

Nuclear matter as a liquid phase of spontaneously
 broken semi-classical $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ chiral
 perturbation theory:
 Static chiral nucleon liquids

Bryan W. Lynn^{1,2,3*}, Brian J. Coffey^{1†}, Kellen E. McGee^{5 ‡}
 and Glenn D. Starkman^{1,4§}

¹Dept Physics/CERCA/ISO, CWRU, Cleveland, OH, 44106 USA

²Dept Physics/Astronomy, University College London, London
 WC1E 6BT, UK

³Physics Division, CERN, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland

⁴Dept Astronomy, CWRU, Cleveland, OH, 44106 USA

⁵Dept Physics/Astronomy, Michigan State U., East Lansing MI,
 48824

Accepted XXX. Received YYY; in original form ZZZ

Abstract

The Standard Model of particle physics (SM), augmented with neutrino mixing, is either the complete theory of interactions of known particles at energies accessible to Nature on Earth, or very nearly so. Candidate effective theories of nuclear structure must therefore reflect SM symmetries, especially the chiral global $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ symmetry of two-massless-quark QCD, *spontaneously* broken to $SU(2)_{L+R}$: i.e. $SU(2)\chi PT$. Naive dimensional operator power counting enables perturbation and truncation in inverse powers of $\Lambda_{\chi SB} \sim 1\text{GeV}$, with analytic operators renormalized to all loop orders. We show that, to $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\chi SB})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\chi SB}^0)$, $SU(2)\chi PT$ of protons, neutrons and 3 Nambu-Goldstone boson (NGB) pions admits a “liquid” phase, with energy required to increase or decrease the nucleon density. We further show that in the semi-classical approximation – i.e. quantum nucleons and classical pions – “Pionless $SU(2)\chi PT$ ”

*E-mail: bryan.lynn@cern.ch

†E-mail: bjc118@case.edu

‡E-mail: kem39@case.edu

§E-mail: glenn.starkman@case.edu

emerges in that chiral liquid: soft static infrared NGB pions decouple from “Static Chiral Nucleon Liquids” (Static χ NL). This vastly simplifies the derivation of saturated nuclear matter (the infinite liquid phase) and of finite microscopic liquid drops (ground-state heavy nuclides).

Static χ NL are made entirely of nucleons. They have even parity, total spin zero, even proton number Z and even neutron number N . The nucleons are arranged so local expectation values for spin and momentum vanish. Static χ NLs explain the power of certain pure-nucleon models to capture experimental ground-state properties of certain nuclides, tracing that (no-longer-mysterious) empirical success directly to the global symmetries of two-massless-quark QCD. We derive the Static χ NL effective Lagrangian from semi-classical $SU(2)\chi PT$ symmetries to order $\Lambda_{\chi SB}, \Lambda_{\chi SB}^0$ including: all relativistic 4-nucleon operators that survive Fierz rearrangement in the non-relativistic limit; $SU(2)\chi PT$ fermion identity operators (which vanish for ${}^2_1H_1, {}^3_1H_2, {}^3_2He_1$ and 4_2He_2) and $\bar{\rho}_\mu$ -exchange operators (which are crucial to $Z \neq N$ asymmetry).

Mean-field Static χ NL non-topological solitons are true solutions of $SU(2)\chi PT$ semi-classical symmetries: e.g. they obey all CVC, PCAC conservation laws. They have zero internal and external pressure. The nuclear liquid-drop model and Bethe-von Weizsäcker semi-empirical mass formula emerge – with correct nuclear density and saturation and asymmetry energies – in an explicit Thomas-Fermi construction.

Pionless and halo/cluster EFTs, composed entirely of nucleons and applied to light ($A \leq 6$) nuclei, are compatible/complementary with, and might provide important ($< 12.5\%$?) corrections to, Static χNL . 4_2He_2 and 6_2He_4 would also be Static χNL s, but are augmented and complicated by the bound-state, by the pseudo-renormalizability and absence of unitarity central to EFTs, and by an explicit pion mass $m_\pi^2 \neq 0$.

1 Introduction

In the Standard Model (SM) of particle physics, Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) describes the strong interactions among quarks and gluons. At low energies, quarks and gluons are confined inside hadrons, concealing their degrees of freedom in such a way that we must employ an effective field theory (EFT) of hadrons. In doing so, we acknowledge as a starting point a still-mysterious experimental fact: Nature first makes hadrons and then assembles nuclei from them [1–4].

Since nuclei are made of hadrons, the fundamental challenge of nuclear physics is to identify the correct EFT of hadrons and use it to characterize all nuclear physics observations. Many such EFTs have been considered [5–9]. Ultimately, the correct choice will both match the observations and be derivable from the SM, i.e. QCD.

Chiral perturbation theory (χPT) [10–15] is a low-energy perturbative approach to identifying the operators in the EFT of hadrons that are allowed by the global symmetries of the SM. It builds on the observation that the up and down quarks ($m_{up} \simeq 6 MeV$), $m_{down} \simeq 12 MeV$), as well as the 3 pions (π^\pm, π^0 ,

$m_\pi \simeq 140\text{MeV}$)—which are pseudo-Nambu-Goldstone bosons (pNGBs) of the chiral symmetry—are all nearly massless compared to the cut-off energy scale in low-energy hadronic physics $\Lambda_{\chi SB} \sim 1\text{GeV}$.

With naive power counting [16], the effective Lagrangian of $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ χPT incorporates explicit breaking and all analytic higher-order quantum-loop corrections into tree-level amplitudes. The resultant perturbation expansion in the inverse of the chiral-symmetry-breaking scale $\Lambda_{\chi SB}^{-1} \sim 1\text{GeV}^{-1}$ renders $SU(2)\chi PT$'s strong-interaction predictions calculable in practice. Its low-energy dynamics of a proton-neutron nucleon doublet and three pions as a pNGB triplet are our best understanding, together with lattice QCD, of the experimentally observed low-energy dynamics of QCD strong interactions. This understanding encompasses: pNGB masses, soft-pion scattering, the applicability of $SU(2)_{L+R} \times SU(2)_{L-R}$ current algebra, the conserved vector current (CVC) and partially conserved axial-vector current (PCAC) hypothesis, semi-leptonic $\vec{\pi}$ decay, leptonic $\vec{\pi}$ decay, semi-leptonic nucleon decay, second-class currents, nucleon axial-vector couplings, the Goldberger-Treiman relation, nuclear beta decay, precise measurement of Cabbibo angle, *etc.*

χPT 's effective-field-theoretic predictive power [10, 12–19] derives from its ability to control its analytic quantum loops by naive power counting in $\Lambda_{\chi SB}^{-1}$, thus maintaining a well-ordered low-energy perturbation expansion that can be truncated. This predictive power stands in stark contrast with theories of strong interactions that lose their field-theoretic predictive power. These include any model of light or heavy nuclei not demonstrably derivable from the Standard Model [20], such as theories of quark bags and other (non-lattice-QCD) confinement models of hadronic structure [21, 22], strange quark matter (and strange quark stars) [23–27], and multi-Skyrmions in chiral pseudo-Goldstone symmetry [28–30].

In contrast, QCD lattice-gauge-theory calculations of quarks and gluons [31–33] control their quantum loops, and we may hope that the detailed properties of the deuteron, the alpha particle, and maybe even heavy nuclei, may someday be directly calculated in lattice QCD.

Triumphant in claiming a role in soft nuclear physics, "pionless EFT" ($\not\chi EFT$) contains only nucleons with contact interactions, and therefore lacks the crucial symmetries of $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ χPT , whose (spontaneously or explicitly broken) phases manifestly govern "in-vacuum" scattering processes like $\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi + \pi s$ and $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N + \pi s$. $\not\chi EFT$ has been demonstrated [34, 35], to explain the structure of the deuteron to high accuracy. Still, non-perturbative re-summation of anomalously large quantum loops, necessary to form the bound-state poles, has been shown applicable only for momentum cut-off

$$\Lambda_{\not\chi}^A < m_\pi \ll \Lambda_{\chi PT}^A = \Lambda_{\chi SB} \sim 1\text{GeV} \quad (1)$$

(Λ for cut-off, A for applicability, $\not\chi$ for $\not\chi EFT$). Although neither has pions, $\not\chi EFT$ (with power counting $Q < \Lambda_{\not\chi}^A$) is not to be confused with our "Static Chiral Nucleon Liquids" (Static χNL), described in detail below, which instead arise within what we shall describe as "Semi-classical-pionless $SU(2)\chi PT$ " with

naive power counting in inverse powers of $\Lambda_{Static\chi NL}^A = \Lambda_{\chi SB}$.

B.W. Lynn [36] first introduced the idea that $SU(2)\chi PT$ could also admit a liquid phase:

“It is legitimate to inquire whether the effective (naive power-counting) Lagrangian (A.14) ... contains a liquid phase. An ‘ $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ chiral liquid’ is defined as a statistically significant number of baryons interacting via chiral operators ... with an almost constant (saturated) density ... (which) can survive as localized ‘(liquid) drops’ at zero external pressure.”

Lynn’s Lagrangian included all analytic $SU(2)\chi PT$ terms of $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\chi SB})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\chi SB}^0)$, renormalized to all orders with naive power counting, and ignored electromagnetic breaking. He argued that, in the exact chiral limit, nucleons in the liquid phase interact with each-other only via the contact terms (28). Study of chiral liquids in [36] focused on those explicit chiral symmetry breaking terms whose origin lies entirely in non-zero light quark masses (in approximation $m_{up} = m_{down} \neq 0$): i.e. the $m = 0, l = 1, n = 1$ contributions in (A.14).

The result is a semi-classical nuclear picture, where Thomas-Fermi nucleons with contact interactions move in a mean spherically symmetric “classical” pion field, which in turn generates a “no-core” radial potential for nucleons. Finite saturating heavy nuclei, with well-defined surfaces, emerge as microscopic droplets of chiral liquid. Saturating infinite nuclear matter emerges as very large drops of chiral liquid, while neutron stars (Q-Stars) emerge as oceans of chiral liquid: Figures 3 and 10 respectively in [36] show these, but using an unphysically large nuclear sigma term. All emerge as non-topological-soliton semi-classical solutions of explicitly-broken $SU(2)\chi PT$.

Lynn’s motivation included the possible emergence of shell structure in that no-core spherical potential [36]:

”The success of the nuclear shell model must mean that, at least in heavy nuclei, nucleons... must move in some sort of mean spherically symmetric field, otherwise, why should the angular momentum of each nucleon be an approximately good quantum number?”

Ref. [36] did not derive semi-classical pion-less $SU(2)\chi PT$. Here, we focus our study of chiral liquids instead on the $n = 0$ chiral limit, and prove the emergence of semi-classical pionless $SU(2)\chi PT$ in that spontaneously broken chiral limit.

1.1 The fatal flaw in non-topological-soliton models of nuclear structure not based on $SU(2)\chi PT$

In modern Quantum Field Theory (QFT), T.D. Lee & G.C. Wick [37], T.D. Lee [38], T.D. Lee & M. Margulies [39], S.A. Chin & J.D. Walecka [40], and R. Serber [41] first identified certain fermion non-topological solitons with the ground state of heavy nuclei (as well as possible super-heavy nuclei) in “normal” and “abnormal” phases, thus making a crucial connection to the ancient

(but still persistently predictive) insight of nuclear liquids, such as G. Gamow's nuclear liquid-drop model (NLDM) and H. Bethe & C.F. von Weizsäcker's semi-empirical Mass-Formula (SEMF). Their crucial QFT insight was to see the nuclear liquid as Thomas-Fermi nucleons moving in a classical, static, 0^+ , neutral σ -meson (or $\sim f_0(500)$?) field:

$$\sigma(\vec{r}) \equiv \frac{g_\sigma}{4\pi} \int d\vec{r}' \rho(\vec{r}') \frac{e^{-m_\sigma |\vec{r}-\vec{r}'|}}{|\vec{r}-\vec{r}'|}, \quad (2)$$

obeying

$$\vec{\nabla}^2 \sigma(\vec{r}) = m_\sigma^2 \sigma(\vec{r}) - g_\sigma \rho(\vec{r}). \quad (3)$$

for nucleon number density $\rho(\vec{r})$. This has potential

$$U = \int \left[\frac{1}{2} (\vec{\nabla} \sigma)^2 + \frac{1}{2} m_\sigma^2 \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{3!} b \sigma^3 + \frac{1}{4!} c \sigma^4 - g_\sigma \rho \right] d\vec{r} \quad (4)$$

and Bohr & Mottelson's [42] nucleon kinetic energy with hard-sphere repulsion

$$T = \int \frac{3}{5} \frac{1}{2m^N} \frac{k_F^2}{(1 - \frac{5}{3\pi} r_{Sphere} k_F)^2} \rho d\vec{r} \quad (5)$$

where nuclei with $Z = N = \frac{1}{2}A$ have $\rho(\vec{r}) = \frac{2}{3\pi^2} k_F^3(\vec{r})$. Minimizing the total energy $E = Am^N + T + U$, subject to the constraint $A = \int \rho d\vec{r}$ (for fixed A), a reasonable picture of finite spherical nuclei emerges! While σ was usually governed by the quartic scalar potential above, R. Serber commented [43] very early-on that a quadratic scalar potential with $b = c = 0$ already gave a reasonable fit to the observed structure of certain finite spherical nuclei, as was found independently by Chin & Walecka [40].

Breaking all precedent, Lee and Walecka and co-workers, as well as Serber, proposed (in the mid-1970s) for the first time, a QFT of liquid nuclear structure composed entirely of nucleons and a static σ field, with no pions! This in exact departure from, and contradiction with, theoretical nuclear physics' previous obsession with Yukawa's pions! In this paper, we will simply replace (for certain nuclei) those authors' classical σ field with quantum-nucleon operators obedient to $SU(2)\chi PT$ semi-classical symmetries.

Mathematically, such solutions emerge as a sub-species of non-topological solitons or Q-balls [37,44–58], a certain sub-set of which are composed of fermions along with the usual scalars. A practical goal was to identify mean-field nucleon non-topological solitons with the ground state of ordinary even-even spin-zero spherically symmetric heavy nuclei, such as ${}^{40}_{20}\text{Ca}_{20}$, ${}^{90}_{40}\text{Zr}_{50}$, and ${}^{208}_{82}\text{Pb}_{126}$.

Nuclear non-topological solitons identified as nuclear liquids became popular with the work of Chin & Walecka [40], carried forward by Serot [59]. Walecka's nuclear Quantum Hydrodynamics -1 (QHD-1) models [60–62] contain four dynamical particles: protons, neutrons, the Lorentz-scalar iso-scalar σ , and the

Lorentz-vector iso-scalar ω_μ .¹ Nucleons are treated as locally free-particles in Thomas-Fermi approximation. Finite-width nuclear surfaces are generated by dynamical attractive σ -particle exchange, allowing them to exist at zero external pressure.

The empirical success of QHD-1 is based on balancing σ -boson-exchange attraction against ω_μ -boson-exchange repulsion. That that balance must be fine-tuned remains a famous mystery of the structure of the QHD-1 ground state. In the absence of long-ranged electromagnetic forces, infinite symmetric $Z = N$ nuclear matter, as well as finite microscopic ground-state $Z = N$ nuclides, appear as symmetric nuclear liquid drops.

The nuclear non-topological solitons of T.D. Lee and co-workers, J.D. Walecka and co-workers, and R. Serber are to be classified as liquids because:

- they have no crystalline or other solid structure;
- it costs energy to either increase or decrease the density of the constituent nucleons compared to an optimum value;
- they survive at zero external pressure, e.g. in the absence of gravity, so they are not a “gas.”

Despite their successes, there is a fatal flaw in all current σ -based nuclear non-topological soliton models, and in all nuclear models not based on $SU(2)\chi PT$. To see this, examine the renormalizable Lagrangian of a nucleon doublet N , a real Lorentz-scalar σ and a Lorentz-vector ω_μ

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{\sigma-\omega}^{Total} &= L_{QHD-1}^{Walecka} + L^{Higgs} + L^{GaugeFixing} + L^{Ghosts} & (6) \\
L_{QHD-1}^{Walecka} &= L_{QHD-1}^{Nucleons} + L_{QHD-1}^\sigma + L_{QHD-1}^\omega \\
L_{QHD-1}^{Nucleons} &= \bar{N} \left(i\gamma^\mu (\partial_\mu - ig_\omega \omega_\mu) - m^N + g_\sigma \sigma \right) N \\
L_{QHD-1}^\sigma &= \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\nu \sigma)^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_\sigma^2 \sigma^2 \\
L_{QHD-1}^\omega &= -\frac{1}{4} \omega_{\mu\nu} \omega^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} m_\omega^2 \omega_\mu \omega^\mu; \quad \omega_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \omega_\nu - \partial_\nu \omega_\mu \\
L^{Higgs} &= |(\partial_\mu - ig_\omega \omega_\mu) \Phi|^2 - \frac{1}{2} m_\omega^2 \omega_\mu \omega^\mu \\
\Phi &= Re(\Phi) + iIm(\Phi); \quad Re(\Phi) = \langle Re(\Phi) \rangle + Re(\phi) \\
m_\omega^2 &= 2g_\omega^2 \langle Re(\Phi) \rangle^2 \\
L^{GaugeFixing} &= (\partial_\mu \omega^\mu)^2 \\
L^{Ghosts} &\rightarrow 0 & (7)
\end{aligned}$$

The reader will recognize $L_{\sigma-\omega}^{Total}$ as a $U(1)$ gauge theory in Lorenz gauge, where the ghosts decouple, augmented with a real scalar σ whose $U(1)$ charge is

¹ In practice, the ω_μ is usually treated as a very heavy non-dynamical auxiliary field and integrated out of the theory, but, in order to be able to properly discuss the renormalized predictions of Walecka’s QHD-1 model, we won’t do so here.

zero. After spontaneous symmetry breaking, $\langle Re(\Phi) \rangle \neq 0$, and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}Im(\Phi)$ becomes the longitudinal component of the Lorentz-vector ω_μ . Then

$$C_V^2 \equiv \frac{g_\omega^2}{m_\omega^2} = 222.65 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$$

and

$$C_S^2 \equiv \frac{g_\sigma^2}{m_\sigma^2} = 303.45 \text{ GeV}^{-2} \quad (8)$$

are fit to the experimentally inferred values of the number density ($k_{Fermi} \simeq 1.42/fm$) and saturated volume energy ($E_{binding}/nucleon \simeq 15.75MeV$) of infinite, symmetric, $Z = N$ nuclear matter – taken approximately to be the interior of ${}_{82}^{208}Pb_{126}$ – neglecting Coulomb and isospin effects.

The fatal flaw is manifest when treating (6) as a QFT beyond tree level. Inclusion of 1-loop quantum corrections will strongly renormalize the values of the constants m^N , g_σ , m_σ^2 , g_ω , and m_ω^2 , and induce higher-order operators in the scalar – $\sim \sigma^6$, σ^{32} , σ^{784} , *etc.* – with coefficients that depend on those renormalized parameters. We can probably re-fit (e.g. via Coleman-Weinberg) the 1-loop σ^n operators to symmetric nuclear matter, including nuclear surface terms and compressibility, which now also depend on those new higher-power σ interactions. Next include 2-loop strong-interactions and re-fit. Because these are strong hadronic interactions, 2-loop effects will be just as large as 1-loop effects, and cannot be truncated. Include 3,4,5, *etc.* quantum loops (which are all required in any QFT of strong hadronic interactions) and re-fit at each order. Not only is such a program impossible in practice, but all the nuclear predictive power of the Walecka model has been completely lost!

This paper cures those problems, and resurrects nuclear liquids as a good starting point toward understanding the properties of bound nuclear matter (with Z and N both even) by strict compliance with the requirements of $SU(2)\chi PT$ effective field theory of protons, neutrons and pions. The static chiral nucleon liquids (Static χ NL) studied below are true solutions to semi-classical $SU(2)\chi PT$, and have all of the semi-classical symmetries of spontaneously broken $SU(2)\chi PT$ found in Appendix A: they include renormalized all-loop-orders analytic quantum corrections; they obey all CVC and PCAC Ward identities; they are dependent on just a few experimentally measurable chiral coefficients; and, by the symmetries of spontaneously broken $SU(2)\chi PT$, they restore (cf. Appendix A) theoretical predictive power over heavy nuclides.

2 The emergence of semi-classical pion-less Static χ NL in strict naive power-counting

We recall the $SU(2)\chi PT$ Lagrangian², with all terms of order $\Lambda_{\chi SB}$ and $(\Lambda_{\chi SB})^0$ in the chiral limit.

