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## The $U_{A}(1)$ Problem

- nine lightest pseudo-scalar mesons show a peculiar spectrum:
- 3 very light pions ( 140 MeV )
- kaons and the $\eta$ around 500 MeV
- $\eta^{\prime}$ around 1 GeV

- this was called the $U_{A}(1)$-problem
- $M_{\pi} \ll M_{\eta} \ll M_{\eta^{\prime}}$
- in contrast: $\rho-\omega-\phi$ appear ideally mixed as expected from OZI rule
- spontaneously broken chiral symmetry: nine Goldstone bosons?

[Glashow (1968)]

## The $U_{A}(1)$ Problem

- the $U(1)$ axial current is anomalous at quantum level
[Adler (1969), Jackiw and Bell (1969)]

$$
\partial^{\mu} A_{\mu}^{0 q}=\partial^{\mu}\left(\bar{q} \gamma_{\mu} \gamma_{5} q\right)=2 m_{q}\left(\bar{q} i \gamma_{5} q\right)+\frac{\alpha_{s}}{4 \pi} F \tilde{F}
$$

and not spontaneously broken

- anomaly vanishes to all orders in perturbation theory at zero momentum
$\Rightarrow$ need additional mechanism
- instantons with non-trivial topology allow to explain $\eta^{\prime}$ mass
[Kogut, Susskind (1975), Belavin et al. (1975), 't Hooft (1976)]
$\Rightarrow$ suggests consistency of QCD with nature


## The Witten-Veneziano Formula

- $\pi, \eta, \eta^{\prime}$ masses can be computed using lattice QCD
- ... but how to establish the relation to the $U_{A}(1)$ anomaly?
- in the 't Hooft limit the Witten-Veneziano formula can be derived ( $m_{q}=0, N_{c} \rightarrow \infty, g^{2} N_{c}$ and $N_{f}$ fixed)

$$
M_{\eta^{\prime}}^{2}=\frac{4 N_{f}}{f_{\pi}^{2}} \chi_{\infty}
$$

[Witten (1979), Veneziano (1979)]

- where $\chi_{\infty}$ is the topological susceptibility in pure Yang-Mills theory
- including $m_{s}>0$ effects

$$
M_{\eta}^{2}+M_{\eta^{\prime}}^{2}-2 M_{K}^{2}=\frac{4 N_{f}}{f_{\pi}^{2}} \chi_{\infty}
$$

- for exact $\operatorname{SU}(3)$ flavour symmetry ( $m_{u}=m_{d}=m_{s}$ ) define (considering only $\bar{q} q$ states ...)
- the flavour octet state $\eta_{8}$

$$
\eta_{8} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\left(\bar{u} i \gamma_{5} u+\bar{d} i \gamma_{5} d-2 \bar{s} i \gamma_{5} s\right)
$$

$\Rightarrow$ a (pseudo) Goldstone boson

- the flavour singlet state $\eta_{0}$

$$
\eta_{0} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\left(\bar{u} i \gamma_{5} u+\bar{d} i \gamma_{5} d+\bar{s} i \gamma_{5} s\right)
$$

$\Rightarrow$ related to $U_{A}(1)$ anomaly

- SU(3) flavour symmetry broken by larger $m_{s}: m_{s} \gg m_{u}=m_{d}=m_{\ell}$
$\Rightarrow$ physical states will be a mixture, e.g.

$$
\binom{|\eta\rangle}{\left|\eta^{\prime}\right\rangle}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\cos \phi & -\sin \phi \\
\sin \phi & \cos \phi
\end{array}\right) \cdot\binom{\left|\eta_{\ell}\right\rangle}{\left|\eta_{s}\right\rangle}
$$

in the quark flavour basis

$$
\eta_{\ell} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\bar{u} i \gamma_{5} u+\bar{d} i \gamma_{5} d\right), \quad \eta_{s}=\bar{s} i \gamma_{5} s
$$

- in nature $m_{u} \neq m_{d} \quad \Rightarrow$ also $\pi_{0}$ mixes
- how did nature arrange the mixing pattern?
- can one determine the mixing angle(s)?


