

# Proposal for Topologically Unquenched QCD

Stephan Dürr

*Physics Department, University of Washington*

*Box 351560, Seattle WA 98195, U.S.A.*

durr@phys.washington.edu

## Abstract

A proposal is presented for simulating an improvement on quenched QCD with dynamical fermions which interact with the gluon configuration only via the topological index of the latter. Strengths and shortcomings of the method are discussed and it is argued that the approximation – though being crude – shares some qualitative aspects of full QCD which relate to the issue of chiral symmetry breaking.

## 1 Motivation

Lattice Field Theory is the only viable technical scheme which allows one to calculate low energy observables in QCD from first principles. For phenomenological applications the lattice spacing  $a$  has to be a fraction of a hadron radius and the physical box-length  $L$  should be large compared to the Compton-wavelength of the low-energy (Goldstone-) modes. Full QCD calculations to be run at phenomenological quark-mass values exceed the present computers abilities.

The most serious problem stems from the fermion functional determinant, the logarithm of which is a nonlocal contribution to the gluonic effective action. This nonlocality – which is more severe the lighter the quark-mass – tends to slow down current algorithms dramatically.

In order to reduce the number of degrees of freedom to be handled numerically, many computations in Lattice QCD have been performed in the quenched approximation, where this determinant is replaced by one [1], or, more recently, in the partially quenched approximation, where the dynamical (sea-) quarks are given a higher mass than the external (valence-) quarks [2]. Thus (partial) quenching amounts to suppressing the contribution of all internal fermion loops in QCD by giving the quarks unphenomenologically high or infinite masses.

Attempts to introduce the corresponding modifications in the low-energy theory artificially in order to learn how to correct for them – the results being “quenched” and “partially quenched Chiral Perturbation Theory” – have shown that the (partially) quenched approximation is, in some aspects, fundamentally different from the full theory: Quenched (euclidean) QCD was found not to have a Minkowski-space counterpart [3] and – at least in principle – numerical results have to be corrected for the occurrence of “enhanced chiral logarithms” [4, 5]. In addition, the  $\eta'$  was found to be a pseudo-Goldstone boson in quenched QCD (as opposed to the situation in QCD) and its propagator shows – in case the

low-energy analysis is correct – a double-pole right at the same position in the  $p^2$ -plane as its single-pole [4]. In a field-theoretic framework single poles and cuts in Green’s functions are associated with particles and their interactions, but there is no way a multiple pole could be identified with a particle.

Besides these somewhat theoretical challenges, there is a very practical problem encountered in quenched simulations: When a correlation-function of operators involving fermionic fields is measured on a set of quenched configurations the entire measurement is dominated (in particular in the limit of small quark-masses and/or strong gauge-coupling) by a single or a limited number of configurations. These so-called “exceptional configurations” have to be removed from the sample and there is a strong theoretical motivation for doing so: Their “exceptional” behaviour results from spurious almost-zero real modes of the Dirac operator which in full QCD would give rise to almost-zero factors in the determinant and thus to a strong suppression of these configurations [6]. Hence removing the “exceptional configurations” is the right thing to do, but the problem is that there is no canonical definition of how much excess is required to make a configuration an “exceptional” one (and obviously this choice influences the result of the measurement).

In the following, we shall propose an alternative to quenched QCD which amounts to including a part of the functional determinant which can be evaluated with limited computational costs. From analytical considerations we will argue that it is not unreasonable to hope that this approximation – though being crude – gets some basic features of full QCD qualitatively right: The “topological” part of the functional determinant is sufficient to get symmetry restoration when the chiral limit is performed in a finite volume and configurations get suppressed by a standard determinant which accounts for nothing but the number of (lattice-descendants of) zero-modes of the Dirac operator on that configuration – which is less than perfect but better than no suppression at all.

## 2 Topologically Unquenched QCD

We start from the generating functional for (euclidean) QCD with quark-masses  $m_i$ , vacuum angle  $\theta$  and external fermionic currents  $\eta, \bar{\eta}$

$$Z_\theta[\bar{\eta}, \eta] = N \cdot \int DA D\bar{\psi} D\psi e^{-\left\{ \int \frac{1}{4} GG + \int \bar{\psi} (\mathcal{D} + M) \psi - i\theta \int \frac{g^2}{32\pi^2} G\tilde{G} + \int \bar{\psi} \eta + \int \bar{\eta} \psi \right\}} \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{D} = \gamma_\mu (\partial_\mu - igA_\mu)$  is the (euclidean) Dirac operator,  $\tilde{G}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\sigma\rho} G_{\sigma\rho}$  is the dual of the field-strength operator and the measure  $DA$  is meant to include gauge fixing and Faddeev Popov terms. Here and in subsequent formulae we shall adopt the convention that the quark-mass matrix  $M$  is diagonal, positive-real and of rank  $N_f$  (i.e. the CP-violation stemming entirely from  $\theta$  if  $\theta \neq \pi\mathbf{Z}$ ) and the normalization factor  $N$  is such as to guarantee  $Z_0[0, 0] = 1$ . Integrating over the fermionic degrees of freedom one gets the usual formula

$$Z_\theta[\bar{\eta}, \eta] = N \cdot \int DA \frac{\det(\mathcal{D} + M)}{\det(\not{\mathcal{D}} + M)} e^{\bar{\eta} (\mathcal{D} + M)^{-1} \eta} e^{-\int \frac{1}{4} GG + i\theta \int \frac{g^2}{32\pi^2} G\tilde{G}} \quad (2)$$

where  $\det(\mathcal{D} + M) = \prod_{i=1}^{N_f} \det(\mathcal{D} + m_i)$ ,  $\bar{\eta} (\mathcal{D} + M)^{-1} \eta = \sum_{i=1}^{N_f} \eta_i^\dagger (\mathcal{D} + m_i)^{-1} \eta_i$  and a factor which does not depend on the gauge field to be integrated over has been pulled out of the normalizing constant.

