

A Model for the Effective Potential of Thermalized Pure SU(Large N) Gauge Theory

Ralf Hofmann

*Max-Planck-Institut für Physik
Werner-Heisenberg-Institut
Föhringer Ring 6, 80805 München
Germany*

Abstract

Based on the (in part verified) ideas of a dynamical “abelian-ization” and subsequent “center-ization” of pure SU(N) gauge theory an effective potential for relevant field variables is constructed in the limit of large of N. To do this the theory is assumed to be thermalized and to be gravitationally deformed. BPS saturation in the dynamics of the monopole field is shown to lead to a suppression of the back reaction due to classical gravity. The classical, effective description of the gauge theory can be justified for both the regime of maximal abelian gauge symmetry and the center symmetric phase.

1 Introduction

Employing loop-expansion within (resummed) perturbation theory, the calculation of effective potentials due to fundamental, renormalizable interactions has a long standing history [1]. Applied to the framework of (imaginary time) finite temperature theory this approach has had its successes investigating the strength of phase transitions of higgsed abelian gauge theories and the electroweak symmetry breaking in the standard model [2]. A common feature of the perturbative results is the fact that the temperature dependence of the ground state of the theory is always contained in the *parameters* of the effective potential and *not* in the *solution* of the corresponding equation of motion. This is due to the fact that the ground state is, for reasons of calculational feasibility, assumed to be a configuration of spatially *constant* and temperature independent, gauge invariant, and scalar field strength. In the linear sigma model, which is a way to picture chiral symmetry breaking, finite temperature effective potentials were obtained by clearly abusing perturbation theory since the expansion parameter is much larger than unity. Even the results of the afore mentioned gauge theory calculations cast doubt on the convergence of the perturbative expansion. A property of the perturbative treatment is the gauge invariance to each and every order in the coupling constant. This invariance is an important guiding principle for the organization of diagrams. Therefore it must not be violated - after all it is crucial to prove renormalizability of the theory. However, there are fairly strong indications that fundamental gauge symmetries masquerade as smaller gauge or even discrete symmetries at low energy [3, 4]. These subgroups are thought to be represented by composite degrees of freedom whose very occurrence as vacuum dominating fields breaks the respective original symmetry spontaneously. Typically, one would have an adjoint, composite scalar field in pure SU(2) Yang-Mills theory whose condensation would generate magnetic monopoles and spontaneously would break the fundamental gauge symmetry down to the abelian subgroup U(1). The condensation of monopoles, in turn, would spontaneously break the U(1) gauge symmetry which in a final transition masquerades as the center symmetry Z_2 to render the theory in its confining phase. Viewed as a composite, the effects of the Higgs field in the Standard Model may have originated from a spontaneous break-down of a higher than SU(2) \times U(1) \times SU(3) gauge theory with no fundamental, scalar matter [5].

These cascading spontaneous symmetry breakings can not be captured in a perturbative approach. In spiritual analogy to Chiral Perturbation Theory (χPT) [6], which is non-renormalizable in the sense that at a fixed order in the momentum expansion there are divergences that can not be swallowed by a counterterm contained in the structure of the classical Lagrangian, we therefore propose an alternative to perturbative calculations of effective potentials at finite temperature. We specialize to the case of SU(N) gauge theories. The idea is that once the relevant degrees of freedom of a low-energy description are identified their interaction can be constrained by a small set of principles. In χPT the only experimentally justified and

very constraining assumption about the nature of pionic degrees of freedom is that they are the Goldstone bosons of a spontaneously broken, global symmetry.

