QCD thermodynamics at weak coupling

York Schröder

(Univ Bielefeld, Germany)

work with: F. Di Renzo, A. Hietanen, K. Kajantie, M. Laine, V. Miccio, K. Rummukainen, C. Torrero, A. Vuorinen

qhpd09, St Goar, 3 Sep 2009

Motivation

Why thermal QCD?

- study confinement and chiral symmetry breaking
- phenomenologically relevant for cosmology
- phenomenologically relevant for RHIC, LHC
- theoretical limit tractable with analytic methods
 - ▷ goal: no models stay within QCD!

Why weak-coupling methods?

need to complement / understand other approaches (mainly LAT)

	Lattice	weak-coupling QCD
Temperature	$T \sim T_c$	$T \gg T_c$
Chemical Potentials	$\mu \lesssim T$	any
Quark masses	close to physical	only at low orders
Dynamic quantities	very limited	yes
Cost	up to ∞	modest
Physical picture	''black box''	sometimes

• can be systematically improved

[cf other talk	s and	poster	session]
----------------	-------	--------	----------

 $[\rightarrow \text{see below}]$

 $[\rightarrow \text{see below}]$

[this talk]

Motivation

Focus on equilibrium thermodynamics of QCD

- structure of QCD phase diagram location of transition line; critical point; properties of transition; ...
- equation of state (EoS) of QGP
- properties of QGP: correlation lengths, spectral functions, ...

Interplay of methods

- QGP is strongly coupled system near $T_c \Rightarrow$ need e.g. LAT
- asymptotic freedom at high $T \Rightarrow$ weak-coupling approach
- cave: strict loop expansion not well-defined IR divergences at higher orders

Discuss

- effective theories
- spatial string tension
- basic thermodynamic observable: pressure p(T)
- quark mass effects on EoS

[Linde 1979; Gross/Pisarski/Yaffe 1981]

[<= main playground]

Motivation

p(T) important for cosmology:

• cooling rate of the universe

$$\partial_t T = -\frac{\sqrt{24\pi}}{m_{\rm Pl}} \frac{\sqrt{e(T)}}{\partial_T \ln s(T)}$$

- with entropy $s = \partial_T p$ and energy density e = Ts p
- \Rightarrow cosmol. relics (dark matter, background radiation etc.) originate when an interaction rate $\tau(T)$ gets larger than the age of the universe t(T).

p(T) in heavy ion collisions:

• expansion rate (after thermalization) given by

$$\partial_{\mu} T^{\mu\nu} = 0$$
 , $T^{\mu\nu} = [p(T) + e(T)] u^{\mu} u^{\nu} - p(T) g^{\mu\nu}$

- with flow velocity $u^{\mu}(t,x)$
 - ▷ hydrodynamic expansion: hadronization at $T \sim 100 150$ MeV ⇒ observed hadron spectrum depends (indirectly) on p(T)

p(T) via (large) computer ($\mu_B = 0$)



[lattice data from Karsch et.al.]

at $T \to \infty$, expect ideal gas: $p_{SB} = \left(16 + \frac{21}{2}N_f\right) \frac{\pi^2 T^4}{90}$ confirms simplicity: 3 dofs $(\pi) \to 52$ $(3 \times 3 \times 2 \times 2 \text{ qu} + 8 \times 2 \text{ gl})$

Energy scales in hot QCD

Interactions make QCD a multiscale system

At asymptotically high T, $g \ll 1 \Rightarrow$ clean separation of 3 scales expansion parameter:

$$g^{2} n_{b}(|k|) = \frac{g^{2}}{e^{|k|/T} - 1} \overset{|k| \leq T}{\approx} \frac{g^{2}T}{|k|}$$

- $|k| \sim \pi T$ aka "hard": fully perturbative at high T thermal fluctuations; effective mass of non-static field modes
- $|k| \sim gT$ aka "soft": dynamically generated; barely perturbative at high T inverse screening length of static color-electric fluctuations; thermal/Debye mass
- $|k| \sim g^2 T$ aka ''ultrasoft'': dynamically generated; non-perturbative at high T inverse screening length of static color-magnetic fluctuations; ''magnetic mass''
- no smaller momentum scales / larger length scales due to confinement

treatment of a multiscale system: effective field theory !

p(T) via weak-coupling expansion

need to explain 20% deviation from ideal gas at $T \sim 4T_c$

structure of pert series is non-trivial !

