

Energy-momentum tensor from the Yang–Mills gradient flow

Hiroshi Suzuki

Theoretical Research Division, RIKEN Nishina Center, Wako 2-1, Saitama 351-0198, Japan

Abstract

A product of gauge fields generated by the Yang–Mills gradient flow at positive flow time does not exhibit the coincidence-point singularity and thus the definition of a local product is independent of the regularization. Such a local product can furthermore be expanded by renormalized local operators at zero flow time with finite coefficients which are governed by renormalization group equations. Using these facts, we construct a formula that relates the small flow-time limit of certain gauge invariant local products and the correctly-normalized conserved energy-momentum tensor in the Yang–Mills theory. Our formula provides a possible method to compute correlation functions of a well-defined energy-momentum tensor by using the lattice regularization and the Monte Carlo simulation.

Keywords: Energy-momentum tensor, Yang–Mills gradient flow, Lattice gauge theory, Wilson flow

1. Introduction

The energy-momentum tensor—the Noether current associated with the translational invariance—is a fundamental observable in any local field theory. Its moments furthermore define the generators of rotational and conformal transformations. See Refs. [1, 2] and references cited therein. Despite of its obvious importance, the realization of the energy-momentum tensor in a non-perturbative framework of field theory provided by the spacetime

Email address: `hsuzuki@riken.jp` (Hiroshi Suzuki)

lattice is very difficult. This is simply because the spacetime lattice explicitly breaks the translational invariance. It is certainly possible to construct a conserved energy-momentum tensor with the lattice regularization, by adjusting coefficients in a linear combination of dimension 4 operators which possibly mixes with the energy-momentum tensor [3, 4].¹ Although this method is in principle sufficient when the energy-momentum tensor is in “isolation”, i.e., when the energy-momentum tensor is separated from other composite operators, it is not obvious at all how one can control the ambiguity of possible higher dimensional operators which may contribute when the energy-momentum tensor coincides with other operators in position space. This implies that it is not obvious at all whether the energy-momentum tensor constructed in the above method generates correctly-normalized translations (and rotational and conformal transformations) on composite operators through Ward–Takahashi (WT) relations. For example, since the fact that the trace or conformal anomaly [7, 8] is proportional to the renormalization group functions [9, 10, 11] is a direct consequence of WT relations [12], it is not obvious whether the above lattice energy-momentum tensor reproduces the correct trace anomaly beyond the one-loop level. Use of a non-invariant regularization is very costly.

In the present note, we consider a quite different approach to the above problem, by taking the Yang–Mills theory as an example. We apply the so-called Yang–Mills gradient flow (or the Wilson flow in the context of lattice gauge theory) whose usefulness in lattice gauge theory has recently been revealed [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21]. A salient feature of the Yang–Mills gradient flow is its ultraviolet (UV) finiteness [15]. More precisely, any product of gauge fields generated by the gradient flow at positive flow time t is UV finite under the standard renormalization. Such a product moreover does *not* exhibit any singularities even if some positions of gauge fields coincide. The basic mechanism for this is that the flow equation is a sort of diffusion equation and the evolution operator in the momentum space $\sim e^{-tk^2}$ acts as an UV regulator for $t > 0$. This property of the gradient flow implies that the definition of a local product of gauge fields for a positive flow time is independent of the regularization (in the limit in which the regulator is removed). Thus, any local product can be studied

¹A somewhat different approach on the basis of the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry has been given in Refs. [5, 6].

by using an arbitrary regularization. This property indicates the possibility that quantities obtained by different regularizations are related by using the gradient flow as an intermediate tool. This principle is particularly noticeable in the recent application of the gradient flow to the precise determination of low-energy constants in QCD [21]. In our present context, there is a hope to relate quantities obtained by the lattice regularization and the dimensional regularization with which the translational invariance is manifest.

