

Universality of the gauge-ball spectrum of the four-dimensional pure U(1) gauge theory

J. Cox

Physics Department, MIT, USA

J. Jersák, H. Pfeiffer

Institut für Theoretische Physik E, RWTH Aachen, Germany

T. Neuhaus

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Finland

P. W. Stephenson

Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università degli Studi di Pisa, Italy

A. Seyfried

Department of Physics, University of Wuppertal, Germany

Abstract

We continue numerical studies of the spectrum of the pure U(1) lattice gauge theory in the confinement phase, initiated in [1]. Using the extended Wilson action $S = -\sum_P [\beta \cos(\Theta_P) + \gamma \cos(2\Theta_P)]$ we address the question of universality of the phase transition line in the (β, γ) plane between the confinement and the Coulomb phases. Our present results at $\gamma = -0.5$ for the gauge-ball spectrum are fully consistent with the previous results obtained at $\gamma = -0.2$. Again, two different correlation length exponents, $\nu_{\text{ng}} = 0.35(3)$ and $\nu_{\text{g}} = 0.49(7)$, are obtained in different channels. We also confirm the stability of the values of these exponents with respect to the variation of the distance from the critical point at which they are determined. These results further demonstrate universal critical behaviour of the model at least up to correlation lengths of 4 lattice spacings when the phase transition is approached in some interval at $\gamma \leq -0.2$.

1 Introduction

The properties of the strongly coupled pure U(1) lattice gauge theory (U(1) theory) remain insufficiently understood after 20 years of its numerical investigation. Because of the two-state signal present on finite toroidal lattices (cubic lattices with periodic boundary conditions), it remains unclear whether a continuum field theory can be constructed at the confinement-Coulomb phase transition. A two-state signal is obviously consistent with the first order, but it does not exclude the second order as long as the latent heat decreases with increasing volume and can be extrapolated to zero in the thermodynamic limit using a power law. Results of recent investigations [2–4] allow such an extrapolation in some range of coupling parameters. Furthermore, when homogeneous spherical lattices (as opposed to the surface of a 5-dimensional hypercube) are used, the two-state signal is not observed at all [5,6].

In such a situation there is little hope of answering the question of the order beyond any doubt while no reliable analytic means are available and lattice sizes in numerical simulations are restricted. Furthermore, the lattice action can be considerably varied and the extended Wilson action used in most works, and also in this paper, is only an example. There may exist regions of the parameter space where the transition is clearly continuous. Indeed, in a recent work [7] the existence of a continuous phase transition possibly with an essential singularity is indicated by results using a novel formulation of the pure compact Abelian gauge theory in continuum.

Therefore it is appropriate to ask how far the properties of the phase transition are also consistent with the scaling behaviour associated with the continuous transition. If for a certain action such a consistency is found in some finite range of scales (in lattice cutoff units), two interesting scenarios are available: First, this consistency indicates the existence of a critical point not too distant in parameter space from the action used so that it dominates the behaviour of the chosen system in the observed range of scales. Second, if the range of scales is very large, the theory might be considered as an effective theory, with finite but large cutoff, even if no critical point is found.

This may be considered a realistic approach to the question of whether the U(1) theory has a physical meaning because considerable indications of a second-order scaling behaviour for the extended Wilson action (parameterized by two simplest plaquette couplings β and γ) already exist. On homogeneous spherical lattices, a volume dependence of several bulk observables described by simple second-order finite size scaling theory was found in a large range of lattice sizes [5,6] at three points of the phase transition, $\gamma = 0, -0.2, -0.5$, of the extended Wilson action and also for the Villain action [8]. This fact (and not the absence of the two-state signal on spherical lattices) is up to now the

most significant evidence for the existence of a non-Gaussian fixed point and universality in the U(1) theory.

