Quark Confinement in C-periodic Cylinders at Temperatures above T_c *

K. Holland and U.-J. Wiese

Center for Theoretical Physics, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, and Department of Physics Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, U.S.A.

MIT Preprint, CTP 2608

June 1, 2018

Abstract

Due to the Gauss law, a single quark cannot exist in a periodic volume, while it can exist with C-periodic boundary conditions. In a Cperiodic cylinder of cross section $A = L_x L_y$ and length $L_z \gg L_x, L_y$ containing deconfined gluons, regions of different high temperature $\mathbb{Z}(3)$ phases are aligned along the z-direction, separated by deconfined-deconfined interfaces. In this geometry, the free energy of a single static quark diverges in proportion to L_z . Hence, paradoxically, the quark is confined, although the temperature T is larger than T_c . At $T \approx T_c$, the confined phase coexists with the three deconfined phases. The deconfineddeconfined interfaces can be completely or incompletely wet by the confined phase. The free energy of a quark behaves differently in these two cases. In contrast to claims in the literature, our results imply that deconfined-deconfined interfaces are not Euclidean artifacts, but have observable consequences in a system of hot gluons.

^{*}This work is supported in part by funds provided by the U.S. Department of Energy (D.O.E.) under cooperative research agreement DE-FC02-94ER40818.

Let us consider SU(3) gauge fields, $A_{\mu}(\vec{x},t) = ieA^a_{\mu}(\vec{x},t)\lambda^a$, in four-dimensional Euclidean space-time at finite temperature $T = 1/\beta$, i.e. with periodic boundary conditions, $A_{\mu}(\vec{x},t+\beta) = A_{\mu}(\vec{x},t)$, in the Euclidean time direction. The action, $S[A_{\mu}] = \int_0^\beta dt \int d^3x (1/2e^2) \text{Tr}F_{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}$, is defined in terms of the field strength, $F_{\mu\nu} =$ $\partial_{\mu}A_{\nu} - \partial_{\nu}A_{\mu} + [A_{\mu}, A_{\nu}]$. It is invariant under gauge transformations $A'_{\mu} = g^{\dagger}(A_{\mu} +$ $\partial_{\mu})g$, where the SU(3) matrices, $g(\vec{x}, t+\beta) = g(\vec{x}, t)$, are also periodic in Euclidean time. The Polyakov loop

$$\Phi(\vec{x}) = \operatorname{Tr}[\mathcal{P}\exp\int_0^\beta dt \ A_4(\vec{x}, t)] \in \mathbf{C},\tag{1}$$

winds around the Euclidean time direction and is constructed from the Euclidean time component A_4 of the non-Abelian gauge potential. Note that \mathcal{P} denotes path ordering. The Polyakov loop is a gauge invariant complex valued scalar field in three dimensions. Under transformations

$$g(\vec{x}, t+\beta) = g(\vec{x}, t)z, \qquad (2)$$

which are periodic up to a center element $z \in \mathbb{Z}(3) = \{\exp(2\pi i n/3), n = 1, 2, 3\}$, the Polyakov loop changes into

$$\Phi'(\vec{x}) = \Phi(\vec{x})z,\tag{3}$$

while the action remains invariant. The expectation value $\langle \Phi \rangle = \exp(-\beta F)$ measures the free energy, F, of a static quark. In the confined phase, F diverges and $\langle \Phi \rangle$ vanishes, while in the deconfined phase F is finite and $\langle \Phi \rangle \neq 0$. Hence, the **Z**(3) center symmetry is spontaneously broken at high temperatures [1].

In a situation with spontaneous symmetry breaking, the physics is sensitive to the spatial boundary conditions and to the way in which the infinite volume limit is approached. Here, we consider spatial volumes of size $L_x \times L_y \times L_z$ with periodic boundary conditions in the x- and y-directions. If one chooses periodic boundary conditions also in the z-direction, the expectation value of the Polyakov loop vanishes even in the deconfined phase. This is a consequence of the Gauss law in a periodic volume [2]. For topological reasons, a single quark cannot exist in a periodic box, because its center electric flux cannot go to infinity. It can only end in an anti-quark such that the total system is $\mathbf{Z}(3)$ neutral.

