ISTITUTO NAZIONALE DI FISICA NUCLEARE

Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati

V. Azcoiti, A. Cruz and A. Nakamura: EFFECTS OF DYNAMICAL QUARK LOOPS ON MONTE CARLO SIMULATION IN LATTICE GAUGE THEORY

# EFFECTS OF DYNAMICAL QUARK LOOPS ON MONTE CARLO SIMULATION IN LATTICE GAUGE THEORY

V. Azcoiti[x][o], A. Nakamura
INFN - Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati

and

A. Cruz[o]
Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Zaragoza, Spain

## ABSTRACT

We have run computer simulations in SU(2) lattice gauge theory including dynamical quark loops. We report the experimental results of the plaquette energy, the plaquette-plaquette correlations, $\langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle$ , the value of the Polyakov line and $\pi$, $\varrho$ and $\omega$ masses and discuss the effects of dynamical quark loops on these quantities. We present also our experimental procedure of the simulations in detail.

## 1. - INTRODUCTION

The incorporation of fermionic degrees of freedom in Monte Carlo (MC) simulations of lattice gauge theories would allow us to reach a new stage of hadron physics. We could calculate, in principle, all the hadronic properties and could see how the QCD vacuum is constructed at low energies.

Unfortunately, we stand now far from such a state. The main difficulty consists in the very long computational time of quark propagators and, especially, of quark vacuum polarization diagrams. Therefore, the first trials to calculate fermion propaga-

tors under SU(N) gauge fields have been done without quark loops (quenched approximation)[1]. The results were quite encouraging: reasonable values of hadron masses, decay constants and baryon magnetic moments have been obtained. After these successful papers, a flood of efforts have been devoted to the improvement of the results along this line towards larger lattices[2].

However, the real world includes quark loops. We expect that the mass splitting between the flavour singlet and non singlet mesons can be explained with quark loops. Chiral symmetry breaking[3] should be confirmed with the inclusion of quark loops.

The hopping parameter expansion had been the only way to include fermion loops numerically[4]. It is a very good and effective approximation for heavy quarks, i. e., small values of the hopping parameter, and for a small lattice. Fake quark loops due to finite size effects are easily eliminated in this approximation. However there is a convergence problem for light quarks, and the computational task is very heavy for a large lattice.

Although the above approaches may be highroads, it is worth while, we believe, to explore the MC simulation of gauge theories without these approximations. Towards the real QCD simulations, we should develope efficient algorithms not only for quark propagators but also for quark loops.

The first numerical results along this line had been obtained by two of us[5] for SU(2) gauge group and Wilson action[6] and by Hamber, Marinari, Parisi and Rebbi[7] for SU(3) and Kogut Susskind action[8]. Here we shall continue the study of the previous paper and report more detailed results. In Section 2, the basic formulae are recalled and several relations are derived which will be useful later. In Section 3, we describe the experimental procedure and the results. Section 4 is devoted to a summary of the problems found in this experiment and to discussing possible approaches to them.


## 2. - FERMIONS IN THE MC SIMULATION

### 2. 1. - General formulation

The Euclidean lattice action has the form :

$$S = S_G(U) + S_F(U, \overline{\psi}, \psi) , \tag{1}$$

where the first term represents the kinetic term of gauge variables, U, with bare coupling g. In this paper we employ the Wilson action[6] both for gauge and fermion parts. The fermion action is bilinear in the fermion fields,

$$S_F = \overline{\psi} \Delta \psi = \overline{\psi}(c - kM)\psi . \tag{2}$$

The matrix $\Delta$ has the form

$$\Delta = c\,\delta_{n,m} - k \sum_{\mu=1}^{4} \left[ (r-\gamma_\mu)\, U_{n,\mu}\, \delta_{n+\hat{\mu},m} + (r+\gamma_\mu)\, U^+_{m,\mu}\, \delta_{n,m+\hat{\mu}} \right], \tag{3}$$

where n and m are site indices and we suppress colour and flavour indices. The hopping parameter, k, is related to the bare mass m, Wilson term r and lattice spacing a as

$$k = \frac{c}{8r + 2ma} . \tag{4}$$

The fermion variables are related to the continuum fermion fields $\psi(x)$ as

$$\psi_n \sim \sqrt{\frac{a^3}{2k}}\, \psi(x) .$$

In this paper we set both r and c to be 1. We use self adjoint Euclidean Dirac matrices:

$$\left\{ \gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu \right\} = 2\delta_{\mu\nu} , \quad \gamma^{\mu +} = \gamma^\mu , \qquad \mu = 1, 2, 3, 4$$

$$\gamma^5 = \gamma^1 \gamma^2 \gamma^3 \gamma^4 .$$

The matrix $\Delta$ has the following property,

$$\gamma^5 \Delta\, \gamma^5 = \Delta^+ . \tag{5}$$

Due to this symmetry, the eigenvalues of $\Delta$ (and $\Delta^{-1}$) appear in complex conjugate pairs.