The other indication of second-order scaling behaviour has been found in the spectrum studies of the U(1) theory in the confinement phase on toroidal lattices. Working with the extended Wilson action at $\gamma = -0.2$, the spectrum of the gauge-balls (GB) at various distances $\tau = |\beta - \beta_c|$ from the phase transition was determined [1]. Its τ -dependence has been found to be described in a very broad interval (outside the narrow region where the two-state signal appears) by simple power laws. Such a behaviour is predicted by the leading term in a second-order scaling picture, parameterized by the correlation length exponent ν . Two different values of the exponent ν were found, one of them non-Gaussian. This suggests the existence of an interesting fixed point in the pure U(1) theory. Of course, another possible explanation discussed in [1] is the occurrence of some cross-over or pre-asymptotic phenomenon. A possible way to distinguish between these possibilities is to look for universal properties and to repeat the calculations at a different point on the phase boundary.

Therefore in this paper we perform a similar analysis at $\gamma = -0.5$. The main aim is to check whether the results for ν are consistent with those at $\gamma = -0.2$. This turns out to be the case, further supporting the presence of a non-Gaussian fixed point, which is the most natural explanation of such a universal scaling behaviour. The alternative explanation that the results of [1] are influenced by a crossover related to a possible tricritical point in the vicinity is no longer probable.

We pay particular attention to the stability of the values of ν with respect to the variation of the β -interval in which they are determined by power-law fits to the measured masses. We demonstrate, also for data obtained previously [1] at $\gamma = -0.2$, that, within the lattice sizes and correlation lengths we could achieve, there is no significant indication that ν approaches the value $1/4$, expected for a weak first order phase transition.

The new results are presented as follows: In section 2 we briefly describe the model and summarize our earlier results on the GB spectrum at $\gamma = -0.2$. In section 3 we present results for the scaling behaviour of the GB masses at $\gamma = -0.5$. In section 4 the stability of the results at both γ values is discussed. In section 5 we compare the results at both γ values and draw our conclusions.

2 The U(1) theory and earlier results for GB masses at $\gamma = -0.2$

2.1 Action and phase diagram

We consider pure U(1) lattice gauge theory with an extended Wilson action

$$S = - \sum_P [\beta \cos(\Theta_P) + \gamma \cos(2\Theta_P)]. \quad (1)$$

Here, $\Theta_P \in [0, 2\pi)$ is the plaquette angle, i.e. the argument of the product of U(1) link variables around a plaquette P , and β and γ are the single and the double charge representation couplings, respectively. Taking $\Theta_P = a^2 g F_{\mu\nu}$, where a is the lattice spacing and $\beta + 4\gamma = 1/g^2$, one obtains for weak coupling g the usual continuum action $S = \frac{1}{4} \int d^4x F_{\mu\nu}^2$.

This lattice gauge theory has a line of phase transitions between the strong coupling confinement phase and the weak coupling Coulomb phase. Its position for the Wilson action ($\gamma = 0$) is $\beta_c \simeq 1.011$ [9], whereas for $\gamma = -0.5$ it is given below in (12). For $\gamma \geq +0.2$ the transition is most probably of 1st order, weakening with decreasing γ [10,9].

The recent studies on spherical lattices suggest that the order changes at $\gamma = \gamma_0 \simeq 0$, and is of 2nd order for $\gamma \leq \gamma_0$ [5,6]. With decreasing γ the 2nd order transition further weakens in the sense that the specific heat peak decreases for fixed lattice size and the autocorrelation time increases [6]. The scaling behaviour of bulk quantities is universal at least in the range $-0.5 \leq \gamma \leq 0$.

On toroidal lattices the disturbing two-state signal weakens with decreasing γ , but is present at least until $\gamma = -0.5$ [9]. For even smaller γ the large autocorrelation time makes simulations prohibitively expensive. Thus on the toroidal lattices the two-state signal on the critical line cannot be avoided.

2.2 Summary of the earlier results at $\gamma = -0.2$

Now we briefly summarize those results obtained for $\gamma = -0.2$ in [1] which are relevant for this work. In the vicinity of the critical point

$$\beta_c = 1.1609(2) \quad (2)$$

in the confinement phase two groups of GB masses have been found with distinctly different scaling behaviour when the phase transition is approached,

$\tau \rightarrow 0$. Most of the GB masses scale proportionally to $\tau^{\nu_{\text{ng}}}$, the value of the correlation length exponent ν_{ng} being non-Gaussian,

$$\nu_{\text{ng}} = 0.35(3). \quad (3)$$

This agrees with the exponent $\nu = 0.365(8)$ found in FSS studies on spherical lattices [5,6,8].

