

Non-Zero Magnetic Screening Mass in QED and QCD at One Loop Level in Non-Equilibrium

Fred Cooper,^{1,*} Chung-Wen Kao,^{2,†} and Gouranga C. Nayak^{3,‡}

¹*T-8, Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA*

²*Theoretical Physics Group, Department of Physics and Astronomy,
University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK*

³*T-8, Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA*

(Dated: November 20, 2018)

Abstract

Using the Schwinger-Keldysh closed time path integral formalism we show that the magnetic screening mass in QED and QCD at one loop level is non-zero as long as the single particle distribution function $f(\vec{k})$ is non-isotropic, *i.e.* it depends on the direction of the momentum. For isotropic distribution functions such as those corresponding to thermal equilibrium the magnetic screening mass at one loop level is found to be zero which is consistent with finite temperature field theory. The non-zero magnetic screening mass in non-isotropic non-equilibrium situations has fundamental importance in that it acts as a natural cut-off to remove infrared divergences in the magnetic sector. Thus it allows one to avoid infrared problems which previously made it difficult to use a transport theory approach using perturbative QCD or QED scattering kernels to study the thermalization of a QED or QCD plasma.

PACS numbers: PACS: 12.38.-t, 12.38.Cy, 12.38.Mh, 11.10.Wx

*Electronic address: fcooper@lanl.gov

†Electronic address: kao@a35.ph.man.ac.uk

‡Electronic address: nayak@shakti.lanl.gov

I. INTRODUCTION

An important problem to be understood in QED and QCD plasmas is how an out of equilibrium plasma thermalizes. This problem is quite important in the case of the QCD plasma produced at the RHIC and the LHC [1] because the system lives for few fm/c after which it hadronizes. As the system is very short lived there is some doubt as to whether the system thermalizes and it is important to know the thermalization time scales of the various components of the plasma. As two nuclei collide almost at the speed of light the initial system of quarks and gluons is highly out of equilibrium. Only after many secondary collisions might this parton system reach local thermal equilibrium before hadronization. Thus there is a competition between the expansion which causes cooling and leads to the phase transition into hadrons, and the equilibration time scales. As all the signatures for quark-gluon plasma detection depend on the non-equilibrium space-time evolution of the partons at RHIC and LHC [2], it is essential to understand the process of the equilibration of partons in conditions found at these experiments.

Due to the impracticality of solving directly using QCD the coupled Schwinger Dyson equations of field theory, the alternative is to solve the relativistic Boltzmann equation:

$$p^\mu \partial_\mu f(x, p) = C(x, p), \quad (1)$$

in the absence of any classical background field [3], in order to study the thermalization of a QED or QCD plasma. In the above equation $f(x, p)$ is the single particle distribution function and $C(x, p)$ is the Boltzmann collision term describing the secondary collisions. The Boltzmann collision term is given by:

$$C(x, p) = \int \frac{d^3 p_2}{(2\pi)^3 p_2^0} \int \frac{d^3 p_3}{(2\pi)^3 p_3^0} \int \frac{d^3 p_4}{(2\pi)^3 p_4^0} |M(pp_2 \rightarrow p_3 p_4)|^2 (2\pi)^4 \delta^4(p + p_2 - p_3 - p_4) [f(x, p_4)f(x, p_3)(1 \pm f(x, p_2))(1 \pm f(x, p)) - f(x, p_2)f(x, p)(1 \pm f(x, p_4))(1 \pm f(x, p_3))]. \quad (2)$$

In the above expression $M(pp_2 \rightarrow p_3 p_4)$ is the matrix element for the $pp_2 \rightarrow p_3 p_4$ collisions, $(1 \pm f)$ is due to Bose enhancement/Fermi suppression factor. Once the initial distribution function is known one can solve this equation to study the thermalization of the system. However, there is a severe infrared divergence problem that must be overcome before solving the above transport equation. The infrared divergence comes from the matrix element squared $|M(pp_2 \rightarrow p_3 p_4)|^2$ when the momentum transfer: $Q^2 = (p - p_3)^2 \rightarrow 0$. This divergence occurs at small angle scattering in perturbative QED or QCD. One way to solve this

