

Properties of predictive formulation of the Nambu-Jona-Lasinio model and ghost problem

V.E. Rochev

Institute for High Energy Physics, 142280, Protvino, Moscow region, Russia

Abstract

Recently proposed by Battistel et al. "the predictive formulation of the NJL model" is discussed and its connection with the differential regularization is noted. The principal problem of this formulation is a non-physical singularity (Landau pole) in meson propagators. A modification of the formulation, which is free of the Landau pole and conserves main features of the approach, is proposed.

PACS numbers: 12.39.-x, 12.38.Bx, 11.30.Rd

arXiv:0810.3364v1 [hep-th] 19 Oct 2008

Effective models of quantum chromodynamics in the non-perturbative region are a considerable part of the modern strong-interaction theory. One of the most successful effective models of quantum chromodynamics of light hadrons is the Nambu-Jona-Lasinio (NJL) model with quark content. Since the NJL model in the leading approximation includes the quark loops and is based on non-renormalized four-fermion interaction, the essential aspect of this model is a regularization, which on the widely current opinion constitutes a part of the definition of NJL model. Though predictions of NJL model for commonly-used regularizations (such as the cutoff in momentum space, the Pauli-Villars regularization or the proper-time regularization) are very similar (see, e.g., [2] for review), nevertheless such dependence on the regularization prescription cannot be satisfactory from the general theoretic point of view.

A very interesting attempt made recently in the work of Battistel, Dallabona and Krein [1] for releasing the NJL model from the regularization dependence. In this work a new method for the definition of one-loop Green functions of the NJL model was proposed. The idea of the method is to avoid the explicit evaluation of divergent integrals with any specific regularization. The finite parts are separated of the divergent ones and are integrated without regularization. Then the NJL model becomes predictive in the sense that its consequences do not depend on the specific regularization of divergent integrals. An important result of work [1] is a proof of the fulfilment of all symmetry constraints on leading-order Green functions. A parameter choice leads to the reasonable values of the constituent quark mass and other model parameters.

In present paper some features of the calculational scheme of work [1]¹ are analyzed, and a connection of the BDK approach with the differential regularization is pointed. The principal problem of the BDK approach is the singularity of meson propagators in euclidean momentum region. The presence of this singularity (Landau pole) prevents meson-loop calculations and, therefore, makes impossible any calculations of corrections to the leading approximation. A modification of the scheme, which is free of Landau pole and conserves the main features of the approach of [1], is proposed.

Following [1] we consider the simplest physically non-trivial variant of the NJL model with chiral symmetry $SU_V(2) \times SU_A(2)$. The model Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\psi}(i\hat{\partial} - m_0)\psi + \frac{g}{2} \left[(\bar{\psi}\psi)^2 + (\bar{\psi}i\gamma_5\boldsymbol{\tau}\psi)^2 \right]. \quad (1)$$

Here ψ is the quark field with n_c colours, m_0 is the current quark mass, g is the coupling constant of m^{-2} dimension, $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ are Pauli matrices.

The leading approximation of the model is the mean-field approximation, which coincide in the case with the leading order of $1/n_c$ -expansion. All Green functions of the leading approximation are expressed in terms of quark one-loop integrals. A problem of calculations of these integrals is reduced to the definition of following five divergent integrals (see [1]):

$$\{I_1; I_1^\mu\} = \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{\{1; k^\mu\}}{(k + k_1)^2 - M^2} \quad (2)$$

$$\{I_2; I_2^\mu; I_2^{\mu\nu}\} = \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{\{1; k^\mu; k^\mu k^\nu\}}{[(k + k_1)^2 - M^2][(k + k_2)^2 - M^2]} \quad (3)$$

Here M is the dynamical (constituent) quark mass, which is a non-trivial solution of the gap equation for NJL model.

