

# The Chiral Symmetry Breaking/Restoration in Dyonic Vacuum

Edward Shuryak<sup>1,2</sup> and Tin Sulejmanpasic<sup>1,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy,  
Stony Brook University,  
Stony Brook, NY 11794, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Kavli Institute of Theoretical Physics,  
University of California at Santa Barbara*

<sup>3</sup>*Institut für Theoretische Physik  
Universität Regensburg  
D-93040 Regensburg, Germany*

(Dated: July 19, 2022)

We discuss the topological phenomena in the QCD-like theories with variable number of fundamental  $N_f$ , focusing on the temperatures at or above the critical value  $T_c$  of chiral symmetry restoration. Nonzero average of the Polyakov line, or holonomy, splits instantons into (anti)selfdual dyons, and we study both bosonic and fermionic interactions between them. The high temperature phase is a dilute gas of “molecules” made of  $2N_c$  dyons, neutral in topological, electric and magnetic charges. At intermediate temperatures the diluteness of the “molecular gas” reaches some critical level at which chiral symmetry gets restored: we comment on why it is different for the fundamental and adjoint fermions. At high density the ensemble is a strongly coupled liquid with crystal-like short range order: we speculate about its possible structure at small and large  $N_f$ . We finally show that certain lattice observations are in agreement with the proposed model, and suggest a number of further lattice tests.

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Qualitative overview

Here we outline the qualitative picture which had emerged in the course of this study, and give the answers to some of the questions which followed from it. Historic introduction to works and ideas which lead us to it will be postponed to the next subsection.

It is perhaps necessary to explain what we mean by the “dyonic vacuum”. Dyons in general are objects possessing both electric and magnetic charges. However, the term is used in two very different contexts. One is the “particle dyons”, the excitations of 't Hooft-Polyakov monopoles, well known in Georgi-Glashow model and many supersymmetric theories: we will *not* discuss those in this work. The second type are the “selfdual dyons”, which appeared as constituents of the instantons. Rather than being particle-like *excitations* of the vacuum, as the monopoles and the

first type of dyons are, they are part of the vacuum itself, describing certain topologically nontrivial component of the gauge fields. Not being particles, they do not have momenta or kinetic energies: they appear in the QCD partition function integrated over their collective variables. While instantons had among such variables color orientations, the dyons will have their positions only. In case of SU(2) color group they are two dyons per instanton, commonly called as  $M$ -type and  $L$  (or twisted) type, (see table I). For review on the instanton dyons see [1], [2] and references therein.

Those integrals are weighted with Boltzmann factors, including certain interaction potentials to be specified below, inducing certain statistical ensembles to be studied.

Here are some physics questions we will discuss:

1. What are the interaction between dyons, especially between the selfdual and anti-selfdual ones?
2. How do fermions contribute to the inter-

action between dyons?

3. What is the qualitative picture of the dyon statistical ensemble, as a function of three key parameters, the temperature  $T$  and the number of fundamental  $N_f$  or adjoint  $N_a$  quarks in the theory? In particular, why chiral transition moves to a stronger coupling?
4. In the high- $T$  limit, gauge field topology was described as a dilute gas of instanton-antiinstanton molecules [3]. How are these objects modified in the case of nonzero holonomy, in the dyon language?
5. What is the Dirac eigenvalue spectra for different dyonic ensembles? At which condition the chiral symmetry breaking takes place?
6. Can one explain the dependence of the chiral phase transition on  $N_f$  and/or  $N_a$ ?
7. Can one evaluate the “gaps” in the Dirac eigenspectra which are developed at  $T > T_c$  using dyonic ensemble?
8. At  $T > T_c$ , using quenched ensemble of gauge fields, it has been found on the lattice that chiral properties crucially depend on the particular periodicity conditions for fermions. In particular, the *periodic* ones does not show chiral restoration transition, unlike the (physical) *anti-periodic* fermions. How can one understand these observations?
9. Why does the chiral transition strongly depend on the color representation of the fermions, such as the fundamental or adjoint ones?

The reader perhaps noticed that this list of questions include neither discussion of the holonomy potential nor other questions related to confinement. We think that any quantitative assessment of the back reaction of the dyons on holonomy can only be done after a more quantitative theory of their ensemble emerges. (The interested reader is referred to discussion in [35].) Making the first steps toward such picture is the main objective of this paper: and here we will consider the holonomy  $\langle P(T) \rangle$  as given, e.g. by the lattice data.

Now we outline the picture. It is convenient to discuss it by defining three regimes, from high to low  $T$ . We will call them:

- (i) High  $T \gg T_c$  case, the regime of a dilute molecular gas
- (ii) Intermediate regime,  $T = (1..2)T_c$ , interacting molecular gas
- (iii) Dense regime,  $T < T_c$ , dyons form a strongly coupled plasma, in its liquid phase

Here are further explanatory comments on each of those:

(i) High temperature implies weak coupling and thus semiclassical treatment of instantons and dyons is applicable. Since these objects have nonzero electric fields, subject to the perturbative Debye screening, their density at high  $T$  is strongly suppressed. In a resulting dilute regime, the ensemble form a “molecular gas” of objects which have zero topological, electric and magnetic charges. The average Polyakov line in this regime is close to 1, i.e. the “Higgs VEV”  $v \approx 0$ , so all  $M$ -type dyons are light while “heavy”  $L, \bar{L}$  dyons are close to instantons and antiinstantons. Such molecules were described in [3] and subsequent works.




FIG. 1: (Color online) The schematic picture of the dyonic molecule, for 2 colors and large  $N_f$ .

Depending which kind of fermions the theory has, their zero modes fall on different dyons. For physical antiperiodic fermions those mode exist for (twisted) or  $L, \bar{L}$  dyons. As the number of fundamental fermions  $N_f$  in the theory increases, they bind this dyon-antidyon pair into

tight  $L\bar{L}$  “clusters”, which play a role of the nucleus of these molecules. Chiral symmetry is unbroken and the lowest Dirac eigenstates “at the gap” are due to independent  $L\bar{L}$  clusters,

The standard Abelian electric charges of both  $L$  and  $\bar{L}$  are equal to -1, so the cluster nuclei of such molecule has a charge -2, so it looks like anti-He, with  $M, \bar{M}$  as “positrons” around it. (This sign of a charge does not violate C parity, of course, because the Abelian projected fields are color-projected to color direction of the holonomy field  $\sim \text{Tr} (F_{\mu\nu} A_4)$  – or more precisely  $\sim \text{Tr} F_{\mu\nu} L$ , where  $L$  is the Polyakov loop – and while both non-Abelian field in it are C-odd, the product is C-even. So these signs are just matter of the definitions already used in the field.)

On the lattice one sometimes uses the so called “valence quarks”, not included in the partition function but used in the analysis of gauge configurations. Those may have arbitrary periodicity conditions. so, using “valence quarks” which are *periodic* over the Matsubara time, one finds that they interact with the lighter  $M$ - type dyons, which are also weaker correlated than the  $L$ -type ones. The difference in their Dirac eigenspectra will be important tool to test the structure of these molecules.

(ii) As  $T$  is lowered, the effective electric coupling  $\alpha_s(T) = g^2(T)/4\pi$  grows and at some  $T$  becomes large. Quite specific point introduced in [5] is the so called “E/M equilibrium point”, at which  $\alpha_s(T) = 1$ . Because of the Dirac condition for electric and magnetic couplings

$$\alpha_s \alpha_{\text{magnetic}} = \text{integer} \quad (1)$$

at this point, with integer being 1, the magnetic alpha is also 1. It has been argued and confirmed on the lattice that at this point magnetic excitations – monopoles – become about as numerous as the usual electric excitations, quarks and gluons. In gluodynamics (no fermions,  $N_f = 0$ ) this happens at  $T \approx 1.4 T_c$ : how this depends on the presence of fermions remains to be studied.

Below  $T_c$  confinement vanishes the density of the electric objects, quarks and gluons, while the monopoles remain. Consequently, the electric Debye mass disappear, while the magnetic screening mass remains finite at all  $T$ . Clearly some account for the magnetic screening becomes necessary. As argued in [37], in the

confined phase ( $T < T_c$ ) there should exist a term in the instanton density  $\sim \exp(-\rho^2 \times \text{const.})$ , where  $\rho$  is the instanton radius, due to *magnetic* screening by *Bose-condensed* magnetic monopoles. The constant in certain dual model was related to a string tension  $\text{const} = 2\pi\sigma$  [37], which describes well the lattice data on instanton size distribution and also explains why in QCD instanton ensemble remains relatively dilute even at  $T = 0$ . It would be very interesting to see if any of that remains to be true at large  $N_f$ .

Near  $T_c$  magnetic screening should be induced mostly by scattering of *non-Bose-condensed* monopoles. To our knowledge no study of the effect has ever been done, and we also defer it for future studies.

The interrelation between the “particle-monopoles” (inducing confinement by their BEC) and the instanton-dyons (inducing chiral symmetry breaking as we discuss below) is of course an intriguing open problem. On the level of gauge configurations themselves or their zero modes one finds no direct relation between them. However, on the level an of effective ’t Hooft Lagrangian an intriguing relation has been found by Poppitz and Unsal [36], in  $N=2$  compactified SYM case. It exists at the level of the partition functions, one being the sum of the particle-dyon excitations and another the sum over the periodic instanton-dyon semi-classical solutions, and clearly deserved further study and generalizations.

While perturbative expansion at  $\alpha_s(T) = 1$  is obviously not helpful, lattice simulation are the only method one can use to treat this region quantitatively. One might think that as in the theories with many fermions the near- $T_c$  regions moves into even stronger coupling, any hopes to use some analytic means should be even less probable. However, the dual – magnetic – formulation of such theories gets then weaker coupled, which will, hopefully, one day be utilized.

Our paper, as many others, rely on the robustness of the topological effects under smooth deformations, even if those are not small. Even if topological gauge objects fluctuate strongly, their topology and related index theorems guarantee the appearance of fermionic zero modes. A “collectivized” set of such zero modes creates the quark condensate, pions and strongly

influence structure of the lowest hadronic states and correlation functions. In contrast to many other papers, we now approach this problem “from above”, from hot symmetric phase at  $T > T_c$ .

Lattice data tell us that in the temperature interval  $(2..1)T_c$  the average Polyakov line  $\langle P(T) \rangle$  changes from  $\approx 1$  to  $\approx 0$ . Thus in this case holonomy takes any generic values  $A_4 = O(\pi T)$ ,  $\nu = O(1)$  and masses of the L,M-type dyons become comparable. The same is true for masses of fermions of different colors.

(iii) The dense regime near and below  $T_c$  we can only discuss qualitatively, as the interaction between the dyons gets very strong. We try to approach the problem from the perspective of the strongly coupled classical plasma.

For large  $N_f$  the basic objects include the  $L\bar{L}$  clusters which, we will argue, strongly repel each other. Therefore the optimal correlations in such medium would be similar to other systems which experience strong repulsive forces, such as closely packed crystals.

For zero  $N_f$  the dominant forces are Coulomb-like and corrections to them in a form of the determinant proposed by Diakonov and collaborators, as well as the screening ones. If so, we found instead dyonic crystals resembling salt: cubic with alternating  $L, M$  dyons.

Needless to say, we do not think that the solid is actually reached, it is well known that strongly correlated liquid have short-range correlations the same as their fully ordered – crystalline – form. While the “dyonic crystals” discussed provide examples of configurations in which the interaction is minimized, thermal fluctuations do kill the long range order, making it a liquid. Perhaps it is worth mentioning that the main parameter in Boltzmann exponents, the mean ratio of the interaction potential per particle to  $T$  also called  $\Gamma$  need to be  $\Gamma > \Gamma_c \sim O(100)$  for solidification. In the dyon problem discussed it is not so as  $\Gamma \sim O(10) \ll \Gamma_c$ .

Let us now focus on the main observable to be discussed, the chiral symmetry breaking. With the increasing number of fundamental fermions  $N_f$ , they produce stronger correlations and reduce the size of the “molecules”. If one wants to follow the lines of constant quark condensate, e.g. the chiral restoration line, one has to increase their density accordingly. This

can only be achieved by a shift to stronger coupling  $g^2$ . The dyon masses and interactions are  $\sim 1/g^2$ , so they become lighter and less interacting classically. (Needless to say, their fermionic zero modes and related interaction must still be there, for topological reasons: they do not depend on the coupling.) The (dimensionless) density of dyons continue to grow to the situation in which the inter-dyon distances gets comparable to the  $L\bar{L}$  molecule size.

The adjoint fermions are very different from the fundamental ones, for two basic reasons. First, some of them remain massless after adjoint Higgsing, and this drastically changes the dependence of the “hopping amplitudes” on the distance, from exponential to power-like. The second qualitative difference is that all dyons now have zero modes. The chiral symmetry is unbroken above such  $T$  when not only heavy  $L$  but also light  $M$  dyons belong to distinct molecules. This puts the chiral phase transition at much weaker coupling (higher  $T$ )

## B. From instantons to dyons

The discovery of the instanton solution [6] have created huge literature, including electroweak physics of baryon charge non-conservation as well as famous exact results for various supersymmetric theories. Obviously we cannot review this huge literature here.

In the context of the QCD-like theories the direct predecessor of this paper is the so called Instanton Liquid Models, for review see [7]. Its main point was account for the so called ‘t Hooft interactions to arbitrary order, by including the fermionic determinant in certain approximation in numerically simulated statistical ensembles. The calculated point-to-point correlations functions have reproduce many lattice results related to chiral  $SU(N_f)$  and  $U(1)$  symmetries. Chiral restoration can be viewed as a disappearance of the nontrivial solution to the so called gap equation. Alternatively, it was explained [3] as a consequence of a structural phase transition in the instanton ensemble, from a random plasma at low  $T$  into a gas of strongly correlated  $\bar{I}I$  instanton-antiinstanton pairs. The pairing mechanism is due to the fermion exchange, thus it gets stronger as  $N_f$  grows.

