

# ELIMINATING INFRARED DIVERGENCES IN THE PRESSURE

I T Drummond, R R Horgan, P V Landshoff

DAMTP, University of Cambridge\*

*and*

A Rebhan

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Technische Universität Wien, Vienna\*

## Abstract

The pressure of a system in thermal equilibrium is expressed as a mass integral over a sum of thermal propagators. This allows a Dyson resummation and is used to demonstrate that potential infrared divergences are rendered harmless.

The perturbative treatment of finite-temperature quantum field theories involving massless bosonic fields always faces infrared divergences starting at a certain loop order. In the case of the partition function or pressure, these set in at three-loop order in four-dimensional theories. One relatively harmless class of these infrared divergences has to do with the appearance of thermal masses. Repeated self-energy insertions in a closed loop give rise to arbitrarily high powers of products of these thermal masses and massless propagators all with the same momentum. However, once these thermal masses are resummed into the propagators, such infrared divergences are avoided. As a remnant, the resummed perturbative series is found to be nonanalytic in the conventional loop expansion parameter — instead of being organized in, say, powers of coupling constant squared, the series then involves single powers and logarithms of the coupling.

On the other hand, if there are modes for which no thermal masses are generated, there is a different source of infrared divergences at and beyond four-loop order in renormalizable theories. This is the case in nonabelian gauge theories at finite temperature, where perturbation theory fails to produce screening masses for static chromomagnetic fields. Since in nonabelian gauge theories there are vertices connecting exclusively magnetostatic modes, it is generally assumed<sup>[1][2]</sup> that perturbation theory has to stop at three loop order. Perturbation theory seems to be capable only of establishing the matching to the nonperturbative sector, which is that of an effective lower-dimensional gauge theory and which has to be treated by nonperturbative methods, for example on a lattice<sup>[3]</sup>.

An open problem of nonabelian gauge theories at finite temperature is therefore whether something like the generation of a thermal screening mass is indeed the mechanism which removes the infrared divergences of perturbation theory. But in this note we show that, in the case of the pressure, a screening mass is not essential to make the infrared divergences harmless. (Within the ladder approximation, something similar has been put forward as a conjecture in Ref. 4.)

---

\* itd@damtp.cam.ac.uk rrh@damtp.cam.ac.uk pvl@damtp.cam.ac.uk rebhana@tph16.tuwien.ac.at

The pressure at temperature  $T$  is given by

$$P = \frac{T}{V} \log Z \quad (1a)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \log Z = & \frac{1}{2} \text{ (circle) } + \frac{1}{12} \text{ (circle with horizontal line) } + \frac{1}{8} \text{ (two circles) } + \frac{1}{48} \text{ (circle with two horizontal lines) } + \frac{1}{8} \text{ (circle with three lines) } \\ & + \frac{1}{24} \text{ (circle with vertical line) } + \frac{1}{16} \text{ (circle with horizontal line and vertical line) } + \frac{1}{16} \text{ (three circles) } + \frac{1}{8} \text{ (circle with vertical line and horizontal line) } + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (1b)$$

By naive powercounting<sup>[1]</sup>, all the diagrams appear to be dangerous beyond three-loop order, and some of them already at three-loop order (if there are unresummed thermal masses). Since they all can be looked at as some subdiagram(s) inserted in one propagator closed onto itself, one might expect that a Dyson resummation could take them into account. But this expectation is spoiled by mismatching combinatorial factors: making a single self-energy insertion in the first diagram of  $\log Z$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \text{ (circle with black dot) } = & \frac{1}{4} \text{ (circle with horizontal line) } + \frac{1}{4} \text{ (two circles) } + \frac{1}{12} \text{ (circle with two horizontal lines) } + \frac{3}{8} \text{ (circle with three lines) } \\ & + \frac{1}{4} \text{ (circle with vertical line) } + \frac{1}{8} \text{ (three circles) } + \frac{1}{4} \text{ (circle with vertical line and horizontal line) } + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (1c)$$

In the traditional ring-resummation<sup>[5]</sup> method, one considers multiple self-energy insertions. This does give the correct combinatorial factors, but only for those diagrams having at least two self-energy insertions, which is sufficient for eliminating the infrared divergences caused by unresummed thermal mass insertions. The case of only one irreducible self-energy insertion is not covered and so we need some other method to see that there is no infrared problem when there are propagators that are not sufficiently screened.

