

Recent Advances in Hamiltonian Lattice Gauge Theory ¹

Shuo-Hong Guo, Xiang-Qian Luo ²

CCAST (World Laboratory), Beijing 100080, China

Department of Physics, Zhongshan University, Guangzhou 510275, China ³

Abstract

We review the recent advances in the Hamiltonian formulation of lattice gauge theory for approaching the continuum physics. In particular, vacuum wave function and glueball spectrum calculations by coupled cluster method with truncation scheme preserving the continuum behavior are described.

1 Introduction

Lattice gauge theory (LGT) has now developed into one of the most informative method for non-perturbative aspects of strong interactions. It is a fundamental theory based on first principle of strong interactions. In 1974, Wilson proposed the Lagrangian formulation of LGT [1] where the gauge field theory is discretized on the D-dimensional space-time lattice. In 1975, Kogut and Susskind derived a lattice Hamiltonian [2] in which only the (D-1)-dimensional space is discretized while the time variable remains continuous. Theoretically, these two approaches are equivalent in the continuum limit.

For simplicity, we consider only the case of pure gauge fields. In the continuum, the action is

$$S = -\frac{1}{4} \int d^D x \mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha \mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}^\alpha. \quad (1)$$

Continuum quantum field theory with such an action suffers from divergence problem, which has to be regularized and renormalized. In perturbative QCD, the theory is regularized at high momenta, and renormalization group equation gives the effective coupling constant \bar{g} as a function of the momentum scale μ , i.e. $\bar{g} = \bar{g}(\mu)$. For SU(N) group, \bar{g} goes to zero when $\mu \rightarrow \infty$, so that the high energy strong interactions can be well described by perturbative QCD. For low energy phenomena, such as quark confinement and glueball spectrum, where \bar{g} becomes large, non-perturbative methods must be employed.

¹Review talk at Beijing workshop on Experimental and Theoretical Study of Glueballs

²E-mail address: STSLXQ@ZSULINK.ZSU.EDU.CN

³Mailing address

LGT uses the space-time discretization to regularize the continuum theory. On the lattice, the gauge field A is replaced by the link variable $U_l(x_0) = \exp(ig \int_{x_0}^{x_0+a\vec{l}} dx_l A_l)$, where a is the lattice spacing. Renormalization group equation predicts the so-called scaling relation $g = g(a)$. g goes to 0 as $a \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, the continuum limit corresponds to the weak coupling limit of the lattice theory. In this limit, the evolution of $g(a)$ is the same as the evolution of $\bar{g}(\mu)$ in the continuum theory, with $a \approx \mu^{-1}$. For a 4D SU(N) theory, the scaling relation is

$$\Lambda_L a = g^{-\frac{b_1}{2b_0^2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2b_0 g^2}} (1 + c_1 g^2 + \dots). \quad (2)$$

The constants b_0 , b_1 and c_i can be calculated by continuum perturbation theory. Λ_L is the lattice scale parameter with dimension of mass, and it can be related to the continuum scale parameter such as Λ_{MS} . When a varies, the lattice coupling constant g must vary accordingly in order to give the same physical results for continuum physics. On the lattice, one calculates dimensionless quantities such as am , with m some physical mass. In the weak coupling region, am should scale as $const. \times \Lambda_L a(g)$. Correct scaling behaviors is crucial for extracting physical results from lattice calculations.

The last two decades has seen a lot of progress in Monte Carlo (MC) simulations of LGT in the Lagrangian formulation, while analytic and numerical investigations of Hamiltonian formulation were not so active. Nowadays, MC simulation of lattice QCD is able to reach $\beta = 6/g^2 \approx 6.4$, but it is unfortunately not weak enough for the scaling behavior to be satisfied, and improvement is a pressing task. In recent years there have been some remarkable advances in the Hamiltonian formulation for approaching the continuum physics. It now seems that the Hamiltonian formulation deserves much attention.