For numerical simulations, it is convenient to integrate the partition function over fermion fields using the Matthews-Salam formula

$$Z = \int \mathscr{D}U\, \mathscr{D}\bar{\psi}\, \mathscr{D}\psi\, e^{-S_G - \bar{\psi}\Delta\psi} = \int \mathscr{D}U\, e^{-S_G} \det(-\Delta) = \int \mathscr{D}U\, e^{-S_G - S_{EF}} . \tag{6}$$

To our knowledge, there is no proof to show the positivity of $\det\Delta$ above $k = 1/8$. We assume, therefore, its positivity. Then we can write

$$\det\Delta = \sqrt{\det\Omega} , \tag{7}$$

where

$$\Omega = \Delta^+\Delta .$$

For small change of the gauge fields,

$$\delta S_{EF} = -\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}\left( \Omega^{-1} \delta\Omega \right) . \tag{8}$$

We may write meson fields in the form

$$\overline{\psi}(x)\Gamma\psi(x) \ ,$$

where $\Gamma$ is a matrix with Dirac and flavour indices. Then, meson propagators are given by

$$G(x,y) = \langle \mathscr{G}(x,y) \rangle \ , \tag{9}$$

where

$$\mathscr{G}(x,y) = \mathscr{G}_{dc} - \mathscr{G}_c = \mathrm{Tr}\left[ \Gamma\Delta^{-1}(x,x)\right] \mathrm{Tr}\left[\widetilde{\Gamma}\Delta^{-1}(y,y)\right] -$$
$$- \mathrm{Tr}\left[ \Gamma\Delta^{-1}(x,y) \ \widetilde{\Gamma}\Delta^{-1}(y,x)\right] \ , \tag{10}$$

with $\widetilde{\Gamma} = \gamma^4\Gamma^+\gamma^4$ and

$$\langle \mathscr{G} \rangle = \frac{\int \mathscr{D}U \ \mathscr{G} e^{-S_G-S_{EF}}}{\int \mathscr{D}U \ e^{-S_G-S_{EF}}}$$

Fig. 1 is a diagrammatic representation of equation (10). Except for flavour-singlet



FIG. 1 - Diagrammatic representation of the fermion contribution to the meson propagator (equation (10)). The first graph represents the quark loops contribution to meson propagator, which is different from zero only for flavour-singlet mesons.

mesons, the first term of equation (10) vanishes. The time slice propagators are defined as

$$G(\tau) = \sum_{\substack{x,y \\ x_4-y_4=\tau}} G(x,y) \ . \tag{11}$$

These propagators, for periodic boundary conditions, show the following behaviour at large $\tau$ :

$$G(\tau) \sim \cosh Ma\left(\tau - \frac{T}{2}\right) \ . \tag{12}$$

In this expression, M is the lightest hadron mass with the same quantum numbers as $\overline{\psi}\Gamma\psi$, and T is periodicity in the time direction.

With the help of the Matthews-Salam formula, we can easily get the formula,

$$k \frac{d}{dk} \log \det \Delta = \text{tr}(1) - \text{tr}(\Delta^{-1}) . \tag{13}$$

After integration over the gauge fields we have

$$k \frac{d}{dk} \langle S_{EF} \rangle = n_f N^4 ( \langle \bar{\psi}(x) \psi(x) \rangle - 4 n_c) , \tag{14}$$

where $n_f$ and $n_c$ are the number of flavours and colours, respectively, and $N^4$ is the number of lattice sites. We will use formula (14) later to estimate the magnitude of the effective fermion action, $S_{EF}$.

