# Perturbative Infra-red physics of Yang-Mills theories

ANDRÉAS TRESMONTANT<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Astro-Particule et Cosmologie, Université Denis Diderot, <sup>2</sup>Laboratoire de Physique Théorique de la Matière Condensée, Université Pierre et Marie Curie

# ABSTRACT

We investigate the infra-red properties of Yang-Mills correlators in a novel Gribov-ambiguity-free class of non-linear covariant gauges. These family of one-parameter gauges (indexed by  $\xi$  below) are continuously connected to the well-studied Landau gauge, and provide a non-perturbative generalization of the Curci-Ferrari-Delbourgo-Jarvis gauges, that might be amenable to lattice simulations. We explicitly compute at one-loop order in perturbation theory the gluon and ghost propagator, as well as the renormalization group flows, down to the deep infra-red regime. In particular, we show that there exists infra-red safe trajectories with no Landau pole, we find that both the gluon and ghost propagators develop a mass gap and that even in non-Landau gauge the gluon propagator is transverse.

# MOTIVATION

### Lifting the Gribov ambiguity:

It is well known that the standard Faddeev-Popov gauge fixing procedure, used to quantize Yang-Mills theories, is plagued by the existence of Gribov copies. Recently, a novel approach was proposed in [1] based on averaging over the Gribov copies, leading to a gauge-fixed Yang-Mills action free of Gribov ambiguities and with effectively massive gluons. Firsts studies were performed in the particular case of the Landau gauge within this gauge-fixed action.

### Landau gauge:

• There exists infra-red safe trajectories allowing perturbative development down to the deep infra-red regime. See left figure,  $\tilde{m} = \frac{m}{\mu}$  with m the gluon mass,  $\mu$  the RG scale, g the coupling constant.





• One-loop perturbative computations of ghost and gluon propagators are in remarkable agreement with lattice simulations. See right figure, G(p) is the gluon propagator.

m

One-loop RG flow in the plane  $(\tilde{m}, g)$ . The arrows point toward the infra-red [1].

Blue points: lattice results [4]. Red curve: one-loop perturbative computations [3].

These exciting results motivate the study outside the Landau gauge in order to investigate the possible gauge dependent effects in the infra-red.

## **GLUON AND GHOST PROPAGATORS** COMPUTED AT ONE-LOOP

We display the gluon and ghost propagators computed at one-loop order in perturbation theory with renormalization group improvement. The computations are performed within these new one-parameter,  $\xi$ , gauges (see below). We defined the RG initial conditions at  $\mu_0 = 1$  Gev and we show our results for various  $\xi(\mu_0) \equiv \xi_i$ .



## **Gluon propagator:**

• Transverse even in non-Landau gauge

• Massive

# **Ghosts propagator**

**PERSPECTIVES** 

• Develops mass gap  $\propto \xi$ 



# **INFRA-RED SAFE TRAJECTORIES**

RG initial conditions:  $\mu_0 = 1$  Gev,  $g(\mu_0) = 3.7$ .



# **THE GAUGE FIXING PROCEDURE**

## Gauge condition:

In order to fix the gauge, we consider the functional

## Lifting the Gribov ambiguities:

We define the vacuum expectation values for any operator  $\mathcal{O}[A]$  from a Once the Gribov degeneracy has been lifted for each individual gauge

#### **Replica :**

 $\mathcal{H}[A,\eta,U] = \int_{\mathcal{T}} \operatorname{tr}\left[\left(A^{U}_{\mu}\right)^{2} + \frac{U^{\dagger}\eta + \eta^{\dagger}U}{2}\right]$ 

where  $\eta$  is an arbitrary  $N \times N$  matrix field and  $A^U_{\mu}$  is the gauge transform of  $A_{\mu}$  with a gauge element  $U \in SU(N)$ . We define our gauge condition as (one of) the extrema of  $\mathcal{H}$  with respect to U.

This is a slight generalization of the Landau gauge case (recovered for  $\eta = 0$ , where many lattice studies are performed [5]) and therefore standard extemization techniques, e.g. the Los Alamos algorithm [6], might be applicable to the present proposal, allowing lattice studies outside the Landau gauge.