The mass of the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$ GB scales as $\tau^{\nu_{\text{g}}}$, with

$$\nu_{\text{g}} = 0.49(7). \quad (4)$$

This correlation length exponent agrees with the Gaussian value $\nu = 1/2$. We also give the result for the ratio of both exponents,

$$\frac{\nu_{\text{ng}}}{\nu_{\text{g}}} = 0.71(8). \quad (5)$$

We note that an observation of two different critical exponents at one value of γ leaves open the possibility that one of these exponent values is caused by crossover phenomena associated with the possible presence of a tricritical point in the vicinity. Two such scenarios have been discussed in [1]. Their confirmation or rejection requires repeating the calculations either at the same γ and substantially larger lattices, which is currently not possible, or at another, distant point in the parameter space.

3 Analysis at $\gamma = -0.5$

3.1 Statistics

We have used a vectorized three-hit Metropolis algorithm with an acceptance of about 50% at each hit. Due to the larger autocorrelation at $\gamma = -0.5$ compared with $\gamma = -0.2$ the measurements have been done after 50 Metropolis sweeps each.

Table 1 shows the lattice sizes $L_s^3 \cdot L_t$ with $L_t = 2L_s$, the β values of the simulations, and the number of measurements in multiples of 1000. The phase transition turns out to be located at $\beta_c = 1.4223(2)$.

The dagger † in table 1 denotes the simulations in which the two state signal is observed in the evolution of the plaquette energy. These runs have been excluded from the analysis.

Table 1

Numbers of measurements in the confinement phase in multiples of 1000. All runs in which the two state signal was present are omitted from the analysis. They are denoted by a † in this table. The phase transition is at $\beta_c = 1.4223(2)$.

β	$16^3 32$	$20^3 40$	$24^3 48$	$28^3 56$	$32^3 64$
1.4	4.5				
1.405	5.0				
1.41	3.6				
1.412	3.0				
1.414	3.6				
1.416	3.0				
1.418	4.1	2.5			
1.419	†	5.5	1.9		
1.42	†	5.7	2.7		
1.4205	†	†	4.1	1.9	
1.4207		†	†	†	1.1
1.4210				†	†

The measurements of the GB masses use the techniques of smearing and diagonalization of the correlation matrices described for pure QCD in [11,12]. The measurement of the effective energies $\epsilon_j(t)$ in the various GB channels and the way of estimating their statistical errors is explained in section 4 of [1].

3.2 Gauge-ball channels

The various gauge-ball channels result from the irreducible representations of the proper cubic group labeled $R = A_1, A_2, E, T_1, T_2$ (with dimensions 1, 1, 2, 3, 3, respectively). Inversion then introduces a parity quantum number $P = \pm 1$ and, since the representations are complex, one can also assign a charge parity $C = \pm 1$. The GB states are completely classified by R^{PC} [13].

We measured the correlation functions of all the 20 channels R^{PC} with momentum $p = 0$ and some of them with the smallest lattice momentum $p = 1$ (in units of $2\pi/L_s$). For the construction of operators with a certain symmetry see section 4 of [1] as well as [13,14].

The effective energies $\epsilon_j(t)$ in each GB channel $j = R^{PC}$ have been determined for as many $t \leq 6$ as possible. The GB energies E_j can in principle be obtained from a fit to a plateau in the values of $\epsilon_j(t)$ which is expected for large t .




Fig. 1. Effective energies from $A_1^{++}(0)$ and $T_2^{++}(0)$ correlation functions (a) at $\beta = 1.414$ on the $16^3 32$ lattice and (b) at $\beta = 1.42$ on the $24^3 48$ lattice. The plateaus have been fitted omitting the points at $t = 0, 1$ at $\beta = 1.414$, omitting $t = 0, 1$ for A_1^{++} and $t = 0, 1, 2$ for T_2^{++} at $\beta = 1.42$. The resulting GB energies E_j and their errors are indicated by horizontal lines.

