

Large N reduction in continuum

R. Narayanan

Department of Physics, Florida International University, Miami, FL 33199

H. Neuberger

School of Natural Sciences, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ 08540

*Rutgers University, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Piscataway, NJ 08855, USA**

Abstract

Three dimensional Euclidean Yang-Mills theory in the planar limit undergoes a phase transition on a torus of side $l = l_c$. For $l > l_c$ the planar limit is l -independent, as expected of a non-interacting string theory. Such a phase might exist in four dimensions as well.

arXiv:hep-lat/0303023v1 26 Mar 2003

* Permanent Address.

Introduction. Over twenty years ago, in the context of $SU(N)$ lattice gauge theory, Eguchi and Kawai [1] made the observation that at infinite number of colors space-time can be replaced by a single point. This dramatic reduction in the number of degrees of freedom should make it easier to deal numerically with planar QCD than with ordinary, three color QCD. For a practical procedure it is essential that some version of large N reduction also hold in the continuum, not just on the lattice. Previous attempts to define a continuous reduced model had problems with topology and fermions [2].

We focus on the continuum limit of pure lattice YM defined on a torus and try to establish that expectation values of traces of Wilson loop operators do not depend on the size of the torus. Wilson loops of arbitrary size can be folded up into the torus and correctly reproduced [3]. The lattice is essential because it provides a regularization with well defined loop equations [4]. Loop equations provide a convenient tool to establish reduction.

We restrict ourselves to three dimensional theories for numerical reasons. We find that continuum large N reduction holds so long as the torus is large enough. The critical side length of a symmetrical torus is denoted by l_c and is defined in terms of a microscopic fundamental physical scale of the theory. Solving the theory for some $l > l_c$ would produce complete and exact information at leading order in N for any l . The system as a whole undergoes a phase transition at $l = l_c$. The number of sites in a numerical simulation in a given direction, L , determines the maximal value the ultraviolet cutoff Λ can take. It is $\Lambda = \frac{L}{l_c}$. For a Wilson action the lowest L that has some semblance to continuum is $L = 3$. Thus, at the expense of larger N one can get numerically close to continuum using very small lattices. The values of N needed are of order 20 to 50 and this trade-off is worth taking.

If a similar result holds in four dimensions, a shortcut to the planar limit becomes a realistic option. Our experience makes us hopeful and our tools should allow us to tackle four dimensions in the future.

A lattice argument. There is a global $Z^d(N)$ ($U^d(1)$ in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit) symmetry on the torus that leaves contractible Wilson loop operators invariant but multiplies Polyakov loops winding around a direction μ by a phase $e^{\frac{2\pi i}{N}k_\mu}$. The preservation of this symmetry is crucial for large N reduction [5]. Eguchi and Kawai have shown that the lattice loop equations in the $N = \infty$ limit on a single site lattice are the same as on an infinite four dimensional lattice as long as the $U^4(1)$ symmetry is unbroken. The continuum limit in

the single site lattice model has to be taken by sending the lattice coupling $b = \frac{1}{g^2 N}$ to infinity, but in $d > 2$ a phase transition occurs, blocking the way. At the transition the $Z^d(N)$ symmetry breaks spontaneously, ruining the equivalence of loop equations. It is possible to fix the single site lattice model by quenching [2, 5] or twisting [6] the system. We take a different approach here. The proof of Eguchi and Kawai goes through for a lattice torus of size $l_1 \times l_2 \dots$ with arbitrary l_μ and in any dimension. The loop equations, together with boundary conditions for small loops, establish equality of expectation values of traces of operators associated with arbitrary finite closed loops in the infinite volume theory and their folded, contractible, counterparts on the torus. Suppose we reduced the model to only an L^d lattice with $L > 1$: Again we expect the global symmetry to break if $b > b_c(L)$ and reduction will hold for $b < b_c(L)$. $b_c(L)$ will increase with L and if $b_c(L)$ depends asymptotically on L as dictated by microscopic scaling for $d = 3, 4$ then continuum large N reduction will hold if we take the limit by keeping $b < b_c(L)$ and taking $b \rightarrow \infty$.