As noted in Ref. [15], furthermore, a local product of gauge fields for a positive flow time can be expanded by renormalized local operators of the original gauge theory with finite coefficients. Those coefficients satisfy certain renormalization group equations that, combined with the dimensional analysis, provide the information on the coefficients as the function of the flow time. Because of the asymptotic freedom, one can then use the perturbation theory to find the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients for small flow times.

By combining these facts, one can actually obtain a formula that relates the small flow-time limit of certain gauge invariant local products and the energy-momentum tensor defined by the dimensional regularization. Since the former can be computed by using the Wilson flow with the lattice regularization [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21] and the latter is conserved and generates correctly-normalized translations on composite operators, our formula provides a possible method to compute correlation functions of a correctly-normalized conserved energy-momentum tensor by using the Monte Carlo simulation.

In the present note, we entirely follow the notational convention of Ref. [15].

2. Yang–Mills theory and the energy-momentum tensor

In the present note, we consider the $SU(N)$ Yang–Mills theory defined in a D dimensional Euclidean space,

$$S = \frac{1}{4g_0^2} \int d^D x F_{\mu\nu}^a(x) F_{\mu\nu}^a(x), \quad (2.1)$$

where the field strength is defined by

$$F_{\mu\nu}(x) = \partial_\mu A_\nu(x) - \partial_\nu A_\mu(x) + [A_\mu(x), A_\nu(x)]. \quad (2.2)$$

We set

$$D = 4 - 2\epsilon, \quad (2.3)$$

and the mass dimension of the bare gauge coupling g_0 is ϵ .

Assuming that the theory is regularized by the dimensional regularization (for a very nice exposition, see Ref. [22]), one can define the energy-momentum tensor for the system (2.1) simply by (see, for example, Ref. [23])

$$T_{\mu\nu}(x) = \frac{1}{g_0^2} \left[F_{\mu\rho}^a(x) F_{\nu\rho}^a(x) - \frac{1}{4} \delta_{\mu\nu} F_{\rho\sigma}^a(x) F_{\rho\sigma}^a(x) \right], \quad (2.4)$$

up to the terms attributed to the gauge fixing and the Faddeev–Popov ghost fields, which are irrelevant in correlation functions of gauge invariant operators. Note that the mass dimension of the energy-momentum tensor is D .

The advantage of the dimensional regularization is its translational invariance. The energy-momentum tensor naively constructed from bare quantities (2.4) is thus conserved and generates correctly-normalized translations on any gauge invariant operator \mathcal{O} through a WT relation,

$$\int d^D x \langle \partial_\mu T_{\mu\nu}(x) \mathcal{O} \rangle = - \langle \partial_\nu \mathcal{O} \rangle, \quad (2.5)$$

where it is understood that the derivative in the right-hand side is acting all the positions in \mathcal{O} . Combined with the dimensional counting and the gauge invariance, this WT relation implies that the energy-momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}(x)$ is finite and [24, 10],²

$$T_{\mu\nu}(x) - \langle T_{\mu\nu}(x) \rangle = \{T_{\mu\nu}\}_R(x). \quad (2.6)$$

3. Yang–Mills gradient flow and gauge invariant products

3.1. Yang–Mills gradient flow and the small flow-time expansion

The Yang–Mills gradient flow defines a $D + 1$ dimensional gauge potential $B(t, x)$ along a fictitious time t , according to the flow equation,

$$\partial_t B_\mu(t, x) = D_\nu G_{\nu\mu}(t, x) + \alpha_0 D_\mu \partial_\nu B_\nu(t, x). \quad (3.1)$$

The initial condition for the flow is

$$B_\mu(t = 0, x) = A_\mu(x), \quad (3.2)$$

²Here, we define the renormalized operator by subtracting its vacuum expectation value. With the dimensional regularization, this subtraction is automatic to all orders in the perturbation theory.

where $A_\mu(x)$ is the D dimensional gauge potential in the previous section. The $D+1$ dimensional field strength and the covariant derivative in Eq. (3.1) are defined by

$$G_{\mu\nu}(t, x) = \partial_\mu B_\nu(t, x) - \partial_\nu B_\mu(t, x) + [B_\mu(t, x), B_\nu(t, x)], \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu + [B_\mu, \cdot], \quad (3.4)$$

respectively. In Eq. (3.1), the last term is introduced to suppress the evolution to the direction of gauge degrees of freedom and it breaks the gauge invariance. Nevertheless, it can be seen that any gauge invariant operator is independent of the parameter α_0 [13]. Note that the mass dimension of the flow time t is -2 .

