# Peeking into the $\theta$ vacuum of 4d SU(2) Yang-Mills theory

Based on 2102.08784 [hep-lat] [Ref. JHEP02, 073 (2021)]

Cambridge High Energy Workshop 2021 - Axion Physics- July 29 2021, zoom@Harvard & MIT

Norikazu Yamada (KEK/SOKENDAI) in collaboration with Ryuichiro Kitano (KEK/SOKENDAI) Ryutaro Matsudo (KEK) Masahito Yamazaki (Kavli IPMU)





### Goal

### Clarify the $\theta$ dependence of free energy density $f(\theta)$ of 4d YM

$$e^{-Vf(\theta)} = \frac{Z(\theta)}{Z(0)}$$
  
where  $Z(\theta) = \int \mathcal{D}U e^{-S_{\rm YM} + i\theta Q}$ ,  $Q = \int d^4x q(x)$  and  $q(x) = \frac{1}{64\pi^2} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F^a_{\mu\nu} F^a_{\rho\sigma}$ 

For *SU*(*N*) YM theory,

 $Q \in \mathbb{Z} \Rightarrow Z(\theta) = Z(\theta + 2\pi) \Rightarrow f(\theta) = f(\theta)$  $S_{\text{YM}} \text{ is CP even } \Rightarrow Z(\theta) = Z(-\theta) \Rightarrow f(\theta) = I(-\theta)$ 

$$= f(-\theta) \int f(\pi - \theta') = f(\pi + \theta')$$

### θ dependence and CP violation

Dilute instanton gas approximation (DIGA)

 $\Rightarrow f(\theta) = \chi(1 - \cos \theta)$ 



- a single branch
- smooth everywhere

### θ dependence and CP violation

Dilute instanton gas approximation (DIGA)

 $\Rightarrow f(\theta) = \chi(1 - \cos \theta)$ 



- a single branch
- smooth everywhere

### Large N argument [Witten (1980, 1998)] $\Rightarrow f(\theta) = \chi/2 \min_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (\theta + 2\pi k)^2 + O(1/N^2)$



- consists of many branches with crossing
- spontaneous CPV (1st order PT) at  $\theta = \pi$  with the order parameter  $\frac{df(\theta)}{d\theta} = -i\langle q(x) \rangle$

### *θ* **dependence** and **CP** violation

Dilute instanton gas approximation (DIGA)

 $\Rightarrow f(\theta) = \chi(1 - \cos \theta)$ 



- a single branch
- smooth everywhere

### Large N argument [Witten (1980, 1998)] $\Rightarrow f(\theta) = \chi/2 \min(\theta + 2\pi k)^2 + O(1/N^2)$ $k \in \mathbb{Z}$



- consists of many branches with crossing
- spontaneous CPV (1st order PT) at  $\theta = \pi$  with the order parameter  $\frac{df(\theta)}{d\theta} = -i\langle q(x) \rangle$

Interested in  $f(\theta)$  around  $\theta \approx \pi$  in 4d SU(N) YM theory.

## Summary of previous results on $f(\theta)$

- Large *N* argument seems robust  $\Rightarrow$  CPV at  $\theta = \pi$  for large *N*
- Formal arguments tell that, for general *N*, CP has to be broken at θ = π if the vacuum is in the confining phase.
   [Gaiotto, et al.(2017)], [Kitano, Suyama, NY(2017)]
- Some numerical evidences of *CPV* for  $N \ge 3$
- What happens to the possible smallest *N*, i.e. *SU*(2) YM ?
   Is it like "large *N*" or "2d *CP*<sup>1</sup>" ?
- $\Rightarrow$  Lattice numerical simulations (difficult due to sign problem)