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{\chi PT}^{Symmetric} &= L_{\chi PT}^{\pi;Symmetric} + L_{\chi PT}^{N;Symmetric} + L_{\chi PT}^{4-N;Symmetric} \\
L_{\chi PT}^{\pi;Symmetric} &= \frac{f_\pi^2}{4} \text{Tr} \partial_\mu \Sigma \partial^\mu \Sigma^\dagger + L_{\chi PT;Non-Analytic}^{\pi;Symmetric} \\
L_{\chi PT}^{N;Symmetric} &= \bar{N} \left(i\gamma^\mu (\partial_\mu + V_\mu) - m^N \mathbb{1} \right) N - g_A \bar{N} \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 A_\mu N \\
&= \bar{N} \left(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m^N \mathbb{1} \right) N + i\vec{J}^\mu \cdot \vec{V}_\mu - g_A \vec{J}^{\mu,5} \cdot \vec{A}_\mu \\
L_{\chi PT}^{4-N;Symmetric} &= C_{\mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} (\bar{N} \gamma^{\mathcal{A}} N) (\bar{N} \gamma_{\mathcal{A}} N) + \dots,
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

with fermion bi-linear and pionic currents

$$\begin{aligned}
\vec{J}^\mu &= \bar{N} \gamma^\mu \vec{t} N; \\
\vec{J}^{\mu,5} &= \bar{N} \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 \vec{t} N; \\
V_\mu &= \vec{t} \cdot \vec{V}_\mu, \quad \vec{V}_\mu = 2i \text{sinc}^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{2f_\pi} \right) [\vec{\pi} \times \partial_\mu \vec{\pi}]; \\
A_\mu &= \vec{t} \cdot \vec{A}_\mu; \quad \vec{A}_\mu = -\frac{2}{\pi^2} \left[\vec{\pi} (\vec{\pi} \cdot \partial_\mu \vec{\pi}) + \text{sinc} \left(\frac{\pi}{f_\pi} \right) (\vec{\pi} \times (\partial_\mu \vec{\pi} \times \vec{\pi})) \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $\pi = |\vec{\pi}| = \sqrt{\vec{\pi}^2}$, and $\text{sinc}(x) \equiv \sin(x)/x$. The pion \rightarrow di-leptons decay constant is $F_\pi = 130.4 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.2 \text{ MeV}$ [63]. We use $f_\pi \equiv F_\pi/\sqrt{2} = 92.207 \pm 0.144 \text{ MeV}$.

The parentheses in the four-nucleon Lagrangian indicate the order of $SU(2)$ index contraction, while $+++$ indicates that one should include all possible combinations of such contractions. As usual, $\gamma^{\mathcal{A}} \equiv (1, \gamma^\mu, i\sigma^{\mu\nu}, i\gamma^\mu \gamma^5, \gamma^5)$, for $\mathcal{A} = 1, \dots, 16$ (with $\sigma^{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{1}{2}[\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu]$). These are commonly referred to as scalar (S), vector (V), tensor (T), axial-vector (A), and pseudo-scalar (P) respectively. $C_{\mathcal{A}}$ are a set of chiral constants.

In the chiral limit, where $\vec{\pi}$'s are massless, the presence of quantum nucleon sources could allow the massless NGB to build up, with tree-level interactions only, a non-linear quantum pion cloud. If we minimize the resultant action with respect to variations in the pion field, the equations of motion³ capture the

² Important infra-red non-analytic terms in the classical pion sector are also included. See Appendix A

³ This is a chiral-limit $SU(2)\chi PT$ analogue of QED where, in the presence of quantum lepton sources, a specific superposition of massless infra-red photons builds up into a classical electromagnetic field. Important examples are the ‘‘exponentiation’’ of IR photons in $e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ asymmetries, and $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-$ Bhabha scattering, at LEP1. Understanding the classical fields generated by initial-state and final-state soft-photon radiation [64, 65] is crucial to dis-entangling high-precision electro-weak loop effects, such as the experimentally confirmed precise Standard Model predictions for the top-quark [66] and Higgs’ [66, 67] masses.

part of the quantum cloud that is to be characterized as a classical soft-pion field, thus giving us the pion ground-state (and content/configuration/structure) in the presence of the ground-state “Chiral Nucleon Liquid” (χ NL) with fixed baryon number $A = Z + N$

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left[\partial_\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial (\partial_\nu \pi^m)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \pi^m} \right] L_{\chi PT}^{Symmetric} \\
&= \left[\partial_\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial (\partial_\nu \pi^m)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \pi^m} \right] L_{\chi PT}^{\pi, Symmetric} \\
&+ i \vec{J}^\mu \cdot \left[\partial_\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial (\partial_\nu \pi^m)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \pi^m} \right] \vec{V}_\mu - g_A \vec{J}^{\mu,5} \cdot \left[\partial_\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial (\partial_\nu \pi^m)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \pi^m} \right] \vec{A}_\mu \quad (11) \\
&- 2 \partial_\mu \vec{J}^\mu \cdot \text{sinc}^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{2f_\pi} \right) (\vec{\pi} \times \hat{m}) \\
&+ \frac{2}{\pi^2} g_A \partial_\mu \vec{J}^{\mu,5} \cdot \left[\vec{\pi} (\vec{\pi} \cdot \hat{m}) + \text{sinc} \left(\frac{\pi}{f_\pi} \right) (\vec{\pi} \times (\hat{m} \times \vec{\pi})) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

We divide the classical pion field into “IR” and “non-IR” parts. By definition, only IR pions survive the internal projection operators associated with taking expectation values of the classical NGB $\vec{\pi}$ s in the $|\chi NL\rangle$ quantum state

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \chi NL | Function(\partial_\mu \vec{\pi}, \vec{\pi}) | \chi NL \rangle & \quad (12) \\
&= \langle \chi NL | \text{IR-part-of} [Function(\partial_\mu \vec{\pi}, \vec{\pi})] | \chi NL \rangle \\
&\equiv \{Function(\partial_\mu \vec{\pi}, \vec{\pi})\}_{IR} \\
0 &= \langle \chi NL | \text{Non-IR-part-of} [Function(\partial_\mu \vec{\pi}, \vec{\pi})] | \chi NL \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

The IR part does not change the χ NL. It could in principle be an important part of the χ NL: a $\vec{\pi}$ condensate, a giant resonance, a breathing mode, a time-dependent flashing-pion mode. To ignore such classical IR $\vec{\pi}$ s would therefore be an incorrect definition of χ NL. For finite χ NL, it could be just a passing pion (of any frequency) which simply does not strike the χ NL.

We call these “IR pions” by keeping in mind a simple picture, where the $\vec{\pi}$ wavelength is longer than the scale within the χ NL over which the local mean values of nucleon spin and momentum vanish. Only such IR pions survive the internal projection operators associated with taking expectation values of the classical NGB $\vec{\pi}$ s in the $|\chi NL\rangle$ quantum state.

We now take expectation values of the $\vec{\pi}$ equations of motion. In the presence

of the quantum χNL source, the classical NGB $\vec{\pi}$ cloud obeys

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \langle \chi NL | \left[\partial_\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial (\partial_\nu \pi^m)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \pi^m} \right] L_{\chi PT}^{Symmetric} | \chi NL \rangle \\
&= \left\{ \left[\partial_\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial (\partial_\nu \pi^m)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \pi^m} \right] L_{\chi PT}^{\pi; Symmetric} \right\}_{IR} \\
&+ i \langle \chi NL | \vec{J}^\mu | \chi NL \rangle \cdot \left\{ \left[\partial_\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial (\partial_\nu \pi^m)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \pi^m} \right] \vec{V}_\mu \right\}_{IR} \\
&- g_A \langle \chi NL | \vec{J}^{\mu,5} | \chi NL \rangle \cdot \left\{ \left[\partial_\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial (\partial_\nu \pi^m)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \pi^m} \right] \vec{A}_\mu \right\}_{IR} \\
&- 2 \langle \chi NL | \partial_\mu \vec{J}^\mu | \chi NL \rangle \cdot \left\{ \text{sinc}^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{2f_\pi} \right) \vec{\pi} \times \hat{m} \right\}_{IR} \\
&+ \frac{2}{\pi^2} g_A \langle \chi NL | \partial_\mu \vec{J}^{\mu,5} | \chi NL \rangle \cdot \left\{ \vec{\pi} (\vec{\pi} \cdot \hat{m}) + \text{sinc} \left(\frac{\pi}{f_\pi} \right) \vec{\pi} \times (\hat{m} \times \vec{\pi}) \right\}_{IR}
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Examining the ground-state expectation values of the nucleon currents and their divergences in (13), we find that almost all of them vanish:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \chi NL | J_\mu^\pm | \chi NL \rangle &= 0, & \langle \chi NL | J_\mu^{\pm,5} | \chi NL \rangle &= 0, \\
\langle \chi NL | \partial^\mu J_\mu^\pm | \chi NL \rangle &= 0, & \langle \chi NL | \partial^\mu J_\mu^{\pm,5} | \chi NL \rangle &= 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

because J_μ^\pm and $J_\mu^{\pm,5}$ change neutron and proton number. Since the liquid ground state is homogeneous, isotropic and spherically symmetric, spatial components of vector currents vanish, in particular

$$\langle \chi NL | J_i^3 | \chi NL \rangle \simeq 0 \tag{15}$$

for Lorentz index $i = 1, 2, 3$. Because left-handed and right-handed protons are equally represented (and separately left-handed and right-handed neutrons are also equally represented) in the nuclear ground state

$$\langle \chi NL | J_\mu^{3,5} | \chi NL \rangle \simeq 0 \tag{16}$$

for all μ . Current conservation (see section 4) enforces

$$\langle \chi NL | \partial^\mu J_\mu^3 | \chi NL \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \chi NL | \partial^\mu J_\mu^{3,5} | \chi NL \rangle = 0. \tag{17}$$

This leaves only a single non-vanishing current expectation value:

$$\langle \chi NL | J_0^3 | \chi NL \rangle \neq 0. \tag{18}$$

Equation (13), governing the classical pion cloud, is thus enormously simplified

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\simeq \left\{ \left[\partial_\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial (\partial_\nu \pi^m)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \pi^m} \right] L_{\chi PT}^{\pi; Symmetric} \right\}_{IR} \\
&+ i \langle \chi NL | J^{3,0} | \chi NL \rangle \left\{ \left[\partial_\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial (\partial_\nu \pi^m)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \pi^m} \right] V_0^3 \right\}_{IR}
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

with

$$\left\{ \left[\partial_\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial (\partial_\nu \pi^m)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \pi^m} \right] V_0^3 \right\}_{IR} = \left\{ 2i \left[(\partial_0 \vec{\pi}) \times \hat{m} + \vec{\pi} \times \hat{m} \partial_0 - \hat{m} \times (\partial_0 \vec{\pi}) - \vec{\pi} \times (\partial_0 \vec{\pi}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \pi^m} \right]^3 \text{sinc}^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{2f_\pi} \right) \right\}_{IR}. \quad (20)$$

A crucial observation is that (20) is linear in $\partial_0 \vec{\pi}$; i.e., in the energy of the classical NGB IR $\vec{\pi}$ field. Expecting the nuclear ground state, and thus its classical IR $\vec{\pi}$ field, to be static, we enforce

$$\{\partial_0 \vec{\pi}\}_{IR} = 0. \quad (21)$$

It now follows that

$$\left\{ \left[\partial_\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial (\partial_\nu \pi^m)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \pi^m} \right] V_0^3 \right\}_{IR} = 0, \quad (22)$$

independent of $\langle \chi NL | J^{3;0} | \chi NL \rangle$. The IR pion equation of motion

$$\left\{ \left[\partial_\nu \frac{\partial}{\partial (\partial_\nu \pi^m)} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \pi^m} \right] L_{\chi PT}^{\pi; \text{Symmetric}} \right\}_{IR} = 0 \quad (23)$$

therefore has no nucleon source. $L_{\chi PT}^{\pi; \text{Symmetric}}$ in (23) includes both its analytic and non-analytic contributions (cf. Appendix equation (A.22)). The ground-state nucleons are not a source of any static IR NGB $\vec{\pi}$ classical field.

The nuclear ground state in the chiral liquid is thus a static chiral nucleon liquid (Static χ NL), with no $\vec{\pi}$ condensate⁴ or time-dependent pion-flashing modes. We now write $|\chi NL\rangle_0$ for the ground state to emphasize that it is static.

We want to quantize the nucleons in the background field of the static χ NL, and so consider the expectation value of the nucleon equation of motion⁵ in the chiral nucleon liquid ground state:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= {}_0 \langle \chi NL | \bar{N} \frac{\partial}{\partial N} L_{\chi PT}^{\text{Symmetric}} | \chi NL \rangle_0 \\ &= {}_0 \langle \chi NL | \bar{N} (i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m^N \mathbf{1}) N | \chi NL \rangle_0 \\ &\quad + i {}_0 \langle \chi NL | \vec{J}^\mu | \chi NL \rangle_0 \cdot \left\{ \vec{V}_\mu \right\}_{IR} - g_{A0} {}_0 \langle \chi NL | \vec{J}^{\mu,5} | \chi NL \rangle_0 \cdot \left\{ \vec{A}_\mu \right\}_{IR} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} {}_0 \langle \chi NL | C_{\mathcal{A}} (\bar{N} \gamma_{\mathcal{A}} N) (\bar{N} \gamma_{\mathcal{A}} N) + + + | \chi NL \rangle_0. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

⁴ After explicit chiral symmetry breaking, with non-zero u, d quark and resultant pion masses, and with Partially Conserved Axial Currents (PCAC), a static S-wave $\vec{\pi}$ condensate is a logical possibility [36].

⁵ We exclude non-analytic nucleon operators with or without explicit $SU(2)_{L-R}$ breaking: e.g. $(N^\dagger N)^2 \ln m_\pi^2 / f_\pi^2$, $(N^\dagger N)^2 \ln N^\dagger N / f_\pi^3$.

Since most of the nucleon $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ currents vanish in the Static χ NL, and since $\{\partial_o \vec{\pi}\}_{IR} = 0$,

$$0 \simeq {}_0\langle \chi NL | \bar{N} \left(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m^N \mathbf{1} \right) N | \chi NL \rangle_0 \quad (25)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} {}_0\langle \chi NL | C_{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{N}\gamma_{\mathcal{A}} N)(\bar{N}\gamma_{\mathcal{A}} N) + + + | \chi NL \rangle_0.$$

Equations (23) and (25) show that, to order $\Lambda_{\chi SB}$ and $(\Lambda_{\chi SB})^0$, Static χ NL are composed entirely of nucleons. That is also the basic premise of many empirical models of the nuclear ground state: pionless $SU(2)\chi PT$, Weizsäcker's semi-empirical mass formula, the nuclear liquid-drop model, nuclear-density-functional models, "Skyrme" nuclear relativistic point-coupling models, pionless EFT ${}^4_2\text{He}_2$, and halo/cluster EFT ${}^6\text{He}_4$. We have shown that that empirical nuclear premise can be (to good approximation) traced directly to the global $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ symmetries of 2-massless-quark QCD, i.e. directly to the Standard Model of elementary particles.

The effective Lagrangian derived from $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \chi PT$ governing Static χ NL can now be written

$$L_{\text{Static}\chi\text{NL}} = L_{\text{Static}\chi\text{NL}}^{\text{FreeNucleons}} + L_{\text{Static}\chi\text{NL}}^{4-N} \quad (26)$$

$$L_{\text{Static}\chi\text{NL}}^{\text{FreeNucleons}} = {}_0\langle \chi NL | \bar{N} \left(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m^N \mathbf{1} \right) N | \chi NL \rangle_0$$

$$L_{\text{Static}\chi\text{NL}}^{4-N} = {}_0\langle \chi NL | \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} C_{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{N}\gamma_{\mathcal{A}} N)(\bar{N}\gamma_{\mathcal{A}} N) + + + | \chi NL \rangle_0,$$

Semi-classical pionless $SU(2)\chi PT$ thus emerges inside nuclear Static χ NL. Within all-loop-orders renormalized analytic $SU(2)\chi PT$ to $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\chi SB})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\chi SB}^0)$, infrared NGB pions effectively decouple from Static χ NL, vastly simplifying the derivation of the properties of saturated nuclear matter (the infinite liquid phase) and of finite microscopic liquid drops (the nuclides). Static χ NL thus explain the (previously puzzling) power of pion-less $SU(2)\chi PT$ to capture experimental ground-state facts of certain nuclides, by tracing that no-longer-mysterious empirical success directly to the global symmetries of two-massless-quark QCD.

It will be shown below that static χ NLs satisfy all relevant $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ vector and axial-vector current-conservation equations in the liquid phase. Static χ NL are therefore solutions of the semi-classical-liquid equations of motion. They are not merely an ansatz, but possess the symmetries of spontaneously broken $SU(2)\chi PT$ (cf. Appendix A.1).

3 Semi-classical pion-less Static χ NL as the approximate ground state of certain nuclei

To further elucidate the properties of the Static χ NL, we must address the four-nucleon interactions. This is best done by resolving $L_{\text{Static}\chi\text{NL}}^{4-N}$ into terms that

are the products of two ground-state current expectation values – usually described as boson-exchange contact interactions – and terms that are the products of two transition matrix elements between the ground state and an excited nuclear state,

$$L_{Static\chi NL}^{4-N} = L_{Static\chi NL}^{4-N;BosonExchange} + L_{Static\chi NL}^{4-N;ExcitedNucleon}. \quad (27)$$

A priori there are 10 possible contact interactions representing isosinglet and isotriplet channels for each of five spatial current types: scalar, vector, tensor, pseudo-scalar and axial-vector. There are therefore 10 chiral coefficients parametrizing 4-nucleon contact terms: $C_S^{T=0}, C_S^{T=1}, C_V^{T=0}, C_V^{T=1}, C_T^{T=0}, C_T^{T=1}, C_A^{T=0}, C_A^{T=1}, C_P^{T=0}$, and $C_P^{T=1}$.

The inclusion of exchange interactions induces the isospin ($T = 1$) operators to appear [36], and potentially greatly complicates the effective chiral Lagrangian. Fortunately, we are interested here in the liquid limit of this Lagrangian. Spinor-interchange contributions are properly obtained by Fierz rearranging first, then imposing the properties of the semi-classical liquid (see Appendix B). The appropriate Static χ NL Lagrangian, and the resulting Dirac equation, are consequently reasonably simple. In fact, for the Static χ NL, the contact interactions can be approximated by⁶

$$\begin{aligned} -L_{Static\chi NL}^{4-N;BosonExchange} &= \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} C_{200}^S \left\{ \langle \bar{N}N \rangle \langle \bar{N}N \rangle \right\} \\ &- \frac{1}{4f_\pi^2} \overline{C_{200}^S} \left\{ \langle \bar{N}N \rangle \langle \bar{N}N \rangle + 4 \langle \bar{N}t_3N \rangle \langle \bar{N}t_3N \rangle \right\} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} C_{200}^V \left\{ \langle N^\dagger N \rangle \langle N^\dagger N \rangle \right\} \\ &- \frac{1}{4f_\pi^2} \overline{C_{200}^V} \left\{ \langle N^\dagger N \rangle \langle N^\dagger N \rangle + 4 \langle N^\dagger t_3N \rangle \langle N^\dagger t_3N \rangle \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

with only 4 independent chiral coefficients:

$$\begin{aligned} C_{200}^S &= C_S^{T=0} \\ -\overline{C_{200}^S} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{2} C_S^{T=0} + \frac{5}{2} C_S^{T=1} + 3 \left(C_T^{T=0} + C_T^{T=1} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(C_P^{T=0} + C_P^{T=1} \right) \right] \\ C_{200}^V &= C_V^{T=0} \\ -\overline{C_{200}^V} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[-C_V^{T=0} + C_A^{T=0} + C_V^{T=1} + C_A^{T=1} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

This is a vast improvement in the predictive power of the theory, while still providing sufficient free parameters to balance vector repulsive forces against scalar attractive forces when fitting (to order $\Lambda_{\chi SB}^0$) non-topological-soliton and Skyrme nuclear models to the experimentally observed structure of ground-state nuclei.

⁶ In this Section, we adopt the shorthand $\langle \rangle$ for $\langle \chi NL |$, and \rangle for $| \chi NL \rangle$.

There is yet another simplification for a sufficiently large number of nucleons: simple Hartree analysis of (28) is equivalent to far more accurate Hartree-Fock analysis of the same Lagrangian without spinor-interchange terms.

More coefficients would be required to parametrize the excited-nucleon interactions:

$$\begin{aligned}
& -L_{Static\chi NL}^{4-N;ExcitedNucleon} \tag{30} \\
&= \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} \sum_{\Psi \neq |\chi NL\rangle} \sum_{\mathcal{A}} \left[C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=0} \langle \chi NL | \overline{N}_c^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} N_c^\beta | \Psi \rangle \langle \Psi | (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lambda\sigma} N_e^\sigma) | \chi NL \rangle \right. \\
&+ \left. \sum_B C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=1} \langle \chi NL | \frac{1}{4} (\overline{N}_c^\alpha \sigma_{cd}^B \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} N_d^\beta) | \Psi \rangle \langle \Psi | (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \sigma_{ef}^B \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lambda\sigma} N_f^\sigma) | \chi NL \rangle \right].
\end{aligned}$$

However, excited-nuclear contributions, which will also include states that are not proton-and-neutron-even, are beyond the scope of this paper, and will be ignored. To the extent that such excited states are energetically well above the ground state, this should be a satisfactory approximation.⁷

We now see that, inside naive power-counting Static χ NL, a nucleon living in the self-consistent field of the other nucleons obeys the Dirac equation

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left\langle \left(i \overrightarrow{\partial}_\mu \gamma^\mu + \Theta \right) N \right\rangle \tag{31} \\
0 &= \left\langle \overline{N} \left(i \overleftarrow{\partial}_\mu \gamma^\mu - \Theta \right) \right\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Theta \equiv -m^N - \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \widehat{C}_{200}^S - \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \widehat{C}_{200}^V \gamma^0 \tag{32}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{C}_{200}^S &\equiv \left(C_{200}^S - \frac{1}{2} \overline{C}_{200}^S \right) \langle \overline{N} N \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \overline{C}_{200}^S \langle \overline{N} t_3 N \rangle t_3 \tag{33} \\
\widehat{C}_{200}^V &\equiv \left(C_{200}^V - \frac{1}{2} \overline{C}_{200}^V \right) \langle N^\dagger N \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \overline{C}_{200}^V \langle N^\dagger t_3 N \rangle t_3 \\
0 &= \left[t_3, \widehat{C}_{200}^S \right] = \left[t_3, \widehat{C}_{200}^V \gamma^0 \right] = [t_3, \Theta].
\end{aligned}$$

Ignoring $L_{Static\chi NL}^{4-N;ExcitedNucleon}$, baryon-number and the third component of isospin are both conserved, i.e. the associated currents $J_{Baryon}^\mu \equiv \overline{N} \gamma^\mu N$ and $J_3^\mu \equiv \overline{N} \gamma^\mu t_3 N$ are both divergence-free. The neutral axial-vector current $J_8^{5,\mu} \equiv \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \overline{N} \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 N$, corresponding to the projection onto SU(2) of the NGB ‘eta’ (η) particle, part of the unbroken $SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$ meson octet, is also divergence

⁷ Various nuclear-Skyrme-modellers are currently investigating the effects of low-lying excited state contributions to (30).

free,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \langle i\partial_\mu J_8^{5,\mu} \rangle &= \langle \bar{N} \{ \Theta, \gamma^5 \} N \rangle \\
&= 2 \left\langle \bar{N} \left(-m^N - \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \overline{C_{200}^S} \right) \gamma^5 N \right\rangle \\
&\simeq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

This result can be understood as a statement that the η particle cannot survive in the parity-even interior of a Static χ NL, since it is a NGB pseudo-scalar in the chiral limit.