A basic device for the definition of integrals (2)–(3) in the BDK approach is an algebraic identity for the propagator function (see eq. (28) in work [1] and see also work [4]). With the identity the divergent parts of integrals (2)–(3) have been expressed via three tensorial and two scalar external-momentum-independent integrals which were treated in the sense of some unspecified

¹we shall name the calculational scheme of work [1] as the BDK approach, or the BDK regularization.

regularization. Then integrals (2)–(3) have been expressed in terms of these five integrals and two standard convergent integrals (see formulae of section III in work [1]).

In connection with these expressions we draw attention to some general regularization-independent property of integrals (2)–(3). Namely, integrals $\{I_1; I_1^\mu\}$ and $\{I_2; I_2^\mu\}$ are connected with following relations

$$\frac{\partial I_1(k_1; M^2)}{\partial M^2} = I_2(k_1, k_1; M^2) \quad (4)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial I_1^\mu(k_1; M^2)}{\partial M^2} = I_2^\mu(k_1, k_1; M^2). \quad (5)$$

These relations are regularization-independent and play a significant part in the approach. It is easy to verify the validity of these relations for traditional regularization schemes (four-dimensional cutoff, Pauli-Villars regularization etc.) by straightforward calculation, but their validity is not evident directly from above-mentioned formulae of work [1]. To prove these relations we should to define derivatives of the external-momentum-independent integrals over M^2 . For this purpose we note that derivatives of logarithmically-divergent integrals are convergent integrals and can be calculated without any regularization. The calculations of these convergent integrals gives us zero value for derivatives of tensorial logarithmically-divergent integrals. Then it is easy to verify that the derivatives of quadratically-divergent integrals are the corresponding logarithmically-divergent integrals. Taking into account these circumstances it is easy to prove eqs. (4) and (5) for BDK expressions of integrals (2)–(3). The significance of relations (4) and (5) are evident since they can be used for alternative definitions of quadratically divergent integrals I_1 and I_1^μ without additional regularization.

With obtained expressions for integrals (2)–(3) the authors of work [1] have analyzed the symmetry constraints on one-loop Green functions and have argued the necessity of consistency relations, which are concluded in zero value for tensorial external-momentum-independent integrals (see eq. (86) in work [1]). With these relations all symmetry properties of the theory (such as Furry theorem, Ward identities etc.) are fulfilled for all one-loop Green functions. This point is one of important results of work [1]. From the point of view of above discussion the BDK consistency relations simply assert zero values of corresponding integration constants.

The choice of parameters of the NJL model with lagrangian (1) in the leading approximation is principally defined by two divergent integrals, namely, logarithmically-divergent integral I_2 and quadratically-divergent integral I_1 . Integral I_1 is a part of the gap equation

$$M = m_0 - 8\text{ign}_c M \cdot I_1, \quad (6)$$

which defines dynamical (constituent) quark mass M . Integral I_2 determines the structure of meson propagators. Both these integrals can easily be defined with differential regularization without using the above-mentioned algebraic identity for the propagator function.

To define I_2 one can use well-known trick, which goes back to Gelfand and Shilov [3] (see also [5]). Namely, let introduce new external variables

$$p = k_1 - k_2, \quad P = k_1 + k_2. \quad (7)$$

Derivatives $\partial I_2 / \partial p_\mu$ $\partial I_2 / \partial P_\mu$ are convergent integrals, and theirs calculation gives us

$$\frac{\partial I_2}{\partial p_\mu} = \frac{ip_\mu}{16\pi^2} \int_0^1 du \frac{u(1-u)}{M^2 - u(1-u)p^2}, \quad \frac{\partial I_2}{\partial P_\mu} = 0. \quad (8)$$