### New method without any expansion

Generate configurations with  $\theta = 0$ Define sub-volume  $V_{sub} = l^4$  and  $Q_{sub} = \sum q(x) \notin \mathbb{Z}$  $e^{-V_{\rm sub}f_{\rm sub}(\theta)} = \frac{Z_{\rm sub}(\theta)}{Z(0)} = \frac{1}{Z(0)} \left[ \mathscr{D}U \ e^{-S_g + i\theta Q_{\rm sub}} = \langle e^{i\theta Q_{\rm sub}} \rangle \right]$  $f_{\rm sub}(\theta) = -\frac{1}{V_{\rm sub}} \ln\langle \cos(\theta Q_{\rm sub}) \rangle$  $f(\theta) = \lim_{V_{\text{sub}} \to \infty} f_{\text{sub}}(\theta) = \lim_{l \to \infty} \left\{ \frac{f(\theta)}{l} + \frac{s(\theta)}{l} + O(1/l^2) \right\} \quad \text{cf) string tension}$ with  $l_{dvn}^4 \ll V_{sub} \ll V_{full}$  ( $l_{dyn}$ : dynamical length scale)

 $s(\theta)$  : surface tension

[Kitano, Matsudo, NY, Yamazaki(2021)]





## Lattice parameters and observables

- SU(2) YM theory by Symanzik improved gauge action
- $\beta = \frac{4}{g^2} = 1.975$  (relatively fine:  $1/(aT_c) = 9.50$ )
- $V_{\text{full}} = 24^3 \times \{48, 6, 8\} \ (T = 0, 1.2T_c, 1.6T_c)$
- · Periodic boundary condition in all directions
- •# of configs = { 68000 , 10000 , 10000 }
- Calculate  $Q_{sub} = \sum q(x)$  and estimate  $x \in V_{sub}$  $\checkmark f(\theta) = -\lim_{V_{\text{sub}} \to \infty} \frac{1}{V_{\text{sub}}} \ln\langle \cos(\theta Q_{\text{sub}}) \rangle$  $\checkmark \frac{df(\theta)}{d\theta} = \lim_{V_{\text{sub}} \to \infty} \frac{1}{V_{\text{sub}}} \frac{\langle Q_{\text{sub}} \sin(\theta Q_{\text{sub}}) \rangle}{\langle \cos(\theta Q_{\text{sub}}) \rangle}$

which are used to crosscheck each other



# $l \to \infty \liminf^{\pi/2} a T = 0$



- $V_{\text{sub}} = l^4$  with  $l \in \{10, 12, \dots, 24\}$
- Data in the range of  $l_{\rm dyn}^4 \ll V_{\rm sub} \ll V_{\rm full}$  are fitted to

$$f_{\rm sub}(\theta) = f(\theta) + \frac{as(\theta)}{l}$$

• Linear extrapolation works well.

 $2\pi$ 

### $\theta$ dependence of $f(\theta)$ at T = 0



f(θ) / χ

- Succeed to calculate up to  $\theta \sim 3\pi/2.2 T_c$
- Monotonically increasing function  $\frac{\theta^2}{1-\cos\theta}$
- Inconsistent with DIGA  $\int d\theta df/d\theta$
- $f(\pi \frac{3}{2}\theta) \neq f(\pi + \theta)$  requires explanation. • Re-weighting (=full velume) method
- Re-weighting (=full volume) method works only around  $\theta = 0$ .

 $\pi/2$ 

• Numerical consistency with  $\int d\theta$ 

()

 $2\pi$ 



 $\pi$ 

θ





## $\theta$ dependence of $f(\theta)$ at $T = 1.2T_c$



- Systematic error due to ambiguity of the scaling region is large for  $\theta > \pi$  $\theta^2/2$
- Within large uncertainty, consistent with the DIG
- Numerical consistency with
- Similar results at  $T = 1.6 T_c$

10







### Discussion

- For  $T > T_c$ , consistent with  $f(\theta) = \chi(1 \cos \theta)$
- At T = 0,  $f(\pi \theta) \neq f(\pi + \theta)$  is not satisfied and it is not like



Why?

• Sub-volume method seems to trace an original branch even after the crossing point is passed.





- Sub-volume method seems to trace an original branch even after the crossing point is passed.
- Similar to the calculation of the static potential, where "string breaking" should happen but never occurs.



- Sub-volume method seems to trace an original branch even after the crossing point is passed.
- Similar to the calculation of the static potential, where "string breaking" should happen but never occurs.