Now, from the field strength extended to the $D+1$ dimension (3.3), we define a $D+1$ dimensional analogue of the energy-momentum tensor by

$$U_{\mu\nu}(t, x) \equiv G_{\mu\rho}^a(t, x)G_{\nu\rho}^a(t, x) - \frac{1}{4}\delta_{\mu\nu}G_{\rho\sigma}^a(t, x)G_{\rho\sigma}^a(t, x). \quad (3.5)$$

Although this is similarly in form to the original energy-momentum tensor (2.4), it is not obvious a priori how this $D+1$ dimensional object and Eq. (2.4) are related. To find the relationship between them is the principal task of the present note. We also use the density operator analysed in Ref. [13],

$$E(t, x) \equiv \frac{1}{4}G_{\mu\nu}^a(t, x)G_{\mu\nu}^a(t, x). \quad (3.6)$$

As shown in Ref. [15], for $t > 0$, any correlation function of $B_\mu(t, x)$ is ultraviolet (UV) finite after the standard renormalization in the D dimensional Yang–Mills theory. This property holds even for any local product of $B_\mu(t, x)$ such as Eqs. (3.5) and (3.6). Also, for small flow times, a local product of $B_\mu(t, x)$ can be regarded as a local field in the D dimensional sense because the flow equation (3.1) is basically a diffusion equation along the time t and the diffusion length in x is $\sqrt{8t}$. These properties allow us to express, as explained in Sec. 8 of Ref. [15], $U_{\mu\nu}(t, x)$ and $E(t, x)$ as an asymptotic series of D dimensional renormalized local operators with finite coefficients. Considering the gauge invariance and the index structure, we have for $D = 4$,

$$U_{\mu\nu}(t, x) = c_T(t) \{T_{\mu\nu}\}_R(x) + c_S(t)\delta_{\mu\nu} \left\{ \frac{1}{4}F_{\rho\sigma}^a F_{\rho\sigma}^a \right\}_R(x) + O(t), \quad (3.7)$$

where abbreviated terms are the contribution of operators with the mass dimension higher or equal to 6. We assume that the renormalized operators in the right-hand side are defined by the minimal subtraction (MS) scheme.³ For Eq. (3.6), similarly, we have for $D = 4$

$$E(t, x) = \langle E(t, x) \rangle + c_E(t) \left\{ \frac{1}{4} F_{\rho\sigma}^a F_{\rho\sigma}^a \right\}_R(x) + O(t). \quad (3.8)$$

In the expansion (3.7), we have no c number expectation value term, because from Eq. (3.5),

$$\langle U_{\mu\nu}(t, x) \rangle = \frac{2\epsilon}{D} \delta_{\mu\nu} \langle E(t, x) \rangle, \quad (3.9)$$

and because $\langle E(t, x) \rangle$ is UV finite as [13],

$$\langle E(t, x) \rangle = \frac{3(N^2 - 1)}{128\pi^2 t^2} g^2 + O(g^4), \quad (3.10)$$

thus Eq. (3.9) vanishes in the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit. In Eq. (3.10), the renormalized gauge coupling g is defined by

$$g_0^2 \equiv \mu^{2\epsilon} g^2 Z, \quad (3.11)$$

where μ is the renormalization scale and Z is the renormalization factor.