In this letter, we consider C-periodic boundary conditions in the z-direction [3]. When a C-periodic field is shifted by L_z , it is replaced by its charge conjugate, i.e. for C-periodic gluons

$$A_{\mu}(\vec{x} + L_z \vec{e}_z, t) = A_{\mu}(\vec{x}, t)^*.$$
(4)

Here * denotes complex conjugation. In a *C*-periodic volume, a single quark can exist, because now its center electric flux can escape to its charge conjugate partner on the other side of the boundary. Note that the system is still translationally

invariant. The allowed gauge transformations, as well as the Polyakov loop, also satisfy C-periodicity

$$g(\vec{x} + L_z \vec{e}_z, t) = g(\vec{x}, t)^*, \ \Phi(\vec{x} + L_z \vec{e}_z) = \Phi(\vec{x})^*.$$
(5)

As a consequence of the boundary conditions, the Z(3) center symmetry is now explicitly broken [4]. If one again considers a transformation $g(\vec{x}, t + \beta) = g(\vec{x}, t)z$, which is periodic, up to a center element $z \in Z(3)$, in the Euclidean time direction, one finds

$$g(\vec{x},t)^* = g(\vec{x},t+\beta)^* z = g(\vec{x}+L_z\vec{e}_z,t+\beta)z = g(\vec{x}+L_z\vec{e}_z,t)z^2 = g(\vec{x},t)^* z^2.$$
 (6)

Consistency requires $z^2 = 1$ and hence z = 1 (because $z \in Z(3)$). Of course, in the infinite volume limit, the explicit Z(3) symmetry breaking due to the spatial boundary conditions disappears. With *C*-periodic boundary conditions, $\langle \Phi \rangle$ is always non-zero in a finite volume. In the confined phase, $\langle \Phi \rangle$ goes to zero in the infinite volume limit, while it remains finite in the high-temperature deconfined phase. *C*-periodic boundary conditions are well-suited for studying the free energy of single quarks, while with periodic boundary conditions a single quark cannot even exist.

The gluon system is known to have a first order phase transition [5] at a temperature T_c . First, we consider the system in the confined phase at temperatures $T < T_c$ in a cylindrical volume with cross section $A = L_x L_y$ and length $L_z \gg L_x, L_y$. Diagrammatically, the partition function is

$$Z = \boxed{c} = \exp(-\beta f_c A L_z), \tag{7}$$

where f_c is the temperature-dependent free energy density in the confined phase. The expectation value of the Polyakov loop (times Z), on the other hand, is given by

$$Z\langle\Phi\rangle = \boxed{c} = \exp(-\beta f_c A L_z) \Sigma_0 \exp(-\beta \sigma L_z), \qquad (8)$$

where σ is the string tension, which is again temperature-dependent. The confining string (denoted by the additional line in the diagram) connects the static quark with its anti-quark partner on the other side of the *C*-periodic boundary. Hence, the free energy of the quark is given by

$$F = -\frac{1}{\beta} \log \Sigma_0 + \sigma L_z.$$
(9)

The free energy diverges as $L_z \to \infty$, indicating that the quark is confined.

Now let us consider the deconfined phase at temperatures $T > T_c$, where three distinct deconfined phases coexist. They are distinguished by different values for the Polyakov loop and are related to each other by Z(3) transformations. The expectation values of the Polyakov loop in the three phases are

$$\Phi^{(1)} = (\Phi_0, 0), \ \Phi^{(2)} = \left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Phi_0\right), \ \Phi^{(3)} = \left(-\frac{1}{2}\Phi_0, -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\Phi_0\right).$$
(10)

In a cylindrical volume, a typical configuration consists of several bulk phases, aligned along the z-direction, separated by deconfined-deconfined interfaces. These interfaces cost free energy F proportional to their area A, such that their interface tension is given by $\alpha_{dd} = F/A$. What matters in the following is the cylindrical shape, not the magnitude of the volume. In fact, our cylinders can be of macroscopic size. The expectation value of the Polyakov loop in a cylindrical volume can be calculated from a dilute gas of interfaces [6]. The interface expansion of the partition function can be viewed as

$$Z = \boxed{\begin{array}{cccc} d_1 \end{array}} + \boxed{\begin{array}{cccc} d_2 \end{array}} + \boxed{\begin{array}{cccc} d_3 \end{array}} + \boxed{\begin{array}{cccc} d_3 \end{array}} + \boxed{\begin{array}{cccc} d_2 \end{array}} + \dots \quad (11)$$

