On the nature of the chiral phase transition

Owe Philipsen

- Chiral phase transition in massless limit constrains the QCD phase diagram
- New picture emerging after 40 years of "common wisdom": 2nd order for all N_f
- Connection to the conformal window

With: F. Cuteri, A. D'Ambrosio, M. Fromm, R. Kaiser, J-P. Klinger, A. Sciarra

CRC-TR 211 Strong-interaction matter under extreme conditions
EL EM EN TS
GOETHE UNIVERSITÄT FRANKFURT AM MAIN
NIC

History: motivation for the critical endpoint

[Rajagopal 95, Halasz et al., PRD 98, Stephanov, Rajagopal, Shuryak PRL 98, Rajagopal, Wilczek 00, Hatta, Ikeda, PRD 03,…]

Breaking/restoration of exact chiral symmetry requires a (non-analytic) phase transition

$N_f = 2:$

Model predictions, early lattice results →



Tricritical point + wing line

Model predictions, no QCD information

Other (mostly ignored) possibilities





The order of the chiral phase transition at $\mu_B = 0$ narrows down possibilities

Nature of the QCD thermal transition at zero density

$N_f = 2+1$

deconfinement p.t.:
breaking of global $Z(3)$ symmetry



[Pisarski, Wilczek, PRD 84]:
(Linear sigma model in 3d)

$N_f = 2$ depends on $U(1)_A$

restored — broken

$N_f \geq 3$ 1st order



triple points



chiral p.t.
restoration of global symmetry in flavour space

$SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_A$

anomalous

The Columbia plot with chemical potential

$N_f = 2$ $\qquad$ $N_f = 2 + 1$

[Figure edited from Sciarra, PhD thesis 2016]





[Stephanov, Rajagopal, Shuryak PRL 98]: (based on models, early lattice)

"As m_s is reduced from infinity, the tricritical point … moves to lower μ until it reaches the T-axis and can be identified with the tricritical point in the (T, m_s)-plane"

The nature of the QCD chiral transition at zero density

…is elusive, massless limit not simulable!



- Coarse lattices or unimproved actions: 1st order for $N_f = 2, 3$
- 1st order region shrinks rapidly as $a \to 0$, no 1st order for improved staggered actions
- For fixed lattice spacing: apparent contradictions between different lattice actions

Details and references: [O.P., Symmetry 13, 2021]

Different view point: mass degenerate quarks





$$Z(N_\mathrm{f}, g, m) = \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu \, (\det M[A_\mu, m])^{N_\mathrm{f}} \, e^{-\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{YM}[A_\mu]}$$

$$N_\mathrm{f}^c(am) = N_\mathrm{f}^\mathrm{tric} + \mathcal{B}_1 \cdot (am)^{2/5} + \mathcal{O}\left((am)^{4/5}\right)$$

- Consider analytic continuation to continuous N_f
- Tricritical point guaranteed to exist if there is 1st order at any N_f
- Known exponents for critical line entering tric. point!
- Continuation to $a \neq 0$: Z(2) surface ends in tricritical line

[Cuteri, O.P., Sciarra PRD 18]

Different view point: mass degenerate quarks





$$Z(N_\mathrm{f}, g, m) = \int \mathcal{D}A_\mu \, (\det M[A_\mu, m])^{N_\mathrm{f}} \, e^{-\mathcal{S}_\mathrm{YM}[A_\mu]}$$

$$N_\mathrm{f}^c(am) = N_\mathrm{f}^\mathrm{tric} + \mathcal{B}_1 \cdot (am)^{2/5} + \mathcal{O}\big((am)^{4/5}\big)$$

- Consider analytic continuation to continuous N_f
- Tricritical point guaranteed to exist if there is 1st order at any N_f
- Known exponents for critical line entering tric. point!
- Continuation to $a \neq 0$: Z(2) surface ends in tricritical line

[Cuteri, O.P., Sciarra PRD 18]