Let us remind its basic ideas which will be used below. In the basis spanned by the zero modes of individual instantons/antiinstantons, one can write the Dirac operator as

$$i\mathcal{D} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & T_{IA} \\ T_{AI} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where we have introduced the overlap sub-matrix  $T_{IA}$

$$T_{IA} = \int d^4x \psi_{0,I}^\dagger(x - z_I) i\mathcal{D} \psi_{0,A}(x - z_A) \quad (3)$$

where  $I, A$  are indices which run over all instantons and antiinstantons in the configuration. Here,  $\psi_{0,I}$  is the fermionic zero mode. The individual matrix elements have the meaning of a hopping amplitude for a quark from one pseudo-particle to another, and the determinant of this matrix is nothing else but the sum over the loop diagrams in which quarks visit each instanton once. Note that two  $\psi$ s have opposite chirality and so if  $i$ =instanton then  $j$ =antiinstanton or v.v. The fermionic determinant is approximated by  $|\det(T_{ij})|^2$ . The low- $T$  ensemble is a dense liquid which breaks chiral symmetry, but at high  $T$  (small size in  $\tau$  direction) it breaks into “ $\bar{I}I$  molecules” and chiral symmetry gets restored. The actual calculation was a simulation of the ensemble with the weight containing  $|\det(T_{ij})|^2$ , which was then used for evaluation of the Dirac spectra and hadronic correlation functions. At high  $T$  approximate factorization of the Dirac matrix into independent  $2 \times 2$  boxes (for separate clusters) explains the deformation of the Dirac eigenvalue spectra and disappearance of near-zero eigenvalues and the existence and the magnitude of the spectral gap  $G$ . We will now extend these ideas to the case of the nonzero holonomy.

The “instanton constituent dyons” have appeared in the context of semiclassical description of the finite temperature instantons (also called calorons). Existence of compactified Matsubara time coordinate allows one to introduce *holonomy*, the gauge-invariant closed loop integral over  $x^4 = \tau$ , namely  $\int_0^{1/T} d\tau A_4$ . Its exponent, the so called Polyakov line, averaged in the statistical ensemble of fields, may have a nonzero value

$$\langle P \rangle = \left\langle \exp \left( i \int d\tau A_4 \right) \right\rangle \neq 0 \quad (4)$$

This calls for new classical solutions which does not approach zero fields at spatial infinity but rather some constant value  $v$  of the  $A_4$ . We will also use dimensionless notations

$$\nu = \frac{v}{2\pi T}, \quad \bar{\nu} = 1 - \nu \quad (5)$$

Explicit solutions of such type [8, 10] demonstrate that an instanton gets split into the  $N_c$  constituent dyons. The names and quantum numbers (for the simplest  $SU(2)$  gauge group we will discuss in this work) cover all four possibilities for the electric and magnetic charges, see Table I. For  $SU(N_c)$  in general there are  $M_1, M_2, \dots, M_{N_c-1}$  static dyons with all diagonal charges and one “twisted”  $L$ -dyon.

name	E	M	mass
$M$	+	+	$v$
$\bar{M}$	+	-	$v$
$L$	-	-	$2\pi T - v$
$\bar{L}$	-	+	$2\pi T - v$

TABLE I: The charges and the mass (in units of  $8\pi^2/g^2T$ ) for 4  $SU(2)$  dyons.

Let us indicate here what qualitative difference the nonzero holonomy brings into this problem. As in this case the fermions are in the “Higgsed” vacuum, they are massive, with masses (in  $SU(2)$ )  $m_f = \pm gv/2$ . Therefore the zero modes at large distances  $r \rightarrow \infty$  are exponentially decreasing with the distance, unlike the power behavior typical for the zero holonomy case. This rapidly decreasing fermionic amplitudes are of course further enhanced by the number  $N_m$  of fermionic zero modes

$$e^{-V} \sim \det T \sim e^{-N_m m_f r} \quad (6)$$

which can create strong linear confining potential for the corresponding dyons and thus produces small-size “clusters” of the size

$$\langle r \rangle \sim (N_m m_f)^{-1} \quad (7)$$

The number of the modes dependence on the fermion’s color charge and the number of its copies. For the usual fundamental quarks  $N_m = 2N_f$ , as there is a zero mode for a quark and for an antiquark.

For the adjoint fermion  $N_m = 2N_c N_a$ . Furthermore, adjoint fermions diagonal in respect

to the Polyakov line VEV remain massless. Interaction between the dyons due to an exchange of the adjoint fermions has been discussed by Unsal [11]. The center of his proposal is a “bion”, a cluster of  $L\bar{M}$  dyons with the magnetic charge 2. Such bions can induce Polyakov-like confinement in the spatially compactified QCD [11].

### C. Overview of lattice data on chiral symmetry restoration and deconfinement

#### 1. The critical lines versus the number of fermions $N_f, N_a$

: Let us start by reviewing current lattice data. Our version of the phase diagram uses the “critical lattice coupling”

$$\beta_c(T_c) = \frac{2N_c}{g^2(T_c)} \quad (8)$$

as a function of  $N_f$  or  $N_a$ . The “bare” coupling values in lattice works are defined at the lattice UV scale  $a$ . In order to make it lattice-independent we have evolved the scale from  $a$  by a factor  $N_t$  (the number of points in the time direction) to the physical scale  $N_t a = 1/T_c$  using the two-loop beta function. The near overlapping points in Fig.2(a) are from different  $N_t$  simulations: their spread is a measure of the inaccuracy of the two-loop beta function used.

The open diamonds in Fig.2(a) correspond to lattice data from Ref. [13]: they show the critical line of the chiral restoration (thin solid line). Above the line is the symmetric (QGP) phase, below is the chirally broken (and confining) one. Moving downward on this figure means increasing the gauge coupling constant. Thus going to  $N_f \sim 10$  produces “the most strongly coupled QGP”, which is by itself a very interesting phenomenon. Why is it happening?

(There are many other simulations reported in lattice literature, of course: we decided not to put those on this plot because of the rather different actions used produce rather random spread of the couplings confusing the picture.)

The situation at  $N_f = 12$  is special. Ref. [14] argued that chiral symmetry remains unbroken. More recent paper [15] have studied the region of even stronger coupling  $6/g^2 \sim 1$ , and

perhaps clarified the picture. They do observe two distinct transitions, with chiral condensate disappearing at stronger coupling (the closed diamond in Fig.2(a)) than deconfinement (the closed box). Thus they found a novel intermediate phase in between, confining but with a zero quark condensate.

The same authors [15] also concluded that those phases are separated by a bulk transition from weaker coupling domain, in which there seem to exist a conformal (infrared fixed point) behavior. If so, the two phase transitions must be below (on the other side of) the true trajectory of the fixed point schematically shown by the (red) dash-dotted line.

(This line may deviate from thick solid (red) line, showing fixed point line using the two-loop beta function, because of very strong coupling involved. The issue where exactly the conformal window starts remains unresolved. We tentatively put the vertical dashed line separating it at  $N_f = 11$  in the figure. This is not a prediction but just a guess, and should not be used in any way.)

Changing the fundamental quarks into either (i) adjoint (triplet in SU(2), octet in SU(3)) or (ii) symmetric rang-2-tensor (triplet in SU(2), sextet in SU(3)) shifts the  $T_c$  of the chiral transition upwards. The theory with two adjoint fermions,  $N_a = 2$ , have been studied in detail, see Fig.2(b) based on [16], but (to our knowledge) not for other values, notably  $N_a = 1$ . (Of course, introducing variable masses may allow to follow the lines continuously.) Clear two distinct transitions were found: but in the opposite order to the previous case. In this case between the solid and dotted lines there is a *deconfined but chirally broken* phase (a plasma of constituent quarks). Furthermore, while the difference between these two points may appear small on this plot, the actual  $T_c$  scales of the two transitions are different by about factor 8.

(It is also noteworthy that these points are close to the conformal window perturbatively, or perhaps already inside it nonperturbatively. We tentatively put its boundary – the vertical dashed line – at  $N_a > 2$ : it is not a prediction and its exact location need to be found numerically in future works. )




FIG. 2: (Color online) The critical lines for chiral restoration (solid line and diamonds) and deconfinement (dotted line a box) of the  $N_c = 3$  gauge theory. We plot the critical lattice coupling  $\beta_c(T_c) = 6/g_c^2(T_c)$  versus the number of fundamental quarks  $N_f$  in (a) or a number of adjoint quarks  $N_a$  in (b). In both the paths of the infrared fixed point, calculated in the 2-loop approximation, are shown by the thick (red) lines. The vertical dashed lines separate “conformal window domain”: its location is a guess. In Fig.(a) we also show, by the dash-dotted (red) line, our guess for the actual location of the fixed point. For the meaning of the data points see text.

## 2. The magnitude of the chiral splittings versus $N_f$ .

Increasing  $N_f$  up to at least 8, the low- $T$  theories retain both confinement and chiral symmetry breaking, but the quantitative relation between them changes. Let us characterize it by the relative splittings between the chiral partners, such as vector-axial  $\rho - A_1$  mesons or the nucleon and the lowest  $1/2^- N^*$  resonance at  $T = 0$

$$\Delta_{\rho A_1} = 2 \frac{m_{A_1} - m_\rho}{m_{A_1} + m_\rho} \quad (9)$$

$$\Delta_{NN^*} = 2 \frac{m_{N^*} - m_N}{m_{N^*} + m_N} \quad (10)$$

The  $N_f$  dependence of these ratios is interesting: in the interval  $N_f = 0..3$  these chiral splittings are “large” near the experimental values (so to say, at  $N_f \approx 2.5$ )

$$\Delta_{\rho A_1}^{exp} \approx 0.45 \quad \Delta_{NN^*}^{exp} \approx 0.55 \quad (11)$$

which are well reproduced on the lattice. Yet calculated for  $N_f = 4$  [17] and 8 [18] theories

one consistently finds about twice smaller values, and at  $N_f = 12$  these splittings were not observed at all [14, 18]. In view of the trend just discussed, as well as because of the two transition observed in [15], we expect the chiral and deconfinement lines to separate, perhaps already at  $N_f > 4$  or so.

## 3. Sensitivity to the fermionic periodicity conditions.

Introducing an arbitrary phase in the periodicity condition of the “valence quarks”, one can switch the fermionic zero mode between the dyons: this has been demonstrated using artificial configurations for calorons e.g. in [19]. There is significant literature covering lattice efforts to understand the difference in lattice gauge configurations below and above  $T_c$ . A paper presenting interesting results on the Dirac eigenvalue spectrum in the  $SU(3)$  quenched and unquenched ensembles we would like to mention is that by Bilgici et al [20]. Its brief summary:

(i) at  $T > T_c$  the Dirac spectrum has a well de-

terminated *gap*  $G$  (no eigenvalues inside  $\lambda < |G|$ ), growing approximately linearly

$$G \sim (T - T_c), T > T_c \quad (12)$$

(in the quenched case, till at least about  $2T_c$ )  
(ii) if arbitrary boundary conditions are used for (valence) fermions, by a phase  $z = \phi/(2\pi)$  in a periodicity condition, they seem to be irrelevant below  $T_c$  but change the results drastically above it.  $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$ , or density of eigenvalues at zero, seem to have a simple dependence on the angle

$$|\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle| \sim c_1(T) + c_2(T) \cos \phi \quad (13)$$

with only one harmonics and positive coefficients  $c_1, c_2$ . For holonomy values shifted above  $T_c$  by  $\pm 2\pi/3$  the phase of the cosine is shifted accordingly.

(iii) As a result antiperiodic fermions  $\cos \phi = -1$  have a density which touches zero at  $T_c$  and develops a gap, restoring chiral symmetry. The periodic fermions, with  $\cos \phi = 1$ , never do so and their  $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$  grow indefinitely above  $T_c$ .

#### 4. *Chiral restoration in different Polyakov phase sectors.*

The previous issue is strongly related to lattice observations that sub-ensembles of quenched configurations at  $T > T_c$  with *different Polyakov phases* show different spectra of the Dirac eigenvalues and chiral parameters. In SU(3) there are two sets, one with  $\langle P \rangle$  real and another with the phase  $e^{\pm i2\pi/3}$ . For example, Fig 1 of [22] shows that these two different subensembles not only have different eigenvalues but also drastically different “participation ratios” (a degree of mode localization on the lattice). This phenomenon gives us the opportunity to study more than one set of holonomies in one simulation.

#### 5. *The spectral gaps at $T > T_c$ versus the fermion periodicity conditions.*

The gap opening is clearly observed for antiperiodic fermions but not for periodic ones, see [20]. An explanation based on dyon-antidyon classical correlation at high  $T_c$  was

offered in [4] Similar studies based on quenched configurations have been extended to adjoint fermions in Ref. [23]. Additional feature now is that chiral and deconfinement transition temperatures do not coincide. Yet again, the antiperiodic fermions show clear gap opening above the chiral transition, while the periodic ones do not.

#### 6. *Identifying the topological objects via their fermionic zero modes.*

In configurations with say exact  $Q=1$  one can locate one exactly zero mode and see its eigenvector is space-time. This can be done for arbitrary fermionic boundary phase. Using such lattice configurations Gatttringer and S. Schaefer [24] have observed that while the eigenvector indicate a single “topological lump”, its position depends on the boundary phase and jumps at certain values, resembling what happens with the different types of constituent dyons inside classical caloron solutions. Such techniques opened the way to locate all kinds of dyons and study their correlations/interactions.

At  $T \sim T_c$ , with massless fermions and restored chiral symmetry, all configurations with nonzero  $Q$  are absent, and the Dirac eigenvalues get gapped. What are the states “at the gap”, with the *lowest* Dirac eigenvalues at  $T > T_c$ ? As demonstrated in [25], those have *two* topological lumps, confirming for the picture of the paired instanton-antiinstantons [3]. As we will argue below, in a dyon language these molecules are more complicated, with  $2N_c$  dyons of all kinds and certain Abelian charge distribution. Therefore, now one should use this method again, to look at Abelian-projected charges, clarifying their structure further.

More recently, Bruckmann et. al. [26] have looked at the fermionic states at the chiral gap at  $2.6 T_c$  for quenched SU(2) gauge simulations. They have shown that the corresponding eigenstates are well localized and correspond to strongly modified local value of the Polyakov line. They have shown that the number of such objects vastly exceeds the density of isolated topological charges deduced from topological susceptibility, ruling out an ideal instanton gas as their source. They also commented, at the end of the section on topology, that their data



“do not exclude” configurations in which the topological charge cancels, like the instanton-antiinstanton molecules to be discussed.

## II. DYON INTERACTIONS

### A. Classical Interaction

As well known, classical interaction of the dyons *inside* one of the sectors – self-dual or anti-selfdual – are absent, as they are protected by the Bogomolny-Prasad-Sommerfeld (BPS) bound. Although it is clear how it works from the explicit solutions [9, 10], we will still discuss it in the dilute limit, as our starting point.