## 2.2. - Pseudo-fermion method and quark propagators

The pseudo-fermion MC method was introduced by Fucito, Marinari, Parisi and Rebbi[9] to calculate $\Delta^{-1}$. The quark propagators, $\Delta^{-1}$, may be expressed in a bosonic integration form,

$$\Delta^{-1}_{ij} = \langle \chi^*_j \phi_i \rangle_{PF} , \tag{15}$$

where

$$\langle \theta \rangle_{PF} = \frac{\int \mathcal{D} \phi^* \mathcal{D} \phi \, \theta \, e^{-S\phi}}{\int \mathcal{D} \phi^* \mathcal{D} \phi \, e^{-S\phi}} , \tag{16}$$

and

$$\chi = \Delta \phi . \tag{17}$$

The bosonic fields, $\phi$, have the same quantum numbers as $\psi$. The "action" $S_\phi$, being positive definite, is given by

$$S_\phi = \chi^+ \chi . \tag{18}$$

Fucito et al. have proposed to evaluate this integral by the MC method.

In terms of the pseudo-fermion fields, the variation (8) may be expressed in the form

$$\delta S_{EF} = - \langle \chi^+ (\delta \Delta \phi) \rangle_{PF} . \tag{19}$$

Since the gauge and the pseudo-fermion MC sweeps of a lattice are performed in turn, we do not know the new gauge configuration, $\{U_{new}\}$ and, therefore, the variation $\delta \Delta$ in equation (19) during updating the pseudo-fermion variables. We rewrite $\delta \Delta$ in the following form,

$$\delta \Delta = - k \sum_{\mu=1}^{4} \left[ (1 - \gamma_\mu)(\text{Ð}U)_{n,\mu} \, \delta_{n+\hat{\mu},m} + (1 + \gamma_\mu)(\text{Ð}U)^+_{m,\mu} \, \delta_{n,m+\hat{\mu}} \right] . \tag{20}$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}U = U_{new} - U_{old} = (V-1)\,U_{old} = (\sum_{i=0}^{3} C_i \sigma^i)\,U_{old}\,. \tag{21}$$

Here $\sigma^i$ are the unit and Pauli matices. Then we may write down $\delta\Delta$ as

$$\delta\Delta = \sum_i C_i\,\delta\Delta^{(i)}\,, \tag{22}$$

where $\delta\Delta^{(i)}$ is obtained by replacing DU with $\sigma^i U_{old}$ in equation (20).

In terms of the pseudo-fermion fields, the connected part of the time slice pro_pagator is given by

$$\mathcal{G}_c(\tau) = \Gamma_{ij}\,\tilde{\Gamma}_{kl}\sum_{\substack{x,y \\ x_4-y_4=\tau}}\,\langle \chi_k^*(y)\,\phi_j(x)\rangle_{PF}\,\langle \chi_i^*(x)\,\phi_l(y)\rangle_{PF}\,. \tag{23a}$$

This form, however, is not appropriate to the computation because we should store all the pseudo-fermion fields generated in the pseudo-fermionic MC iterations. We can rewrite (22a) as

$$\mathcal{G}_c(\tau) = \Gamma_{ij}\,\tilde{\Gamma}_{kl}\Bigg[ \Big\langle \sum_{\substack{x,y \\ x_4-y_4=\tau}}\,\chi_i^*(x)\,\phi_j(x)\,\chi_k^*(y)\,\phi_l(y)\Big\rangle_{PF} - $$

$$- \sum_{x_4-y_4=\tau}\,\Big\langle \sum_x \chi_i^*(x)\,\phi_j(x)\Big\rangle_{PF}\,\Big\langle \sum_y \chi_k^*(y)\,\phi_l(y)\Big\rangle_{PF}\Bigg]\,. \tag{23b}$$

By this simple trick, we can drastically save in computer memory.

## 2. 3. - Discrete pseudo-fermions

In this paper we will study the case of a SU(2) gauge theory. We employ for gau_ge variables the discrete subgroup of SU(2) defined by the symmetries of an icosahe-dron[10]. Here is a simple trick to reduce the computer time in the pseudo-fermionic MC calculation: We make also pseudo-fermion variables discrete. Suppressing Dirac, colour and site indices, we may write the pseudo-fermion fields as

$$\phi = r\left(\begin{matrix}\alpha\\\beta\end{matrix}\right)\,,$$

where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ satisfy the condition,

$$|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1\,.$$

Just this condition is also satisfied by a column vector of a SU(2) matrix. We replace the pseudo-fermion field $\phi$ by a column vector of the representation of the icosahedral

group in the numerical computation.