Since the errors are sometimes very large or the effective energies could not be determined at all, the reliability of the determination of the energies E_j strongly depends on the GB channel. We classify this reliability in a similar way as done in [1]:

- +++ states.** At most β values a plateau in $\epsilon_j(t)$ is found and can be fitted at $t \geq 2$ or $t \geq 3$.
- ++ states.** At most β values a plateau in $\epsilon_j(t)$ is found only if $t = 1$ is included.
- + states.** Plateaus in $\epsilon_j(t)$ can be found only at some β values and only if $t = 1$ is included.
- ? states.** No plateaus in $\epsilon_j(t)$ are found: we cannot determine a GB energy at all.

Table 2 shows the quality of the GB channels at $\gamma = -0.5$. It is similar to the situation at $\gamma = -0.2$ [1] with some differences in the + and ? states. In contrast to [1] we have no β point close to the phase transition with a particularly high statistics. This prevents us from verifying small deviations from the one-particle dispersion relation for states denoted in [1] by an asterisk.

The effective energies $\epsilon_j(t)$ of A_1^{++} (+++ quality) and T_2^{++} (++ quality) with $p = 0$ are shown in fig. 1 (a) at $\beta = 1.414$ on the $16^3 32$ lattice and (b) at $\beta = 1.42$ (close to β_c) on the $24^3 48$ lattice. The horizontal lines are the resulting GB energies E_j with errors.

The GB masses m_j have been calculated from the GB energies E_j using the

Table 2

GB states observed in various channels with symmetry R^{PC} and momentum $p = 0, 1$ (in units of $2\pi/L_s$) and their scaling behaviour. If two momenta are listed in one line, the masses have been assumed to be the same. The ordering of the lines is the same as used in [1]. The reliability of the energy determination is indicated as “quality”. In the columns “ ν ” and “mass” the scaling exponent of the GB mass and its approximate proportionality to one of the mass scales is indicated. The ratio of each mass to the corresponding mass scale is given in the column “ratio”. The ratios at $\gamma = -0.2$ from [1] are shown for comparison. Since we used only GB masses $m_j(\beta) \leq 1.0$ in lattice units in the determination of the scaling behaviour, the amplitudes and therefore the ratios are not known for all of these channels.

$R^{PC}(p)$	Quality	ν	Mass	Ratio		
				$\gamma = -0.5$	$\gamma = -0.2$	
$A_1^{++}(0, 1)$		ν_g	m_g	1	1	
$T_1^{-+}(1)$				1.0(3)	1.01(6)	
$A_2^{+-}(0)$	+++		m_{ng}	1.0(1)	1.00(4)	
$E^{+-}(0)$				1.0(1)	0.98(4)	
$T_1^{+-}(0, 1)$				1	1	
$T_2^{+-}(0, 1)$				1.0(1)	1.00(4)	
$T_2^{--}(1)$					1.04(5)	
$E^{++}(0, 1)$				++	$\simeq 2m_{ng}$	2.2(2)
$T_2^{++}(0, 1)$			2.1(2)	2.07(9)		
$A_1^{-+}(0)$?	ν_{ng}			2.88(13)	
$A_1^{--}(0)$?				2.73(14)	
$A_2^{++}(0)$	+				3.22(16)	
$A_2^{--}(0)$	+				3.0(3)	2.73(15)
$E^{--}(0)$	+					2.95(14)
$T_1^{++}(0, 1)$	+				3.5(4)	3.61(18)
$T_1^{--}(0, 1)$	+			$\simeq 3m_{ng}$	3.0(3)	2.94(13)
$T_2^{-+}(0)$	+					3.10(14)
$T_2^{-+}(1)$	+					2.63(12)
$T_2^{--}(0)$	+					3.25(16)
$A_1^{+-}(0)$	+				3.0(3)	
$A_2^{-+}(0)$	+					
$E^{-+}(0)$	+				2.8(3)	
$T_1^{-+}(0)$	+				3.8(4)	

lattice dispersion relation

$$2(\cosh E_j - 1) = m_j^2 + 2 \sum_{\mu=1}^3 (1 - \cos p_\mu). \quad (6)$$

If the masses for a certain R^{PC} are consistent for both $p = 0$ and $p = 1$, we assumed equality and used the same parameter in the fits. In this case both momenta are listed in the same line in table 2 and are denoted by the same symbol in figs. 2 and 4.