## $\eta$ and $\eta^{\prime}$ Mixing

- mixing angle definition via Fock states theoretically difficult
$\Rightarrow$ use matrix elements instead

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{P}_{\eta}^{\ell} & \mathbf{P}_{\eta}^{s} \\
\mathbf{P}_{\eta^{\prime}}^{\ell} & \mathbf{P}_{\eta^{\prime}}^{s}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
c_{\ell} \cos \phi_{\ell} & -c_{s} \sin \phi_{s} \\
c_{\ell} \sin \phi_{\ell} & c_{s} \cos \phi_{s}
\end{array}\right)
$$

defined via pseudo-scalar matrix elements

$$
\mathbf{P}_{P}^{q}=\langle 0| \bar{q} i \gamma_{5} q|P\rangle, \quad P=\eta, \eta^{\prime}, \quad q=\ell, s
$$

- note: usually defined via decay constants obtained from

$$
\langle 0| A_{\mu}^{q} \mid P(p)=i f_{P}^{q} p_{\mu}
$$

with

$$
A_{\mu}^{\ell}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\bar{u} \gamma_{\mu} \gamma_{5} u+\bar{d} \gamma_{\mu} \gamma_{5} d\right), \quad A_{\mu}^{s}=\bar{s} \gamma_{\mu} \gamma_{5} s
$$

## $\eta$ and $\eta^{\prime}$ Mixing

- angles are then obtained from

$$
\frac{\mathbf{P}_{\eta^{\prime}}^{\ell}}{\mathbf{P}_{\eta}^{\ell}}=\tan \phi_{\ell}, \quad \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\eta}^{s}}{\mathbf{P}_{\eta^{\prime}}^{s}}=-\tan \phi_{s}
$$

- from $\chi$ PT and $1 / N_{c}$ arguments one expects

$$
\left|\phi_{\ell}-\phi_{s}\right| \ll 1
$$

- if correct, define a single angle $\phi$ obtained from

$$
\tan ^{2} \phi=-\frac{\mathbf{P}_{\eta^{\prime}}^{\ell} \mathbf{P}_{\eta}^{s}}{\mathbf{P}_{\eta}^{\ell} \mathbf{P}_{\eta^{\prime}}^{s}}
$$

- note: all renormalisation constants cancel in the ratios


## Motivation

## fundamental questions:

- does QCD reproduce the experimental mass pattern?
- how does nature arrange for the mixing?
- can we relate the $\eta^{\prime}$ mass to the $U_{A}(1)$ anomaly


## Challenges

- $\eta, \eta^{\prime}$ involve OZI-rule violating diagrams
$\Rightarrow$ so-called fermionic disconnected diagrams
- due to noise computationally challenging
$\Rightarrow$ only few lattice results available
- lattice definition of $\chi_{t}$
- must be cleanly defined
- must be properly renormalised

filled symbols: $\eta \quad$ open: $\eta^{\prime}$
[HSC, J. J. Dudek et al., Phys. Rev. D83 (2011)]
[RBC/UKQCD, N. Christ et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 105 (2010)]
[UKQCD, E. B. Gregory et al., Phys.Rev. D86 (2012)]


## Meson Masses and Matrix Elements from Lattice QCD

- let $O(x, t)$ be an operator with quantum numbers of a given state
- for instance for the pion it is given by

$$
O(x, t)=\bar{u} i \gamma_{5} d(x, t), \quad O(t)=\sum_{x} O(x, t)
$$

projected to zero momentum

- create pion at time 0 and annihilate at $t$

$$
C_{\pi}(t)=\left\langle O(0) O^{\dagger}(t)\right\rangle \propto \sum_{n}\langle 0| O(0)|n\rangle\langle n| e^{-H t} O(0) e^{H t}|0\rangle
$$

inserting a complete set of states $|n\rangle$ and using the time evolution operator $\exp -\mathrm{Ht}$