By eliminating the renormalized action density from Eqs. (3.7) and (3.8), we have

$$\{T_{\mu\nu}\}_R(x) = \frac{1}{c_T(t)} U_{\mu\nu}(t, x) - \frac{c_S(t)}{c_T(t)c_E(t)} \delta_{\mu\nu} [E(t, x) - \langle E(t, x) \rangle] + O(t). \quad (3.12)$$

This expression relates the energy-momentum tensor (2.6) and the short flow-time behavior of gauge-invariant local products defined by the gradient flow.

3.2. Constraint from the trace anomaly

Since $U_{\mu\nu}(t, x)$ (3.5) is traceless for $D = 4$,

$$\delta_{\mu\nu} U_{\mu\nu}(t, x) = 2\epsilon E(t, x) \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} 0, \quad (3.13)$$

³We assume that the renormalized operators in the right-hand side are defined by subtracting their vacuum expectation values.

because $E(t, x)$ (3.6) is finite and does not produce a $1/\epsilon$ singularity, while the trace part of the energy-momentum tensor is given by the trace anomaly [9, 10, 11],

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta_{\mu\nu} \{T_{\mu\nu}\}_R(x) \\
&= \delta_{\mu\nu} [T_{\mu\nu}(x) - \langle T_{\mu\nu}(x) \rangle] \\
&= \epsilon \frac{1}{2g_0^2} F_{\rho\sigma}^a(x) F_{\rho\sigma}^a(x) - \left\langle \epsilon \frac{1}{2g_0^2} F_{\rho\sigma}^a(x) F_{\rho\sigma}^a(x) \right\rangle \\
&\xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} -\frac{\beta}{2g^3} \{F_{\rho\sigma}^a F_{\rho\sigma}^a\}_R(x), \tag{3.14}
\end{aligned}$$

the coefficients $c_T(t)$ and $c_S(t)$ in Eq. (3.7) are not independent. In the last line of Eq. (3.14), β denotes the β function for $D = 4$, defined by

$$\beta \equiv \left(\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \right)_0 g = -\frac{1}{2} g \left(\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \right)_0 \ln Z, \tag{3.15}$$

where the subscript 0 implies that the derivative is taken while the bare quantities are kept fixed. Thus, considering the trace part of Eq. (3.7), we have for $D = 4$,

$$c_S(t) = \frac{\beta}{2g^3} c_T(t). \tag{3.16}$$

We note that in the MS scheme,

$$Z = 1 - \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left[b_0 g^2 + \frac{1}{2} b_1 g^4 + O(g^6) \right] + O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\right), \tag{3.17}$$

where

$$b_0 = \frac{11N}{48\pi^2}, \quad b_1 = \frac{17N^2}{384\pi^4}, \tag{3.18}$$

and Eqs. (3.11) and (3.15) yield

$$\beta = -b_0 g^3 - b_1 g^5 + O(g^7). \tag{3.19}$$

4. Renormalization group equation and the limiting formula

4.1. Renormalization group equation for the coefficients

We now operate

$$\left(\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \right)_0, \tag{4.1}$$

on the both sides of Eq. (3.7). Since the left-hand side of Eq. (3.7), i.e., Eq. (3.5), is entirely defined in terms of bare quantities (through the gradient flow equation (3.1) and the initial condition (3.2)), the action of (4.1) on the left-hand side identically vanishes. In the right-hand side, this vanishing-ness must hold in each powers of t and, considering the case $\mu \neq \nu$ and $\mu = \nu$, we infer that

$$\left(\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu}\right)_0 c_T(t) \{T_{\mu\nu}\}_R(x) = 0, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\left(\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu}\right)_0 c_S(t) \left\{ \frac{1}{4} F_{\rho\sigma}^a F_{\rho\sigma}^a \right\}_R(x) = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

For the first relation (4.2), we recall that the energy-momentum tensor is not renormalized as Eq. (2.6). Then by expressing the operation (4.1) in terms of renormalized quantities, we have

$$\left(\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} + \beta \frac{\partial}{\partial g}\right) c_T(t) = 0. \quad (4.4)$$