Basing on these results and using identity $p^2 \frac{\partial f}{\partial p^2} = \frac{1}{2} p_\mu \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_\mu}$, we naturally go to following definition

$$I_2(p^2) = -\frac{i}{16\pi^2} \int_0^1 du \log \frac{M^2 - u(1-u)p^2}{M_0^2}, \quad (9)$$

where M_0 is the integration constant. This expression coincide with the BDK ones if constant M_0 is related with scalar external-momentum-independent integral I_{log} (see eq. (40) in work [1]) as

$$I_{log} = -\frac{i}{16\pi^2} \log \frac{M^2}{M_0^2} = I_2(0). \quad (10)$$

An essential feature of above calculation is the permutation of two limits – differentiation and regularization removing. Sure, such permutation is implied also in work [1] (in the calculations of finite parts). This permutation is an essence of Gelfand-Shilov differential regularization [3], which is based on the infinite differentiability of generalized functions.

To define I_1 we use regularization-independent relation (4), which gives (with taking into account eq. (10))

$$I_1 = \frac{i}{16\pi^2} (M^2 \log \frac{M_0^2}{M^2} + m^2 - M_1^2), \quad (11)$$

where M_1^2 is the integration constant of eq. (4). With taking into account the consistency relations such definitions also corresponds to BDK ones.

To calculate M_0 and M_1 and, therefore, to define I_0 and I_1 in full, we can use in the chiral limit ($m_0 = 0$) two regularization-independent relations of NJL model (see, e.g. [2]), namely

$$f_\pi^2 = \frac{4n_c M^2}{i} I_2(0) \quad (12)$$

where f_π is the pion-decay constant, and

$$\chi = 2c^3 = \frac{8n_c M}{i} I_1 \quad (13)$$

where $\chi = \langle 0 | \bar{\psi}\psi | 0 \rangle$ and c is the quark condensate. We have from eq.(12)

$$I_2(p^2) = \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \left[\frac{4\pi^2 f_\pi^2}{n_c M^2} - \int_0^1 du \log(1 - u(1-u) \frac{p^2}{M^2}) \right]. \quad (14)$$

Then, using eqs. (11) and (13), we obtain for M_1

$$M_1^2 = M^2 + \frac{4\pi^2 f_\pi^2}{n_c} - \frac{4\pi^2 c^3}{n_c M}. \quad (15)$$

This equation (we shall refer it as BDK equation) plays a key part in the BDK approach. At pion constant f_π and quark condensate c being fixed eq. (15) is the equation for dynamical quark mass M , where M_1 is a parameter. In terms of new variable $x = -\frac{(n_c/2\pi^2)^{1/3}}{c} M$ eq. (15) can be written as

$$x^3 - 3ax + 2 = 0, \quad (16)$$

where $a = \frac{(n_c/2\pi^2)^{2/3}}{3c^2} (M_1^2 - \frac{4\pi^2 f_\pi^2}{n_c})$. Depending on value of parameter a , three cases are possible:

1. At $a < 1$ equation (16) possesses one real negative root $x_1 < 0$;
2. At $a = 1$ equation (16) possesses one negative root $x_1 = -2$ and one positive root $x_2 = 1$.
3. At $a > 1$ equation (16) possesses one negative root $x_1 < 0$ and two positive roots $0 < x_2 < 1$ and $x_3 > 1$.

It is clear, that at $c < 0$ the second case ($a = 1$) only can be physically accepted. Just this situation authors of work [1] take as solely possible choice for model parameters. The value of dynamical quark mass, which corresponds to positive root $x_2 = 1$ at $n_c = 3$, is $M = -1.873 c$. At condensate value $c = -250$ MeV it gives $M = 468$ MeV. Coupling constant g can be defined from well-known relation of the NJL model

$$g = -M/2c^3, \quad (17)$$

which is also regularization-independent (see, e.g., [2]). Noteworthy, the quark mass value and the coupling value depend on the quark condensate value only, and do not depend on the pion constant value. The last one defines the value of M_1 , which is $M_1 = 879$ MeV at $f_\pi = 93$ MeV.