## Meson Masses and Matrix Elements from Lattice QCD

- which leads to

$$
\left.C_{\pi}(t) \propto \sum_{n}|\langle 0| O| n\right\rangle\left.\right|^{2} e^{-\left(E_{n}-E_{0}\right) t}
$$

- and for large times the lowest state dominates

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} C_{\pi}(t) \propto e^{-\left(E_{1}-E_{0}\right) t}
$$

- $E_{1}-E_{0}$ corresponds at zero momentum to the mass $M_{\pi}$
- and matrix elements of the pion for $n=1$

$$
\langle 0| O|\pi\rangle
$$

- also define effective masses

$$
M=-\frac{d}{d t} \log C_{\pi}(t)
$$

## Ensemble-Details $\quad(\rightarrow$ talk of K. Jansen)

- $2+1+1$ quark flavour ensembles from ETM Collaboration $m_{u}=m_{d}<m_{s}<m_{c}$
[ETMC, R. Baron et. al., JHEP 06111 (2010)]
- three lattice spacings ( $A, B$ and $D$ ensembles): $a_{A}=0.086 \mathrm{fm}, a_{B}=0.078 \mathrm{fm}$ and $a_{D}=0.061 \mathrm{fm}$
- charged pion masses range from $\approx 230 \mathrm{MeV}$ to $\approx 500 \mathrm{MeV}$
- $L \geq 3 \mathrm{fm}$ and $M_{\pi} \cdot L \geq 3.5$ for most ensembles
- bare $m_{s}$ and $m_{c}$ fixed for each lattice spacing
- use $r_{0}=0.45(2)$ fm (from $f_{\pi}$ ) for $\eta, \eta^{\prime}$ $r_{0}$ Sommer scale determined from static $\bar{q} q$ potential
$\Rightarrow r_{0} M$ is dimensionless (with $M$ a mass)


## Flavour Singlet Pseudo-Scalar Mesons

- need to estimate correlator matrix

$$
\mathcal{C}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\eta_{\ell \ell} & \eta_{\ell s} \\
\eta_{s \ell} & \eta_{s s}
\end{array}\right)
$$

- $\eta_{X Y}$ correlator of appropriate operators, e.g.


$$
\eta_{s s}(t) \equiv\left\langle\bar{s} i \gamma_{5} s(t) \bar{s} i \gamma_{5} s(0)\right\rangle
$$

- connected and disconnected

$\underline{t}^{\prime}$ contributions
- diagonalise matrix $\Rightarrow$ masses $M_{P}$ and matrix elements $\mathbf{P}_{P}^{q}$
- $P=\eta$ : lowest state, $P=\eta^{\prime}$ : second state, $P=\eta_{c} \ldots$


## $\eta$ and $\eta^{\prime}$ Masses Overview

filled symbols: $\eta \quad$ open: $\eta^{\prime}$

- $\eta^{\prime}$ mainly the flavour singlet
- disconnected contributions significant
$\Rightarrow$ very noisy
- chiral extrapolation uncertain
$\Rightarrow$ no clear picture
- need for improvement

[C. Michael, K. Ottnad, S. Reker, C.U., JHEP 1211 (2012) 048]


## Effective Mass Plots

- effective masses for $\eta, \eta^{\prime}, \eta_{c}, \ldots$
- $\eta$ mass well determined
- $\eta^{\prime}$ :
- at small $t / a$ excited states dominant
- disconnected contributions noisy
$\Rightarrow$ signal lost in noise before plateau reached
- large systematics in $\eta^{\prime}$

$\Rightarrow$ need to reduce noise/increase statistics tremendously
or remove excited states to fit at smaller $t / a$
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## Improved $\eta^{\prime}$ Extraction

- recall: disconnected contributions noisy
- lets make an assumption: disconnected contributions couple only to $\eta$ and $\eta^{\prime}$ states, not to higher states
[Neff et al. (2001), K.Jansen, C.Michael, C.U. (2008)]
- replace connected contributions by only the ground states
- if assumption justified: there should be a plateau in the effective masses from very low
 times on!