## 3. - EXPERIMENT AND DATA

In this experiment we use essentially the same computer program as in our previous paper, where the reliability of the program was discussed in detail. We employ the Metroplis algorithm[11] for updating both gauge and pseudo-fermion fields. Periodic boundary conditions are imposed on both gauge and fermion fields. Two flavours are generated independently to reduce systematic erros. Typical computer time on a $4^4$ lattice is one hour in a VAX11/780 for one gauge sweep which contains $2 \times 200$ pseudo-fermionic MC iterations with five hits. The times for one sweep of the pseudo-fermion field, for one calculation of $\delta \Delta$ over the fixed pseudo-fermion and for one calculation of the propagators are about 7.5, 2.2 and 1.3, respectively, in units of one gauge sweeping time. The rate of acceptance in performing one upgrading step on a pseudo-fermion vector with four Dirac and two color components is roughly 5%.

Convergence is satisfactorily fast. In Fig. 2 we show the behaviour of the expectation value of $S_\phi$ for the first four gauge configurations. The run is initiated with all

FIG. 2 - Expectation value of $S_\phi$ against the number of pseudofermionic MC iterations for the first gauge configurations. The starting gauge configuration has been chosen randomly (hot start). For each gauge configuration, we have used 40 pseudofermionic MC iterations as thermalization. The crosses correspond to hot start for the initial pseudofermionic configuration, and the circles to cold start. The theoretical value of $\langle S_\phi \rangle$ is 2048 on a $4^4$ lattice with two colour degrees of freedom. After each gauge sweeping, the pseudofermionic MC calculation starts from the last configuration in the previous iteration.



gauge variables chosen randomly (hot start). For any gauge configuration, the following condition should be satisfied:

$$\langle S_\phi \rangle_{PF} = \text{(Number of degrees of freedom)} . \tag{24}$$

After each gauge sweeping, the pseudofermionic MC calculation starts from the last configuration in the previous iteration. The Fig. 2 shows that after a few gauge configurations, condition (24) is satisfied with a few percent error. We monitored this quantity when running the program.

The plaquette energy, $E_p$, and the chiral order parameter, $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$, are plotted as a function of the number of MC gauge iterations in Fig. 3. Ten or twenty iterations seem to be enough for these quatities to reach equilibrium.



FIG. 3 - Expectation values of the plaquette energy (a) and the chiral order parameter $\bar{\psi}(x)\psi(x)$ (b) against the number of MC gauge configurations. Each point was obtained averaging over four gauge configurations. The initial conditions for gauge fields are cold start (crosses) and equilibrium configuration for $\beta = 2.2$ and $k = 0.18$ (circles) respectively.

Now we shall report the experimental data. First let us investigate the effects of fermion loops to the gauge fields. In Figs. 4 and 5, we plot the expectation values of the plaquette energy and the Polyakov line as a function of the hopping parameter, where the Polyakov line is defined as[12]

$$L = \frac{1}{n_c} \frac{1}{N^3} \left| \sum_x \text{Tr} \prod_{i=1}^{N_t} U_t(t_i, x) \right| . \tag{25}$$

In the figures the points at $k = 0$ correspond to the quenched case, i. e. pure gauge case. When we put quark loops into the system, the plaquette energy decreases, i. e., the system temperature goes down. The Polyalov line is used as an order parameter of deconfinement in the pure gauge theories. Fermion loops increase this order parameter. These observations indicate that fermion loops push the gauge configuration to a more ordered state. The effect becomes prominent above $k \simeq 0.15$. In this region, as we will see, the fermion determinant makes a sizable contribution to the action.

In Fig. 6, we illustrate the fermion loops effect in the plaquette-plaquette correlation function, $G(\tau)$, for $\tau = 0$ and 1. We define $G(\tau)$ as

FIG. 4 - Expectation value of the plaquet te energy as a function of the hopping parameter k (k = 0 corresponds to the pure gauge case). These values have been obtained from about 50 MC gauge iterations.

FIG. 5 - Expectation value of the Wilson line as a function of the hopping parameter k. These values have been obtained under the same conditions as in Fig. 4.