As is known, the  $SU(2)$ -gauge field configurations on  $\mathbf{R}^4$  with finite action boundary condition or on the torus  $\mathbf{T}^4$  fall into inequivalent topological classes (labeled by an index  $\nu \in \mathbf{Z}$ ) and a theorem by Bott guarantees that this holds true for any simple Lie group, in particular for all  $SU(N_c)$  theories [7]. In a given sector  $\nu$ , any gauge field  $A^{(\nu)}$  has an action which is bounded from below by  $8\pi^2/g^2 \cdot |\nu|$ . Choosing an arbitrary “standard configuration”  $A_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)}$  in each sector the generating functional (2) can be rewritten as

$$Z_\theta[\bar{\eta}, \eta] = N \cdot \sum_{\nu \in \mathbf{Z}} \frac{\det(\mathcal{D}_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)} + M)}{\det(\not{\partial} + M)} e^{i\nu\theta} \cdot \int DA^{(\nu)} \frac{\det(\mathcal{D}^{(\nu)} + M)}{\det(\mathcal{D}_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)} + M)} e^{\bar{\eta}(\mathcal{D}^{(\nu)} + M)^{-1}\eta} e^{-\int \frac{1}{4} GG} \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}^{(\nu)}$  refers to the actual  $A^{(\nu)}$  whereas  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)}$  refers to  $A_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)}$ .

Equation (3) explicitly splits the full determinant in (2) into two (individually gauge-invariant) factors: The second factor  $\det((\mathcal{D}^{(\nu)} + M)/(\mathcal{D}_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)} + M))$  – which remains inside the integral – describes the deviation of the actual gauge field  $A^{(\nu)}$  from the standard configuration  $A_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)}$  into which it may be continuously deformed. The first factor  $\det((\mathcal{D}_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)} + M)/(\not{\partial} + M))$  – which depends on  $\nu$  only and thus may be pulled out of the integral – accounts for the topology of  $A^{(\nu)}$ . Equation (3) makes apparent that quenched QCD actually does two modifications simultaneously: It sets both determinant factors equal one. In contrast, partially quenched QCD keeps both of them at the price of using unphenomenologically high quark-masses.

An interesting alternative could be to keep the first (“topological”) factor – with exactly the same quark-mass as in the propagator sandwiched between the currents  $\bar{\eta}, \eta$  – and to replace the second (“continuous”) factor by one. The result defines “topologically unquenched QCD”:

$$Z_{\theta, \{A_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)}\}}^{\text{TU}}[\bar{\eta}, \eta] = N \cdot \sum_{\nu \in \mathbf{Z}} \frac{\det(\mathcal{D}_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)} + M)}{\det(\not{\partial} + M)} e^{i\nu\theta} \cdot \int DA^{(\nu)} e^{\bar{\eta}(\mathcal{D}^{(\nu)} + M)^{-1}\eta} e^{-\int \frac{1}{4} GG} . \quad (4)$$

Initially, the motivation to treat the two determinants in (3) on unequal footing is an economic one: The “topological” factor in (3) is universal for all configurations within one class. Moreover it bears the knowledge about the nontrivial topological structure of QCD. On the other hand, the “continuous” factor in (3) causes a dramatic slowdown in numerical computations, since this determinant (or its change) has to be computed for each configuration individually.

Note that the full-QCD generating functional (3) is independent of the reference-configurations, whereas the “topologically unquenched” truncation (4) does depend on this choice. Later, we shall get rid of this ambiguity by describing two alternative strategies for choosing the background to be used as a reference-configuration in a given topological sector.

Note further that there is, a priori, no evidence that the approximation (4) should be particularly good, i.e. it is not obvious that the “topological” determinant (even with the best possible choice for the reference-backgrounds) should be close to the full determinant. Nevertheless, it is possible to show that the present analytical knowledge about QCD in a finite box indicates that it is at least not illegitimate to hope that including the “topological” part of the determinant may result in a approximation to full QCD which is worth studying.

### 3 Implementation with Stepwise Refinement

Suppose we are provided a set of quenched configurations and we want to measure a correlation function built from fermionic external currents. Then the procedure according to “topologically unquenched QCD” would be as follows:

1. Classify the configurations w.r.t. their topological indices  $\nu$  (using a method you consider both trustworthy and efficient).
2. Use the gauge action you trust to compute, in each class, the gauge-action of every configuration as well as the class-average  $\bar{S}^{(\nu)}$  and choose the reference-configuration according to one of the following two prescriptions:
  - (i) Choose – out of the class  $\nu$  – the configuration with minimal gauge-action as the representative  $A_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)}$ .
  - (ii) Choose – out of the class  $\nu$  – the configuration for which the gauge-action is closest to the class-average  $\bar{S}^{(\nu)}$  as the representative  $A_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)}$ .
3. Use the fermion action and the method you consider both trustworthy and efficient to compute the standard-determinants  $\det((\mathcal{D}_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)} + M)/(\not{\partial} + M))$ .
4. For each of the higher topological sectors either include the corresponding determinant computed in step 3 into the measurement or eliminate the corresponding fraction of configurations from that sector.