problem is to insert ad-hoc momentum transfer cut-off values in the integrations. However, the results are quite sensitive to the values of these ad-hoc cut-offs. A more satisfactory solution is to use a medium modified resummed propagator to evaluate the scattering matrix elements squared: $|M(pp_2 \rightarrow p_3p_4)|^2$ [4]. In this way the medium dependent screening masses act as a natural cut-off for the infrared divergences. The calculation of the screening mass taking into account the contribution of all loops is an extremely difficult task and one therefore limits the calculation to the one or two-loop level. Although the Debye screening mass has been shown to be non-zero in equilibrium at one loop order, the magnetic screening mass is zero at one loop as shown by one loop calculations using finite temperature field theory methods [5, 6, 7]. Hence a general supposition has been that even if the electric field is screened the magnetic field is not screened at one loop level and thus one has an infrared problem to contend with in that approximation.

In this paper we show that this supposition is not necessarily true. We find that the magnetic field is screened at the one loop level as long as the medium is non-isotropic. Since parton model considerations lead to non-isotropic initial conditions for the plasma, this leads to a natural solution to the infrared problem. All the earlier calculations done [5, 6, 7] assumed either equilibrium or isotropic distribution functions. We will show that the magnetic screening mass in QED and QCD at one loop level is non-zero for non-isotropic non-equilibrium situations. Hence there seems to be no natural infrared problem in non-equilibrium non-isotropic situations. This solves the problem of having infrared divergences in transport approaches which study the thermalization of non-equilibrium QED and QCD plasmas. Of course one expects that an exact study would provide non-perturbative effects of similar magnitude to the contribution to the magnetic mass due to non-isotropic effects. These effects are beyond the scope of this paper.

The paper is organized as follows: In section II we derive the one loop magnetic and Debye screening mass formula in QED and QCD by using the closed-time path (CTP) formalism [8]. We summarize and conclude our main results in section III.

II. MAGNETIC SCREENING MASS IN QED AND QCD AT ONE LOOP LEVEL

In this section we will derive the magnetic and Debye screening mass in QED and QCD at the one loop level. In case of QCD we will determine only the quark loop contribution in this




FIG. 1: One Loop Graphs for the Gluon (Photon) Self-Energy With Quark (Electron) Loop.

paper. The gluon loop contribution to these screening masses was discussed in a previous paper [13] and we will combine these two results to discuss the total one loop contribution later. As we are interested in the infrared properties we will consider the infrared limit to define magnetic and Debye screening masses [9]: *i.e.* we will take

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_D^2 &= \text{Re}\Pi^L(p_0 = 0, |\vec{p}| \rightarrow 0) \quad \text{and} \\
 m_g^2 &= \text{Re}\Pi^T(p_0 = 0, |\vec{p}| \rightarrow 0),
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3}$$

where Π^L, Π^T are the longitudinal and transverse component of the self energy as defined below and Re means the real part of the self energy. The imaginary part of the self energy gives the damping rates [5, 7].

A. Magnetic Screening Mass in QED at One Loop Level

The diagram for the photon self energy in QED at one loop level is shown in Fig. 1. The retarded self energy part can be written as [7]:

$$\Pi_R^{\mu\nu}(p) = ie^2 \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \text{Tr}[\gamma^\mu S_{11}(k-p)\gamma^\nu S_{11}(k) - \gamma^\mu S_{21}(k-p)\gamma^\nu S_{12}(k)],
 \tag{4}$$

where 1, 2 correspond to +, - contour of the closed-time path.

In this paper we will consider massless fermions since the infrared divergence problems occur in the massless limit. The fermion propagators S can be written as $S_{ij}(k) = \not{k} \Delta_{ij}(k)$ where $\Delta_{ij}(k)$ are defined below. Expressing the results in terms of retarded, advanced and

symmetric propagators we get from the above equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_R^{\mu\nu}(p) = \frac{ie^2}{2} \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \text{Tr}[\gamma^\mu(\not{k}-\not{p})\gamma^\nu\not{k}] & [\Delta_S(k-p)\Delta_R(k) + \Delta_A(k-p)\Delta_S(k) \\ & + \Delta_A(k-p)\Delta_A(k) + \Delta_R(k-p)\Delta_R(k)], \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{A/R}(k) &= \frac{1}{k^2 \pm i \text{sgn}(k_0)\epsilon} \quad \text{and} \\ \Delta_S(k) &= -2\pi i \delta(k^2) [1 - 2\theta(k_0)f(\vec{k}) - 2\theta(-k_0)f(-\vec{k})]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