•
$$p(\mathbf{T}) \equiv \lim_{V \to \infty} \frac{T}{V} \ln \int \mathcal{D}[A^a_{\mu}, \psi, \bar{\psi}] \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\hbar} \int_0^{h/T} d\tau \int d^{3-2\epsilon} x \mathcal{L}_{QCD}\right)$$

= $c_0 + c_2 g^2 + c_3 g^3 + (c'_4 \ln g + c_4) g^4 + c_5 g^5 + (c'_6 \ln g + c_6) g^6 + \mathcal{O}(g^7)$

 $[c_2$ Shuryak 78, c_3 Kapusta 79, c'_4 Toimela 83, c_4 Arnold/Zhai 94, c_5 Zhai/Kastening 95, Braaten/Nieto 96, c'_6 KLRS 03]

- root cause of nonanalytic (in α_s) behavior well understood: above-mentioned dynamically generated scales
- clean separation best understood in effective field theory setup
 [this talk]
- other re-organizations possible, e.g. 2PI skeleton-expansion [see talk by JP Blaizot]

Effective theory prediction for p(T)

$$\begin{split} \frac{p_{\text{QCD}}(T)}{p_{\text{SB}}} &= \frac{p_{\text{E}}(T)}{p_{\text{SB}}} + \frac{p_{\text{M}}(T)}{p_{\text{SB}}} + \frac{p_{\text{G}}(T)}{p_{\text{SB}}} , \quad p_{\text{SB}} = \left(16 + \frac{21}{2}N_f\right)\frac{\pi^2 T^4}{90} \\ &= 1 + g^2 + g^4 + g^6 + \dots & \Leftarrow 4d \text{ QCD} \\ &+ g^3 + g^4 + g^5 + g^6 + \dots & \Leftarrow 3d \text{ adj H} \\ &+ \frac{1}{p_{\text{SB}}}\frac{T}{V}\int \mathcal{D}[A_k^a]\exp\left(-S_{\text{M}}\right) & \Leftarrow 3d \text{ YM} \end{split}$$

- this could be coined the physical leading-order (!) approximation
- collect contributions to p(T) from all physical scales
 - weak coupling, effective field theory setup
 - faithfully adding up all Feynman diagrams
 - get long-distance input from clean lattice observable:

$$p_{\mathsf{G}}(T) \equiv \frac{T}{V} \ln \int \mathcal{D}[A_k^a] \exp\left(-S_{\mathsf{M}}\right) = T \# g_{\mathsf{M}}^6$$

only one non-perturbative (but computable!) coeff needed

• how does this work in detail?

Effective theory setup: $QCD \rightarrow EQCD$

high T: QCD dynamics contained in 3d EQCD integrate out $|p| \gtrsim 2\pi T$: ψ , $A_{\mu}(n \neq 0)$

$$p_{\text{QCD}}(T) \equiv p_{\text{E}}(T) + \frac{T}{V} \ln \int \mathcal{D}[A_k^a, A_0^a] \exp\left(-\int d^{3-2\epsilon} x \,\mathcal{L}_{\text{E}}\right)$$
$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{E}} = \frac{1}{2} Tr \, F_{kl}^2 + Tr \, [D_k, A_0]^2 + m_{\text{E}}^2 Tr \, A_0^2 + \lambda_{\text{E}}^{(1)} (Tr \, A_0^2)^2 + \lambda_{\text{E}}^{(2)} Tr \, A_0^4 + \dots$$

