Systematics in the HAL QCD method and diagnoses of the direct method

Takumi Iritani (RIKEN) Feb. 5-9 2018 @ INT-18-70W "Multi-Hadron Systems from Lattice QCD"



HAL OCD Collaboration Sinya Aoki (Wed.), K. Sasaki, T. Aoyama, Daisuke Kawai (Fri.), T. Miyamoto (YITP), T. Hatsuda, Takumi Doi (Thu.), TI, S. Gongyo, T. M. Doi (RIKEN), T. Inoue (Nihon Univ.), N. Ishii, Y. Ikeda, H. Nemura, K. Murano (RCNP), F. Etminan (Univ. of Birjand)

<u>Contents</u>

Intro.: Direct Method vs. HAL QCD Method Part I: Systematics in the HAL QCD Method Part II: Diagnoses of the Direct Method

Challenges in Multi-Baryon Systems

measurement of ground state from temporal correlation $C_{NN}(t) = c_0 \exp(-E_0^{NN}t) + c_1 \exp(-E_1^{NN}t) + \dots \simeq c_0 \exp(-E_0^{NN}t)$

• S/N problem (A: mass number) Parisi '84, Lepage '89

 $S/N \sim \exp[-A \times (m_N - (3/2)m_\pi) \times t]$



2 Hadrons in Lattice QCD (1) Direct Method

- temporal correlation of the two-hadron $R(t) \equiv C_{BB}(t) / \{C_B(t)\}^2$
- Euclidean time • energy shift from plateau of $\Delta E_{\rm eff}(t) = \log \frac{R(t)}{R(t+1)} \longrightarrow E_{BB}^L - 2m_B$ 25 g.s. saturation is mandatory! ഥ effective energy shift 20 F plateau fitting ∆E_{eff}(t) [MeV] 15 10 Ħ 5 ex. L = 8 fm @ phys. mass 0 $\delta E_{\rm el} \simeq 25 \,\,{\rm MeV} \longrightarrow t > 10 \,\,{\rm fm}$ -5 -10 -15 $S/N \sim \exp[-2(m_N - (3/2)m_\pi)t]$ 5 25 0 10 15 20 30 t [a] $\rightarrow 10^{-32}$ extremely difficult! 4

L

2 Hadrons in Lattice QCD (2) HAL QCD Method

Ishii-Aoki-Hatsuda '06

Hadrons to Atomic nuclei from Lattice QCD

• **spatial** correlation of the two-hadron

Nambu-Bethe-Salpeter wave func. $\psi_k(\vec{r}) = \langle 0|B(\vec{r})B(\vec{0})|B(\vec{k})B(-\vec{k}); in \rangle$

- asymptotic region $r \gg R$ $\psi_k(\vec{r}) \simeq C \sin(kr - l\pi/2 + \delta(k))/(kr)$
- interacting region r < R

$$(\nabla^2 + k^2)\psi_k(\vec{r}) = m \int d\vec{r'} U(\vec{r}, \vec{r'})\psi_k(\vec{r'})$$



<u>energy-indep. & non-local potential & faithful to δ </u> $U(\vec{r}, \vec{r'}) = \sum_{|\vec{p}| \le p_{\text{th}}} [E_p - H_0] \psi_p(\vec{r}) \psi_p^*(\vec{r'})$

HAL QCD method: NBS wave func. \rightarrow <u>U(r,r')</u> \rightarrow observables 5

"Time-dependent" HAL QCD Method (1)

$$R(\vec{r},t) \equiv \langle 0|T\{B(\vec{x}+\vec{r},t)B(\vec{x},t)\}\overline{\mathcal{J}}(0)|0\rangle / \{C_B(t)\}^2$$
$$= \sum_n a_n \psi_{W_n}(\vec{r})e^{-(W_n - 2m_B)t} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-\Delta W_{\text{th}}t})$$
$$g.s. \& \text{ scattering state NBS funcs. satisfy}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} E_{W_0} - H_0 \end{bmatrix} \psi_{W_0}(\vec{r}) = \int d\vec{r'} U(\vec{r}, \vec{r'}) \psi_{W_0}(\vec{r'})$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} E_{W_1} - H_0 \end{bmatrix} \psi_{W_1}(\vec{r}) = \int d\vec{r'} U(\vec{r}, \vec{r'}) \psi_{W_1}(\vec{r'})$$

$$\vdots$$

 $\mathcal{O}(e^{-\delta E_{\rm inel}t}) \ll \mathcal{O}(e^{-\delta E_{\rm el}t})$