In the above equations $f(\vec{k})$ is the non-equilibrium distribution function which must satisfy the constraint of yielding a finite number and energy density upon integration. As we are interested in studying the properties of the medium we will neglect the vacuum part of the self energy from the above equation. The divergence in the vacuum part of the self energy is absorbed in the redefinition of the bare quantities. We consider here only the terms which are proportional to the distribution function: we will not consider the combination $\Delta_R\Delta_R$ and $\Delta_A\Delta_A$ in eq. (5). After performing the trace in eq. (5) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_R^{\mu\nu}(p) = 2ie^2 \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} & [(k-p)^\mu k^\nu + k^\mu(k-p)^\nu - g^{\mu\nu}(k-p) \cdot k] \\ & \cdot [\Delta_S(k-p)\Delta_R(k) + \Delta_A(k-p)\Delta_S(k)]. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

In the rest frame of the medium the longitudinal and transverse components of the self energies are given by [7, 12]:

$$\Pi^L(p) = L_{00}(p)\Pi^{00}(p) \quad \text{with} \quad L_{00}(p) = -\frac{|\vec{p}|^2}{p^2}; \quad (8)$$

and

$$\Pi^T(p) = \frac{1}{2}T_{ij}(p)\Pi^{ij}(p) \quad \text{with} \quad T_{ij}(p) = -\delta_{ij} + \frac{p_i p_j}{|\vec{p}|^2}, \quad (9)$$

where we have assumed that we are interested in a static limit ($p_0=0$ and $|\vec{p}| \rightarrow 0$) so that we have contracted only with L_{00} and T_{ij} in the above. If we do not consider the static limit we have to consider more combinations in the above equations [12].

Let us first consider the transverse component $\Pi_R^T(p)$ of the self energy:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_R^T(p) = \frac{1}{2}(-\delta_{ij} + \frac{p_i p_j}{|\vec{p}|^2})\Pi_R^{ij}(p) &= ie^2 \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} [(-\delta_{ij} + \frac{p_i p_j}{|\vec{p}|^2}) \\ & ((k-p)^i k^j + k^i(k-p)^j - g^{ij}(k-p) \cdot k)] [\Delta_S(k-p)\Delta_R(k) + \Delta_A(k-p)\Delta_S(k)]. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Simplifying the above equation we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_R^T(p) = & -2ie^2 \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} [(k_0 - p_0)k_0 - (\vec{k} \cdot \hat{p})(\hat{p} \cdot (\vec{k} - \vec{p}))] \\ & [\Delta_S(k-p)\Delta_R(k) + \Delta_A(k-p)\Delta_S(k)]. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Using the expressions for Δ from eq. (6) and taking the real part we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}\Pi_R^T(p) = & -2ie^2 \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} [(k_0 - p_0)k_0 - (\vec{k} \cdot \hat{p})(\hat{p} \cdot (\vec{k} - \vec{p}))] \\ & \{[\frac{-2\pi i \delta((k-p)^2)}{k^2} [1 - 2\theta(k_0 - p_0)f(\vec{k} - \vec{p}) - 2\theta(-k_0 + p_0)f(-\vec{k} + \vec{p})] \\ & + \frac{-2\pi i \delta(k^2)}{(k-p)^2} [1 - 2\theta(k_0)f(\vec{k}) - 2\theta(-k_0)f(-\vec{k})]]\}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Setting $p_0 = 0$ and again dropping the terms which does not involve the distribution function (the vacuum contribution) we get from the above equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}\Pi_R^T(p_0 = 0, \vec{p}) = & 8\pi e^2 \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} [(k_0^2 - (\vec{k} \cdot \hat{p})(\hat{p} \cdot (\vec{k} - \vec{p})))] \\ & \{[\frac{\delta(k_0^2 - |\vec{k} - \vec{p}|^2)}{k_0^2 - |\vec{k}|^2} [\theta(k_0)f(\vec{k} - \vec{p}) + \theta(-k_0)f(-\vec{k} + \vec{p})] \\ & + \frac{\delta(k_0^2 - |\vec{k}|^2)}{(k_0^2 - |\vec{k} - \vec{p}|^2)} [\theta(k_0)f(\vec{k}) + \theta(-k_0)f(-\vec{k})]]\}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