A few comments shall be added:

In step 1 the choice which method is used for determining  $\nu$  – though not being part of the very definition of “topologically unquenched QCD” – has a crucial influence on whether the proposed method may be competitive or not. We shall collect a few comments about this point in the appendix.

In step 2 the decision which criterion – (i) or (ii) – is used in order to select the reference configurations may or may not have a big influence on the outcome of the “topologically unquenched” measurement. We emphasize that for either choice there is a sound theoretical motivation. Strategy (i) – choose the configuration which minimizes the gauge-part of the total action – is nothing but the semiclassical ansatz being pushed to account for topology: Within each sector, the determinant is exact for the configuration having least gauge-action, i.e. for the one which, in a semiclassical treatment, gives the dominant contribution of that sector to the path-integral. Strategy (ii) – choose the configuration which in its gauge-action is closest to the class-average of the sector – takes into account that in a Monte Carlo simulation the system as a whole doesn’t try to minimize the total action-density but rather the free-energy-density: The configuration which is most typical in a certain sector is not the one with minimal action but the one which has additional instanton-antiinstanton pairs and topologically trivial excitations such as to find an optimum between the additional amount of action to be paid and the additional amount of entropy to be gained. It is the very aim of the second strategy to choose a background which realizes such an optimum pay-off as reference-configuration. A discussion in which regime of quark-masses and box-lengths the two strategies are expected to lead to comparable results and in which regime only one of them may be trustworthy follows near the end of the article. Note finally that in the present form either strategy for selecting the reference-backgrounds tries to find, in each sector, a

configuration which minimizes the action or maximizes the likelihood to occur with respect to the gluons only, none of them takes into account the shift – both in action and entropy – which is brought in by the fermions.

In step 3 one has to perform an ab-initio computation of the determinant  $\det((\mathcal{D}_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)} + M)/(\mathcal{D} + M))$  w.r.t. two backgrounds which cannot be continuously deformed into each other and which, for this reason, are not close to each other. This means that any approximate evaluation of the determinant which is tantamount to an expansion in  $\delta A$  is necessarily inadequate. Nevertheless, the task can be achieved – e.g. by the eigenvalue method.

In step 4 the previously quenched sample gets modified so as to look more like a full-QCD sample – at least w.r.t. the distribution of winding numbers. For QCD in a finite box Leutwyler and Smilga have shown that in the regime <sup>1</sup>  $V\Sigma m \gg 1$  the distribution of topological indices is gaussian with width [8]

$$\langle \nu^2 \rangle = V\Sigma m/N_f \quad (5)$$

where  $m/N_f$  is to be replaced by the reduced mass for unequally massive flavors. In other words: By its width, this distribution knows about the size <sup>2</sup> of the chiral condensate and thus about the amount of dynamical symmetry breaking in QCD. In quenched QCD the distribution is much broader as there is no determinant to suppress the higher sectors and, as a consequence, there is “too much” chiral symmetry breaking (which coincides with the observation that there is one pseudo-Goldstone boson in excess [4]). The “topologically unquenched” approximation introduces for each of the higher sectors an average-determinant which reduces its weight. As a result, the total distribution of topological indices gets narrower than (strategy (i)) or as wide as (strategy(ii)) the corresponding full-QCD distribution (for details see below). Whether the distribution being too narrow is equally unwelcome as being too wide or whether the limited amount of dynamical symmetry breaking can be compensated by somewhat larger quark-masses is an interesting question to be studied numerically.

There are two aspects in which the algorithm above should be improved. First, as the reweighting procedure results in eliminating a huge fraction of the configurations from the previously quenched sample the “topologically unquenched” determinant should get included into the measure right in the beginning. In addition, the more realistic strategy for choosing the reference backgrounds should try to choose, in each sector, a configuration which is “most typical” in the sense <sup>3</sup> of full QCD (strategy (ii')) rather than in the sense of quenched QCD (strategy (ii)). These topics are addressed in due course.

The fact that the functional determinant in (4) is a number which depends only on the total topological charge of the background configuration but not on its other details suggests that one could try to precompute the determinants on artificially constructed backgrounds prior to running the “topologically unquenched” simulation. From the Leutwyler-Smilga result (5) (which applies

<sup>1</sup> $\Sigma = \lim_{m \rightarrow 0} \lim_{V \rightarrow \infty} |\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle|$ , where  $m_i = m \forall i$  for simplicity; note that  $V\Sigma m \rightarrow \infty$  when  $m \rightarrow 0$  as the box has to be scaled accordingly:  $L \simeq 1/M_\pi, M_\pi^2 \simeq m\Lambda_{\text{had}}$

<sup>2</sup>The numerical value for  $\Sigma$  is of course scheme- and scale-dependent.