FIG. 6 - (a) Time slice plaquette-plaquette correlation function $G(\tau)$ at $\tau = 0$ against the number of MC gauge sweeps. The solid line stands for the pure gauge case. The triangles correspond to k = 0.20 and have been obtained with a thermalization of 40 gauge MC iterations. The crosses correspond to k = 0.23 and the thermalization is 68 sweeps. (b) Time slice plaquette-plaquette correlation function $G(\tau)$ at $\tau = 1$ against the number of MC gauge sweeps. The hatched region stands for the corresponding va lue in the pure gauge case. The crosses correspond to k = 0.23 and the thermalization for gauge fields is 68 sweeps.

$$G(\tau) = N_s \left[ \left< W(\tau) W(0) \right> - \left< W(0) \right>^2 \right] , \qquad (26)$$

where

$$W(\tau) = \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{\substack{\text{spatial} \\ \text{plaquette}}} \frac{1}{2} tr(U_p) ,$$

and $N_s$ is the number of space-like plaquettes. In this figure, we plot $G(\tau)$ as a function of the number of MC iterations. The solid line and the hatched region in the figures stand for the corresponding values in the pure gauge theory. The value of $G(0)$ is much smaller than that of the pure gauge case: the fluctuation of the plaquette energy decreases due to fermion loops. The value of $G(1)$ is very small and we cannot distinguish it from zero. The pure gauge configurations generated with fermion loops seem to be fairly different from those of the pure gauge case. Note that the glue-ball masses are essentially determined by $G(\tau)$. Our measurement here does not allow a determination of the glue-ball masses because of poor statistics and the problem of the fake quark loops due to the small size of the lattice. However, if one wants to know a realistic value of the glue-ball mass, the effects of fermion loops should be considered seriously.

Next, we will study the problems related to the quark propagators. In Fig.7, we plot $\left< \bar{\psi}(x)\psi(x) \right>$ on a $4^4$ lattice as a function of k at $\beta = 2.2$. Here $\left< \bar{\psi}(x)\psi(x) \right>$ is defined by

$$\left< \bar{\psi}(x)\psi(x) \right> = \frac{1}{n_f N^4} \ tr(\Delta^{-1}) .$$

From these values we can estimate the magnitude of $S_{EF}$ using equation (14). We fit the data in Fig. 7 with a spline approximation and integrate it to obtain Fig. 8. We find that there is a sizable contribution of $det\Delta$ to the total action at large k, i.e., light quark mass regions.

We have measured $E_p$ and $\left< \bar{\psi}\psi \right>$ also on a $4^3 \times 8$ lattice at $\beta = 2.2$. We do not see any significant difference in the data between $4^4$ and $4^3 \times 8$ lattices within statistical errors.

In Table I, we present the "masses" of $\pi$, $\varrho$ and $\omega$ in reciprocal lattice distance units. Here "masses" are defined as

$$Ma = cosh^{-1} \frac{G(\tau = 1)}{G(\tau = 2)} \quad \text{(see equation (11))}.$$

We have found that the $\pi/\varrho$ mass ratios are about one and that the splitting of $\varrho$ and $\omega$ has the correct sign for the observed region of the parameters. We should notice, however, i) the "mass" defined above has a strong contamination of higher states because

FIG. 7 - Expectation value per flavour of $8 - \bar{\psi}(x)\psi(x)$ as a function of the hopping parameter k. The solid line is a spline interpolation for the data on a $4^4$ lattice. The crosses are the correspon ding expectation values in a $4^3 \times 8$ lattice.

FIG. 8 - Expectation value of $S_\phi$ as a function of the hopping parameter k and for one flavour. This figure was obtain ed by integrating equation (13) and using the values of $<\bar{\psi}\psi>$ represented in Fig. 7.

of the short distance of the propagators; ii) the value of the Polyakov line is larger than that of quenched case and the finite temperature effects are more serious; iii) in this experiment we could not determine the physical k (fixed for example from $\pi$-$\varrho$ mass difference) at which all hadronic quantities should be measured, and iv) statistics is not enough.

Recently, Otto[13] has claimed that even a small number of pseudofermionic iterations might be sufficient in order to include fermion loops. We have performed two experiments with the same conditions except the number of MC iterations (experiments 2a and 2b in the Table I). Though the values of hadron masses obtained from these two experiments are consistent with each other, the error bars of Exp. 2b are much larger than those of Exp. 2a as a natural consequence of the smaller number of pseudofermionic iterations. Both experiments give about the same value of $<\bar{\psi}\psi>$. This is also the case for the plaquette energy: $E_p = 0.293$ for Exp. 2a and $E_p = 0.310$ for Exp. 2b. These quantities can be usually obtained with small statistical error. For such quantities, a smaller number of pseudofermionic iterations might be suffi- cient if we include the proper number of thermalization runs.

