

and the second second

How small How sm

Matteo Baggioli

富嶽

三十六景

家川

神

いない、語つる

Wilczek Quantum Center & Jiao-Tong University Shanghai



Hydrodynamics = effective field theory = continuum description valid when L >>> a

Hydrodynamics in a slide





Until which scale can we trust the hydrodynamic expansion ?

Which is the physical scale setting the breakdown of the hydrodynamic expansion ?

Hydrodynamic modes

$$\omega(k \to 0) \,=\, 0$$

[conserved quantities, Goldstones]

Non-Hydrodynamic modes

$$\omega(k \to 0) \neq 0$$

[relaxing modes, transient modes]

$$\mathcal{D}_{AB}(\omega,k)\left|\delta\psi^A\right| = 0$$

Dynamical matrix

Field fluctuations (e.g. energy, momentum)

Example:

$$\mathcal{D}_{AB}^{\perp}(\omega,k) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\eta k^2}{\chi_{\pi\pi}} - i\omega & -iGk \\ -\frac{ik}{\chi_{\pi\pi}} & Gk^2 \xi_{\perp} - i\omega \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\omega_{\text{diff}}(z \equiv \mathbf{q}^2) = -i \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n z^n,$$
$$\omega_{\text{sound}}^{\pm}(z \equiv \sqrt{\mathbf{q}^2}) = -i \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n e^{\pm \frac{i\pi n}{2}} z^n,$$

Hydrodynamics = theory of slow and large-scale processes (expansion in gradients) [Withers, Grozdanov, Starinets, Kovtun, Tadic, and many more]

$$\mathrm{Det}\mathcal{D}_{ab} = F(\omega, k^2) = 0$$

Critical points $\omega_c, k_c^2 \in \mathbb{C}$

$$F(\omega_c, k_c^2) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial F(\omega_c, k_c^2)}{\partial \omega} = 0,$$



$$\mathcal{R} \equiv |k_c|$$

Position of the lowest critical point determines the regime of applicability of linearized hydrodynamics (in momentum space)

X2>Y3+111.992Y

"until when non-hydro modes are harmless"



USELESS BEAUTY



GOOD READINGS

Or not ?

For the moment, a very beautiful mathematical result and few computations in holographic models, SYK model and kinetic theory



Can we apply these concepts to realistic liquids ?





There is a liquid to solid crossover going to small sizes (or large momenta)

Identification of a low-frequency elastic behaviour in liquid water

TELEGRAPHER EQUATION (Heaviside)

$$\omega^2 \,+\, i\,\omega/\tau\,-\,v^2\,k^2\,=\,0\,,$$

Several simulations and (few) experiments confirm this is a good description for shear waves in liquids

$$\omega = -\frac{i}{2\tau} \pm \sqrt{v^2 k^2 - \frac{1}{4\tau^2}},$$

$$\mathcal{R} \equiv |k_c| = rac{1}{2 \, v \, au} = k_g \, .$$





Non-affine displacements

Singular parts of the displacements (cf.dislocations and vortices)

[MB et Al] arXiv:2101.05015

$$u_i(\mathbf{x}) = \underbrace{\gamma_{ij} x^j}_{j} + \underbrace{u'_i(\mathbf{x})}_{j}$$

non-affine

Macroscopic phase relaxation (symmetry restoration)





We can extract the radius of convergence from real data (MD simulations + experiments)

- Simple because the collision happens at real values of momentum (unfortunately not the same in the longitudinal sector)
- The simple telegrapher equation would certainly receive corrections but it fits very well the data around the critical point (=corrections & higher order modes negligible)

[MB] arXiv:2010.05916



Liquid	$k_c a$
2D Yukawa (MD) [20]	0.25
dusty plasma (MD) $[21, 22]$	0.3-1.2
2D Yukawa (EXP) [23]	0.16-0.31
Liquid Fe (EXP) [24, 25]	0.3
Liquid Cu (EXP) [24, 25]	0.4
Liquid Zn (EXP) [24, 25]	0.3
3D LJ fluid (MD) [26]	0.2-0.7
Liquid Fe (MD) [26]	0.2-0.7
IPL8-IPL12 fluid (MD) $[26]$	0.2-0.7
Liquid Hg (MD) [26]	0.15-0.55
Supercritical Ar (MD) [27]	0.05-0.8
Subcritical liquid Ar (MD) [27]	0.2-0.7
Supercritical CO_2 [27]	0.1-0.5
Liquid Ga (EXP, MD) [28]	0.25-0.6
2D Coulomb classical fluids (MD) [29]	0.3-2
Quark Gluon Plasma [30]	3.3

 $k_c a \approx \mathcal{O}(1)$

Breakdown scale given by the only microscopic scale available: the inter-molecular distance a

Below "a", the continuum clearly stops to make sense because we start seeing the individual fluid particles (cf. phonons with wavelength comparable to lattice spacing)

arXiv:2010.05916

Coulomb liquids

arXiv:2010.05916



Holographic results

[Baggioli, Gran, Tornso 2020]





Holographic models with dynamical gauge fields (EM interactions at the boundary)

Mixed b.c.s.







Not supported by any quantitative computation ! Wrong (or not so simple) ???



Direct computations challenge this slogan



Results in SYK model

[Choi, Mezei, Sarosi, 2020]

Do these results support our idea ?



Conclusions



Direct application of the recent mathematical framework to realistic systems



"Experimental verification" of intuitive arguments : Hydro limited by microscopic inhomogeinities scale, Hydro work worse at low temperature



Surprise : hydro does not work better at strong coupling (see more later)

Comments

"Hydro works better at strong coupling"



Comments

[Pantelidou, Jansen]



Hydro works better in large number of dimensions (true?). Why ?

$$a = \left(\frac{2(D-1)}{D}n\right)^{-1/D}$$

Can we explain it from this?

Simple (or not) questions

Given a liquid, is the radius of convergence growing if I make it more viscous and why ?

Which physical properties determine the radius of convergence ? And how the latter depends on them ?

Other expansions in physics (chiral perturbation theory, elasticity, cosmology)



Do we really need complex space ? For experiments it's a no-go! Other ideas ? See [Heller & friends]





11/2

- ACTION

North Colle

Thanks!

富藏三十六景

神奈川神

いないいのつき