<sup>3</sup>Anticipating that in a given sector a histogram-plot of the configurations as a function of  $S_{\text{gauge}}^{(\nu)}$  (for a quenched sample) or of  $S_{\text{gauge}}^{(\nu)} - \log(\det(\mathcal{D} + M)/\det(\mathcal{D} + M))$  (in case of full QCD) shows roughly a gaussian distribution (cf. op.3 in [9]), the configuration which differs in its gauge- or total action from the corresponding class-average by the smallest absolute amount is considered the “most-typical” configuration of that sector in the sense of quenched or full QCD, respectively.

to full QCD) one has an estimate of how many determinants will eventually be needed. The backgrounds may be constructed following either of the two strategies mentioned above. Within the strictly semiclassical strategy – choice (*i*) – the reference-backgrounds are gotten in a rather simple way: Place  $\nu$  copies of a sufficiently large (i.e.  $\rho \simeq 0.3\text{fm} > \rho_{\text{thr}}$ ) single-instanton solution (for  $\nu > 0$ ) on the lattice and cool this background (with a sufficiently perfect action) in order to allow the instantons to adjust their positions and their relative orientations in colour-space. Within the more realistic strategy – choice (*ii'*) which takes into account the competing effects of increased action versus increased entropy – the backgrounds are constructed as follows: Place  $\nu$  instantons (for  $\nu > 0$ ) with typical sizes (i.e.  $\rho \simeq 0.3\text{fm}$ ) randomly on the lattice plus additional instanton-antiinstanton pairs such as to achieve an instanton density of  $1\text{fm}^{-4}$  [10, 11]. Optionally, dress this background with thermal fluctuations by applying a reasonable number of heating-steps (monitoring  $\nu$  in order to guarantee that it stays unchanged). Thus a pure Metropolis algorithm might look as follows:

1. Determine from the box-length and the quark-masses at which your simulation shall be done – via (5) – the  $\nu$  needed <sup>4</sup> and construct the corresponding  $A_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)}$  – according to philosophy (*i*) or (*ii'*) – as indicated above.
2. Use the fermion action and method you trust to evaluate, on the backgrounds constructed in step 1, the determinants  $\det((\mathcal{D}_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)} + M)/(\not{\partial} + M))$ .
3. Run the updating algorithm you trust; determine for each newly proposed configuration its topological index (via the method you trust) and include the ratio of the corresponding two standard determinants computed in step 2 into the Metropolis acceptance test, i.e. base this test on

$$\Delta S \equiv S_{\text{glue}}^{(\nu),\text{new}} - S_{\text{glue}}^{(\nu),\text{old}} - \log\left(\frac{\det(\mathcal{D}_{\text{std}}^{(\nu,\text{new})} + M)}{\det(\mathcal{D}_{\text{std}}^{(\nu,\text{old})} + M)}\right) \quad (6)$$

where the latter contribution is nonzero only if there is a change  $\nu_1 \rightarrow \nu_2$ .

A few comments shall be added:

The alert reader will have realized that the prescription for constructing the standard-backgrounds makes use of knowledge about the size-distribution and partly about the density of (anti-) instantons in full QCD which was won in previous lattice-studies. In other words: The “topologically unquenched” simulation as outlined above is not entirely from first principles. In fact, the approximation depends – strictly speaking – on the strategy-intrinsic quality of the artificially constructed backgrounds which got used for computing the determinants. In particular, constructing the reference backgrounds according to strategy (*ii'*) is a non-trivial task, since it means that one has to make an a-priori guess concerning the “most typical” configurations in full QCD. Nevertheless, it should be stressed that the approximation is supposed to be fairly insensitive to the details of this choice – provided the “mistake” is done uniformly in all sectors: Though strategies (*i*) and (*ii'*) end up constructing

---

<sup>4</sup>The fact that a periodic torus doesn't support a selfdual solution with  $\nu = \pm 1$  [12] is completely irrelevant in the context of Lattice-QCD: When the box length is much larger than the instanton size a wide window of meta-stability opens which, for all practical purposes, amounts to stable single-(anti-) instanton solutions. Moreover, by using twisted boundary conditions in at least one spatial direction the problem is completely avoided.

reference-backgrounds which look quite different (very smooth in the first case versus pretty rough in the second case) the final “topologically unquenched” sample may, in case the volume is not too large, still be pretty much the same in either case – the only thing which matters is the (strategy-intrinsic) ratio of determinants computed in step 3 (for details see below).

There is one more issue which shall be mentioned briefly: In full QCD the HMC-algorithm was found to have serious problems in fluctuating between the different topological sectors if quarks get sufficiently light [13]. It may well be that newly suggested configurations which would cross into another sector are unlikely to get accepted not because of an increase in gluon action but because of a decrease of the log of the functional determinant they would bring. If this is true the situation is likely to be better in “topologically unquenched QCD” as in this approximation the newly proposed configuration is judged not on the basis of its own determinant but of the collective determinant of the new sector. Needless to say that, in case a numerical investigation finds such an improved behaviour, this would be interesting in the context of full QCD as well.

## 4 Cost Estimate

At this point it might be worth convincing the reader that the extra-costs (as compared to a quenched run) brought by the “topologically unquenched” approximation are, in fact, rather moderate.

Regardless of the strategy chosen for selecting or constructing the standard-backgrounds, the overhead as compared to a quenched simulation results from the CPU-time spent on determining  $\nu$  for every newly proposed configuration and from the determinants which get evaluated. There is, however, an important difference between these two cost-factors: Preparing the reference-backgrounds and computing the determinants is a fixed investment which is given by  $L, a, m$  only – it is independent of the length of the simulation. On the other hand, determining for each configuration its index  $\nu$  gives rise to costs which grow linearly in simulation-time and thus provide the main overhead in a long run.