Similarly, the axial-vector current of the 3rd component of $SU(2)_{L-R}$ isospin $J_3^{5,\mu} \equiv \bar{N} \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 t_3 N$ is divergence-free,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle i\partial_\mu J_3^{5,\mu} \rangle &= \langle \bar{N} \{ \Theta, \gamma^5 \} t_3 N \rangle \\
&= 2 \left\langle \bar{N} \left(-m^N - \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \overline{C_{200}^S} \right) \gamma^5 t_3 N \right\rangle \\
&\simeq 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

because the $SU(2)\chi PT$ π_3 particle is also a NGB pseudo-scalar in the chiral limit, and cannot survive in the interior of a parity-even Static χ NL.

Even though explicit pion and η fields vanish in Static χ NL, their quantum numbers reappear in its PCAC properties from nucleon bi-linears and four-nucleon terms in the divergences of axial vector currents. That these average to zero in Static χ NL plays a crucial role in the conservation of axial-vector currents within the liquid.

It is now straightforward to see that, in the liquid approximation, a homogeneous $SU(2)\chi PT$ nucleon liquid drop with no meson condensate satisfies all relevant CVC and PCAC equations. In fact, of all the space-time components of the three $SU(2)_{L+R}$ vector currents J_a^μ and three $SU(2)_{L-R}$ axial vector currents $J_a^{5,\mu}$, only J_3^0 does not vanish in Static χ NL.

The neutral $SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$ currents are conserved $\langle \partial_\mu J_8^\mu \rangle = \langle \partial_\mu J_8^{5,\mu} \rangle = 0$ in the Static χ NL mean field. In addition, the neutral $SU(3)_{L+R}$ vector current's spatial components $J_8^{\mu=1,2,3}$ and $SU(3)_{L-R}$ axial-vector currents $J_8^{5,\mu}$ all vanish. Only J_8^0 , proportional to the baryon number density, survives in the Static χ NL mean field.

Since Static χ NL chiral nuclear liquids satisfy all relevant χPT CVC and PCAC equations in the liquid phase, they are true solutions of the all-orders-renormalized tree-level semi-classical liquid equations of motion truncated at $O(\Lambda_{\chi SB}^0)$.

4 Nuclei and neutron stars as mean-field static χ NL

4.1 Thomas-Fermi non-topological solitons, liquid drops and the semi-empirical mass formula

Mean-field Static χ NL non-topological solitons are solutions of $SU(2)\chi PT$ semi-classical symmetries, obeying all CVC and PCAC conservation laws. They have zero internal and external pressure. The nuclear liquid-drop model and Bethe-Weizsäcker SEMF emerge – with correct nuclear density, and saturation and asymmetry energies – in an explicit Thomas-Fermi construction.

Gathering together previous results, a nucleon living in the self-consistent mean field (MF) of the other nucleons inside Static χ NL obeys the Dirac equation

$$0 = (i\partial_\mu\gamma^\mu + \Theta) N \quad (36)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta &\equiv -m^N - \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \left(\widehat{C}_{200}^S + \widehat{C}_{200}^V \gamma^0 \right), \\ \widehat{C}_{200}^S &\equiv \left(C_{200}^S - \frac{1}{2} \overline{C}_{200}^S \right) \langle \bar{N}N \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \overline{C}_{200}^S \langle \bar{N}t_3N \rangle t_3 \\ \widehat{C}_{200}^V &\equiv \left(C_{200}^V - \frac{1}{2} \overline{C}_{200}^V \right) \langle N^\dagger N \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \overline{C}_{200}^V \langle N^\dagger t_3N \rangle t_3. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

From (28), (30), and (31) for MF-Static χ NL, we assemble the effective Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} L_{MF-Static\chi NL} &= \bar{N} (i\partial_\mu\gamma^\mu + \Theta) N + L_{Static\chi NL}^{4-N;BosonExchange} \\ &+ L_{Static\chi NL}^{4-N;ExcitedNucleon} \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

$$\begin{aligned} -L_{Static\chi NL}^{4-N;BosonExchange} &= \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} C_{200}^S \left\{ \langle \bar{N}N \rangle \langle \bar{N}N \rangle \right\} \\ &- \frac{1}{4f_\pi^2} \overline{C}_{200}^S \left\{ \langle \bar{N}N \rangle \langle \bar{N}N \rangle + 4 \langle \bar{N}t_3N \rangle \langle \bar{N}t_3N \rangle \right\} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} C_{200}^V \left\{ \langle N^\dagger N \rangle \langle N^\dagger N \rangle \right\} \\ &- \frac{1}{4f_\pi^2} \overline{C}_{200}^V \left\{ \langle N^\dagger N \rangle \langle N^\dagger N \rangle + 4 \langle N^\dagger t_3N \rangle \langle N^\dagger t_3N \rangle \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Although $L_{Static\chi NL}^{4-N;ExcitedNucleon}$ is included in (30), it is beyond the scope of this paper: we will ignore its contributions to those MF-Static χ NL non-topological solitons constructed from (38) throughout the paper.

In Appendix D, we construct explicit liquid MF-Static χ NL solutions, constrained to order $4\pi f_\pi \approx \Lambda_{\chi SB} \simeq 1\text{GeV}$ and $(\Lambda_{\chi SB})^0$ naive power-counting, in an independent-nucleon model, in the Thomas-Fermi free-particle approximation.⁸ Constant-density non-topological solitons, i.e. liquid drops comprised entirely of nucleons, emerge as homogeneous and isotropic semi-classical static solutions with internal and external pressures both zero. Their surface is a step function. Before electro-magnetic breaking, nuclear matter and finite nuclei then have identical microscopic structure, serving as a model of the ground state of both infinite nuclear matter and finite liquid drops. There is no need for an additional confining interaction to define the finite-drop surface. With even proton number Z , and even neutron number N , nucleons are arranged in pairs so that local expectation values for spin vanish, $\langle \vec{s} \rangle \simeq 0$. The microscopic structure is also spherically symmetric, so that local momenta have a vanishing expectation value, $\langle \vec{k} \rangle \simeq 0$. Consequently, total spin $\vec{S} = 0$ and total momentum $\vec{K} = 0$ in the center-of-mass.

The semi-empirical mass formula [69, 70] reads

$$M(\frac{A}{Z}\text{Nucleus}_N) = Zm_p + Nm_n - E_{\text{Binding}}^{\text{Soliton}} - E_{\text{Binding}}^{\text{Surface,Pairing}} \quad (40)$$

with $A = Z + N$, and

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\text{Binding}}^{\text{Soliton}}/A &\equiv a_{\text{Volume}} - a_{\text{Asymmetry}} \left(\frac{Z - N}{Z + N} \right)^2 - a_{\text{Coulomb}} \frac{Z(Z - 1)}{A^{4/3}} \\ E_{\text{Binding}}^{\text{Surface,Pairing}}/A &\equiv -\frac{a_{\text{Surface}}}{A^{1/3}} + a_{\text{Pairing}} \frac{\delta_0(Z, N)}{A^{3/2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Here

$$\delta_0 \equiv \begin{cases} +1 & \text{for } Z \text{ even, } N \text{ even,} \\ -1 & \text{for } Z \text{ odd, } N \text{ odd,} \\ 0 & \text{for } A=Z+N \text{ odd.} \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

$a_{\text{Volume}} = 15.75$ MeV, $a_{\text{Surface}} = 17.8$ MeV, $a_{\text{Coulomb}} = 0.711$ MeV, $a_{\text{Asymmetry}} = 23.7$ MeV, and $a_{\text{Pairing}} = 11.18$ MeV are experimentally determined.

In showing (in Appendix D) that the SEMF is (almost) an $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \chi PT$ non-topological soliton prediction, we first display symmetric $Z = N$ ground-state zero-pressure Hartree-Fock non-topological-soliton solutions, fit to inferred experimental values for symmetric-nuclear-matter density and volume binding

⁸ G. Gelmini and B. Ritz [68] independently identified an effective Lagrangian, built from $O(\Lambda_{\chi SB})$ free nucleons and $O(\Lambda_{\chi SB}^0)$ point-coupling interaction-operators. Although they imply that it corresponds to Chin-Walecka infinite symmetric $Z = N$ nuclear matter, it does not. They did not search for, nor did they find, infinite or finite $Z = N$ bound-state non-topological-soliton solutions with zero internal and external pressure, which could therefore survive in an external vacuum. Neither did they consider the point-coupling \overline{C}_{200}^V and \overline{C}_{200}^S terms included here, and in [36], which are necessary for $Z \neq N$ nuclides. Their expression for the overall pressure is negative, corresponding to unstable imploding nucleon matter.

energy:

$$\begin{aligned} C_V^2 &\equiv \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \left(C_{200}^V - \frac{1}{2} \overline{C_{200}^V} \right) = 1.893 \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \\ C_S^2 &\equiv -\frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \left(C_{200}^S - \frac{1}{2} \overline{C_{200}^S} \right) = 2.580 \frac{1}{f_\pi^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

i.e., fit to the Fermi momentum ($k_{Fermi} = 1.42/\text{fm}$) and saturated volume energy ($E_{binding}/nucleon = 15.75\text{MeV}$).

Copying treatment of asymmetric nuclides by Niksic [71], we observe that for heavy nuclei $\left(\frac{Z-N}{Z+N}\right)^2 \ll 1$, and work to leading order in that small quantity. In Appendix D.2, we derive asymmetric $Z \neq N$ nuclear matter, for which fermion-exchange terms are crucial, fitting to $a_{Asymmetry} = 23.7 \text{ MeV}$. For $k_F = 1.42/\text{fm}$ we find:

$$\overline{C_{200}^V} = 0.61. \quad (44)$$

Additional results for $\overline{C_{200}^V}$ are given in Appendix D.3. Combining (43) and (44) gives:

$$C_{200}^V = 2.198. \quad (45)$$

In practice, there is very little sensitivity to our 4th independent chiral coefficient $\overline{C_{200}^S}$: this in agreement with Niksic [71] et al., who argue that, although the total iso-vector strength has a relatively well-defined value, the distribution between the iso-vector Lorentz-scalar $\vec{\delta}$ exchange channel, and the iso-vector Lorentz-vector $\vec{\rho}_\mu$ exchange channel, is not determined by ground-state data. Since we have already taken $\left(\frac{Z-N}{Z+N}\right)^2 \ll 1$, and since

$$N^\dagger N - \bar{N} N \simeq \frac{3}{10} \frac{k_F^2}{m_{*8}^2} N^\dagger N = (0.0762) N^\dagger N \ll N^\dagger N \quad (46)$$

with $k_F = 279.7\text{MeV}$ and $m_{*8} = 555\text{MeV}$, only the combination $(\overline{C_{200}^V} + \overline{C_{200}^S})$ can strictly be fit to our $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\chi SB}^0)$ Static χNL accuracy. Therefore, without loss of generality, we choose

$$\overline{C_{200}^S} = 0. \quad (47)$$

All coefficients in (43), (44), (45), and (47) then obey naive $\sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ dimensional power counting, and so are legitimate natural chiral coefficients. Note the fine-tuning between $C_{200}^V = 2.198$ and $C_{200}^S = -2.580$ in (43) and (45) inherited from R. Serber's and J.D. Walecka's 1974 quadratic models [40], [43] and [41]. That fine-tuning is alleviated in (43) by the our inclusion of $\vec{\rho}_\mu$ exchange, necessary to Static χNL s. Equations (43), (44), (45) and (47) all satisfy naive dimensional power-counting $\mathcal{O}(1)$ naturalness, and so are legitimate chiral coefficients.

After inclusion of electromagnetic chiral symmetry breaking, our microscopic Static χ NL solitons' saturated nucleon density, as well as their volume, asymmetry and electromagnetic terms, fit $E_{Binding}^{Soliton}$ in the Bethe-Weizsäcker SEMF.

The SEMF is closely associated with Gamow's nuclear liquid-drop model (NLDM). Recall that, following Walecka's infinite symmetric nuclear matter (and neutron matter), we have imposed on the Thomas-Fermi mean field the condition that the pressure vanish both internally and externally, not just at the surface of a finite "drop." Our non-topological soliton nuclei therefore resemble ice cream balls scooped from an infinite vat [72], more than they do conventional liquid drops.

We clearly have no right to use the Thomas-Fermi approximation to calculate $E_{Binding}^{Surface,Pairing}$ at order $\Lambda_{\chi SB}$ and $(\Lambda_{\chi SB})^0$ in spontaneously broken $SU(2)_{L-R}$. Unsurprisingly, the surface energy calculated entirely as a change in density gives incorrect $a_{Surface}$. However, there exist $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\chi SB}^{-2})$ nuclear-surface $SU(2)\chi PT$ terms that might replace the scalar σ particle in the Chin-Walecka model in describing the nuclear surface [40, 61, 62], namely

$$\mathcal{L}_{Static\chi NL}^{Surface} = -\frac{1}{2}C_{220} \left[\frac{\partial_\nu}{\Lambda_{\chi SB}} (\bar{N}N) \frac{\partial^\nu}{\Lambda_{\chi SB}} (\bar{N}N) \right]. \quad (48)$$

with an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant C_{220} , obeying naturalness and absorbing all-orders quantum loops. $\mathcal{L}_{Static\chi NL}^{Surface}$ is invariant under non-linear $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ transformations including pions, but is automatically pion-less, even without the liquid approximation. It contains no dangerous $\partial_0 \sim m_N$ nucleon mass terms, so non-relativistic re-ordering is unnecessary. Nucleon-exchange and spinor-interchange interactions must also be included.

Meanwhile, calculation of $a_{Pairing}$ involves understanding low-level excited states, such as Z-odd N-odd states appearing in

$$\begin{aligned} -L_{Static\chi NL; t_\pm t_\mp}^{4-N:ExcitedNucleon} &= \sum_{\Psi \neq Static\chi NL} \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} \\ &\times \left[C_S^{T=1} \langle \chi NL | (\bar{N}_c^\alpha(t_\pm)_{cd} N_d^\alpha) | \Psi \rangle \langle \Psi | (\bar{N}_e^\lambda(t_\mp)_{ef} N_f^\lambda) | \chi NL \rangle \right. \\ &\left. + C_V^{T=1} \langle \chi NL | (\bar{N}_c^\alpha(t_\pm)_{cd} \gamma^{\mu:\alpha\beta} N_d^\beta) | \Psi \rangle \langle \Psi | (\bar{N}_e^\lambda(t_\mp)_{ef} \gamma_\mu^{\lambda\sigma} N_f^\sigma) | \chi NL \rangle \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

These are beyond the scope of this paper, and may require explicit pions lying outside semi-classical pion-less $SU(2)\chi PT$.

This empirical success of Static χ NL, viewed as liquid drop SEMF non-topological solitons, coupled with the fact that chiral perturbation theory is a direct consequence of the Standard Model of particle physics (i.e. the global symmetries of QCD) – as correct nuclear physics, atomic physics, etc. must ultimately be – motivates us to consider, in a companion paper, the connection of certain mainstream nuclear-model frameworks to the MF-Static χ NL solutions we have identified here.

4.2 Neutron Stars

Putting aside exotica (i.e. quark condensates, pion condensates, strange-kaon condensates, etc.), we conjecture that much of the structure of neutron stars may be traced directly to 2-massless-quark QCD, and thus directly to the Standard Model. This will be explored further in a companion paper. Here we note only that the models of Harrison & Wheeler [73], Salpeter [74] and Baym, Pethic and Sutherland [75], are all based on the Bethe-von Weizsäcker semi-empirical mass formula [76]. They would therefore seem to follow from Static χNL ; however, we do not yet know how well the observed chart of nuclides and these neutron-star models match the "ice-cream scoop" Static χNL no-surface SEMF, augmented by Coulomb repulsion – i.e. (40) with $E_{Binding}^{Surface,Pairing}$ set to 0.

4.3 Shell structure from explicit $SU(2)_{L-R}$ -breaking?

We conjecture here that non-topological Static χNL solitons could, with inclusion of explicit $SU(2)_{L-R}$ breaking, be re-quantized to incorporate no-core nuclear shell structure and magic numbers, as imagined in [36]. Lynn first introduced the idea [36] that $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \chi PT$ could admit a liquid phase. Like ours, his Lagrangian included only terms of $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\chi SB})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\chi SB}^0)$ and ignored electro-magnetic breaking. Though he did not anticipate Static χNL s, he was careful to include only and all those terms that respect the $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ semi-classical symmetries - i.e. of quantum nucleons and classical pions - discussed in this paper. These included strong-interaction terms that survive the chiral limit, as well as explicit $SU(2)_{L-R}$ -breaking terms that do not.

The purpose of [36] was to generate a "no-core" classical static spherical central potential for $|\vec{\pi}|$, in which all of the quantum nucleons moved, and thus plausibly shell structure for certain heavy even-even ground-state spin-zero spherical nuclei. It now seems advantageous to focus on doubly-magic or spherically-magic nuclides.

Such shell structure is plausible in semi-classical $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \chi PT$ because the explicit symmetry-breaking terms have naive operator power counting $m = 0, l = 1, n = 1$ in (A.14). Ignoring $\pi^\pm - \pi^0$ mass splitting, these are

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\chi PT}^{N;\chi SB} &\simeq (m_{up} + m_{down}) (a_1 + 2a_3) \left[1 - \cos \frac{|\vec{\pi}|}{f_\pi} \right] \bar{N}N \\ &= \beta \sigma_{\pi N} \left[1 - \cos \frac{|\vec{\pi}|}{f_\pi} \right] \bar{N}N \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

with experimental parameters

$$\begin{aligned} (a_1, a_2, a_3) &= (0.28, -0.56, 1.3 \pm 0.2) \\ (m_{up}, m_{down}; \sigma_{\pi N}) &= (6 \text{ MeV}, 12, \text{ MeV}; 60 \text{ MeV}) \\ \beta &= 0.864 \pm 0.120 \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

measured in $SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R \chi PT$ processes [17] and [77].

Since $L_{\chi PT}^{N;\chi SB} > 0$, the explicit symmetry-breaking terms lower the effective nucleon mass inside a static $\pi = |\vec{\pi}|$ condensate. In [36] it was shown that an unphysically large "pion-nucleon sigma term" $\beta\sigma_{\pi N} \geq 400$ MeV, requiring $\beta \geq 6.66$, causes an S-wave $|\vec{\pi}|$ pion-condensate to form.

Note that $L_{\chi PT}^{N;\chi SB}$ is further suppressed in the 2-light-quark sector because

$$(m_{up} + m_{down}) \sim \frac{m_{\pi}^2}{\Lambda_{\chi SB}} \sim 0.02\text{GeV}. \quad (52)$$

This is why unphysically large β was necessary to form the unphysical π -condensate in [36]. However, one should check whether the physical experimental values $\beta \simeq 1$ and $\sigma_{\pi N} \simeq 60\text{MeV}$, result in a $|\vec{\pi}|$ S-wave condensate. Maybe (52) and Static χNL s partially explain why it is empirically so successful to take certain nuclear structure to be independent of the pion mass.

Simplifying with $m_{\pi^{\pm}} - m_{\pi^0} = 0$ avoids "parity doubling" [36], though with observed electro-magnetic breaking ($m_{\pi^{\pm}} - m_{\pi^0} \neq 0$) that is not obviously impossible in very heavy nuclides, nuclear matter, neutron matter and neutron stars.

We conjecture that semi-classical $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \chi PT$ (i.e. including all $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\chi SB})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\chi SB}^0)$ non-strange analytic naive operator power-counting terms, both those from the chiral-limit and those from explicit $m_{up}, m_{down} \neq 0$ chiral symmetry breaking) applied to certain *finite* nuclei, nuclear and neutron matter and neutron stars will give a reasonable match to their structure.

5 Pionless EFT and halo/cluster EFT: light nuclei are also composed entirely of nucleons

Our Static χNL free-nucleon approximation did not have to be a good one. One might have imagined further hierarchies in the structure of a nucleus – that deuterons are made of nucleons, alpha particles are made of deuterons, light nuclei are made of alpha particles, and so on up the chart of the nuclides.