It is interesting to compare the parameter values of the BDK approach with the parameter values of traditional regularizations. The value of quark mass (468 MeV) in the BDK approach is noticeably higher in comparison with the values in the four-dimensional momentum cutoff regularization (236 MeV) and the Pauli-Villars regularization (240 MeV) (at given value of quark condensate -250 MeV). Apart from the quark mass dependence on the condensate value is quite different. In the BDK approach the quark mass is proportional to the condensate, whereas in four-momentum cutoff and Pauli-Villars regularization the quark mass increases at decreasing the absolute value of condensate. For instance, at condensate value $c = -210$ MeV the quark mass is $M = 393$ MeV in the BDK approach and $M = 423$ MeV in the four-dimensional momentum cutoff. At the same time, from the point of view of the phenomenology the parameters values in BDK approach are quite reasonable. Apart from it is necessary to recognize that expressions for Green functions much more simple in comparison with any traditional regularization.

An essential difference from other regularizations manifests the properties of Green functions in the euclidean momentum region. In the BDK approach the meson propagators possess a non-physical singularity – a pole at the negative momentum square (Landau pole, or Landau ghost).² The meson propagators in the NJL model are scalar and pseudoscalar parts of the two-particle amplitude and can be written as

$$D_\sigma = -\frac{ig}{m_0/M - 4ign_c(4M^2 - p^2)I_2(p^2)} \quad (18)$$

for the sigma-meson and

$$D_\pi = -\frac{ig}{m_0/M + 4ign_cp^2I_2(p^2)}. \quad (19)$$

for the pion. In the chiral limit the equation for the Landau pole, as it follows from eq.(14), is

$$z \log \frac{z+1}{z-1} = 2 + \frac{1}{n_c} \left(\frac{2\pi f_\pi}{M} \right)^2, \quad (20)$$

where $z = \sqrt{1 - \frac{4M^2}{p^2}}$. At above values of the model parameters ($n_c = 3$, $f_\pi = 93$ MeV, $M = 468$ MeV) this equation has solution $p_L^2 = -4.29M^2 = -(969 \text{ MeV})^2$, i.e., Landau mass value $M_L^2 = -p_L^2$ approximately twice larger in comparison with the quark mass: $M_L = 2.07M$.

The existence of the Landau pole is a serious problem of the BDK approach. In particular, any calculations with meson loops become problematic. Though such calculations exceed the framework of the one-loop approximation, which is a subject of work [1], the impracticability of these calculations means a principal impossibility of calculations of corrections to leading approximation and cannot be acceptable.

Further, the Landau pole in quantum electrodynamics due to smallness of fine structure constant α is located in the very distant asymptotic euclidean region ($(M_L^2)^{QED} \simeq -m_e^2 \exp\{\frac{3\pi}{\alpha}\}$, where m_e is the electron mass and $\alpha \simeq 1/137$), and its presence can be in principle ignored. Really, at the much smaller energies the quantum electrodynamics becomes a part of an asymptotically free grand unification theory with self-consistent asymptotic behavior. In the NJL model with the BDK regularization the Landau pole is located near the physical region of the model, and similar reasoning are impossible in principle. From the other hand, the traditional regularizations, such as the four-dimensional cutoff or the Pauli-Villars regularization, are free on this problem – the meson

²The existence of such pole was discovered firstly in quantum electrodynamics [6] and presents a characteristic feature of theories without an asymptotic freedom in deep-euclidean region.

propagators in these regularizations do not have the Landau poles. Therefore, BDK regularization, possessing the certain appeal and simplicity, contains serious defect as the nearby Landau pole.

To improve the situation a compromise approach is necessary, which conserves main features of BDK regularization and at the same time solves the problem of the Landau pole. Such compromise can be achieved with the Feynman regularization for logarithmically divergent integral I_2 :

$$I_2(p^2) = \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} \left\{ \frac{1}{(M^2 - (p+q)^2)(M^2 - q^2)} - \frac{1}{(M_r^2 - (p+q)^2)(M_r^2 - q^2)} \right\}, \quad (21)$$

where M_r is a regulator mass ($M_r^2 > M^2$), and the definition of quadratically divergent integral I_1 as before is made by relation (4).