The first term has no interfaces and thus the whole cylinder is filled with deconfined phase d_1 only. An entire volume filled with either phase d_2 or d_3 would not satisfy the boundary conditions. The second and third terms have one interface separating phases d_2 and d_3 . Here, *C*-periodic boundary conditions exclude phase d_1 . The sum of the diagrammatic terms is given by

$$Z = \exp(-\beta f_d A L_z)$$

+
$$2 \int_0^{L_z} dz \, \exp(-\beta f_d A z) \gamma \exp(-\beta \alpha_{dd} A) \exp(-\beta f_d A (L_z - z)) + \dots$$

=
$$\exp(-\beta f_d A L_z) [1 + 2\gamma \exp(-\beta \alpha_{dd} A) L_z + \dots].$$
(12)

The first term is the Boltzmann weight of deconfined phase of volume AL_z with a free energy density f_d . The second term contains two of these bulk Boltzmann factors separated by an interface contribution $\gamma \exp(-\beta \alpha_{dd} A)$, where γ is a factor resulting from capillary wave fluctuations of the interface. Note that in three dimensions, γ is to leading order independent of the area A [7]. In the above expression, we have integrated over all possible locations z of the interface. It is straightforward to sum the interface expansion to all orders, giving

$$Z = \exp(-\beta f_d A L_z + 2\gamma \exp(-\beta \alpha_{dd} A) L_z).$$
(13)

In exactly the same way, the expectation value of the Polyakov loop is given by

$$Z\langle\Phi\rangle = \exp(-\beta f_d A L_z) \{\Phi^{(1)} + \int_0^{L_z} dz \ \gamma \exp(-\beta \alpha_{dd} A) \\ \times \frac{1}{L_z} [\Phi^{(2)} z + \Phi^{(3)} (L_z - z) + \Phi^{(3)} z + \Phi^{(2)} (L_z - z)] + ... \} \\ = \Phi_0 \exp(-\beta f_d A L_z) \{1 - \gamma \exp(-\beta \alpha_{dd} A) L_z + ... \}.$$
(14)

Summing the whole series and dividing by Z, one obtains

$$\langle \Phi \rangle = \Phi_0 \exp(-3\gamma \exp(-\beta \alpha_{dd} A) L_z).$$
 (15)

Note that $\langle \Phi \rangle$ is real, as it should be. The free energy of a static quark in a *C*-periodic cylinder is therefore given by

$$F = -\frac{1}{\beta} \log \Phi_0 + \frac{3\gamma}{\beta} \exp(-\beta \alpha_{dd} A) L_z.$$
(16)

This result is counter intuitive. Although we are in the deconfined phase, the quark's free energy diverges in the limit $L_z \to \infty$, as long as the cross section A of the cylinder remains fixed. This is the behavior one typically associates with confinement. In fact,

$$\sigma' = \frac{3\gamma}{\beta} \exp(-\beta \alpha_{dd} A) \tag{17}$$

plays the role of the "string tension", even though there is no physical string that connects the quark with its anti-quark partner on the other side of the *C*-periodic boundary. Confinement in *C*-periodic cylinders arises because disorder due to many differently oriented deconfined phases destroys the correlations of center electric flux between quark and anti-quark.

Of course, this paradoxical confinement mechanism is due to the cylindrical geometry and the specific boundary conditions. Had we chosen C-periodic boundary conditions in all directions, the deconfined phases d_2 and d_3 would be exponentially suppressed, so that the entire volume would be filled with phase d_1 only. In that case, the free energy of a static quark is $F = -(1/\beta) \log \Phi_0$, which does not diverge in the infinite volume limit, as expected. Had we worked in a cubic volume, a typical configuration would have no interfaces, the whole volume would be filled with deconfined phase d_1 and again the free energy of a static quark would be $F = -(1/\beta) \log \Phi_0$. Finally, note that, in a cylindrical volume, even the static Coulomb potential is linearly rising with a "string tension" e^2/A . Due to Debye screening, this trivial confinement effect is absent in the gluon plasma.

In contrast to claims in the literature [8], our result implies that deconfineddeconfined interfaces are more than just Euclidean field configurations. In fact, they can lead to a divergence of the free energy of a static quark and thus they have physically observable consequences. Of course, the issue is somewhat academic. First of all, the existence of three distinct deconfined phases relies on the Z(3)symmetry, which only exists in a pure gluon system — not in the real world with light dynamical quarks. Secondly, the effect is due to the cylindrical geometry and our choice of boundary conditions. Even though it is not very realistic, this set-up describes a perfectly well-defined Gedanken-experiment, demonstrating the physical reality of deconfined-deconfined interfaces.