2 Hamiltonian versus Lagrangian Formulation

The Lagrangian formulation starts from the path integral $Z = \int [dU_l] e^{-S[\{U_l\}]}$. Wilson [1] proposed an action

$$S = \frac{1}{g^2} \sum_p \text{Tr}(U_p + U_p^\dagger - 2), \quad (3)$$

where U_p is the ordered product of U around an elementary plaquette. The mass spectrum can be obtained by computing the correlation function $C(t) = \langle \Phi(t)\Phi(0) \rangle$, where $\Phi(t)$ is some appropriate operator with nonzero projection onto the lowest excited state. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
C(t) &= Z^{-1} \int [dU_l] e^{-S\{U_l\}} \Phi(t)\Phi(0) = \text{Tr}[e^{Ht}\Phi(0)e^{-Ht}\Phi(0)] \\
&= \sum_n |\langle \Phi(0)|n \rangle|^2 e^{-(\epsilon_n - \epsilon_0)t} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_0)t}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

For (4) to hold at not too large t , Φ must have sufficiently large projection onto the lowest excited state. Furthermore, statistics must be sufficient and finite size effects must be under control. Despite existing problems, the Lagrangian formulation simulated by MC algorithm is still the most efficient way for obtaining low energy hadron mass spectrum.

In contrast, the Hamiltonian formulation starts from the lattice Hamiltonian [2]

$$H = \frac{g^2}{2a} \sum_l E_l^\alpha E_l^\alpha - \frac{1}{g^2 a} \sum_p \text{Tr}(U_p + U_p^\dagger - 2), \tag{5}$$

where E_l^α is chromo-electric fields on the l link, and it is also generator of the gauge group. The mass spectrum can be obtained directly by solving the eigen-equation $H\Psi[U] = \epsilon_\Psi\Psi[U]$. Here ϵ_Ψ is the eigenvalue of H . When $a \rightarrow 0$, a huge number of gauge configurations are correlated, and it is very difficult to diagonalize the Hamiltonian with sufficient accuracy. For this reason, there is no satisfactory (3+1)-D result in this formulation up to now. In a feasible calculation, the gauge configuration space has to be truncated. An inappropriate truncation scheme often violates the continuum limit, and destroys the scaling behavior for the physical quantities. Therefore, special care must be taken when choosing a truncation scheme.

On the other hand, the Hamiltonian method does have some advantages over the Lagrangian method. It is relatively simple to obtain wave functions of the hadronic states, and it is likely that more physical information on the glueballs can be derived in this formulation.

3 Brief Comments on Earlier Investigations

We would like to mention here some earlier work on the Hamiltonian formulation:

- a)** Strong coupling expansion with Padé approximants [3]. Since the strong coupling expansion diverges at small g , some approximants must be used to extrapolate the strong coupling series to the weak coupling region. This introduces uncertainties and no conclusive results have been obtained.
- b)** Eigen-equation method with truncated gauge configurations proposed by Greensite [4]. This is just the coupled cluster method with a special truncation scheme. In [4], only the strong coupling region was explored. However, the scaling region was not reached and no concrete results were obtained.
- c)** Variational method. The vacuum energy ϵ_Ω is obtained by minimizing the expectation value of H in the trial vacuum state $|\Omega\rangle$, and the mass gap is obtained by minimizing the expectation value of H in the trial excited state $|\Psi\rangle$ with $\langle\Omega|\Psi\rangle = 0$. Some earlier results [5] were consistent with asymptotic scaling predictions. However, since the variation energies depend strongly on the choice of trial wave functions, it is not clear whether this method can give reliable results for the mass spectrum in a systematic way.
- d)** Models with exact ground state [6]. Some modified Hamiltonians with classical continuum limit the same as that of the Kogut-Susskind (K-S) Hamiltonian were proposed. These models possess an exact ground state of the form $|\Omega\rangle = e^{S[U]}|0\rangle$, where $|0\rangle$ is the fluxless state and $S(U)$ is some gauge invariant operator. The mass gaps were obtained by minimizing the excitation energies, which was shown to have good scaling behavior in (2+1)-D theories. The problem is that the modified Hamiltonian differs at quantum level from the K-S Hamiltonian by a relevant operator and hence belongs to a universal class different from the K-S Hamiltonian.
- e)** Linked cluster expansion method [7]. While the Hamiltonian can not be diagonalized exactly, its sub-matrix $\langle\Psi_i|H|\Psi_j\rangle$ on a finite set of strong coupling basis Ψ_i can be diagonalized. This is a variant of strong coupling expansion, and some approximants must be used to extrapolate the results into the weak coupling region. However, such an extrapolation might lead to uncertainties.
- f)** Unitary transformation and variational method for LGT with fermions [8]. A variational form of hadronic wave functions that takes into account the effect of sea quarks was proposed $|\Psi\rangle = e^{C\bar{\psi}\Gamma\psi}|0\rangle$. Meson spectrum and chiral condensates were obtained in low dimensional cases. They were consistent with scaling predictions. This is a first step towards the more systematic coupled cluster method.