In the following, we shall derive an unconventional formula for the partition function of a quantum field theory at finite temperature, which has the form of a resummed one-loop quantity, while being exact.

The partition function  $Z$  may be written<sup>[2]</sup> as a path integral:

$$Z(T) = \int \prod_r d\phi_r \exp(iS[\phi, T]) \quad (2)$$

Here, the thermal action is written in terms of unrenormalised fields and couplings:

$$S[\phi, T] = \int_C d^4x \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_r (\partial\phi_r \cdot \partial\phi_r - m_r^2 \phi_r^2) + \mathcal{L}_{INT} \right) \quad (3)$$

In the variant of the real-time thermal field theory we are using, the integration is over all  $\mathbf{x}$  and over the time-contour  $C$  which, in the complex  $t$ -plane, runs along the real axis from  $-\infty$  to  $+\infty$ , back to  $-\infty$ , and then down to  $-\infty - i/T$ . The action has been written as if all the fields  $\phi$  were real scalars;

the modification to the actual case of QCD, with quarks, gluons and ghosts, provides no essential difference to what we are going to do. We do need initially to include a mass for each field; in the end, all the masses will be set at their physical values.

Simply giving masses to gauge fields, even only temporarily, might appear to be a dangerous procedure. Explicit mass terms destroy the gauge invariance. If we want to preserve unitarity, the ghost contribution changes discontinuously when masses are introduced: the massless limit is no longer smooth<sup>[6]</sup>. However, we shall assume that the gauge theory has been gauge fixed first and the only change we shall make is to add masses to all the fields. The mass terms then do not change the total number of degrees of freedom. It does not matter that, in the presence of the masses, the theory is not physical; the masses are just a mathematical device. We discuss this further below.

A simple differentiation with respect to the auxiliary masses gives

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial m_r^2} \log Z = -\frac{1}{2} i Z^{-1} \int \prod_r d\phi_r \left( \int_C d^4x \phi_r^2(x) \right) \exp(iS[\phi, T]) \quad (4a)$$

which is just<sup>[2]</sup>

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial m_r^2} \log Z = -\frac{1}{2} i \left\langle \int_C d^4x \phi_r^2(x) \right\rangle \quad (4b)$$

Here,  $\langle \dots \rangle$  denotes a thermal average. Space-time translation invariance tells us that the thermal average of  $\phi_r^2(x)$  is independent of  $x$ , and so the  $x$  integration is trivial:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial m_r^2} \log Z &= -\frac{V}{2T} \langle \phi_r^2(0) \rangle \\ &= -\frac{V}{2T} \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} D_r^{12}(q, T) \end{aligned} \quad (4c)$$

Here,

$$D_r^{12}(q, T) = \left\langle \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \phi_r(0) \phi_r(x) \right\rangle \quad (5)$$

$D_r^{12}(q, T)$  is an element of the familiar  $2 \times 2$  matrix propagator  $\mathbf{D}_r(q, T)$  of Keldysh-contour<sup>[2],[7]</sup> real-time thermal field theory. This matrix propagator has the general structure<sup>[8][9]</sup>

$$\mathbf{D}_r(q, T) = \mathbf{M}(q^0, T) \begin{pmatrix} i\hat{D}_r(q, T) & 0 \\ 0 & -i\hat{D}_r^*(q, T) \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{M}(q^0, T) \quad (6a)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{D}_r(q, T) &= \frac{1}{q^2 - m_r^2 - \Pi_r(q, T)} \\ \mathbf{M}(\omega, T) &= \sqrt{n(\omega, T)} \begin{pmatrix} e^{|\omega|/2T} & e^{-\omega/2T} \\ e^{\omega/2T} & e^{|\omega|/2T} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (6b)$$

with  $n(\omega, T)$  the Bose distribution

$$n(\omega, T) = \frac{1}{e^{|\omega|/T} - 1} \quad (6c)$$

On multiplying out the matrices in (6) we obtain

$$D_r^{12}(q, T) = -2n(q^0, T) e^{|q^0|/2T} e^{-q^0/2T} \text{Im} \hat{D}_r(q, t) \quad (7)$$