The question of Higgs topology and monopole interaction has been addressed in many references [45–47]. It is important to remind the behavior of the  $A_4$ , the effective “Higgs” field, at the dyon’s center: it is going to zero for  $M$ -type and to  $A_4 = \pi\hat{\phi} \cdot \vec{r}$  for the “twisted”  $L$ -dyon. (In case of the true Higgs field, it has to go to zero at the point where there is no preferred direction of color. However for the “Higgsing” with the Polyakov loop, which is an element of  $SU(2)$ , and its value at infinity (which defines an unbroken  $U(1)$  direction), the Polyakov loop can be viewed as  $L \in SU(2)/U(1) = S^2$  mapping. At points where no particular color direction can be chosen, and the Polyakov loop takes a value  $L(\vec{x}_0) = \pm \mathbf{1}$ : thus two types of dyons. For a caloron –the  $L$ – $M$  pair in  $SU(2)$ – one can see from quantum numbers that both electric and magnetic charges are opposites, so they should both create attraction. The other long-distance force is Higgs-mediated, and because dyons of  $M$  type have  $A_4(x_M) = 0$  and the  $L$  has  $A_4(x_L) = \pi\tau$ , this turns out to be repulsive and *cancels* the attractive Coulomb forces.

We will consider dyon-antidyon pairs, starting with  $M\bar{M}$  (which do not have a temporal twist, i.e. dyons completely static in time). We take them at large distance  $d \gg 1/v$ , where  $1/v$  is the size of their cores. Inside some ball around the dyon (antidyon) of radius  $r_0$  such that  $1/v \ll r_0 \ll d$  the field strength can be written as a small deviation from selfduality due to the other dyon, i.e. of the order  $1/d$ . On the surface and outside of these balls

the intensity of the “Higgs” field is given by  $|A_4| = v - 1/r_1 - 1/r_2$ , where  $r_{1,2}$  are distances from the dyon and antidyon, so as to conform to the expected asymptotic formulas for dyon and antidyon (see e.g. [2]).

For a single dyon the Higgs field can be written as

$$\vec{A}_4 = h(\mathbf{r})\hat{\phi}, \quad (14)$$

where  $\hat{\phi} = \vec{A}_4/|A_4|$ . Asymptotically  $h(\mathbf{r}) = v - 1/r$ . An ansatz which properly describes two dyons would have to obey the condition that asymptotically  $|\vec{A}_4| \approx v - 1/r_1 - 1/r_2$ . However the direction of the higgs in color space is a gauge choice, and can be chosen arbitrarily at each point. One can even make a choice such that the higgs points in one color direction (gauge combing), but one then has to introduce patches, as the gauge transformation cannot be made single valued. We do not specify this gauge choice, as we only deal with action, which is gauge invariant.

That being said, we expect that the influence of the other dyon will change the  $h$  function by introducing an additive coulomb term near the core of the first dyon, i.e. if  $r_1 \ll r_2$  we have

$$H(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2) \approx (h(r_1) - 1/r_2)\hat{\phi} \quad (15)$$

where  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  are distances from monopoles to the point of observation. Analogous relation holds when  $r_2 \ll r_1$ .

Now we determine the action of the system of two dyons, writing the action as an integral over three regions

$$S = \frac{\beta}{2} \left( \int_1 \text{Tr}(F^2) d^3x + \int_2 \text{Tr}(F^2) d^3x + \int_{outside} \text{Tr}(F^2) d^3x \right) \quad (16)$$

where 1 and 2 denote the regions around dyon and antidyon respectively. Inside these regions we assume selfduality (anti-selfduality) up to some small correction of the order of  $1/d$  inside the cores, i.e.  $D_i A_4 = \mp \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ijk} F^{jk} + f_i$ , where is the field strength induced by the other

(anti)dyon and  $f = o(1/d)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \beta \int_1 d^3x \left( \text{Tr} (D_i A_4) \epsilon_{ijk} F^{jk} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} f_i^2 \Big) \approx \\ &\approx \beta \int_1 d^3x \partial_i (A_4 B^i) + o(1/d^2) = \\ &= 4\pi \left( v - \frac{1}{r_0} - \frac{1}{d} \right) + o(1/d^2), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where the integration is over a ball of radius  $r_0$  centered around the first dyon. We pause to comment on this expression. In the case when we have a single dyon, we can integrate on the surface at infinity, which would just simply yield  $4\pi v\beta$ , i.e. the usual “mass” of a dyon. However it is more instructive to divide the region of integration into a small ball of radius  $r_0$  and the rest. The small ball is a total derivative and yields the contribution  $4\pi(v - 1/r_0)\beta$  to the action. Then we can write the action as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{single dyon}} &= 4\pi(v - 1/r_0)\beta \quad (18) \\ &+ \beta \int_{\text{outside}} d^3x \frac{1}{2} (E^2 + B^2); \end{aligned}$$

where we integrate over the volume outside the ball. However in this region the fields are abelian and behave in an expected way. We can write  $E_i = \frac{q_e \hat{r}_i}{r^2} \hat{\phi}$  and  $B_i = \frac{q_m \hat{r}_i}{r^2} \hat{\phi}$  and the result is  $4\pi/r_0$ , and the sum of the region inside and outside gives the expected result  $4\pi v$ .

Coming back to the case of two dyons. Including the region around the antidyon The result now is

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \int_{\text{cores}} F^2 = 8\pi \left( v - \frac{1}{r_0} - \frac{1}{d} \right) \quad (19)$$

The expression for a single dyon has been modified by the presence of the other dyon. We now can write the integral outside as the sum of electric and magnetic parts, i.e.

$$E_i = \frac{\hat{r}_1^i}{r_1^2} + \frac{\hat{r}_2^i}{r_2^2} \quad (20)$$

$$B_i = \frac{\hat{r}_1^i}{r_1^2} - \frac{\hat{r}_2^i}{r_2^2} \quad (21)$$

and contribute the expected terms  $4\pi/d$  for the electric and  $-4\pi/d$  for the magnetic, and they cancel. Also there are two self energy terms which are given by  $4\pi/r_0$  for electric and magnetic field separately, which cancel the  $1/r_0$

contribution to the inside-the-sphere integration.

Notice that even though the electric and magnetic fields cancel outside the cores, the dyon-antidyon system still attracts, due to the modification of their mass by the presence of the other (anti)dyon. Thus there exists a large-distance classical Higgs-based attraction for the  $MM$  dyons.

One can equally well consider  $L\bar{L}$  dyons with the twist, i.e. with core time dependence. The only modification is that then the contribution to the action of the core is given by  $4\pi\bar{v}$ , where  $\bar{v} = 1 - v$ . Also for a purely selfdual sector, and the interaction of  $L$  and  $M$  dyon is seen to cancel. This result is well known from the original works [8, 10], but here we see that since the “higgs” asymptotic look like  $v - 1/r_M + 1/r_L$  (see [2]), the “higgs” interaction is repulsive, which exactly *cancel*s the attractive forces of the  $E$  and  $B$  field. Note also that due to this effect of “dyon mass renormalization” we expect that if  $L$  dyon has a fermionic zero mode, which as we will see in the next subsection, depends on this holonomy-mass, and as a result its effect may be renormalized due to the presence of the  $M$  dyon. This was observed in the original papers by van Baal et. al. and it followed from the exact solution, but here we see its physical origin.

### III. FERMION-INDUCED INTERACTIONS

Fermionic interactions between dyons are central for this paper. It is induced by presence of fermionic localized modes facilitated by the twist in the gauge fields. The fermionic interaction can be seen by integrating out the fermions, which introduces  $\det \mathcal{D}$  factor in the partition function. It is important to note that since the Dirac operator depends on the gauge field, the determinant will in principle depend on the moduli space of the dyon-antidyon ensemble.

To see that the pair of a dyon and anti-dyon will be attracted due to fermions, we only need to consider the fact that both the dyon and anti-dyon have an exact zero mode if they are in isolation. Pulling the dyon-antidyon away from each other to infinity would then result

in a zero mode of the Dirac operator, and the measure would reduce to zero. Therefore the fermionic interactions induce attractions.

However practically we can look at the determinant of the Dirac operator in the basis of localized modes of  $L$  and  $\bar{L}$  dyons, which we denote as  $T_{IJ}$ , where the indices run through all dyon and anti-dyon zero modes. Since the Dirac operator in the chiral basis connects between left and right fermions only, the diagonal elements are all zero, and only blocks  $T_{I\bar{I}}$  and  $T_{\bar{I}I}$  remain, where now  $I$  runs through dyon zero modes only, and  $\bar{I}$  through anti-dyon zero modes only.

It is quite clear that in the case of a dyon-antidyon pair, since  $\det T = -|T_{I\bar{I}}|^2$  we have that  $V_{eff} = -\ln(T_{L\bar{L}}(r_{L\bar{L}}))$ , and since the matrix element is approximately  $T_{L\bar{L}} \sim e^{-Mr/2}$ , where  $M$  is the “mass” of the fermion [50], the resulting effective potential between dyons is linearly confining.

While in this paper we will focus on only the zero modes of the fundamental quarks, we would like to mention some important works on the adjoint fermions, which naturally appear in the supersymmetric context. For periodic compactification the corresponding index theorem is discussed in [38] (see also citations therein). Extensive discussion of the zero modes for the periodic and antiperiodic adjoint fermions can be found in [39].

### A. Fermionic zero mode for arbitrary periodicity condition

As we have mentioned in the introduction, one should not confuse the “particle dyons” and “instanton” (or selfdual) dyons: while mathematically similar they are associated with quite different physics. The “particle” dyons are time-independent 3-d objects and their fermionic zero mode are 3-d normalizable and time independent. For the “instanton dyons” we need 4-d normalizable zero modes associated with the topological charge  $Q$  of the 4-d theory: and the fact that such dyons possess only its fraction leads to a necessity to share those.

Some important technical differences are also induced by the fact that in QCD-like theories the role of the Higgs boson is played by  $A_4$

rather than scalars or pseudoscalars. As a result, the corresponding gamma matrix for Higgs is  $\gamma_0$  and the interaction with Higgs is chirally symmetric by itself.

On top of holonomy (Polyakov line) there can be fermionic (-), bosonic (+) or anyonic boundary conditions imposed

$$\psi(\beta) = \exp(i\phi)\psi(0) \quad (22)$$

On the lattice one can also use different  $\phi$  for dynamical and “valence” quarks, the latter absent in the partition function and used only for analysis of pre-simulated configurations. For example, often ensemble corresponds to quenched (no dynamical quarks) approximation, while “valence” quarks are just a tool to be inserted for analysis and they may have any boundary conditions we like.

We start with the Dirac equation

$$\not{D}\psi = 0, \quad (23)$$

and look for a normalizable solution within the hedgehog ansatz

$$A_i^a = \epsilon_{aji}\mathcal{A}\hat{r}^j, \quad (24)$$

$$A_4^a = \mathcal{H}\hat{r}^a. \quad (25)$$

Since the Dirac operator is chiral, we may write the fermion in terms of upper and lower components  $\psi_L$  and  $\psi_R$ . We do the calculation for the lower component, namely  $\psi_R$ . The Dirac equation then reads

$$-(\sigma^\mu)_{\alpha\beta}(D_\mu)_{AB}(\psi_R)_\beta^B, \quad (26)$$

where we explicitly wrote the Dirac indices  $\alpha, \beta$  and color indices  $A, B$ . Now we ansatz

$$\psi_\alpha^A = \alpha(r)\epsilon_{A\alpha} + \beta(r)[(\hat{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma})\epsilon]_{A\alpha}. \quad (27)$$

We may choose to consider the matrix

$$\eta_{A\alpha} = -\psi_\beta^A \epsilon_{\beta\alpha} \quad (28)$$

in which case

$$\eta = \alpha_1(r)\mathbf{1} + \alpha_2(r)\hat{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \quad (29)$$

The rule of acting with a color and the spin sigma matrices on this object is such that we multiply by a color matrix  $\tau$  from the left, and

if we multiply by a spin matrix  $\sigma$ , then we multiply from the right, and put a minus sign, i.e.

$$\sigma\psi = \eta\epsilon\sigma^T = -\eta\sigma\epsilon. \quad (30)$$

If we wish to construct fermion density, we see that

$$\psi^*_\alpha\psi^A_\alpha = \text{Tr}(\eta^\dagger\eta) \quad (31)$$

We now plug the ansatz into (26) and obtain the following two equations

$$\alpha'_1(r) + \frac{\mathcal{H} + 2\mathcal{A}}{2}\alpha_1 + \frac{\phi}{\beta}\alpha_2 = 0, \quad (32a)$$

$$\alpha'_2(r) + \left(\frac{\mathcal{H} - 2\mathcal{A}}{2} + \frac{2}{r}\right)\alpha_2 + \frac{\phi}{\beta}\alpha_1 = 0. \quad (32b)$$

where we have assumed  $\psi_R \propto e^{i\phi t/\beta}$ , i.e. that the Fermion has arbitrary periodicity condition in the imaginary time direction.