2 General ideas

Here we appeal to the intuition [7] that fundamental and pure $SU(N)$ gauge theories essentially masquerade as (dual) $U(1)^{N-1}$ but higgsed theories within some intermediate range of resolution. Thereby, a non-zero Higgs field expectation signals the condensation of correspondingly charged magnetic monopoles. These theories, in turn, may be invariant only under the discrete subgroups Z_N as one tunes down the resolution even further [3, 4]. The confinement picture relying on the condensation of center vortices has been impressively verified on the lattice for $N=2$ [8]. Note that there monopole and Z_2 vortex condensation were found *not* to be mutually exclusive. On the contrary, the appearance of Z_2 vortices in the confining phase seems to imply an even stronger form of monopole condensation. Consequently, although an effective description may be in terms of scalar monopole fields, a transition to the phase, where only the center symmetry survives, is captured. A question worth asking then is whether there are, in analogy to χPT , physically motivated constraints so as to render the interaction of these Higgs fields unique. In this paper we argue that at least for large N the answer seems to be yes.

For the case $N = 3$ it was argued in [9] that the maximal abelian subgroup $U(1)^{3-1}$ can be promoted to $U(1)^3$ and afterwards diminished back to $U(1)^{3-1}$ by imposing one constraint on the sum of phases of the 3 Higgs fields and by (trivially) integrating out the additional gauge field. This is suggested by the observation that the magnetic charges of the dual $U(1)^3$ theory are integer multiples of the positive (artificially extended) root vectors of $SU(3)$. If this procedure would hold in general, one would have to impose $\#$ (positive) roots $= \frac{1}{2}(N^2 - N)$ minus $\#$ physical magnetic charges $= \#$ non-trivial center elements $= N - 1$ equals $\frac{1}{2}N^2 - \frac{3}{2}N + 1$ $\#$ constraints on the $\#$ in part artificially introduced Higgs fields $= \frac{1}{2}(N^2 - N)$. This, however, would make general considerations impractical. Therefore, one is forced to consider small N for an exact treatment. Thus we choose to *simulate* the case $N > 3$ by considering a $U(1)$ symmetry reducing to the center symmetry Z_N at low temperature.

3 BPS saturation and gravitational interaction

It has proven useful in the past to consider interaction with gravity as a guide to derive justified expressions for, say, the energy-momentum-tensor in the limit of a flat but bounded spacetime [10]. We therefore start with the following action of an abelian Higgs model which is *minimally* coupled to gravity

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[-\frac{1}{16\pi G} R - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + \overline{\mathcal{D}}_\mu \phi \mathcal{D}^\mu \phi - V(\bar{\phi}\phi) \right]. \quad (1)$$

Thereby, $\mathcal{D}_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu + ieA_\mu$ denotes the gauge covariant derivative, and V is the to-be-constructed effective potential for the Higgs field.

In view of the thermal treatment, which we will apply below to the effective SU(N) dynamics, we consider the theory with a *euclidean* signature of the metric with spacetime having the topology of a 4-torus so that in appropriately chosen coordinates the fields ϕ and $\bar{\phi}$ are periodic along each coordinate. Let us for the moment ignore the gauge sector of the theory. Our goal is to construct the potential $V(\bar{\phi}\phi)$ such that there exist solutions to

$$\nabla_\mu \nabla^\mu \phi = \frac{\partial V}{\partial \bar{\phi}}, \quad \nabla_\mu \nabla^\mu \bar{\phi} = \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi}, \quad (2)$$

which can be obtained by ignoring an appropriately constrained gravity. Here ∇_μ denotes the covariant derivative with respect to the gravitational background. The key is to look for BPS saturated [12] solutions to the field equations (2).

Let us give an example. For BPS saturation along a compact dimension it is essential that the ‘‘square root’’ $V^{1/2}(\phi)$ of the potential possesses a single pole [13]. So let us consider

$$V(\bar{\phi}, \phi) = \frac{\Lambda^6}{\bar{\phi}\phi}, \quad (3)$$

where Λ is a mass scale. It is easily checked (see also [15]) that fields $\phi, \bar{\phi}$ satisfying

$$\partial^\mu \phi = \frac{1}{2} \bar{V}^{1/2}(\bar{\phi}), \quad \partial^\mu \bar{\phi} = \frac{1}{2} V^{1/2}(\phi), \quad (\mu = 1, \dots, 4), \quad (4)$$

do satisfy

$$\nabla_\mu \nabla^\mu \phi = \frac{\partial V}{\partial \bar{\phi}} + \frac{\bar{V}^{1/2}(\bar{\phi})}{4} \sum_\kappa g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\kappa g_{\mu\nu}, \quad \nabla_\mu \nabla^\mu \bar{\phi} = \frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi} + \frac{V^{1/2}(\phi)}{4} \sum_\kappa g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\kappa g_{\mu\nu}. \quad (5)$$