For Eq. (4.3), on the other hand, we may set

$$F_{\rho\sigma}^a(x) F_{\rho\sigma}^a(x) - \langle F_{\rho\sigma}^a(x) F_{\rho\sigma}^a(x) \rangle \equiv Z_S \{F_{\rho\sigma}^a F_{\rho\sigma}^a\}_R(x), \quad (4.5)$$

and this implies

$$\left(\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} + \beta \frac{\partial}{\partial g} + \gamma_S\right) c_S(t) = 0, \quad (4.6)$$

where

$$\gamma_S \equiv - \left(\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu}\right)_0 \ln Z_S. \quad (4.7)$$

Similarly, for Eq. (3.8), we have

$$\left(\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} + \beta \frac{\partial}{\partial g} + \gamma_S\right) c_E(t) = 0, \quad (4.8)$$

and thus

$$\left(\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} + \beta \frac{\partial}{\partial g}\right) \frac{c_S(t)}{c_E(t)} = 0. \quad (4.9)$$

The above renormalization group equations for the coefficients imply that, by the standard argument and the fact that dimensionless quantities can

depend on μ only through the dimensionless combination $\sqrt{8t}\mu$,

$$c_T(t)(g; \mu) = c_T(t_0)(\bar{g}(-\xi); \mu_0), \quad (4.10)$$

$$c_S(t)(g; \mu) = \exp \left[\int_0^{-\xi} d\xi' \gamma_S(\bar{g}(\xi')) \right] c_S(t_0)(\bar{g}(-\xi); \mu_0), \quad (4.11)$$

$$\frac{c_S(t)}{c_E(t)}(g; \mu) = \frac{c_S(t_0)}{c_E(t_0)}(\bar{g}(-\xi); \mu_0), \quad (4.12)$$

where we have explicitly written the dependence on the renormalized gauge coupling and on the renormalization scale. In these expressions, the running coupling $\bar{g}(\xi)$ is defined by

$$\frac{d\bar{g}(\xi)}{d\xi} = \beta(\bar{g}(\xi)), \quad \bar{g}(0) = g, \quad (4.13)$$

and we introduced a variable

$$\xi \equiv \ln \frac{\sqrt{8t}\mu}{\sqrt{8t_0}\mu_0}. \quad (4.14)$$

Although we do not need to know the renormalization constant Z_S in Eq. (4.5) and the anomalous dimension γ_S in Eq. (4.7) in what follows, it is interesting to note that they can be determined from the trace anomaly (3.14). Plugging Eqs. (3.11) and (4.5) into Eq. (3.14), we have

$$\epsilon \frac{Z_S}{Z} \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} -\frac{\beta}{g}. \quad (4.15)$$

In the MS scheme with which only pole terms are subtracted, this implies

$$\frac{Z_S}{Z} = 1 - \frac{1}{\epsilon} \frac{\beta}{g}. \quad (4.16)$$

Then, using Eq. (3.15), Eq. (4.7) yields

$$\gamma_S = -g^3 \frac{d}{dg} \left(\frac{\beta}{g^3} \right). \quad (4.17)$$

This shows that γ_S becomes non-trivial only from the two-loop order,

$$\gamma_S = 2b_1 g^4 + O(g^6). \quad (4.18)$$

In the one-loop order, the running coupling (4.13) is given by

$$\bar{g}(-\xi)^2 = \frac{1}{2b_0} \frac{1}{-\xi + 1/(2b_0g^2)} = \frac{1}{2b_0} \frac{1}{-\ln(\sqrt{8t}\Lambda) + \ln(\sqrt{8t_0}\mu_0)}, \quad (4.19)$$

where Λ is the Λ parameter in the one-loop level,

$$\Lambda = \mu e^{-1/(2b_0g^2)}, \quad (4.20)$$

and the integral appearing in Eqs. (4.11) is

$$\int_0^{-\xi} d\xi' \gamma_S(\bar{g}(\xi')) = \frac{b_1}{b_0} [g^2 - \bar{g}(-\xi)^2]. \quad (4.21)$$

In the small flow-time limit $t \rightarrow 0$, $-\xi \rightarrow +\infty$ and the running coupling $\bar{g}(-\xi)$ (4.19) becomes very small. Thus, the right-hand sides of Eqs. (4.10)–(4.12) allow us to compute the small flow-time behavior of the coefficients by using the perturbation theory.