More simplification can be done by using the δ function integration which yield:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}\Pi_R^T(p_0 = 0, \vec{p}) = & \frac{4\pi e^2}{(2\pi)^4} \int \frac{d^3k}{|\vec{k}|^2 - |\vec{k} - \vec{p}|^2} \\ & \{[-|\vec{k} - \vec{p}|^2 + (\vec{k} \cdot \hat{p})(\hat{p} \cdot (\vec{k} - \vec{p}))] \left(\frac{f(\vec{k} - \vec{p}) + f(-\vec{k} + \vec{p})}{|\vec{k} - \vec{p}|} \right) \\ & + [|\vec{k}|^2 - (\vec{k} \cdot \hat{p})(\hat{p} \cdot (\vec{k} - \vec{p}))] \left(\frac{f(\vec{k}) + f(-\vec{k})}{|\vec{k}|} \right) \}]. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

In the limit $|\vec{p}| \rightarrow 0$ we expand: $f(\vec{k} - \vec{p})$ and $\frac{1}{|\vec{k} - \vec{p}|}$ to the leading order and use: $f(\vec{k} - \vec{p}) \simeq f(\vec{k}) - \vec{p} \cdot \nabla_k f(\vec{k})$ and $\frac{1}{|\vec{k} - \vec{p}|} \simeq \frac{1}{|\vec{k}|} [1 + \frac{\vec{p} \cdot \vec{k}}{|\vec{k}|^2}]$ in the rest of our calculation. This yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}\Pi_R^T(p_0 = 0, \vec{p}) \simeq & \frac{4\pi e^2}{(2\pi)^4} \int \frac{d^3k}{|\vec{k}|} \frac{1}{2\vec{k} \cdot \vec{p} - |\vec{p}|^2} \{ (2\vec{p} \cdot \vec{k} - |\vec{p}|^2) [f(\vec{k}) + f(-\vec{k})] + \\ & [-|\vec{k}|^2 - |\vec{p}|^2 + 2\vec{p} \cdot \vec{k} + (\vec{k} \cdot \hat{p})^2 - \vec{p} \cdot \vec{k}] \frac{\vec{p} \cdot \vec{k}}{|\vec{k}|^2} [f(\vec{k}) + f(-\vec{k})] - \\ & (1 + \frac{\vec{p} \cdot \vec{k}}{|\vec{k}|^2}) [-|\vec{k}|^2 - |\vec{p}|^2 + 2\vec{p} \cdot \vec{k} + (\vec{k} \cdot \hat{p})^2 - \vec{p} \cdot \vec{k}] [\vec{p} \cdot \nabla_k f(\vec{k}) + \vec{p} \cdot \nabla_k f(-\vec{k})] \}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Taking the limit $|\vec{p}| \rightarrow 0$ we get:

$$m_g^2(\hat{p}) = \text{Re}\Pi_R^T(p_0 = 0, |\vec{p}| \rightarrow 0, \hat{p}) = e^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[[1 + (\hat{p} \cdot \hat{k})^2] \left[\frac{f(\vec{k}) + f(-\vec{k})}{|\vec{k}|} \right] + [1 - (\hat{p} \cdot \hat{k})^2] \left[\frac{\hat{p} \cdot \nabla_k}{\hat{p} \cdot \hat{k}} f(\vec{k}) + \frac{\hat{p} \cdot \nabla_k}{\hat{p} \cdot \hat{k}} f(-\vec{k}) \right] \right]. \quad (16)$$

After changing $\vec{k} \rightarrow -\vec{k}$ in the $f(-\vec{k})$ part of the integration we get:

$$m_g^2(\hat{p}) = 2e^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[[1 + (\hat{p} \cdot \hat{k})^2] \frac{f(\vec{k})}{|\vec{k}|} + [1 - (\hat{p} \cdot \hat{k})^2] \left[\frac{\hat{p} \cdot \nabla_k}{\hat{p} \cdot \hat{k}} f(\vec{k}) \right] \right]. \quad (17)$$