Let us now investigate how the paradoxical confinement mechanism turns into the ordinary one as we lower the temperature to $T \approx T_c$. Since the phase transition is of first order, around T_c , the three deconfined phases coexist with the confined phase. Then, there are also confined-deconfined interfaces with an interface tension α_{cd} . There are two possible scenarios — complete or incomplete wetting [9, 10]. If $\alpha_{dd} = 2\alpha_{cd}$ at $T = T_c$, a deconfined-deconfined interface is unstable and splits into a pair of confined-deconfined interfaces. A film of confined phase grows to macroscopic size and completely wets the deconfined-deconfined interface. Note that $\alpha_{dd} > 2\alpha_{cd}$ is not possible in thermal equilibrium. Thus, the condition for complete wetting does not require fine-tuning. The alternative is incomplete wetting, which corresponds to $\alpha_{dd} < 2\alpha_{cd}$. In that case, both confined-deconfined and deconfined-deconfined interfaces are stable. Numerical simulations indicate that complete wetting is realized in the gluon system [11, 6].

Assuming complete wetting, the partition function takes the form

$$Z = \boxed{c} + \boxed{d_1}$$
$$+ \sum_i \{ \boxed{c} \quad d_i \quad c \quad + \quad \boxed{d_i} \quad c \quad d_i^* \} + \dots$$
(18)

The sum over *i* extends over the three deconfined phases and d_i^* denotes the chargeconjugate of d_i . For example, $d_1^* = d_1$ and $d_2^* = d_3$. Note that due to complete wetting, one always has an even number of interfaces. The diagrammatic terms from above give

$$Z = \exp(-\beta f_c A L_z) + \exp(-\beta f_d A L_z)$$

+
$$3 \int_0^{L_z} dz_1 \int_{z_1}^{L_z} dz_2 \left\{ \exp(-\beta f_c A z_1) \delta \exp(-\beta \alpha_{cd} A) \exp(-\beta f_d A (z_2 - z_1)) \right\}$$

×
$$\delta \exp(-\beta \alpha_{cd} A) \exp(-\beta f_c A (L_z - z_2)) + \exp(-\beta f_d A z_1) \delta \exp(-\beta \alpha_{cd} A)$$

×
$$\exp(-\beta f_c A (z_2 - z_1)) \delta \exp(-\beta \alpha_{cd} A) \exp(-\beta f_d A (L_z - z_2)) + \dots$$
(19)

Again, there is a factor for every bulk phase and for every interface. The capillary wave fluctuations of a confined-deconfined interface are characterized by the constant δ . Note that now we integrate over the positions z_1 and z_2 of the two interfaces. Similarly, the diagrammatic terms for the expectation value of the Polyakov loop are

$$Z\langle\Phi\rangle = \boxed{c} + \boxed{d_1}$$
$$+ \sum_i \{ \boxed{c} + \boxed{d_i} + \boxed{c} + \boxed{d_i} + \boxed{c} + \boxed{d_i} + \dots \quad (20)$$

The center electric flux connecting the quark with its C-periodic partner is constricted into a tube when it passes through a region of confined phase. Summing the series for Z and $Z\langle\Phi\rangle$ as we did before yields

$$\langle \Phi \rangle = \frac{\Phi_0 \exp(\beta x L_z) + \Sigma_0 \exp(-\beta (x+\sigma) L_z)}{2 \cosh[\beta L_z \sqrt{x^2 + (3\delta^2/\beta^2)} \exp(-2\beta \alpha_{cd} A)]}.$$
 (21)

Here

$$x = \frac{1}{2}(f_c - f_d)A$$
 (22)

measures the free energy difference between confined and deconfined phases. If $f_d < f_c + \sigma/A$, the resulting "string tension" is given by

$$\sigma' = \sqrt{x^2 + (3\delta^2/\beta^2) \exp(-2\beta\alpha_{cd}A)} - x,$$
(23)

which is independent of the string tension σ in the confined phase. In particular, at the finite volume critical point, i.e. at $f_d = f_c$, we have

$$\sigma' = \frac{\sqrt{3\delta}}{\beta} \exp(-\beta \alpha_{cd} A), \qquad (24)$$

For $f_d > f_c + \sigma/A$, on the other hand,

$$\sigma' = \sigma + \sqrt{x^2 + (3\delta^2/\beta^2)\exp(-2\beta\alpha_{cd}A)} + x.$$
(25)

Note that now x < 0 and hence, as expected, σ' reduces to σ in the large A limit.