F)B(0

L

with elastic saturation (exponentially easier than g.s. saturation!)

$$\left[\frac{1}{4m_B}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - H_0\right]R(\vec{r}, t) = \int d\vec{r'}U(\vec{r}, \vec{r'})R(\vec{r'}, t)$$

"Time-dependent" HAL QCD Method (2)

$$\left[\frac{1}{4m_B}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - H_0\right]R(\vec{r}, t) = \int d\vec{r'}U(\vec{r}, \vec{r'})R(\vec{r'}, t)$$

local pot. by velocity expansion of E-indep. & non-local pot. U(r,r') $U(\vec{r},\vec{r'}) = \left[V_0(\vec{r}) + V_1(\vec{r})\mathbf{L}\cdot\mathbf{S} + V_2(\vec{r})\nabla^2 + \cdots\right]\delta(\vec{r}-\vec{r'})$

previous results by **HAL QCD** mainly employ

"leading order approximation" of wall-type quark source

$$U(\vec{r}, \vec{r'}) \simeq V_0^{\text{LO}}(\vec{r})\delta(\vec{r} - \vec{r'})$$

Q: Is this expansion reasonable & converged?



NN Systems from Lattice QCD

- Inconsistency between these methods
- It was a long-standing problem in lattice QCD.



Fundamental Problem in Direct Method: Fake Plateau

Simple plateau fitting is challenging.

ground state saturation requires huge temporal correlation



Normality Check Aoki's Talk (Wed)

previous studies show "anomalous behavior."



Part I: Systematics in the HAL QCD Method
Ref.
T for HAL QCD Coll., PoS(Lattice 2016) 109, arXiv:1610.09763.
& in prep

Next: Reliability of the HAL QCD Method

convergence of velocity expansion
 inelastic state contamination

Setup & Channel: $\Xi\Xi(^{1}S_{0})$ at $m_{\pi} = 0.51$ GeV

better signal & the same SU(3) rep. as $NN(^{1}S_{0})$

time-dep. HAL QCD method

$$\left[\frac{1}{4m_B}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - H_0\right]R(\vec{r}, t) = \int d\vec{r'}U(\vec{r}, \vec{r'})R(\vec{r'}, t)$$

local pot. by velocity expansion of E-indep. & non-local pot. U(r,r')

LO approximation (standard in previous. HAL QCD works) $U(\vec{r}, \vec{r'}) \simeq V_0^{\text{LO}}(\vec{r})\delta(\vec{r} - \vec{r'})$

N²LO approximation & V₂(r) $U(\vec{r}, \vec{r'}) \simeq [V_0^{N^2LO}(\vec{r}) + V_2^{N^2LO}(\vec{r})\nabla^2]\delta(\vec{r} - \vec{r'})$

→ Check: higher order correction of the HAL QCD pot. by using wall-type & smeared-type quark sources

Time Dependence of the Spatial Correlation



time-dep. HAL QCD method is essential!







Systematic in LO Potential

- Wall src. = time-indep.
- Smeared src. → Wall src.



t-dep. implies systematics from truncation



Higher Order Approximation (N²LO) (1)

$$U(r,r') \simeq \left[V_0^{N^2 \text{LO}}(r) + V_2^{N^2 \text{LO}}(r) \nabla^2 \right] \delta(r-r')$$



Higher Order Approximation (N²LO) (2)

$$U(r,r') \simeq \left[V_0^{N^2 \text{LO}}(r) + V_2^{N^2 \text{LO}}(r) \nabla^2 \right] \delta(r-r')$$



Phase Shift and Uncertainties in Velocity Expansion

 Wall src. LO approx. (standard of HAL QCD studies) works well at low energy.