In the approach pursued here, we have to deal with one lattice artifact. There will be a cross-over in the lattice internal energy for the Wilson gauge action at some small b for a finite torus size and a finite N . The cross-over becomes a “bulk” transition at infinite N , occurring at $b_c^B(N = \infty, L)$ for any finite lattice of size L^d in lattice units. Lattice large N reduction would imply that $b_c^B(N = \infty, L)$ does not depend on L , $b_c^B(N = \infty, L) = b_c^{B\infty}$. This is consistent with numerical simulations. The loop equation, together with constraints which come from the parallel transporters being unitary matrices, produce the “bulk” transition without losing their validity or changing their form. The lattice transition occurs when the unitary matrix associated with the 1 by 1 loop, of size 1 by 1, opens a gap at $\theta = \pi$ in its spectrum in the large N limit. As b increases further the gap widens. In the continuum this means that parallel transport round a tiny loop will not differ much (in norm) from the identity. Similar transitions occur at $b_c^B(N, L = \infty)$ for large enough N . The common limiting value at $b_c^B(N = \infty, L = \infty) = b_c^{B\infty}$ is rapidly approached. This family of transitions are lattice artifacts not associated with any symmetry breaking. Examples are the Gross-Witten [7] transition in two dimensions and Creutz’s transitions [8] for $N > 4$ in four dimensions.

Even though lattice reduction is valid on either side of $b_c^B(N = \infty, L)$ as long as one is below $b_c(L)$, we have to be above $b_c^B(N = \infty, L)$ to realize continuum reduction. For $L = 1$ (the Eguchi-Kawai model) and $d > 2$, the infinite N “bulk” and $Z^d(N)$ breaking transitions

accidentally fuse at a $b_c \neq b_c^{B\infty}$. Similar “accidents” can happen for $L=2,3\dots$, but a window opens for large enough L between $b_c^{B\infty}$ and $b_c(L)$. In three dimensions, an $L = 3$ lattice already has a window.

$b_c^{B\infty} = 0.5$ [7] and $b_c(L) = \infty$ in $d = 2$. The $U^2(1)$ symmetries are not broken and continuum reduction works on tori of any size in two dimensions. The “bulk” transition occurs close to $b_c^{B\infty} = 0.4$ in $d = 3$. Ordinary scaling in $d = 3$ would require $\frac{L}{b_c(L)}$ to approach a finite nonzero limit as $L \rightarrow \infty$. Using Monte Carlo simulations we have found that $4.3 < \frac{L}{b_c(L)} < 5$ for $L = 3, 4, 5, 6$. We compared folded and unfolded versions of the same loop on tori of different sizes and found the spectral densities associated with them to match as long as $\frac{L}{b_c(L)} > 5$ and this supports our statement in the abstract. Numerically, this leaves open the possibility that l_c is exactly equal to the large N limit of the finite temperature phase transition of $2 + 1$ dimensional pure $SU(N)$ gauge theory.

Continuum perturbation theory. If we had a scalar field theory where the field is a hermitian $N \times N$ matrix we know that independence on the torus size is impossible. This dependence does not go away in the planar limit. On the level of Feynman diagrams (taken in coordinate space) it is easy to calculate the dependence on torus size for large l , in particular if the theory is massive [9]. The leading correction is exponentially suppressed in l and comes from one virtual particle going round a non-contractible circle on the torus. There is a stable particle like that and it is in the adjoint representation of $SU(N)$. In the gauge case, if there is confinement, we could use only singlets under $SU(N)$ and, at infinite N , these singlets make sub-leading contributions to the free energy at leading, $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$, order. We conclude that for a confining gauge theory a planar diagram with a ribbon representation of propagators makes no contribution if one tears one of the propagators out of the surface and winds it round the torus.

Another way to see how reduction works in perturbation theory is to understand what happens to momentum space [5]. Having a torus means that momenta are quantized in units of $\frac{2\pi}{l}$ and there is no way around this for a massive scalar matrix field. In the gauge case the Feynman expansion starts from a constant gauge field background. The gauge invariant content of this moduli space consists of d sets of angles θ_μ^i which effectively fill the intervals between the quantized momenta making momentum space continuous and l independent. The filling has to be uniform and this is true at infinite N if the global $Z^d(N)$ symmetry is unbroken. The background - in a translation invariant gauge - is given by

$A_\mu = \text{diag}(\theta_\mu^1, \theta_\mu^2, \dots, \theta_\mu^N)$ but only the set $\{e^{i\theta_\mu^1}, e^{i\theta_\mu^2}, \dots, e^{i\theta_\mu^N}\}$ labels truly distinct vacua. This is why $|\theta_\mu^i| < \frac{\pi}{l}$, exactly as needed to fill in the gaps between the $\frac{2\pi k}{l}$'s. At infinite N the vacuum is characterized by d eigenvalue distributions on the complex unit circle.