FIG. 3: The profile of (nonnormalized) zero-mode components  $\alpha_{1,2}$  (the solid and the dashed curves) as a function of the distance from the dyon. We show four different values of  $\phi = 0, 0.2v/\beta, 0.4v/\beta, 0.5v/\beta, 0.55v/\beta$ . Note that the zero mode delocalizes at  $\phi = 0.5v/\beta$

We solve the equation (26) exactly in the appendix, and the result is shown in Fig. 3. However here we can easily look at the asymptotic behavior of the solution, i.e. when  $\mathcal{H}(r \rightarrow \infty) = v$  and  $\mathcal{A}(r \rightarrow \infty) = 0$ , then

$$\alpha'(r) + \frac{v}{2}\alpha_1(r) + \frac{\phi}{\beta}\alpha_2(r) = 0, \quad (33)$$

$$\beta'(r) + \frac{v}{2}\alpha_2(r) - \frac{\phi}{\beta}\alpha_1 = 0. \quad (34)$$

This equation is easily solvable by taking the substitution  $\alpha_\pm = \alpha \pm \beta$  we get

$$\alpha_\pm = e^{-\left(\frac{v}{2} \pm \frac{\phi}{\beta}\right)r}. \quad (35)$$

In order for the solution to be normalizable, we must have that both  $\alpha_\pm$  vanish at infinity. This is only possible if  $|\phi| < |v|\beta/2$

## B. $M$ and $L$ Dyon Zeromodes

The formulas derived in the previous section why the zero mode "jumps" from one dyon to the other with the change of the periodicity condition of fermions. However there we assumed static dyon solution, which means we can directly apply the derivation to the  $M$  dyon. Therefore, in accordance with our result in the previous section, we have that the zero mode of the  $M$  dyon behaves as,

$$\psi_M \sim e^{-\left(\frac{|v|}{2} - |\phi|\right)r}, \quad (36)$$

where everything is expressed in units of  $\beta = 1/T$ . Now it is quite clear that  $\phi \in (-v/2, v/2)$  will preserve normalizability of the solution. But what if  $v/2 < \phi < \pi$ . Then we can use the equation for the zero mode on the  $L$  dyon, but we must first go to static gauge in which  $v \rightarrow \bar{v} = 2\pi - v$ , and then the equation for the zero mode has asymptotic behavior

$$\psi_M \sim e^{-\left(\frac{|\bar{v}|}{2} - |\phi|\right)r}. \quad (37)$$

However such a zero mode for  $\phi = 0$  is not periodic, but because we have to apply a time dependent gauge transformation to reinstate  $A_4 \rightarrow v$  at infinity in the form  $U = \exp(i\pi t \vec{\tau} \cdot \hat{r})$ , the fermions (in the fundamental representation) gain an antiperiodicity "for free". Therefore in the above formula we replace  $\phi$  by  $\bar{\phi} = \pi - \phi$ , or

$$\psi_M \sim e^{-\left(\frac{|\bar{v}|}{2} - |\bar{\phi}|\right)r}. \quad (38)$$

Now we insert  $\bar{v} = 2\pi - v$  and  $\bar{\phi} = \phi - \pi$ , where now  $\phi$  and  $v$  are the (true) holonomy and periodicity of fermions. We assume  $\phi \in (v/2, \pi)$ , so that the exponential term become

$$\frac{|\bar{v}|}{2} - |\bar{\phi}| = \pi - \frac{v}{2} - \pi + \phi = \phi - \frac{v}{2}. \quad (39)$$

In other words, we see that the exponent makes the fermion normalizable for  $\phi \in (v/2, \pi)$ . Now we explore the region  $\phi \in (\pi, 2\pi - v/2)$ . Then we argue that the zeromode on the  $L$  dyon is still normalizable. Indeed the exponent now becomes

$$\frac{|\bar{v}|}{2} - |\bar{\phi}| = 2\pi - \frac{v}{2} - \phi \in (0, \pi - v/2). \quad (40)$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_M &\sim e^{-(|v|/2 - |\phi|)} && -|v|/2 < \phi < |v|/2 \\ \psi_L &\sim \begin{cases} e^{-(|\phi| - |v|/2)} & |v|/2 < \phi < \pi \\ e^{-(2\pi - |v|/2 - |\phi|)} & \pi < \phi < 2\pi - |v|/2 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

### C. The fermionic interaction among the clusters

As it has been already mentioned above, on general grounds one expects the  $L\bar{L}$  clusters to repel each other, as say atoms do, because of the Pauli principle. In this section we will show how it works using the first “non-diagonal” diagrams in which fermion exchange between such clusters take place.

The fermion determinant will be of the form

$$\det \mathcal{D} = |T_{1\bar{1}}|^2 |T_{2\bar{2}}|^2 \dots |T_{N\bar{N}}|^2 - T_{1\bar{2}} T_{2\bar{2}} T_{2\bar{1}} T_{1\bar{1}} T_{3\bar{3}} \dots T_{N\bar{N}} \dots, \quad (42)$$

where  $T_{1\bar{1}} = -T_{1\bar{1}}^*$ . We can interpret the first term as fermions hopping from one dyon to the antidyon and back, for each of the pairs  $1\bar{1}, 2\bar{2}$  etc. The second term is a bit different. It can be interpreted as a fermion hopping from 1 to  $\bar{2}$  and then from  $\bar{2}$  to 2 to  $\bar{1}$  back to 1. So the loop is facilitated by 4 fermionic zeromodes. The determinant will then be a sum of all such terms, with appropriate minus sign to facilitate Fermi statistics (notice that a dyon-antidyon pair will be repelled by another dyon-antidyon pair because of fermi statistics).

It is simple to see that chiral symmetry is necessarily restored if the ensemble is made of dyonic pairs. Then the determinant is dominated by matrix elements  $T_{I\bar{I}}$ , where index  $I, \bar{I}$  go over dyons and anti-dyons respectively, which are closes pairs, i.e.  $T_{I\bar{J}} \ll T_{I\bar{I}}$ , for  $\bar{J} \neq \bar{I}$ . Then the spectrum of the Dirac operator is exactly solvable and is given by  $\lambda_I = \pm |T_{I,\bar{I}}|$ .

Therefore very small eigenvalues will be given by very small matrix elements  $T_{I\bar{I}}$  of the dyonic pairs. This matrix element is small only if the respective dyons are very far away (much further then the range of the transition element, i.e.  $\bar{v}$ ). But since the overall configuration is anyway weighted by the determinant to the power of the number of flavors  $N_f$ , these configurations are strongly suppressed, and the density of such eigenvalues goes to zero at small eigenvalues, implying that, by Banks-Casher relation, the chiral symmetry is restored.

A  $2N \times 2N$  matrix of the form

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A \\ -A^\dagger & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (43)$$

has a determinant equal to

$$\det M = |\det A|^2 \quad (44)$$

Notice that the determinant is always positive.

Let us now consider the fermionic determinant in the basis of fermionic localized modes for 2 dyons and 2 antidyons, labeled with indices 1, 2 and  $\bar{1}, \bar{2}$  respectively.

$$\det \mathcal{D} = |T_{1\bar{1}} T_{2\bar{2}} - T_{1\bar{2}} T_{2\bar{1}}|^2, \quad (45)$$

Now we consider a configuration of dyons and antidyons on a rectangle  $a \times b$ . A little thought will immediately reveal that if we put them on a square such that as we go around we have  $1\bar{1}\bar{2}\bar{2}$ , the determinant vanishes when  $a = b$ , or in other words clusters  $1 - \bar{1}$  and  $2\bar{2}$  are mutually infinitely repelling already when  $b = a$ . However we can make them come closer if we orient them on the rectangle as  $1\bar{1}2\bar{2}$ , i.e. dyons  $1 - \bar{1}$  and  $2 - \bar{2}$  form independent clusters with distance  $r_{1\bar{1}} = r_{2\bar{2}} = a$  and  $r_{1\bar{2}} = r_{2\bar{1}} = \sqrt{a^2 + b^2}$ . Then the repulsion for small  $b/a$  will be

$$V_{eff} = -\ln(\det \mathcal{D}) \sim -\log\left(T(a)T'(a)\frac{b^2}{a}\right), \quad (46)$$

where  $T(r_{I\bar{I}}) = T_{I\bar{I}}$ . Quite clearly the effective potential becomes infinite when  $b \rightarrow 0$ , making an effective repulsion between clusters of dyon and antidyon.

To discuss this further we introduce the diagrammatic interpretation of the determinant. The determinant can be viewed as a sum over all fermionic loops. Let us view a determinant

in some basis of local fermionic states. This need not (and in fact most certainly is not) an eigenbasis of the Dirac operator. The basis vectors we denote as  $\psi_n$ , which are localized at  $\mathbf{x}_n$ . Since this basis is not an eigenbasis of the Dirac operator  $\mathcal{D}$ , we have that

$$i\mathcal{D}\psi_n = J_n, \quad (47)$$

where  $J_n$  is a spinor resulting from the action of the Dirac operator. However we may view  $J_n$  as a source of our basis, and interpret  $\psi_n(y) = \int d^4y \Delta(x-y)J_n(y)$ , where  $\Delta(x-y)$  is the fermionic propagator. Then  $\mathcal{D}$  taken between two states  $\psi_{m,n}$  will be

$$(i\mathcal{D})_{mn} = \int d^4x d^4y J_m^\dagger(x) \Delta(x-y) J_n(y). \quad (48)$$

Therefore we can view the matrix elements  $T_{I\bar{I}}$  as being integrated propagators from one source to another.

The diagrammatic description of the determinant  $A$  in the upper right quadrant is then

$$\det A = \begin{array}{ccccccc} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \end{array} + (\text{all possible perm})$$

where the black circle represents the dyon and gray the anti-dyon.

The complex conjugation can be viewed, instead of fermion going from the dyon to anti-dyon, as the opposite propagation of an anti-fermion going from an anti-dyon to dyon. The determinant is then given as

$$\begin{aligned} \det \mathcal{D} &= |\det A|^2 = \det(A) \det(A^\dagger) = \\ &= \left( \begin{array}{ccccccc} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \end{array} + \dots \right) \\ &\times \left( \begin{array}{ccccccc} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \end{array} + \dots \right) = \\ &= \begin{array}{ccccccc} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \end{array} \\ &+ \begin{array}{ccccccc} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \end{array} + \dots \quad (49) \end{aligned}$$

The interpretation of this expansion is then straightforward. The determinant can be interpreted in terms of all loop diagrams connecting the various dyons which carry a zero mode. It is quite evident from this diagrammatic expansion that every diagram of two loops will have

a similar diagram with the opposite sign where the two loops join via a small channel (see Fig. 4).




FIG. 4: (Color online) A graphical interpretation of the weight in the background of the dyons. Note that the relative minus sign will always induce a repulsion between a dyon-antidyon pair.

Let us now think how many pairs can we make from  $N$  dyons and  $N$  anti-dyons. After a bit of thought we can see that it is  $N!$ . All terms like that involve permuting in the above expression two positions of two (anti)dyons, and because it requires two exchanges, the sign remains the same. The determinant will be integrated over the moduli space of the dyon-antidyon pairs, and so all of these kind of permutation can be taken to be the same. Therefore the first term will contribute with a factor of  $N!$  to the determinant.

The second term is a bit more tricky. We proceed in the following way. Let us consider  $k$  4-plets (a 2 dyon-antidyon pairs) which facilitate one loop. The number of ways we can have one 4-plet is  $(N(N-1))^2$ , because we can pick two dyons in  $N(N-1)$  ways, and the same for anti-dyons. For  $k$  such 4-plets we have the expression

$$N_{k-4plets} = \frac{[N(N-1)(N-2)\dots(N-2k+1)]^2}{2^k k!}, \quad (50)$$

where the  $k!$  factor is present to compensate for all possible interchanges of all  $k$  4-plets. The rest of dyons and antidyons can be made into pairs, and since there are  $N-2k$  leftover (anti)dyons we can do this in  $(N-2k)!$  ways.

Combining this with the above factor we get

$$N_{4\text{-plets}}^k = \frac{N!^2}{2^k(N-2k)!k!}. \quad (51)$$

Now we consider the integrals over such matrix elements. Generally we will have that for the arrangement of pairs the integral over the moduli space (assuming flat moduli space metric – an assumption justified only in dilute phase) will be given by

$$N! \left( c_0 \frac{V}{m^3} \right)^N, \quad (52)$$

i.e. integrating over pairs will introduce a volume given by the range of their matrix elements  $T_{L\bar{L}} \sim e^{-mr}$ , and an overall volume corresponding to the integration over the center of mass of each pair. Notice that we also put in the factor  $N!$ , which is an overall degeneracy of the integral.

In the case of  $k$  4-plets and  $N-2k$  pairs, we have

$$\frac{N!^2}{2^k(N-2k)!k!} \left( c_1 \frac{V}{m^3} \right)^k \left( c_0 \frac{V}{m^3} \right)^{N-2k} \quad (53)$$

Therefore the partition function can be approximated as

$$Z \approx N! \left( c_0 \frac{V}{m^3} \right)^N \sum_{k=0}^{N/2} \frac{(-1)^k N!}{2^k(N-2k)!k!} \left( \frac{c_1 \rho}{c_0^2 m^3 N} \right)^k \quad (54)$$

This expression can be written as

$$Z \approx N! \left( c_0 \frac{V}{m^3} \right)^N \sum_{k=0}^{N/2} \frac{(-1)^k N!}{(N-2k)!k!} \left( \frac{A}{N} \right)^k \quad (55)$$

where the factor

$$A = (c_1/2c_0^2)\rho/m^3 \quad (56)$$

The coefficient  $c_1/c_0^2$  is just a numerical factor, but it depends on how fast the matrix element falls off with distance, but it does not depend on overall coefficient in front.

The sum above can be computed by using the identity

$$H_N(x) = \sum_k^{N/2} (-1)^k \frac{N!}{k!(N-2k)!} (2x)^{N-2k}$$

Then the partition function becomes

$$Z \approx N! N^{N/2} \left( \frac{c_0 \sqrt{A}}{\rho m^3} \right)^N H_N \left( \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{N}{A}} \right) \quad (57)$$

The approximation can only be valid if  $A$  is small, therefore  $1/A$  is large. We can employ an asymptotic form of Hermite polynomial for large  $N$  in the following form [48]

$$e^{-x^2/2} H_N(x) \approx \quad (58)$$

$$\approx \frac{2^{N/2-3/4} \sqrt{n!}}{(\pi N)^{1/4} \sqrt{\sinh \phi}} e^{(n/2+1/4)(2\phi - \sinh 2\phi)} \quad (59)$$

for  $x = \sqrt{2N+1} \cosh \phi$ . Another asymptotic series assuming  $x = \sqrt{2N+1} \cos \phi$  leads to an oscillatory asymptotic, which is clearly a good indicator that our approximation of just including 4-plet diagrams is invalidated, and that higher order diagrams become important

If this is a good criterium then we expect that chiral symmetry will be restored for  $A > 1/8$ , or  $\rho/m^3 < c_0^2/2c_1$ , where  $\rho$  is the density of one species of dyons.

Finally going back to (54) for a moment, we see that if we look for the quantity  $\langle k \rangle = A \partial(\ln Z) / \partial A$ , we will pull down  $k$ , and hence each coefficient will have a factor of  $k$  in front. Note that this is *not* an average number of 4-plets. Each configuration has arbitrary many 4-plets, 6-plets, etc. They are part of the determinant for every configuration. The question is rather whether these factors are important or not. However this quantity does give us some information on the relative importance of these terms. Namely if the zero 4-plet term is dominant, then we expect this quantity to be close to zero. If, however, the one 4-plet term is dominant, the quantity becomes negative. It takes little thought to see that the quantity becomes more negative as higher  $k$  terms become more and more important. In Fig. 5 we show  $\langle k \rangle / N$  as a function of parameter  $A$ . Notice the abrupt change as we approach the critical value  $A = 1/8$




FIG. 5:  $\langle k \rangle / N$  as a function of parameter  $A$  defined in (56).

## IV. BOSONIC ONE-LOOP INTERACTIONS

### A. Electric screening

The basic physics of the electric screening can be explained most simply following the original derivation by one of us [32] (in the Coulomb gauge). If some object possessing a nonzero  $A_4$  is immersed into a quark-gluon plasma, those quanta from the heat bath are scattered on it. The simplest diagram comes from the quartic term in the gauge Lagrangian,  $\sim g^2 A_m^2 A_4^2$  which couples the heat bath gluons directly to square of  $A_4$ , but there are also other diagrams contributing to the forward scattering amplitude. The result was the expression for the QCD Debye mass[51]

$$M_D^2 = g^2 T^2 (N_c/3 + N_f/6) \quad (60)$$

The next relevant paper was by Pisarski and Yaffe (PY) [33] who calculated the one-loop action of the calorons (the finite-T instantons). Its main part is the following correction to the instanton action

$$\delta S_{PY} = \frac{2\pi^2 \rho^2}{g^2} M_D^2 \quad (61)$$

where  $\rho$  is the instanton radius. The first factor in this expression comes from the (4d) dipole moment of the instanton, and the second from the forward scattering amplitude of the thermal plasma quanta on it, for derivation see [34].