This is the expression for the magnetic screening mass in QED at one loop level in terms of the non-isotropic non-equilibrium distribution function $f(\vec{k})$. For any equilibrium distribution function $f(\vec{k}) = f_{eq}(k_0)$ we get from the above equation $m_g^2 = 0$ which is consistent with finite temperature QED results. It can also be checked that for any isotropic distribution function $f(|\vec{k}|)$ we also get $m_g^2 = 0$. Only for a non isotropic distribution function $f(\vec{k})$ do we get a non-zero magnetic screening mass in QED at one loop level.

B. Magnetic Screening Mass in QCD at One Loop Level

First of all consider the situation of the quark loop contribution to the gluon self energy (see Fig. 1). The only difference between the contribution to the gluon self energy from a quark loop and the photon self energy with an electron loop is a factor of $\frac{d_{ab}}{2}$ which comes from $\text{Tr}[T^a T^b]$ associated with the quark-gluon vertex. Hence the quark loop contribution to the magnetic mass coming from the gluon self energy is given by:

$$m_g^2(\hat{p}) = g^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[[1 + (\hat{p} \cdot \hat{k})^2] \frac{f_q(\vec{k})}{|\vec{k}|} + [1 - (\hat{p} \cdot \hat{k})^2] \left[\frac{\hat{p} \cdot \nabla_k}{\hat{p} \cdot \hat{k}} f_q(\vec{k}) \right] \right] \quad (18)$$

where $f_q(\vec{k})$ is the quark distribution function. This expression is similar to the expression found in our earlier work [13] where we have considered the gluon loop contributions (see Fig. 2) in covariant gauge in the frozen ghost formalism [10, 11, 12]. In the frozen ghost formalism [10, 11, 12], the gluon self energy is obtained from the gluon loop and tadpole loop as shown in Fig. 2. In this formalism the ghost does not contribute to the medium effect because the initial density of states are chosen to be that of the physical gluons. It can be seen that apart from color factors the expression for the magnetic screening mass of quark




FIG. 2: One Loop Graphs for the Gluon Self-Energy with Gluon Loop and Tadpole Diagrams

and gluon loops are the same. (Here we are only considering the contributions proportional to the single particle distribution function. In the vacuum sector, the quark and gluon loops contributions have opposite signs).

Using Eq. (18) and summing over all the quark flavors and then adding the gluon loop contributions from our previous work [13] we obtain the final expression for the magnetic screening mass in QCD:

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_g^2(\hat{p}) = & g^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \{ [1 + (\hat{p} \cdot \hat{k})^2] \left[\frac{N_c f_g(\vec{k}) + \sum_q f_q(\vec{k})}{|\vec{k}|} \right] \right. \\
 & \left. + [1 - (\hat{p} \cdot \hat{k})^2] \left[\frac{\hat{p} \cdot \nabla_k}{\hat{p} \cdot \hat{k}} [N_c f_g(\vec{k}) + \sum_q f_q(\vec{k})] \right] \right\}. \quad (19)
 \end{aligned}$$

This is the expression for the magnetic screening mass in QCD at one loop level in non-equilibrium. For any equilibrium distribution function $f(\vec{k}) = f_{eq}(k_0)$ we get from the above equation $m_g^2 = 0$ which is consistent with finite temperature QCD results. It can also be checked that for any isotropic distribution function $f(|\vec{k}|)$ we also get $m_g^2 = 0$. Only for a non isotropic distribution function $f(\vec{k})$ do we get a non-zero magnetic screening mass in QCD at the one loop level.

