altra alt

Crossover toward Quark Matter in Neutron Stars

sites strat strat strat strat strat stratics strat strat strat strat strat strat strat.

Kenji Fukushima The University of Tokyo

- XVth Quark Confinement and the Hadron Spectrum -

Phase Diagram



Chemical Potential $\mu_{\rm B}$

Isospin rich matter may not have a 1st-order transition at all.

Phase Diagram

ALAR SALAR SAL

Meson-Rich Crossover (at low density)

The picture of ideal hadron resonance gas works. Thermodynamics dominated by non-interacting mesons. Deconfinement = Hagedorn Transition Near T_c conformality is the most broken.

Baryon-Rich Crossover (at high density)

Baryons interact very strongly (in the large N_c limit). Quark degrees of freedom encoded in pion exchanges. **Conformality restored very early via interactions.**

> Fujimoto-Fukushima-McLerran-Praszalowicz (2022) → Talk by Yuki Fujimoto on August 4th.

Equation of State for Neutron Stars Fujimoto-Fukushima (2020)

Data-driven EOS agrees with an empirical EOS (APR) and seems to continue to the pQCD EOS with **crossover**.



See: Fujimoto-Fukushima-Murase (2018-2021) for ML (NN) inference.



Underlying Physics for Crossover

Baryonic (Nuclear) Matter and **Quark** Matter are not distinguishable = Quarkyonic

McLerran-Pisarski (2008)



Pressure of Quark Matter Kinetic Energy ~ O(N_c)

Pressure of Baryonic Matter Interaction Energy ~ O(N_c)

Underlying Physics for Crossover

ALAR ALAR ALAR ALARA ALARA



Fukushima-Kojo-Weise (2020)

NN, NNN, NNNN, all many-body interactions become the same order of $O(N_c)$ around ~ $2n_0$



Quantum percolation has a critical density as a function of energy.

Partial deconfinement!



Underlying Physics for Crossover ಕ್ಷಳಿಸುವುದೆ, ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರವನ್ನು ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರವನ್ನು ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಿಗೆ ಕ್ಷಣಿಸುವುದೆ, ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಿಸುವುದೆ, ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಿಸುವುದೆ, ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಿಸುವು Fujimoto-Fukushima-Weise (2020) In the neutron star nuclear matter is neutron rich and the neutron pairing is formed. **Neutron superfluid Color superconductor Chiral symmetry** can be broken by this component. $\sim 10 n_0 \rightarrow n_B$ $\sim 5 n_0$ $\sim n_0$ Neutron pairing: $\langle nn \rangle \sim \langle udd \, udd \rangle$ Corresponding diquark pairing: $\langle ud \rangle \langle ud \rangle \langle dd \rangle$

Underlying Physics for Crossover Controversy



Underlying Physics for Crossover Controversy

Alford-Baym-Fukushima-Hatsuda-Tachibana (2018)





Cherman-Sen-Yaffe (2018)

Hadronic phase has no color flux and no phase... Distinguishable?

Underlying Physics for Crossover

Gap matrix in color-flavor space



$$\begin{aligned} \textbf{Distribution} & \textbf{Underlying Physics for Crossover} \\ \textbf{Abelian CFL vortex} \\ \Phi^{A} &= \Delta_{CFL} e^{i\nu_{A}\varphi} \begin{pmatrix} f(r) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & f(r) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & f(r) \end{pmatrix} \\ \textbf{Non-Abelian CFL vortex} \\ \Phi^{(1)} &= \Delta_{CFL} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\nu_{1}\varphi}f(r) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g(r) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g(r) \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Underlying Physics for Crossover

Why Non-Abelian ?

$$\Phi^{(1)} = \Delta_{\rm CFL} e^{\frac{i}{3}\nu_1\varphi} \begin{pmatrix} e^{\frac{2i}{3}\nu_1\varphi}f(r) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-\frac{i}{3}\nu_1\varphi}g(r) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{-\frac{i}{3}\nu_1\varphi}g(r) \end{pmatrix}$$

Abelian Phase
(Superfluid Vortex) Non-Abelian Phase (T₃ and T₈)
(Gauged Vortex)