Here $g_{\mu\nu}$ denotes the metric and $V \equiv \bar{V}^{1/2}(\bar{\phi})V^{1/2}(\phi)$, where $V^{1/2}$ is only determined up to a constant phase $V_{\text{real parameter}}^{1/2} \rightarrow e^{i\delta} V_{\text{real parameter}}^{1/2}$. For (2) and (5) to be the same we need $\sum_\kappa g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\kappa g_{\mu\nu} = 0$. This would be the case if $g_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu}(s, t, u)$, where $s \equiv x^1 - x^2 + x^3 - x^4$, $t \equiv x^1 - x^2 - x^3 + x^4$, and $u \equiv x^1 + x^2 - x^3 - x^4$. We hope to be able to give an example for a *dynamical* $g_{\mu\nu}(s, t, u)$ in a future publication. For now let us only find solutions to (4). Choosing $\delta = \pm\frac{\pi}{2}$ and factorizing the coordinate dependences,

$$\phi(x) = \prod_{\mu=1}^4 \phi_\mu(x_\mu), \quad \bar{\phi}(x) = \prod_{\mu=1}^4 \bar{\phi}_\mu(x_\mu), \quad (6)$$

one obtains the following solutions

$$\phi_\mu^{(n(\mu))}(x_\mu) = \sqrt{\frac{\Lambda^3 \beta(\mu)}{4 [\prod_{\mu \neq \lambda} \alpha(\lambda)] |n(\mu)| \pi}} e^{2n(\mu)\pi i \frac{x_\mu}{\beta(\mu)}}, \quad (n(\mu) \in \mathbf{Z}), \quad (7)$$

where $\alpha(\mu)$ is a constant of mass dimension 1/2 satisfying

$$\alpha(\mu) = \frac{\Lambda^3 \beta(\mu)}{4 [\prod_{\mu \neq \lambda} \alpha(\lambda)] |n(\mu)| \pi}, \quad (8)$$

and $\beta(\mu)$ is the μ th cycle of the torus obeying

$$\frac{\beta(\mu)}{n(\mu)} = \frac{\beta(\lambda)}{n(\lambda)}, \quad (\mu, \lambda = 1, \dots, 4). \quad (9)$$

Note that the dependences of $\phi, \bar{\phi}$ on $\alpha(\mu)$ drop out thanks to (8). A generalization of this 4-dimensional example to an even-dimensional spacetime with torus topology and positive-definite metric is straight-forward.

4 The case of finite temperature

Let us now return to the effective description of thermalized SU(N) gauge theories. In general we have only one compact dimension here, namely $0 \leq \tau \equiv x_4 \leq \beta \equiv \frac{1}{T}$ where T denotes the temperature. As for gravity we assume the euclidean version of the Robertson-Walker metric. We construct V by satisfying the following three constraints:

- 1) The gravitational deformation of the ground state be encoded in the shape of the potential to a good approximation.
- 2) According to what was said in section 2 we the potential V shall show a smooth transition to a Z_N symmetric phase for field modulus $|\phi|$ close to a single mass scale Λ .
- 3) The T dependence of the ground state be entirely absorbed into the corresponding *solutions* to the field equations and *not* in the usual, perturbatively obtained T dependence of *parameters* of the effective potential.

We will justify a posteriori that, except for the critical region where they drive the phase transition, quantum fluctuations are integrated out for large N and hence are contained in the shape of the potential. Given this fact, the theory can be viewed as a classical one.