3.3 Two mass scales

Having determined the GB masses m_j at various β , their scaling behaviour with β is analyzed. First, the power law

$$m_j = c_j(\beta_c^{(j)} - \beta)^{\nu_j} \quad (7)$$

is fitted to the individual GB masses measured in each GB channel $j = R^{PC}$. The results for the critical values $\beta_c^{(j)}$ agree well within the error bars, so we assume equality $\beta_c^{(j)} = \beta_c$ and use the power law

$$m_j = c_j(\beta_c - \beta)^{\nu_j} \quad (8)$$

with one β_c for all GB channels.

The resulting ν_j from the fits (8) are shown in fig. 2. In these fits we restricted β to the values having $m_j(\beta) \leq 1.0$ in lattice units. So the scaling behaviour could be determined for all GB channels with +++ and ++, but only for some of the + channels.

Fig. 2 shows different critical exponents ν_j for the scaling of GB masses in two groups of GB channels separated by the double vertical line in the figure. These two groups consist of the same GB channels as found at $\gamma = -0.2$ [1]. The two critical exponents are very similar to the results at $\gamma = -0.2$, see (3),(4), and are therefore called ν_g and ν_{ng} respectively. The third column of table 2 shows the association of GB channels to one of the two groups with ν_g or ν_{ng} .

To demonstrate the difference between the exponents ν_g and ν_{ng} in a way independent of the numerical value β_c , fig. 3 shows the masses of A_1^{++} and T_1^{+-} in a doubly logarithmic plot. These two channels are the highest quality representatives of the ν_g and ν_{ng} group, respectively.




Fig. 2. Values of ν_j obtained separately in each channel. The double vertical line separates two groups with distinctly different ν_j . The dashed vertical lines separate channels with different quality within the group with the non-Gaussian exponent with decreasing quality from left to right.




Fig. 3. A log-log plot of the masses of the A_1^{++} and T_1^{+-} gauge-balls in the interval $1.412 \leq \beta \leq 1.4205$. The results from the channels with $p = 0, 1$ are denoted by circles and squares, respectively. The solid line is the result of a straight line fit considering errors in both directions. The dashed line with a gradient of one, i.e. assuming equal exponents, is shown for comparison.




Fig. 4. The amplitudes c_j of the fits (8) under the assumption that there are just two critical exponents. The vertical lines have the same meaning as in fig. 2.

The slope of the solid line in fig. 3 is the ratio

$$\frac{\nu_{\text{ng}}}{\nu_{\text{g}}} = 0.663(24). \quad (9)$$

The dashed line with slope one (if the exponents were equal) is shown for comparison. The result (9) is compatible with the value (5) obtained at $\gamma = -0.2$.

Assuming there are just two critical exponents ν_{g} and ν_{ng} we use the power law fit (8) again with only two different exponents ν_j . Fig. 4 shows the results obtained for the amplitudes c_j . We find the same amplitude for all ν_{g} GB masses. The amplitudes of the ν_{ng} GB masses seem to be integer multiples of another amplitude value. This situation is again very similar to the results at $\gamma = -0.2$ [1].

The ratios of the amplitudes c_j in each of the two groups of GB states have been determined using the amplitudes of the highest quality channels A_1^{++} and T_1^{+-} as a reference. These amplitude ratios determine the mass ratios in a possible continuum limit and are shown in the fifth column of table 2. The results at $\gamma = -0.2$ from [1] are given for comparison. The amplitude ratios turn out to be compatible within error bars for all GB channels for which the amplitudes have been determined at both γ values.




Fig. 5. Masses of the A_1^{++} (lower points) and T_1^{+-} gauge-balls versus β for both momenta ($p = 0, 1$ being denoted by circles and squares, respectively). The dashed curves are fits to the data shown. The full curves represent the mass scales obtained in a fit with all $+++$ GB states.

To present results for the values of β_c , ν_g , and ν_{ng} with reliable error estimates, we repeat the power law fit (8) with two exponents and fit the $+++$ gauge-balls only. The results are

$$\nu_g = 0.51(3), \quad (10)$$

$$\nu_{ng} = 0.35(2), \quad (11)$$

and

$$\beta_c = 1.4223(2). \quad (12)$$

The ratio ν_{ng}/ν_g is consistent with (9).