TABLE I - Column 1 contains the conventional line number assigned for identification of the different runs. Column 2 contains the values of $\beta$, column 3 those of k, the hopping parameter. Column 4 contains the size of the lattice. Column 5 contains the average of $\langle\bar\psi\psi\rangle$ over the sample expressed by columns 9 and 10. All errors in column 5 are the differences from the grand average to the partial averages evaluated on the odd and even groups of 4 gauge MC sweeps. Columns 6, 7 and 8 contains the masses of the hadrons $\pi$, $\varrho$ and $\omega$, respectively, measured in reciprocal of the lattice spacing, for the experiments where they have been measured. The errors in these columns are the differences from the values obtained with the grand averages of the propagators at $\tau=1$, $\tau=2$, to those obtained from the partial averages evaluated on the odd and even groups of 4 gauge sweeps. Column 9 contains the number of thermalization gauge sweeps, followed by the number of sweeps on which the averages have been evaluated. Analogously, column 10 contains, for each flavour (2x) the number of thermalization pseudo-fermion sweeps, followed by the number of sweeps on which averages are evaluated. The initial conditions for the different lines are: (1) Random configuration (Hot start). (2a) Hot start. (2b) A late configuration from 3. (3) Last configuration from 2. (4) A late configuration from 3. (5) Last configuration from 3. (6) Last configuration from 5. (7) Last configuration from 6. (8) Last configuration from 7. (9) Last configuration from 8. (10) Cold configuration from 5. (11) Last configuration from 10. (12) Last configuration from 11. (All link variables set to 1).

| no. | $\beta$ | k | Size | $\langle\bar\psi\psi\rangle$ | $m_\pi a$ | $m_\varrho a$ | $m_\omega a$ | Number of Gauge Sweeps | Number of Fermi Sweeps |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3.0 | 0.23 | $4^4$ | $4.67^{+}_{-}0.21$ | $3.14^{+}_{-}0.21$ | $2.69^{+}_{-}0.30$ | $2.82^{+}_{-}0.08$ | $8+128$ | $2 \times (25+175)$ |
| 2a | 2.5 | 0.23 | $4^4$ | $4.75^{+}_{-}0.01$ | $2.09^{+}_{-}0.08$ | $2.75^{+}_{-}0.37$ | $3.47^{+}_{-}0.03$ | $12+144$ | $2 \times (25+175)$ |
| 2b | 2.5 | 0.23 | $4^4$ | $4.73^{+}_{-}0.00$ | $1.90^{+}_{-}1.19$ | $2.11^{+}_{-}0.42$ | $2.84^{+}_{-}2.72$ | $20+200$ | $2 \times (5+15)$ |
| 3 | 2.2 | 0.23 | $4^4$ | $4.82^{+}_{-}0.02$ | $2.28^{+}_{-}0.26$ | $2.46^{+}_{-}0.30$ | $2.61^{+}_{-}0.26$ | $28+204$ | $2 \times (25+175)$ |
| 4 | 2.2 | 0.20 | $4^4$ | $5.70^{+}_{-}0.05$ | $2.62^{+}_{-}0.08$ | $2.28^{+}_{-}0.04$ | $2.45^{+}_{-}0.12$ | $4+168$ | $2 \times (25+175)$ |
| 5 | 2.2 | 0.24 | $4^4$ | $4.50^{+}_{-}0.03$ | | | | $4+52$ | $2 \times (25+25)$ |
| 6 | 2.2 | 0.18 | $4^4$ | $6.30^{+}_{-}0.05$ | | | | $4+52$ | $2 \times (25+25)$ |
| 7 | 2.2 | 0.14 | $4^4$ | $7.46^{+}_{-}0.05$ | | | | $4+40$ | $2 \times (25+25)$ |
| 8 | 2.2 | 0.10 | $4^4$ | $7.92^{+}_{-}0.03$ | | | | $4+52$ | $2 \times (25+25)$ |
| 9 | 2.2 | 0.08 | $4^4$ | $7.97^{+}_{-}0.03$ | | | | $4+72$ | $2 \times (25+25)$ |
| 10 | 2.2 | 0.24 | $4^3 \times 8$ | $4.57^{+}_{-}0.03$ | | | | $4+48$ | $2 \times (25+25)$ |
| 11 | 2.2 | 0.18 | $4^3 \times 8$ | $6.34^{+}_{-}0.05$ | | | | $4+54$ | $2 \times (25+25)$ |
| 12 | 2.2 | 0.10 | $4^3 \times 8$ | $7.93^{+}_{-}0.03$ | | | | $4+64$ | $2 \times (25+25)$ |