An explanation of points 1)–3) is in order now. Point 1) is a call for simplicity. Rather than solving a fully coupled system of equations 1) ensures a partial decoupling. Applied to inflationary cosmology the implementation of this point causes a Hubble parameter which is much smaller than the mass of inflaton fluctuations during the de Sitter regime [15]. This is in contrast to the usual slow-roll paradigm which implies fluctuations of small mass (compared to the Hubble parameter) during inflation. Point 2) incorporates the simplest possible dimensional transmutation: A dimensionless coupling constant g plus N^2-1 fields in the fundamental theory are mapped onto a dimensionless coupling constant e , $2(N-1)$ fields, plus a mass scale Λ in the effective theory. Since we are only interested in global properties of the ground state a single mass scale is reasonable. Note, however, that disturbing the vacuum of SU(N) gauge theory locally, a wealth of mass scales is to be considered [11].

Point 3) is based on the idea that a T independent potential, which describes the thermal properties of the ground state in terms of the corresponding solution, may be of qualitative relevance in nonequilibrium situations where the mean resolution is considered an adjustable external quantity.

In an application to very early cosmology it was shown in ref. [15] that ϕ and $\bar{\phi}$ being solutions of the BPS equations,

$$\partial_\tau \phi = \bar{V}^{1/2}, \quad \partial_\tau \bar{\phi} = V^{1/2}, \quad (10)$$

implies that away from Planckian initial conditions they are approximate solutions to the corresponding euclidean second-order equations involving a small gravitational coupling term.

Again, the existence of BPS saturated solutions along a compact dimension ($0 \leq \tau \leq \beta$) necessitates $\bar{V}^{1/2}$ and $V^{1/2}$ to possess single poles [13]. Together with 2) this fixes the potential uniquely as

$$V(\bar{\phi}\phi) = \frac{\Lambda^6}{\bar{\phi}\phi} + \lambda^2 \Lambda^{-2(N-3)} (\bar{\phi}\phi)^{N-1} - 2\lambda \Lambda^{6-N} \frac{1}{\bar{\phi}\phi} \text{Re} \phi^N \quad (\lambda \sim 1). \quad (11)$$

Note that adding a constant to V destroys the existence of BPS saturated solutions and therefore property 1). Modulo a constant phase $e^{i\delta} V^{1/2}$ is given as

$$V^{1/2} = \frac{\Lambda^3}{\phi} - \lambda \frac{\phi^{N-1}}{\Lambda^{N-3}}, \quad (\lambda \sim 1). \quad (12)$$

The choice of phase is correlated with a choice of gauge. For the ground state solution we fix the gauge to shuffle as much physics as possible into the scalar sector. At $T > 0$ we fortunately have a criterion on how to do this: solutions to eqs.(10) must be *periodic*. Only the choice $\delta = \pm\pi$ leads to periodic solutions [14]. In ref. [15] it was shown that for sufficiently large N up to the first point of inflexion $|\phi|_c$ of the potential the positive-power part in $V^{1/2}$ can be neglected, and that in this domain the solutions are

$$\phi^{(n)}(\tau) = \sqrt{\frac{\Lambda^3 \beta}{2|n|\pi}} e^{2n\pi i \frac{\tau}{\beta}}, \quad (n \in \mathbf{Z}). \quad (13)$$

It is observed that inflexion point $|\phi|_c$ does exist only for $N > 8$. There is a slow convergence $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} |\phi|_c = \Lambda$. For $N \leq 8$ there is no conventional phase transition (no tachyonic fluctuations). However, as we shall see below, a (quasi)classical discussion of the transition is only appropriate in the limit of large N anyhow. The distinct topologies are labelled by n . Since within each given topology the BPS saturated solution is the one of lowest spatial action density these solutions are *stable* against classical perturbations. In ref. [15] it was shown that there exists a pure gauge configuration A_μ , which solves the euclidean Maxwell equations in a gravitational background and the *background* of the Higgs field $\phi^{(1)}$ (and trivially also for $\phi^{(n)}$).