4.2. Lowest order approximation and the limiting formula

By considering the solution of the flow equation (3.1) (see Ref. [15]) in the tree-level approximation, in Eq. (3.7), we have

$$c_T(t) = g_0^2 + O(t), \quad (4.22)$$

simply because of our definition of the energy-momentum tensor (2.4). If we apply Eq. (4.10) to this expression by substituting Eq. (4.19), it depends on $\sqrt{8t_0}\mu_0$ while the left-hand side of Eq. (4.10) does not. This shows that $c_T(t)$ should depend on g^2 and $\sqrt{8t}\mu$ through a particular combination as

$$\begin{aligned} c_T(t) &= g^2 \mu^{2\epsilon} \left\{ 1 + g^2 \left[2b_0 \ln(\sqrt{8t}\mu) + c_1 \right] \right\} + O(g^6) + O(t) \\ &= g_0^2 Z^{-1} \left\{ 1 + g_0^2 \mu^{-2\epsilon} \left[2b_0 \ln(\sqrt{8t}\mu) + c_1 \right] \right\} + O(g_0^6) + O(t), \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

where c_1 is a constant. Similarly, since the lowest-order approximation yields

$$c_E(t) = 1 + O(t), \quad c_S(t) = -\frac{b_0}{2} g_0^2 \mu^{-2\epsilon} + O(t), \quad (4.24)$$

where the latter follows from Eq. (3.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{c_S(t)}{c_E(t)} &= -\frac{b_0}{2}g^2 \left\{ 1 + g^2 \left[2b_0 \ln(\sqrt{8t\mu}) + c_2 \right] \right\} + O(g^6) + O(t) \\ &= -\frac{b_0}{2}g_0^2\mu^{-2\epsilon}Z^{-1} \left\{ 1 + g_0^2\mu^{-2\epsilon} \left[2b_0 \ln(\sqrt{8t\mu}) + c_2 \right] \right\} + O(g_0^6) + O(t),\end{aligned}\tag{4.25}$$

where c_2 is another constant.⁴

Applying Eqs. (4.10) and (4.12) to above expressions and using Eq. (4.19), we have asymptotic behaviors of the coefficients in Eq. (3.12),

$$\frac{1}{c_T(t)} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} -2b_0 \ln(\sqrt{8t\Lambda}) - c_1,\tag{4.28}$$

and

$$\frac{c_S(t)}{c_E(t)} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} -\frac{b_0}{2} \frac{1}{-2b_0 \ln(\sqrt{8t\Lambda}) - c_2},\tag{4.29}$$

and hence

$$\frac{c_S(t)}{c_T(t)c_E(t)} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} -\frac{b_0}{2} \left[1 - \frac{c_1 - c_2}{-2b_0 \ln(\sqrt{8t\Lambda})} \right].\tag{4.30}$$

In particular, as the limiting formula, we have

$$\{T_{\mu\nu}\}_R(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \left\{ -2b_0 \ln(\sqrt{8t\Lambda})U_{\mu\nu}(t, x) + \frac{b_0}{2}\delta_{\mu\nu} [E(t, x) - \langle E(t, x) \rangle] \right\}.\tag{4.31}$$

This is the relation that we were seeking. One can obtain the correctly-normalized conserved energy-momentum tensor from the small flow-time limit of gauge invariant products given by the Yang–Mills gradient flow.