 \sim .

$$A_{\varphi}^{(1)} = -\frac{\nu_1}{g_{\rm c}r} \left[1 - h(r)\right] \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & \frac{1}{3} & 0\\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{3} \end{pmatrix}$$

Non-Abelian vortex carries Non-Abelian Magnetic Flux

Underlying Physics for Crossover

If C is large enough, $f \rightarrow 1, g \rightarrow 1, h \rightarrow 0$

$$\langle W_3(C) \rangle \sim \operatorname{tr} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\frac{4\pi i}{3}\nu_1} & 0 & 0\\ 0 & e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}\nu_1} & 0\\ 0 & 0 & e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}\nu_1} \end{pmatrix}$$

 $\sim e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}\nu_1}$

Center element of the non-Abelian magnetic flux appears (making the vortices "anyons")

> Cherman-Sen-Yaffe (2018) See also Hirono-Tanizaki (2019)



Crossover or not?



Baryon Chemical Potential

August 2, 2022 @ University of Stavanger, Norway

allow allow

Low and High Density Regions



August 2, 2022 @ University of Stavanger, Norway

allow allow

Low and High Density Regions



August 2, 2022 @ University of Stavanger, Norway



Interpolated by a polytrope EOS

$$p(\rho) \sim K \rho^{\Gamma}$$

To support the massive neutron stars the intermediate EOS must be stiff, and where it becomes stiff is parametrized by ρ_{stiff} .

For the first-order scenario one more parameter, p_{1st} , is necessary.

allow allow allow allow allow allo allow allow allow allow allow allow allow

Parameter regions excluded by physical conditions



For a conservative choice we use $\Gamma = 3.5$ in our simulation.

aller and aller a strate aller and aller aller a strate aller a strate aller a strate aller a strate aller

Parameter regions excluded by physical conditions



Assuming a transition at far high density, p_{1st} is irrelevant.

 10^{0} Pressure [GeV/fm³] Crossover 10⁻¹ **Ouark Matter** (pQCD) $ho_{
m stiff}$ We call this "With Crossover". 10⁻² Nuclear Matter (χ EFT) 10^{-3} **Discard the phase transition** 10^{0} (too high density to probe) p_{1st} Strong First-order 10^{-1} **Ouark Matter** (pQCD) 10^{-2} We call this "Without Crossover". Nuclear Matter (χ EFT) 10^{-3} 10^{0} 10 Energy Density [GeV/fm³]

Aller & Aller & Aller & Aller & Aller & Aller Aller & Aller



(Remark)

Weak 1st-order at intermediate density is still possible, but in this construction to match pQCD, it is inevitably very weak 1st, and there is no qualitative difference from the crossover.

August 2, 2022 @ University of Stavanger, Norway



Fujimoto-Fukushima-Hotokezaka-Kyutoku (appearing)

A side remark: Thermal Index $P_{\text{thermal}} \approx \rho \varepsilon_{\text{thermal}}(\Gamma_{\text{th}} - 1)$

Fujimoto-Fukushima-Hidaka-Hiraguchi-Iida (2021)



Thermal index is not larger than 1.8 and could be ~1.5 at high density.

Important Consistency Check

ALIAN ALIAN

Fujimoto-Fukushima-Hotokezaka-Kyutoku (2022)



From the kilonova data the ejecta mass is known to be $0.05M_{\odot}$

The remaining mass outside the apparent horizon after the BH formation should be larger than this mass.

Equal mass case is disfavored, but unequal mass is possible. If the mass ratio is determined independently (in the inspiral stage), the ejecta mass imposes a useful constraint on EOS.

Summary

aller a aller a aller a aller a aller a aller aller a aller

Gravitational waves from the post-merger stage should be sensitive to EOS at high density.

- Needs further upgrade but should be coming if the (reliable) theoretical prediction is made.
- **Crossover (or weak 1st-order PT at low density)** vs. strong 1st-order PT at high density
 - □ Life-time till the BH collapse signifies the sudden softening of EOS associated with quark matter.

Kilonova and ejecta mass give another constraint.

□ Some discussions on the maximum NS mass could be changed with realistic EOS.