five matching coefficients[E. Braaten, A. Nieto, 95; KLRS 02; M. Laine, YS, 05] $p_{\mathsf{E}} = T^4 \left[\# + \#g^2 + \#g^4 + \#g^6 + ... \right], m_{\mathsf{E}}^2 = T^2 \left[\#g^2 + \#g^4 + ... \right],$ $g_{\mathsf{E}}^2 = T \left[g^2 + \#g^4 + \#g^6 + ... \right], \lambda_{\mathsf{E}}^{(1),(2)} = T \left[\#g^4 + ... \right].$ higher order operators do not (yet) contribute[S. Chapman, 94; Kajantie et al, 97, 02]

$$\frac{\delta p_{\text{QCD}}(T)}{T} \sim \delta \mathcal{L}_{\text{E}} \sim g^2 \frac{D_k D_l}{(2\pi T)^2} \mathcal{L}_{\text{E}} \sim g^2 \frac{(gT)^2}{(2\pi T)^2} (gT)^3 \sim g^7 T^3$$

Effective theory setup: $QCD \rightarrow EQCD \rightarrow MQCD$

the IR of 3d EQCD is contained in 3d MQCD

integrate out $|p| \gtrsim gT$: A_0

$$p_{\text{QCD}}(T) \equiv p_{\text{E}}(T) + p_{\text{M}}(T) + \frac{T}{V} \ln \int \mathcal{D}[A_k^a] \exp\left(-\int d^{3-2\epsilon} x \mathcal{L}_{\text{M}}\right)$$
$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{M}} = \frac{1}{2} Tr F_{kl}^2 + \dots$$

two matching coefficients

[KLRS 03; P. Giovannangeli 04, M. Laine/YS 05]

$$p_{\mathsf{M}} = Tm_{\mathsf{E}}^3 \left[\# + \# \frac{g_{\mathsf{E}}^2}{m_{\mathsf{E}}} + \# \frac{g_{\mathsf{E}}^4}{m_{\mathsf{E}}^2} + \# \frac{g_{\mathsf{E}}^6}{m_{\mathsf{E}}^3} + \dots \right], \ g_{\mathsf{M}}^2 = g_{\mathsf{E}}^2 \left[1 + \# \frac{g_{\mathsf{E}}^2}{m_{\mathsf{E}}} + \# \frac{g_{\mathsf{E}}^4}{m_{\mathsf{E}}^2} + \dots \right].$$

higher order operators do not (yet) contribute

$$\frac{\delta p_{\rm QCD}(T)}{T} \sim \delta \mathcal{L}_{\rm M} \sim g_{\rm E}^2 \frac{D_k D_l}{m_{\rm E}^3} \mathcal{L}_{\rm M} \sim g_{\rm E}^2 \frac{(g^2 T)^2}{m_{\rm E}^3} (g^2 T)^3 \sim g^9 T^3$$

Shopping list for c_6

 $\dots + g^6$

- 4-loop sum-integrals needed, const term
- DOABLE?! manpower OR brainpower? [YS/AV ??]

matching coeffs

• 2-loop ϵ -terms for $m_{\rm E}^2$, $g_{\rm E}^2$ DONE. ML/YS 05: IBP, reduction, master sum-ints

 $\dots + g^6$

• 4-loop integrals needed DONE. KLRS 03: reduction, master ints, HPL

match MS/LAT

• 4-loop const in LAT reg via NSPT DONE. LMRST 06: LAT pert

 $\ldots + g^6$

• measure < Plaquette > in 3d SU(N) DONE. HKLRS 05: LAT Monte Carlo

Shopping list for c_6

4-loop sum-integrals?

- a single one has already been computed
 - painfully disentangled (sub-)divergences by hand
 - constant term only numerically
 - \triangleright gave the g^6 term in scalar ϕ^4
- in QCD, need $\mathcal{O}(10^8)$ of them
- ideas to profit from algorithmic T = 0 methods not fruitful (yet?)
 - ▷ as used and tested extensively for the 3d part
- find a smart duality to map the problem to sth simpler?