- Sub-volume method seems to trace an original branch even after the crossing point is passed.
- Similar to the calculation of the static potential, where "string breaking" should happen but never occurs.
- In the present case, the domain to domain-wall transition should occur but does not in this method.



- Sub-volume method seems to trace an original branch even after the crossing point is passed.
- Similar to the calculation of the static potential, where "string breaking" should happen but never occurs.
- In the present case, the domain to domain-wall transition should occur but does not in this method.







- Sub-volume method seems to trace an original branch even after the crossing point is passed.
- Similar to the calculation of the static potential, where "string breaking" should happen but never occurs.
- In the present case, the domain to domain-wall transition should occur but does not in this method.





### Summary and conclusion

- We have developed a sub-volume method, which enables us to calculate  $f(\theta)$  up to  $\theta \sim 3\pi/2$  at T = 0 in SU(2) Yang-Mills theory.
- Combining with the theory requirement  $f(\pi \theta) = f(\pi + \theta)$ , our result provides with the evidence for spontaneous *CPV* at T = 0.  $\Rightarrow$  4d *SU(2)* YM belongs to large N class (not like *CP*<sup>1</sup> model).
- The same method yields the result consistent with the DIGA,  $f(\theta) \sim \chi(1 \cos \theta)$ , above  $T_c$  within large systematic uncertainty.
- Application to QCD is straightforward.

### Future studies

- exploring the location of  $T_c(\theta)$
- applying the sub-volume method to the finite • density system.



θ

### SU(N) with $N = 2, \dots \infty$



## Backup slides



 $\Rightarrow f(\theta) \Big|_{\theta \approx 2\pi} \sim 0 \Rightarrow 2\pi$ -periodicity is expected.

In this case,  $Q_{\rm sub}$  is almost always integer if  $\rho_{\rm instanton}^4 \ll V_{\rm sub}$ .



### $\theta$ -vacuum

- The vacuum can have an integer winding number, labeled by  $|n\rangle$ .
- But, this label is changed by gauge transformation, e.g.  $U_{(1)}|n\rangle \rightarrow |n+1\rangle$ .

• Define 
$$|\theta\rangle = \sum_{n=\infty}^{+\infty} e^{in\theta} |n\rangle \iff U_{(1)} |\theta\rangle = e^{-i\theta} |\theta\rangle$$
  
•  $\langle \theta_{+} |\theta_{-}\rangle_{I} = \sum e^{in\theta} e^{-im\theta} \langle m_{+} |n_{-}\rangle_{I} = \sum e^{i\theta Q} \sum \langle e^{i\theta Q} |\theta_{-}\rangle_{I}$ 

$$= \sum_{Q} \int_{\in Q} \mathscr{D}A \ e^{-S_g + i\theta Q} +$$
$$= \int \mathscr{D}A \ e^{-S_g + i\theta Q} + \int J \cdot A$$



## Expected behavior of $f_{sub}(\theta)$ as a function of $V_{sub}$

- It must be  $V_{\rm sub} \gg l_{\rm dyn}^4$ .
- As long as  $V_{\text{sub}} \gg l_{\text{dyn}}^4$ ,  $f_{\text{sub}}(\theta)$  is expected to show the scaling behavior,  $f_{\text{sub}}(\theta) = f(\theta) + \frac{s(\theta)}{l} + O(1/l^2)$ .
- Buch a behavior will end as  $V_{sub} \rightarrow V_{full}$  , where  $Q_{\text{sub}} \rightarrow Q_{\text{full}} \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Thus,  $V_{\text{sub}} \ll V_{\text{full}}$  is required.
- On the other hand, the method fails when  $|\theta Q_{sub}| \sim \pi$  because  $f_{\rm sub}(\theta) \propto \ln \langle \cos(\theta Q_{\rm sub}) \rangle$  becomes ill-defined.
- Crucial question:

 $V_{\rm sub}$  satisfying  $l_{\rm dyn}^4 \ll V_{\rm sub} \ll V_{\rm full}$  and  $|\theta Q_{\rm sub}| < \pi$  exists?







### Similarity to the static potential calculation

In the static potential calculation, Wilson loop is inserted.

