arXiv:hep-ph/0502016v1 2 Feb 2005

Dyson-Schwinger equation in the global color symmetry model

Hongting Yang

Department of Physical Science and Technology, College of Science

Wuhan University of Technology, Wuhan 430070, P.R. China

Abstract

Three kinds of solutions to the Dyson-Schwinger equation in the global color symmetry model are summarized, some calculations on the quark condensate and the tensor susceptibility of QCD vacuum are reported.

PACS: 11.15.Tk; 11.30.Fs; 12.38.Aw; 12.38.Lg

Keywords: Dyson-Schwinger equation; Global color symmetry model; Quark condensate; Tensor susceptibility.

E-mail: yht@mail.whut.edu.cn

The global color symmetry model (GCM) was proposed twenty years ago [1]. As one of the phenomenological models for studying QCD, GCM has been successfully applied to the description of strong interaction physics ([2]-[21]). Based on the solution to the Dyson-Schwinger equation obtained in GCM, recent calculation shows that, the value of the tensor susceptibility of QCD vacuum is much smaller than the earlier estimations obtained by QCD sum rules techniques or from chiral constituent quark model [22]. The various calculations based on this solution verify this conclusion [23]. The great discrepancy in the tensor susceptibility is not removed until the new solution to the Dyson-Schwinger equation is found [24]. Later, based on this new solution, the flavor number dependence of quark condensate and tensor susceptibility of the QCD vacuum is checked [25]. In this work, the two solutions to the Dyson-Schwinger equation will be summarized briefly, and the third solution as well as the corresponding values of quark condensate and tensor susceptibility for different number of flavors will be reported.

The GCM partition function for massless quarks in Euclidean space is

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\rm GCM} = \int \mathcal{D}\bar{q}\mathcal{D}q\mathcal{D}A e^{-S_{\rm GCM}[\bar{q},q,A]}, \tag{1}$$

where the GCM action is

$$S_{\rm GCM}[\bar{q},q,A] = \int {\rm d}x[\bar{q}(x)(\partial\!\!\!/ - ig\!\!\!A)q(x) + \int {\rm d}x{\rm d}y\frac{1}{2}A^a_\mu(x)[D^{ab}_{\mu\nu}(x-y)]^{-1}A^b_\nu(y). \tag{2}$$

Here the gluon 2-point Green's function with Feynman-like gauge is $D^{ab}_{\mu\nu}(x-y) = \delta_{\mu\nu}\delta^{ab}D(x-y)$. The important dynamical characteristics of local color symmetry are included in $D(x-y)$. The phenomenological gluon propagator is treated as the model input parameter and is adjusted to reproduce the pion decay constant $f_\pi = 87$ MeV.

Applying the standard bosonization procedure, the GCM partition function in terms of the bilocal field integration can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\rm GCM} = \int \mathcal{D}\mathcal{B}^\theta \exp\left(-S[\mathcal{B}^\theta]\right), \tag{3}$$

where the action is

$$S[\mathcal{B}^\theta] = -\mathrm{Tr}\,\mathrm{Ln}[G^{-1}] + \int \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y \frac{\mathcal{B}^\theta(x,y)\mathcal{B}^\theta(y,x)}{2g^2 D(x-y)} \tag{4}$$

with the quark inverse Green's function G^{-1} defined as

$$G^{-1}(x,y) = \not{\partial}\delta(x-y) + \Lambda^\theta \mathcal{B}^\theta(x,y)\,. \tag{5}$$

The quantity $\Lambda^\theta = \frac{1}{2}K^a C^b F^c$ arises from Fierz reordering of the current-current interaction

$$\Lambda^\theta_{ji}\Lambda^\theta_{lk} = (\gamma_\mu \frac{\lambda^a}{2})_{jk}(\gamma_\mu \frac{\lambda^a}{2})_{li}\,. \tag{6}$$

Here the Dirac matrix is $K^a = (I_D, i\gamma_5, \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\gamma_\mu, \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5)$, the color matrix is $C^b = (\frac{4}{3}I_c, \frac{i}{\sqrt{3}}\lambda^a_c)$, and the flavor matrices for $N_F = 2$ flavors and $N_F = 3$ flavors are respectively $F^c_{N_F=2} = (\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}I_F, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\vec{\tau}_F)$ and $F^c_{N_F=3} = (\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}I_F, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\lambda^a_F)$.