[GLSTV 2008]

[⇐ see below]

Algorithmic methods: reduction, IBP

can do 4-loop scalar theory on paper:



1 integral

25M integrals (2^96^6)

for QCD, need a computer:

powerful method: integration by parts (IBP)

 \Rightarrow systematically use $0 = \int d^d k \, \partial_{k_\mu} f_\mu(k)$

many incarnations: Laporta, Baikov, Gröbner

key idea: lexicographic ordering among all loop integrals

arrive at rep in terms of irreducible (\equiv master) integrals

$$\sum_{i} \frac{\mathsf{poly}_i(d,\xi)}{\mathsf{poly}_i(d)} \mathsf{Master}_i(d)$$

[Chetyrkin/Tkachov 81]

[Laporta 00]

Algorithmic methods: integration

Evaluating Masters

- numerical integration; cave: precision (MC?)
- explicit integration; can be an ''art''
- difference equations
 - ▷ solve directly
 - solve numerically
 - Laplace transform
- differential equations

Mathematical structure

- interested in the coefficients of an ϵ expansion
- in many cases, these are from a generic class of functions/numbers
- e.g. harmonic polylogarithms HPL(x)
- e.g. harmonic sums S(N)

[Remiddi/Vermaseren 00]

[Vermaseren 98]

Algorithmic methods: harmonic sums

find interesting new numbers

''the language that Feynman diagrams speak''?

[J. Vermaseren]

Parametric behavior of some observables

pressure, energy density, ...

•
$$\frac{p}{T^4} \sim 1 + g^2 + g^3 + g^4 \ln g + g^4 + g^5 + g^6 (\ln g + [np]) + \dots$$

correlation lengths $\xi = m_{\rm E}^{-1}$ für $Tr F_{0i}F_{jk}$, Tr Pol etc.

• $m_{\rm E} \sim gT + g^2 T (\ln g + [{\rm np}]) + \dots$

correlation lengths $\xi = m_{\rm G}^{-1}$ für $Tr F_{ij}^2$

•
$$m_{\rm G} \sim [{\rm np}] \times g^2 T + \dots$$

spatial string tension

• $\sqrt{\sigma_s} \sim [np] \times g^2 T + \dots$

 \Rightarrow use these quantities e.g. as precision test of eff. th. setup

Spatial string tension: $W_s(R_1, R_2) = \exp(-\sigma_s R_1 R_2)$ at large R_1, R_2 SU(3), 4d lat: $\frac{\sqrt{\sigma_s}}{T} = \operatorname{fct}\left(\frac{T}{T_c}\right)$; $T_c \approx 1.2\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$ SU(3), 3d MQCD: $\frac{\sqrt{\sigma_s}}{T} = \# \frac{g_M^2}{g_E^2} \frac{g_E^2}{T} = \operatorname{fct}\left(\frac{T}{\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}}\right)$; # = 0.553(1) [Teper, Lucini 02]



[4d lattice data from Boyd et al, 96] (cave: no cont. extrapolation)