⁴Using Eq. (4.23) in Eq. (3.16), we have

$$c_S(t) = -\frac{b_0}{2}g_0^2\mu^{-2\epsilon}Z^{-1} \left\{ 1 + g_0^2\mu^{-2\epsilon} \left[2b_0 \ln(\sqrt{8t\mu}) + \frac{b_1}{b_0} + c_1 \right] \right\} + O(g_0^6),\tag{4.26}$$

and then using Eq. (4.25),

$$c_E(t) = 1 + g_0^2\mu^{-2\epsilon} \left(\frac{b_1}{b_0} + c_1 - c_2 \right) + O(g_0^4).\tag{4.27}$$

It is interesting to note that the limiting form (4.31) is quite independent of the detailed definition of the gradient flow; the form and coefficients follow merely from the finiteness of the local products and the renormalizability of the Yang–Mills theory. The sub-leading corrections in the asymptotic form, i.e., the coefficients c_1 and c_2 in Eqs. (4.28) and (4.29) will, on the other hand, depend on the detailed definition of the gradient flow. For off-diagonal elements of the energy-momentum tensor, the formula reduces to

$$\{T_{\mu\nu}\}_R(x) = -2b_0 \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \ln(\sqrt{8t}\Lambda) U_{\mu\nu}(t, x), \quad \text{for } \mu \neq \nu, \quad (4.32)$$

and the trace part is simply given by

$$\delta_{\mu\nu} \{T_{\mu\nu}\}_R(x) = 2b_0 \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} [E(t, x) - \langle E(t, x) \rangle]. \quad (4.33)$$

5. Conclusion

In the present note, for the Yang–Mills theory, we constructed a formula that relates the short flow-time limit of some gauge invariant local products generated by the Yang–Mills gradient flow and the correctly-normalized conserved energy-momentum tensor. Our final result is Eq. (4.31). The right-hand side of Eq. (4.31) can be computed by the Wilson flow in lattice gauge theory with appropriate discretizations of operators (3.5) and (3.6) (see Refs. [13, 16], for example). Here, the continuum limit $a \rightarrow 0$ must be firstly taken and the $t \rightarrow 0$ limit is taken afterwards; otherwise our basic reasoning does not hold.

Although the $t \rightarrow 0$ limiting expression (4.31) is correct, we do not mean the formula itself is practically optimal. For our reasoning to work, the lattice spacing a must be much smaller compared with the square-root of the flow time $\sqrt{8t}$. For the $t \rightarrow 0$ limit, therefore, we have to make the lattice spacing quite small. It must be thus useful to know sub-leading corrections to the formula (4.31) for small t . The constants c_1 and c_2 in Eq. (4.28) and (4.29) tell the sub-leading corrections and these can be determined by computing some (actually 15) one-loop Feynman diagrams.⁵ In any case, the practical feasibility of Eq. (4.31) to be carefully examined; one worries about the contamination by higher dimensional operators (i.e., $O(t)$ terms in Eq. (3.12)) and the finite-size effect which we did not take into account in the present note.

⁵We hope to report this computation in the near future.

If our strategy turns to be practically feasible, it provides a completely new method to compute correlation functions containing the energy-momentum tensor. It is clear that the present approach to the energy-momentum tensor on the lattice is not limited to the case of the Yang–Mills theory, although the treatment might be slightly complicated with the presence of the scalar field. The application will then include, the determination of the shear and bulk viscosity (see Refs. [25, 26], for example), the measurement of thermodynamical quantities (see Ref. [27] and references cited therein), the mass and the decay constant of the pseudo Nambu–Goldstone boson associated with the (classical) dilatation invariance (see Ref. [28] and references cited therein), and so on.

It is also clear that our basic idea that operators defined with the lattice regularization and in the continuum theory can be related through the gradient flow is not limited to the energy-momentum tensor. It might be possible to construct, for example, an ideal chiral current or an ideal supercurrent on the lattice, by using the gradient flow as an intermediate tool. It appears interesting to pursue this idea.

Acknowledgements

The possibility that the Yang–Mills gradient flow (or the Wilson flow) can be useful to define the energy-momentum tensor in lattice gauge theory was originally suggested to me by Etsuko Itou. I would like to thank her for enlightening discussions. I would also like to thank Martin Lüscher for a clarifying remark on the precise meaning of Eq. (3.8). This work is supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research 23540330.