It is obvious that the method chosen for determining the topological index will have the greatest impact on the overall-performance of “topologically unquenched QCD” – irrespective of whether strategy (*i*) or (*ii'*) is implemented. In the appendix we advocated a field-theoretical definition with little or no cooling at all. In the latter case at least half of the potentially suggestible backgrounds have to be tossed away as they can’t get an index assigned. For the former variety we guess – based on the evidence given in [14] how quickly cooling with an “over-improved” action tends to pin down  $g^2/(32\pi^2) \int G_{\mu\nu}^a \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^a dx$  near an integer (say 5 sweeps to be within 2.99 and 3.01, etc.) – that applying  $O(3)$  cooling sweeps is sufficient to determine  $\nu$ . Thus, in an approximation where a cooling-sweep is considered twice as expensive as a complete update, the overhead from  $\nu$ -determinations is roughly a factor 2...6 over a quenched simulation.

In addition, there are costs for computing the determinants. In order to give an estimate, assume that a “topologically unquenched” simulation shall be done with up- and down-quarks having realistic masses. Demanding that the pion ( $M_\pi \simeq 140\text{MeV}$ ) fits three times into the box, one ends up requiring  $L \simeq 4.4\text{fm}$ . Trusting the usual values <sup>5</sup>  $\Sigma \simeq (200\text{MeV})^3$  and  $m \simeq 5\text{MeV}$ , one realizes that

<sup>5</sup>Values for  $\Sigma$  and  $m$  are scheme- and scale-dependent, but the product is RG-invariant.

the simulation will be in the regime  $V\Sigma m \simeq 10$ . From equ. (5)  $\langle \nu^2 \rangle \simeq 5$ , i.e. the Leutwyler Smilga analysis predicts  $\#(\nu) \propto e^{-\nu^2/(2.5)}$  [8]. This means that the sectors  $\nu = -10 \dots 10$  will be sufficient for simulations producing up to 10'000 independent configurations. Hence  $O(20)$  standard-determinants<sup>6</sup> must be computed. Strategy (*i*) is relatively cheap: The artificially constructed backgrounds tend to be extremely smooth, thus the lowest  $O(50)$  eigenvalues are expected to give a reliable estimate for these determinants. Strategy (*ii'*) somewhat more expensive: There are still  $O(20)$  determinants only which shall get evaluated, but this time the backgrounds do have high-temperature fluctuations, thus the lowest  $O(150)$  eigenvalues of the Dirac operator will be required.

In summary, the “topologically unquenched” approximation is expected to consume about one order of magnitude more CPU-time than a quenched run, i.e. it might be considered an alternative to a high-statistics quenched study.

## 5 Qualitative Aspects

The proposal for “topologically unquenched QCD” comes with two strategies – (*i*) and (*ii/ii'*) – for selecting or constructing the reference backgrounds. In order to judge the quality of these approximations we list the various kinds of damage one may do to a configuration before computing “its” determinant

- removing (topologically trivial) high-frequency excitations
- removing instantons and antiinstantons pairwise
- removing the remaining (anti-)instantons (of one kind)

and declare our firm belief that the harm done by these modifications increases from top to bottom<sup>7</sup>. Accepting this point of view, it is easy to rank the approximations to full QCD mentioned so far (worst first – best last):

- (*o*) removing all sorts of excitations thoroughly – the determinant gets “evaluated” on an entirely flat background: this is the quenched approximation.
- (*i*) removing all topologically trivial excitations and as many instanton-antiinstanton pairs as possible – the determinant gets evaluated on an extremely smooth background which reflects nothing but the excess of instantons over antiinstantons (or vice versa) in the original configuration: this is “topologically unquenched QCD” with strategy (*i*).
- (*ii'*) removing or replacing the topologically trivial excitations and accounting for the topologically nontrivial ones by an estimated number of instanton-antiinstanton-pairs and the correct number of single-(anti-) instantons: this is “topologically unquenched QCD” with strategy (*ii'*).

Knowing that the determinant depends in a particularly sensitive way on the precise locations of the low-lying eigenvalues of the Dirac operator, approximations (*o*) and (*i*) seem to amount to serious mutilations of full QCD: Since the

<sup>6</sup>This number could be cut by a factor of 2 since the standard determinant is symmetric  $\nu \leftrightarrow -\nu$  but it may be advantageous to be able to check this explicitly.

<sup>7</sup>Some supporting evidence can be found in [11] and references cited therein, but the aim of this proposal is to persuade at least one collaboration to implement “topologically unquenched QCD” in its various forms, as this would (hopefully) provide a direct verification of the claim.



work by Banks and Casher it is known that the phenomenon of chiral symmetry breaking in QCD is associated with a coalescence of low-lying eigenmodes of the Dirac operator near zero virtuality (see [8] and references therein). These low-lying modes are usually thought of as being the descendents of the exact zero-modes (in the continuum) of the (anti-) instantons present in the configuration. Thus eliminating all or most of the (anti-) instantons seems to cause serious harm. We have two comments on this: First, the density near zero virtuality is not directly proportional to the (anti-)instanton density – in fact, in the Instanton Liquid Model the chiral symmetry restoration at high temperature is due to instanton-antiinstanton pairs aligning in euclidean time direction [10, 15], i.e. the (anti-)instanton density isn't altered that dramatically near the chiral phase-transition. Second, we recall that the elimination of excitations concerns only the “copy” of the configuration used for the “determinant-evaluation” and not the configuration itself – otherwise it would be a mystery why the quenched approximation (*o*) could have anything to do with full QCD.