Fig. 5 shows the scaling of the masses of the GB states A_1^{++} and T_1^{+-} with β . The dashed curves are power law fits to the data shown while the solid curves represent the results from the fit to all $+++$ GB states which lead to (10)...(12).




Fig. 6. Values of ν_g (circles) and ν_{ng} (squares) at $\gamma = -0.5$ obtained in a fit with $\beta_{\min} \leq \beta \leq \beta_c$ (a) with $\beta_c = 1.4223$ fixed and (b) with free β_c . The horizontal lines indicate the values (10) and (11).

4 Stability of ν and comparison with essential singularity

4.1 Stability of ν

In order to test the reliability of the numerical determination of the exponents ν_g and ν_{ng} we repeat the power law fits (8) and restrict the β values to the range near the phase transition $\beta_{\min} \leq \beta \leq \beta_c$. The resulting exponents are then plotted against β_{\min} to detect any possible non-asymptotic behaviour.

Fig. 6, part (a) shows the exponents ν_g and ν_{ng} against β_{\min} obtained from the power law fit (8) using the + + + GB masses with $\beta_c = 1.4223$ fixed. In the fit with free β_c in part (b) of fig. 6 we use only the masses in the two highest quality GB channels A_1^{++} and T_1^{+-} to avoid any influence caused by the fact that the masses of some GB states could be determined only at a few β values near the phase transition.

The critical exponents ν_g , ν_{ng} , and even their statistical errors are very stable with respect to β_{\min} when β_c is fixed (fig. 6 (a)). With free β_c (fig. 6 (b)) the exponents are smaller if the fit is restricted to the β values near the phase transition, but their statistical errors grow by an amount comparable to this effect.

For comparison we also present the same analysis at $\gamma = -0.2$ using our data from [1]. Fig. 7 (a) and (b) show these results with $\beta_c = 1.1609$ fixed and with free β_c using the same GB channels as in fig. 6.

The resulting critical exponents obtained with β_c fixed turn out to be very stable. They are quite stable even with free β_c .

Currently we are unable to decide whether the decrease of the exponents at




Fig. 7. Values of ν_g (circles) and ν_{ng} (squares) at $\gamma = -0.2$ obtained in a fit with $\beta_{\min} \leq \beta \leq \beta_c$ (a) with $\beta_c = 1.1609$ fixed and (b) with free β_c . The horizontal lines indicate the values (4) and (3).




Fig. 8. Masses of the A_1^{++} (lower points) and T_1^{+-} gauge-balls (upper points) at $\gamma = -0.2$ (left plot) and $\gamma = -0.5$ (right plot). The momenta $p = 0, 1$ are denoted by circles and squares, respectively. The fits with the essential singularity law (13) with free β_c using all data give the solid curves. The dashed curves are produced with fixed β_c and restricting $1.152 \leq \beta \leq \beta_c$ at $\gamma = -0.2$ resp. $1.416 \leq \beta \leq \beta_c$ at $\gamma = -0.5$.

$\gamma = -0.5$ with free β_c near the transition is a statistically significant effect. The data at $\gamma = -0.2$ have in general larger statistics than those at $\gamma = -0.5$ and do not show such a decrease (fig. 7 (b)).

If the fits are made using $g - g_c$ instead of $\beta - \beta_c$ in (8), we find fully consistent values for the critical exponents ν_g and ν_{ng} .

4.2 Comparison with essential singularity

Motivated by [7] we have also explored the possible existence of an essential singularity and tried to describe the scaling of the masses of $j = A_1^{++}$ and

$j = T_1^{+-}$ with the essential singularity law

$$m_j(\beta) = c_j \exp\left(-\frac{\eta_j}{\sqrt{\beta_c - \beta}}\right) \quad (13)$$

with constants η_j .

