, and probably down to  $a \approx 0.06$  fm, while keeping  $m_{\text{res}} \approx 10^{-3}$ . Given present estimates of CPU requirements, these appear to be attainable parameters in a five year time-scale.

Given the exciting potential of DWF simulations, I cannot resist an exhortation. For an outsider, a striking *lacuna* in present DWF studies is the lack of calculations of quantities involving heavy (and in particular  $b$ ) quarks. There are so many interesting and important heavy-light quantities to calculate that this is a serious omission. More generally, as stressed

here by Soni, the lattice community now has a great new method, and needs to think hard about increasing its repertoire.

Clearly, the next such DWF meeting should be very interesting!

## Acknowledgments

I thank Tom Blum and Amarjit Soni for the invitation to speak and for organizing a very stimulating workshop. I thank Norman Christ, Meifeng Lin and particularly Maarten Golterman and Yigal Shamir for very helpful correspondence and discussions. This work was supported in part by the US Department of Energy.

- 
- [1] D. B. Kaplan, Phys. Lett. B **288**, 342 (1992) [arXiv:hep-lat/9206013].
  - [2] Y. Shamir, Nucl. Phys. B **406**, 90 (1993) [arXiv:hep-lat/9303005].
  - [3] M. A. Clark and A. D. Kennedy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 051601 (2007) [arXiv:hep-lat/0608015].
  - [4] D. J. Antonio *et al.* [RBC and UKQCD Collaborations], arXiv:hep-ph/0702042.
  - [5] D. J. Antonio *et al.* [RBC and UKQCD Collaborations], arXiv:hep-lat/0610080.
  - [6] Links to other talks at this meeting, many of which addressed related issues, can be found at <https://www.bnl.gov/riken/dwf/talks/default.asp>.
  - [7] S. R. Sharpe, PoS **LAT2006**, 022 (2006) [arXiv:hep-lat/0610094].
  - [8] D. J. Antonio *et al.* [RBC and UKQCD Collaborations], arXiv:0705.2340 [hep-lat].
  - [9] C. Bernard, M. Golterman and Y. Shamir, arXiv:hep-lat/0610003.
  - [10] R. Sommer, arXiv:hep-lat/0611020.
  - [11] J. Garden, J. Heitger, R. Sommer and H. Wittig [ALPHA Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. B **571**, 237 (2000) [arXiv:hep-lat/9906013].
  - [12] R. Sommer *et al.* [ALPHA Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **129**, 405 (2004) [arXiv:hep-lat/0309171].
  - [13] M. Della Morte, R. Hoffmann, F. Knechtli, R. Sommer and U. Wolff, JHEP **0507**, 007 (2005) [arXiv:hep-lat/0505026].
  - [14] L. Del Debbio, L. Giusti, M. Lüscher, R. Petronzio and N. Tantalo, JHEP **0702**, 056 (2007) [arXiv:hep-lat/0610059].
  - [15] M. Gockeler *et al.*, arXiv:hep-lat/0610071;  
G. Schierholz, talk at this meeting.
  - [16] J. Wennekers and H. Wittig, JHEP **0509**, 059 (2005) [arXiv:hep-lat/0507026].
  - [17] T. Draper *et al.*, arXiv:hep-lat/0609034.
  - [18] S. R. Sharpe, arXiv:hep-lat/0607016, to be published by World Scientific.
  - [19] J. Bijnens, AIP Conf. Proc. **768**, 153 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0409068].
  - [20] D. Becirevic and G. Villadoro, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 094036 (2004) [arXiv:hep-lat/0408029].
  - [21] C. Aubin *et al.* [MILC Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **70**, 114501 (2004) [arXiv:hep-lat/0407028].
  - [22] G. Colangelo, S. Durr and C. Haefeli, Nucl. Phys. B **721**, 136 (2005) [arXiv:hep-lat/0503014].
  - [23] R. Narayanan and H. Neuberger, Nucl. Phys. B **412**, 574 (1994) [arXiv:hep-lat/9307006].
  - [24] V. Furman and Y. Shamir, Nucl. Phys. B **439**, 54 (1995) [arXiv:hep-lat/9405004].
  - [25] M. Golterman, Y. Shamir and B. Svetitsky, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 034501 (2005), hep-lat/0503037.