Pionless EFT does describe light nuclei such as deuterons, tritons, helions and alpha particles. However, pionless EFT is only claimed by its proponents to be clearly applicable at momenta up to $\Lambda_{\pi}^A < m_{\pi}$ [78]. This is far less than the Fermi-momentum of nuclear matter ($k_F \simeq 280$ MeV), which we claim is relevant for describing the leading-order properties of heavy (even-even spin-zero) spherical nuclei. We certainly expect corrections to the Static χNL picture due to low-momentum ($k \lesssim \Lambda_{\pi}^A$) physics, and expect pionless EFT to be an appropriate language for characterizing those corrections. However, in heavy nuclei we expect those corrections to be suppressed by the fraction of relative density

$$\frac{\langle N^{\dagger} N \rangle_{k \leq \Lambda_{\pi}^A}}{\langle N^{\dagger} N \rangle_{k \leq k_F}} = \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\Lambda_{\pi}^A/k_F\right)^3\right) < \mathcal{O}\left(\left(m_{\pi}/k_F\right)^3\right) \simeq 1/8 \quad (53)$$

of nucleons with low momentum.

The possibility of hierarchical clustering in nuclear matter has been examined previously, particularly the question of deuteron formation in nuclear matter. Sedrakian and Clark [79] found that deuterons form only at low densities ($N^\dagger N \ll 0.16\text{fm}^{-3}$). At these densities and low temperatures ($T \lesssim 2\text{ MeV}$), they find that a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) of deuterons will form. However, at the densities appropriate for heavy nuclei ($N^\dagger N \gtrsim 1\text{fm}^{-3} \gg 0.16\text{fm}^{-3}$), and low temperature, they found a weakly coupled BCS superfluid of nucleon Cooper pairs, with likely only a very low fraction of deuteron BEC.

More recently, Sedrakian and Clark [80] returned to these questions in fuller complexity. They considered the limited experimental evidence that large enough nuclei (specifically $N = Z$, spin-zero ${}^{92}_{46}\text{Pd}_{46}$) may contain some strongly interacting pairs [81] in the isoscalar, spin-aligned channel – though not the tightly bound dimers that are free deuterons.

The failure of at least this first step in what could have been a chain of hierarchical structure formation in nuclei, might be understood, at least heuristically, in analogy to the early universe – deuterons are fragile, bound only by 2.2 MeV, whereas the Fermi momentum of neutrons and protons in bulk nuclear matter proves to be close to 280 MeV. The fragility of early universe deuterons in the presence of abundant energetic photons that can photo-dissociate it, slows down nucleosynthesis, keeping the deuteron abundance low in the so-called deuterium bottleneck. In bulk nuclear matter, the high Fermi-momentum of the nucleons ensures that deuterons that form are rapidly disrupted by collisions with abundant energetic nucleons. Meanwhile fragile deuterons can form only in rare soft collisions between nucleons. The result – a nuclear deuterium bottleneck that, in detailed balance between deuteron production and destruction, keeps the fraction of nucleons bound into deuterons very low.

The suppression of α -particle abundance in detailed balance is directly due to the absence of deuterons that can easily make α s, combined with the plenitude of nucleons that can disrupt α s. Presumably this is one reason why large nuclei with evident shell structure are made primarily of nucleons not of α s.

In fitting the parameters $C_{\mathcal{A}}$ in Eq. (2), we must fit to inferred infinite-nuclear-matter data. It is currently impossible to relate them to the superficially similar parameters of Pionless EFT. The crisp question is whether experimental measurements can calibrate Static χNL to Pionless EFT contact interactions. We present detailed arguments why this is not possible in Appendix E; here, we present a series of obstacles to doing so:⁹

1. For $A \leq 4$, Pionless EFT has no exchange terms analogous with $\overline{C_{200}^S}, \overline{C_{200}^V}$.
2. Any imagined correspondence between Pionless EFT momentum-independent

⁹ We use the usual 4-nucleon contact-interaction Lorentz structure S, V, T, A, P naming convention in subscripts.

couplings in (E.1) and those of Static χNL in (28) would start by trying

$$\begin{aligned} C_0^{1S_0} + m_\pi^2 D_2^{1S_0} &= C_{0,S} - 3C_{0,T} + m_\pi^2 (D_{2,S} - 3D_{2,T}) \stackrel{?}{\leftrightarrow} C_{200}^S + C_{200}^V \\ C_0^{3S_1} + m_\pi^2 D_2^{3S_1} &= C_{0,S} + C_{0,T} + m_\pi^2 (D_{2,S} + D_{2,T}) \stackrel{?}{\leftrightarrow} C_{200}^S + C_{200}^V \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

However, we see that Pionless EFT momentum-independent couplings capture the spin structure of the deuteron and therefore contain tensor interactions $C_{0,T}, D_{2,T}$ which are absent in spin-independent Static χNL .

3. Since Static χNL have no spin-dependent contact tensor interactions, we might instead try

$$\frac{1}{4}(C_0^{1S_0} + 3C_0^{3S_1}) + \frac{1}{4}m_\pi^2(D_2^{1S_0} + 3D_2^{3S_1}) = C_{0,S} + m_\pi^2 D_{2,S} \stackrel{?}{\leftrightarrow} C_{200}^S + C_{200}^V \quad (55)$$

But spontaneously broken Static χNL cannot contain operators proportional to any combination of $m_\pi^2 D_2^{1S_0}$ and $m_\pi^2 D_2^{3S_1}$, which must instead arise from explicit $SU(2)_{L-R}$ breaking.

4. Pionless EFT momentum-independent couplings $\widetilde{C}_0^{(s)}, \widetilde{D}_2^{(s)}$ are *non-perturbatively* renormalized at the bound-state poles $k_{1S_0 Pole}, k_{3S_1 Pole}$ corresponding to the anomalously large scattering lengths a^{1S_0}, a^{3S_1} , while the couplings in Static χNL are instead *perturbatively* renormalized (to all analytic loops) at $\Lambda_{\chi SB}$ within naive dimensional power counting.
5. In consequence, while Pionless EFT is not a valid self-consistent theory for $Q \gg \Lambda_{\#}^A$, Static χNL (after truncation) is valid and self-consistent up to about $6 \times$ nuclear density, for momenta $0 \leq k \lesssim 6^{1/3} k_F$ with $6^{1/3} k_F \simeq 500 \text{MeV} \gg \Lambda_{\#}^A$, i.e. momentum-independent couplings in Pionless EFT and Static χNL are renormalized at different momenta in completely different ways.
6. The softening of the static singular $\delta^3(\vec{r})$ potential in Pionless EFT requires that its couplings be cut-off-dependent at scale $\simeq \Lambda_{\#}^A < m_\pi$ [78]. Momentum-independent $\widetilde{C}_0^{1S_0}(a^{1S_0}, \Lambda_{\#}^A)$ and $\widetilde{C}_0^{3S_1}(a^{3S_1}, \Lambda_{\#}^A)$ are then regularization-scheme-dependent¹⁰. There is no singular potential and no regularization-scheme-dependence in Static χNL .
7. Even if we imagined a possible one-to-one correspondence, say

$$\frac{1}{4} \left[\widetilde{C}_0^{1S_0}(a^{1S_0}, \Lambda_{\#}^A) + 3\widetilde{C}_0^{3S_1}(a^{3S_1}, \Lambda_{\#}^A) \right] \stackrel{?}{\leftrightarrow} C_{200}^S(\Lambda_{\chi SB}) + C_{200}^V(\Lambda_{\chi SB}), \quad (56)$$

we would need to run $\widetilde{C}_0^{(s)}$ from $\Lambda_{\#}^A < m_\pi$ all the way up to near $\Lambda_{\chi SB}$. In analogy with high-precision running of $\alpha_{QED}(q^2 = 0)$ up to $\alpha_{QED}(q^2 = M_Z^2)$

¹⁰ As well as momentum-dependent $\widetilde{C}_2^{1S_0}(a^{1S_0}, \Lambda_{\#}^A)$ and $\widetilde{C}_2^{3S_1}(a^{3S_1}, \Lambda_{\#}^A)$ in Appendix E.

at LEP1/SLC discussed in Appendix E.1, a complicated strong-interaction dispersion relation capturing all appropriate hadronic physics between m_π and $\Lambda_{\chi SB}$ is necessary. It must incorporate, among other things ≤ 4 real pions, and the real and virtual effects of γ s, $\vec{\pi}$ s, σ , ω_μ , $\vec{\rho}_\mu$, $\vec{\delta}$, *etc.*. We are unaware of the construction of such running in the literature, so currently, in practice, no correspondence like (56) can be calibrated.

It follows that the momentum-independent couplings in Pionless EFT are unrelated to those in Static χNL ; they cannot be experimentally calibrated to one another.

Similar arguments are presented in Appendix E.2, showing that the momentum-dependent renormalized couplings $\widetilde{C}_2^{(s)}$ and $\widetilde{E}_4^{(s)}$, in Pionless EFT, are unrelated to, and cannot be calibrated to, those in Static χNL .

Unfortunately, we do not expect to *ever* be able to calibrate these different EFT's coefficients to one another. In order to compare them with our Static χNL s, the Pionless EFT couplings $\widetilde{C}_0^{(s)}$ and $\widetilde{C}_2^{(s)}$ (with $s = {}^3S_1, {}^1S_0$) must be properly run from $1/a^{(s)}$ (where they are defined) up to near $\Lambda_{\chi SB}$ (where we have truncated $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \chi PT$). Such running is *in principle* impossible because, among other reasons, it requires powerful unitarity cancellations at the σ , ω_μ , $\vec{\rho}_\mu$, and $\vec{\delta}$ peaks, where cross sections are known to contain ratios of partial widths. For example, at the $\vec{\rho}$ peak with initial state i and final state j

$$\sigma_{i \rightarrow \vec{\rho} \rightarrow j} \sim \frac{\Gamma_{\vec{\rho} \rightarrow i}}{\sum_k \Gamma_{\vec{\rho} \rightarrow k}} \frac{\Gamma_{\vec{\rho} \rightarrow j}}{\sum_k \Gamma_{\vec{\rho} \rightarrow k}} \quad (57)$$

with $\Gamma_{\vec{\rho} \rightarrow k}$ the $\vec{\rho}$ resonance partial width to the k th decay channel. Appendix E.1 recalls such cancellations for true renormalizable and unitary theories, such as QED and the Standard Model.

In profound contrast, EFT's *pseudo-renormalizability* fails at the $\vec{\rho}$ peak (i.e. (57) is violated) for at least two reasons. First, unitarity is by definition not a feature of, and is excluded by, low-energy EFTs – Static χNL s and Pionless EFT both specifically exclude appropriate higher-energy unitarity terms. Second, EFT coefficients $\widetilde{C}_0^{(s)}$ and $\widetilde{C}_2^{(s)}$ are not related to one another by renormalizability constraints.

It is similarly impossible to relate the parameters of Static χNL to scattering lengths of free particles involving pions in vacuum. The Lagrangian (9) contains the spontaneously broken vacuum physics of $\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi +$ pions and $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N +$ pions. However, we have shown that, to the extent it is described by spontaneously broken Static χNL , nuclear structure is pionless. It therefore cannot be calibrated to these processes. Meanwhile, nucleon-nucleon Nijmegen scattering, as described by Pionless EFT, should be contained in corrections to our work below $\Lambda_{\vec{\pi}}^A$.

U. van Kolck and the Pionless EFT community like to reveal relationships among their results by plotting them on the complex $Re(k) - Im(k)$ momentum plane inside the circle $|k| \leq \Lambda_{\vec{\pi}}^A < m_\pi$. To that disc we add an orthogonal $A = Z + N$ axis – forming a 3-D cylindrical $Re(k) - Im(k) - A$ volume – and highlight some

Pionless EFT results. In the $A = 2$ plane, $N - N$ elastic scattering is properly compared to Nijmegen data and lies along positive $Re(k)$. The -2.2MeV bound deuteron is at $k_{Pole}^{3S_1}$ on the positive $Im(k)$ axis, while the shallow resonance is at $k_{Pole}^{1S_0}$ on the negative $Im(k)$ axis. The $A = 4$ plane places the deeply bound (-28.296MeV) α particle ($\sim \frac{4}{2}\text{He}_2$) at positive $Im(k)$.

Halo/cluster EFT at $A \geq 5$ has no pions, and is mathematically similar to Pionless EFT, becoming Pionless EFT for light nuclei when the cores are nucleons. We plot only the classic example $\frac{6}{2}\text{He}_4$, where the energy required to remove the cluster (α particle), or either of the 2 halo nucleons, is much less than to break up the cluster. It lies on the $A = 6$ plane at positive $Im(k)$.

In order to plot our Thomas-Fermi Static χ NL results from Appendix D and show their position relative to Pionless EFT, we add an annulus to that Pionless EFT cylinder, extending the radius of its $Re(k) - Im(k)$ base to the region $\Lambda_{\#}^A < |k| \leq \Lambda_{Static\chi NL}^A = \Lambda_{\chi SB} \sim 1\text{GeV}$. Our bound-state Static χ NL "ice-cream-scoop" nuclei are then horizontal lines along $Im(k)$, in the positive $Im(k) - A$ quarter-plane, with $0 \leq |k| \leq k_F \approx 280\text{MeV}$: they intersect the A axis at $A_{\text{EvenEven}} = Z_{\text{Even}} + N_{\text{Even}} \geq 4$. For visual simplicity, we plot symmetric $Z = N$ Static χ NL nuclei only for ${}_{14}^{28}\text{Si}_{14}$ and ${}_{20}^{40}\text{Ca}_{20}$, at $A = 28, 40$. We show asymmetric $\frac{(Z-N)^2}{(Z+N)^2} \ll 1$ Static χ NL only for ${}_{20}^{48}\text{Ca}_{28}$, ${}_{28}^{60}\text{Ni}_{32}$, ${}_{40}^{90}\text{Zr}_{50}$ and ${}_{82}^{208}\text{Pb}_{126}$ at $A = 48, 60, 90, 208$. For further pedagogical simplicity, we have averaged $\frac{1}{2}(k_F^p + k_F^n) \approx k_F \approx 280\text{MeV}$.

Going forward, an important challenge is to find an $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \chi PT$ integration of the physics of Static χ NL and that of Pionless EFT and halo/cluster EFT.

Vis-a-vis Figure 1, $\frac{4}{2}\text{He}_2$ [78] and $\frac{6}{2}\text{He}_4$ would also be Static χ NLs, but they are augmented and complicated by an explicit $\vec{\pi}$ mass, $m_{\vec{\pi}}^2 \neq 0$, which may (or may not) be traced entirely to *allowed* [17] **explicit** $SU(2)_{L-R}$ symmetry breaking. We conjecture that a still-reasonable picture of these light even-even nuclei will emerge when setting $m_{\vec{\pi}}^2 = 0$ and forbidding explicit symmetry breaking: i.e. completely ignoring pions! If so, $\frac{4}{2}\text{He}_2$ and $\frac{6}{2}\text{He}_4$ could be treated as Static χ NLs and would be obedient to spontaneously broken $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ semi-classical symmetries. That enhanced symmetry may give new insight into the physics of α particles moving in the nuclear-matter medium.

In the Summary of the 1985 Paris Conference on Nuclear Physics with Electro-magnetic Probes [82], Torleif Ericson showed just how many facets there are to the nuclear "truth" – different physical domains require different descriptions, each of which is the truth for that domain. If Static χ NL as derived from the symmetries of QCD describes heavy (spin-zero even-even) spherical nuclei, its truth may be difficult to directly relate to accurate descriptions of other physical domains.




Figure 1: Illustration (not to scale) of the domains of applicability of various analytic treatments of nuclear systems plotted in the 3-dimensional space defined by complex momentum (Rek , Imk) and atomic/baryon number A . At the base sits the $A = 2$ complex k plane. Pionless effective field theory is valid inside the cylinder whose base is the disk with radius $\Lambda_{\chi}^A < m_{\pi}$, although that has so far only been applied to the $A = 2, 4, 6$ – nucleon-nucleon scattering through the Nijmegen potential along the Rek axis with $A = 2$, the deuteron singlet and triplet states on the Imk axis with $A = 2$; and helium-4 and helium-6, also along the Rek axis, but with $A = 4, 6$. The even-even spin-zero nuclei to which the chiral nuclear liquid treatment of this paper are applicable are shown here: ${}_{14}^{28}\text{Si}_{14}$, ${}_{20}^{40}\text{Ca}_{20}$, ${}_{20}^{48}\text{Ca}_{28}$, ${}_{28}^{60}\text{Ni}_{32}$, ${}_{40}^{90}\text{Zr}_{50}$, and ${}_{82}^{208}\text{Pb}_{126}$. Their treatment incorporates k 's along the Imk axis from 0 to $k_{\text{Fermi}} \ll \Lambda_{\chi\text{SB}}$. See text for further details.

6 Conclusions

The Standard Model of particle physics, augmented by neutrino mixing and General Relativity (i.e. Frank Wilczek's ‘‘Core Theory’’ [83]) is the most power-

ful, accurate, predictive, and experimentally successful scientific theory known to humans. No experimental counter-example has ever been observed in the known universe.¹¹ Its local $SU(3)_{Color}$ Quantum Chromo-Dynamic subset is, according to all experimental evidence, the complete and correct theory of the strong interactions of known fundamental particles at all energies accessible to current technology.¹² It must therefore underlie the complete and correct theory of the structure and interactions of atomic nuclei.

In this paper, we have explored some of the implications of this inescapable connection for nuclear structure as directly derivable from Standard Model, especially from the global symmetries of QCD. In this, we have been guided by two key observations: that nuclei are made of protons and neutrons, not quarks; and that the up and down quarks, which are the fermionic constituents of the protons and neutrons, are much lighter than the principal mass scales of QCD, such as the proton and neutron masses. Taken together, these strongly suggest that the full complexity of the Standard Model can largely be captured, for the purposes of nuclear physics, by an effective field theory (EFT) – $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ chiral perturbation theory ($SU(2)\chi PT$) of protons and neutrons.

In writing down an EFT Lagrangian, one incorporates all analytic higher-order quantum-loop corrections into tree-level amplitudes. $SU(2)\chi PT$ enables the operators of that EFT Lagrangian (and the states) to be expressed as a perturbation expansion, for naive power counting, in inverse powers of the chiral-symmetry-breaking scale $\Lambda_{\chi SB} \sim 1 GeV$.

Building on this longstanding insight, we have studied the chiral limit of spontaneously broken $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ (i.e. $SU(2)\chi PT$), including only operators of order $\Lambda_{\chi SB}$ and $\Lambda_{\chi SB}^0$. We find that $SU(2)\chi PT$ of protons,¹³ neutrons and 3 pNGB pions - admits a semi-classical liquid phase, a Static Chiral Nucleon Liquid (Static χ NL).

Static χ NLs are made entirely of nucleons, with approximately zero anti-proton and anti-neutron content. They are parity even and time-independent. As we have studied them so far, not just the total nuclear spin $\vec{S} = 0$, but also the local expectation value for spin $\langle \vec{s} \rangle \simeq 0$. Similarly, the nucleon momenta vanish locally in the spherically symmetric Static χ NL rest frame. For these reasons, our study of Static χ NL is applicable to bulk ground-state spin-zero nuclear matter, and to the ground state of appropriate spin-zero parity-even nuclei with an even number Z of protons and an even number N of neutrons.

We classify these solutions of $SU(2)\chi PT$ as “liquid” because energy is required both to pull the constituent nucleons further apart and to push them closer together. This is analogous with the balancing of the attractive Lorentz-scalar σ -exchange force and the repulsive Lorentz-vector ω_μ -exchange force in

¹¹ The need for dark matter will not be a counter-example until a non-SM dark matter candidate is discovered. Cosmic acceleration is a core-theory phenomenon, since the cosmological constant is within GR. The inflaton may yet be the Higgs field non-minimally coupled to gravity.

¹² Neutrinos may have undiscovered interactions connected to their mass and to their flavor oscillations. These are unlikely to affect the conclusions of this paper.

¹³ Note that in the chiral limit, electromagnetic interactions are ignored.

the Walecka model. The nucleon number density therefore takes a saturated value even in zero external pressure (e.g. in the absence of gravity), so this is not a “gas.” Meanwhile they are statistically homogeneous and isotropic, lacking the reduced symmetries of crystals or other solids.

We have shown that in this ground-state liquid phase, the expectation values of many of the allowed operators of the most general $SU(2)\chi PT$ Lagrangian vanish or are small. We have further conjectured that, for studying (static) ground-state systems, many more operators are small because they involve transitions to excited intermediate states. Going forward, it is imperative to understand the contribution of $L_{Static\chi NL}^{4-N:ExcitedNucleon}$ (30) to empirical models of heavy nuclear ground states.

We have also shown that this spontaneously broken ground-state liquid phase does not support a classical pion field – infrared pions decouple from this solution. We expect that this emergence of “semi-classical pion-less $SU(2)\chi PT$ ” is at the heart of the apparent theoretical independence of much successful nuclear structure physics from pion properties such as the pion mass.

We have, with David M. Jacobs, constructed explicit Static χNL ’s in the Thomas-Fermi approximation, demonstrating the existence of zero-pressure non-topological soliton Static χNL solutions with macroscopic (infinite nuclear matter) and microscopic (heavy nuclear ground states). J. Boguta [84] long ago insightfully pictured ground-state finite nuclei as “spherical ice-cream scoops” taken from a “huge homogenous vat of ice-cream” (nuclear matter).

