BERGISCHE
UNIVERSITÄT
WUPPERTAL

JÜLICH
FORSCHUNGSZENTRUM

Continuum EoS for QCD with N_f =2+1 flavors

In collaboration with: S. Borsanyi, Z. Fodor, S.D. Katz, K.K. Szabo
(Wuppertal-Budapest collaboration)

28.11.2012| Stefan Krieg

Outline

- Motivation
- Simulation
  - Ensembles/statistics
  - Scale setting (LCP)
  - T/2 subtraction
  - Systematics: finite vol., lattice spacing, histogram method
- Results
  - Trace Anomaly, comparison with literature
  - Pressure, entropy, energy density, speed of sound
- Conclusions

Motivation: status 2012



Simulation: ensembles/statistics



Simulation: scale setting



w_0: JHEP **1209** 010

Aim: estimate error of scale setting procedure

- original LCP
- step-scaling procedure like in 2010, w_0 based observable
- deviations on the 2% level
- Included in analysis

Simulation: T/2 subtraction

- Reaching large temperatures requires small lattice spacings
- Algorithmically T=0 runs have difficulties to reach a<0.05 fm (frozen topology, diverging autocorrelation times).
- Solution: T/2 subtraction:

$$I_{sub}(T) = (I(T) - I(T/2))_{\beta(a_0)} + (I(T/2) - I(\text{`T=0'}))_{\beta(2a_0)}$$

- Requires new simulations, however these are still in the high-temperature phase ($N_t=8 \rightarrow N_t=16$, …)

Systematics

- Finite volume effects
  - Studied explicitly in 2010 (see also Lattice 2011):
    - no effects (larger that statistical errors) seen.
  - This study includes larger volumes

  → Finite volume effects will be negligible compared to other systematic uncertainties
- Scale setting and lattice spacing artifacts
  - We vary the range of lattice spacings in our fits:
    - N_t=6 is included or left out
  - We use different scale settings
  - We include $O(a^4)$ in our fit procedure

Simulation: systematics, histogram method

- vacuum fits
  - 7 different fit models (incl. direct subtr. w. interp.)
- continuum extrapolation
  - Vary node points (8 different sets)
  - Include or leave out leave N_t=6
  - With or without improvement factors
  - We use two different scale settings (f_k vs. w_0)
  - Fit includes a^2 or a^2 and a^4 terms

→ This results in $7 \times 8 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ = 896 different fits

- Weighting: we consider AICc, Q, or unweighted histograms

Results: trace anomaly



Results: trace anomaly @ 215 MeV



Results: pressure



Results: pressure @ 215 MeV



Results: pressure @ 215 MeV



Results: entropy et al.



Results: trace anomaly



Conclusions

- We have performed a continuum extrapolation of the EoS for N_f=2+1 QCD
- We carefully studied and included systematic uncertainties
- Within our error the discrepancy to the hotQCD/HISQ results remains
- Final conclusion requires continuum extrapolation of HISQ data combined with a study of systematic uncertainties.
- In any case above T≈300 MeV charm effects become important.

BERGISCHE UNIVERSITÄT WUPPERTAL

JÜLICH FORSCHUNGSZENTRUM

Thank You for Your attention!

Simulation: ensembles/statistics

- Vacuum (T=0) runs:
  - Renormalization (& w_0 scale setting):
    - Volumes: 32^4, 48^4, 64^4
    - #traj.: $O(10^4)$ for 32^4
$O(10^5)$ for 48^4
$O(10^3)$ for 64^4
  - Scale setting (f_k):
    - Volumes: $32^3 \times 64$, $40^3 \times 64$, $48^3 \times 64$
    - #traj.: $O(10^4)$ for $32^3 \times 64$,
$O(10^3)$ for $40^3 \times 64$ and $48^3 \times 64$

Simulation: ensembles/statistics

- Used available ensembles (see *e.g.* 1305.5161)
- Added ensembles:
  - $32^3 \times 6$, $32^3 \times 8$, with 13-50$\times 10^3$ trajectories
- Use sufficently large volumes only
  - L>2 fm for all T
  - L>5.3 (12); 4.2 (10); 5.2 (8) @ 150 MeV
    - $48^3 \times 8$
    - $64^3 \times 10$
    - $64^3 \times 12$

    } @ O(10^4) trajectories each
- Additional $48^3 \times 16$, $64^3 \times 20$, $64^3 \times 24$ ensembles (T/2 subtraction, 215 MeV point)

Results: entropy @ 215 MeV