To summarize, much efforts have been made in earlier investigations, but it seems difficult to use them to study the continuum physics of a realistic theory such as QCD₄. More systematic and unambiguous methods are required.

4 Recent Advances: Coupled-Cluster Method

In the 90's, one has seen considerable developments in Hamiltonian LGT for approaching the scaling region. One of the most promising analytical method is the coupled-cluster method with an appropriate truncation scheme [11]. We will discuss this method in some details.

4.1 Coupled-cluster method (CCM)

Let the vacuum state be

$$|\Omega\rangle = e^{R[U]}|0\rangle, \quad (6)$$

The eigen-equation $H|\Omega\rangle = \epsilon_\Omega|\Omega\rangle$ becomes [4, 11, 12]

$$\sum_l \{[E_l^\alpha, [E_l^\alpha, R]] + [E_l^\alpha, R][E_l^\alpha, R]\} - \frac{2}{g^4} \sum_p \text{tr}(U_p + U_p^\dagger) = \frac{2a}{g^2} \epsilon_\Omega. \quad (7)$$

$R[U]$ is composed of various gauge invariant Wilson loops, and it can be expanded in a series of graphs

$$R[U] = \sum_n R_n[U] = \sum_{n,i} C_{n,i} \sum_x G_{n,i}[U]. \quad (8)$$

For example, in (2+1)D SU(2) theory, $G_{1,1} = \square$, $G_{2,1} = \square\square$, $G_{2,2} = \square$, etc.

The eigen-equation (7) is a system of nonlinear equations for the coefficients $C_{n,i}$. In practice, this equation must be truncated at some finite n . Inappropriate truncation scheme would violate the continuum limit of (13) and destroy the scaling behavior.

4.2 The continuum limit of a graph

The continuum limit of a generic graph $G_{n,i}$ has the form

$$G_{n,i}[U] = g^2 a^4 [A_{n,i} Tr(\mathcal{F}^2) + a^2 B_{n,i} Tr(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{F})^2 + \dots]. \quad (9)$$

For example, the elementary plaquette behaves as

$$U_p = ReTr(Pe^{i \oint_{\square} gA \cdot dx}) = ReTr[1 + i \oint_{\square} gA \cdot dx - \frac{1}{2} (\oint_{\square} gA \cdot dx)^2 + \dots]. \quad (10)$$

Note that up to the A^2 term, it is not necessary for path to be ordering because of the trace. Once the A^2 term is determined, we can supply the A^3 and A^4 terms to make up gauge invariant expressions. Thus with x_0 at its center,

$$\begin{aligned} \oint_{\square} A \cdot dx &= \int_{-a/2}^{a/2} dx_{\mu} dx_{\nu} [\partial_{\mu} A_{\nu}(x_0 + x) - \partial_{\nu} A_{\mu}(x_0 + x)] \\ &= a^2 \mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}(x_0) + \frac{a^4}{24} (\mathcal{D}_{\mu}^2 + \mathcal{D}_{\nu}^2) \mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}(x_0) + O(a^6, A^2). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Therefore, (10) becomes

$$Tr[U_p - 1] = -\frac{a^4 g^2}{2} Tr(\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}) + \frac{a^6 g^2}{24} Tr(\mathcal{D}_{\mu} \mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu})^2 + \dots \quad (12)$$

The continuum limit of other graphs can be calculated in a similar way. Therefore, the operator R has the continuum limit

$$R[U] = - \int d^{D-1}x [\mu_0 Tr(\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}) + \mu_2 Tr(\mathcal{D}_{\mu} \mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu})^2 + \dots]. \quad (13)$$

The vacuum state for the SU(2) gauge theory was first investigated by Greensite [9] and later by Arisue [10] using simulation method. Nice scaling behavior for μ_0 and μ_2 was obtained in the 3D theory [10]. These coefficients approach constant values in the scaling region.