We speculate that the extension of the line of thinking contained in this paper to $SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R \chi PT$,¹⁴ will be instructive on the experimentally current question of strange nuclei, and on the astrophysically relevant question of strange nuclear matter and even dark matter.

Although Pionless EFT and Static χNL are compatible and complementary, we regard Pionless EFT as providing important corrections only for momenta below $\Lambda_{\#}^A < m_{\pi}$. Momenta less than $\sim 6^{1/3} k_F^{NuclearMatter} \simeq 500 MeV \gg k_F^{NuclearMatter} \simeq 280 MeV$ belong to Static χNL s. We estimate that Pionless EFT corrections to Static χNL are $< 12.5\%$.

The Standard Model (augmented by neutrino mixing) is, as a result of five decades of experimental and theoretical effort, a remarkably complete and correct description of all non-gravitational interactions of known fundamental particles, without experimentally identified exception. Nature has been kind, by building atoms out of electrons and nuclei, and nuclei out of protons and neutrons, and by making the up and down quark so much lighter than those, to

¹⁴ Strange Chiral Nuclear Liquids [77], a form of Strange Baryon Matter [85], consist of a Static χNL immersed in a kaon condensate driven by large $m_{strange} \simeq 0.24 GeV$, $\beta \simeq 9$. These strange chiral liquids are identified [77], [86] as a possible $SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R \chi PT$ macroscopic dark matter candidate [87] (a.k.a. “Macro”) non-topological soliton [88] which is fully consistent with the dynamics of ordinary nuclides in this paper. The possible formation of Standard Model macros was discussed originally in [23], and more specifically for strange baryon matter in [85,89] Although there are constraints on their mass and size, such SM dark matter candidates remain broadly consistent with current limits [85,90–145]

afford us a possible pathway to relate the emergent physics of: atoms ¹⁵; the deuteron [34, 35]; the heavy nuclides in this paper; and the structure of the proton [146] in lattice gauge theory, directly to the fundamental interactions of the Standard Model. It is incumbent on us to avail ourselves of that kindness by striving to obediently connect our phenomenological/empirical models to Nature’s magnificent fundamental theory.

Acknowledgments

This paper is dedicated to BWL’s teacher, Gerald Feinberg (1933-1992) who predicted the muon neutrino; and teased emergent physics - positronium, muonium (i.e. renormalizable bound states), the periodic table (i.e. atomic physics), and the polarizability of di-hydrogen (i.e. chemistry) - directly from the Standard Model.

We thank David M. Jacobs¹⁶, who chose not to co-author this paper, for his co-construction of $Z = N$ Thomas-Fermi non-topological solitons with zero internal and external pressure in section 4.1, and his co-extension of them to temperature $T > 0$.

BWL thanks Torleif Ericson and Magda Ericson for valuable discussions. BJC, BWL and GDS thank Bira van Kolck for crucial discussions. BJC and BWL thank Chien-Shiung Wu for teaching them nuclear physics, Robert Serber for many enlightening discussions on basic nuclear physics [147] and his work on nuclear structure [41]. BJC and BWL thank IPNO, Universite de Paris Sud, for their hospitality in summer 2019; while BJC thanks CWRU for its hospitality in fall 2019. GDS is partially supported by a grant from the US DOE to the particle-astrophysics theory group at CWRU.

References

- [1] T. E. O. Ericson and W. Weise, *Pions and Nuclei* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, UK, 1988).
- [2] S. Weinberg, Phys. Lett. B **251**, 288 (1990).
- [3] C. Ordóñez and U. van Kolck, Phys. Lett. B **291**, 459 (1992).
- [4] U. Van Kolck, L. J. Abu-Raddad, and D. M. Cardamone, AIP Conf. Proc. **631**, 191 (2002), nucl-th/0205058.
- [5] J. L. Friar, D. G. Madland, and B. W. Lynn, Phys. Rev. **C53**, 3085 (1996), nucl-th/9512011.
- [6] T. Bürvenich, D. G. Madland, J. A. Maruhn, and P.-G. Reinhard, Phys. Rev. C **65**, 044308 (2002).

¹⁵Gary Feinberg: private communication

¹⁶david.m.jacobs83@gmail.com; D.M. Jacobs, Department of Physics&Astronomy, Hamilton College, 198 College Hill Rd., Clinton, NY 13323

- [7] P. Finelli, N. Kaiser, D. Vretenar, and W. Weise, *Nuclear Physics A* **735**, 449 (2004).
- [8] J. J. Rusnak and R. J. Furnstahl, *Nucl. Phys.* **A627**, 495 (1997), nucl-th/9708040.
- [9] B. A. Nikolaus, T. Hoch, and D. G. Madland, *Phys. Rev.* **C46**, 1757 (1992).
- [10] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **166**, 1568 (1968).
- [11] S. Weinberg, *Physica* **A96**, 327 (1979).
- [12] S. Coleman, J. Wess, and B. Zumino, *Phys. Rev.* **177**, 2239 (1969).
- [13] C. G. Callan, S. Coleman, J. Wess, and B. Zumino, *Phys. Rev.* **177**, 2247 (1969).
- [14] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *Annals of Physics* **210**, 142 (1984).
- [15] J. Gasser, *Nuclear Physics B* **250**, 465 (1985).
- [16] A. Manohar and H. Georgi, *Nuclear Physics B* **234**, 189 (1984).
- [17] H. Georgi, *Weak Interactions and Modern Particle Theory* (Benjamin Cummings, 1984).
- [18] B. Borasoy and B. R. Holstein, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C6**, 85 (1999), hep-ph/9805430.
- [19] E. E. Jenkins and A. V. Manohar, Baryon chiral perturbation theory, in *Workshop on Effective Field Theories of the Standard Model Dobogoko, Hungary, August 22-26, 1991*, pp. 113–137, 1991.
- [20] A. de Shalit and H. Feshbach, *Theoretical Nuclear Physics* (John Wiley & Sons, 1974).
- [21] E. Farhi and R. L. Jaffe, *Phys. Rev. D* **30**, 2379 (1984).
- [22] E. Farhi and R. L. Jaffe, *Phys. Rev. D* **32**, 2452 (1985).
- [23] E. Witten, *Phys. Rev.* **D30**, 272 (1984).
- [24] S. A. Chin and A. K. Kerman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43**, 1292 (1979).
- [25] C. Alcock, E. Farhi, and A. Olinto, *Astrophys. J.* **310**, 261 (1986).
- [26] C. Alcock, E. Farhi, and A. Olinto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, 2088 (1986).
- [27] C. Alcock and E. Farhi, *Phys. Rev.* **D32**, 1273 (1985).
- [28] V. A. Nikolaev and O. G. Tkachev, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **55**, 101 (1992), [*Yad. Fiz.*55,179(1992)].

- [29] R. M. Nikolaeva, V. A. Nikolaev, and O. G. Tkachev, *J. Phys.* **G18**, 1149 (1992).
- [30] A. D. Jackson, C. Weiss, A. Wirzba, and A. Lande, *Nucl. Phys.* **A494**, 523 (1989).
- [31] R. Narayanan and H. Neuberger, Large N QCD on the lattice: A Review of recent results in the fermionic sector, in *Hadrons and Strings Workshop: A Trento ECT Workshop Trento, Italy, July 12-17, 2004*, pp. 120–143, 2005, hep-lat/0501031, [,120(2005)].
- [32] S. Muroya, A. Nakamura, C. Nonaka, and T. Takaishi, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **110**, 615 (2003), hep-lat/0306031.
- [33] D. G. Richards, Review of N N interaction from lattice QCD, in *Chiral dynamics: Theory and experiment. Proceedings, 3rd Workshop, Newport News, USA, July 17-22, 2000*, pp. 444–445, 2000, nucl-th/0011012.
- [34] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **137**, B672 (1965).
- [35] U. van Kolck, *Phys. Rev. C* **49**, 2932 (1994).
- [36] B. W. Lynn, *Nuclear Physics B* **402**, 281 (1993).
- [37] T. D. Lee and G. C. Wick, *Phys. Rev.* **D9**, 2291 (1974).
- [38] T. D. Lee, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **47**, 267 (1975).
- [39] T. D. Lee and M. Margulies, *Phys. Rev.* **D11**, 1591 (1975), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev.*D12,4008(1975); ,401(1974)].
- [40] S. A. Chin and J. D. Walecka, *Phys. Lett.* **52B**, 24 (1974).
- [41] R. Serber, *Phys. Rev.* **C14**, 718 (1976).
- [42] A. Bohr and B. Mottelson, *Nuclear Structure, Volume 1* (Benjamin, New York, 1969).
- [43] R. Serber, Private communication, Quoted by T.D. Lee in [38]., 1974.
- [44] S. Bahcall, B. W. Lynn, and S. B. Selipsky, *Nuclear Physics B* **331**, 67 (1990).
- [45] S. Bahcall, B. W. Lynn, and S. B. Selipsky, *Nucl. Phys.* **B325**, 606 (1989).
- [46] S. B. Selipsky, D. C. Kennedy, and B. W. Lynn, *Nucl. Phys.* **B321**, 430 (1989).
- [47] B. W. Lynn, *Nucl. Phys.* **B321**, 465 (1989).
- [48] S. R. Bahcall and B. W. Lynn, *Nuovo Cim.* **B113**, 959 (1998).

- [49] S. Bahcall and B. W. Lynn, Potential motion for Thomas-Fermi nontopological solitons, Unpublished, 1992.
- [50] G. Rosen, Journal of Mathematical Physics **9**, 999 (1968).
- [51] T. D. Lee, Phys. Rept. **23**, 254 (1976).
- [52] R. Friedberg, T. D. Lee, and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. **D13**, 2739 (1976).
- [53] R. Friedberg, T. D. Lee, and A. Sirlin, Nucl. Phys. **B115**, 32 (1976).
- [54] S. R. Coleman, Nucl. Phys. **B262**, 263 (1985), [Erratum: Nucl. Phys. B269,744(1986)].
- [55] R. Friedberg and T. D. Lee, Phys. Rev. **D15**, 1694 (1977).
- [56] J. Werle, Phys. Lett. **71B**, 367 (1977).
- [57] T. F. Morris, Phys. Lett. **76B**, 337 (1978).
- [58] T. F. Morris, Phys. Lett. **78B**, 87 (1978).
- [59] B. D. Serot and J. Walecka, Phys. Lett. **87**, 172 (1979).
- [60] S. Chin, Ann. Phys. **108**, 301 (1977).
- [61] B. D. Serot and J. D. Walecka, Adv. Nucl. Phys. **16**, 1 (1986).
- [62] F. E. Serr and J. D. Walecka, Phys. Lett. **B79**, 10 (1978), [Erratum: Phys. Lett. 84B,529(1979)].
- [63] C. Amsler *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B667**, 1 (2008).
- [64] S. Jadach and B. F. L. Ward, AIP Conf. Proc. **201**, 201 (1990).
- [65] D. R. Yennie, S. C. Frautschi, and H. Suura, Annals Phys. **13**, 379 (1961).
- [66] B. W. Lynn and R. G. Stuart, Nucl. Phys. **B253**, 216 (1985).
- [67] A. Djouadi and C. Verzegnassi, Phys. Lett. **B195**, 265 (1987).
- [68] G. Gelmini and B. Ritz, Phys. Lett. B **357**, 431 (1995).
- [69] C. F. von Weizsacker, Zeitschrift fur Physik **96**.
- [70] J. Rohlf, *Modern Physics from α to Z^0* . John Wiley and Sons (John Wiley, 1994).
- [71] T. Niksic, D. Vretenar, and P. Ring, Phys. Rev. **C78**, 034318 (2008), 0809.1375.
- [72] J. Boguta, Phys. Lett. B **120**, 34 (1983).

- [73] B. Harrison, M. Wakano, and J. Wheeler, Matter-energy at high density; end point of thermonuclear evolution, in *La Structure et l'évolution de l'univers, Onzième Conseil de Physique Solway, Stoops, Belgium, 1958*.
- [74] E. E. Salpeter, *Astrophys. J.* **134**, 669 (1961).
- [75] G. Baym, C. Pethick, and P. Sutherland, *Astrophys. J.* **170**, 299 (1971).
- [76] S. Shapiro and S. Teukolsky, *Black Holes, White Dwarfs, and Neutron Stars* (Wiley, New York, 1983).
- [77] B. W. Lynn, (2010), Liquid Phases in SU(3) Chiral Perturbation Theory (SU(3) ChPT: Drops of Strange Chiral Nucleon Liquid (S Ch NL) and Ordinary Chiral Heavy Nuclear Liquid (Ch NL), arXiv[hep-ph] 1005.2124.
- [78] B. van Kolck, Private communication.
- [79] A. Sedrakian and J. W. Clark, *Phys. Rev.* **C73**, 035803 (2006), nucl-th/0511076.
- [80] A. Sedrakian and J. W. Clark, *Eur. Phys. J.* **A55**, 167 (2019), 1802.00017.
- [81] B. Cederwall *et al.*, *Nature* **469**, 68 (2011), 1101.2187.
- [82] T. E. O. Ericson, *Nucl. Phys.* **A446**, 507C (1985).
- [83] F. Wilczek, *PoS LHCP2016*, 047 (2016), 1609.06941.
- [84] J. Boguta, Private communication to B.W.Lynn.
- [85] B. W. Lynn, A. E. Nelson, and N. Tetradis, *Nucl. Phys.* **B345**, 186 (1990).
- [86] Coffey, Brian and Lynn, Bryan and Starkman, Glenn, To be published, In progress, 2021.
- [87] B. Lynn, K. E. McGee, G. D. Starkman, and D. M. Jacobs, To be published (2020).
- [88] B. Coffey, B. Lynn, and G. Starkman, To be published, In progress, 2021.
- [89] A. E. Nelson, *Phys. Lett.* **B240**, 179 (1990).
- [90] E. Witten, *Phys.Rev.* **D30**, 272 (1984).
- [91] A. De Rujula and S. Glashow, *Nature* **312**, 734 (1984).
- [92] J. Madsen and K. Riisager, *Phys.Lett.* **B158**, 208 (1985).
- [93] B. Paczynski, *Astrophys.J.* **304**, 1 (1986).
- [94] C. Alcock and A. Olinto, *Ann.Rev.Nucl.Part.Sci.* **38**, 161 (1988).
- [95] G. Liu and B. Barish, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **61**, 271 (1988).

- [96] P. Price, Phys.Rev. **D38**, 3813 (1988).
- [97] J. Madsen, Phys.Rev.Lett. **61**, 2909 (1988).
- [98] G. D. Starkman, A. Gould, R. Esmailzadeh, and S. Dimopoulos, Phys.Rev. **D41**, 3594 (1990).
- [99] A. Gould, The Astrophysical Journal **386**, L5 (1992).
- [100] M. Fukugita, T. Futamase, M. Kasai, and E. Turner, The Astrophysical Journal **393**, 3 (1992).
- [101] MACHO collaboration, D. Bennett *et al.*, (1995), astro-ph/9510104.
- [102] MACHO Collaboration, EROS Collaboration, C. Alcock *et al.*, Astrophys.J.Lett. (1998), astro-ph/9803082.
- [103] G. Marani, R. Nemiroff, J. Norris, K. Hurley, and J. Bonnell, (1998), astro-ph/9810391.
- [104] C. Boehm, P. Fayet, and R. Schaeffer, Phys.Lett. **B518**, 8 (2001), astro-ph/0012504.
- [105] (Macho Collaboration) C Alcock, R. Allsman *et al.*, (2000), astro-ph/0011506.
- [106] EROS Collaboration, C. Afonso *et al.*, Astron.Astrophys. **400**, 951 (2003), astro-ph/0212176.
- [107] R. H. Cyburt, B. D. Fields, V. Pavlidou, and B. D. Wandelt, Phys.Rev. **D65**, 123503 (2002), astro-ph/0203240.
- [108] X.-l. Chen, S. Hannestad, and R. J. Scherrer, Phys.Rev. **D65**, 123515 (2002), astro-ph/0202496.
- [109] L. Chuzhoy and A. Nusser, Astrophys.J. **645**, 950 (2006), astro-ph/0408184.
- [110] P. Price, Radiat.Meas. **40**, 146 (2005).
- [111] EROS-2 Collaboration, P. Tisserand *et al.*, Astron.Astrophys. **469**, 387 (2007), astro-ph/0607207.
- [112] G. D. Mack, J. F. Beacom, and G. Bertone, Phys.Rev. **D76**, 043523 (2007), 0705.4298.
- [113] J. Hu and Y.-Q. Lou, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **384**, 814 (2008).
- [114] B. Carr, K. Kohri, Y. Sendouda, and J. Yokoyama, Phys.Rev. **D81**, 104019 (2010), 0912.5297.

- [115] R. Massey, T. Kitching, and J. Richard, *Rept.Prog.Phys.* **73**, 086901 (2010), 1001.1739.
- [116] I. F. Albuquerque and C. Perez de los Heros, *Phys.Rev.* **D81**, 063510 (2010), 1001.1381.
- [117] G. E. Pavalas, *AIP Conf.Proc.* **1304**, 454 (2010), 1010.2071.
- [118] L. Labun, J. Birrell, and J. Rafelski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, **111102** (2013), 1104.4572.
- [119] K. Griest, M. J. Lehner, A. M. Cieplak, and B. Jain, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **107**, 231101 (2011), 1109.4975.
- [120] G. D. Mack and A. Manohar, (2012), 1211.1951.
- [121] A. Barnacka, J. Glicenstein, and R. Moderski, *Phys.Rev.* **D86**, 043001 (2012), 1204.2056.
- [122] P. Astone *et al.*, (2013), 1306.5164.
- [123] K. Griest, A. M. Cieplak, and M. J. Lehner, (2013), 1307.5798.
- [124] G. D. Mack and A. Manohar, *J.Phys.* **G40**, 115202 (2013).
- [125] C. Dvorkin, K. Blum, and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys.Rev.* **D89**, 023519 (2014), 1311.2937.
- [126] P. Pani and A. Loeb, (2014), 1401.3025.
- [127] D. M. Jacobs, G. D. Starkman, and B. W. Lynn, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **450**, 3418 (2015), 1410.2236.
- [128] D. M. Jacobs, G. Allwright, M. Mafune, S. Manikumar, and A. Weltman, *Phys. Rev.* **D94**, 103516 (2016), 1511.00570.
- [129] D. M. Jacobs, G. D. Starkman, and A. Weltman, *Phys. Rev.* **D91**, 115023 (2015), 1504.02779.
- [130] D. Cyncynates, J. Chiel, J. Sidhu, and G. D. Starkman, *Phys. Rev.* **D95**, 063006 (2017), 1610.09680, [Addendum: *Phys. Rev.D95,no.12,129903(2017)*].
- [131] D. Cyncynates, E. Dimastrogiovanni, S. Kumar, J. Sidhu, and G. D. Starkman, (2017), 1711.04348.
- [132] F. Kühnel, G. D. Starkman, and K. Freese, (2017), 1705.10361.
- [133] A. Bhoonah, J. Bramante, F. Elahi, and S. Schon, *Phys. Rev.* **D100**, 023001 (2019), 1812.10919.
- [134] J. Bramante *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D99**, 083010 (2019), 1812.09325.

- [135] F. Kuhnel, A. Matas, G. D. Starkman, and K. Freese, (2018), 1811.06387.
- [136] Y. Bai, A. J. Long, and S. Lu, Phys. Rev. **D99**, 055047 (2019), 1810.04360.
- [137] J. S. Sidhu, R. M. Abraham, C. Covault, and G. Starkman, JCAP **1902**, 037 (2019), 1808.06978.
- [138] P. W. Graham, R. Janish, V. Narayan, S. Rajendran, and P. Riggins, Phys. Rev. **D98**, 115027 (2018), 1805.07381.
- [139] S. Kumar, E. Dimastrogiovanni, G. D. Starkman, C. Copi, and B. Lynn, Phys. Rev. **D99**, 023521 (2019), 1804.08601.
- [140] J. S. Sidhu, Phys. Rev. **D101**, 043526 (2020), 1912.04732.
- [141] J. S. Sidhu and G. D. Starkman, (2019), 1912.04053.
- [142] Y. Bai and J. Berger, (2019), 1912.02813.
- [143] J. S. Sidhu and G. Starkman, Phys. Rev. **D100**, 123008 (2019), 1908.00557.
- [144] J. S. Sidhu, R. J. Scherrer, and G. Starkman, Phys. Lett. **B803**, 135300 (2020), 1907.06674.
- [145] J. S. Sidhu, G. Starkman, and R. Harvey, Phys. Rev. **D100**, 103015 (2019), 1905.10025.
- [146] N. Christ, Lattice gauge theories, in *The Standard Model at 50: Proceedings, Case Western Reserve University. June 1-4, 2018*, 2018.
- [147] R. Serber, *About nuclear Physics* (World Scientific, 1987).
- [148] H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. B **298**, 187 (1993).
- [149] E. E. Jenkins, X.-d. Ji, and A. V. Manohar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 242001 (2002), hep-ph/0207092.
- [150] S. Weinberg, Nuclear Physics B **363**, 3 (1991).
- [151] S. Weinberg, Phys. Lett. B **295**, 114 (1992).
- [152] D. C. Kennedy and B. W. Lynn, Nucl. Phys. **B322**, 1 (1989).
- [153] P. Manakos and T. Mannel, Z. Phys. **A330**, 223 (1988).
- [154] P. Manakos and T. Mannel, Zeitschrift für Physik A Atomic Nuclei **334**, 481 (1989).
- [155] S. Fleming, T. Mehen, and I. W. Stewart, Nuclear Physics A **677**, 313 (2000).
- [156] H. W. Hammer, S. König, and U. van Kolck, Nuclear effective field theory: status and perspectives, 2019, 1906.12122.