The vacuum configurations are obtained by minimizing the bilocal action: $\frac{\delta S[\mathcal{B}]}{\delta \mathcal{B}}\Big|_{\mathcal{B}_0} = 0$, which gives

$$\mathcal{B}^\theta_0(x) = g^2 D(x)\mathrm{tr}[G_0(x)\Lambda^\theta]\,. \tag{7}$$

These configurations provide self-energy dressing of the quarks through the definition $\Sigma(p) \equiv \Lambda^\theta \mathcal{B}^\theta_0(p) = i\not{p}[A(p^2)-1] + B(p^2)$. The self-energy functions $A(p^2)$ and $B(p^2)$ satisfy the Dyson-Schwinger equations

$$[A(p^2)-1]p^2 = \frac{8}{3}\int \frac{\mathrm{d}^4q}{(2\pi)^4}\, g^2 D\left((p-q)^2\right)\, \frac{A(q^2)q\cdot p}{q^2A^2(q^2)+B^2(q^2)}\,, \tag{8}$$

$$B(p^2) = \frac{16}{3}\int \frac{\mathrm{d}^4q}{(2\pi)^4}\, g^2 D\left((p-q)^2\right)\, \frac{B(q^2)}{q^2A^2(q^2)+B^2(q^2)}\,. \tag{9}$$

The quark Green's function at $\mathcal{B}^\theta_0$ is given by

$$G_0(x,y) = G_0(x-y) = \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{-i\not{p}A(p^2)+B(p^2)}{p^2A^2(p^2)+B^2(p^2)}e^{ip\cdot(x-y)}\,. \tag{10}$$

One variation of Eqs. (8) and (9) is

$$[A(s)-1]s = \frac{1}{3\pi^3}\int_0^\infty s'\mathrm{d}s'\int_0^\pi \sin^2\chi g^2 D(s,s')\frac{\sqrt{ss'}A(s')\cos\chi}{s'A^2(s')+B^2(s')}\mathrm{d}\chi\,, \tag{11}$$

$$B(s) = \frac{2}{3\pi^3}\int_0^\infty s'\mathrm{d}s'\int_0^\pi \sin^2\chi g^2 D(s,s')\frac{B(s')}{s'A^2(s')+B^2(s')}\mathrm{d}\chi\,, \tag{12}$$

where $s=p^2$, and $g^2D(s,s')=g^2D(s+s'-2\sqrt{ss'}\cos\chi)$. With this solution, we found the value of tensor susceptibility of QCD vacuum is very small [22, 23]. The second variation of Eqs. (8) and (9) is

$$A(s) \equiv 1 \tag{13}$$

$$B(s) = \frac{1}{3\pi^2}\int_0^\infty \frac{s'B(s')}{s'+B^2(s')}g^2D(s+s')\mathrm{d}s' \,. \tag{14}$$

With this solution, the great discrepancy in the value of QCD vacuum tensor susceptibility is removed [24, 25]. In general, Eqs. (8) and (9) have the third variation

$$[A(s)-1]s = \frac{1}{12\pi^2}\int_0^\infty s'\mathrm{d}s'\int_0^\pi \sin\varphi g^2D(s,s')\frac{\sqrt{ss'}A(s')\cos\varphi}{s'A^2(s')+B^2(s')}\mathrm{d}\varphi \,, \tag{15}$$

$$B(s) = \frac{1}{6\pi^2}\int_0^\infty s'\mathrm{d}s'\int_0^\pi \sin\varphi g^2D(s,s')\frac{B(s')}{s'A^2(s')+B^2(s')}\mathrm{d}\varphi \,, \tag{16}$$

where $g^2D(s,s')=g^2D(s+s'-2\sqrt{ss'}\cos\varphi)$. As in Ref. [1], the hadron properties follow from considering deviations from these vacuum configurations. If only the isoscalar $\sigma(x)$ and isovector $\vec{\pi}(x)$ fields are considered, the approximate local-field effective action can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} S[\sigma,\vec{\pi}] &= -\mathrm{Tr}\,\mathrm{Ln}\left\{\not{\partial}A(x-y)+m\delta^{(4)}(x-y)+V[\sigma,\vec{\pi}]B(x-y)\right\} \\ &\quad +\frac{1}{2}\int \mathrm{d}^4z[\sigma^2(z)+\vec{\pi}^2(z)]\int \mathrm{d}^4wB(w)\mathrm{tr}[G(w)]\,, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $V[\sigma,\vec{\pi}]=\sigma(\frac{x+y}{2})+i\gamma_5\vec{\pi}(\frac{x+y}{2})\cdot\vec{\tau}$ and m is the quark bare mass. Expanding the spectrum of $S[\sigma,\vec{\pi}]$ to second order about its minimum $S[1,0]$ with $\sigma(x)=1+\delta(x)$:

$$S[1+\delta(x),\vec{\pi}(x)]-S[1,0]=\frac{1}{2}{f_\delta}^2\int\left[(\partial_\mu\delta)^2+{m_\delta}^2\delta^2\right]\mathrm{d}^4z+\frac{1}{2}{f_\pi}^2\int\left[(\partial_\mu\vec{\pi})^2+{m_\pi}^2\vec{\pi}^2\right]\mathrm{d}^4z+\cdots\,, \tag{18}$$

