

# Dense nucleonic matter and the renormalization group

Matthias Drews<sup>1,2,a</sup>, Thomas Hell<sup>1,2</sup>, Bertram Klein<sup>1</sup>, and Wolfram Weise<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Physik Department T39, Technische Universität München, 85748 Garching, Germany*

<sup>2</sup>*ECT\*, Villa Tambosi, I-38123 Villazzano (Trento), Italy*

**Abstract.** Fluctuations are included in a chiral nucleon-meson model within the framework of the functional renormalization group. The model, with parameters fitted to reproduce the nuclear liquid-gas phase transition, is used to study the phase diagram of QCD. We find good agreement with results from chiral effective field theory. Moreover, the results show a separation of the chemical freeze-out line and chiral symmetry restoration at large baryon chemical potentials.

## 1 Introduction

The quest for the critical end point of a first-order chiral transition in the QCD phase diagram is still unsettled. Lattice calculations at imaginary chemical potential seem to disfavor a first-order transition [1]. Model calculations are so far not conclusive. In the Polyakov-loop-extended quark-meson model, studied using the functional renormalization group, the critical endpoint lies in an unphysical region at very small temperatures and outside the range of applicability of the model [2]. In the Polyakov–Nambu–Jona-Lasinio model, the existence of the critical endpoint depends crucially on its input parameters such as the strengths of the axial anomaly and vector couplings [3].

A related question is whether there exists a connection between chiral symmetry restoration and the chemical freeze-out line as determined in a hadron-resonance-gas model analysis of heavy-ion collision data [4]. For very small baryon chemical potentials the chiral crossover lies close to the chemical freeze-out points, not unexpectedly since chemical equilibration requires multi-particle effects and collective phenomena right at the borderline of hadronization mostly into pions [5]. At larger baryon chemical potentials it is mandatory to take all the well-established constraints from nuclear physics into account. A way to do this is to start with a model based on the relevant nucleonic and mesonic degrees of freedom. In order to study chiral restoration, a chiral nucleon-meson model is chosen [6]. No relationship between chiral restoration and chemical freeze-out points is found in this model, at least not in the mean-field approximation [7].

In the following, we will briefly review the chiral nucleon-meson model and its mean-field treatment. Then we strengthen the conclusions by providing a self-consistent treatment of thermal mesonic and nucleonic fluctuations in the framework of the functional renormalization group (FRG). The phase diagram around the nuclear liquid-gas transition is compared with results of calculations using chiral effective field theory [8].

---

<sup>a</sup>e-mail: matthias.drews@ph.tum.de

## 2 The chiral nucleon-meson model

The dominant degrees of freedom around the nuclear liquid-gas transition are nucleons and pions. The pions are combined with a scalar field,  $\sigma$ , into a four-component vector,  $\phi = (\sigma, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ , that transforms under  $\text{SO}(4) \cong \text{SU}(2) \times \text{SU}(2)$ , with the invariant  $\rho = \frac{1}{2}|\phi|^2 = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma^2 + \boldsymbol{\pi} \cdot \boldsymbol{\pi})$ . Moreover, the nucleon is coupled to an isoscalar vector field,  $\omega_\mu$ , generating a repulsive short-range nucleon-nucleon interaction. The Lagrangian of the chiral nucleon-meson model reads [6]:

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\psi} \left[ i \not{\partial} + g_s (\sigma + i \gamma_5 \boldsymbol{\pi} \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau}) - g_v \gamma^\mu \omega_\mu + \gamma^0 \mu \right] \psi + \partial_{[\mu} \omega_{\nu]} \partial^{[\mu} \omega^{\nu]} + \frac{1}{2} m_v^2 \omega_\mu \omega^\mu + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \sigma \partial^\mu \sigma + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \boldsymbol{\pi} \cdot \partial^\mu \boldsymbol{\pi} + U_{\text{mic}}(\rho, \sigma).$$