- [157] S. Fleming, T. Mehen, and I. W. Stewart, *Phys. Rev. C* **61**, 044005 (2000).
- [158] T. D. Cohen and J. M. Hansen, The predictive power of effective field theory in nn scattering: 3s_1 - 3d_1 mixing at next-to next-to leading order, 1999, nucl-th/9908049.
- [159] J. Soto and J. Tarrús, *Phys. Rev. C* **81**, 014005 (2010).
- [160] D. B. Kaplan, M. J. Savage, and M. B. Wise, *Nuclear Physics B* **478**, 629 (1996).
- [161] M. C. Birse, *Phys. Rev. C* **74**, 014003 (2006).
- [162] L. P. P. V B Berestetskii and E. Lifshitz, *Quantum Electrodynamics* Volume 4: Course of Theoretical Physics (Elsevier, 2008).
- [163] E. E. Salpeter and H. A. Bethe, *Phys. Rev.* **84**, 1232 (1951).
- [164] J. R. Sapirstein and D. R. Yennie, *Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys.* **7**, 560 (1990).
- [165] G. P. Lepage, *Phys. Rev. A* **16**, 863 (1977).
- [166] B. W. Lynn, M. E. Peskin, and R. G. Stuart, RADIATIVE CORRECTIONS IN $SU(2) \times U(1)$: LEP / SLC, in *In *Ellis, J. (Ed.): Pececi, R.d. (Ed.): Physics At Lep, Vol. 1*, 90-152 and SLAC Stanford - SLAC-PUB-3725 (85,REC.SEP.) 86p*, 1985.
- [167] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, *An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory* (Westview Press, New York, 1995).
- [168] T. A. Collaboration, *Physics Reports* **427**, 257 (2006).
- [169] J. Erler and A. Freitas, (2018).
- [170] A. Messiah, *Quantum Mechanics* (Dover, New York, 2014).
- [171] G. P. Lepage, How to renormalize the Schrodinger equation, in *Nuclear physics. Proceedings, 8th Jorge Andre Swieca Summer School, Sao Jose dos Campos, Campos do Jordao, Brazil, January 26-February 7, 1997*, pp. 135–180, 1997, nucl-th/9706029.

Appendix A $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ χPT of a nucleon doublet and a pion triplet in the spontaneously broken (i.e. chiral) limit

The chiral symmetry of two light quark flavors in QCD, together with the symmetry-breaking and Goldstone’s theorem, makes it possible to obtain an approximate solution to QCD at low energies using a $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ EFT,

where the degrees of freedom are hadrons [10–17, 148]. In particular, the non-linear $SU(2)_\chi PT$ effective Lagrangian has been shown to successfully model the interactions of pions with nucleons, where a perturbation expansion (e.g., in soft momentum $\vec{k}/\Lambda_{\chi SB} \ll 1$, baryon number density $\frac{N^i N}{f_\pi^2 \Lambda_{\chi SB}} \ll 1$, for chiral symmetry breaking scale $\Lambda_{\chi SB} \approx 1$ GeV) has demonstrated predictive power. Such *naive* power-counting in $\Lambda_{\chi SB}^{-1}$ includes all analytic quantum-loop effects into experimentally measurable coefficients of $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ current-algebraic operators obedient to the global symmetries of QCD, with light-quark masses generating additional explicit chiral-symmetry-breaking terms. Therefore, $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \chi PT$ tree-level calculations with a naive power-counting effective Lagrangian are to be regarded as true predictions of QCD and the Standard $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ Model of elementary particles.

A.1 Non-linear transformation properties

We present the Lagrangian of $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \chi PT$ of a nucleon doublet and a pNGB triplet. We employ the defining $SU(2)$ strong-isospin representation of unitary 2×2 Pauli matrices σ_a , with asymmetric structure constants $f_{abc} = \epsilon_{abc}$

$$\begin{aligned}
t_a &= \frac{\sigma_a}{2}, \quad a = 1, 3 \\
\text{Tr}(t_a t_b) &= \frac{\delta_{ab}}{2} \\
[t_a, t_b] &= i f_{abc} t_c \\
\{t_a, t_b\} &= \frac{\delta_{ab}}{2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

The $SU(2)_{L+R}$ vector and $SU(2)_{L-R}$ axial-vector charges obey the algebra

$$\begin{aligned}
[Q_a^{L+R}, Q_b^{L+R}] &= i f_{abc} Q_c^{L+R} \\
[Q_a^{L-R}, Q_b^{L-R}] &= i f_{abc} Q_c^{L+R} \\
[Q_a^{L+R}, Q_b^{L-R}] &= i f_{abc} Q_c^{L-R}.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

We consider a triplet representation of NGBs,

$$\pi_a t_a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} & \pi^+ \\ \pi^- & -\frac{\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} \end{bmatrix} \tag{A.3}$$

and a doublet of nucleons,

$$N = \begin{bmatrix} p \\ n \end{bmatrix}. \tag{A.4}$$

For pedagogical simplicity, representations of higher mass are neglected, even though the $SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$ baryon decuplet (especially Δ_{1232}) is known to have important nuclear structure [1] and scattering [149] effects.

Since $SU(2)\chi PT$ matrix elements are independent of representation [12,13], we choose a representation [16,17,148] where the NGB triplet has only derivative couplings,

$$\Sigma \equiv \exp(2i\pi_a \frac{t_a}{f_\pi}). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Under a unitary global $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ transformation, given by $L \equiv \exp(il_a t_a)$ and $R \equiv \exp(ir_a t_a)$,

$$\Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma' = L \Sigma R^\dagger. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

It also proves useful to introduce the “square root” of Σ

$$\xi \equiv \exp(i\pi_a \frac{t_a}{f_\pi}), \quad (\text{A.7})$$

which transforms as

$$\xi \rightarrow \xi' = \exp(i\pi'_a \frac{t_a}{f_\pi}) \quad (\text{A.8})$$

We observe that

$$\xi' = L \xi U^\dagger = U \xi R^\dagger, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

for a certain unitary local transformation matrix $U(L, R, \pi_a(t, x))$.

The vector and axial-vector NGB currents

$$\begin{aligned} V_\mu &\equiv \frac{1}{2}(\xi^\dagger \partial_\mu \xi + \xi \partial_\mu \xi^\dagger) \\ A_\mu &\equiv \frac{i}{2}(\xi^\dagger \partial_\mu \xi - \xi \partial_\mu \xi^\dagger) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

transform straightforwardly as

$$\begin{aligned} V_\mu &\rightarrow V' = U V_\mu U^\dagger + U \partial_\mu U^\dagger \\ A_\mu &\rightarrow A' = U A_\mu U^\dagger. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Meanwhile the nucleons transform as

$$N \rightarrow N' = U N \quad (\text{A.12})$$

and

$$D_\mu N \equiv \partial_\mu N + V_\mu N \rightarrow U(D_\mu N). \quad (\text{A.13})$$

A.2 Naive $\Lambda_{\chi SB}$ operator power counting

The $SU(2)\chi PT$ Lagrangian, including all analytic quantum-loop effects for soft momenta ($\ll 1\text{GeV}$) [16, 148], can now be written:

$$L_{\chi PT} = \tag{A.14}$$

$$-\sum_{\substack{l,m,n \\ l+m \geq 1}} C_{lmn} f_\pi^2 \Lambda_{\chi SB}^2 \left(\frac{\partial_\mu}{\Lambda_{\chi SB}} \right)^m \left(\frac{\bar{N}}{f_\pi \sqrt{\Lambda_{\chi SB}}} \right)^l \left(\frac{N}{f_\pi \sqrt{\Lambda_{\chi SB}}} \right)^l \left(\frac{m_{quark}}{\Lambda_{\chi SB}} \right)^n f_{lmn} \left(\frac{\pi_a}{f_\pi} \right),$$

where f_{lmn} is an analytic function, and the dimensionless constants C_{lmn} are $O(\Lambda_{\chi SB}^0)$ and, presumably, ~ 1 . As a power series in $\Lambda_{\chi SB}$,

$$L_{\chi PT} \sim \Lambda_{\chi SB} + (\Lambda_{\chi SB})^0 + \frac{1}{\Lambda_{\chi SB}} + \left(\frac{1}{\Lambda_{\chi SB}} \right)^2 + \dots \tag{A.15}$$

We take, self-consistently, $\Lambda_{\chi SB} \simeq 1\text{GeV}$ and, in higher orders, reorder the non-relativistic perturbation expansion in ∂_0 to converge with large nucleon mass $m^N \simeq \Lambda_{\chi SB}$ [2, 150, 151]. As the terms in (A.14) already include all analytic loop corrections, renormalized to all orders, we can perform tree-level calculations to arrive at strong-interaction predictions.

A.3 The Chiral Symmetric Limit

For the purposes of this paper, we retain from (A.14) only terms of order $\Lambda_{\chi SB}$ and $\Lambda_{\chi SB}^0$, i.e. $1 \leq m + l + n \leq 2$. We can further divide $L_{\chi PT}$ into a symmetric piece (i.e., spontaneous $SU(2)_{L-R}$ breaking with massless Goldstones) and a symmetry-breaking piece (i.e., explicit $SU(2)_{L-R}$ breaking, traceable to quark masses) generating three massive pNGB:

$$L_{\chi PT} = L_{\chi PT}^{\text{Symmetric}} + L_{\chi PT}^{\text{Symmetry-Breaking}}. \tag{A.16}$$

In this paper, we are interested only in unbroken $SU(2)\chi PT$ and so take $n = 0$ in (A.14)

$$L_{\chi PT}^{\text{Symmetry-Breaking}} = 0. \tag{A.17}$$

We separate $L_{\chi PT}^{\text{Symmetric}}$ into pure-meson terms, terms quadratic in baryons (i.e. nucleons), and four-baryon terms:

$$L_{\chi PT}^{\text{Symmetric}} = L_{\chi PT}^{\pi;\text{Symmetric}} + L_{\chi PT}^{N;\text{Symmetric}} + L_{\chi PT}^{4-N;\text{Symmetric}} \tag{A.18}$$

with (as in (9))

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\chi PT}^{\pi;\text{Symmetric}} &= \frac{f_\pi^2}{4} \text{Tr} \partial_\mu \Sigma \partial^\mu \Sigma^\dagger + L_{\chi PT;\text{non-Analytic}}^{\pi;\text{Symmetric}} \\ L_{\chi PT}^{N;\text{Symmetric}} &= \bar{N} \left(i\gamma^\mu D_\mu - m^N \mathbf{1} \right) N - g_A \bar{N} \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 A_\mu N \\ L_{\chi PT}^{4-N;\text{Symmetric}} &\sim \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \left(\bar{N} \gamma^{\mathcal{A}} N \right) \left(\bar{N} \gamma_{\mathcal{A}} N \right) + \dots, \end{aligned} \tag{A.19}$$

As described below (9), the parentheses in the four-nucleon Lagrangian indicate the order of $SU(2)$ index contraction, and + + + indicates that one should include all possible combinations of such contractions. As usual, $\gamma^{\mathcal{A}} \equiv (1, \gamma^\mu, i\sigma^{\mu\nu}, i\gamma^\mu\gamma^5, \gamma^5)$, for $\mathcal{A} = 1, \dots, 16$ (with $\sigma^{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{1}{2}[\gamma^\mu, \gamma^\nu]$). These are commonly referred to as scalar (S), vector (V), tensor (T), axial-vector (A), and pseudo-scalar (P) respectively.

In this paper, we will focus on the *Semi-Classical Symmetries* of chiral (i.e. spontaneously broken) $SU(2)\chi PT$. Nucleons N are treated as quantum fermions. Pions are classical fields: i.e. $\xi, V_\mu, A_\mu, U, \Sigma, \pi_a, R, L$ defined in Subsection (A.1) are not quantized: their non-trivial commutation properties are entirely due to strong isospin.

A.4 $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ invariant 4-nucleon contact interactions

Focus on the 4-fermion terms in (A.19).

Using the completeness relation for 2×2 matrices (sum over $B = 0, 1, 2, 3$)

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^B &= (1, \vec{\sigma}); \quad \delta_{cf}\delta_{ed} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{B=0}^3 \sigma_{cd}^B \sigma_{ef}^B. \\ t^B &= \left(\frac{1}{2}, \vec{t}\right) = \frac{1}{2} \sigma^B; \quad \delta_{cf}\delta_{ed} = 2 \sum_{B=0}^3 t_{cd}^B t_{ef}^B; \quad [\vec{t}, U(\vec{\pi}(x), r, l)] \neq 0; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

(We use $\alpha \dots \sigma$ for relativistic spinor indices, while $a \dots f$ are isospin indices.) Both iso-scalar and iso-vector 4-nucleon contact interactions appear in the $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ invariant Lagrangian:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\chi PT}^{4-N; \text{Symmetric}} &= \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=0} (\overline{N}_a^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A} \alpha\beta} N_a^\beta) (\overline{N}_b^\lambda \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lambda\sigma} N_b^\sigma) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=1} (\overline{N}_a^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A} \alpha\beta} N_b^\beta) (\overline{N}_b^\lambda \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lambda\sigma} N_a^\sigma) \\ &\longrightarrow \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=0} (\overline{N}_c^\alpha U_{ca}^\dagger \gamma^{\mathcal{A} \alpha\beta} U_{ad} N_d^\beta) (\overline{N}_e^\lambda U_{eb}^\dagger \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lambda\sigma} U_{bf} N_f^\sigma) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=1} (\overline{N}_c^\alpha U_{ca}^\dagger \gamma^{\mathcal{A} \alpha\beta} U_{bd} N_d^\beta) (\overline{N}_e^\lambda U_{eb}^\dagger \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lambda\sigma} U_{af} N_f^\sigma) \\ &= \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=0} (\overline{N}_c^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A} \alpha\beta} N_c^\beta) (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lambda\sigma} N_e^\sigma) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=1} (\overline{N}_c^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A} \alpha\beta} N_d^\beta) (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lambda\sigma} N_f^\sigma) \delta_{cf} \delta_{ed} \\ &= \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=0} (\overline{N}_c^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A} \alpha\beta} N_c^\beta) (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lambda\sigma} N_e^\sigma) \\ &\quad + 2 \frac{1}{4f_\pi^2} \sum_{B=0}^3 C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=1} (\overline{N}_c^\alpha \sigma_{cd}^B \gamma^{\mathcal{A} \alpha\beta} N_d^\beta) (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \sigma_{ef}^B \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lambda\sigma} N_f^\sigma). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.21})$$

A.5 Certain non-analytic NGB 4-pion interactions

Non-analytic interactions of pions are induced in quantum loops. There are situations where loop effects are important and can be qualitatively distinguished from tree-level interactions by their analytic structure. For example, the $\pi_a + \pi_b \rightarrow \pi_c + \pi_d$ scattering amplitude contains a term [17] in the chiral limit.

$$L_{non-Analytic}^{\pi;Symmetric} \leftrightarrow \left[-\delta_{ab}\delta_{cd}\frac{s^2}{32\pi^2} - \delta_{ac}\delta_{bd}\frac{3s^2 + u^2 - t^2}{196\pi^2} - \delta_{ad}\delta_{bc}\frac{3s^2 + t^2 - u^2}{196\pi^2} \right] \ln\left(-\frac{s}{\kappa}\right) + \text{cross-terms}. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

Here $s = (p_a + p_b)^2$, $t = (p_a - p_c)^2$, $u = (p_a - p_d)^2$ are Mandelstam variables and κ is an arbitrary renormalization scale.

This paper crucially concerns itself with the far-infrared region of NGB pion momenta. The imaginary part of $\ln\left(-\frac{s}{\kappa}\right)$ arises from the unitarity of the S-matrix and is related to a total cross-section. The real part of $\ln\left(-\frac{s}{\kappa}\right)$ diverges in the far-infrared, and might have been important to χ NL. We show that it is not! ¹⁷

Following [152], we pack this non-analytic S-Matrix $\mathcal{O}\left(\Lambda_{\chi SB}^0\right)$ term, and all other such non-analytic terms in the pure pion sector, into a non-analytic effective Lagrangian $L_{non-Analytic}^{\pi;Symmetric}$, which is also to be analyzed at tree-level.

Appendix B 4-nucleon contact interactions in Static χ NL's

B.1 Boson-exchange-inspired vs. excited-nucleon-inspired 4-nucleon contact interactions

We wish to study the ground state expectation value of $L_{\chi PT}^{4-N;Symmetric}$. Using (A.21)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \chi NL | -L_{\chi PT}^{4-N;Symmetric} | \chi NL \rangle = & \quad (\text{B.1}) \\ & \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} \sum_{\mathcal{A}} \left\{ \langle \chi NL | C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=0} (\overline{N}_c^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} N_c^\beta) (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lambda\sigma} N_e^\sigma) | \chi NL \rangle \right. \\ & \left. + 2 \frac{1}{4} \sum_B \langle \chi NL | C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=1} (\overline{N}_c^\alpha \sigma_{cd}^B \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} N_d^\beta) (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \sigma_{ef}^B \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lambda\sigma} N_f^\sigma) | \chi NL \rangle \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now introduce a complete set of states

$$\mathbb{1} = | \chi NL \rangle_0 \langle \chi NL | + \sum_{\Psi \neq \text{Static } \chi NL} | \Psi \rangle \langle \Psi | \quad (\text{B.2})$$

¹⁷ It clarifies things to regularize $\ln\left(-\frac{s}{\kappa}\right) \rightarrow \ln\left(-\frac{sIR}{\kappa}\right)$ with $|sIR| > 0$ in the Infra-Red.

and classify 4-nucleon Static χ NL interaction terms as either inspired by “boson exchange”

$$\begin{aligned}
-L_{Static\chi NL}^{BosonExchange} &= \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} \sum_{\mathcal{A}} \quad (B.3) \\
&\times \left\{ C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=0} \langle \chi NL | (\overline{N}_c^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} N_c^\beta) | \chi NL \rangle_0 \langle \chi NL | (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} N_e^\sigma) | \chi NL \rangle_0 \right. \\
&\quad + 2 \frac{1}{4} \sum_B C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=1} \langle \chi NL | (\overline{N}_c^\alpha \sigma_{cd}^B \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} N_d^\beta) | \chi NL \rangle_0 \\
&\quad \left. \times \langle \chi NL | (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \sigma_{ef}^B \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} N_f^\sigma) | \chi NL \rangle_0 \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

or “excited-nucleon” inspired

$$\begin{aligned}
-L_{Static\chi NL}^{ExcitedNucleon} &= \sum_{\Psi \neq Static\chi NL} \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} \sum_{\mathcal{A}} \quad (B.4) \\
&\times \left\{ C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=0} \langle \chi NL | (\overline{N}_c^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} N_c^\beta) | \Psi \rangle \langle \Psi | (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} N_e^\sigma) | \chi NL \rangle_0 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2 \frac{1}{4} \sum_B C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=1} \langle \chi NL | (\overline{N}_c^\alpha \sigma_{cd}^B \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} N_d^\beta) | \Psi \rangle \langle \Psi | (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \sigma_{ef}^B \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} N_f^\sigma) | \chi NL \rangle_0 \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

A useful theorem is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{4} \langle \chi NL | (\overline{N}_c^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} N_c^\beta) | \chi NL \rangle_0 \langle \chi NL | (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} N_e^\sigma) | \chi NL \rangle_0 \quad (B.5) \\
&+ \langle \chi NL | (\overline{N}_c^\alpha t_{3;cd} \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} N_d^\beta) | \chi NL \rangle_0 \langle \chi NL | (\overline{N}_e^\lambda t_{3;ef} \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} N_f^\sigma) | \chi NL \rangle_0 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \langle \chi NL | (\overline{p}_c^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} p_c^\beta) | \chi NL \rangle_0 \langle \chi NL | (\overline{p}_e^\lambda \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} p_e^\sigma) | \chi NL \rangle_0 \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \langle \chi NL | (\overline{n}_c^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} n_c^\beta) | \chi NL \rangle_0 \langle \chi NL | (\overline{n}_e^\lambda \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} n_e^\sigma) | \chi NL \rangle_0
\end{aligned}$$

Going forward, we will use the notation $\rangle \equiv | \chi NL \rangle_0$ and $\langle \equiv \langle \chi NL |$ in this Appendix.