it is found that

$${m_\delta}^2=\frac{N_cN_f}{4\pi^2{f_\delta}^2}\int_0^\infty s\mathrm{d}s\;\frac{B^2(s)[B^2(s)-sA^2(s)]}{[B^2(s)+sA^2(s)]^2}\,, \tag{19}$$

$$\begin{aligned} {f_\delta}^2 = \frac{N_cN_f}{4\pi^2}\int_0^\infty s\mathrm{d}s\;(B^2-sA^2)B^2\left[\frac{2s[2sA'^2-A(A'+2sA'')]+A^2+2B(B'+2sB'')-4sB'^2}{4(B^2-sA^2)(B^2+sA^2)^2}\right. \\ \left.+\frac{16s(sAA'+BB')^2+sA^4}{4(B^2+sA^2)^4}-\frac{4s(sA'^2+B'^2)+2sA(A'+2sA'')+A^2+2B(B'+2sB'')}{2(B^2+sA^2)^3}\right]\,; \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

and

$$m_\pi{}^2 = \frac{mN_cN_f}{4\pi^2 f_\pi{}^2}\int_0^\infty s\mathrm{d}s\ \frac{B(s)}{sA^2(s)+B^2(s)}\,, \tag{21}$$

$$f_\pi{}^2 = \frac{N_cN_f}{16\pi^2}\int_0^\infty s\mathrm{d}s\ \frac{B^2}{(B^2+sA^2)^2}\Big[\,12s^2A'^2+2sA(A'+2sA'')+12sB'^2$$
$$+2B(B'+2sB'')-\frac{16s(sAA'+BB')^2}{B^2+sA^2}+\frac{A^2B^2}{B^2+sA^2}+2A^2\Big]\,. \tag{22}$$

Usually, the derivative terms involving A', A'' and B'' in the equations above are dropped [1, 2]. If all the derivative terms are dropped [23, 24, 25], the expression for $f_\pi{}^2$ is simplified to

$$f_\pi{}^2 = \frac{N_cN_f}{16\pi^2}\int_0^\infty s\mathrm{d}s\ \frac{A^2(s)B^2(s)}{[B^2(s)+sA^2(s)]^2}\left[2+\frac{B^2(s)}{B^2(s)+sA^2(s)}\right]\,. \tag{23}$$

In this work, we use eq. (23) to fit f_π. The self-energy functions $A(s)$ and $B(s)$ are determined from Eqs. (15) and (16), the third variation of Eqs. (8) and (9). The corresponding values of quark condensate and QCD vacuum tensor susceptibility for two models are calculated and given as below.

The quark condensate is calculated via

$$\langle\bar{q}q\rangle = -\frac{3}{4\pi^2}\int_0^\infty s\mathrm{d}s\ \frac{B(s)}{s+B^2(s)}\,. \tag{24}$$

Another quantity $\Pi_\chi(0)$ to be calculated is defined as

$$\frac{1}{12}\Pi_\chi(0) \equiv -\frac{3}{4\pi^2}\int_0^\infty s\mathrm{d}s\left[\frac{B(s)}{s+B^2(s)}\right]^2\,, \tag{25}$$

which relates the quark condensate to the tensor susceptibility χ via the definition

$$\chi \equiv \frac{\Pi_\chi(0)}{6\langle\bar{q}q\rangle}\,. \tag{26}$$

We choose two different gluon propagators as follows. It should be noted that the ultraviolet behavior of them are different from that in QCD [26, 27]. The two models are respectively numbered as model 1:

$$g^2D(s) = 3\pi^2\frac{\lambda^2}{\Delta^2}e^{-\frac{s}{\Delta}}\,, \tag{27}$$

and model 2:

$$g^2D(s) = 4\pi^2 d\frac{\lambda^2}{s^2+\Delta}\,. \tag{28}$$

Here $d = 12/(33 - 2N_f)$. The calculation results for model 1 and model 2 are respectively given in Table 1 and in Table 2.

Table 1: The numerical results for model 1

$N_F = 2$				$N_F = 3$			
Δ	λ	$-\langle\bar{q}q\rangle^{1/3}$	$\Pi_\chi(0)/12$	Δ	λ	$-\langle\bar{q}q\rangle^{1/3}$	$\Pi_\chi(0)/12$
[GeV^2]	[GeV]	[MeV]	[GeV^2]	[GeV^2]	[GeV]	[MeV]	[GeV^2]
0.200	1.380	227	-0.0015	0.200	1.285	197	-0.0010
0.400	1.738	254	-0.0016	0.400	1.648	224	-0.0011
0.600	2.019	274	-0.0017	0.600	1.938	244	-0.0012