While the microscopic potential,  $U_{\text{mic}}$ , is unknown a priori, the relevant object of interest is the effective potential  $U$  at a given temperature and baryon chemical potential with respect to the potential right at the equilibrium point of nuclear matter,  $U(T, \mu) - U(T = 0, \mu = \mu_c)$ . Here,  $\mu_c = M_N - B = 923$  MeV, i. e., the difference of the nucleon mass and the binding energy per nucleon, coincides with the critical chemical potential at the  $T = 0$  intercept of the liquid-gas phase transition line. In the mean-field approximation the spatial components of the  $\omega_\mu$  field vanish in order to preserve rotational invariance. In addition, we assume that there is no pion condensate, so only the mean-field values of the  $\sigma$  and the  $\omega_0$  will contribute. The nucleons can be integrated out and the effective potential takes the form

$$U_{\text{MF}} = U(\sigma, \omega_0) - 4T \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} \log \left[ 1 + e^{-(E_N(p) - \mu_{\text{eff}})/T} \right] - 4T \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} \log \left[ 1 + e^{-(E_N(p) + \mu_{\text{eff}})/T} \right],$$

with  $E_N(p)^2 = p^2 + (g_s \sigma)^2$  and  $\mu_{\text{eff}} = \mu - g_v \omega_0$ . The potential  $U(\sigma, \omega_0)$  is chosen in such a way as to reproduce nuclear physics constraints [7]. The mean-field potential  $U_{\text{MF}}$  is then minimized as a function of  $\sigma$  and  $\omega_0$ . Next we explain how to go beyond this mean field approximation.

## 3 Adding fluctuations

In order to incorporate fluctuations in a self-consistent manner, the functional renormalization group (FRG) method is used ([9] and references therein). The effective action,  $\Gamma_k$ , at a renormalization scale  $k$ , interpolates in this framework between the microscopic action,  $S = \Gamma_{k=\Lambda}$ , at a cutoff scale  $\Lambda$  and the full effective action,  $\Gamma_{\text{eff}} = \Gamma_{k=0}$ , with all fluctuations integrated out. The flow of this action, as the scale  $k$  is lowered, is governed by Wetterich's flow equation [10]:

$$k \partial_k \Gamma_k = \text{Tr} \left( \frac{k \partial_k R_k}{\Gamma^{(2)} + R_k} \right).$$

The trace is taken over all fields, as well as their momenta and internal degrees of freedom.  $\Gamma^{(2)}$  is the second derivative of the effective action with respect to the fields, such that the last expression is the full propagator, with an insertion of a regulator function  $R_k$ . This regulator function ensures that only fluctuations around  $k$  are contributing at that scale. The regulator gives low momentum modes an effective mass of order  $k^2$ . In practice,  $R_k$  is chosen to be the regulator proposed by Litim [11] for application at finite temperatures [12, 13]:

$$R_k = (k^2 - p^2) \cdot \theta(k^2 - p^2).$$

The potential is fitted to reproduce nuclear physics constraints such as the liquid-gas transition. The effective potential is therefore expanded around  $T = 0$  and  $\mu = \mu_c$  and the flow of

$$\bar{\Gamma}_k = \Gamma_k(T, \mu) - \Gamma_k(0, \mu_c)$$

is computed. Thermal fluctuations around the liquid-gas transition are treated self-consistently in this way [12]. In the local-potential approximation and in leading order in the derivative expansion, the flow equation for the effective action,  $\bar{\Gamma}_k$ , reduces to an equation for the effective potential,  $\bar{U}_k$ . The trace can be computed explicitly and the flow equation for the effective potential becomes

$$\partial_k \bar{U}_k = f(T, \mu) - f(0, \mu_c),$$

where

$$f(T, \mu) = \frac{k^4}{12\pi^2} \left\{ \frac{3[1 + 2n_B(E_\pi)]}{E_\pi} + \frac{1 + 2n_B(E_\sigma)}{E_\sigma} - \frac{8[1 - n_F(E_N, \mu_{\text{eff}}) - n_F(E_N, -\mu_{\text{eff}})]}{E_N} \right\}.$$

Here

$$E_\pi^2 = k^2 + m_\pi^2, \quad E_\sigma^2 = k^2 + m_\sigma^2, \quad E_N^2 = k^2 + 2g_s^2 \rho, \quad m_\pi^2 = U'_k(\rho), \quad m_\sigma^2 = U'_k(\rho) + 2\rho U''_k(\rho),$$

$$m_N = g_s \sigma, \quad \mu_{\text{eff}} = \mu - g_v \omega_{0,k}, \quad n_B(E) = \frac{1}{e^{\beta E} - 1} \quad \text{and} \quad n_F(E, \mu) = \frac{1}{e^{\beta(E-\mu)} + 1}.$$

The flow equation for the background vector field  $\omega_{0,k}$  leads to the integral equation


$$\omega_{0,k} = \frac{2g_v}{3\pi^2 m_v^2} \int_k^\Lambda d\tilde{k} \tilde{k}^4 \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} \frac{n_F(E_N(\tilde{k}), \mu_{\text{eff}}) + n_F(E_N(\tilde{k}), -\mu_{\text{eff}})}{E_N(\tilde{k})}.$$

The effective potential is fixed in such a way that the nuclear saturation density, the binding energy, the surface tension of a nuclear droplet, and the compression modulus obtained from the full potential agree with empirical data. The flow equation is then solved for temperatures and baryon chemical potentials around the liquid-gas phase transition using a numerical method on a discretized grid [14].