4.3 Truncation scheme preserving the continuum limit

The eigen-equation (7) has to be solved in some truncation scheme. If in the expansion (8), we let n be the order of a graph, then we have

$$\sum_l [E_l^\alpha, [E_l^\alpha, R_n]] \in R_n + \text{lower orders terms}, \quad (14)$$

$$\sum_l [E_l^\alpha, R][E_l^\alpha, R] \in R_{n_1+n_2} + \text{lower order terms}. \quad (15)$$

Thus the last term must be truncated such that the orders of graphs appearing in (7) do not exceed some finite order N . A conventional prescription [4, 13] was that in (15), only graphs with order N were preserved, while graphs with order greater than N were discarded.

We [11] have shown that these truncation schemes violate the continuum limit of the term (15), and hence destroy the scaling behavior of μ_0 and μ_2 . The essential point is that, since a general graph G_i has the continuum limit(9), the continuum limit of $[E_l^\alpha, G_i][E_l^\alpha, G_j]$ is

$$[E_l^\alpha, G_i][E_l^\alpha, G_j] \propto g^2 a^6 \text{Tr}(\mathcal{D}\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu})^2 + \dots \quad (16)$$

For this equation to be valid, all graphs generated from the l.h.s. must be included. On the contrary, if some graphs were kept and others were discarded, the continuum limit would change into $a^4 g^2 \text{Tr}(\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu})$, leading to seriously wrong continuum behavior.

Based on this consideration, we proposed a truncation scheme [11] that respects the continuum limit,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_l \{ [E_l^\alpha, [E_l^\alpha, \sum_n^N R_n(U)]] + \sum_{n_1+n_2 \leq N} [E_l^\alpha, R_{n_1}(U)][E_l^\alpha, R_{n_2}(U)] \} \\ - \frac{2}{g^4} \sum_p \text{tr}(U_p + U_p^\dagger) = \frac{2a}{g^2} \epsilon_\Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

To confirm the validity of this method, we must test the convergency of the truncation scheme at large N and check the scaling behavior of various quantities, in particular, the coefficients μ_0 , and μ_2 of the vacuum wave function and the glueball masses $m(J^{pc})$.

4.4 Results

We have examined this method for several lattice field systems:

- a)** (2+1)D U(1) theory [14]. μ_0 and the mass gap m_A are calculated up to 8th order. The results show clear tendency of convergence and exponential scaling. The mass gap agrees with MC and other analytic results. (See Fig. 1).
- b)** (2+1)D SU(2) theory [11, 15]. Reasonable results with power scaling for μ_0 , μ_2 and m_S are obtained even at the 3rd order. Convergent results are obtained up to 7th order. The continuum limit of $m_S \approx 1.4 e^2$ is somewhat lower than Teper's MC results. (See Fig. 2).
- c)** (2+1)D SU(3) theory [16]. Up to the 3rd order, we obtained μ_0 , μ_2 , $m(0^{++})$ and $m(0^{--})$, consistent with power scaling, $m(0^{++}) \approx 2.09e^2$, and $m(0^{--}) \approx 3.71e^2$. (See Figs. 3, 4).
- d)** (1+1)D O(3) σ model [17]. Up to the 8th order, the triplet mass m_T is consistent with MC results, indicating that asymptotic scaling occurs at rather large values of $1/g^2$. At smaller values of β , there exists a scaling region according to the whole β function. We confirm that $\mu_0 m_T \propto const.$ in this region. (See Fig. 5).
- e)** (1+1)D O(2) model [18] (Hamiltonian formulation of 2D XY model). Convergency was examined up to the 10th order. There is a clear signal of KT phase transition at $g^2 \approx 1$. The critical point and critical exponent are consistent with results by other methods. (See Fig. 6).
- f)** Estimates of QCD₄ glueball masses from QCD₃ results by dimensional reduction [19]. In the strong coupling limit or large N_c limit, the fixed time vacuum expectation value of an operator $O(U)$ in D dimensional confinement theory ($2 < D \leq 4$) corresponds to the path integral expression $\langle O(U) \rangle$ in (D-1)-dimensional theory. For long wavelength excitations, the mass ratios should be approximately the same for (3+1)D and (2+1)D. Combining our updated QCD₃ data $m(0^{++}) \approx (2.15 \pm 0.06)e^2$, and the recent MC data for the QCD₃ string tension $\sigma = (0.554 \pm 0.004)e^2$, we obtain