We do not only expect strategy (*i*) to do better than the quenched approximation (*o*), but we also expect strategy (*ii'*) to do better than (*i*) for the following reason: The “topologically unquenched” determinant leads to a suppression of the higher topological sectors, which – in view of (5) – is welcome, but within strategy (*i*) this suppression is likely to be much too severe in large boxes. This prediction follows from the fact that the determinant introduced in strategy (*i*) is exact for the background which, from the classical point of view, dominates that sector. The point is that this semiclassical treatment is indeed adequate for sufficiently small coupling-constant, i.e. in a ridiculously small box. In a larger volume the effective coupling strength increases and strategy (*i*) is unable to account for this change. To see this more clearly we stipulate the validity of the index theorem on the lattice [9] which allows us to rewrite the two determinants appearing in (3) using the Vafa-Witten representation [16]

$$\frac{\det(\mathcal{D}_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)} + M)}{\det(\not{\partial} + M)} = \prod_{i=1}^{N_f} m_i^{|\nu|} \cdot \frac{\prod_{\lambda>0} \det(\lambda_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)2} + m_i^2)}{\prod_{\lambda>0} \det(\lambda_{\text{free}}^2 + m_i^2)} \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{\det(\mathcal{D}^{(\nu)} + M)}{\det(\mathcal{D}_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)} + M)} = \prod_{i=1}^{N_f} \frac{\prod_{\lambda>0} \det(\lambda^{(\nu)2} + m_i^2)}{\prod_{\lambda>0} \det(\lambda_{\text{std}}^{(\nu)2} + m_i^2)} \quad (8)$$

Strategy (*i*) retains a determinant (7) which is appropriate in a small volume and thus strongly suppresses the higher topological sectors. As it comes to larger volumes, the semiclassical treatment breaks down and the “continuous” determinant (8) reduces the suppression of the higher sectors caused by the original form of (7) – in full QCD, but not within strategy (*i*). The virtue of strategy (*ii'*) is that this change is accounted for by successively redefining the standard-backgrounds used in (7). In other words: Within strategy (*ii'*) parts which would belong to (8) in (*i*) are gradually reshuffled into the “topological” part (7) as the box-volume increases. As a consequence, strategy (*i*) might be trustworthy only as long as  $V\Sigma m \leq 1$ ; strategy (*ii'*), on the other hand, is hoped to give a reasonable approximation to full QCD even in the regime  $V\Sigma m \gg 1$ .

The Vafa-Witten-representation of the functional determinant is interesting in yet another respect as it shows that the two factors (7) and (8) do have different structures. It is the prefactor  $m^{|\nu|}$  ( $m_i = m \forall m_i$  for simplicity) which makes the difference. In QCD, this prefactor is known to cause the strong sup-

pression of nonzero winding numbers in the limit  $V\Sigma m \ll 1$  [8]. In other words: This prefactor accounts for the fact that chiral symmetry gets restored if the chiral limit is performed in a finite volume. The fact that this prefactor is still around in the “topologically unquenched” approximation (with either choice for the reference-backgrounds) means that TU-QCD (unlike Q-QCD) gets the phenomenon of chiral symmetry restoration in a finite box qualitatively right.

Finally, the fact that the number of virtual quark-loops is not restricted in TU-QCD means that there is an infinite number of diagrams contributing to the  $\eta'$ -propagator (not just the connected and the hairpin diagram as in Q-QCD) and this propagator may even be well-defined in the field-theoretic sense.

## 6 Summary

In this letter it is proposed to factorize the QCD fermion functional determinant into two factors, the first one referring to a standard background in the actual topological sector, the second one describing the effect of the deviation of the actual configuration from that reference background. Then “topologically unquenched QCD” is defined to take the “topological” factor into account (with exactly the same quark-mass as in the propagator) and to set the “continuous” factor to one. In this sense the quarks happen to be fully dynamical (the number of quark-loops not being restricted whatsoever) but to interact in a way which pays no attention to the details of the gluon-configuration but just to its index which, in turn, is sensitive to the topologically nontrivial excitations only.

The proposal comes along with two strategies of how to select or construct the reference-backgrounds on which the standard-determinants get evaluated: One of them adopts a semiclassical point of view, the other one tries to choose a configuration which is as likely to occur as possible. We have given an estimate in which regimes of quark-masses and box-lengths one or the both of these two strategies may render “topologically unquenched QCD” an approximation which is reasonably close to full QCD and we have argued that costs in terms of CPU-time are implied which are roughly one order of magnitude higher than the costs of a quenched run. Thus in “topologically unquenched QCD” direct simulations at physical  $M_\pi/M_\rho$  are possible on present day’s machines.

The “topologically unquenched” approximation is expected to reduce the problem of “exceptional configurations” encountered in quenched QCD but it is unlikely to eliminate it completely: In “topologically unquenched QCD” configurations get suppressed as compared to quenched QCD, but the determinant which achieves this suppression doesn’t pay attention to anything but the number of lattice-descendants of zero-modes of the Dirac operator on that configuration. The main difference as compared to quenched QCD lies in the distribution of topological indices: For sufficiently large volume strategy (*i*) effectively acts as a constraint to the topologically trivial sector whereas strategy (*ii'*) is expected to give rise to a gaussian distribution with full-QCD-appropriate width.