We studied several fits. Including all data and leaving all parameters of (13) free, the resulting β_c is far off the anticipated value (solid curves in fig. 8). Fixing $\beta_c = 1.4223$ (resp. $\beta_c = 1.1609$ at $\gamma = -0.2$) and restricting (13) to the data near the phase transition $1.416 \leq \beta \leq \beta_c$ (resp. $1.152 \leq \beta \leq \beta_c$ at $\gamma = -0.2$) we obtain a satisfactory description of the masses (dashed curves). But in this case the results η_j are not very stable with respect to the choice of β_c , e.g. varying $\beta_c = 1.4223 \pm 0.0002$ results in a variation of $\eta_g = 0.05 \pm 0.02$.

It is thus possible that for data in the critical region the results are consistent with an essential singularity. However, establishing the existence of such a singularity would need much larger correlation lengths.

5 Comparison of the results at $\gamma = -0.2$ and $\gamma = -0.5$ and conclusions

We have compared the scaling of the gauge-ball masses when the phase transition is approached at $\gamma = -0.5$ from the confinement phase with the analogous results obtained at $\gamma = -0.2$ [1]. Both the critical exponents and the amplitudes ratios of the GB masses which are expected to show a universal behaviour at a second order phase transition, have fully compatible values at both γ .

So it is most probable that the results obtained for the scaling of GB masses reflect properties of the line of deconfinement phase transitions in the parameter space (β, γ) of the extended Wilson action in a region of values $\gamma \leq -0.2$. The most natural explanation of this universality would be the presence of a continuous phase transition in the coupling parameter space not far from, though not necessarily at the points we have investigated. Its localization may finally require the introduction of additional coupling parameters outside the (β, γ) plane of the extended Wilson action.

This is to be compared with other attempts to explain the occurrence of two distinct critical exponents. Certain scenarios (called T_g and T_{ng} in [1]) in which the cross-over near a tricritical point is responsible for the different exponents observed in non-vanishing distance from the critical line, are most probably ruled out as such an effect should be γ -dependent.

The scenario suggested in [3], in which ν_{ng} is some effective value of ν which decreases to $1/4$ as the phase transition is approached, is not supported (but also not excluded) by our stability analysis. In any case $\nu_{\text{g}} \simeq 0.5$ is far away from the value $1/4 = 1/d$ expected for a first order transition.

Of course, future work on larger lattices may disclose new facts. The question whether there is a certain range of parameters in which the phase transition is of second order is still open. However, our results obtained for the gauge-ball masses as small as 0.2 in lattice units are fully consistent with this possibility.

Acknowledgements

The computations have been performed on the Cray-T90 of HLRZ Jülich. J.J. and H.P. thank HLRZ Jülich for hospitality. The work was supported by DFG.

References

- [1] J. Cox, W. Franzki, J. Jersák, C. B. Lang, T. Neuhaus, and P. W. Stephenson, *Nucl. Phys.* **B499** (1997) 371.
- [2] I. Campos, A. Cruz, and A. Tarancón, *Phys. Lett.* **424B** (1998) 328.
- [3] I. Campos, A. Cruz, and A. Tarancón, *Nucl. Phys.* **B528** (1998) 325.
- [4] J. Cox, T. Neuhaus, and H. Pfeiffer, *Study of the order of the phase transition in pure $U(1)$ gauge theory with Villain action*, contribution to the conference Lattice '98.
- [5] J. Jersák, C. B. Lang, and T. Neuhaus, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77** (1996) 1933.
- [6] J. Jersák, C. B. Lang, and T. Neuhaus, *Phys. Rev.* **D54** (1996) 6909.
- [7] K. I. Kondo, *Existence of confinement phase in quantum electrodynamics*, hep-th/9803133.
- [8] C. B. Lang and P. Petreczky, *Phys. Lett.* **387B** (1996) 558.
- [9] H. G. Evertz, J. Jersák, T. Neuhaus, and P. M. Zerwas, *Nucl. Phys.* **B251** [FS13] (1985) 279.
- [10] G. Bhanot, *Nucl. Phys.* **B205** [FS5] (1982) 168.
- [11] M. Teper, *Phys. Lett.* **183B** (1986) 345.
- [12] C. Michael and M. Teper, *Nucl. Phys.* **B314** (1989) 347.
- [13] B. Berg and A. Billoire, *Nucl. Phys.* **B221** (1983) 109.
- [14] C. Michael, *Acta Phys. Pol.* **B21** (1990) 119.