B.2 Contact-interactions that mimic hadronic boson-exchange

Taking expectation values inside the Static χ NL,

$$\begin{aligned}
-L_{Static\chi NL}^{BosonExchange} &\simeq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{f_\pi} \quad (B.6) \\
&\times \left[C_S^{T=0} \langle \overline{N}_c^\alpha N_c^\alpha \rangle \langle \overline{N}_e^\lambda N_e^\lambda \rangle \right. \\
&\quad + C_V^{T=0} \langle \overline{N}_c^\alpha \gamma^{0;\alpha\beta} N_c^\beta \rangle \langle \overline{N}_e^\lambda \gamma_0^{\lambda\sigma} N_e^\sigma \rangle \\
&\quad + 2 C_S^{T=1} \left\{ \frac{1}{4} \langle \overline{N}_c^\alpha N_c^\alpha \rangle \langle \overline{N}_e^\lambda N_e^\lambda \rangle + \langle \overline{N}_c^\alpha t_{3;cd} N_d^\alpha \rangle \langle \overline{N}_e^\lambda t_{3;ef} N_f^\lambda \rangle \right\} \\
&\quad \left. + 2 C_V^{T=1} \left\{ \frac{1}{4} \langle \overline{N}_c^\alpha \gamma^{0;\alpha\beta} N_c^\beta \rangle \langle \overline{N}_e^\lambda \gamma_0^{\lambda\sigma} N_e^\sigma \rangle + \langle \overline{N}_c^\alpha t_{3;cd} \gamma^{0;\alpha\beta} N_d^\beta \rangle \langle \overline{N}_e^\lambda t_{3;ef} \gamma_0^{\lambda\sigma} N_f^\sigma \rangle \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The factorization in $L_{Static\chi NL}^{BosonExchange}$, and its name, are inspired by a simple picture of forces carried by heavy hadronic-boson exchange, which is commonly envisioned in Walecka-like, nuclear-Skyrme and density-functional models; i.e. we have integrated out the auxiliary fields:

- Lorentz-scalar isoscalar σ , with chiral coefficient $C_S^{T=0}$;
- Lorentz-vector isoscalar ω_μ with chiral coefficient $C_V^{T=0}$;
- Lorentz-scalar isovector $\vec{\delta}$, with chiral coefficient $C_S^{T=1}$;
- Lorentz-vector isovector $\vec{\rho}_\mu$, with chiral coefficient $C_V^{T=1}$.

To order $\Lambda_{\chi SB}^0$, the only 4-nucleon contact terms allowed by local $SU(2)\chi PT$ symmetry are exhibited in (B.3) (i.e. (B.6)) and (B.4). Note that isospin operators $\vec{t} = \frac{1}{2}\vec{\sigma}_{Pauli}$ have appeared. However, quantum-loop naive power counting requires inclusion of nucleon Lorentz-spinor-interchange interactions, in order to enforce anti-symmetrization of fermion wavefunctions. These are the same magnitude, $(\Lambda\chi SB)^0$, as direct interactions. The empirical nuclear models of Manakos and Mannel [153, 154] were specifically built to include such spinor-interchange terms.

Explicit inclusion of spinor-interchange terms yields a great technical advantage for the liquid approximation: it allows us to treat Static χ NLs in Hartree-Fock approximation, i.e. including fermion wave function anti-symmetrization, rather than in less-accurate Hartree approximation.

Because of normal-ordering, such point-coupling contact spinor-interchange terms don't appear in the analysis of the deuteron [34, 35], which has only 1 proton and 1 neutron.

B.3 Contact-interactions, including spinor-interchange terms enforcing effective anti-symmetrization of fermion wavefunctions in the Hartree-Fock approximation

In this section, we write an effective Static χ NL Lagrangian in terms of the 10 independent chiral coefficients $C_S^{T=0}$, $C_V^{T=0}$, $C_T^{T=0}$, $C_A^{T=0}$, $C_P^{T=0}$ and $C_S^{T=1}$, $C_V^{T=1}$, $C_T^{T=1}$, $C_A^{T=1}$, $C_P^{T=1}$ governing 4-nucleon contact interactions.

For pedagogical simplicity, we first focus on the ‘‘boson-exchange-inspired’’ terms, with power-counting contact-interactions of order $(\Lambda\chi SB)^0$. ‘‘Direct’’ terms depend only on $C_S^{T=0}$, $C_V^{T=0}$, $C_S^{T=1}$, and $C_V^{T=1}$, because isoscalar ($C_T^{T=0}$, $C_A^{T=0}$, and $C_P^{T=0}$) and isovector ($C_T^{T=1}$, $C_A^{T=1}$, $C_P^{T=1}$) vanish when evaluated in the liquid. ‘‘Spinor-interchange’’ terms depend all 10 coefficients after Fierz rearrangement. Such terms do not appear in the $SU(2)\chi PT$ analysis of the deuteron ground state, because it only has 1 proton and 1 neutron. The combination of direct and spinor-interchange terms (which we refer to below as ‘‘Total’’) depend on all 10 coefficients.

Because of the inclusion of spinor-interchange terms, Hartree treatment of the resultant Static χ NL Lagrangian is equivalent to Hartree-Fock treatment of

the liquid. When building the semi-classical liquid quantum state, this enforces the anti-symmetrization of the fermion wavefunctions. A crucial observation is that the resultant liquid depends on only four independent chiral coefficients. C_{200}^S , C_{200}^V , $\overline{C_{200}^S}$, and $\overline{C_{200}^V}$. These provide sufficient free parameters to balance the scalar attractive force carried by C_{200}^S and $\overline{C_{200}^S}$ against the vector repulsive force carried by C_{200}^V and $\overline{C_{200}^V}$ when fitting to the experimentally observed structure of ground-state nuclei. This is the case for our Non-topological Soliton nuclear model, where $C_{200}^S - \frac{1}{2}\overline{C_{200}^S} < 0$ and $C_{200}^V - \frac{1}{2}\overline{C_{200}^V} > 0$,

Motivated by the empirical success of Non-topological Soliton models we conjecture that excited-nucleon-inspired contact-interaction terms are small, and that the simple picture of scalar attraction balanced against vector repulsion persists when including them. But such analysis is beyond the scope of this paper.

B.3.1 Lorentz Vector (V) and Axial-vector (A) forces

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle L^{4-N;V,A} \rangle &\equiv L_{Static\chi NL}^{V,A} \\
-L_{Static\chi NL}^{V,A} &= \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} \sum_{\mathcal{A}=V,A} \left\{ C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=0} \langle (\overline{N_c^\alpha} \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} N_c^\beta) \rangle \langle (\overline{N_e^\lambda} \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} N_e^\sigma) \rangle \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2 \frac{1}{4} \sum_B C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=1} \langle (\overline{N_c^\alpha} \sigma_{cd}^B \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} N_d^\beta) \rangle \langle (\overline{N_e^\lambda} \sigma_{ef}^B \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} N_f^\sigma) \rangle \right\} \\
&\quad - L_{Static\chi NL;ExcitedNucleon}^{V,A} \tag{B.7} \\
-L_{Static\chi NL;ExcitedNucleon}^{V,A} &= \sum_{\Psi \neq Static\chi NL} \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} \sum_{\mathcal{A}=V,A} \\
&\quad \times \left\{ C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=0} \langle (\overline{N_c^\alpha} \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} N_c^\beta) | \Psi \rangle \langle \Psi | (\overline{N_e^\lambda} \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} N_e^\sigma) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2 \frac{1}{4} \sum_B C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=1} \langle (\overline{N_c^\alpha} \sigma_{cd}^B \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} N_d^\beta) | \Psi \rangle \langle \Psi | (\overline{N_e^\lambda} \sigma_{ef}^B \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} N_f^\sigma) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
-L_{Static\chi NL}^{V,A} &= \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} \sum_{\mathcal{A}=V,A} \left[C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=0} \left\{ 2 \langle (\overline{p_c^\alpha} \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} p_c^\beta) \rangle \langle (\overline{n_e^\lambda} \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} n_e^\sigma) \rangle \right\} \right. \\
&\quad + \left[C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=0} + C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=1} \right] \left\{ \langle (\overline{p_c^\alpha} \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} p_c^\beta) \rangle \langle (\overline{p_e^\lambda} \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} p_e^\sigma) \rangle \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \langle (\overline{n_c^\alpha} \gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta} n_c^\beta) \rangle \langle (\overline{n_e^\lambda} \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} n_e^\sigma) \rangle \right\} \right] \\
&\quad - L_{Static\chi NL;ExcitedNucleon}^{V,A} \tag{B.8}
\end{aligned}$$

Direct terms: The properties of Static χ NLs vastly simplify this expression

$$\begin{aligned} -L_{Static\chi NL;Direct}^{V,A} &= \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} C_V^{T=0} \{2 \langle p^\dagger p \rangle \langle n^\dagger n \rangle\} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} [C_V^{T=0} + C_V^{T=1}] \{ \langle p^\dagger p \rangle \langle p^\dagger p \rangle + \langle n^\dagger n \rangle \langle n^\dagger n \rangle \} \end{aligned} \quad (B.9)$$

with simplified notation $\langle p_c^{\alpha\dagger} p_c^\alpha \rangle \langle n_e^{\lambda\dagger} n_e^\lambda \rangle \equiv \langle p^\dagger p \rangle \langle n^\dagger n \rangle$.

Spinor-interchange terms: After interchanging the appropriate spinors, normal ordering creation and annihilation operators, and Fierz re-arrangement, spinor-interchange contributions depend on $C_V^{T=0}, C_A^{T=0}, C_V^{T=1}, C_A^{T=1}$.

$$\begin{aligned} -L_{Static\chi NL;SpinorInterchange}^{V,A} &= \\ &\frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} \left[- (C_V^{T=0} + C_V^{T=1}) + (C_A^{T=0} + C_A^{T=1}) \right] \\ &\times \left\{ \langle p_L^\dagger p_L \rangle \langle p_L^\dagger p_L \rangle + \langle p_R^\dagger p_R \rangle \langle p_R^\dagger p_R \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \langle n_L^\dagger n_L \rangle \langle n_L^\dagger n_L \rangle + \langle n_R^\dagger n_R \rangle \langle n_R^\dagger n_R \rangle \right\} \\ -L_{Static\chi NL;ExcitedNucleon;SpinorInterchange}^{V,A} & \end{aligned} \quad (B.10)$$

where we have divided $p = p_L + p_R$ and $n = n_L + n_R$ into left-handed and right-handed spinors.

Total direct and spinor-interchange terms:

$$\begin{aligned} -L_{Static\chi NL;Total}^{V,A} &= \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} C_V^{T=0} \{2 \langle p^\dagger p \rangle \langle n^\dagger n \rangle\} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} [C_V^{T=0} + C_V^{T=1}] \{2 \langle p_L^\dagger p_L \rangle \langle p_R^\dagger p_R \rangle + 2 \langle n_L^\dagger n_L \rangle \langle n_R^\dagger n_R \rangle\} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} [C_A^{T=0} + C_A^{T=1}] \{ \langle p_L^\dagger p_L \rangle \langle p_L^\dagger p_L \rangle + \langle p_R^\dagger p_R \rangle \langle p_R^\dagger p_R \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle n_L^\dagger n_L \rangle \langle n_L^\dagger n_L \rangle + \langle n_R^\dagger n_R \rangle \langle n_R^\dagger n_R \rangle \} \\ -L_{Static\chi NL;ExcitedNucleon;Total}^{V,A} & \end{aligned} \quad (B.11)$$

The reader should note the cancellation of the term

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} [C_V^{T=0} + C_V^{T=1}] &\left\{ \langle p_L^\dagger p_L \rangle \langle p_L^\dagger p_L \rangle + \langle p_R^\dagger p_R \rangle \langle p_R^\dagger p_R \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \langle n_L^\dagger n_L \rangle \langle n_L^\dagger n_L \rangle + \langle n_R^\dagger n_R \rangle \langle n_R^\dagger n_R \rangle \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (B.12)$$

showing that vector-boson exchange cannot carry forces between same-handed fermion protons, or between same-handed fermion neutrons.

Significant simplification follows because Static χ NLs are defined to have equal left-handed and right-handed densities

$$\begin{aligned}\langle p_L^\dagger p_L \rangle &= \langle p_R^\dagger p_R \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle p^\dagger p \rangle \\ \langle n_L^\dagger n_L \rangle &= \langle n_R^\dagger n_R \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle n^\dagger n \rangle.\end{aligned}\quad (\text{B.13})$$

so that the contribution of (B.11) to the Lorentz-spinor-interchange Lagrangian is

$$\begin{aligned}-L_{\text{Static}\chi\text{NL};\text{Total}}^{V,A} &= \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} C_{200}^V \{ \langle N^\dagger N \rangle \langle N^\dagger N \rangle \} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4f_\pi^2} \overline{C_{200}^V} \{ \langle N^\dagger N \rangle \langle N^\dagger N \rangle + 4 \langle N^\dagger t_3 N \rangle \langle N^\dagger t_3 N \rangle \} \\ &\quad - L_{\text{Static}\chi\text{NL};\text{ExcitedNucleon};\text{Total}}^{V,A}\end{aligned}\quad (\text{B.14})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}C_{200}^V &= C_V^{T=0} \\ -\overline{C_{200}^V} &= \frac{1}{2} [-C_V^{T=0} + C_A^{T=0} + C_V^{T=1} + C_A^{T=1}]\end{aligned}\quad (\text{B.15})$$

The crucial observation is that (B.14), (B.15) depend on just *two* independent chiral coefficients, C_{200}^V and $\overline{C_{200}^V}$, instead of four, while still providing sufficient free parameters to fit the vector repulsive force (i.e., within Non-topological Soliton, Density Functional and Skyrme nuclear models) up to naive power-counting order $(\Lambda\chi SB)^0$, to the experimentally observed structure of ground-state nuclei.

B.3.2 Lorentz Scalar (S), Tensor (T) and Pseudo-scalar (P) forces

$$\begin{aligned}\langle L^{4-N};\text{ScalarTensorPseudoscalar} \rangle &\equiv L_{\text{Static}\chi\text{NL}}^{\text{ScalarTensorPseudoscalar}} \\ -L_{\text{Static}\chi\text{NL}}^{\text{ScalarTensorPseudoscalar}} &= \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} \sum_{\mathcal{A}=S,T,P} \left\{ C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=0} \langle (\overline{N}_c^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A}} \alpha\beta N_c^\beta) \rangle \langle (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lambda\sigma} N_e^\sigma) \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 \frac{1}{4} \sum_B C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=1} \langle (\overline{N}_c^\alpha \sigma_{cd}^B \gamma^{\mathcal{A}} \alpha\beta N_d^\beta) \rangle \langle (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \sigma_{ef}^B \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lambda\sigma} N_f^\sigma) \rangle \right\} \\ &\quad - L_{\text{Static}\chi\text{NL};\text{ExcitedNucleon}}^{\text{ScalarTensorPseudoscalar}} \\ -L_{\text{Static}\chi\text{NL};\text{ExcitedNucleon}}^{\text{ScalarTensorPseudoscalar}} &= \sum_{\Psi \neq \text{Static}\chi\text{NL}} \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} \sum_{\mathcal{A}=S,T,P} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=0} \langle (\overline{N}_c^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A}} \alpha\beta N_c^\beta) | \Psi \rangle \langle \Psi | (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lambda\sigma} N_e^\sigma) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 \frac{1}{4} \sum_B C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=1} \langle (\overline{N}_c^\alpha \sigma_{cd}^B \gamma^{\mathcal{A}} \alpha\beta N_d^\beta) | \Psi \rangle \langle \Psi | (\overline{N}_e^\lambda \sigma_{ef}^B \gamma_{\mathcal{A}}^{\lambda\sigma} N_f^\sigma) \right\}\end{aligned}\quad (\text{B.16})$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
-L_{Static\chi NL}^{ScalarTensorPseudoscalar} &= \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} \sum_{\mathcal{A}=S,T,P} \left[C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=0} \left\{ 2 \left\langle \overline{p}_c^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A}} \alpha \beta p_c^\beta \right\rangle \left\langle \overline{n}_e^\lambda \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} n_e^\sigma \right\rangle \right\} \right. \\
&+ \left[C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=0} + C_{\mathcal{A}}^{T=1} \right] \left\{ \left\langle \overline{p}_c^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A}} \alpha \beta p_c^\beta \right\rangle \left\langle \overline{p}_e^\lambda \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} p_e^\sigma \right\rangle \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \left\langle \overline{n}_c^\alpha \gamma^{\mathcal{A}} \alpha \beta n_c^\beta \right\rangle \left\langle \overline{n}_e^\lambda \gamma^{\lambda\sigma} n_e^\sigma \right\rangle \right\} \right] \\
&- L_{Static\chi NL;ExcitedNucleon}^{ScalarTensorPseudoscalar} \tag{B.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Direct terms: The properties of Static χ NLs give

$$\begin{aligned}
-L_{Static\chi NL;Direct}^{ScalarTensorPseudoscalar} &= \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} C_S^{T=0} \langle \overline{N}N \rangle \langle \overline{N}N \rangle \\
&+ \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} \left(C_S^{T=1} \right) \{ \langle \overline{p}p \rangle \langle \overline{p}p \rangle + \langle \overline{n}n \rangle \langle \overline{n}n \rangle \} \tag{B.18}
\end{aligned}$$

Spinor-interchange terms: Spinor-interchange contributions depend on 6 chiral coefficients: isoscalars $C_S^{T=0}$, $C_T^{T=0}$, $C_P^{T=0}$ and isovectors $C_S^{T=1}$, $C_T^{T=1}$, $C_P^{T=1}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
-L_{Static\chi NL;SpinorInterchange}^{ScalarTensorPseudoscalar} &= \tag{B.19} \\
&\frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(C_S^{T=0} + C_S^{T=1} \right) + 3 \left(C_T^{T=0} + C_T^{T=1} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(C_P^{T=0} + C_P^{T=1} \right) \right] \\
&\times \{ \langle \overline{p}_L p_R \rangle \langle \overline{p}_L p_R \rangle + \langle \overline{p}_R p_L \rangle \langle \overline{p}_R p_L \rangle + \langle \overline{n}_L n_R \rangle \langle \overline{n}_L n_R \rangle + \langle \overline{n}_R n_L \rangle \langle \overline{n}_R n_L \rangle \} \\
&- L_{Static\chi NL;ExcitedNucleon;SpinorInterchange}^{ScalarTensorPseudoscalar}
\end{aligned}$$

Total direct and spinor-interchange terms: As above, the fact that Static χ NLs are defined to have equal left-handed and right-handed scalar densities simplifies the total direct and spinor-interchange contribution:

$$\begin{aligned}
-L_{Static\chi NL;Total}^{ScalarTensorPseudoscalar} &= \frac{1}{2f_\pi^2} C_{200}^S \left\{ \langle \overline{N}N \rangle \langle \overline{N}N \rangle \right\} \\
&- \frac{1}{4f_\pi^2} \overline{C_{200}^S} \left\{ \langle \overline{N}N \rangle \langle \overline{N}N \rangle + 4 \langle \overline{N}t_3 N \rangle \langle \overline{N}t_3 N \rangle \right\} \\
&- L_{Static\chi NL;ExcitedNucleon;Total}^{ScalarTensorPseudoscalar} \tag{B.20}
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{200}^S &= C_S^{T=0} \tag{B.21} \\
-\overline{C_{200}^S} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{2} C_S^{T=0} + \frac{5}{2} C_S^{T=1} + 3 \left(C_T^{T=0} + C_T^{T=1} \right) + \left(C_P^{T=0} + C_P^{T=1} \right) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

Once again we find that (B.20) and (B.21) depend on just *two* independent chiral coefficients, C_{200}^S and $\overline{C_{200}^S}$, instead of six, while still providing sufficient free

parameters to fit the scalar attractive force (i.e. within Non-topological Soliton, Density Functional and Skyrme nuclear models) up to naive power-counting order $(\Lambda\chi SB)^0$, to the experimentally observed structure of ground-state nuclei.