In spite of how attractive these theoretical aspects may look, we feel that an honest judgement of how useful the “topologically unquenched” approximation may be is likely to be possible only after it has been implemented. Nevertheless, even for the case of full QCD it might prove useful to split the functional determinant into a topologically trivial and a topologically nontrivial factor and to evaluate the two of them by different techniques and to different accuracies.

## Appendix: Determining the Topological Indices

Determining the topological index of a gluon background in a way which produces results quickly and reliably is so crucial to the overall-performance of “topologically unquenched QCD” that the literature on this point shall be briefly reviewed. We are aware of four methods to determine the topological index [9]:

(a) The local field-theoretic method: The index is defined through

$$\nu = \frac{g^2}{32\pi^2} \int G_{\mu\nu}^a \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^a d^4x \quad (9)$$

where  $G_{\mu\nu}^a \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^a$  is implemented on the lattice by any operator approaching this limit under  $a \rightarrow 0$  (the simplest choice being tantamount to adding up the sines of the plaquette-angles).

(b) The global field-theoretic method: The index is defined through

$$\nu = \frac{g^2}{32\pi^2} \int_S K_\mu d\sigma_\mu \quad \text{with} \quad K_\mu = 2\epsilon_{\mu\nu\sigma\rho} (A_\nu^a \partial_\sigma A_\rho^a - \frac{2}{3} g f^{abc} A_\nu^a A_\sigma^b A_\rho^c) \quad (10)$$

where the surface-integral is over  $S^3$  at infinity and  $K_\mu$  is implemented by any operator having the appropriate continuum-limit.

(c) The index-theorem based method: The index is defined through

$$\nu = n_- - n_+ \quad (11)$$

where  $n_-(n_+)$  denotes the number of lattice-descendents of lefthanded (righthanded) exact zero-modes of  $\mathcal{D}$  in the continuum.

(d) The anomaly-based method: The index is defined through

$$\nu = \lim_{m \rightarrow 0} m \int \psi^\dagger \gamma_5 \psi d^4x \quad (12)$$

where  $\lim_{m \rightarrow 0}$  implies critical tuning (for a Wilson-type action).

While many of these methods were recently tested and found to give rise to comparable results (when implemented with sufficient care) for the topological susceptibility in QCD [17] we believe that in our case – nothing being known about the spectrum of  $\mathcal{D}$  on the background at hand – method (a) is likely to determine the topological indices in the quickest possible way. Nevertheless, the fact that on the lattice the operator involved in (a) undergoes thermal renormalization provides a challenge: Simply integrating the Chern density, i.e. computing  $g^2/(32\pi^2) \int G_{\mu\nu}^a \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^a dx$  gives a value which is, in general, not close to an integer. In fact, a histogram-plot over many configurations tends to reveal accumulations near regularly displaced, non-integer values, e.g. near  $0, \pm 0.7, \pm 1.4$  etc. There are two options of how to deal with this situation:

The first, simplistic, approach is just to define a “confidence interval” – e.g.  $\pm 0.2$  – around each of the values  $0, \pm 0.7, \pm 1.4, \dots$  and to assign the configurations lying within these bounds the indices  $\nu = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2 \dots$  etc. The remaining configurations which didn’t get an index assigned are then simply tossed away.

The second, more sophisticated, approach is to make use of the fact that cooling a configuration is able to remove the effect brought in by thermal renormalization: Cooling a set of gluon-configurations results in the peaks (in the histogram plot) being shifted closer to the corresponding integers and the valleys between the peaks getting thinned out under each sweep.

The problem, however, is that these two methods do not necessarily agree in their results: A configuration which has, without cooling, a measured value of  $g^2/(32\pi^2) \int G_{\mu\nu}^a \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^a dx$  so close to 0.7 (in our example) as to justify a classification as of  $\nu = 1$  in the simplistic approach, may easily be assigned, after a few cooling-sweeps, the trivial index  $\nu = 0$  in the sophisticated approach. While this phenomenon certainly is annoying in practice, it is nothing we have to worry about in principle, as its origin can be understood on rather simple grounds and the disagreement is expected to disappear, once the lattice-spacing is sufficiently small: The mismatch is caused by the fact that besides eliminating the high frequency noise (which causes the multiplicative renormalization), cooling also affects the instanton content of a configuration. The problem is that cooling does not only favour annihilation of instanton-antiinstanton pairs (which is completely harmless in the present context) but also tends to influence the size-distribution of the remaining (anti-)instantons – which may have a dramatic influence on  $\nu$ -assignments on lattices with nowadays typical  $a$ . The point is that under repeated cooling with the naive (Wilson) action, a single-instanton solution shrinks monotonically until it finally falls through the grid. In order to prevent the cooling algorithm at least from losing large instantons one has to modify the action w.r.t. which cooling is done in such a way that all instantons with a radius  $\rho$  above a certain threshold  $\rho_{\text{thr}}$  (typically  $\rho_{\text{thr}} \simeq 2.3a$ ) tend to get blown up (“over-improved actions”) or stay constant (“perfect action”) under a sweep. The price to pay, however, is that the small ones ( $\rho < \rho_{\text{thr}}$ ) get compressed and finally pushed through the grid even more efficiently than under cooling with an unimproved action [14]. Thus determining the topological index of a configuration with cooling (using an improved action) yields results for the integrated Chern density which are sharply peaked near integer values but the procedure is sensitive to instantons with  $\rho > 2.3a$  only. On the other hand, determining the topological index by the first “simplistic” approach (no cooling being involved) has an inferior signal-to-noise ratio (about half of the configurations can’t be assigned an index and have to be tossed away) but the advantage is that the procedure is sensitive to all instantons the lattice can support (i.e. those with  $\rho > 0.7a$ ). Hence, any potential disagreement between the simplistic and the sophisticated assignment is naturally explained as being due to instantons with sizes between  $0.7a < \rho < 2.3a$  (approximately). The statement that such a disagreement will disappear once the lattice-spacing is small enough takes its origin from the fact that in an  $SU(3)$ -type gauge-theory (with a realistic value for the string tension) the distribution of (anti-)instantons as a function of their radius is sharply peaked around  $\rho_0 \simeq 0.3\text{fm}$  with small sizes suppressed according to  $n \propto (\rho/\rho_0)^6$  [10]. For example, on a lattice with  $a = 0.13\text{fm}$  a mismatch may arise from instantons having sizes between  $\rho \simeq 0.1\text{fm}$  and  $0.3\text{fm}$ , which is a considerable fraction of all instantons. Once the lattice-spacing is as small as e.g.  $a = 0.03\text{fm}$  the percentage of configurations for which the two varieties don’t agree is supposed to be extremely small, since in this case either sensitivity-threshold ( $\rho_{\text{thr}} \simeq 0.02\text{fm}$  versus  $\rho_{\text{thr}} \simeq 0.07\text{fm}$ ) lies in the  $(\rho/\rho_0)^6$ -type suppressed tail of the distribution.