## 4. - DISCUSSIONS

The experiment presented in this article demostrates, we believe, that we can and we should proceed in the MC simulation of gauge theories with dynamical fermions and that, on the way, many things should be clarified. We hope that one can make the best use of the experiences here at the next steps. Though the small size of the lattice and the employement of SU(2) as gauge group are strong limitations in this experiment, the following observations made here seem to be general features :

i) The CPU time is not hopelessly long;

ii) The gauge configurations generated with light quark loops are fairly different from those of the pure gauge case;

iii) There is no strong size effects between $4^4$ and $4^3 \times 8$ lattices in regard to $E_p$ and $\langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle$.

iv) The $E_p$ and $\langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle$ do not suffer too much from statistical errors, but the hadron propagators do.

Let us comment upon these points. We have used several tricks to save compu- ter time, but reduction of CPU time is still possible[14]. We employed the Metropolis algorithm for the pseudofermionic MC calculation. However the heat-bath method could be more efficient because this algorithm works well for a gaussian distribution. We have used here the standard Wilson action with the Wilson term r set to 1. If we want to stu dy only global nature of the fields (the plaquette energy, the Polyakov line, $\langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle$, etc) and give up the calculation of $\Delta^{-1}$, we can perform simulations in less CPU time with the Kogut-Susskind action because it has one component on each site, though it is not clear whether a lattice with the Kogut-Susskind action is equivalent to a lattice of the same size with the Wilson action.

In the case of the quenched approximation, there is a window where the correla tion length is large enough so that scaling has set in and yet not so large compared to the lattice size[15]. The data described in the previous section suggest that the correla tion length changes when the fermion loops are considered. The lattice distance is also different from that of the pure gauge theories. In the scaling region, the lattice distance is related to the bare coupling constant g as

$$a = \frac{1}{\Lambda} (\beta_0 g^2)^{-\beta_1/2\beta_0^2} \exp\left(- \frac{1}{2\beta_0 g^2}\right) , \tag{27a}$$

where $\beta_0$ and $\beta_1$ are the coefficients of the first and the second terms of the $\beta$ func- tion and, for massless QCD, they are given by[16]

$$\beta_o = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \left( \frac{11}{3} n_c - \frac{2}{3} n_f \right),$$

(27b)

$$\beta_1 = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \left[ \frac{34}{3} n_c^2 - \frac{10}{3} n_c n_f - \frac{1}{n_c} (n_c^2 - 1) n_f \right].$$

From this formula we can see our lattice ($n_c = 2$, $n_f = 2$) shrinks faster than that with $n_f = 0$ as $\beta (= 4/g^2)$ increases. This may be a part of the reason why the expectation values of the Polyakov line are larger than in the pure gauge case. We should search for a new window and remeasure the correlation length, the glue-ball masses, etc. there.

The quantities $E_p$ and $\langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle$ do not suffer much from statistical errors and are stable against changing the lattice size. The estimation of the fermion determinant in Fig. 8 is reliable. Convergence of $E_p$ and $\langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle$ even on a $4^3 \times 8$ lattice is good. See Fig. 9. This raises our hope of going to larger lattices.



FIG. 9 - Expectation values of mean energy per plaquette, $E_p$ (a) and chiral order parameter $\bar{\psi} \psi$ (b) against the number of MC gauge sweeps. The circles have been obtained from a $4^4$ lattice and the crosses are the results for a $4^3 \times 8$ lattice.

As we have seen in this experiment, the field configuration on a lattice with quark loops is fairly different from that of the quenched approximation. In the latter case, Kogut et al. and the Bielefeld group have shown that at finite temperature the system presents a deconfinement phase where chiral symmetry is restored. With quark loops, however, the situation may be very different because the phase transition between confined and deconfined phases desappears if we use the Polyakov line as an order parameter[17]. Furthermore, the gauge configurations which give zero eigenvalues

of $\Delta$ being essential to the chiral symmetry breaking, are suppressed with respect to the quenched case due to the measure det$\Delta$ . This problem should be investigated very urgently.

## REFERENCES

(1) - H. Hamber and G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. Letters $\underline{47}$, 1792 (1981); Phys. Rev. D27, 208 (1983); E. Marinari, G. Parisi and C. Rebbi, Phys. Rev. Letters $\underline{47}$, 1795 (1981); D. Weingarten, Phys. Letters $\underline{109B}$, 57 (1982); Nuclear Phys. B215, 1 (1983); F. Fucito et al., Nuclear Phys. B210(FS6), 314 (1982); G. Martinelli, G. Parisi, R. Petronzio and F. Rapuano, Phys. Letters $\underline{116B}$, 434 (1982); C. Bernard, T. Draper, K. Olynyk and M. Rushton, Phys. Rev. Letters $\underline{49}$, 1076 (1982).