Insertion of (7) into (4) gives, with (1),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial P}{\partial m_r^2} &= - \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} N(q^0, T) I_r(q, T) \\ N(q^0, T) &= \frac{\epsilon(q^0)}{e^{q^0/T} - 1} \\ I_r(q, T) &= -\text{Im} \frac{1}{q^2 - m_r^2 - \Pi_r(q, T)}\end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

Notice that, although we have not written it explicitly, both  $\Pi_r(q, T)$  and therefore  $I_r(q, T)$  depend on all the masses. We assume that the pressure vanishes if all the masses are set to  $\infty$ , because then all the particles are static. In order to complete the calculation of the pressure, we may set all the masses  $m_r$  equal to the same value  $m$ , and integrate. Then the true pressure, for all the masses zero, is

$$P = \sum_r \int_0^\infty dm^2 \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} N(q^0, T) I_r(q, T, m)\tag{9}$$

We have checked explicitly, in the first few orders, that (9) does reproduce the diagrams in (1b) with the correct combinatorial factors. This can be seen by expanding out the Dyson resummed propagators, upon which the mass integral can be eliminated by appropriate partial integrations. This also works for the more precariously looking case of nonabelian gauge theories, where Feynman gauge turns out to be the simplest case to consider. That we are spoiling BRS invariance by giving masses to all fields does not appear to be a problem. This should not come as a surprise, since the diagrammatic expansion in (1b) does not know about BRS. However, we clearly need to have a gauge fixed theory; otherwise even the interaction-free pressure would come out wrong.<sup>[6]</sup>

We now argue that (9) is not infrared divergent. First, it is evident that any infrared divergences that may be present in the self energies  $\Pi_r(q, T, m)$  for some values of its arguments will not cause a divergence in  $P$ ; the Dyson resummation, which puts  $\Pi_r$  into the denominator of  $I_r$ , has seen to this. Rather, what might cause trouble is a zero of the denominator of an  $I_r$ , or of  $N(q^0, T)$ .

What is responsible for the increased sensitivity to the infrared regime at finite temperature is the singularity of  $N(q^0, T)$  at  $q^0 = 0$ . Near  $q^0 = 0$ , it behaves as  $\epsilon(q^0)T/q^0$ . However, this is rendered harmless by  $I_r$ .  $\epsilon(q^0)I_r(q, T)$  is proportional to the spectral density defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_r(q, T) &= \left\langle \int d^4 x e^{iq \cdot x} [\phi_r(x), \phi_r(0)] \right\rangle \\ &= D_r^{21}(q, T) - D_r^{12}(q, T) \\ &= 2\epsilon(q^0) I_r(q, T)\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

and the spectral density vanishes at  $q_0 = 0$ , for  $D_r^{21}(q, T) = e^{q^0/T} D_r^{12}(q, T)$ . In fact, the integral over the singular piece of  $N(q^0, T)$  times the spectral density gives

$$\int \frac{dq^0}{2\pi} \frac{\rho_r(q, T)}{q^0} = - \frac{1}{q^2 - m^2 - \Pi_r(q, T)} \Big|_{q^0=0}.\tag{11}$$

Using this, we can write (9) as

$$P = \frac{1}{2} T \sum_r \int_0^\infty dm^2 \int \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\mathbf{q}^2 + m^2 + \Pi_r(q^0 = 0, \mathbf{q}, T)}$$

$$+ \sum_r \int_0^\infty dm^2 \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} \left( N(q^0, T) - \frac{\epsilon(q^0)T}{q^0} \right) I_r(q, T, m) \quad (12)$$

which separates off what would be identified as the zero-mode contribution in the imaginary-time formalism.