Hints from string theory. In view of developments during the last few years [10] it seems more likely now than ever before that indeed large N $SU(N)$ pure gauge theories are equivalent to some string theory at zero string coupling. This means that the logarithm of the partition function defined on a finite torus and divided by the volume of the torus, is, in the planar limit, given by a sum of extended, spherical, two dimensional excitations embedded in the same torus. But, there is no way for the spherical surface to become non-contractible on the torus and thus it cannot detect that target space is a torus [11]. Hence, one can have no dependence on l . It is well known that simple string models on toroidal backgrounds cannot distinguish very large radii from very small ones; l_c , as a minimal radius, realizes a similar phenomenon in the unknown non-interacting string theory describing planar three dimensional pure YM.

It used to be revolutionary to think that statistical field theories on finite volumes can have phase transitions. This is no longer true. To the early toy model examples [12] we can add now cases of true, full fledged field theories with real relativistic degrees of freedom, also developing phases transitions in the planar limit [10].

Large N phase transitions. There seem to be at least two kinds of large N phase transitions. There are transitions that occur only in observables, as a function of their size and there are transitions that affect the system as a whole. An example of the first kind is a plausible phase transition associated with Wilson loop operators at infinite N . Small loops will have parallel transporters with a spectral gap and big loops will have almost uniform distributions to account for confinement in all finite irreducible representations. At finite N there are no gaps in the spectra but the eigenvalue density is exponentially suppressed as N increases. In pure gauge theories non-local observables are natural and at infinite N they easily can depend non-analytically on their size. This non-analyticity may have no effect on local observables. The case of tori and the associated $Z^d(N)$ symmetries we discuss here has to do with a phase transition that affects the system as a whole and it may have more profound consequences.

A fundamental distinction between the two types of transition is exemplified by the situation in two dimensions in the continuum. Spectrally, Wilson loop operators undergo a

large N transition at a critical area, but the $Z^2(N)$ symmetry never breaks, so the critical torus size, l_c^2 , is zero. Moreover, traces of all possible Wilson loop operators are analytic in the area [13]. In our study we have used two dimensions as a test case for our numerical methods. These methods reproduced the known continuum results.

The distinction between the two phase transitions is particular to the toric geometry. For example, two dimensional $SU(N)$ gauge theory at infinite N on a sphere does have a transition [14] of the system as a whole and Wilson loop operators defined on the sphere do have expectation values dependent on the area of this sphere [15]. There are no Polyakov loops and no $Z^2(N)$ extra symmetries.

The basic observables used in our study have been the distribution of eigenvalues of Wilson and Polyakov loops. For large N these observables are unconventional because they involve traces of all powers of the basic unitary matrix, not only a few low powers. Thus, issues of renormalization are potentially serious [16]. On the other hand, eigenvalues of large matrices have many universal properties [17], and the dynamics of the gauge theory would be encoded in the transformations one needs to carry out in order to bring these eigenvalue distributions to universal forms. It might be difficult to understand these observables in perturbation theory. On the other hand these variable might be more natural in an effective string theory if one exists. The situation in lattice regularization is very clear: We numerically finds features that scale as the universal features of the field theory would have it.

The driving force behind a phase transition as the lattice size of the torus is reduced at fixed lattice coupling is the tendency of Polyakov loop operators, P_μ , to break spontaneously some or all of the $Z^d(N)$ [5]. The new aspect is that this transition also breaks spontaneously some of the torus symmetries and, as such, triggers transitions in other quantities [11], which are invariant under $Z^d(N)$. Natural candidates are the “big-plaquette” operators $P_{\mu\nu} = P_\mu P_\nu P_\mu^\dagger P_\nu^\dagger$ which measure the coupling between P_μ ’s in different directions. The spectra of the $P_{\mu\nu}$ operators open gaps at locations that are numerically indistinguishable from the points where P_μ or P_ν break their $Z(N)$. So long as reduction holds ($l > l_c$), a $P_{\mu\nu}$ is an ordinary $l \times l$ Wilson loop on the l^d torus.