## 4 Results and discussion

The nuclear liquid-gas phase transition has been studied extensively within the framework of chiral effective field theory ( $\chi$ EFT, [15] and references therein). In the left plot of Fig. 1 the first-order line and the critical point are shown, as computed in the nucleon-meson model, both at mean-field level and including fluctuations. They are compared with a  $\chi$ EFT computation [8] which takes into account all one- and two-pion exchange processes, as well as three-body forces and  $\Delta$ -isobar excitations. With fluctuations, the transition is bent away from the mean-field curve to higher chemical potentials, in very good agreement with  $\chi$ EFT results. This is remarkable, given the very different approaches. Whereas the temperature of the critical point is 15.1 MeV in  $\chi$ EFT, it is shifted to a value of  $T_c = 18.3$  MeV in the RG treatment of the nucleon-meson model, in good agreement with empirical results [16].

In order to address the entanglement between chemical freeze-out points and chiral restoration, the chiral condensate is studied as a function of temperature and chemical potential. In the nucleon-meson model, the chiral condensate is proportional to the expectation value of  $\sigma$ . In the plot on the right-hand side of Fig. 1, contour lines of  $\sigma$  normalized to its vacuum expectation value,  $f_\pi$ , are shown. In the whole area of temperatures up to 100 MeV and baryon chemical potentials smaller than about



**Figure 1.** Left: liquid-gas phase transition in  $\chi$ EFT [8] (dashed) and in the chiral nucleon-meson model both at mean-field level (dotted) and with fluctuations (solid). Right: contour plots of  $\sigma/f_\pi$  representing the chiral order parameter. Within the region of applicability, the condensate is non-zero throughout and chiral symmetry is spontaneously broken.

1 GeV, the chiral order parameter  $\sigma/f_\pi$  still exceeds 0.65 and chiral symmetry is not restored in its trivial Wigner-Weyl realization. The line at which chiral symmetry is restored must therefore intersect the  $\mu$ -axis at considerably larger baryon chemical potentials and is therefore well separated from the nuclear liquid-gas phase transition, as it should be. In the region of applicability, there is no sign of a chiral first-order phase transition. This demonstrates the importance of taking the constraints from nuclear physics properly into account in calculations modeling the QCD phase diagram.

## References

- [1] P. de Forcrand, O. Philipsen, JHEP **0701**:077 (2007)
- [2] T. Herbst, J. Pawłowski, B.-J. Schaefer, Phys. Lett. B **696**, 58 (2011)
- [3] K. Fukushima, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 114028 (2008),  
N. Bratovic, T. Hatsuda, W. Weise, Phys. Lett. B **719**, 131 (2013),  
T. Hell, K. Kashiwa, W. Weise, J. Mod. Phys. **4**, No. 5, 644 (2013)
- [4] A. Andronic, P. Braun-Munzinger, J. Stachel, Phys. Lett. B **673**, 2, 142 (2009)
- [5] P. Braun-Munzinger, J. Stachel, C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. B **596**, 61 (2004).
- [6] J. Berges, D.-U. Jungnickel, C. Wetterich, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **18**, 3189 (2003)
- [7] S. Floerchinger, C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. A **890-891**, 11 (2012)
- [8] S. Fiorilla, N. Kaiser, W. Weise, Nucl. Phys. A **880**, 65 (2012)
- [9] P. Kopietz, L. Bartosch, F. Schütz, Lect. Notes Phys. **798** (2010) (Springer, Berlin & Heidelberg)
- [10] C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. B **301**, 90 (1993)
- [11] D. Litim, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 105007 (2001)
- [12] D. Litim, J. Pawłowski, JHEP **0611**:026 (2006)
- [13] J.-P. Blaizot *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. A **784**, 376 (2007)
- [14] J. Adams, *et al.*, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **10**, 2367 (1995)
- [15] J. Holt, N. Kaiser, W. Weise, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys, in print (2013), arXiv: 1304.6350
- [16] V. A. Karnaukhov *et al.*, Phys. Atom. Nucl. **71** 2067 (2008)