Methodology to determine order of transition

Finite size scaling of generalised cumulants

$$B_n = \frac{\langle (\bar{\psi}\psi - \langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle)^n \rangle}{\langle (\bar{\psi}\psi - \langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle)^2 \rangle^{n/2}}$$

Standard staggered fermions, bare parameters: β, am, N_f, N_τ

(Pseudo-critical) phase boundary: $B_3 = 0$ 3d manifold

Second-order 3d Ising:

2d chiral critical surface separates 1st order from crossover



$$B_4(\beta_c, am, N_\sigma) \approx 1.604 + c\,(am - am_c)\,N_\sigma^{1/0.6301}$$

Methodology to determine order of transition

Finite size scaling of generalised cumulants

$$B_n = \frac{\langle(\bar{\psi}\psi - \langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle)^n\rangle}{\langle(\bar{\psi}\psi - \langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle)^2\rangle^{n/2}}$$

Standard staggered fermions, bare parameters: β, am, N_f, N_τ

(Pseudo-critical) phase boundary: $B_3 = 0$ 3d manifold

Second-order 3d Ising:

2d chiral critical surface separates 1st order from crossover



$$B_4(\beta_c, am, N_\sigma) \approx 1.604 + c\,(am - am_c)\,N_\sigma^{1/0.6301}$$

Bare parameter space of unimproved staggered LQCD

[Cuteri, O.P., Sciarra 21] ~120 M Monte Carlo trajectories with light fermions, aspect ratios 3,4,5





- Tricritical scaling observed in different variable pairings
- Old question: $m_c/T = 0$ or $\neq 0$? Answered for $N_f = 2$
- New question: will $N_f^{\rm tric}$ slide beyond $N_f = 3$?

Bare parameter space of unimproved staggered LQCD

[Cuteri, O.P., Sciarra 21]



1st order scenario does not fit!



- Tricritical scaling observed also in plane of mass vs. lattice spacing, 2nd order in continuum
- Allows extrapolation to lattice chiral limit, tricritical points $N_\tau^{\rm tric}(N_f)$
- 1st order scenario: $m_c(a) = m_c(0) + c_1(aT) + c_2(aT)^2 + \dots$

Incompatible with data! $\chi^2_{\rm dof} > 10$

Nf=3 O(a)-improved Wilson fermions

[Kuramashi et al. PRD 20] $m_\pi^c \leq 110\ \mathrm{MeV} \quad N_\tau = 4, 6, 8, 10, 12$



Re-analysis using: $am_{PS}^2 \propto am_q$



[Cuteri, O.P., Sciarra, JHEP 21]

Tricritical scaling!

Nf=3 consistent with staggered, 2nd order in chiral continuum limit!

The Columbia plot in the continuum

[Cuteri, O.P., Sciarra JHEP 21]

[HotQCD PRL 19]

$T_c^0 = 135(8)\text{MeV}$

Universality class(es)?

[HotQCD PRD 22]

HISQ, crossover
down to $m_\pi \approx 80$ MeV

$T_c^0 = 98(6)\text{MeV}$



Talks by S. Ejiri
K. Kanaya

Consistent with:
fRG, DSE, bootstrap…

[G. Fejos, PRD 22]
[S. R. Kousvos, A. Stergiou SciPost 23]
[J. Bernhardt, C. S. Fischer PRD 23]
[R. D. Pisarski, F. Rennecke PRL 24]
[G. Fejos, T. Hatsuda PRD 24]

Crossover for DW fermions, Nf=3, $m_q \sim m_{phys}$ [Zhang et al., PoS LAT22, 23]

Imaginary chemical potential: cutoff effects

Repeat study of Columbia plot with $\mu = i\,0.81\pi T/3$



Same situation as $\mu = 0$

1st-order region not connected to continuum limit!