The zero-mode contribution is clearly harmless in the infrared, i.e.  $|\mathbf{q}| \rightarrow 0$ , as long as the number of spatial dimensions is greater than two. This is true even for  $m = 0$  and for the case where  $\Pi_r$  does not furnish a mass term. At  $q^0 = 0$ , one would not expect singularities at real values of  $|\mathbf{q}|$ . Nevertheless, such singularities can appear at some stages of a perturbative evaluation of  $\Pi_r$ . In the magnetostatic sector of QCD, these spacelike singularities have been termed ‘‘Landau ghosts’’<sup>[10]</sup>. These are generally assumed to disappear in more accurate calculations of  $\Pi_r$ , but even so their presence would not introduce divergences in (12). The corresponding singularities are smeared out by the additional integration over  $m^2$ .

Actually, the zero-mode contribution itself is ultraviolet divergent, but this divergence can be avoided by using dimensional regularization<sup>[11]</sup>; otherwise it has to be combined with the second term. Furthermore, there is a logarithmic divergence in the integral over  $m^2$  for large  $m^2$ , but this is merely an artifact of the above separation. In the complete expression (9),  $I_r$  behaves as  $1/m^4$  when  $m^2 \rightarrow \infty$ , assuming that  $\text{Im} \Pi_r$  does not blow up in this limit.

Consider now the singularities that might arise in (12) from a zero in the denominator of an  $I_r$ . Clearly, the denominator can vanish only if  $\Pi_r(q, T, m)$  is real. This will be the case for  $q^0 = 0$ , whereas for nonvanishing  $q_0$  it will happen only in some low order of a perturbative evaluation. Even then,  $\Pi_r$  produces a mass gap (the plasma frequency), which protects us from infrared divergences also when  $m = 0$ , while  $m > 0$  will only improve the infrared behaviour. Moreover, when evaluated through higher orders,  $\Pi_r$  will eventually produce an imaginary part, which removes the singularity from the real axis.

Since, in the form (9), the pressure is manifestly infrared finite, this might provide a better starting point for a correspondingly improved perturbative evaluation of the pressure than standard perturbation theory, which, in nonabelian gauge theories, is expected to have an insurmountable barrier beyond three loop order. In (9), the primary objects to compute are self energy diagrams. As long as these are kept in the denominator of (8), all infrared problems should be eliminated. When this becomes essential, one clearly is going beyond ordinary perturbation theory: the final result will not have a power-series expansion in the coupling. Of course, a practical evaluation of (12) will have to cope with a great number of technical difficulties, but it does seem to offer a way to circumvent the no-go argument against a perturbative approach to the pressure.

*This research is supported in part by the EU Programme ‘‘Human Capital and Mobility’’, Network ‘‘Physics at High Energy Colliders’’, contract CHRX-CT93-0357 (DG 12 COMA), and by PPARC.*

## References

- 1 A D Linde, Phys Lett 96B (1980) 289; D Gross, R Pisarski, L Yaffe, Rev Mod Phys 53 (1981) 43
- 2 M LeBellac, *Thermal field theory*, Cambridge University Press (1996)
- 3 E Braaten, Phys Rev Lett 74 (1995) 2164
- 4 A P de Almeida and J Frenkel, Phys Rev D47 (1993) 640
- 5 J I Kapusta, *Finite-temperature field theory*, Cambridge University Press (1989)
- 6 H van Dam and M Veltman, Nucl Phys B22 (1970) 397
- 7 L V Keldysh, Sov Phys JETP 20 (1965) 1018
- 8 N P Landsman and Ch G van Weert, Physics Reports 145 (1987) 142
- 9 P V Landshoff and A Rebhan, Nucl Phys B410 (1993) 23
- 10 J M Cornwall, W-S Hou, J E King, Phys Lett 153B (1985) 173
- 11 P Arnold and O Espinosa, Phys Rev D47 (1993) 3546