parameter-free comparison; support for hard/soft+ultrasoft picture

Outlook for p(T): $g^6 \to g^7 \to g^8$

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \frac{p_{\rm G}}{p_{\rm SB}} & = & \#_{(6)} \left(\frac{g_{\rm M}^2}{T} \right)^3 + [\delta \mathcal{L}_{\rm M}]_{(9)} \\ \\ g_{\rm M}^2 & = & g_{\rm E}^2 \left[1 + \#_{(7)} \frac{g_{\rm E}^2}{m_{\rm E}} + \left(\frac{g_{\rm E}^2}{m_{\rm E}} \right)^2 \left(\#_{(8)} + \#_{(10)} \frac{\lambda_{\rm E}}{g_{\rm E}^2} \right) + \cdots _{(9)} \right] \\ \\ \frac{p_{\rm M}}{p_{\rm SB}} & = & \frac{m_{\rm E}^3}{T^3} \left[\#_{(3)} + \frac{g_{\rm E}^2}{m_{\rm E}} \left(\#_{(4)} + \#_{(6)} \frac{\lambda_{\rm E}}{g_{\rm E}^2} \right) + \left(\frac{g_{\rm E}^2}{m_{\rm E}} \right)^2 \left(\#_{(5)} + \#_{(7)} \frac{\lambda_{\rm E}}{g_{\rm E}^2} + \#_{(9)} \left(\frac{\lambda_{\rm E}}{g_{\rm E}^2} \right)^2 \right) \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{g_{\rm E}^2}{m_{\rm E}} \right)^3 \left(\#_{(6)} + \#_{(8)} \frac{\lambda_{\rm E}}{g_{\rm E}^2} + \#_{(10)} \left(\frac{\lambda_{\rm E}}{g_{\rm E}^2} \right)^2 + \#_{(12)} \left(\frac{\lambda_{\rm E}}{g_{\rm E}^2} \right)^3 \right) \\ & \quad + [3d \operatorname{5loop} \operatorname{Opt}]_{(7)} + [\delta \mathcal{L}_{\rm E}]_{(7)} + [3d \operatorname{6loop} \operatorname{Opt}]_{(8)} + \cdots _{(9)}] \\ \\ m_{\rm E}^2 & = & T^2 \left[\#_{(3)} g^2 + \#_{(5)} g^4 + [4d \operatorname{3loop} 2pt]_{(7)} + \cdots _{(9)} \right] \\ \lambda_{\rm E} & = & T \left[\#_{(6)} g^4 + \#_{(8)} g^6 + \cdots _{(10)} \right] \\ g_{\rm E}^2 & = & T \left[g^2 + \#_{(6)} g^4 + \#_{(8)} g^6 + \cdots _{(10)} \right] \\ \frac{p_{\rm E}}{p_{\rm SB}} & = & \#_{(0)} + \#_{(2)} g^2 + \#_{(4)} g^4 + \#_{(6)} g^6 + [4d \operatorname{5loop} \operatorname{Opt}]_{(8)} + \cdots _{(10)} \end{array}$$

notation: $\#_{(n)}$ enters p_{QCD} at g^n

[cave: no $\frac{1}{\epsilon} + 1 + \epsilon$, no IR/UV, and no logs shown above]

Matching p(T) at $N_f = 0$

in the meantime ...

- want to show results / tackle simpler problems / phenomenology
- strive for best possible description of pure-glue sector



- fix unknown perturbative $\mathcal{O}(g^6)$ coeff
- use available lattice data here: at $3-5T_c$ [Boyd et al 1996]
- translate via $T_c/\Lambda_{\overline{\rm MS}} pprox 1.20$
- match at intermediate $T\sim 3-5T_c$
- (at high T? [Endrödi et al LAT07; Borsanyi])

Quark mass dependence

analyze quark mass dependence to NLO

 $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}} = 200 \text{ MeV}$ strategy: ''unquenching'' 4.0start from $N_f = 0$, i.e. $m_q = \infty$ lower N_f quark masses to $m_{q,phys}$ p at any T increases estimate this "correction factor" • aproach is systematic 3.0 LO: $c_0(N_f)/c_0(0)$ NLO: $[c_0 + g^2 c_2](N_f) / [c_0 + g^2 c_2](0)$ - $[N_f = 4]/[N_f = 0] O(g^2)$ - $[N_f = 4]/[N_f = 0] O(g^0)$ • computed $c_{0,2}(T, N_c, N_f, m_i, \mu_i)$ ---- $[N_f = 3]/[N_f = 0] O(g^2)$ good convergence LO→NLO ---- $[N_f = 3]/[N_f = 0] O(g^0)$ \triangleright $N_f = 3:5\%$ effect 2.9 400 600 800 1000 \triangleright $N_f = 4$: even better T / MeV

charm quark contributes already at low $T\sim 350 MeV$

Setting the scale

now ready to estimate thermodynamic quantities



T/MeV

Thermodynamic quantities

now use the recipe $p(N_f=0) \times \text{corr.fct}$ to obtain s(T) = p'(T), e(T) = Ts(T) - p(T), c(T) = e'(T) = Tp''(T)