Imaginary chemical potential, improved actions

$\mu = i\pi T/3$ Roberge-Weiss boundary

- [Bonati et al., PRD 19]
  stout-smeared staggered $N_\tau = 4$

  quark mass scan down to $m_\pi \approx 50$ MeV
  fixed m_{ud}/m_s

- [Bielefeld+Frankfurt, PRD 22]
  HISQ $N_\tau = 4$

  quark mass scan down to $m_\pi \approx 55$ MeV
  fixed m_s

- No sign of 1st-order phase transition!

- Entire chiral critical surface moves to massless limit



Columbia plot with chemical potential, continuum

If we take these results seriously:

Critical point not ruled out

Class of low energy models now ruled out!

But requires additional critical surface





$\nexists$ Tuning of parameters for $N_f = 2 + 1$ theory with critical point at $\mu = 0$!

Summary: constraints on the critical point



?



- Ordering of critical temperatures $\mu_B^{\rm cep} > 3.1\ T_{pc}(0) \approx 485\ \text{MeV}$ [O.P. Symmetry 21]
- Cluster expansion model of lattice fluctuations $\mu_B^{\rm cep} > \pi T$ [Vovchenko et al. PRD 18]
- Singularities, Pade-approx. fluctuations $\mu_B^{\rm cep} > 2.5T, T < 125\ \text{MeV}$ [Bollweg et al. PRD 21]
- Direct simulations with refined reweighting $\mu_B^{\rm cep} > 2.5T$ [Wuppertal-Budpest collaboration, PRD 21]

- Consistent with DSE, fRG [Fischer PPNP 19; Fu, Pawlowski, Rennecke PRD 20; Gao, Pawlowski PRD 21]

CEP seen at larger density, but "not yet controlled" $(T_{\rm CEP}, \mu_{B_{\rm CEP}}) = (98, 643)\ \text{MeV}$

Outlook: towards the conformal window, $N_f > 6$

<u>Onset of conformal window Nf*:</u>

$10 \lesssim N_f^* \lesssim 12$ { [Braun, Gies 11]; [Lombardo, Pallante, Deuzeman 13] }

$8 \lesssim N_f^* \lesssim 9$ [Hasenfratz et al. 23]

What is the value of N_f^* ?

Scenario 1



- 2nd order for all N_f
- $N_f^{tric} = N_f^*$

N_f^{tric} at $T = 0$

Scenario 2



- 2nd order turns into 1st order at N_f^{tric}
- $6 < N_f^{tric} < N_f^*$

N_f^{tric} at $T > 0$

$N_f > 6$,   preliminary

- Additional lattice spacing, $N_\tau = 10$
- Scale setting for temperature: Sommer scales r_0, r_1
- Quantitative values of T not important, but when is T=0?
- N_f^* is boundary for tricritical scaling (conformal scaling beyond!)

$$T_c(m) = T_{tric} + A \cdot m^{2/5} + B \cdot m^{4/5}$$



Preliminary result: $7 < N_f^* < 9$

Conclusions

- Chiral transition at zero density is second order for Nf=2-6 massless quark flavours
- So far consistent between all lattice discretisations + DSE
- Imaginary chemical potential has no effect on the order of the chiral transition
- Lesson from cutoff effects:

  Correct UV sector of a theory is crucial for its phase diagram!

  “Low energy effective models” can be deceiving
- Onset of conformal window in reach

Backup slides

Bare parameter space of unimproved staggered LQCD

[Cuteri, O.P., Sciarra JHEP 21] ~120 M Monte Carlo trajectories with light fermions, aspect ratios 3,4,5



- Data points implicitly labeled by Nf
- Tricritical scaling observed in lattice bare parameter space
- Tricritical extrapolation always possible!

Digression: tricritical points as function of Nf



- $N_\tau^{\mathrm{tric}}(N_f)$ increasing function
- Tricritical line in the plane of the lattice chiral limit, separates 1st from 2nd
- Is there a tricritical point in the continuum?

progressing to finer lattices



New $N_\tau = 10$ result on predicted scaling curve!