Restricting ourselves to $n = 1$, it is readily seen that the Higgs mechanism induced vector mass m_A is much smaller than the mass m_ϕ of the Higgs quanta for $|\phi| < |\phi|_c$:

$$\frac{m_A}{m_\phi} = \frac{e}{\sqrt{6}} \left(\frac{|\phi|}{\Lambda} \right)^3 . \quad (14)$$

For $e < 1$ there is a considerable suppression of m_A as compared to m_ϕ since $|\phi|_c \leq \Lambda$ [15]. Therefore, the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, which led to the above ground state solution, is justified. On the other hand, using solution $\phi^{(1)}$ explicitly, we derive

$$\frac{m_\phi}{T} = \sqrt{6} \times 2\pi \sim 15.4 , \quad (|\phi| < |\phi|_c) . \quad (15)$$

So with prevailing momenta $p \sim T$ scalar quantum fluctuations of mass m_ϕ are to be neglected since they can be viewed as implicitly contained in V . But this is exactly what one expects from an effective potential of explicit mass scale Λ : Quantum fluctuations of momenta larger than Λ are integrated out and do not deform the classically obtained ground state. For the vector contributions one may argue that at sufficiently small coupling e the deformation of the ground state is marginal. As a consequence of the dynamics outlined above the ground state behaves like a medium with *constant* specific heat $2\pi\Lambda^3$ [15].

Let us now look at the regime where $|\phi| \sim |\phi|_c$. For large N we have $|\phi|_c \sim \Lambda$. At $|\phi|_c$ scalar fluctuation become *massless*. Therefore they are dynamically relevant. For $|\phi|$ slightly larger than $|\phi|_c$ scalar fluctuations are *tachyonic*, and hence they strongly drive the system towards phase overened by the (spontaneously broken) Z_N symmetry. Gauge invariance masquerades as a discrete symmetry at low energy [3]. Viewed from a euclidean perspective, BPS saturated solutions still exist, but the modulus of ϕ starts to vary along the euclidean time dimension [14]. This signals that the ground state becomes unstable and that one approaches a phase transition. Once ϕ relaxes to one of the N points ϕ_k of minimal energy ($V^{1/2} = 0$) with

$$\phi_k = \Lambda \exp \left[2\pi i \frac{k}{N} \right] , \quad (k = 0, \dots, N-1) , \quad (16)$$

euclidean and Minkowskian description are equivalent. This is also true for the description of topologically non-trivial defects such as Z_N domain walls [14]. For a similar situation [16] it has been shown, however, that as a result of the rapidity of the phase transitions domains cannibalize very efficiently within periods of the order of Λ^{-1} . Due to the topological triviality of ϕ_k the ground state then is a perfect thermal insulator. Moreover, along the lines of refs.[17] it can be argued for the Z_N symmetric theory that relic vector bosons couple very weakly to matter not charged under the original $SU(N)$ gauge group if N is not too small. This is a consequence of the absence of matter-field-composed lower dimensional operators which possibly could mediate a more rapid decay. So viewed within a cosmological

setting relic vector bosons contribute to the dark matter of the universe. Extending the fundamental $SU(N)$ theory by a fundamental fermionic matter sector, one should assign Z_N charge to color neutral composite operators of these fields which are relevant in the confining phase. The latent heat ΔQ of the transition between the abelian gauge theory and the center symmetric phase should be defined by the value of V at $|\phi|_c$. It is a measure for the fourth power of the reheating temperature when applying the model to cosmic inflation. Keeping Λ fixed, ΔQ viewed as a function of N has a maximum of $\sim 1.62 \Lambda^4$ at $N=14$ and for $N \rightarrow \infty$ approaches Λ^4 .

The mass of scalar fluctuations around one of the N vacua is $m_\phi = \sqrt{2}N\Lambda$. So if we interpret this phase as the confining one we see that even though quantum fluctuations should in principle matter at $|\phi| = \Lambda$ the description in terms of classical fields becomes better and better with growing N . This may relate to the observation that bound states of light quarks acquire zero width in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ since there are no fluctuations in the vacuum which possibly could mediate a decay.