For completeness, let us also discuss the incomplete wetting case, even though it seems not to be realized in the gluon system. Diagrammatically, the partition function then takes the form

$$Z = \boxed{c} + \boxed{d_1} + \boxed{d_2} \quad d_3$$

$$+ \boxed{d_3} \quad d_2 + \sum_i \{ \boxed{c} \quad d_i \quad c \quad + \boxed{d_i} \quad c \quad d_i^* \}$$

$$+ \sum_{i,j} \boxed{d_i \quad d_j \quad d_i^*} + \dots \qquad (26)$$

Now we also have deconfined-deconfined interfaces. The sum in the last term is restricted to $d_j \neq d_i, d_i^*$. In complete analogy to the previous calculations, one obtains

$$\langle \Phi \rangle = \frac{\Phi_0 \exp(\beta (x - (\gamma/\beta) \exp(-\beta \alpha_{dd} A))L_z) + \Sigma_0 \exp(-\beta (x + \sigma)L_z)}{2 \cosh[\beta L_z \sqrt{(x + (\gamma/\beta) \exp(-\beta \alpha_{dd} A))^2 + (3\delta^2/\beta^2) \exp(-2\beta \alpha_{cd} A)]}} \times \exp(-\gamma \exp(-\beta \alpha_{dd} A)L_z).$$

$$(27)$$

It is straightforward to extract the "string tension" σ' and examine the limiting cases as we did for complete wetting.

In conclusion, we have found a paradoxical mechanism for confinement that works even deep in the deconfined phase, provided the Universe is a cylinder and has specific boundary conditions. Ignoring subtle infra-red effects related to the boundary conditions in a situation with spontaneously broken symmetry has led other authors to conclude that deconfined-deconfined interfaces are just artifacts of the Euclidean description. Our calculation relates the presence of interfaces to the free energy of a static quark and thus shows that deconfined-deconfined interfaces have physically observable consequences. Even though an experimentalist cannot choose the boundary conditions of the Universe, a lattice field theorist, performing a numerical simulation of the gluon system, can. In fact, one can use our results to extract the string tension σ , as well as the interface tensions α_{cd} and α_{dd} , from simple lattice measurements of a single Polyakov loop. This may turn out to be technically easier than applying standard methods.

Acknowledgements

We are indebted to R. Brower, S. Chandrasekharan and S. Bashinsky for very interesting discussions. One of the authors (U.-J. W.) wishes to thank the theory group of the Weizmann Institute in Rehovot, where part of this work was done, for its hospitality, and the A. P. Sloan foundation for its support.

References

- [1] L. D. McLerran and B. Svetitsky, Phys. Rev. D24 (1981) 450.
- [2] E. Hilf and L. Polley, Phys. Lett. B131 (1983) 412.
- [3] A. S. Kronfeld and U.-J. Wiese, Nucl. Phys. B357 (1991) 521.
- [4] U.-J. Wiese, Nucl. Phys. B375 (1992) 45.
- [5] R. V. Gavai, F. Karsch and B. Petersson, Nucl. Phys. B322 (1989) 738;
 M. Fukugita, M. Okawa and U. Ukawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. 63 (1989) 1768;
 N. A. Alves, B. A. Berg and S. Sanielevici, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64 (1990) 3107.
- [6] B. Grossmann, M. L. Laursen, T. Trappenberg and U.-J. Wiese, Nucl. Phys. B396 (1993) 584.
- [7] V. Privman and M. E. Fisher, J. Stat. Phys. 33 (1983) 385;
 E. Brezin and J. Zinn-Justin, Nucl. Phys. B257 [FS14] (1985) 867.
- [8] A. V. Smilga, Ann. Phys. 234 (1994) 1;
 J. Kiskis, hep-lat/9510029;
 T. H. Hansson, H. B. Nielsen and I. Zahed, Nucl. Phys. B451 (1995) 162.
- [9] Z. Frei and A. Patkós, Phys. Lett. B229 (1989) 102.
- [10] T. Trappenberg and U.-J. Wiese, Nucl. Phys. B372 (1992) 703.
- [11] K. Kajantie, L. Kärkkäinen and K. Rummukainen, Nucl. Phys. B333 (1990) 100; Nucl. Phys. B357 (1991) 693.