This term is only present in the plasma phase, at  $T > T_c$ , as only in this case there exist thermal quarks and gluons undergoing this scattering.

Going forward to calorons at nonzero holonomy, a corresponding one-loop effective action has been computed by Diakonov, Gromov, Petrov and Slizovskiy (DGPS) [35]. The caloron is now a superposition of the M and L dyons, separated by distance  $r_{ML}$ , and the basic expression from which the effect comes is the following integral

$$\langle A_4^2 \rangle \sim \int d^3 r \left( \frac{1}{r_L} - \frac{1}{r_M} \right)^2 = 4\pi r_{ML} + \dots \quad (62)$$

where  $r_L, r_M$  are distances from the dyon centers to the observation point  $\vec{r}$ .

(The dots stand for corrections due to a finite dyon size: the Coulombic  $A_4$  is true only at large distance. Note also that at large  $r$  the integral converges because the integrand is  $\sim r_{LM}^2/r^4$ . This term comes again from the quartic term in the action, in which two gauge potentials are the  $A_4$  of the instanton and two others belong to the thermal gluons.)

Thus the electric screening effectively generates confinement of two dyons, with a potential linearly depending on the  $LM$  separation:

$$V_{scr}^{LM} = r_{LM} \frac{2\pi M_D^2}{T g^2} \quad (63)$$

At zero holonomy this result matches the PY answer because of the relation

$$\pi \rho^2 T = r_{ML} \quad (64)$$

which, so to say, relates the 4-d dipole of the instanton to the 3-d dipole of the dyon pair. The second factor is still the same thermal integral producing  $T^2$ . One obvious effect of fermions in the theory/plasma is that a generalization of the DGPS result to theory with the generalized Debye factor as in (60). As a result, the electric screening effect ensures  $LM$  “binding” into a finite-size object with the (inverse) size

$$\langle r_{ML} \rangle^{-1} \sim T(N_c/3 + N_f/6) \quad (65)$$

Although asymptotically at  $N_f \rightarrow \infty$  this size is  $O(1/N_f)$ , the coefficient  $1/6$  in (60) makes it less important for “interesting”  $N_f = 0..10$ .



Note also, that for  $L\bar{L}$  or  $M\bar{M}$  pairs with the *same* electric charge, there will be plus in the integral (62) above and thus the effect becomes repulsive and the integral diverges: it needs to be regulated by some opposite charges. For molecules consisting of all 4 ( $L, M, \bar{L}, \bar{M}$ ) dyons, to be discussed shortly, the screening potential is

$$V_{scr} = \frac{M_D^2}{2Tg^2} < A_4^2 > |_{LM\bar{L}\bar{M}} \quad (66)$$

in which the  $A_4$  now contains all 4 Coulomb contributions. This integral is of course convergent because of total charge zero of the molecule.

Let us give an example of the electric multi-dyon potential screening creates in this case. We will later see that the direct fermionic interaction binds  $L\bar{L}$  pairs stronger than the  $LM$  interaction. Therefore, for simplicity one can ignore the  $L\bar{L}$  cluster size and put them at the same point, the origin. Another simplification appears if one puts  $M, \bar{M}$  and  $L\bar{L}$  at one line. The integral (62) changes to

$$\int d^3r \left( \frac{2}{r} - \frac{1}{r_M} - \frac{1}{r_{\bar{M}}} \right)^2 \quad (67)$$

The corresponding potential is shown in Fig.6. As one can see, like for DGPS case, the potential consists of linear segments, but is now deformed away from the companion dyon. (Note, that it is not due to their Coulomb repulsion, which is also there but will be discussed in the next subsection.)

### B. The one-loop effects and bosonic determinants

Effects which come from bosonic determinants have long history summarised in Ref. [2]. One important result of the DGPS paper [35] was the derivation of the one-loop metric on the moduli spaces for  $LM$  pair. It contains Coulomb forces (without coupling, one order less than classical  $O(1/g^2)$  effects). Essentially the asymptotic effective interaction due to both selfdual and anti-selfdual interactions is such that:




FIG. 6: (Color online) Potential shape of the  $M$  (or  $\bar{M}$ ) dyon created by the electric screening. The charge-2  $L\bar{L}$  pair is assumed to be in the origin, and the companion dyon in point 1.

- $L$  kind dyons and antidyons always repel with a Coulomb potential of  $8\pi/r$ . The same with  $M$  type dyons
- $L$  and  $M$  type dyons attract each other with  $-8\pi/r$ .

As it was elaborated in the Diakonov's lectures [2], he further combined these results with Manton's result for identical dyons and conjectured for the arbitrary number of selfdual  $L, M$  dyons, in form of one common determinant. While the matrix elements themselves have only  $1/r$  terms, after the  $\log(\det G)$  is computed one gets all powers of  $1/r$ , involving non-trivial manybody interactions. Those corrections are mostly repulsive and will be important in section VI, when we will consider statistical ensemble these forces generate.

To calculate the effective interactions between dyons and antidyons, one also must consider the moduli space metric of the ensemble, which is given by the overlap of gluonic zero-modes. This effect, if applied to the  $L\bar{L}$  pair, produces a mild Higgs-induced repulsion, contrary to the classical interaction we discuss above, which is attractive and  $\sim -1/(g^2 r)$ . The moduli space metric has no powers of  $g$ , so it is sub-leading in weak coupling. In general, one should include both effects

$$Z \sim d^3 r_L d^3 r_{\bar{L}} \frac{\exp[-S_{int}(r_{L\bar{L}})]}{\sqrt{\det(-\Delta)}} \quad (68)$$

where  $\det(-\Delta_\perp)$  is the one loop quadratic operator determinant in the  $L\bar{L}$  background for all modes *orthogonal to the quasi-zero mode*. All factors associated with “longitudinal” collective coordinate, such as Jacobian associated to  $L\bar{L}$  distance  $r_{L\bar{L}}$ , are to be included as a “one-loop” part of the interaction in the exponent.

Definition of “longitudinal” and “perpendicular” coordinates is a nontrivial task. In principle such construction is known for instantons, under the name of the “streamline” equation. Finding its solution for the  $L\bar{L}$  pair, or even providing approximate ansatz for it, good only at large distances, remains one of the open problems we hope to address elsewhere.

### C. The partition function

The partition function for an instanton-antiinstanton molecule can be recovered using known elements for each of the ingredients. Let us start with dimensional considerations, valid at high enough temperatures. If the fermions are all massless, the overall power of the  $T$ -dependence of total molecular density can be determined from the known power of the  $\Lambda_{QCD}$  in the instanton-antiinstanton measures, namely

$$n_{mol} = \frac{\log Z_{mol}}{V} \sim T^3 \left( \frac{T}{\Lambda} \right)^{-\frac{11N_c}{3} + \frac{4N_f}{3}} \quad (69)$$

Typically the power in the second factor is large and negative, so this density rapidly decreases with  $T$ . (It is so except near the boundary of the asymptotic freedom domain where that power is getting small: we will not discuss this region.)

Translation from the dyonic to instanton language at the level of the moduli metric and partition function has been studied for self-dual and anti-selfdual sectors by Diakonov et al [40]. Their expression, in the  $SU(2)$  case for pure gauge theory is

$$dZ_{LM} = d^3 r_L d^3 r_M T^6 2\pi C \left( \frac{8\pi^2}{g^2} \right)^4 \left( \frac{\Lambda_{PV} e^\gamma}{4\pi T} \right)^{22/3} F_D(r_{LM}) e^{-V_{scr}(r_{LM})} \quad (70)$$

where  $r_{LM} = |\vec{r}_m - \vec{r}_M|$ , numerical constant  $C = 1.0314\dots$ , and the scale parameter  $\Lambda_{PV}$

is for the Pauli-Villars regularization [52] The factor

$$F_D(r) = \left( 1 + \frac{v\bar{v}r}{2\pi T} \right) (1 + vr)^{\frac{4v}{3\pi T} - 1} (1 + \bar{v}r)^{\frac{4\bar{v}}{3\pi T} - 1}$$

is the correction appearing due to non-zero holonomy. If the holonomy  $v = 0$  or antiholonomy  $\bar{v} = 0$  vanishes, in the expression above  $F_D = 1$  and it reduces to the well known caloron measure, using the relation (64). In the limit of large dyon separation one may keep only the r-terms: note that it then becomes flat and r-independent as one would expect. The screening potential for  $LM$  pair

$$V_{scr}(r) = \frac{2\pi r}{\pi^2 T} \left[ \pi T \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right) - v \right] \left[ -\pi T \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right) + \bar{v} \right] \quad (71)$$

We have excluded one more factor in the partition function of [40]

$$\exp(-V \frac{v^2 \bar{v}^2}{12\pi^2 T}) \quad (72)$$

which does not depend on the calorons/dyons and is just a one-loop contribution to the probability to have holonomy  $v$  in the ensemble: it certainly should not be repeated twice.

The same expression can be repeated for the  $\bar{L}, \bar{M}$  pair, and then the combined into the 4-particle partition function for a “molecule”. Since, unlike [40], we are interested in the theories with fermions, we introduced extra factors which include that for zero modes as well as the nonzero mode part

$$dZ_{mol} = dZ_{LM} dZ_{\bar{L}\bar{M}} \left[ \frac{m^2 + |T_{IA}(r_{L\bar{L}})|^2}{\Lambda^2} \right]^{N_f} C(N_f) \left( \frac{\pi^2 r_{LM} r_{\bar{L}\bar{M}} \Lambda^4}{T^2} \right)^{N_f/6} e^{-V_{scr} - V_{L\bar{L}}} \quad (73)$$

As we already discussed in the preceding section,  $V_{screening}$  is defined by the 4-particle expression for  $A_4$  integrated over the volume. If one of the particle is going to large distances, the expression reduces to a dipole and return the linear confinement result, preventing “ionization” of a molecule.

The bracket in the power of  $N_f/6$  comes from the non-zero mode part of the fermionic determinant calculated by 't Hooft. The power of




FIG. 7: Histograms of the distributions of the distance between the  $LM$  dyons (stars) and  $LL$  (boxes) dyons, for  $N_c = 2, N_f = 4$  molecule, in the units of the Matsubara time  $1/T$ . The fermionic mass is taken to be  $m_f = T$  and the holonomy  $\nu = 0.1$ .

$\Lambda$  in it corresponds to correct beta function of the theory with  $N_f$  fermions, and is therefore fixed. Its dimension should be compensated by some parameters with the dimension of the distance, which in the case of a single instanton can only be its size  $\rho$ . At finite temperature instantons lose 4-d spherical symmetry and another dimensional parameter –  $T$  appears, as well as a nonzero holonomy  $v$ . Lacking explicit evaluation of the nonzero mode determinant, we just used the instanton expression and the relation  $\pi\rho^2 T = r$  translating its size into the current language. At least for small-size instantons (small  $r$ ) this should work. As a result we get factors  $r^{3N_f/2}$  in the measure, or a repulsive potential  $\sim N_f \log(1/r)$  trying to dissolve the molecule. Recall however that it only suppose to be true at small  $r$ , while at large  $r$  the one-loop electric screening effects generate an attractive potential linear in  $r$  which would prevent it from happening.

We have introduced here the fermion mass  $m$  in the Dirac operator, assuming it is the same for all flavors, for the normalization reasons[53]. The term proportional to the masses is nothing else but a square of the independent instanton and antiinstantons: and since their nor-

malization have been already determined by 't Hooft, the flavor-dependent normalization constant  $C(N_f)$  can be determined for  $\Lambda_{PV}$ .

If the fermion masses are set to zero, the fermions couple instanton to antiinstanton via the overlap matrix element and four integrals over dyon positions produce three convergent integrals, while one remaining integral over the global position produces one factor of  $V$ , the box volume.

Even for the simplest case of  $SU(2)$  color, when molecules contain 4 dyons, their position space is already 12-dimensional. Therefore we used standard Metropolis algorithm to generate their statistical distributions. Fig.7 shows one typical example of the output: in it we compare the distances between the  $LM$  dyons (stars) with that of the  $LL$  (boxes). The latter are seen to be much tighter placed, forming a “nucleus” of the molecule.

## V. MODELLING THE DYONIC ENSEMBLE

### A. Three Molecular Models

As a first step toward the understanding of the dyonic ensembles, and their role in chiral symmetry breaking/restoration, we had formulated some simplified models.

For calculation purposes it is convenient for these models to treat the dyon density

$$n_d = n_L = n_M = n_{\bar{L}} = n_{\bar{M}} \quad (74)$$

(which is also the same as the instanton density  $n_{inst} + n_{antiinstanton}$ ) as the basic dimensional quantity, providing the units of length  $n_d^{-1/3}$ . Using such length units we put  $n_d = 1$  for a while, and will be expressing other dimensional quantities in these units. We will be working with traditional periodic boxes of some size  $L \times L \times L$ , with  $L$  “large”, and thus put into such boxes  $N_d = L^3$  dyons of each kind.

For each configuration of these models we then calculate the fermionic matrix  $T_{ij}$ , and calculate its eigenvalues. In this way we get part of the Dirac spectrum built on the subspace of the dyon zero modes. (The same procedure as has been used in the instanton liquid models before). Since we assume that fermionic zero

modes resign on  $L, \bar{L}$  dyons only, this part of the calculation ignores the  $M, \bar{M}$  dyons. The matrix is thus of the size  $2N_d \times 2N_d$ . For reasons of opposite chirality, two quarters of the matrix, when both  $i, j = L$  or  $\bar{L}$  are zero, so fermionic hopping occurs only from a dyon and anti-dyon.

We assume the matrix element  $T_{ij}$ , where is given by

$$T_{ij} = c \frac{e^{-Mr_{ij}}}{\sqrt{1 + Mr_{ij}}} \quad (75)$$

where one of the indices counts  $L$  dyons, and the other counts  $\bar{L}$  dyons. The constant  $c$  will be left undetermined, whereas the “mass”  $M$  is given by

$$M = \bar{v} = 2\pi - v. \quad (76)$$

The form of the matrix element is not derived, but it is postulated as expected form for the matrix element of the Dirac operator in the zero mode basis. We introduce a regulator at  $r = 0$ , so as to make deal with smooth distributions. However there will be a natural cutoff for how close the dyon and antidyon can get before they are part of a perturbative vacuum, which is anyway roughly the size of their cores  $1/M = 1/\bar{v}$ . Strictly speaking the definition of the distance at which the dyon-antidyon pair is irrelevant is defined as the distance at which it no longer supports a localized fermionic mode.