Following the standard Faddeev-Popov procedure, and averaging over  $\eta$  with a weight

 $\mathcal{P}[\eta] = \mathcal{N} \exp\left(-\frac{g_0^2}{4\xi_0} \int_{x} \operatorname{tr} \eta^{\dagger} \eta\right),$ 

leads to a gauge-fixing action:

$$S_{\rm CFDJ}[A,c,\bar{c},h] = \int_x \left\{ \partial_\mu \bar{c}^a D_\mu c^a + ih^a \partial_\mu A^a_\mu + \xi_0 \left[ \frac{(h^a)^2}{2} - \frac{g_0}{2} f^{abc} ih^a \bar{c}^b c^c - \frac{g_0^2}{4} \left( f^{abc} \bar{c}^b c^c \right)^2 \right] \right\}$$

that corresponds to the Curci-Ferrari-Delbourgo-Jarvis gauges. However, these gauge-fixings suffer from Gribov ambiguities due to the presence of Gribov copies that correspond to extrema  $U_i \equiv U_i[A, \eta]$  of two-steps averaging procedure:  $\langle \mathcal{O}[A] \rangle$ .  $\langle \mathcal{O}[A] \rangle$  is an average over Gribov copies and over the "noise" field  $\eta$ :

$$\langle \mathcal{O}[A] \rangle = \frac{\int \mathcal{D}\eta \mathcal{P}[\eta] \sum_{i} \mathcal{O}[A^{U_i}] s(i) e^{-\beta_0 \mathcal{H}[A,\eta,U_i]}}{\int \mathcal{D}\eta \mathcal{P}[\eta] \sum_{i} s(i) e^{-\beta_0 \mathcal{H}[A,\eta,U_i]}},$$

where the sums run over all Gribov copies, s(i) is the sign of the functional determinant of the Faddeev-Popov operator evaluated at  $U = U_i$  and  $\beta_0$  is a free parameter which controls the lifting of degeneracy between Gribov copies according to the value of the functional  $\mathcal{H}[A,\eta,U_i].$ 

In particular we have for a gauge invariant operator that:  $\langle \mathcal{O}_{inv}[A] \rangle = \mathcal{O}_{inv}[A].$ 

This average over the Gribov copies can be cast into a functional integral formulation

$$\langle \mathcal{O}[A] \rangle = \frac{\int \mathcal{D}\mathcal{V}O[A^U] e^{-S_{\rm CF}[A,\mathcal{V}]}}{\int \mathcal{D}\mathcal{V} e^{-S_{\rm CF}[A,\mathcal{V}]}},$$

that involves the Curci-Ferrari action (see below),  $S_{CF}[A, V]$ . Using a super matrix field  $\mathcal{V}$ 

$$\mathcal{V}(x,\theta,\bar{\theta}) = \exp\left\{ig_0\left(\bar{\theta}c + \bar{c}\theta + \bar{\theta}\theta\hat{h}\right)\right\}U,$$

defined on a super space parametrized by two Grassmannian coordinates  $\underline{\theta} = (\theta, \overline{\theta})$  with metric  $g^{MN}$  defined as  $g^{\theta\theta} = -g^{\theta\theta} = \beta_0 \overline{\theta} \theta - 1$ , the Curci-Ferrari action takes the very compact form:

field configuration, we average over the latter with the Yang-Mills weight (denoted by an overall bar):

$$\overline{\langle \mathcal{O}[A] \rangle} = \frac{\int \mathcal{D}A \, \langle \mathcal{O}[A] \rangle \, e^{-S_{\rm YM}[A]}}{\int \mathcal{D}A \, e^{-S_{\rm YM}[A]}}$$

Note however that the denominator in Eq.(1) depends explicitly on the field configuration A, and therefore it is a non trivial task to formulate this two-steps average  $\langle \mathcal{O}[A] \rangle$  as a functional integral with one local action.