Time-dependence of Potential (N²LO)

• N²LO velocity expansion $U(r, r') \simeq \left[V_0^{N^2LO}(r) + V_2^{N^2LO}(r)\nabla^2\right]\delta(r - r')$ t-indep. => convergence of the velocity expansion up to N²LO



Part I: Systematics in the HAL QCD Method Ref. TI for HAL QCD Coll., PoS(Lattice 2016) 109, arXiv:1610.09763. & in prep

convergence of velocity expansion
 inelastic state contamination

t-dep. of the Wall src.

single saturation is later than smeared src.







Intermission: "Correct" finite volume method analysis for two-baryon in lattice QCD

Lüscher's Method from HAL QCD: G.S. Energy

• eigenvalue at finite box L³ with HAL QCD pot. $[H_0 + V_0(r) + V_2(r)\nabla^2]\Psi = \Delta E\Psi$

$$\Delta E_0^L \simeq -\frac{2\pi a_0}{\mu L^3} \left[1 + c_1 \frac{a_0}{L} + c_2 \left(\frac{a_0}{L}\right)^2 \right]$$

attractive but unbound

scattering length
$$a_0 \equiv \lim_{k \to 0} \frac{\tan \delta(k)}{k}$$
$$= 0.93(29) \text{ fm}$$



finite vol. energy shift $\Delta E_L \longrightarrow k \cot \delta(k)$ by Lüscher's formula



Part II: Diagnosis of the Fake Plateaux in the Direct Method Ref.

T for HAL QCD Coll., PoS(Lattice 2016) 109, arXiv:1610.09763. & in prep.

Contamination and Fake Plateaux



Final Check: magnitudes of the contamination & origin of the fake plateaux

Eigenfunctions & Eigenvalues

Solving $H_0 + V(r)$ in the finite box





Eigenmode Decomposition of the Spatial Correlator



Overlap of Excited States

$$R^{\text{wall/smear}}(\vec{r},t) = \sum_{n} a_{n}^{\text{wall/smear}} \Psi_{n}(\vec{r}) e^{-\Delta E_{n}t}$$

"<u>smeared src.</u>" has large overlaps with scat. states.



Contaminations of Excited States

$$R(t) = \sum_{n} b_{n}^{\text{wall/smear}} e^{-\Delta E_{n}t} \text{ with } b_{n}^{\text{wall/smear}} = a_{n}^{\text{wall/smear}} \sum_{\vec{r}} \Psi_{n}(\vec{r})$$

b_n: magnitude of contamination in $\Delta E_{\rm eff}(t)$



Origin of Fake Plateaux and Saturation

1

$$\Delta E_{\text{eff}}^{\text{wall/smear}}(t) \equiv \log \frac{R(t)}{R(t+1)} = \log \frac{\sum_{n} b_{n}^{\text{wall/smear}} \exp(-\Delta E_{n}t)}{\sum_{n} b_{n}^{\text{wall/smear}} \exp(-\Delta E_{n}(t+1))}$$

• "direct measurement" is reproduced by low-modes
g.s. saturation for smeared src. ~ 10 fm !!!



Sink Op. Projection with Proper Eigenmode (1)

"correct sink operator"

$$R^{(n)}(t) = \sum_{\vec{x}, \vec{y}} \Psi_n(|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|) \langle B(\vec{x}, t) B(\vec{y}, t) \overline{\mathcal{J}_{BB}}(0) \rangle / \{C_B(t)\}^2$$



Sink Op. Projection with Proper Eigenmode (2)

