# QCD at imaginary chemical potential with Wilson fermions

Andrei Alexandru & Anyi Li

Sign 2014 Workshop GSI — Darmstadt



#### Outline

- Motivation
- Imaginary chemical potential
- Compression method and reweighting
- Numerical results
- Conclusions

# Expected QCD phase diagram



# Imaginary chemical potential

For imaginary chemical potential,  $\gamma_5$  symmetry insures that the determinant is real.

 $M(U,\mu)^{\dagger} = \gamma_5 M(U,-\mu^*)\gamma_5 \Rightarrow \det M(U,i\mu_I) \in R$ 

The grand canonical partition function is periodic in the complex plane due to the invariance of Haar measure and pure gauge action's invariance under the Z3 transformations

 $[U_{\mu}(\boldsymbol{x},t)]_{\pm} = \begin{cases} U_{\mu}(\boldsymbol{x},t)e^{\pm i\frac{2\pi}{3}} & \text{if } t = N_t - 1 \text{ and } \mu = 4, \\ U_{\mu}(\boldsymbol{x},t) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$ 

$$Z_{GC}(T, V, \mu) = Z_{GC}(T, V, \mu \pm i\frac{2\pi}{3}T)$$

- Simulations are easy to setup since the chemical potential is introduced as a phase.
- For μ/T=iπ,± iπ/3 we have a Z(2) symmetry. For example for μ=iπ, U and U\* have equal probability.
- At high temperatures this symmetry is spontaneously broken and restored at low temperatures. (Roberge-Weiss transition)



 $P_{\pm i\pi/3}(U) = P_{\pm i\pi/3}((U^*)_{\mp})$ 

A. Roberge and N. Weiss, Nucl. Phys. B275 (1986) 734.

#### Previous studies

- N<sub>f</sub>=2 P. de Forcrand and O. Philipsen 2002, M. D'Elia and F. Sanfilippo 2009 (staggered)
- Nf=3 P. de Forcrand and O. Philipsen 2010 (staggered)
- N<sub>f</sub>=4 M. D'Elia and M.-P. Lombardo 2003, 2004, M. D'Elia, F. Di Renzo, and M. P. Lombardo 2007, P. Cea, L. Cosmai, M. D'Elia, and A. Papa 2010 (staggered)
- N<sub>f</sub>=2 K. Nagata and A. Nakamura 2011, O. Philipsen and C. Pinke 2014 (wilson)

### Imaginary chemical potential



# Imaginary chemical potential





#### P. de Forcrand and O. Philipsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 105 (2010) 152001

#### Possible scenarios



# Reweighting

We want to use multi-histogram reweighting in  $\beta$  and  $\mu$  to fill in the gaps in the scanned region.

$$\langle O(U) \rangle_{\beta,\mu} = \frac{\langle O(U)\alpha(U) \rangle_{\beta_0,\mu_0}}{\langle \alpha(U) \rangle_{\beta_0,\mu_0}}$$

$$\alpha(U) = e^{-(\beta - \beta_0)S_g(U)} \frac{\det M(U, \mu)}{\det M(U, \mu_0)}$$

A. M. Ferrenberg and R. H. Swendsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 63 (1989) 1195-1198.

![](_page_9_Figure_5.jpeg)

#### Compression method

• Using Schur complement techniques separate out the phase dependence in the determinant

 $\det M = \det \mathcal{Q} \cdot \det \left[ e^{-\mu L_t/2} + T \cdot \mathcal{U} \cdot e^{+\mu L_t/2} \right]$ 

• Once the eigenvalues of TU are known we can compute the determinant for any phase, hence any Fourier coefficient  $4N_{*}L^{3}$ 

$$\det M(\mu) = \det \mathcal{Q} \cdot e^{+\mu L_t \cdot 2N_c L_s^3} \prod_{i=1}^{c} (e^{-\mu L_t} + \lambda_i)$$

• The T and U matrices are N<sub>t</sub> times smaller than M and the calculation is sped up considerably.

P. E. Gibbs, Phys. Lett. B172 (1986) 53.

AA and U. Wenger, *Phys.Rev.* D83 (2011) 034502, [arXiv:1009.2197].

K. Nagata and A. Nakamura, Phys. Rev. D82 (2010) 094027, [arXiv:1009.2149].

# Numerical results for N<sub>f</sub>=3

#### Simulation parameters -- L<sub>s</sub>=6

- Clover fermions with fixed c<sub>sw</sub>
- Iwasaki action: β = 1.65, 1.67, 1.69, 1.70, 1.71, 1.73
- Imaginary chemical potential:  $\mu/T = 0$ , i  $\pi/24$ , i  $\pi/12$ , i  $\pi/6$ , i  $\pi/3$
- About 20,000 configs for each ensemble
- We compute the determinant compression for each config

![](_page_12_Figure_6.jpeg)

# Polyakov loop distribution

![](_page_13_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Figure_3.jpeg)

#### Polyakov loop susceptibility

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_3.jpeg)

15

#### Pseudo-critical line

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

16

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Simulation parameters -- L<sub>s</sub>=8

- Clover fermions with fixed c<sub>sw</sub>
- Iwasaki action: β = 1.65, 1.67, 1.69, 1.70, 1.71, 1.72, 1.73
- Imaginary chemical potential: μ/T = 0, i π/24, i π/12, i π/6, i π/ 4, i π/3
- About 1,000 configs for each ensemble
- We compute the determinant compression for each config

![](_page_18_Figure_6.jpeg)

# Polyakov loop susceptibility

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

 $b_4(\beta, L) = b_4(\beta_c, \infty) + ax + bx^2 \qquad x \equiv (\beta - \beta_c)L^{1/\nu}$ 

23

![](_page_23_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Critical temperature

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

1.715

β

1.720

1.725

 $4 \times 6^3$ 

 $\times 8^3$  $\times 10^{3}$ 

1.710

1.705

1.700

- crossover

- 3D Ising

1st order

1.730

![](_page_27_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### Conclusions and outlook

- We analyzed the phase diagram of  $N_{f=3}$  QCD with  $m_{\pi}=760$  MeV at imaginary chemical potential using a multi-histogram reweighting both in temperature and chemical potential.
- We used N<sub>t</sub>=4 and two different volumes: 6<sup>3</sup> and 8<sup>3</sup>. The finite volume effects are substantial: the Binder cumulant measurements are inconclusive.
- Using finite volume scaling to extract the exponents indicates that the transition is a triple point.
- The triple point is also confirmed by the distribution of the imaginary part of the Polyakov loop close to the RW point.
- The Polyakov loop susceptibility scales with the volume at RW point as expected for a first order point. The transition seems to turn into a crossover at some point between  $\mu=i\pi/6$  and  $\mu=i\pi/3$ .
- We started generating data for larger volume, 104, and plan to trace out the phase transition from the RW point and determine where it turns into a crossover.