## Acknowledgments

It is a pleasure to acknowledge a series of most delightful conversations with Steve Sharpe. In addition, I would like to thank Philippe de Forcrand for teaching me about various cooling algorithms.

This work is supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF).

## References

- [1] H.Hamber, G.Parisi, Phys.Rev.Lett. **47**, 1792 (1981); E.Marinari, G.Parisi, C.Rebi, Phys.Rev.Lett. **47**, 1795 (1981); D.Weingarten, Phys.Lett. **109B**, 57 (1982).
- [2] N.Eicker et al. (SESAM), Phys.Lett. **B407**, 290 (1997).
- [3] A.Morel, J.Phys.**48**, 111 (1987).
- [4] C.Bernard, M.Golterman, Phys.Rev. **D46** 853 (1992) and Nucl.Phys. Proc.Supp. **26**, 360 (1992); S.Sharpe, Phys.Rev. **D46**, 3146 (1992) and Nucl.Phys. Proc.Supp. **30**, 213 (1993).
- [5] C.Bernard,M.Golterman, Phys.Rev. **D49**, 486 (1994); S.Sharpe, Phys.Rev. **D56**, 7052 (1997); M.Golterman, K.Leung, Phys.Rev. **D57** 5703 (1998).
- [6] W.Bardeen et al, Phys.Rev. **D57**, 1633 (1998).
- [7] A.Belavin, A.Polyakov, A.Schwartz, Y.Tyupkin, Phys.Lett.**59B**, 85 (1975); G.t'Hooft, Phys.Rev.Lett. **37**, 8 (1976) and Phys.Rev. **D14**, 3432 (1976); C.Callan, R.Dashen, D.Gross, Phys.Lett. **63B**, 334 (1976); R.Bott, Bull. Soc.Math.France **84**, 251 (1956).
- [8] H.Leutwyler, A.Smilga, Phys.Rev. **D46**, 5607 (1992); A.Smilga, hep-th/9503049.
- [9] J.Smit, J.C.Vink, Nucl.Phys. **B286**, 485 (1987); R.Narayanan, P.Vranas, Nucl.Phys. **B506**, 373 (1997); C.R.Gattringer, I.Hip, C.B.Lang, Phys. Lett. **B409**, 371 (1997) and Nucl.Phys. **B508**, 329 (1997); C.R.Gattringer, I.Hip, hep-lat/9712015; P.Hasenfratz,V.Laliena,F.Niedermayer, Phys.Lett. **B427**, 125 (1998); P.Hernandez, hep-lat/9801035.
- [10] T.Schäfer, E.V.Shuryak, Rev.Mod.Phys. **70**, 323 (1998).
- [11] J.W.Negele, hep-lat/9709129, hep-lat/9804017 and hep-lat/9810053.
- [12] P.Braam, P.vanBaal, Comm.Math.Phys. **122**, 267 (1989).
- [13] B.Allés et al, Phys.Lett. **B389**, 107 (1996).
- [14] P.deForcrand, M.Garcia Pérez, I-O.Stamatescu, Nucl.Phys. **B499**, 409 (1997) and Nucl.Phys. Proc. Supp. **63**, 549 (1998).
- [15] D.I.Diakonov, V.Petrov, Phys.Lett. **147B**, 351 (1984) and Nucl.Phys. **B245**, 259 (1984); E.Shuryak, J.Verbaarschot, Nucl.Phys. **B341**, 1 (1990) and **B410**, 55 (1993); T.Schäfer, E.Shuryak, J.Verbaarschot, Nucl.Phys. **B412**, 143 (1994); T.Schäfer, E.Shuryak, Phys.Rev. **D54**, 1099 (1996).
- [16] C.Vafa, E.Witten, Nucl.Phys. **B234**, 173 (1984) and Comm.Math.Phys. **95**, 257 (1984).
- [17] B.Allés, M.D'Elia, A.DiGiacomo, R.Kirchner, hep-lat/9711026.