 "correct sink operator" -> "true plateau" appears $R^{(n)}(t) = \sum \Psi_n(|\vec{x} - \vec{y}|) \langle B(\vec{x}, t) B(\vec{y}, t) \overline{\mathcal{J}_{BB}}(0) \rangle / \{C_B(t)\}^2$ \vec{x}, \vec{y} 5 100 48 48 80 0 II B ΔE_{eff}(t) [MeV] L = ∆*E*_{eff}(*t*) [MeV] L 60 83 क्ष -5 40 20 ΔE_0 g.s. proj. wall ΔE_1 \$ direct wall src. g.s. proj. smeared 1st proj. wall direct smeared src. 1st proj. smeared -15 $\mathbf{0}$ 13 10 10 12 13 15 11 12 14 15 11 14 t [a] t [a]

HAL QCD = Lüscher's method with proper projection ≠ naive plateau fitting

Summary

Direct Method vs. HAL QCD Method

- HAL QCD method can control scattering states.
- We checked
 - The velocity expansion of non-local pot. has good convergence at low energies.
 - Leading order expansion of the wall src. (standard of HAL QCD studies) works well.
 - The inelastic state contamination is under control.
- We show the origin of the fake plateau in the direct method comes from the scattering state contamination.
- HAL QCD results at (almost) physical point
 Next Talk by <u>Takumi Doi</u>



Volume Dep. of the Fake Plateaux (1)



Volume Dep. of the Fake Plateaux (2)

- Volume indep. does not mean ground state saturation.
- Volume dep. appears at later time.



Sink Operator Dependence of the Plateaux

- smeared src. depend on "sink"
- wall src. is stable



Lüscher's Finite Volume Method & Bound State

1. Lüscher's formula $k \cot \delta_0(k) = \frac{1}{\pi L} \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{Z}^3} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{n}|^2 - (kL/2\pi)^2}$ **2.** Effective Range Expansion (**ERE**)

ex. physical quark mass $k \cot \delta_0(k) \simeq \frac{1}{a_0} + \frac{1}{2}r_{\rm eff}k^2 + \cdots$ $NN(^{3}S_{1})$ finite volume 0.4 $-\sqrt{-(k/m_\pi)^2}$ $\substack{k ext{cot} \ \delta_0/m_\pi \\ \delta_0 & 0 \\ \delta_0 & 0 \\ \delta_0 & 0 \\ \delta_0 & \delta_0 \\ \delta_0 & \delta_$ L = 12 fm3. Search bound state @ S-matrix's pole $k_0 \cot \delta_0(k_0) = -\sqrt{-k_0^2}$ & physical pole cond. -0.4 $\left. \frac{d}{dk^2} (k \cot \delta_0(k)) \right|_{k^2 = k_0^2} < \frac{d}{dk^2} \left(-\sqrt{-k^2} \right) \Big|_{k^2 = k_0^2}$ -0.2 -0.10.2 0.0 0.1 $(k/m_{\pi})^2$ 40

Volume Independence of the Potential

• The potential from L = 40, 48 and 64 are consistent.



NN(${}^{1}S_{0}$) System at M_{Pl} = 510 MeV(1) LO Approx.

$$U(r, r') \simeq V_0^{\text{LO}}(r)\delta(r - r')$$

• Quantitatively, the same as $\Xi\Xi ({}^{1}S_{0})$



NN($^{1}S_{0}$) System at M_{Pl} = 510 MeV(2) N²LO Approx.

$$U(r,r') \simeq \left[V_0^{N^2 LO}(r) + V_2^{N^2 LO}(r) \nabla^2 \right] \delta(r-r')$$

• Quantitatively, the same as $\Xi\Xi ({}^{1}S_{0})$



$NN(^{1}S_{0})$ System at $M_{Pl} = 510$ MeV (3) Phase Shift

- Quantitatively, the same as $\Xi\Xi ({}^{1}S_{0})$
- $NN({}^{1}S_{0})$ is **unbound** at this pion mass.
- Wall src. LO approx. is consistent at low energy



$NN(^{1}S_{0})$ System at $M_{PI} = 510$ MeV (4) Proton Mass

- LO approx. wall src. potential is stable against time.
- Inelastic contamination is under control.



Fake Plateaux for Binding System

