Non-perturbative renormalisation of minimally doubled fermions

Johannes Weber

February 17, 2012

<□ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ >

Simulations with canonical Karsten-Wilczek operator

Study of Karsten-Wilczek action

$$S_{KW}^{f} = a^{4} \sum_{x} \left\{ \frac{1}{2a} \sum_{\mu=1}^{4} \left[\overline{\psi}(x) \left(\gamma_{\mu} (1 + d(\beta) \delta_{\mu,4}) - i \gamma_{4} (1 - \delta_{\mu,4}) \right) U_{\mu}(x) \psi(x + a\hat{\mu}) \right. \\ \left. - \overline{\psi}(x + a\hat{\mu}) \left(\gamma_{\mu} (1 + d(\beta) \delta_{\mu,4}) + i \gamma_{4} (1 - \delta_{\mu,4}) \right) U_{\mu}^{\dagger}(x) \psi(x) \right] \right. \\ \left. + \overline{\psi}(x) \left(m_{0} + c(\beta) \frac{i \gamma_{4}}{a} \right) \psi(x) \right. \\ \left. + \beta \sum_{\mu < \nu} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N_{c}} \Re tr P_{\mu,\nu} \right) (1 + d_{p}(\beta)) \right.$$
(1)

- Perturbation theory: 3 counterterms break hypercubic symmetry
- Due to quenched approximation no sensitivity to parameter $d_p(\beta)$
- Parameter $c(\beta)$ has dimension three conterterm
- Parameter $d(\beta)$ numerically small

Hypercubic symmetry breaking effects

Hypercubic symmetry of physical observables must be restored in order to have the *right continuum limit*. Concerns even naïvely unaffected quantities like **hadron masses**.

- KW Dirac operator explicitly selects time direction
- Correlation function measurement process selects time direction

Both origins of symmetry breaking clash!

How to disentangle? Two possible solutions:

- either two different KW Dirac operators
- different measuring directions

Restoration of hypercubic symmetry means tuning the counterterms

Pion modes along the c axis

Data on 32^4 , 30 configurations reveals dependence of effective mass on *c*.



▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

- reveals phase transitions at extreme values of c
- temporal correlators have a minimum in the middle

Pion mass cont'd: more statistics

Larger sample shows that effective masses do not match.



- Effective mass extraction is questionable here
- Central region cannot be considered a plateau here

Low lying excited states? Slopes at the central points?

Pion mass cont'd: larger volume

Larger volume removes excited states. However, **oscillations in temporal rho** mode are clearly visible.



Oscillations in the pion can be removed with modified fit function:

$$C(n) \propto (1 + B(-1)^t) \cosh\left(m(t - rac{T}{2}\right)$$

• Oscillating factor is due to second zero mode at $k_4 = \pi/2$

▲ロト ▲御 ト ▲ 臣 ト ▲ 臣 ト の Q @

Summary and open questions

- Simulations with minimally doubled valence quarks
- Hadronic masses reveal phase transitions at extreme parameter values
- Hadronic modes in different measuring directions: symmetry restoration as renormalisation condition
- Oscillations in temporal rho due to second zero mode: study in HPE on the way
- > Further problem remains: effective mass plateaus split, not yet understood

▲ロ ▶ ▲周 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● の Q @

► Safe extraction of effective masses necessary for renormalisation