Table 2: The numerical results for model 2

$N_F = 2$				$N_F = 3$			
Δ	λ	$-\langle\bar{q}q\rangle^{1/3}$	$\Pi_\chi(0)/12$	Δ	λ	$-\langle\bar{q}q\rangle^{1/3}$	$\Pi_\chi(0)/12$
[GeV^4]	[GeV]	[MeV]	[GeV^2]	[GeV^4]	[GeV]	[MeV]	[GeV^2]
10^{-4}	0.551	201	-0.0014	10^{-4}	0.492	170	-0.00092
10^{-3}	0.791	224	-0.0014	10^{-3}	0.712	190	-0.00090
10^{-2}	1.164	255	-0.0014	10^{-2}	1.061	221	-0.00091
10^{-1}	1.776	304	-0.0014	10^{-1}	1.650	268	-0.00098

The results of these calculations show that, compared with the results for $N_F = 2$ flavors, the values of $-\langle\bar{q}q\rangle^{1/3}$ and $\Pi_\chi(0)/12$ for $N_F = 3$ flavors are universally lowered. For $N_F = 2$ flavors, compared with the results obtained from Eqs. (13) and (14), the values of $-\langle\bar{q}q\rangle^{1/3}$ are roughly invariant, while the values of $\Pi_\chi(0)/12$ are only about $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{5}$ of those obtained in Refs. [24, 25]. It should be noted that, the values of $-\langle\bar{q}q\rangle^{1/3}$ as well as $\Pi_\chi(0)/12$ are similar to those [23] obtained from Eqs. (11) and (12).

This work and those previously finished summarize the three solutions to the Dyson-Schwinger equation in the global color symmetry model and the

corresponding results for the quark condensate and the tensor susceptibility of QCD vacuum. The physically acceptable solution is only one of them. This work again suggests that, the measurements of the quark condensate and the tensor susceptibility of QCD vacuum are necessary and meaningful.

References

[1] R.T. Cahill and C.D. Roberts, Phys. Rev. D32(1985)2419.

[2] C.D. Roberts, R.T. Cahill and J. Praschifka, Ann. Phys. (NY)188(1988)20.

[3] M.R. Frank, P.C. Tandy and G. Fai, Phys. Rev. C43(1991)2808.

[4] R.T. Cahill, Nucl. Phys. A543(1992)63c.

[5] M.R. Frank and P.C. Tandy, Phys. Rev. C46(1992)338.

[6] C.D. Roberts and A.G. Williams, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 33(1994)477.

[7] C.D. Roberts, R.T. Cahill, M.E. Sevior and N. Iannella, Phys. Rev. D49(1994)125.

[8] R.T. Cahill and S. Gunner, Phys. Lett. B359(1995)281; R.T. Cahill and S. Gunner, Mod. Phys. Lett. A10(1995)3051.

[9] C.W. Johnson, G. Fai and M. R. Frank, Phys. Lett. B386(1996)75.

[10] M.R. Frank and C.D. Roberts, Phys. Rev. C53(1996)390.

[11] M.R. Frank and T. Meissner, Phys. Rev. C53(1996)2410.

[12] C.J. Burden, C.D. Roberts and M.J. Thomson, Phys. Lett. B371(1996)163.

[13] A. Bender, D. Blaschke, Y. Kalinovsky and C. D. Roberts, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77(1996)3724.

[14] C.J. Burden and D.-S. Liu, Phys. Rev. D55(1997)367.

[15] P. C. Tandy, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 39(1997)117.

[16] T. Meissner, Phys. Lett. B405(1997)8.

[17] M. R. Frank and T. Meissner, Phys. Rev. C57(1998)345.

[18] P. Maris, C.D. Roberts and P.C. Tandy, Phys. Lett. B420(1998)267.

[19] M.A. Ivanov, Yu.L. Kalinovsky, P. Maris and C.D. Roberts, Phys. Lett. B416(1998)29; M.A. Ivanov, Yu.L. Kalinovsky, P. Maris and C.D. Roberts, Phys. Rev. C57(1998)1991.

[20] Xiao-fu Lü, Yu-xin Liu, Hong-shi Zong and En-guang Zhao, Phys. Rev. C58(1998)1195; Hong-shi Zong, Yu-xin Liu, Xiao-fu Lü, Fan Wang and En-guang Zhao, Commun. Theor. Phys. (Beijing, China)36(2001)187.

[21] H.S. Zong, J.L. Ping, H.T. Yang, X.F. Lü, F. Wang, Phys. Rev. D67(2003)074004.

[22] H.T. Yang, H.S. Zong, J.L. Ping and F. Wang, Phys. Lett. B557(2003)33.

[23] H.T. Yang, hep-ph/0412043.

[24] H.T. Yang, hep-ph/0412154.

[25] H.T. Yang, hep-ph/0501285.

[26] P. Maris and C.D. Roberts, Phys. Rev. C56(1997)3369.

[27] K. Kusaka, H. Toki and S. Umisedo, Phys. Rev. D59(1999)116010.