## Excited State Removal

## w/o removal

- we see a plateau from $t / a=2$ on
- for both $\eta$ and $\eta^{\prime}$
- $\eta$ : good agreement with previous results
- $\eta^{\prime}$ : possibly much better determination
- assumption justified?
- systematic uncertainties?
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## Masses w/ and w/o Excited State Removal

$\eta:$

- masses agree well
- improved precision
$\eta^{\prime}$ :
- masses determined much better
- always agreement within $2 \sigma$
- systematics hard to quantify
w/o removal



## Masses w/ and w/o Excited State Removal

$\eta:$

- masses agree well
- improved precision
$\eta^{\prime}$ :
- masses determined much better
- always agreement within $2 \sigma$
- systematics hard to quantify
w/ removal

- can take the difference $\mathrm{w} /$ and $\mathrm{w} / \mathrm{o}$ to estimate systematics


## Strange Quark Mass Dependence

- $m_{s}$ not perfectly tuned to its physical value
- two re-tuned ensembles for $a_{A}$
$\Rightarrow$ can estimate $m_{s}$ dependence
- estimate

$$
D_{\eta} \equiv \frac{d\left(a M_{\eta}\right)^{2}}{d\left(a M_{\mathrm{K}}\right)^{2}}=1.47(11)
$$

- now assume:
$D_{\eta}$ independent of

a, $m_{\ell}, m_{s}, m_{c}$
- ...correct $\eta$ masses


## Continuum Limit: Scaling Test for $M_{\eta}$

- use two ensembles sets (A60, B55, D45) (A40, B35, D30) with $r_{0} M_{\mathrm{PS}} \approx$ const
- correct $M_{\eta}$ using $D_{\eta}$ linearly in $M_{\mathrm{K}}^{2}$
$\Rightarrow r_{0} M_{\mathrm{K}}=1.34$ fixed
- compatible with both, constant and linear continuum extrapolation

$\Rightarrow$ lattice artifacts seem under control


## Chiral Extrapolation of $M_{\eta}$

- now correct all $\left(r_{0} M_{\eta}\right)^{2}$ using $D_{\eta}$
$\Rightarrow\left(r_{0} \bar{M}_{\eta}\right)^{2} \propto$ const $+\left(r_{0} M_{\mathrm{PS}}\right)^{2}$
- all $a$-values fall on the same curve!
- extrapolate $\left(r_{0} \bar{M}_{\eta}\right)^{2}$ linearly in $\left(r_{0} M_{\mathrm{PS}}\right)^{2}$ to $M_{\mathrm{PS}}=M_{\pi}$
$\Rightarrow$ result

$$
M_{\eta}=552(10)_{\text {stat }} \mathrm{MeV}
$$

- similarly with $\left(\bar{M}_{\eta} / \bar{M}_{\mathrm{K}}\right)^{2}$ or GMO
 relation


## Chiral Extrapolation of $M_{\eta^{\prime}}$

[PRL 111181602 (2013)]

- no clear dependence on
- lattice spacing
- strange quark mass
- errors still significant
- include all data in extrapolation
- $\left(r_{0} M_{\eta^{\prime}}\right)^{2} \propto$ const $+\left(r_{0} M_{\mathrm{PS}}\right)^{2}$
$\Rightarrow$ result

$$
M_{\eta^{\prime}}=1006(54)_{\text {stat }} \mathrm{MeV}
$$

- fitting $A, B$ and $D$ separately gives
 compatible results


## Mixing Angles $\phi_{\ell}$ and $\phi_{s}$

- $\Delta \phi=3(1)_{\text {stat }}(3)_{\text {sys }}{ }^{\circ}$ confirms expectation, smallness of OZI corrections
- data well described by a single angle
- but cannot exclude a finite difference

- systematic uncertainty from fits to data from different lattice spacings separately