(2) - A. Hasenfratz, P. Hasenfratz, Z. Kunst and C.B. Lang, Phys. Letters $\underline{117B}$, 81 (1982); P. Hasenfratz and I. Montvay, Phys. Rev. Letters $\underline{50}$, 309 (1983); H. Lipps, G. Martinelli, R. Petronzio and F. Rapuano, Phys. Letters $\underline{126B}$, 250 (1983); P. Hasenfratz and F. Montvay, DESY preprint 83-072 (1983); M. Fukugita, T. Kaneko and A. Ukawa, Nuclear Phys. B230(FS10), 62 (1983).

(3) - J. Kogut et al., Phys. Rev. Letters $\underline{48}$, 1140 (1982); Phys. Rev. Letters 50, 393 (1983); J. Engels, F. Karsch and H. Satz, Phys. Letters $\underline{113B}$, 398 (1982); J. Engels and F. Karsch, Phys. Letters $\underline{125B}$, 481 (1983). See also H. Hamber and G. Parisi in ref.(1).

(4) - O. Stamatescu, Phys. Rev. $\underline{D25}$, 1130 (1982); C.B. Lang and H. Nicolai, Nuclear Phys. B200(FS4), 135 (1982); A. Hasenfratz, P. Hasenfratz, Z. Kunst and C.B. Lang, Phys. Letters $\underline{110B}$, 289 (1982); P. Hasenfratz, in the Proceedings of the Johns Hopkins Workshop, Florence, 1982; See also J. Kuti and J. Polony, in Proceedings of the John Hopkins Workshop, Florence, 1982, where the hopping parameter expansion series was calculated by a subtle stochastic method. To our knowledge, this is the first paper which studied the effect of quark loops positively.

(5) - V. Azcoiti and A. Nakamura, Phys. Rev. $\underline{D27}$, 255 (1983).

(6) - K. Wilson, Erice Lecture Notes 1975, ed. by A. Zichichi (Plenum Press, 1977).

(7) - H. Hamber, E. Marinari, G. Parisi and C. Rebbi, Phys. Letters $\underline{124B}$, 99 (1983).

(8) - T. Banks et al. , Phys. Rev. D15, 1111 (1977); L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. D16, 3031 (1977).

(9) - F. Fucito, E. Marinari, G. Parisi and C. Rebbi, Nuclear Phys. B180, 369 (1981); E. Marinari, G. Parisi and C. Rebbi, Nuclear Phys. B190 (FS3), 734 (1981).

(10) - C. Rebbi, Phys. Rev. D21, 3350 (1980); D. Petcher and D. H. Weingarten, Phys. Rev. D22, 2465 (1980).

(11) - N. Metropolis, A. W. Rosenbluth, A. H. Teller and E. Teller, J. Chem. Phys. 21, 1087 (1953).

(12) - A. N. Polyakov, Phys. Letters 72B, 477 (1978); N. Weiss, Phys. Rev. D24, 475 (1981); L. G. Yaffe and B. Svetitsky, Phys. Rev. D26, 963 (1982); G. Martinelli, G. Parisi, R. Petronzio and F. Rapuano, CERN preprint TH-3456 (1982).

(13) - S. Otto and M. Randeria, Caltech preprint CALT-68-991, to appear in Nuclear Phys. ; B. S. Otto, Phys. Letters 135B, 129 (1984).

(14) - See G. Parisi, Frascati preprint LNF-84/14 (1984), where strategies and tactics to reduce CPU time and memories are discussed from many point of view.

(15) - M. Creutz, L. Jacobs and C. Rebbi, Phys. Rev. Letters 42, 1390 (1979); Phys. Rev. D20, 1915 (1979); M. Creutz, Phys. Rev. Letters 43, 553 (1979); Phys. Rev. D21, 2308 (1980).

(16) - See, for example, C. Itzykson and J. Zuber, Quantum Field Theory (Mc Graw-Hill, 1980), chap. 13.

(17) - P. Hasenfratz, F. Karsch and I. O. Stamatescu, CERN preprint TH-3636 (1983); A. Nakamura, in preparation.