In euclidean region $p^2 < 0$ integral (21) can be represented as

$$I_2 = \frac{i}{16\pi^2} F\left(-\frac{p^2}{M^2}\right),$$

where

$$F(x) = \int_0^1 du \log \frac{M_r^2/M^2 + u(1-u)x}{1 + u(1-u)x}. \quad (22)$$

Prove the absence of zeroes of this function at $x > 0$. Evaluating elementary integrals in eq. (22) and introducing variables $v = \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{1 + \frac{4}{x}} - 1)$ and $v_r = \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{1 + \frac{4M_r^2}{xM^2}} - 1)$ we obtain following expression

$$F = 2 \left[\log \frac{1 + v_r}{1 + v} + v_r \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{v_r}\right) - v \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{v}\right) \right]. \quad (23)$$

If $M_r^2 > M^2$, then $v_r > v$, and from elementary inequalities $\log \frac{1+v_r}{1+v} > 0$ and $v_r \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{v_r}\right) > v \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{v}\right)$ it follows that $F > 0$ in euclidean region, i.e. the meson propagators do not possess Landau pole with this definition. For other aspects this modified regularization is similar with BDK regularization. For the modified regularization

$$I_2(0) = -\frac{i}{16\pi^2} \log \frac{M^2}{M_r^2}, \quad (24)$$

and, consequently, I_1 is defined by same formula (11) with substitution

$$M_0 \rightarrow M_r,$$

i.e. integration constant M_0 everywhere is substituted by regulator mass M_r .

Equation (15), which determines quark mass M , has exactly the same form for this modified regularization, and, consequently, all parameter values are the same. Remark, condition $M_r^2 > M^2$ is the automatical consequence of formula (12). Therefore, the proposed modification conserves main features of the BDK regularization and simultaneously solves the problem of Landau pole.

A general receipt for definitions of divergent integrals (2) and (3) can be formulated as follows: integrals (3) are defined by formulae

$$\{I_2; I_2^\mu; I_2^{\mu\nu}\} = \{I_2; I_2^\mu; I_2^{\mu\nu}\}^{BDK}(M^2) - \{I_2; I_2^\mu; I_2^{\mu\nu}\}^{BDK}(M_r^2). \quad (25)$$

Upper index *BDK* means that each integral with mass M or M_r is defined by formulae of work [1].³

³With such definitions integrals I_2 and I_2^μ are convergent without additional regularization. Since for self-consistency of the receipt it is necessary to verify the coincidence of usual calculation of these integrals with the calculation by formula (25), based on the BDK definition of divergent integrals. Simple calculation demonstrates the reality of such coincidence

Then integrals (2) are defined by eqs.(4)–(5). A consistency relation is the coincidence of integration constants, and, therefore,

$$I_1^\mu = -k_1^\mu I_1 \quad (26)$$

as in the BDK approach with consistency conditions.

It should be noted, that due to linearity of consistency constraints considered in work [1], the analysis of symmetry conservation, which was made in this work, can be carried to the proposed modification.