## Single Mixing Angle $\phi$

[PRL 111181602 (2013)]

- extrapolate $\phi$ linearly in $\left(r_{0} M_{\mathrm{PS}}\right)^{2}$
$\Rightarrow \phi=46(1)_{\mathrm{stat}}(3)_{\mathrm{sys}}{ }^{\circ}$
- systematic error from fitting different lattice spacings separately
- with $m_{\ell}=m_{s}$ we reproduce the $\mathrm{SU}(3)$ symmetric value $54.7^{\circ}$

- interpretation: $\eta^{\prime}$ meson mainly the flavour singlet state
$\Rightarrow$ far from ideally mixed


## Yang-Mills $\chi_{\infty}$ from Spectral Projectors

## K. Cichy, E. Garcia-Ramos, K. Jansen

- spectral projectors $R_{M}$ allow for a clean definition of $\chi_{t}$
[Giusti, Lüscher, (2009)]

$$
\chi_{t}=\frac{Z_{S}^{2}}{Z_{P}^{2}} \frac{\left\langle\operatorname{Tr}\left[\gamma_{5} R_{M}^{2}\right] \operatorname{Tr}\left[\gamma_{5} R_{M}^{2}\right]\right\rangle}{V}
$$

- spectral projectors estimated stochastically
- dedicated quenched ensembles with Iwasaki gauge action see Cichy, Garcia-Ramos, Jansen (2013) for $N_{f}=2$ and $2+1+1$ results
- four values of the lattice spacing from 0.07 fm to 0.14 fm
- Wilson twisted mass valence quarks
$\Rightarrow$ automatic $\mathcal{O}(a)$ improvement


## Continuum Limit $\chi_{\infty}$ (preliminary)

## K. Cichy, E. Garcia-Ramos, K. Jansen

- box length fixed to

$$
L \sim 2.8 \mathrm{fm}
$$

- $Z_{S} / Z_{P}$ computed with spectral projectors
- linear scaling in $a^{2}$ as expected
$\Rightarrow$ continuum limit:
$r_{0}^{4} \chi_{\infty}=0.049(6)$

- using $r_{0}=0.5 \mathrm{fm} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \chi_{\infty}=(185(6) \mathrm{MeV})^{4}$
$\Rightarrow$ WV formula well fulfilled with physical mass values


## Witten-Veneziano Formula (preliminary)

K. Cichy, E. Garcia-Ramos, K. Jansen, K. Ottnad, F. Zimmermann, C.U.

- define

$$
M_{U_{A}(1)}^{2}=M_{\eta}^{2}+M_{\eta^{\prime}}^{2}-2 M_{K}^{2}
$$

- extrapolates almost constant in $M_{\mathrm{PS}}^{2}$
- systematics very similar to $M_{\eta^{\prime}}$
- dominant statistical noise
- the extrapolated value agrees with separat mass extrapolations
$\Rightarrow$ to be investigated further



## Summary

- study $U_{A}(1)$ problem in LQCD
- $\eta, \eta^{\prime}$ mixing angle

$$
\phi=46(1)_{\text {stat }}(3)_{\text {sys }}{ }^{\circ}
$$

- $\eta, \eta^{\prime}$ masses

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{\eta} & =551(8)_{\mathrm{stat}}(6)_{\mathrm{sys}} \mathrm{MeV} \\
M_{\eta^{\prime}} & =1006(54)_{\mathrm{stat}}(38)_{\mathrm{sys}}(+61)_{\mathrm{ex}} \mathrm{MeV}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Yang-Mills $\chi_{\infty}$

$$
\chi_{\infty}=(185(6) \mathrm{MeV})^{4}
$$

from spectral projectors
[HSC, J. J. Dudek et al., Phys. Rev. D83 (2011)]
[RBC/UKQCD, N. Christ et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 105 (2010)] [UKQCD, E. B. Gregory et al., Phys.Rev. D86 (2012)]
[ETMC, C. Michael et al., PRL 111 (2013)]

- test of Witten-Veneziano formula