- [26] S. Aoki and Y. Taniguchi, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 054510 (1999), [arXiv:hep-lat/9811007].
- [27] Y. Shamir, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 054513 (2000), [arXiv:hep-lat/0003024].
- [28] M. Golterman and Y. Shamir, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 074501 (2003) [arXiv:hep-lat/0306002].
- [29] N. Christ (RBC/UKQCD), PoS (LAT2005) 345.
- [30] Y. Kikukawa, Nucl. Phys. B **584**, 511 (2000) [arXiv:hep-lat/9912056].
- [31] P. Hernandez, K. Jansen and M. Lüscher, Nucl. Phys. B **552**, 363 (1999) [arXiv:hep-lat/9808010].
- [32] D. J. Antonio *et al.*, arXiv:hep-lat/0612005.
- [33] C. Allton *et al.* [RBC and UKQCD Collaborations], arXiv:hep-lat/0701013.
- [34] R. G. Edwards, U. M. Heller and R. Narayanan, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 034502 (1999) [arXiv:hep-lat/9901015].
- [35] C. Allton *et al.* [RBC and UKQCD Collaborations], arXiv:hep-lat/0701013.
- [36] R. Mawhinney, talk at this meeting.
- [37] M. Bochicchio *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B262**, 331 (1985).
- [38] T. Blum *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 074502 (2004) [arXiv:hep-lat/0007038].
- [39] T. Blum and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3595 (1997) [arXiv:hep-lat/9706023].
- [40] T. Blum, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **73**, 167 (1999) [arXiv:hep-lat/9810017].
- [41] S. Aoki, T. Izubuchi, Y. Kuramashi and Y. Taniguchi, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **83**, 624 (2000) [arXiv:hep-lat/9909154] and Phys. Rev. D **62**, 094502 (2000) [arXiv:hep-lat/0004003].
- [42] A. Ali Khan *et al.* [CP-PACS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **63**, 114504 (2001) [arXiv:hep-lat/0007014].
- [43] M. Golterman and Y. Shamir, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 034502 (2005), [arXiv:hep-lat/0411007].
- [44] K. Symanzik, Commun. Math. Phys. **45**, 79 (1975), Nucl. Phys. B **226**, 187 and 205 (1983).
- [45] M. Lüscher, S. Sint, R. Sommer and P. Weisz, Nucl. Phys. B **478**, 365 (1996) [arXiv:hep-lat/9605038].
- [46] T. Blum *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 114506 (2003), [arXiv:hep-lat/0110075].
- [47] S. R. Sharpe and R. L. Singleton, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 074501 (1998), [arXiv:hep-lat/9804028].
- [48] O. Bär, G. Rupak and N. Shoreh, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 034508 (2004) [arXiv:hep-lat/0306021].
- [49] T. Bhattacharya, R. Gupta, W. Lee and S. R. Sharpe, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 114507 (2006) [arXiv:hep-lat/0509160].
- [50] L. Lellouch and M. Lüscher, Commun. Math. Phys. **219**, 31 (2001) [arXiv:hep-lat/0003023].
- [51] C. W. Bernard, T. Draper, A. Soni, H. D. Politzer and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D **32** (1985) 2343.
- [52] J. Laiho and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 114020 (2002), [arXiv:hep-lat/0203106]; *ibid.* D **71** 014021 (2005), [arXiv:hep-lat/0306035].
- [53] C. J. D. Lin, G. Martinelli, E. Pallante, C. T. Sachrajda and G. Villadoro, Nucl. Phys. B **650**, 301 (2003) [arXiv:hep-lat/0208007].
- [54] R. Mawhinney, talk at this workshop.
- [55] J. I. Noaki *et al.* [CP-PACS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **68**, 014501 (2003) [arXiv:hep-lat/0108013].
- [56] L. Maiani, G. Martinelli, G. C. Rossi and M. Testa, Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys. **3**, 706 (1989).
- [57] C. Dawson *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B514**, 318 (1998), [arXiv:hep-lat/9707009].
- [58] N. Christ, talk at this workshop.
- [59] T. Das, G. S. Guralnik, V. S. Mathur, F. E. Low and J. E. Young, Phys. Rev. Lett. **18**, 759 (1967).

- [60] S. Peris, arXiv:hep-ph/0204181.
- [61] N. Yamada, T. Blum, M. Hayakawa and T. Izubuchi [RBC Collaboration], PoS **LAT2005**, 092 (2006) [arXiv:hep-lat/0509124];  
T. Doi, T. Blum, M. Hayakawa, T. Izubuchi and N. Yamada, arXiv:hep-lat/0610095.
- [62] M. Golterman, talk at this workshop.
- [63] R. Gupta, G. Kilcup and S. R. Sharpe, Phys. Lett. B **147**, 339 (1984).