We proceed by three models:

1. The Random Gas Model
2. The Random Molecular Model
3. The Reweighted Molecular Model

The simplest model-I is that of the “Random Gas Model”, in which all correlations between the dyons are ignored and they are placed randomly. The only parameter of the model is the fermion mass  $M$  entering the matrix  $T_{ij}$ , to be expressed in units of  $n_d^{1/3}$ . (In reality, both the dyon density and the holonomy, defining  $M$ , will be function of the temperature  $T$ , but we prefer to study our models in their parameter space before mapping some of the results to lattice data, see below.)

In Fig.VA we show the results of such calculation. We use the box of the size  $6^3$  and

thus 216 dyons of each kind, and a range of fermion masses as indicated in the figure caption. The characteristic feature of the “Random Gas Model” is a large peak near eigenvalues  $\lambda \approx 0$ . Since the density of quazero eigenvalues is proportional to the quark condensate (Casher-Banks theorem), we conclude that this model provides large or “enhanced” chiral symmetry breaking. More quantitatively, we find from this simulation that the condensate, for  $M = \pi/2$ , is




FIG. 8: (Color online) The Dirac eigenvalue spectrum for the random dyon gas

Our  $2^{nd}$  model is the “Random Molecules Model”, in which we include pair correlations between  $L, \bar{L}$  dyons. As we discussed above, we expect significant attraction between those, of classical Higgs-related origin, as well as the fermion-induced “confinement”. We focus here on the fermionic interaction. As the number of fermionic zero modes grows, proportionally to the number of flavors  $N_f$ , we expect that at large enough  $N_f$  the molecule mean size  $R_m$  decreases as  $\sim 1/N_f$ . We model the vacuum as being composed out of random molecules. The following distribution of the size of molecules is used:

$$D_{mol}(r) = Nr^2 \left( \frac{e^{-Mr}}{\sqrt{1 + Mr}} \right)^{2N_f} \quad (77)$$

where  $r^2$  is due to the measure of the dyon-antidyon coordinates, and  $N$  is the normalization constant. The above form is inspired by a weight  $(\det T_{ij})^{N_f}$ , for a dilute molecule ensemble. Average molecular size will roughly be given by  $R_m = 1/(N_f m)$ .

At this stage we have ignored any interaction




FIG. 9: (Color online) The eigenvalue gap and the quark condensate for the random gas model, as a function of the “mass”  $M$ .

between the molecules, placing them randomly with random orientations.

The model has two parameters, the holonomy “mass”  $M$  and the number of flavors  $N_f$ . In Fig. 10 we show the Dirac spectrum for several values of  $N_f$ , as a function of  $M$  and in Fig. 11 the lowest eigenvalue and chiral condensate results. Note that here there is explicit dependence of chiral condensate on holonomy.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> model is a modification of the second by reweighting the configurations with the determinant  $\det T_{ij}^{2N_f} / (\prod_i D_{mol}(r_{ii}))$ , where  $r_{ii}$  is the distance between closest neighbors. The result is shown in Fig. 12 and in Fig. 13

## B. Mapping the models to finite $T$ QCD

Our three models were defined in such a way, that each step has introduced one new parameter: with the dyon density it brings the total number of parameters to four. Yet a QCD-like theories with massless fermions have only two dimensional parameters, the temperature  $T$  and  $\Lambda$ . Thus only a 2-parameter subspace of our (up-to) four parameter model space can be compared to reality.

Now is the time to map those parameters. Like lattice practitioners do, it is thus natural to measure all dimensional quantities in units of  $T$ .

The dimensionless dyon density  $n_d/T^3$  can be considered to be one of the key parameters. It has not yet been measured on the lattice, but it can be. While it is the same as the density

of instantons, it is *not* given by the topological susceptibility  $\chi(T)$ , as neutral molecules contribute to the former but not the latter. Semi-classical theory tells us the large- $T$  asymptotical dependence on  $T$ , expression (69). For qualitative estimates one may use it normalized to its value at  $T_c$ . The factor in front of the power of  $T_c/T$  depends on the coupling, in a particular definition used by 'tHooft, and the fermionic factors its value is  $O(1)$  for physical QCD or  $N_f = 2$ , which one can use for absolute normalization.

The fermion mass  $M/T \sim 1/N_f$  and thus, keeping the coupling fixed while increasing  $N_f$ , one finds that the cluster size is reducing and thus we are going into a regime of more dilute gas. However, if one wants to follow the line of “fixed eigenvalue spectrum” and/or fixed  $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$ , one needs to keep the same diluteness of the molecular model, or keep constant

$$R_m^3 n_d = const, \quad (78)$$

where  $R_m \sim 1/(N_f M)$ . Thus the dyon density should grow as  $N_f^3$ , e.g. from  $N_f = 2$  to 12 increase by a factor 216.

The only way it can be achieved is by a shift into the stronger coupling! Crude estimate ignoring preexponent gives a shift of

$$\frac{8\pi^2}{g^2(T_c(N_f))} - \frac{8\pi^2}{g^2(T_c(N_f = 2))} = 3 \ln(N_f/2) \quad (79)$$

This qualitatively explains why chiral restoration line  $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle = 0$  derived in lattice studies, see Fig.2 dramatically shifts into stronger coupling.




FIG. 10: (Color online) The Dirac eigenvalue spectrum. The horizontal axis is the eigenvalue of the Dirac operator  $\lambda$  expressed in units of  $c$  defined in the eq. (75), and vertical axis is the probability density  $dP/\lambda$ . The plots are for  $N_f = 2$  and  $M = (\pi/6 \dots 9) \times \pi/6n^{1/3}$ , where  $n$  is the density of  $L$  dyons. Note that the chiral symmetry is restored as a function of  $M$  which is connected to holonomy as  $M = \bar{v} = 2\pi - v$ .




FIG. 11: (Color online) The smallest eigenvalue and the chiral condensate for the Random Molecule model, as a function of the mass (holonomy) for  $N_f = 2$ .

Unfortunately our attempts to do it quantitatively failed, for the following reason. The coupling  $g$  in the semiclassical expressions and on the lattice (such as Fig.2) are defined in different schemes, with the scales  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$  and  $\Lambda_{lat}$ . Perturbatively they only differ by a calculable factor, but as their ratio happen to be large, this relation is not very useful in practice. For example, for QCD or  $N_f = 3$  theory, the former

is about 300 MeV and the latter about 5 MeV. The instanton density includes huge factor

$$\exp\left(-\frac{8\pi^2}{g^2}\right) \sim (\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}/\Lambda_{lat})^{11N_c/3-2N_f/3} \sim 60^9 \quad (80)$$

Obviously any small deviation from the two-loop beta function usually used would result in huge uncertainties which make any numerical comparison of the semiclassical and lattice




FIG. 12: (Color online) The Dirac eigenvalue spectrum for a Random Molecule Ensemble (blue) and Reweighted Random Molecule Ensemble (red). The horizontal axis is the eigenvalue of the Dirac operator  $\lambda$  expressed in units of  $c$  defined in the eq. (75), and vertical axis is the probability density  $dP/\lambda$ . The plots are for  $N_f = 2$  and  $M = (30, 25, 20, 15, 10, 5) \times \pi/6n^{1/3}$ , where  $n$  is the density of  $L$  dyons. The reweighting becomes unreliable in the last plot, and only one configuration dominates.




FIG. 13: (Color online) The smallest eigenvalue and the chiral condensate for the Reweighted Random Molecule model, as a function of holonomy for  $N_f = 2$  and  $M = \pi/6 \dots 30 \times \pi/6$ . Note that reweighting becomes unreliable at around  $M = 15 \times \pi/6$ , and that we show this result only to demonstrate the trend that chiral-symmetry persists to lower values of  $M$  then for the non-reweighted case.

densities meaningless.

The tests of this explanation however can still be made using lattice data. The most straightforward one would be to measure the dyon molecule density and size and see if the relation (78) holds. To do so one can e.g. use Dirac eigenstates in certain interval of  $\lambda$  which can identify a dyon-antidyon cluster.

### C. Structure of strongly coupled “cluster liquid”

With large number of fermions  $L\bar{L}$  are strongly coupled into a charge -2 well localized objects, compensated by the negatively charged  $M$  and  $\bar{M}$  dyons which are more homogeneously distributed.

The  $L\bar{L}$  “nuclei”, with the fermions attracted to them, form mutually repulsive “atoms”. The question is what arrangements those should

have to get the lowest energy. One obvious idea is those with the best packing in 3d, namely the face-center-cubic (*fcc*) or the hexagonal-close-packing (*hcp*). Selecting between those one may follow the guidance given by ordinary atoms which are neutral and spherically symmetric by themselves. High-density solid  $He^4$  is of the *hcp* structure, and perhaps that would be the approximate local symmetry of our strongly correlated  $L\bar{L}$  liquid. If so, each of them has 12 nearest neighbors, organized in two hexagons at two planes above and below the cluster.

While large number of correlated neighbors reinforces the correlations, simple estimates show that the parameter  $\Gamma$  (the average interaction potential divided by  $T$ ) does *not* reach the critical value needed for the ensemble to get solidified. Thus, with the parameter range at hand we expect a strongly coupled liquid, with smaller number of well-correlated neighbors but with their locations still correspond to those in the crystal. Explicit statistical simulations of it are possible, but are deferred for further studies.

## VI. STATISTICAL MECHANICS DRIVEN BY BOSONIC MODULI SPACE METRIC EFFECTS

Let us now discuss the opposite limit of *zero*  $N_f = 0$ , in which there are no  $L\bar{L}$  clustering. Let us further imagine that for some reason one can decouple the two sectors, dyons and antidions, and discuss what kind of a system would be created by “Diakonov’s determinantal forces”. Assuming that the antiseifdual sector do not exist, let us thus focus on the  $M, L$  sector. Since the electric and magnetic charges in it have the same sign, one may in this section simply call them + and - dyons.

At large distances the forces between them are Coulombic, and one may think that the crystal those would generate is a simple cubic crystal of alternating charges, like e.g. the usual salt  $NaCl$ . Any charge is thus strongly correlated with 6 nearest neighbors.

Classical Coulombic systems, are well known to be unstable against charges falling on each other. (Of course for real ions electron repulsion solves this issue, stabilizing the salts.) We thus studied the following question: can the Di-

akonov’s determinantal forces stabilize a cubic crystal?

We use the moduli space metric  $G_{ij}$  for the selfdual sector as suggested in [2] to calculate the effective potential of a crystal configuration of  $L$  and  $M$  dyons, with a lattice spacing  $a$ , for a displacement of a single dyon somewhere in a center. The log of the measure,  $V_d = -\ln(\det G)$ , will be discussed below. For a purely Coulombic crystal, the crystal potential as a function of a displacement  $\Delta x$  has infinite Coulombic dips as displacement  $\Delta x$  approaches  $\pm a$ , which means that for purely Coulombic interactions the alternating charges will fall on each other. However the effective potential  $V_d$  contains repulsion and, as shown in 14, this leads to a pronounced minimum at small lattice spacings  $a$  (high density). On closer inspection, however, there is always a small, but clear peak in the measure, which becomes significantly stronger as the system becomes dense.

(As expected, the coulombic dips at  $\pm a$  persist. This divergence –corresponding to small-size instantons and the factor  $1/\rho^5$  in the measure - is removed by quantum fluctuations, which produce a stronger factor  $\rho^{11N_c/3-2N_f/3}$ .)

On the other hand, as discussed in [2] it seems that from the point of view of the far field metric, the antiseifdual sector behaves similarly to the selfdual one, and the interaction between  $L$  and  $\bar{L}$  is similar to the interaction between  $\bar{L}$  and  $L$  (i.e. repulsive), while that of  $L$  and  $\bar{M}$  is attractive. Therefore we have three possible structures depicted in Fig 15:

For nonzero number of quark flavors  $N_f$  fermions correlate the  $L$  and  $\bar{L}$ , then they will repel the other pairs, therefore making the hexagonal crystal, as we discussed above. For zero  $N_f$  they can be either strongly correlated (b) or form an alternating crystal (c). Lattice practitioners often introduce the so called “valence” quarks, which are not in the measure but are only used for a diagnostic purposes of the “quenched” ( $N_f = 0$ ) theory. Dirac eigenvalue spectrum and chiral properties revealed by such studies can be computed and compared to the lattice data.

In a standard way we model the Dirac matrix by a “hopping” matrix (2,3), with the matrix elements being some function of a distance between dyon-antidyon  $f(r)$ . We expect these






FIG. 14: (color online) The effective potential  $V_d = -\ln(\det G)$ , where  $G$  is the Diakonov's determinant, as a function of the displacement  $\Delta x$  of a single dyon in the center of a cubic  $6 \times 6 \times 6$  crystal, in the direction of the adjacent dyon. The graphs have been rescaled for better comparison as follows: (blue) solid  $684V_d, a = 0.1$ ; (red) dash  $818V_d, a = 0.25$ ; (brown) short dash  $917V_d, a = .5$ ; (green) dash-dotted  $967V_d, a = 0.75$ ; (blue) long-dash  $1000V_d, a = 1$ . The units of  $\Delta x, a$  is the Matsubara time. Note that as dyonic density increases by a factor  $10^3$ , this one-loop bosonic interaction creates a significant minimum at  $\Delta X = 0$ , stabilizing the cubic structure.

functions to be exponential in distance  $r = |\vec{r}|$  at large  $r$  and some constant we call  $f(0)$  at small  $r$ .