References

- [1] C. G. Callan, Jr., S. R. Coleman, R. Jackiw and , *Annals Phys.* **59** (1970) 42.
- [2] S. R. Coleman, R. Jackiw and , *Annals Phys.* **67** (1971) 552.
- [3] S. Caracciolo, G. Curci, P. Menotti, A. Pelissetto and , *Nucl. Phys. B* **309** (1988) 612.
- [4] S. Caracciolo, G. Curci, P. Menotti, A. Pelissetto and , *Annals Phys.* **197** (1990) 119.

- [5] H. Suzuki, Nucl. Phys. B **868** (2013) 459 [arXiv:1209.2473 [hep-lat]].
- [6] H. Suzuki, Phys. Lett. B **719** (2013) 435 [arXiv:1209.5155 [hep-lat]].
- [7] R. J. Crewther, Phys. Rev. Lett. **28** (1972) 1421.
- [8] M. S. Chanowitz, J. R. Ellis and , Phys. Lett. B **40** (1972) 397.
- [9] S. L. Adler, J. C. Collins and A. Duncan, Phys. Rev. D **15** (1977) 1712.
- [10] N. K. Nielsen, Nucl. Phys. B **120** (1977) 212.
- [11] J. C. Collins, A. Duncan and S. D. Joglekar, Phys. Rev. D **16** (1977) 438.
- [12] K. Fujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **23** (1981) 2262.
- [13] M. Lüscher, JHEP **1008** (2010) 071 [arXiv:1006.4518 [hep-lat]].
- [14] M. Lüscher, PoS LATTICE **2010** (2010) 015 [arXiv:1009.5877 [hep-lat]].
- [15] M. Lüscher and P. Weisz, JHEP **1102** (2011) 051 [arXiv:1101.0963 [hep-th]].
- [16] S. Borsanyi, S. Dürr, Z. Fodor, C. Hoelbling, S. D. Katz, S. Krieg, T. Kurth and L. Lellouch *et al.*, JHEP **1209** (2012) 010 [arXiv:1203.4469 [hep-lat]].
- [17] S. Borsanyi, S. Dürr, Z. Fodor, S. D. Katz, S. Krieg, T. Kurth, S. Magers and A. Schafer *et al.*, arXiv:1205.0781 [hep-lat].
- [18] Z. Fodor, K. Holland, J. Kuti, D. Negradi and C. H. Wong, JHEP **1211** (2012) 007 [arXiv:1208.1051 [hep-lat]].
- [19] Z. Fodor, K. Holland, J. Kuti, D. Negradi and C. H. Wong, PoS LATTICE **2012** (2012) 050 [arXiv:1211.3247 [hep-lat]].
- [20] P. Fritzsche and A. Ramos, arXiv:1301.4388 [hep-lat].
- [21] M. Lüscher, arXiv:1302.5246 [hep-lat].
- [22] J. C. Collins, “Renormalization. An introduction to renormalization, the renormalization group, and the operator product expansion,” Cambridge, UK: Univ. Pr. (1984) 380p

- [23] D. Z. Freedman, I. J. Muzinich, E. J. Weinberg and , *Annals Phys.* **87** (1974) 95.
- [24] S. D. Joglekar, *Annals Phys.* **100** (1976) 395 [Erratum-ibid. **102** (1976) 594].
- [25] H. B. Meyer, *Phys. Rev. D* **76** (2007) 101701 [arXiv:0704.1801 [hep-lat]].
- [26] H. B. Meyer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100** (2008) 162001 [arXiv:0710.3717 [hep-lat]].
- [27] L. Giusti, H. B. Meyer and , *JHEP* **1301** (2013) 140 [arXiv:1211.6669 [hep-lat]].
- [28] T. Appelquist, Y. Bai and , *Phys. Rev. D* **82** (2010) 071701 [arXiv:1006.4375 [hep-ph]].