- $\frac{Z(\Box)}{Z(1)} = \frac{1}{Z(1)} \int \mathcal{D}U \operatorname{Tr}\left[e^{i \oint A}\right] e^{-S_{\text{QCD}}} = \langle \operatorname{Tr}\left[e^{i \oint A}\right] e$
- $V(\mathscr{A}) = -\lim_{\mathscr{A} \to \infty} \ln \langle \operatorname{Tr}[e^{i \oint A}] \rangle = \sigma \mathscr{A} + \cdots$

In sub-volume method, instead a operator extending over subvolume is inserted.

 $f(\theta)$  is analogous to  $\sigma$  in the static potential.

$$^{A}]\rangle \rightarrow e^{-V(\mathcal{A})}$$



### About smearing

- Need to numerically calculate  $q(x) = \frac{1}{64\pi^2} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F^a_{\mu\nu} F^a_{\rho\sigma}$  on the lattice Raw configurations are contaminated by local lumps. •
- Smearing (= smoothing a configuration) removes such short-distance artifacts. lacksquare
- However, at the same time, smearing may alter relevant topological excitations, too.  $\bullet$
- We studied this point and developed the procedure to restore relevant information. [Kitano, NY, Yamazaki (2021)]
  - calculate an observable every 5 steps of the smearing
  - extrapolate those back to  $n_{APE} \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\langle O \rangle = \lim_{n_{APE} \rightarrow 0} \langle O(n_{APE}) \rangle$

### $n_{\rm APE} \rightarrow 0 \, {\rm limit} \, {\rm at} \, T = 0$



1 /

• Fit range  $n_{APE} = [20, 40]$  determined in [Kitano, WY, Yangazaki (20, 20, 1)]. • Linear fiteworks well. • Monetonfic function  $f(\pi) < f(3\pi/2)$ 0  $(3\pi/2)$ 

 $\pi/2$ 

-10

-20

()



 $3\pi/2$ 

 $\pi$ 

θ

## Learning from $2d CP^{N-1}$ model

$$\mathscr{L} = \frac{N}{2g} \overline{D_{\mu}z} D_{\mu}z - i\theta q$$

 $D_{\mu} = \partial_{\mu} + iA_{\mu} , \quad A_{\mu} = i\bar{z}$  $q(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \partial_{\mu} A_{\nu} = \frac{i}{2\pi} \frac{i}{2\pi} e_{\mu\nu} \partial_{\mu} A_{\nu} = \frac{i}{2\pi} \frac{i}{2\pi} e_{\mu\nu} \partial_{\mu} A_{\nu} = \frac{i}{2\pi} e_{\mu\nu} \partial_{\mu} A_{\mu\nu} = \frac{i}{2\pi} e_{\mu\nu} \partial_{\mu} A_{\mu\nu} = \frac{i}{2\pi} e_{\mu\nu} \partial_{\mu} A_{\mu\nu} = \frac{i}{2$ 

- Good testing ground for 4d SU(N) because of many similarities [asymptotic freedom, dynamical mass gap, instanton, 1/N expandable, ...]
- Gapped and CP broken at  $\theta = \pi$  for  $N \ge 3$ .
- But  $CP^1$  (*i.e.* N = 2) is exceptional!  $\Rightarrow$  gapless and no CPV at  $\theta = \pi$  ( $\Leftrightarrow$  Haldane conjecture)

*z* : N-component complex scalar field with  $\bar{z}z = 1$ 

$$\frac{\bar{z}\partial_{\mu}z}{\pi} \epsilon_{\mu\nu}\overline{D_{\mu}z} D_{\mu}z$$

### $f(\theta)$ in 2d $CP^{N-1}$ model (lattice results)



$$e^{-V_{\text{sub}}f_{\text{sub}}(\theta)} = \frac{1}{Z[0]} \int \mathcal{D}z \mathcal{D}\bar{z} e^{-S_{CP(N-1)}-i\theta Q}$$

$$= \langle e^{-i\theta Q_{\text{sub}}} \rangle$$

$$Q_{\text{sub}} = \int_{x \in V_{\text{sub}}} d^2x \frac{1}{2\pi} \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \partial_{\mu} A_{\nu} \rightarrow Q_{\text{sub}}^{\text{lat}} = \frac{-i}{2\pi} \sum_{x \in V_{\text{sub}}} \ln P_x$$

$$(P_x: \text{plaquet})$$

$$(P_x: \text{plaquet})$$

$$(P_x: \text{plaquet})$$
while others indicate CPV.