In the first approximation we can consider only next-neighbor matrix elements, and use the cubic structure (b). Then we can write the upper-right (or the lower-left) part of the Dirac operator matrix, in the triple-index notations with  $n, m, l$  being positions in units of  $a$  along the three spatial coordinates in the cubic lattice

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{nml}^{n'm'l'} &= f(0)\delta_n^{n'}\delta_m^{m'}\delta_l^{l'} \\
&+ f(a)(\delta_n^{n'+1}\delta_m^{m'}\delta_l^{l'} + \delta_n^{n'-1}\delta_m^{m'}\delta_l^{l'} \\
&+ \delta_n^{n'}\delta_m^{m'+1}\delta_l^{l'} + \delta_n^{n'}\delta_m^{m'-1}\delta_l^{l'} \\
&+ \delta_n^{n'}\delta_m^{m'}\delta_l^{l'+1} + \delta_n^{n'}\delta_m^{m'}\delta_l^{l'-1}) \quad (81)
\end{aligned}$$

Upon standard diagonalization by transformation to the dual lattice momentum states

$$|\mathbf{k}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L^3}} \sum_{\mathbf{I}=(n,m,n)} e^{\frac{2\pi i \mathbf{I} \cdot \mathbf{k}}{L}}, \quad (82)$$

we obtain that the spectrum is given by

$$\nu(\vec{k}) = f(0) + f(a)(\cos k_1 + \cos k_2 + \cos k_3), \quad (83)$$

where  $k_{1,2,3}$  go from  $(0, 2\pi)$ , and the elementary number of states is given by standard  $dN = V d^3k / (2\pi)^3$ . The density of states is

$$\frac{dN}{d\lambda} = V \int d^3k \delta(\lambda - \cos k_1 - \cos k_2 - \cos k_3), \quad (84)$$

where we have used the *shifted* eigenvalues

$$\lambda = (\nu - f(0))/f(a) \quad (85)$$

The spectrum can be integrated to yield

$$\frac{dN}{d\lambda} = \int dk_1 dk_2 \frac{1}{|\sin k_3(k_1, k_2)|}, \quad (86)$$

where  $k_3 = \arccos(\lambda - \cos k_1 - \cos k_2)$ , and the region of integration is such that  $|\nu - \cos k_1 - \cos k_2| \leq 1$ . Numerical integration yield the curve shown in Fig. 16

We see that the density of states form a band with a sharp boundary, it goes to zero at  $|\lambda| > 3$ . For scenario (b) this shape will appear in the spectrum centered around  $\pm|f(0)|$ , and, for vanishing  $f(a)$ , will be delta function-like. Each of those morphs into a shape of Fig.16 in a type-(b) crystal as  $f(a)$  increases. If they are separated by more than the width of the peak, the chiral symmetry is *not* broken. The condition for chiral symmetry breaking is therefore

$$\left| \frac{f(a)}{f(0)} \right| > \frac{1}{3} \quad (87)$$

Alternative structure (c) can be motivated as follows. As mentioned earlier, the long range interactions between  $L$ s and  $M$ s, become the same regardless of them being dyons or anti-dyons. This means that the cubic crystal will have  $L$ s and  $\bar{L}$ s located at positions of " + " ion and  $M$  and  $\bar{M}$  at positions of " - " ion. In this case, the spectrum of the Dirac operator is

$$\nu = 2f(a\sqrt{2})(\cos k_1 + \cos k_2 + \cos k_3 + \cos k_4), \quad (88)$$

where we have approximated that, on average, each  $L$  has 4 nearest  $\bar{L}$ s. Similarly as before we get that

$$\frac{dN}{d\nu}(\nu = 0) = 2f(a\sqrt{2}) \int \frac{dk_1 dk_2 dk_3}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{|\sin k_4|}, \quad (89)$$




FIG. 15: Three possible crystal structures discussed in the text.




FIG. 16: (Color online) The plot of the density of states of the cubic lattice with the next-neighbor interactions.

where  $k_4 = \arccos(\cos k_1 + \cos k_2 + \cos k_3)$ , and  $\cos k_1 + \cos k_2 + \cos k_3 \leq 1$

#### A. Note on confinement of the cubic crystal

Here we show that the Polyakov loop of a crystal configuration is indeed zero. We have that

$$\text{tr } L(\mathbf{x}) = \text{tr } e^{i(\frac{v}{2} + V(\mathbf{x}))\tau_3} = 2 \cos\left(\frac{v}{2} + V(\mathbf{x})\right), \quad (90)$$

where we used the gauge-combed gauge, and where  $V(x)$  is some potential which goes to  $-v/2$  at the position of  $M$  and  $\bar{M}$  dyons and to  $-v/2 + \pi$  at the position of  $L$  and  $\bar{L}$  dyons. Using the identity that  $\cos(\alpha + \beta) = \cos \alpha \cos \beta -$

$\sin \alpha \sin \beta$ , we have that

$$\text{tr } L(\mathbf{x}) = 2 \cos \frac{v}{2} \cos(V(\mathbf{x})) + 2 \sin \frac{v}{2} \sin(V(\mathbf{x})). \quad (91)$$

The above expression has to be integrated over all possible crystal orientations and positions. This is equivalent, though, to integrating over  $\mathbf{x}$  in the region of one crystal unit, i.e.

$$\langle \text{tr } L(\mathbf{x}) \rangle = 2 \frac{1}{a^3} \int_{a^3} d^3x [2 \cos \frac{v}{2} \cos(V(\mathbf{x})) + 2 \sin \frac{v}{2} \sin(V(\mathbf{x}))] \quad (92)$$

However, setting  $v = \pi$  (maximally nontrivial holonomy), we see that the first term vanishes because  $\cos(\pi/2) = 0$ , and the second term vanishes because  $V(\mathbf{x})$  is alternating between  $L$  and  $M$  dyons in sign, and, since  $\sin$  is an odd function, this term too vanishes. Therefore the Polyakov loop averaged over crystal configurations vanishes, and it depends explicitly on the holonomy being nontrivial.

Finally let us note that such “confinement-in-average” phenomenon has its predecessors, resembling a finite-density holographic model of densely packed baryons [43]. In it baryons are modeled by instantons, which also undergo transition into a “dyon phase” in which they restore chiral symmetry in average.

## VII. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In this work we have done qualitative study of the interactions of (anti)selfdual dyons, as well as some study of the statistical ensembles

following from them. We emphasized in particular the importance of the *dyon-antidyon* interaction, both classical (bosonic) and fermion-induced ones, instead of the interactions inside the selfdual and antiselfdual separate sectors. We specifically were focusing on the SU(2) theory and the temperatures above and near the chiral restoration phase transition.

We already summarized the overall picture resulting from this study at the very beginning of the paper, so let us just outline the elements of the picture which we believe explain certain lattice observations. We will also emphasize what lattice practitioners can do to test our predictions further.

### 1. Existence of the “topological molecules”

At high  $T$  the instanton/dyon density is small due to electric screening, the topological object must make “molecules”, neutral in terms of all three charges involved: topological, electric and magnetic. In the SU(2) theory they contain all 4 types of the dyons. We predict a peculiar distribution, with “nucleus” of  $L\bar{L}$  cluster at the center, with  $M$  and  $\bar{M}$  at the periphery, see Fig.IA. This effect is predicted to get more pronounced with the increasing number of quark flavors  $N_f$ . It is important to check it on the lattice, perhaps by identifying the fermionic sites “at the gap” in ensembles with varying  $N_f$ . Its generalization to any number of colors is straightforward.

### 2. The critical line versus the fermion numbers $N_f, N_a$ :

Model simulations with such clusters, random or interacting with each other, predict certain distinct shapes of the Dirac eigenspectrum at small  $\lambda$ . We have in particularly found at which diluteness of the “cluster gas” one gets particular value of the chiral condensate, the chiral symmetry restoration or certain size of the “gaps”. These eigenvalue spectra and “lines of constant condensate” can be compared with the lattice ones, in order to see if chiral breaking does happen in the “molecular gas” regime, or at a denser regime.

The increasing number of fermions leads to stronger fermion-induced interactions, binding the  $L\bar{L}$  pairs into tighter clusters. In terms of our molecular gas model, it gets much more dilute, unless the overall density of the dyons is significantly increased. This can only be achieved by *going into stronger coupling domain*, which reduces the dyon masses and interactions. That is why the critical lines in Fig.2 go downward with increasing flavors.

We have also realized why there is a qualitative difference between the fundamental and adjoint fermions. While the former have zero modes only with one (heavier) dyons  $L\bar{L}$ , the adjoint have zero modes for all dyons, including lighter  $M, \bar{M}$  (for SU(2)). The latter are much less correlated, thus their chiral restoration temperature is much higher.

### 3. Chiral splittings of hadronic masses versus $N_f$

As this parameter is now becoming measurable on the lattice, with the progress in computer/lattice technology, it is perhaps time to map it more consistently, and also think again about the physics it reveals.

Rapid decrease of the chiral condensate scale around  $N_f \sim 4$  has been in fact predicted by the instanton liquid simulations [7] long ago. The reason for that has been a “dip” in the eigenvalue spectrum developed due to the “molecule” formation[54]. This very phenomenon is in fact central in our current study. What has not been predicted in 1990’s was a significant shift to the stronger coupling and drastic increase of the overall instanton/dyon density (or, in alternative language, a rapid decrease of the hadronic scale), which makes a very small quark condensate relevant. It would be important to study transition to “molecular” topological structure in lattice simulation.

The dependence of the quark condensate on the density of “molecules” we found in our calculations is interesting. As seen in Fig.10, at low density there is a minimum between two “molecular peaks”, but at some diluteness there is a sudden appearance of a small peak inside this minimum. This implies a sudden jump in the quark condensate value, in a small interval of parameters. It is more pronounced

than many crossover phase transitions: and thus we may call this phenomenon a phase transition in the dyonic ensemble, from “atomic” to a “molecular” state, at  $N_f > 3$ . Using quark masses as interpolating parameters between  $N_f = 3, 4, 5$ , lattice practitioners can see if this change of Dirac spectrum is also occurring in lattice simulations as well.

#### 4. Dependence on the Polyakov line phase, or holonomy

is naturally explained by different fermionic masses which appear in the  $T_{ij}$  hopping amplitudes.

Since the rest of the paper has been for SU(2) gauge group, let us discuss in a bit more detail the two SU(3) options shown in Fig 1 of [22], namely the real  $\langle P \rangle$  sector as well as the one with the phase of  $P$  being  $2\pi/3$ . Generic holonomy in SU(3) is described by 3 parameters  $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3$  subject to one condition ( $\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \mu_3 = 0 \pmod{1}$ ). If one imposes one more condition, such as the fixed phase of  $\langle P \rangle$ , there is only one free parameter left. If the phase is zero,  $\langle P \rangle$  is real, the one-parameter family of possible holonomies is

$$\mu_1 = 0; \mu_2 = 1/2 - \delta; \mu_3 = 1/2 - \delta \quad (93)$$

If the phase is  $2\pi/3$  this solution is simply rotated additively to

$$\mu_1 = 1/3; \mu_2 = 1/3 + 1/2 - \delta; \mu_3 = 1/3 + 1/2 - \delta \quad (94)$$

The masses of monopoles are determined by the differences, which are the same in both cases

$$\nu_1 = \nu_3 = 1/2 + \delta, \nu_2 = 2\delta \quad (95)$$

since for gluonic observable the two sectors are identical by  $Z_{N_c}$  symmetry.

However the fundamental fermions notice the difference, as their masses are given by  $\mu_i$ , not  $\nu_i$ . Furthermore, which dyon gets the zero mode depends on the phase parameter  $z$  in fermionic periodicity condition: the rule is that it is the one in which  $\nu$  sector  $z$  resign on the circle. The antiperiodic fermions ( $z = 1/2$ ) picks up the second type of dyons  $\nu_2 = 2\delta$  in the real sector and the first one  $\nu_1 = 1/2 + \delta$  in the one with the phase  $2\pi/3$ . The lowest mass of the

fermion is  $2\pi T\delta$  in the former case, while in the complex ones it is  $(2\pi T)\min(1/6, 1/3 - \delta)$ .

Of course, in lattice subsector with the fixed phase, the modulus still has some average and the distribution, determined by the effective potential of  $\langle P \rangle$  at a give  $T$ , which is known if the lattice simulation is made. We however dont know the values: let us say take some generic value between 0 and 1 as a guess: a half

$$|\langle P \rangle| = 1/2 = (1 - 2\cos(2\pi\delta))/3 \rightarrow \delta \approx 0.29 \quad (96)$$

If so, the fermion masses for the two sectors are  $m/(2\pi T) = 0.29$  and  $0.04$ , respectively. Such large mass difference explains why the participation ratios (roughly, the fraction of the box volume occupied by a mode) are so different: while in the real sector the Dirac modes occupy only about 1 percent of the box, in the complex sectors nearly the whole box is occupied.)

#### 5. Dirac eigenstates “at the gap”.

The objects found via this method by Bruckmann et al [26] are consistent with being made of  $L$  and  $\bar{L}$  dyons, but apparently they must be neutral under the topological charge because they do not contribute to topological susceptibility. The clusters we propose have both  $L$  and  $\bar{L}$  dyons, with zero total topology, yet still able to support the fermionic localized states. Further lattice studies of the abelian projected electric and magnetic fields correlated with those objects would further clarify their origins.

#### A. Dependance on fermionic periodicity conditions

In several works [20, 23] effects of the temporal boundary conditions on the chiral condensate on quenched ensambles was explored. In addition to the restoration of the chiral symmetry for the physical, *antiperiodic*, boudnary conditions, an increase in the chiral condensate for the periodic condition above  $T_c$  was observed.

In the case of the adjoint fermions the drop of chiral condensate happens for both the periodic and antiperiodic sectors. There is how-

ever a qualitative difference: the drop is slower for the periodic case, differs in shape, and was not traced to reach zero. A qualitative difference is certainly expected on the basis of Ref. [39]: the zero modes for periodic and antiperiodic boundary conditions are drastically different. For periodic case, all zero modes are democratically distributed, whereas for the antiperiodic boundary conditions they all fall onto the heaviest one (the  $L$  dyon). The case of antiperiodic boundary condition then restores chiral symmetry in the way similar to fundamental quarks, by condensation into  $L\bar{L}$  clusters. The case of periodic adjoint fermions is quite different, it has “democratic” distribution of zero modes over all dyons of the instanton. This makes restoration of the chiral symmetry much more difficult, as now correlating the “heaviest”  $L\bar{L}$  is insufficient and also “light”  $M\bar{M}$  pairs should form. Although for *periodic* fundamental and/or adjoint fermions, complete restoration of chiral symmetry was not observed, we expect that, at high enough temperature, this will indeed be the case, as all topology must be screened. More quantitative analysis of the adjoint fermion case is postponed for future studies.

We finally comment that the case of dynamical adjoint fermions was treated analytically in [12], where it was shown that the chiral symmetry is indeed restored.

### 1. Short-range correlations of dyons in quenched and non-quenched ensembles

At high temperature, the vacuum is mostly dominated by perturbative fluctuations: the coupling is simply too small to allow any kind of large quantum effects. As we lower the temperature, the formation of topological objects starts to be possible. Although still suppressed, the vacuum is able to polarize into topological objects, which can support localized fermionic modes of small eigenvalue, but still not small enough to break chiral symmetry. Also, the “mass”  $M$  of these zero modes, which interpolates from  $2\pi T$  to  $\pi T$  i.e. reduces by a half in units of temperature as temperature is decreased, makes it harder to break chiral symmetry at high temperature, as the tail of zero modes, being the inverse of this mass, does

not extend very far, and, thus, at small density of topological charge, the off-diagonal matrix elements are simply too small to matter, and the ensemble of dyons is the ensemble of pairs of  $L\bar{L}$  pairs and neutral random clouds of light  $M, \bar{M}$  dyons.