A principal distinction among the BDK regularization and the proposed ghostless modification consists in the treating of integral I_2 . Parameter M_0 in the BDK regularization is the integration constant whereas parameter M_r in the Feynman regularization (21) is introduced "by hands" and seems to be an outside object. The question arises, if really this object is some "secret parameter", which ensures the self-consistency of the NJL model on the quantum level? We cannot answer to this question now with the full confidence, but the structure of the BDK regularization gives us an allusion to the possible realization of this idea. The term with regulator mass M_r in the definition of integral I_2 by formula (21) can be interpreted as the rise of some repulsive interaction (i.e. interaction with a negative coupling) at the one-loop level. The coupling constant of the NJL model is connected with the quark mass and the condensate by formula (17). If the quark condensate is negative the negative coupling corresponds to the negative quark mass. In this connection it is not out of place to recall about the negative solution of BDK equation (15) ("quark ghost"). In the physical case this solution is $-2M$, where M is the dynamical quark mass. The existence of this solution can be an indication of such repulsive interaction, which becomes apparent on the one-loop quantum level. At given above parameter values we have $|M_r| \simeq 1.3M$. This value, of course, is far from the expected value. When the absolute value of the quark condensate decreases ratio $|M_r|/M$ arises, and at $c = -210$ MeV it equals to $\simeq 1.5$. At $c = -150$ MeV it reaches expected value 2, but the last value of the condensate is phenomenologically unacceptable since it leads to the very large value of current quark mass $m_0 = 21$ MeV. Therefore, the question of the possible "inter-termination of ghosts" in the framework of the NJL model remains to be open.

In conclusion discuss briefly the definition of model parameters beyond the chiral limit. At $m_0 \neq 0$ from eq.(19) it follows the pion spectrum equation

$$m_0 = \frac{2in_c M^2}{c^3} \cdot m_\pi^2 \cdot I_2(m_\pi^2). \quad (27)$$

Practically this equation is used for definition of current quark mass m_0 .

Taking approximation $I_2(m_\pi^2) \simeq I_2(0)$, we obtain well-known current-algebraic Gell-Mann-Oakes-Renner formula

$$m_\pi^2 f_\pi^2 \simeq -m_0 < \bar{\psi}\psi >. \quad (28)$$

This relation, of course, is regularization-independent (and what is more, model-independent). At $m_\pi = 135$ MeV, $c = -250$ MeV we obtain from eq.(28) $m_0 = 5.2$ MeV. The exploiting of regularization-dependent exact value $I_0(m_\pi^2)$ changes this result very slightly (approximately of 1 percent) due to the smallness of pion mass, and such specification, of course, lays out the framework of the model, it being right as for the BDK regularization as the modified variant.

The sigma-meson mass in the chiral limit is $2M$. Beyond the chiral limit the equation on the sigma-meson mass follows from eq.(18)

$$m_0 = \frac{2in_c M^2}{c^3} \cdot (m_\sigma^2 - 4M^2) \cdot I_2(m_\sigma^2). \quad (29)$$

With rather crude approximation $I_2(m_\sigma^2) \simeq I_2(0)$ and with taking into account eq.(28) we obtain well-known regularization-independent formula (see, e.g., [2])

$$m_\sigma^2 \simeq 4M^2 + m_\pi^2. \quad (30)$$

The much more exact (but regularization-dependent) approximation is $I_2(m_\sigma^2) \simeq I_2(4M^2)$. In this case we obtain

$$m_\sigma^2 \simeq 4M^2 + 0.21m_\pi^2 \quad (31)$$

for the BDK regularization, and

$$m_\sigma^2 \simeq 4M^2 + 0.26m_\pi^2 \quad (32)$$

for the modified variant.

As we see from the above formulae, in the physical region of energies about 1 GeV the quantitative difference of these regularizations is not very significant.

I thank R.G. Jafarov for fruitful discussions.

References

- [1] O.A. Battistel, G. Dallabona and G. Krein, Phys.Rev. D **77**, 065025 (2008) (hep-th/0803.0537)
- [2] S.P. Klevansky, Rev.Mod.Phys., **64** 649 (1992)
- [3] I. M. Gelfand and G. E. Shilov, *Generalized Functions*, Academic, San Diego, 1964, Vol. 1
- [4] O.A. Battistel and M.C. Nemes, Phys.Rev. D **59**, 055010 (1999)
- [5] J.C. Collins, *Renormalization*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1984
- [6] L.D. Landau and I.Ya. Pomeranchuk, Dokl.Akad.Nauk Ser.Fiz. **102**, 489 (1955)