$$\frac{m(0^{++})}{\sqrt{\sigma}} \approx 3.88 \pm 0.11, \quad (18)$$

which is to be compared with the recent MC data for QCD₄: $m(0^{++})/\sqrt{\sigma} \approx 3.95$. We see that the dimensional reduction relation works quite well in this case. If we further use the MC result for the QCD₄ string tension $\sigma \approx 0.44 \text{ GeV}$, we obtain for QCD₄:

$$m(0^{++}) \approx 1.71 \pm 0.05 \text{ GeV}, \quad (19)$$

which is consistent with the IBM data $M(0^{++}) = 1.740 \pm 0.071$ [21].

g) Preliminary calculations of QCD spectrum in (3+1)D [20]. We have also calculated the 0^{++} , 0^{--} and 1^{+-} glueball masses in QCD_4 in low order approximations. Although the scaling behavior for these glueball masses has not been achieved, we do observe plateaus for glueball mass ratios in $\beta \in (6.0, 6.4)$. From the plateaus we obtain

$$\frac{M(0^{--})}{M(0^{++})} = 2.44 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.20, \quad \frac{M(1^{+-})}{M(0^{++})} = 1.91 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.12, \quad (20)$$

where the first error is the error of the data in the plateau, the second error is the estimated error due to finite order truncation. Our results are in good agreement with the MC and t-expansion results.

5 Other Developments

a) Improved Hamiltonians. The idea of improved lattice actions was proposed in the early 80's [22]. Recently the improved actions have attracted much attention [23]. The purpose is to push the $O(a)$ errors to higher orders and remove the tadpole lattice artifacts. Using improved actions, one can obtain results on coarser lattice, which was previously obtained on finer lattice. The computation time may then be greatly reduced. Starting from Lepage's improved Lagrangian, an improved Hamiltonian [24] can be straightforwardly derived using the transfer matrix method or the Legendre transform method. However, the color electric energy becomes an infinite series with long range terms. This deficiency can be cured by the Legendre transformation of a suitable improved Lagrangian with infinite time-like terms, yielding the same order of improvement but with only local and nearest neighbor interactions [24].

b) Universality of LGT in Hamiltonian and Lagrangian formulations [25]. Hamer et al. recently derived the relation between the coupling constants g_H and g_L in both formulations. Relations between velocity of light in both formulations were also derived. Using these relations, a comparison was made for (2+1)D $\text{SU}(2)$ theory between various Hamiltonian calculations and MC results in the Lagrangian formulation. A striking demonstration of universality between both formulation was obtained.

c) Calculation of hadronic structure functions [26]. A major difficulty in Hamiltonian LGT is that a great number of correlated configurations are involved. Recently Kröger and Scheu showed in a scalar model that by using

specific reference frame (e.g. Breit frame), the number of relevant configurations may be greatly reduced, so that they could obtain nice results for distribution function consistent with the theoretical prediction.

6 Conclusions and Outlook

Recent work on Hamiltonian LGT shows that with appropriate calculation schemes (CCM with continuum limit preserved truncation, Breit frame, etc.), we can efficiently enter the scaling region and obtain reliable results. More calculations on (3+1)D should be performed for further establishing the advantage of the Hamiltonian formulation in spectrum and wave function calculations. As the number of correlated configurations increase considerably from (2+1)D to (3+1)D, improved Hamiltonians may be necessary for efficient calculations in (3+1)D.