One way to interpret the $Z^d(N)$ breaking transition is as a condensation of windings, because the Polyakov loop unitary matrix, when raised to higher powers, looks like multiple windings of a string round a non-contractible loop in target space. So long as the eigenvalues

of the Polyakov loop are uniformly distributed round the circle, as mandated by the $Z^d(N)$ symmetry at infinite N , these higher powers don't do anything dramatic. If we write the eigenvalue density as a Fourier series on the circle, coefficients of high powers - reflecting high windings - would vanish. But, once a gap develops in the spectrum, the coefficients in the Fourier series become non-trivial, attaining a power dependence on order [18].

Beyond the transition. For l just a bit smaller than l_c exactly one of the $Z(N)$ factors in the $Z^3(N)$ breaks spontaneously. Thus, the forty eight element cubic symmetry group of our equal sided torus breaks down to an eight dimensional group acting in the plane perpendicular to the direction in which the Polyakov loop spectra took on non-uniform structure. The $P_{\mu\nu}$ variables containing the broken direction appear to open gaps while the remaining $P_{\mu\nu}$ variable still has a smooth spectrum. The situation could be interpreted as representing a finite temperature phase.

In order to prepare ourselves for what to look for when the torus is further squeezed we studied the 1^d EK model, now interpreted as a simple effective model for the dynamics of the vacuum manifold of the full system. Simulations we have carried out in three and four dimensions showed that at infinite N these models undergo a staircase of transitions, breaking one additional $Z(N)$ factor at a time. The possible continuum meaning of the various intermediate phases will have to wait for more work.

In super-symmetric YM gauge theories, compactified super-symmetrically on tori, the perturbative mechanism driving the spontaneous breaking of the $Z^d(N)$ symmetry can be eliminated. Beyond perturbation theory we do not know the answer, and other global symmetries come into play. It is conceivable that in some cases $l_c = 0$, indicative of a pure matrix model representation of the planar limit of a continuum gauge theory. The lattice provides a constructive definition of this matrix model and may show that the models are not defined by ordinary matrix integrals: Although the physical size is zero, regularization issues require one to take $L \rightarrow \infty$ in a way correlated with $b \rightarrow \infty$. It is possible that, precisely at zero physical size $l = 0$, spontaneous compactification occurs through this process. Somehow, there may be a way here to get four dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 4$ planar YM starting from ten dimensions. This certainly would be interesting.

Future lattice work. As we said already, our three dimensional simulations should be extended to four dimensions. A variety of technicalities have been learned from our three dimensional work and therefore there is reason to be optimistic. It would be interesting

to consider tori with higher symmetries both in three and four dimensions, obtained by identifying points in the parent R^d by non-hypercubic crystallographic groups.

Building on earlier two dimensional work we know how to calculate meson propagators in the planar limit. Meson momenta of values below the ultraviolet cutoff can be introduced by multiplying the original link matrices $U_\mu(x)$ by e^{ip_μ} -phases. One has no finite volume effects to worry about: to get to the continuum limit one just increases b , making sure that l stays larger than l_c . Values of N in the range of few tenths seem to be adequate. The lattice Dirac matrices are much smaller (and much denser) than in usual simulations. We would be able to address the smoothness of the two point meson correlation function, at infinite N , as a function of q^2 , where q is Euclidean momentum. Could there be a non-analyticity at some q^2 ? After all, if the crossover between *physical* strong and weak gauge forces happens in a range of scales that shrinks to zero at infinite N , phase transitions may occur in every observable, not only special ones, like Wilson loops. In four dimensions this could, finally, bring about a peaceful coexistence between large N and instantons [19].

In parallel simulations of the pure gauge case, large N work will require a floating point effort per node that grows as N^3 while communication demands will only grow as N^2 . So, PC farms with off the shelf communications would be well suited.

Final words. Our final conjecture about three dimensions is stated in the abstract. We call it a “conjecture” because our numerical tests have been relatively modest and because the consequences of the conjecture could be far reaching: many applications of ’t Hooft’s large N limit [20] assume analyticity in momenta and this assumption is now challenged.