### **Previous Lattice calculations of 4d** SU(N)

 $\mathscr{L}_{\theta} = \frac{1}{4} F^{a}_{\mu\nu} F^{a}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{i\theta q}{4}$  $q(x) = \frac{g^2}{64\pi^2} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F^a_{\mu\nu} F^a_{\rho\sigma}$ 

• Sign problem makes direct lattice calculation difficult/impossible.

### **Previous Lattice calculations of 4d** SU(N)

 $\mathscr{L}_{\theta} = \frac{1}{4} F^{a}_{\mu\nu} F^{a}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{i\theta q}{4}$  $q(x) = \frac{g^2}{64\pi^2} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F^a_{\mu\nu} F^a_{\rho\sigma}$ 

• Sign problem makes direct lattice calculation difficult/impossible.

• Relies on Taylor expansion around  $\theta = 0$ 

$$f(\theta) = \frac{\chi}{2} \theta^2 (1 + b_2 \theta^2 + b_4 \theta^4 + \cdots)$$

and determines each coefficient on the lattice by

$$\begin{split} \chi &= \frac{\langle Q^2 \rangle_{\theta=0}}{V} \\ b_2 &= -\frac{\langle Q^4 \rangle_{\theta=0} - 3 \langle Q^2 \rangle_{\theta=0}^2}{12 \langle Q^2 \rangle_{\theta=0}} \\ b_4 &= \frac{\langle Q^6 \rangle_{\theta=0} - 15 \langle Q^2 \rangle_{\theta=0} \langle Q^4 \rangle_{\theta=0} + 30 \langle Q^2 \rangle_{\theta=0}^3}{360 \langle Q^2 \rangle_{\theta=0}} \\ \vdots \end{split}$$



### First two coefficients



### [Review by Vicari and Panagopoulos (2018)]



### First two coefficients







### First two coefficients



only small corrections to the large N limit indicates CPV for  $N \ge 3$ . (No SU(2) calculation)





DIGA:  $f(\theta) \sim T^4 \exp\left(-\frac{8\pi^2}{g^2(T)}\right)(1-$ 

$$-\cos\theta) \sim \frac{T^{4-\frac{11N}{3}}\Lambda^{\frac{11N}{3}}(1-\cos\theta)}{\propto \chi(T)} = \frac{\theta^{2}/2(1+b_{2}\theta^{2}+b_{4}\theta^{4}+\cdots)}{\Rightarrow b_{2}=-1/12, \cdots}$$



$$-\cos\theta) \sim \frac{T^{4-\frac{11N}{3}}\Lambda^{\frac{11N}{3}}(1-\cos\theta)}{\propto \chi(T)} = \frac{\theta^{2}/2(1+b_{2}\theta^{2}+b_{4}\theta^{4}+\cdots)}{\Rightarrow b_{2}=-1/12, \cdots}$$







DIGA works for  $T > 1.15 T_c$  (No SU(2) calculation)



- smoothly connected to large N limit
  - $\Rightarrow N \in \mathbb{Z}$  can be analytically continued to  $\mathbb{R}$
  - $\Rightarrow f(\theta)$  would be smooth function of N
- $b_2 \neq -\frac{1}{12}$  (*i.e.* not instanton-like)
  - $\Rightarrow$  conjectured that SU(2) belongs to large N class and *CPV* takes places at  $\theta = \pi$ .



- smoothly connected to large N limit
  - $\Rightarrow N \in \mathbb{Z}$  can be analytically continued to  $\mathbb{R}$
  - $\Rightarrow f(\theta)$  would be smooth function of N
- $b_2 \neq -\frac{1}{12}$  (*i.e.* not instanton-like)
  - $\Rightarrow$  conjectured that SU(2) belongs to large N class and *CPV* takes places at  $\theta = \pi$ .