- use eff numbers of bosonic dof's $g_{\text{eff}}(T) \equiv e(T) / \left[\frac{\pi^2 T^4}{30}\right]$ $h_{\text{eff}}(T) \equiv s(T) / \left[\frac{2\pi^2 T^3}{45}\right]$ $i_{\text{eff}}(T) \equiv c(T) / \left[\frac{2\pi^2 T^3}{15}\right]$
- observe significant structure
- at 2nd order phase transition $i(T) \sim (T T_c)^{-\gamma}$

Thermodynamic quantities

consider dimensionless ratios



• equation of state

$$w(T) \equiv \frac{p(T)}{e(T)} = \frac{p(T)}{Tp'(T) - p(T)}$$

sound speed (squared)

$$c_s^2(T) \equiv \frac{p'(T)}{e'(T)} = \frac{p'(T)}{Tp''(T)} = \frac{s(T)}{c(T)}$$

• $\left(\frac{1}{3} - w(T)\right) \propto$ "trace anomaly" (or "interaction measure")

peak around 70MeV not (yet) visible in lattice simulations

Thermodynamic quantities

most recent lattice data

[Bazavov et al, 2009]



- HotQCD 2009
- $N_f = 2 + 1$ m_s physical light quarks not
- $N_{\tau} = 8$ two (staggered) actions

Summary

- thermodynamic quantities of QCD are relevant for cosmology and heavy ion collisons
- these quantities can be determined numerically at $T\sim 200$ MeV, and analytically at $T\gg 200$ MeV; multi-loop sports, eff. theories convenient
- effective field theory opens up tremendous opportunities: analytic treatment of fermions, universality, superrenormalizabilty
- spatial string tension
 - successful test of effective theory setup
- QCD pressure
 - not even known at ''physical leading order''
 - problem reduced to one (hard) perturbative computation
 - shows friendly functional behavior with fitted unknown coefficient
- quark mass dependence in EoS
 - shows good convergence
 - \triangleright charm quark contributes already at fairly low T
 - need reliable lattice simulations in transition region

Summing up IR contributions beyond 4-loop

Can one do without the EQCD \rightarrow MQCD matching?

- treat 3d EQCD on the lattice
- still much simpler than full QCD
- measure condensates on physical line
- 3d EQCD is superrenormalizable
 - ▷ can perform LAT $\leftrightarrow \overline{MS}$ matching exactly in perturbation theory
 - \triangleright before cont. limit, all numbers are f(am)
 - \triangleright action not (yet) completely $\mathcal{O}(a)$ improved
 - \triangleright large discretization effects such as $a \ln(a)$ present

Compute parameters needed for reliable continuum extrapolation

- need to compute (4-loop) diagrams in lattice regularization
 - via Numerical Stochastic Perturbation Theory

[Di Renzo et al 2008]

• invested $\sim 4 \cdot 10^{18}$ flops on APE (Parma), Ben (Trento)

Summing up IR contributions beyond 4-loop

Measure condensates

[HKLRS 2008]

- main idea: measure $\left\langle TrA_{0}^{2}
 ight
 angle \sim\partial_{m^{2}}\mathcal{F}$ and integrate
- know integration constant from perturbative analysis

▷ since dimensionless expansion parameter is g_E^2/m_E

- sampled the function at 13 points used 186 lattices, with $(\beta = \frac{6}{ag_F^2}, N_s)$ from (24,48) up to (240,512)
- get a good perturbation-theory inspired fit and integrate
- invested $\sim 1.4 \cdot 10^{18}$ flops at CSC (Fin)
- ... do not yet fully understand the result ...

Summing up IR contributions beyond 4-loop



- need to include $\langle (TrA_0^2)^2 \rangle$?
- $\langle TrA_0^2 \rangle$ fluctuates too much at small m_{E} (or T) \rightarrow systematically overestimated?
 - physical phase of EQCD is metastable
 - cure this by improved eff. theories?

[Kajantie et al 1997] [Vuorinen/Yaffe; Pisarski; ...]