Clearly there are many avenues to explore further. It is our hope that the tools of lattice field theory and those of string theory will eventually find problems that both sets of techniques can be reliably applied to and that this confluence would teach us useful lessons. This paper is certainly not unique in trying to go in this direction [21] and we hope that the number of such attempts would increase further in the future. Perhaps the most unique feature of our program is that if indeed there is a string theory describing gauge theories, we shall discover features of what likely is its simplest limit, where the string coupling vanishes. Even if the free string theory exists and is equivalent to the planar limit it still remains possible that away from the planar limit the equivalence does not hold because the string side becomes inconsistent. In that case, stringy features at finite N are only an approximate property of gauge theories.

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank Joe Kiskis with whom we collaborated in the initial stages of this project. H. N. would like to thank M. Douglas, V. Kazakov, I. Klebanov, J. Maldacena, N. Seiberg, E. Witten for useful comments. R. N. acknowledges a contract from Jefferson Lab under which this work was done. The Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility (Jefferson Lab) is operated by the Southeastern Universities Research Association (SURA) under DOE contract DE-AC05-84ER40150. H. N. acknowledges partial support at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton from a grant in aid by the Monell Foundation, as well as partial support by the DOE under grant number DE-FG02-01ER41165 at Rutgers University.

-
- [1] T. Eguchi, H. Kawai, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48 (1982) 1063.
 - [2] D. J. Gross, Y. Kitazawa, Nucl. Phys. B206 (1982) 440.
 - [3] Closed finite loops in R^d and contractible loops on T^d are simply related: The equivalence class of loops identifiable under translations is defined by the tangent vectors $t_\mu(s) = \frac{dx_\mu}{ds}$ to the curve $C = \{x_\mu(s)\}$. The functions $t_\mu(s)$ reconstruct the class on a torus of any given size.
 - [4] Yu. M. Makeenko, A. A. Migdal, Phys. Lett. 88B (1979) 135.
 - [5] G. Bhanot, U. M. Heller, H. Neuberger, Phys. Lett B112 (1982) 47; H. Levine, H. Neuberger, Phys. Lett. B119 (1982) 183, J. Kiskis, R. Narayanan, H. Neuberger, Phys. Rev. D66 (2002) 025019.
 - [6] A. Gonzalez-Arroyo, M. Okawa, Phys. Rev. D27 (1983) 2397.
 - [7] D. J. Gross, E. Witten, Phys. Rev. D21 (1980) 446.
 - [8] M. Creutz, Phys. Rev. Lett.46 (1981) 1441.
 - [9] H. Neuberger, Phys. Lett. B233 (1989) 183.
 - [10] O. Aharony, S. S. Gubser, J. Maldacena, H. Ooguri, Y. Oz, Phys. Rept. 323 (2000) 183; N. Drukker, D. J. Gross, Phys. Rev. D60 (1999) 125006; O. Aharony, hep-th/0212193; F. Bigazzi, A. L. Cotrone, M. Petrini, A. Zaffaroni, hep-th/0303191.
 - [11] J. J. Atick, E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B310 (1988) 291.
 - [12] H. Neuberger, Nucl. Phys. B179 (1980) 253.
 - [13] B. Durhuus, P. Olesen, Nucl. Phys. B184 (1981) 461.
 - [14] M. Douglas, V. Kazakov, Phys. Lett. B319 (1993) 219.

- [15] V. Kazakov, Phys. Lett. B105 (1981) 453.
- [16] R. A. Brandt, F. Neri, Phys. Rev. D24 (1981) 879.
- [17] P. J. Forrester, N. C. Snaith, J. J. M. Verbaarschot, cond-mat/0303207.
- [18] D. J. Gross, A. Matytsin, Nucl. Phys. B429 (1994) 50.
- [19] H. Neuberger, Phys. Lett. B94 (1980) 199.
- [20] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B117 (1976) 519.
- [21] M. Caselle, M. Hasenbusch, M. Panero, hep-lat/0211012; K. J. Juge, J. Kuti, C. Morningstar, hep-lat/0207004; M. Teper, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 109 (2002) 134; Phys. Rev. D66 (2002) 097502.