However things change drastically as temperature is decreased. The gluon dynamics facilitate the increase of topological density, due to a suppression of the action of any field configuration at lower temperature by the coupling  $1/g^2$ . At one point the moduli space metric of topological objects becomes the sole dictator of the distribution of topological (dyonic) field configuration of dyons, the rest simply being fluctuations which is also not suppressed at all, but does not change the important topological properties of the background configuration. The dynamics of dyons becomes important solely through the geometry of the moduli space metric.

The interaction of  $L$  and anti- $L$  is very similar to the interaction between  $L$  and  $L$ , i.e. they repel (coulombically), and the  $L$  and anti- $M$  attract from the point of view of the metric (at large distances), just like  $L$  and  $M$ . The vacuum then needs to undergo a transition in the structure, from pairs of  $L\bar{L}$  and  $M\bar{M}$ , to the crystal of alternating dyons and antidyons.

Such an abrupt change in the vacuum structure of the quenched ensemble is absent upon introduction of dynamical fermions. In this case the situation changes drastically. The increase of topological density is suppressed by the presence of fermions, as increasing density means making pairs come closer together. By arguments in the article, such a scenario will make the fermionic determinant be smaller and smaller, eventually going to zero if the molecules overlap. That means that a correct topological density is harder to develop with fermions. Increasing the flavors makes it even harder, as the smallness of the fermionic measure is enhanced by  $N_f$ . However, if  $N_f$  is not too large chiral symmetry may still be broken, but the nature of this transition is now vastly different. The pairs, instead of abruptly changing their structure, are acting like slippery objects, trying to keep their distance as large as possible to all other pairs.

## 2. Small comment about deconfinement

Recent work by Bruckmann et al [42] have argued that uncorrelated dyons of all kinds create linear confinement. An ensemble of correlated neutral “molecules” we propose would not do that and generate short-range correlations only. This potentially links both deconfinement and chiral restoration with molecule formation.

**Note added:** After our paper was completed we learned about important study [49] on the lattice, in which some of the tests proposed above were successfully performed. For *periodic* fermions their near-zero eigenmodes with small eigenvalues are indeed identified with the type- $M, \bar{M}$  dyons, while for *antiperiodic* fermions those are indeed related with the type- $L, \bar{L}$  dyons. This conclusion was reached by correlating the topology with the sign of the Polyakov line at the dyon center. The difference in inverse participation ratios between the two cases is indeed naturally explained by large difference in  $M$  and  $L$  actions. For the “heavier”  $L$  dyons, even the shape of the fermionic eigenmodes was shown to agree with the corresponding semiclassical predictions. These ob

### Acknowledgments.

Strong motivation for this study during the last decade came from multiple discussions with Pierre van Baal. We also acknowledge more recent discussions with Mitya Diakonov and Falk Bruckmann. This work was supported in parts by the US-DOE grant DE-FG-88ER40388.

### Appendix A: Exact solution of the zeromodes

Although zeromodes of a caloron were found in all generality elsewhere [8, 10], we here use an approach which is more illuminating. One of us would like to thank A. G. Abanov for useful discussions on this issue.

Here we solve equations (32). To do this we separate the matrix  $M(r)$  as

$$M(r) = M_0(r) + M_1(r), \quad (\text{A1})$$

where

$$M_0(r) = \left( \frac{\mathcal{H}}{2} + \frac{1}{r} \right) \mathbf{1} =, \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$M_1(r) = \frac{z}{\beta} \sigma_1 + \left( \mathcal{A} - \frac{1}{r} \right) \sigma_3 \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$= \frac{z}{\beta} \sigma_1 - \frac{v}{\sinh(vr)} \sigma_3. \quad (\text{A4})$$

The solution can then be written as  $\alpha = \exp(-\int_0^r M_0(r) dr) \chi$ , or

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{r \sinh rv}} \chi \quad (\text{A5})$$

with the differential equation for  $\chi$  reading

$$\frac{d}{dr} \chi = -M_1(r) \chi, \quad (\text{A6})$$

i.e.

$$\chi'_1(r) = \frac{v}{\sinh(vr)} \chi_1(r) - \frac{\phi}{\beta} \chi_2(r), \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$\chi'_2(r) = -\frac{v}{\sinh(vr)} \chi_2(r) - \frac{\phi}{\beta} \chi_1(r), \quad (\text{A8})$$

we may take a change of variables  $\xi = rv$ . Then the equations read

$$\chi'_1(\xi) = \frac{1}{\sinh(\xi)} \chi_1(r) - \varsigma \chi_2(r), \quad (\text{A9})$$

$$\chi'_2(\xi) = -\frac{1}{\sinh(\xi)} \chi_2(r) - \varsigma \chi_1(r), \quad (\text{A10})$$

where we labeled  $\varsigma = \phi/(v\beta)$ . We now eliminate  $\xi_2$ , and obtain the second order differential equation

$$-\frac{d^2}{d\xi^2} \chi_1 - \frac{1}{2 \cosh^2 \frac{\xi}{2}} \chi_1 = -\varsigma^2 \chi_1. \quad (\text{A11})$$

This equation has a general solution

$$\chi_1(\xi) = c_1 \left( -2\varsigma + \tanh \frac{\xi}{2} \right) e^{\varsigma \xi} + c_2 \left( 2\varsigma + \tanh \frac{\xi}{2} \right) e^{-\varsigma \xi} \quad (\text{A12})$$

with arbitrary constants  $c_{1,2}$ . Using the first order equations we can write  $\chi_2$  as

$$\chi_2(\xi) = c_1 \left( 2\varsigma - \coth \frac{\xi}{2} \right) e^{\varsigma \xi} + c_2 \left( 2\varsigma + \coth \frac{\xi}{2} \right) e^{-\varsigma \xi} \quad (\text{A13})$$

The function  $\chi_2(\xi)$  is divergent when  $\xi \rightarrow 0$ , except if  $c_1 = c_2$ , in which case  $\xi_2(0) = 0$ . Therefore  $c_2 = c_1$ . The constant  $c_1$  can be determined by overall normalization. The solution then becomes

$$\chi_1(\xi) = \quad (A14a)$$

$$= 2c_1 \left( -2\varsigma \sinh(\xi\varsigma) + \tanh \frac{\xi}{2} \cosh(\xi\varsigma) \right)$$

$$\chi_2(\xi) = \quad (A14b)$$

$$= 2c_1 \left( 2\varsigma \cosh(\xi\varsigma) - \coth \frac{\xi}{2} \sinh(\xi\varsigma) \right)$$

Finally, combining with (A5) we obtain

$$\alpha_{1,2} = \frac{\sqrt{v}}{\sqrt{\xi \sinh \xi}} \chi_{1,2}. \quad (A15)$$

$\sqrt{v}$  can be absorbed into constant  $c_1$ , and our final expression is

$$\alpha_{1,2} = \frac{\chi_{1,2}}{\sqrt{\xi \sinh \xi}}. \quad (A16)$$

with functions  $\chi_{1,2}$  given by (A5),  $\xi = vr$ ,  $\varsigma = \phi/(v\beta)$ . Note that the value of  $\alpha_1(\xi \rightarrow 0)$  is given by

$$c1(1 - 4\varsigma^2), \quad (A17)$$

and the solution is completely regular at  $r = 0$ .

- 
- [1] F. Bruckmann, D. Negradi and P. van Baal, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **34**, 5717 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0309008].
- [2] D. Diakonov, *Topology and Confinement*, arXiv:0906.2456v1 (2009)
- [3] E. M. Ilgenfritz and E. V. Shuryak, *Nucl. Phys. B* **319**, 511 (1989).
- [4] F. Bruckmann, *PoS CONFINEMENT8*, 179 (2008) [arXiv:0901.0987 [hep-ph]].
- [5] J. Liao and E. Shuryak, *Phys. Rev. C* **75**, 054907 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0611131].
- [6] A. A. Belavin, A. M. Polyakov, A. S. Schwartz and Yu. S. Tyupkin, *Phys. Lett. B* **59**, 85 (1975).
- [7] T. Schafer and E. V. Shuryak, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **70**, 323 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9610451].
- [8] K. -M. Lee and C. -h. Lu, *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 025011 (1998) [hep-th/9802108].
- [9] K. M. Lee and P. Yi, *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 3711 (1997) [arXiv:hep-th/9702107].
- [10] T. C. Kraan and P. van Baal, *Phys. Lett. B* **435**, 389 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9806034].
- [11] M. Unsal, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 065001 (2009) [arXiv:0709.3269 [hep-th]].
- [12] M. Unsal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 032005 (2008) [arXiv:0708.1772 [hep-th]].
- [13] K. Miura, M. P. Lombardo and E. Pallante, arXiv:1110.3152 [hep-lat].
- [14] A. Deuzeman, M. P. Lombardo and E. Pallante, arXiv:1012.6023 [hep-lat].
- [15] A. Cheng, A. Hasenfratz and D. Schaich, arXiv:1111.2317 [hep-lat].
- [16] G. Cossu, M. D'Elia, A. Di Giacomo, G. Lacagnina and C. Pica, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 074506 (2008) [arXiv:0802.1795 [hep-lat]].
- [17] R. D. Mawhinney, *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **83**, 57 (2000) [arXiv:hep-lat/0001032].
- [18] X. Y. Jin and R. D. Mawhinney, *PoS LAT2009*, 049 (2009) [arXiv:0910.3216 [hep-lat]].
- [19] F. Bruckmann, D. Negradi and P. van Baal, *Nucl. Phys. B* **666**, 197 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0305063].
- [20] E. Bilgici, F. Bruckmann, J. Danzer, C. Gattringer, C. Hagen, E. M. Ilgenfritz and A. Maas, *Few Body Syst.* **47**, 125 (2010) [arXiv:0906.3957 [hep-lat]].
- [21] E. Bilgici, C. Gattringer, E. -M. Ilgenfritz and A. Maas, *JHEP* **0911**, 035 (2009) [arXiv:0904.3450 [hep-lat]].
- [22] C. Gattringer, M. Gockeler, P. E. L. Rakow, A. Schafer, W. Soldner and T. Wettig, *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **106**, 492 (2002) [arXiv:hep-lat/0110182].
- [23] E. Bilgici, C. Gattringer, E. M. Ilgenfritz and A. Maas, *JHEP* **0911**, 035 (2009) [arXiv:0904.3450 [hep-lat]].
- [24] C. Gattringer and S. Schaefer, *Nucl. Phys. B* **654**, 30 (2003) [arXiv:hep-lat/0212029].
- [25] C. Gattringer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 221601 (2002) [arXiv:hep-lat/0202002].
- [26] F. Bruckmann, T. G. Kovacs and S. Schierenberg, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 034505 (2011) [arXiv:1105.5336 [hep-lat]].
- [27] S. Hands and P. Kenny, *Phys. Lett. B* **701**, 373 (2011) [arXiv:1104.0522 [hep-lat]].

- [28] M. N. Chernodub and V. I. Zakharov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 082002 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0611228].
- [29] J. Liao and E. Shuryak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 162302 (2008) [arXiv:0804.0255 [hep-ph]].
- [30] H. Y. Chen, N. Dorey and K. Petunin, JHEP **1006**, 024 (2010) [arXiv:1004.0703 [hep-th]].
- [31] P. van Baal, PoS CONFINEMENT8, 062 (2008) [arXiv:0901.2853 [hep-ph]].
- [32] E. V. Shuryak, Sov. Phys. JETP **47**, 212 (1978) [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **74**, 408 (1978)].
- [33] R. D. Pisarski and L. G. Yaffe, Phys. Lett. B **97**, 110 (1980).
- [34] E. V. Shuryak, Nucl. Phys. B **203**, 140 (1982).
- [35] D. Diakonov, N. Gromov, V. Petrov and S. Slizovskiy, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 036003 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0404042].
- [36] E. Poppitz, M. Unsal, JHEP **1107**, 082 (2011). [arXiv:1105.3969 [hep-th]].
- [37] E. V. Shuryak, arXiv:hep-ph/9909458.
- [38] E. Poppitz and M. Unsal, JHEP **0903**, 027 (2009) [arXiv:0812.2085 [hep-th]].
- [39] M. Garcia Perez, A. Gonzalez-Arroyo and A. Sastre, JHEP **0906**, 065 (2009) [arXiv:0905.0645 [hep-th]].
- [40] D. Diakonov, N. Gromov, V. Petrov and S. Slizovskiy, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 036003 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0404042].
- [41] S. Borsanyi, Z. Fodor, C. Hoelbling, S. D. Katz, S. Krieg, C. Ratti and K. K. Szabo [Wuppertal-Budapest Collaboration], JHEP **1009**, 073 (2010) [arXiv:1005.3508 [hep-lat]].
- [42] F. Bruckmann, S. Dinter, E. M. Ilgenfritz, B. Maier, M. Muller-Preussker and M. Wagner, arXiv:1111.3158 [hep-ph].
- [43] K. -Y. Kim, S. -J. Sin and I. Zahed, JHEP **0809** (2008) 001 [arXiv:0712.1582 [hep-th]].
- [44] C. Ratti and E. Shuryak, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 034004 (2009) [arXiv:0811.4174 [hep-ph]].
- [45] N. S. Manton, Nucl. Phys. B **126**, 525 (1977).
- [46] J. N. Goldberg, P. S. Jang, S. Y. Park and K. C. Wali, Phys. Rev. D **18**, 542 (1978).
- [47] S. F. Magruder, Phys. Rev. D **17**, 3257 (1978).
- [48] S. Gabor. *Orthogonal Polynomials*, American Mathematical Society 1995.
- [49] V. G. Bornyakov, E. -M. Ilgenfritz, B. V. Martemyanov and M. Muller-Preussker, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 034506 (2009) [arXiv:0809.2142 [hep-lat]].
- [50] note that this is not the mass which break chiral symmetry, but is an effective mass which is given by the condensate of  $A_4$ .
- [51] In 1977, when QCD was only 4 years old, the main finding was its positivity, which ensured *screening* of a charge, as opposed to the antiscreening by the vacuum loops: thus the “plasma” name.
- [52] Note that the explicit constants and the definition of the  $\Lambda$  parameter are not really important since they will change in a theory with fermions.
- [53] We also ignored small nondiagonal matrix elements of the type  $m < I_1 | I_2 >$  resulting from non-orthogonality of the zero modes of different pseudoparticles.
- [54] This dip should not be confused with that due to the finite size of the system, which is well described by the random matrix theory.