C. Debye Screening Mass in QED at One Loop Level

Taking the (00) component of the self energy in eq. (5), using eqs. (8), (3) and carrying out similar algebra as above we obtain the final expression for the Debye screening mass:

$$m_D^2(\hat{p}) = -4e^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\hat{p} \cdot \nabla_k}{\hat{p} \cdot \hat{k}} f(\vec{k}). \quad (20)$$

This is the expression for the Debye screening mass in non-equilibrium at the one loop level in QED in terms of any arbitrary non-isotropic distribution function $f(\vec{k})$ of the electron. For any isotropic distribution function $f(|\vec{k}|)$ we get from the above equation:

$$m_D^2(\hat{p}) = \frac{4e^2}{\pi^2} \int dk k f(k), \quad (21)$$

where $k = |\vec{k}|$. For an equilibrium distribution function the above equation gives:

$$m_D^2 = \frac{e^2 T^2}{3}, \quad (22)$$

which is the same result in QED obtained by using finite temperature QED methods [5, 6, 7].

D. Debye Screening Mass in QCD at One Loop Level

Using the quark-gluon vertex instead of the photon-electron vertex we obtain the following expression for the contribution to the Debye screening mass in QCD from a quark-loop:

$$m_D^2(\hat{p}) = -2g^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\hat{p} \cdot \nabla_k}{\hat{p} \cdot \hat{k}} f_q(\vec{k}). \quad (23)$$

This expression for the Debye screening mass in QCD is valid in non-equilibrium situations for any non-isotropic distribution function $f(\vec{k})$ for a single quark flavor. Adding the gluon loop expression in a covariant gauge from our earlier work [13] and summing over all quark flavors we get:

$$m_D^2(\hat{p}) = -2g^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\hat{p} \cdot \nabla_k}{\hat{p} \cdot \hat{k}} [N_c f_g(\vec{k}) + \sum_q f_q(\vec{k})]. \quad (24)$$

This is our final result for the Debye screening mass in QCD at the one loop level in non-equilibrium for any non-isotropic distribution function $f(\vec{k})$. For isotropic quark and gluon distribution functions the above equation gives:

$$m_D^2(\hat{p}) = \frac{2g^2}{\pi^2} \int dk k [N_c f_g(k) + \sum_q f_q(k)], \quad (25)$$

where $k = |\vec{k}|$. For an equilibrium distribution of quarks and gluons at high temperature the above equation gives:

$$m_D^2 = g^2 T^2 \left[\frac{N_c}{3} + \frac{N_f}{6} \right], \quad (26)$$

which is the same result obtained in QCD by using finite temperature QCD techniques [5, 6, 7].

III. CONCLUSION

Using the Schwinger-Keldysh closed time path integral formalism we have shown that the magnetic screening mass in QED and QCD at one loop level is non-zero as long as the distribution function is non-isotropic, *i.e.* it depends on the direction of the momentum. For isotropic distribution functions such as those describing thermal equilibrium the magnetic screening mass at one loop level is found to be zero which is consistent with finite temperature field theory results in QED and QCD. The non-zero magnetic screening mass in non-isotropic non-equilibrium situations has fundamental importance in that it acts as a natural cut-off to remove infrared divergences in the magnetic sector when we study the thermalization of a QED or QCD plasma using a microscopic transport theory approach. This is particularly important at RHIC and LHC heavy-ion collisions because it is unlikely that partons are thermalized quickly before hadronization. As any ad-hoc infrared cut-off put by hand change the plasma properties, using this natural infrared cutoff we avoid ad-hoc infrared cutoff methods which are sensitive to the cutoff. We can use the Debye screening mass discussed above as the infrared cut-off in the electric sector and the magnetic mass derived in this paper as the infrared cut-off in the magnetic sector. Hence for non-equilibrium QED and QCD plasma descriptions the magnetic screening mass derived in non-equilibrium can be used to remove infrared divergences in the magnetic sector.

A non-equilibrium non-perturbative calculation of the magnetic screening mass is very difficult. However, in [13], we showed that the values of the magnetic screening masses found by using a single particle distribution function obtained from parton model considerations for conditions relevant at RHIC and LHC energies was comparable to screening masses obtained from lattice QCD equilibrium results at the corresponding temperatures. Hence in the absence of non-equilibrium non-perturbative calculations, one can use the one loop level

result derived in this paper to study thermalization of QED and QCD plasma using transport methods.