We would like to thank Q. Chen, X. Fang, H. Kröger, J.M. Liu and D. Schütte for collaboration, C. Hamer, J.J. Liu and N. Scheu for discussions. This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation under grant numbers 19575075, 19605009 and 19677205, and by National Education Committee under grant number jiao-wai-si-liu [1996] 644.

References

- [1] K. Wilson, *Phys. Rev.* **D10** (1974) 2445.
- [2] J. Kogut, L. Susskind, *Phys. Rev.* **D11** (1975) 395.
- [3] T. Banks et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D15** (1977) 1111.
- [4] J. Greensite, *Nucl. Phys.* **B166** (1980) 113.
- [5] H. Arisue et al., *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **70** (1983) 229.
- [6] S. Guo et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D38**(1988)2571; *Phys. Rev.* **D44**(1991)1296.
- [7] C. Hamer, A. Irving, T. Preece, *Nucl. Phys.* **B270**(1986) 553.
- [8] Q. Chen, X.Q. Luo, *Phys. Rev.* **D42** (1990) 1293; X.Q. Luo et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D50** (1994) 501.
- [9] J. Greensite, *Phys. Lett.* **B191**(1987)431.

- [10] H. Arisue, *Phys. Lett.* **B280** (1992) 85.
- [11] S. Guo et al., *Phys.Rev.* **D49**(1994)507; *Nucl.Phys.B(P.S.)***47**(1996)827.
- [12] C. Hamer, W. Zheng and D. Schütte, hep-lat/9603026.
- [13] C. Llewellyn-Smith, N. Watson, *Phys.Lett.* **B302**(1993)463; R. Bishop et al., *Phys.Rev.* **D48**(1993)887.
- [14] X. Fang, J. Liu, S.H.Guo, *Phys.Rev.* **D53**(1996)1523.
- [15] Q.Chen et al.,*Phys.Rev.***D50**(1994)3564; Fang, Guo, Luo, in progress.
- [16] Q. Chen, X.Q.Luo, S.H.Guo, *Phys.Lett.* **B341**(1995)349; *Phys.Lett.* **B348** (1995) 560; *Nucl.Phys.B(P.S.)***47** (1996) 274.
- [17] X. Fang, S.H.Guo, J.M.Liu, *Phys.Rev.***D54** (1996) 6521.
- [18] J.M.Liu, X.Y.Fang, S.H.Guo, *Phys. Rev.* **B** (1997)
- [19] X.Q.Luo, Q.Z.Chen, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A11** (1996) 2435.
- [20] X.Q.Luo et al., *Nucl. Phys.* **B(P.S.)****53** (1997) 243.
- [21] J.Sexton, A.Vaccarino, D.Weingaren, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** (1995) 4563.
- [22] K.Symmanzik, *Nucl. Phys.* **B226**(1983)187, 205. H. Hamber, C.M.Wu, *Phys.Lett.* **B133** (1983) 251.
- [23] G.P.Lepage, 1996 Schladming Winter School Lectures.
- [24] X.Q.Luo, S. Guo, H. Kröger, D. Schütte, *Nucl. Phys.* **B(P. S.)**, to appear.
- [25] C. Hamer et al., *Phys.Rev.***D54**(1996)2395; *Phys.Rev.***D53**(1996)7316.
- [26] H. Kröger and N. Scheu, *Nucl.Phys.B(P.S.)***53**(1997)321.

Figure Captions

Fig.1. Mass gap m_A in (2+1)D U(1) theory.

Fig.2. O^+ glueball mass in (2+1)D SU(2) theory.

Fig.3. Coefficients in QCD₃ vacuum wave function. Δ : strong coupling expansion; \times : third order; Dot lines: mean values in the scaling region.

Fig.4. QCD₃ glueball masses marked by \times . Dot lines: mean values in the scaling region; Dash lines: strong coupling expansion; Δ : third order from a set of connected graphs.

Fig.5. Triplet mass gap m_T in (1+1)D O(3) nonlinear model.

Fig.6. Mass gap m_A in (1+1)D O(2) model. Solid circles: fit to the KT form.

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/hep-lat/9706017v1>