This can be efficiently done using the replica trick, that is making use of the identity

$$\frac{1}{\int \mathcal{D}\mathcal{V} \, e^{-S_{\mathrm{CF}}[A,\mathcal{V}]}} = \lim_{n \to 0} \int \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \left( \mathcal{D}\mathcal{V}_k \, e^{-S_{\mathrm{CF}}[A,\mathcal{V}_k]} \right).$$

The resulting Lagrangian is the one we used for our perturbative computations:

(1)

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{4} \left( F^a_{\mu\nu} \right)^2 + \partial_\mu \bar{c}^a D_\mu c^a + \beta_0 \left( \frac{1}{2} (A^a_\mu)^2 + \xi_0 \bar{c}^a c^a \right) + i h^a \partial_\mu A^a_\mu + \xi_0 \left[ \frac{(h^a)^2}{2} - \frac{g_0}{2} f^{abc} i h^a \bar{c}^b c^c - \frac{g_0^2}{4} \left( f^{abc} \bar{c}^b c^c \right)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{g_0^2} \sum_{k=2}^n \int_{\underline{\theta}_k} \operatorname{tr} \left\{ D_\mu \mathcal{V}^\dagger_k D_\mu \mathcal{V}_k + \frac{\xi_0}{2} g^{MN} \partial_N \mathcal{V}^\dagger_k \partial_M \mathcal{V}_k \right\}.$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{SUSY}$$

 $S_{\rm CF}[A,\mathcal{V}] = \frac{1}{g_0^2} \int_{x,\theta} \operatorname{tr} \left\{ D_{\mu} \mathcal{V}^{\dagger} D_{\mu} \mathcal{V} + \frac{\xi_0}{2} g^{MN} \partial_N \mathcal{V}^{\dagger} \partial_M \mathcal{V} \right\}, \qquad \text{In particular at the bare level, each replica contributes to the gluon square mass } n\beta_0.$ square mass a factor  $\beta_0$  leading to an effective gluon square mass  $n\beta_0$ . The ghosts are effectively massive outside the Landau gauge, with a tree level square mass  $\xi_0\beta_0$ 

### the functional $\mathcal{H}[A, \eta, U]$ for given A and $\eta$ .



## **RENORMALIZATION**

The previous gauge-fixed Lagrangian was shown to be renormalizable to all orders of perturbation theory [2] independently of the way the limit  $n \to 0$ , induced by the replica, is taken. We therefore have considered renormalization schemes in which

$$n\beta_0 = Z_{m^2}m^2 \ \xi_0 = Z_{\xi}\xi_R n$$

such that the two tree level renormalized square masses survive to the  $n \rightarrow 0$  limit. As a consequence, the gluon propagator remains transverse even in non-Landau gauge, and the theory presents infra-red safe renormalization group trajectories.

## The formulation of the gauge condition derived as an extremization of the functional $\mathcal{H}$ is a slight generalization of the one routinely employed in the Landau gauge where lattice simulations are performed. We therefore expect (see [2]), that the present proposal is amenable to lattice simulations. This would provide non perturbative computations outside the Landau gauge to which we could compare our predictions.

On the other hand, our two-steps averaging procedure allows the computations of new quantities such that correlations between different gauge orbits

 $\overline{\langle A \rangle \langle A \rangle} = \overline{\langle AA \rangle} + \overline{\langle A\partial \Lambda \rangle} + \dots$ 

that involve non trivial correlators of the super-symmetric fields. We thus believe that information on Gribov copies might be encoded in the super-symmetric sector of our theory, which is currently under studies.

# REFERENCES

- [1] J. Serreau and M. Tissier, Phys. Lett. B, 712 (2012), 97
- [2] J. Serreau, M. Tissier, A. Tresmontant arXiv:1307.6019, (2013)
- [3] M. Tissier, N. Wschebor Phys. Rev. D, 84 (2011), 045018
- [4] A. Cucchieri and T. Mendes, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100 (2008), 241601
- [5] A. Cucchieri, T. Mendes and E. M. S. Santos, Phys. Rev.Lett. 103 (2009), 141602.
- [6] R. Gupta, G. Guralnik, G. Kilcup, A. Patel, R. S. Sharpe and T. Warnock, Phys. Rev. D, 36 (1987), 2813.