-
- [1] K. Geiger, Phys. Rep. 280 (1995) 237; X. N. Wang, Phys. Rep. 280 (1997) 287; G. C. Nayak, A. Dumitru, L. McLerran and W. Greiner, Nucl. Phys. A 687 (2001) 457; R. Baier, A. H. Mueller, D. Schiff and D. T. Son, Phys. Lett. B 502 (2001) 51; A. H. Mueller, Phys. Lett. B 475 (2000) 220; R.S. Bhalerao, G.C. Nayak, Phys. Rev. C 61 (2000) 054907; G. C. Nayak and V. Ravishankar, Phys. Rev D55 (1997) 6877; Phys. Rev. C58 (1998) 356.
- [2] K. Geiger and J. I. Kapusta, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 (1993) 1920; X-M Xu, D. Kharzeev, H. Satz and X-N. Wang, Phys. Rev. C53 (1996) 3051; G. C. Nayak, Phys. Lett. B442 (1998) 427; JHEP 9802 (1998) 005, hep-ph/9704281.
- [3] Y. Kluger, J.M. Eisenberg, B. Svetitsky, F. Cooper and E. Motolla, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67 (1991) 2427; Phys. Rev. D45 (1992) 4659; F. Cooper, J. M. Eisenberg, Y. Kluger, E. Motolla and B. Svetitsky, Phys. Rev. D 48 (1993) 190; F. Cooper, hep-ph/9209212; L. McLerran and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 2233; Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 3352; A. Kovner, L. McLerran and H. Weigert, Phys. Rev D 52 (1998) 3809; Phys. Rev. D 52 (1998) 6231; D. D. Dietrich, G. C. Nayak and W. Greiner, Phys. Rev. D64 (2001) 074006; hep-ph/0009178; J. Phys. G28 (2002) 2001; G.C. Nayak, D. D. Dietrich and W. Greiner, Rostock 2000/Trento 2001, Exploring Quark Matter 71-78, hep-ph/0104030; C. D. Roberts and S. M. Schmidt, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 45 Suppl.1:1-103, 2000; J.C.R. Bloch, C. D. Roberts and S. M. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. D61 (2000) 117502; J. C. R. Bloch, *et. al*, Phys. Rev. D (1999) 116011.
- [4] H. Heiselberg, X.N. Wang, Nucl. Phys. B 462:389-414 (1996); J. Ruppert, G. C. Nayak, D. D. Dietrich, H. Stoecker and W. Greiner, Phys. Lett. B520 (2001) 233; J-P. Blaizot and E. Iancu, Phys. Rept. 359 (2002) 355.
- [5] R. D. Pisarski, Phys. Rev. D47 (1993) 5589 and references therein; E. Braaten and R. D. Pisarski, Nucl. Phys. B 339 (1990) 310 and references therein; T. Altherr, Phys. Lett. B341 (1995) 325 and references therein; R. Baier, M. Dirks, K. Redlich and D. Schiff, Phys. Rev. D56 (1997) 2548 and references therein.
- [6] J-P. Blaizot, E. Iancu and R. R. Parwani, Phys. Rev. D52 (1995) 2543.
- [7] M. H. Thoma, hep-ph/0010164, 10 th Jyvaskyla Summer School, Jyvaskyla, Finland, 31 Jul-18

Aug (2000).

- [8] J. Schwinger, J. Math. Phys. **2** (1961) 407; P. M. Bakshi and K. T. Mahanthappa, J. Math. Phys. **4** (1963) 1; **4** (1963) 12; L. V. Keldysh, Zh. Eksp. Teo. Fiz. **47** (1964) 1515; [Sov. Phys. JETP **20** (1965) 1018]; G. Zhou, Z. Su, B. Hao and L. Yu, Phys. Rep. **118** (1985) 1; F. Cooper, hep-th/9504073; hep-ph/9810377;
- [9] A. K. Rebhan, Phys. Rev. D48 (1993) R3967.
- [10] P. V. Landshoff and A. Rebhan, Nucl. Phys. B 383 (1992) 607 and Erratum, *ibid* 406 (1993) 517.
- [11] M. D'Attanasio and M. Pietroni, Nucl. Phys. B 498 (1997) 443.
- [12] C.-W. Kao, G. C. Nayak and W. Greiner, Phys. Rev. D (in press), hep-ph/0102153.
- [13] F. Copper, C.-W. Kao and G. C. Nayak, hep-ph/0204042.