Methods: Lattice simulation



statistical errors are (much) smaller than the symbol sizes

Fit: $c_1/\beta + c_2/\beta^2 + c_3/\beta^3 + c_4 \ln \beta/\beta^4 + c_4/\beta^4 + c_5/\beta^5 + c_6/\beta^6$

Methods: Lattice simulation





significance loss due to the UV subtractions

continuum limit of infinitevolume extrapolated data

$$B_{\rm G} + \left(\frac{43}{12} - \frac{157}{768}\pi^2\right)c_4' = 10.7 \pm 0.4 \qquad (N_c = 3)$$

Algorithmic methods: Loop-and-Leg sports



for pressure: 4 loops, 0 legs

$$\Phi_{2} = \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{12} - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}$$

Thermal pressure p(T): 4d vs 3d ($N_f = 0$)



depencence on g^6 constant

this non-perturbative contribution is unknown, but computable!

Thermal pressure p(T): 4d vs 3d ($N_f = 0$)



scale dependence

Thermal pressure p(T): 4d vs 3d ($N_f = 0$)



 g^6 constant is a guess.

non-perturbative contrib not known, but computable!

Hadron resonance gas

from PDG, get http://pdg.lbl.gov/2009/mcdata/mass_width_2008.csv:

*MASS(MeV)	,Err+	,Err-	,WIDTH(MeV)	,I	,G,J	,P,C,A,Ch	nrg,R,S,Name	,Quarks
1.3957018E+02	,3.5E-0	4,3.5E-0	04,2.5284E-14	,1	,-,0	,-, ,B,	+, ,R,pi	,uD
1.349766E+02	,6.0E-0	4,6.0E-0	04,7.8E-06	,1	,-,0	,-,+, ,	0, ,R,pi	,(uU-dD)/sqrt(2)
5.4751E+02	,1.8E-0	1,1.8E-0	01,1.30E-03	,0	,+,0	,-,+, ,	0, ,R,eta	,x(uU+dD)+y(sS)
8.0E+02	,4.0E+0	2,4.0E+0	02,8.0E+02	,0	,+,0	,+,+, ,	0, ,R,f(0)(600)	,Maybe non-qQ
7.755E+02	,4.0E-0	1,4.0E-0	01,1.4940E+02	,1	,+,1	,-, ,B,	+, ,R,rho(770)	,uD

extract list of Mesons and Baryons, incl masses + deg.factors

take the \sim 200 well established ones only $\Rightarrow \sim$ 1000 resonances

$$\frac{p_{had}(T)}{T^4} = \sum_{i \in Baryons} \frac{d_i}{2\pi^2} \int_0^\infty dp \, p^2 \ln\left(1 + e^{-\sqrt{p^2 + m_i^2/T^2}}\right)$$
$$- \sum_{i \in Mesons} \frac{d_i}{2\pi^2} \int_0^\infty dp \, p^2 \ln\left(1 - e^{-\sqrt{p^2 + m_i^2/T^2}}\right)$$

String tension and inverse correlation lengths



[lattice date from: Hart et al 00; Boyd et al 96; Kaczmarek at al 00; Teper 98; Laine et al 01; Datta et al 02]

''full 4d'': 4d lattice Monte Carlo

```
''full 3d'': 3d lattice, couplings(g^2,T)
```

effective coupling constant g_{E}^{2} numerically



The IR problem

[Linde 1979; Gross/Pisarski/Yaffe 1981]

 $(\ell+1)$ loops, 2ℓ vert, 3ℓ propags



$$\sim \left(T\sum_{n}\int d^{3}p\right)^{\ell+1} \frac{(gp)^{2\ell}}{[(2\pi nT)^{2} + p^{2} + \Pi(2\pi nT, p)]^{3\ell}}$$

IR power counting: n=0, define $\Pi(0, p \rightarrow 0) \equiv m^2$

$$\sim T^{\ell+1}g^{2\ell}m^{3(\ell+1)+2\ell-6\ell} = g^6T^4\left(\frac{g^2T}{m}\right)^{\ell-3}$$

• $\Pi_L(0,p) \sim (gT)^2 \Leftarrow \mathsf{OK}$: get series in g

• $\Pi_T(0,p) \sim (g^2 T)^2 \Leftarrow \underline{\text{all}} \text{ orders important!}$