5 Summary

To summarize, based on a small set of principles we have *constructed* an effective potential for the description of global ground state properties of thermalized $SU(N)$ pure gauge theory in effective field variables for large N . To motivate the constraint on the potential that it allows for BPS saturation solutions along a compact dimension we have constructed an example where BPS saturation of the dynamical monopole condensate leads to a decoupling of gravity for a spacetime of 4-torus topology. As one application this potential puts to practice the appeal of the gauge principle to cosmic evolution. In particular, the questions of how inflationary cosmology works, how it is terminated, and what the origin of ultra-high energy cosmic rays and the reason for their stability may be can be addressed in an orderly fashion [15].

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank P. van Baal, F. Bruckmann, M. Keil, and P. Majumdar for stimulating discussions. The warm hospitality and financial support during a visit to the Instituut-Lorentz last December are gratefully acknowledged.

References

- [1] S. Coleman and E. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 1888 (1973).
 C. Ford, I. Jack, and D. R. T. Jones, Nucl. Phys. **B387**, 373 (1992), Erratum-
 ibid. **B504**, 551 (1997).
 C. Ford, D. R. T. Jones, P. W. Stephenson, and M.B. Einhorn, Nucl. Phys.

- B395**, 395 (1993).
 C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. **B301**, 90 (1993).
 L. V. Laperashvili, H. B. Nielsen, and D. A. Ryzhikh, hep-th/0109023.
- [2] D. Bödeker, W. Buchmüller, Z. Fodor, and T. Helbig, Nucl. Phys. **B423**, 171 (1994).
 Z. Fodor and A. Hebecker, Nucl. Phys. **B432**, 127 (1994).
- [3] L.M. Krauss and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 1221 (1989).
- [4] G. Mack and E. Pietarinen, Nucl. Phys. **B205**, 141 (1982).
- [5] E. Farhi and L. Susskind, Phys. Rept. **74**, 277 (1981).
- [6] S. L. Glashow and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **20**, 224 (1968).
 S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **166**, 1568 (1968).
 J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Annals Phys. **158**, 142 (1984).
 J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Nucl. Phys. **B250**, 465 (1985).
- [7] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. **B190**, 455 (1981).
 T. Suzuki, Prog. Theor. Phys. **80**, 929 (1988); **81**, 752 (1989).
 S. Maedan and T. Suzuki, Prog. Theor. Phys. **81**, 229 (1989).
 H. Ichie, H. Suganuma and H. Toki, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 2944 (1995).
 M. N. Chernodub, F. V. Gubarev, M. I. Polikarpov, V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B600**, 163 (2001), hep-th/0010265.
- [8] L. Del Debbio, M. Faber, J. Greensite, and S. Olejnik, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 2298 (1997).
 P. de Forcrand and M. D'Elia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 4582 (1999).
- [9] S. Maedan and T. Suzuki, Prog. Theor. Phys. **81**, 229 (1989).
- [10] C. G. Callan, S. Coleman, and R. Jackiw, Annals. Phys. **59**, 42 (1970).
- [11] R. Hofmann, Phys. Lett. **B520**, 257 (2001), hep-ph/0109007.
 R. Hofmann, Nucl. Phys. **B623**, 301 (2002), hep-ph/0109008.
 K. G. Chetyrkin, S. Narison, V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B550**, 353 (1999).
- [12] E. B. Bogomolny, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **24**, 449 (1976).
 M. K. Prasad and C. M. Sommerfield, Phys. Rev. Lett. **35**, 760 (1975).
- [13] X. Hou, A. Losev, and M. Shifman, Phys. Rev. **D61**, 085005 (2000) .
 G. Dvali and M. Shifman, Phys. Lett. **B454**, 277 (1999).
- [14] R. Hofmann, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 065012 (2000), hep-th/0004178.
- [15] R. Hofmann and M. T. Keil, hep-ph/0111076.

- [16] G. N. Felder, L. Kofman, A.D. Linde, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 123517 (2001), hep-th/0106179.
- [17] K. Hamaguchi, Y. Nomura, and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. **D58**, 103503 (1998), hep-ph/9805346.
K. Hamaguchi and Y. Nomura, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 063507 (1999), hep-ph/9809426.