Appendix C Nucleon bi-linears and semi-classical nuclear currents in Static χ NL

The structure of Static χ NL suppresses various nucleon bi-linears:

- Vectors' space-components: because it is a 3-vector, parity odd and stationary

$${}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N}_c^{\alpha}\vec{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}N_c^{\beta})|\chi NL\rangle_b \sim {}_0\langle\chi NL|\vec{k}|\chi NL\rangle_b \simeq 0 \quad (\text{C.1})$$

- Tensors: because the local expectation value of nuclear spin $\langle\vec{s}\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\langle\vec{\sigma}\rangle \simeq 0$

1. σ^{0j} :

$$\begin{aligned} & {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N}_c^{\alpha}\sigma^{0j;\alpha\beta}N_c^{\beta})|\chi NL\rangle_b \\ &= {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N}_L\sigma^{0j}N_R)|\chi NL\rangle_b + {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N}_R\sigma^{0j}N_L)|\chi NL\rangle_b \\ &= 2{}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N}_L\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \vec{s}_j \\ \vec{s}_j & 0 \end{bmatrix}N_R)|\chi NL\rangle_b \\ &+ 2{}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N}_R\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \vec{s}_j \\ \vec{s}_j & 0 \end{bmatrix}N_L)|\chi NL\rangle_b \\ &\simeq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

2. σ^{ij} :

$$\begin{aligned} & {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N}_c^{\alpha}\sigma^{ij;\alpha\beta}N_c^{\beta})|\chi NL\rangle_b \\ &= {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N}_L\sigma^{ij}N_R)|\chi NL\rangle_b + {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N}_R\sigma^{ij}N_L)|\chi NL\rangle_b \\ &= -2i\epsilon_{ijk}{}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N}_L\vec{s}_kN_R)|\chi NL\rangle_b \\ &\quad -2i\epsilon_{ijk}{}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N}_R\vec{s}_kN_L)|\chi NL\rangle_b \\ &\simeq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

- Axial-vectors: because p_L, p_R are equally represented in Static χ NL, as are n_L, n_R

$$\begin{aligned} & {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N}_c^{\alpha}\gamma^{A;\alpha\beta}N_c^{\beta})|\chi NL\rangle_b \\ &= {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N}_L\gamma^{\mu}\gamma^5N_L)|\chi NL\rangle_b + {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N}_R\gamma^{\mu}\gamma^5N_R)|\chi NL\rangle_b \\ &= -{}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N}_L\gamma^{\mu}N_L)|\chi NL\rangle_b + {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N}_R\gamma^{\mu}N_R)|\chi NL\rangle_b \\ &\simeq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

- Pseudo-scalars: because Static χ NL are of even parity

$$\begin{aligned}
& {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_c^\alpha}\gamma^{P;\alpha\beta}N_c^\beta)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} \\
&= {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_R}\gamma^5N_L)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} + {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_L}\gamma^5N_R)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} \\
&= -{}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_R}N_L)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} + {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_L}N_R)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} \\
&\simeq 0
\end{aligned} \tag{C.5}$$

Therefore, various Lorentz and isospin representations are suppressed in Static χ NLs. In summary: Isoscalars

$$\begin{aligned}
& {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_c^\alpha}N_c^\alpha)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} \neq 0 \\
& {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_c^\alpha}\gamma^{0;\alpha\beta}N_c^\beta)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} \neq 0 \\
& {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_c^\alpha}\vec{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}N_c^\beta)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} \simeq 0 \\
& {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_c^\alpha}\gamma^{T;\alpha\beta}N_c^\beta)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} \simeq 0 \\
& {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_c^\alpha}\gamma^{A;\alpha\beta}N_c^\beta)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} \simeq 0 \\
& {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_c^\alpha}\gamma^{P;\alpha\beta}N_c^\beta)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} \simeq 0
\end{aligned} \tag{C.6}$$

and Isoectors

$$\begin{aligned}
& {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_c^\alpha}t_{cd}^\pm\gamma^{\mathcal{A}\alpha\beta}N_d^\beta)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} = 0 \\
& {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_c^\alpha}t_{cd}^3N_d^\alpha)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} \neq 0 \\
& {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_c^\alpha}t_{cd}^3\gamma^{0;\alpha\beta}N_d^\beta)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} \neq 0 \\
& {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_c^\alpha}t_{cd}^3\vec{\gamma}^{\alpha\beta}N_d^\beta)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} \simeq 0 \\
& {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_c^\alpha}t_{cd}^3\gamma^{T;\alpha\beta}N_d^\beta)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} \simeq 0 \\
& {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_c^\alpha}t_{cd}^3\gamma^{A;\alpha\beta}N_d^\beta)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} \simeq 0 \\
& {}_0\langle\chi NL|(\overline{N_c^\alpha}t_{cd}^3\gamma^{P;\alpha\beta}N_d^\beta)|\chi NL\rangle_{\mathfrak{b}} \simeq 0
\end{aligned} \tag{C.7}$$

Now form the semi-classical nuclear currents

$$\begin{aligned}
J_k^\mu &= \bar{N}\gamma^\mu t_k N \quad k = 1, 2, 3 \\
J_\pm^\mu &= J_1^\mu \pm iJ_2^\mu = \begin{Bmatrix} \bar{p}\gamma^\mu n \\ \bar{n}\gamma^\mu p \end{Bmatrix} \\
J_3^\mu &= \frac{1}{2}(\bar{p}\gamma^\mu p - \bar{n}\gamma^\mu n) \\
J_8^\mu &= \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}(\bar{p}\gamma^\mu p + \bar{n}\gamma^\mu n) \\
J_{QED}^\mu &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}J_8^\mu + J_3^\mu = \bar{p}\gamma^\mu p \\
J_{Baryon}^\mu &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}J_8^\mu = \bar{p}\gamma^\mu p + \bar{n}\gamma^\mu n \\
J_k^{5\mu} &= \bar{N}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 t_k N \quad k = 1, 2, 3 \\
J_\pm^{5\mu} &= J_1^{5\mu} \pm iJ_2^{5\mu} = \begin{Bmatrix} \bar{p}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 n \\ \bar{n}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 p \end{Bmatrix} \\
J_3^{5\mu} &= \frac{1}{2}(\bar{p}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 p - \bar{n}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 n) \\
J_8^{5\mu} &= \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}(\bar{p}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 p + \bar{n}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 n) \tag{C.8}
\end{aligned}$$

$SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ nuclear currents within Static χ NL are obedient to its semi-classical symmetries

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle 0 | \chi NL | J_3^0 | \chi NL \rangle &\neq 0; & \langle 0 | \chi NL | \partial_\mu J_3^\mu | \chi NL \rangle &\simeq 0 \\
\langle 0 | \chi NL | J_\pm^\mu | \chi NL \rangle &= 0; & \langle 0 | \chi NL | \partial_\mu J_\pm^\mu | \chi NL \rangle &= 0 \\
\langle 0 | \chi NL | J_3^{\mu,5} | \chi NL \rangle &\simeq 0; & \langle 0 | \chi NL | J_8^{\mu,5} | \chi NL \rangle &\simeq 0 \\
\langle 0 | \chi NL | J_\pm^{\mu,5} | \chi NL \rangle &= 0; & \langle 0 | \chi NL | \partial_\mu J_\pm^{\mu,5} | \chi NL \rangle &= 0 \\
\langle 0 | \chi NL | J_8^0 | \chi NL \rangle &\neq 0; & \langle 0 | \chi NL | \partial_\mu J_8^\mu | \chi NL \rangle &\simeq 0 \\
\langle 0 | \chi NL | J_{QED}^0 | \chi NL \rangle &\neq 0; & \langle 0 | \chi NL | \partial_\mu J_{QED}^\mu | \chi NL \rangle &\simeq 0 \\
\langle 0 | \chi NL | J_{Baryon}^0 | \chi NL \rangle &\neq 0; & \langle 0 | \chi NL | \partial_\mu J_{Baryon}^\mu | \chi NL \rangle &\simeq 0 \\
\langle 0 | \chi NL | J_3^{\mu=1,2,3} | \chi NL \rangle &\simeq 0; & \langle 0 | \chi NL | J_8^{\mu=1,2,3} | \chi NL \rangle &\simeq 0 \\
\langle 0 | \chi NL | J_{QED}^{\mu=1,2,3} | \chi NL \rangle &\simeq 0; & \langle 0 | \chi NL | J_{Baryon}^{\mu=1,2,3} | \chi NL \rangle &\simeq 0 \tag{C.9} \\
\langle 0 | \chi NL | i\partial_\mu J_3^{\mu,5} | \chi NL \rangle &= \langle 0 | \chi NL | 2 \left(-m^N - \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \overline{C_{200}^S} \right) \gamma^5 t_3 | \chi NL \rangle &\sim \pi_3 \simeq 0 \\
\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \langle 0 | \chi NL | i\partial_\mu J_8^{\mu,5} | \chi NL \rangle &= \langle 0 | \chi NL | 2 \left(-m^N - \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \overline{C_{200}^S} \right) \gamma^5 | \chi NL \rangle &\sim \eta \simeq 0
\end{aligned}$$

Appendix D Thomas-Fermi non-topological solitons and the ancient semi-empirical mass formula

We are interested here in semi-classical solutions to (31), identifiable as quantum chiral nucleon liquids, that are, for reasons laid out in the main body of the paper: in the ground state, spin zero, spherically symmetric, and even-even (i.e. have an even number of protons and of neutrons). We employ relativistic mean-field point-coupling Hartree-Fock and Thomas-Fermi approximations, ignoring the anti-nucleon sea.¹⁸

We seek solutions that are static, homogeneous and isotropic. Given the absence of any surface terms at the order $\Lambda_{\chi SB}^0$ in chiral symmetry breaking to which we are working, we avoid the *ad hoc* imposition of such terms. We therefore impose the condition that the pressure vanishes everywhere, rather than just at the surface of a finite “liquid drop.” Our finite Static χNL nuclei therefore resemble “ice cream balls scooped from an infinite vat [84], more than they do conventional liquid drops (which have surface tension).

The Thomas-Fermi approximation replaces the neutrons and protons with homogeneous and isotropic expectation values over free neutron and proton spinors, with (for $j = n$ and p) effective reduced mass m_*^j , 3-momentum \vec{k}^j , energy $E^j = \sqrt{(\vec{k}^j)^2 + (m_*^j)^2}$, and zero spin. Most of these vanish because of the absence of any preferred direction for spin or momenta in Static χNL :

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{n}n &\rightarrow \langle \bar{n}n \rangle = \left\langle \frac{m_*^n}{E_n} \right\rangle \\
 \bar{n}(\gamma^0, \vec{\gamma})n &\rightarrow \langle \bar{n}(\gamma^0, \vec{\gamma})n \rangle = (1, \vec{0}) \\
 \bar{n}(\sigma^{0j}, \sigma^{ij})n &\rightarrow \langle \bar{n}(\sigma^{0j}, \sigma^{ij})n \rangle = 0 \\
 \bar{n}(\gamma^0, \vec{\gamma})\gamma^5 n &\rightarrow \langle \bar{n}(\gamma^0, \vec{\gamma})\gamma^5 n \rangle = 0 \\
 \bar{n}\gamma^5 n &\rightarrow \langle \bar{n}\gamma^5 n \rangle = 0;
 \end{aligned} \tag{D.1}$$

and similarly for protons by taking $n \rightarrow p$. To simplify our notation, we drop the $\langle \dots \rangle$ in the remainder of this paper.

Within the liquid drop, the baryon number density

$$N^\dagger N = p^\dagger p + n^\dagger n, \tag{D.2}$$

and scalar density

$$\bar{N}N = \bar{p}p + \bar{n}n. \tag{D.3}$$

¹⁸ We thank D. Jacobs for his contributions to this appendix.

The neutron contributions to these densities are

$$\begin{aligned}
n^\dagger n &= 2 \int_0^{k_F^n} \frac{d^3 k^n}{(2\pi)^3} = \frac{(k_F^n)^3}{3\pi^2} \\
\bar{n}n &= 2 \int_0^{k_F^n} \frac{d^3 k^n}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{m_*^n}{\sqrt{(\vec{k}^n)^2 + (m_*^n)^2}} \\
&= \frac{m_*^n}{2\pi^2} \left(k_F^n \mu_*^n - \frac{1}{2} (m_*^n)^2 \ln \left(\frac{\mu_*^n + k_F^n}{\mu_*^n - k_F^n} \right) \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{D.4}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
m_*^n &\equiv m_n + \frac{C_{200}^S}{f_\pi^2} \bar{N} N - \frac{\overline{C_{200}^S}}{f_\pi^2} \bar{n}n \\
\mu_*^n &\equiv \sqrt{(k_F^n)^2 + (m_*^n)^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.5}$$

The equivalent proton contributions are obtained by straightforward substitution of $n \leftrightarrow p$.

It is convenient to define

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon^{fn} &\equiv 2 \int_0^{k_F^n} \frac{d^3 k^n}{(2\pi)^3} \sqrt{(\vec{k}^n)^2 + (m_*^n)^2} \\
&= \frac{3}{4} \mu_*^n n^\dagger n + \frac{1}{4} m_*^n \bar{n}n \\
P^{fn} &\equiv 2 \int_0^{k_F^n} \frac{d^3 k^n}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{(\vec{k}^n)^2}{3\sqrt{(\vec{k}^n)^2 + (m_*^n)^2}} \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \mu_*^n n^\dagger n - \frac{1}{4} m_*^n \bar{n}n,
\end{aligned} \tag{D.6}$$

and equivalently for protons, by again substituting $n \leftrightarrow p$. These look conveniently like the neutron and proton energy density and pressure, and indeed

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon^{fn} - 3P^{fn} &= m_*^n \bar{n}n \\
\epsilon^{fn} + P^{fn} &= \mu_*^n n^\dagger n.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.7}$$

and equivalently for p . However, the actual nucleon energy density and pressure are properly constructed from the stress-energy tensor:

$$\left(T_{\chi PT; Liquid}^N \right)^{\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial L_{\chi PT; Liquid}^N}{\partial (\partial_\mu N)} \partial^\nu N - g^{\mu\nu} L_{\chi PT; Liquid}^N, \tag{D.8}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon^N &\equiv \left(T_{\chi PT; Liquid}^N \right)^{00} \\
P^N &\equiv \frac{1}{3} \left(T_{\chi PT; Liquid}^N \right)^{jj}.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.9}$$

The total nucleon energy is thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon^N &= \epsilon^f p + \epsilon^f n + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{C_{200}^V}{f_\pi^2} (N^\dagger N)^2 - \frac{\overline{C_{200}^V}}{f_\pi^2} [(p^\dagger p)^2 + (n^\dagger n)^2] \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{C_{200}^S}{f_\pi^2} (\overline{N} N)^2 - \frac{\overline{C_{200}^S}}{f_\pi^2} [(\overline{p} p)^2 + (\overline{n} n)^2] \right) \\
&= \frac{3}{4} (\mu_B^p p^\dagger p + \mu_B^n n^\dagger n) - \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{C_{200}^V}{f_\pi^2} (N^\dagger N)^2 - \frac{\overline{C_{200}^V}}{f_\pi^2} [(p^\dagger p)^2 + (n^\dagger n)^2] \right) + U^N
\end{aligned} \tag{D.10}$$

with

$$U^N \equiv \frac{1}{4} (m_p \overline{p} p + m_n \overline{n} n) - \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{C_{200}^S}{f_\pi^2} (\overline{N} N)^2 - \frac{\overline{C_{200}^S}}{f_\pi^2} [(\overline{p} p)^2 + (\overline{n} n)^2] \right) \tag{D.11}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_B^n &\equiv \mu_*^n + \frac{C_{200}^V}{f_\pi^2} N^\dagger N - \frac{\overline{C_{200}^V}}{f_\pi^2} n^\dagger n \\
\mu_B^p &\equiv \mu_*^p + \frac{C_{200}^V}{f_\pi^2} N^\dagger N - \frac{\overline{C_{200}^V}}{f_\pi^2} p^\dagger p.
\end{aligned} \tag{D.12}$$

The nucleon pressure

$$\begin{aligned}
P^N &= P^f p + P^f n + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{C_{200}^V}{f_\pi^2} (N^\dagger N)^2 - \frac{\overline{C_{200}^V}}{f_\pi^2} [(p^\dagger p)^2 + (n^\dagger n)^2] \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{C_{200}^S}{f_\pi^2} (\overline{N} N)^2 - \frac{\overline{C_{200}^S}}{f_\pi^2} [(\overline{p} p)^2 + (\overline{n} n)^2] \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} (\mu_B^p p^\dagger p + \mu_B^n n^\dagger n) + \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{C_{200}^V}{f_\pi^2} (N^\dagger N)^2 - \frac{\overline{C_{200}^V}}{f_\pi^2} [(p^\dagger p)^2 + (n^\dagger n)^2] \right) - U^N
\end{aligned} \tag{D.13}$$

ϵ^N and P^N are related by the baryon number densities:

$$\epsilon^N + P^N = \mu_B^p p^\dagger p + \mu_B^n n^\dagger n. \tag{D.14}$$

The objects of our calculations are therefore the six quantities: $\mu_B^{n,p}$, $m_*^{n,p}$, and $k_F^{n,p}$. These are, respectively, the chemical potential, reduced mass, and Fermi-momentum for neutrons and protons.

D.1 $Z = N$ heavy nuclei in the chiral-symmetric limit

To calculate binding energies, we work in the chiral symmetric limit, $m_p = m_n$: e.g. zero electromagnetic breaking, and $m_8 = \frac{1}{2}(m_p + m_n)$. We first study the

case $Z = N$, so $m_*^n = m_*^p \equiv m_*$ for equal numbers of protons and neutrons. We search for a solution of the chiral-symmetric liquid equations that has $P^N = 0$.

In this simple case, $\mu_B^p = \mu_B^n \equiv \mu_B$, $\mu_*^p = \mu_*^n \equiv \mu_*$, $m_p = m_n \equiv m_N$, and $k_{Fn} = k_{Fp} \equiv k_F$. Thus

$$k_F = \sqrt{\mu_*^2 - m_*^2}. \quad (\text{D.15})$$

It is also the case that $n^\dagger n = p^\dagger p = \frac{1}{2}N^\dagger N$, and $\bar{n}n = \bar{p}p = \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}N$. We are therefore able to write the baryon density as

$$N^\dagger N = \frac{\mu - \mu_*}{C_V^2} \quad (\text{D.16})$$

and the scalar density as

$$\bar{N}N = \frac{m_N - m_*}{C_S^2}, \quad (\text{D.17})$$

where, to make connection to Walecka's model of nuclear matter

$$\begin{aligned} C_V^2 &\equiv \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \left(C_{200}^V - \frac{1}{2} \overline{C_{200}^V} \right) \\ C_S^2 &\equiv -\frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \left(C_{200}^S - \frac{1}{2} \overline{C_{200}^S} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.18})$$

The baryon and scalar densities are simply:

$$N^\dagger N = 2(2) \int_0^{k_F} \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} = \frac{2k_F^3}{3\pi^2} \quad (\text{D.19})$$

and

$$\bar{N}N = 2(2) \int_0^{k_F} \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{m_*}{\sqrt{k^2 + m_*^2}} = \frac{m_*}{\pi^2} \left(\mu_* k_F - m_*^2 \ln \left[\frac{\mu_* + k_F}{m_*} \right] \right). \quad (\text{D.20})$$

(One pre-factor of 2 is for spin, the other counts protons and neutrons.) The fermion pressure is now

$$P^N = \frac{1}{4} \left[\mu N^\dagger N + C_V^2 \left(N^\dagger N \right)^2 - m_N \bar{N}N - C_S^2 \left(\bar{N}N \right)^2 \right] \quad (\text{D.21})$$

To these six equations (D.15)-(D.21) in the seven variables k_F , μ_* , $\delta\mu \equiv \mu - \mu_*$, m_* , $\bar{N}N$, $N^\dagger N$ and P^N , we add the physical condition that the Static χNL non-topological soliton pressure vanish internally, in order that it remain stable when immersed in the physical vacuum:

$$P^N = 0, \quad (\text{D.22})$$

eliminating P^N as a free variable.




Figure 2: $\Delta_{\bar{N}N}$ (cf. (D.25)) as a function of baryon chemical potential μ_B (dashed curve) for $C_V^2 = 222.65 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ and $C_S^2 = 303.45 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$, the Chin and Walecka values [40] equivalent to ours. A solution of the complete set of $Z = N$ chiral-symmetric pressureless-liquid equations must have $\Delta_{\bar{N}N} = 0$, and thus is found at $\mu_B \simeq 923.17 \text{ MeV}$, where the dashed curve intersects the μ_B axis. This value equals the Chin-Walecka value shown as a red dot.

Equations (D.15)-(D.19) can be solved analytically to give k_F, μ_* , $N^\dagger N$ and $\bar{N}N$ as functions of m_* and δ_μ :

$$\begin{aligned} k_F &= \left(\frac{3\pi^2 \delta_\mu}{2 C_V^2} \right)^{1/3} \\ \mu_* &= \sqrt{k_F^2 + m_*^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.23})$$

Equation (D.21), with $P^N = 0$, then becomes a quartic equation for m_* in terms of δ_μ :

$$0 = m_*^2 + \left(\frac{3\pi^2 \delta_\mu}{2C_V^2} \right)^{2/3} - \left[\frac{C_V^2 (m_N - m_*)(2m_N - m_*)}{C_S^2 \delta_\mu} - 2\delta_\mu \right]^2, \quad (\text{D.24})$$

This has up to four roots $m_*(\delta_\mu; C_S^2, C_V^2)$, for every value of δ_μ , C_S^2 , and C_V^2 ¹⁹. To be an actual solution of the complete set of $Z = N$ chiral-symmetric pressureless-liquid equations, the root must also satisfy (D.20), i.e.

$$\Delta_{\bar{N}N} \equiv 1 - \frac{C_S^2}{\pi^2} \frac{m_*}{m_N - m_*} \left(\mu_* k_F - m_*^2 \ln \left[\frac{\mu_* + k_F}{m_*} \right] \right) = 0 \quad (\text{D.25})$$

¹⁹ But only one of these four roots might be an infinite Static χNL , and then only if it were the $P^N \rightarrow 0$ limit of a *finite* Walecka non-topological soliton. Those solitons satisfy "Newtonian roll-around-ology" [36, 44–49] where the mean field nucleons move within a dynamic σ field. $P_{Internal}^N \neq 0$ and $P_{External}^N = 0$ are then connected by the dynamic σ surface.




Figure 3: Solid blue line: $f_\pi^2 C_S^2$; dashed red line: $f_\pi^2 C_V^2$. The Fermi level, k_F , is in inverse Fermis. The calibration used a bulk binding energy $E_{Vol} = 15.75$ MeV.

(using (D.23) for $k_F(\delta_\mu; C_V^2)$ and $\mu_*(\delta_\mu; C_S^2, C_V^2)$).

$m_N/f_\pi \approx 939/93 \approx 10.10$, but in principle C_S^2 and C_V^2 are free parameters. For given values of C_S^2 and C_V^2 , we must search for a value of $\delta\mu$ such that (D.25) holds. The existence of such a value of $\delta\mu$ is not assured for arbitrary values of C_S^2 and C_V^2 .

Fitting to experimental values, Chin and Walecka found that their parameters $C_V^2 = 222.65 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ and $C_S^2 = 303.45 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$. In Figure 2, we show that there does indeed exist a pressureless chiral-symmetric nuclear liquid for C_S^2 and C_V^2 equal to the Chin and Walecka values. Furthermore, the inferred value of the baryon chemical potential is 923.17 MeV, and is consistent with Chen and Walecka's value. Figure 3 shows representative values of C_V^2 and C_S^2 for different values of k_F using the first approach.

Remarkably, we can now understand Chin and Walecka's nuclear matter to be a pressureless chiral-symmetric nuclear liquid. We also perhaps thereby gain some insight into the relative insensitivity of nuclear properties to pion properties.

In the companion paper we explore the wider space of solutions to the pressure-less chiral-symmetric nuclear liquid equations.

D.2 $Z \neq N$ heavy nuclei in the chiral-symmetric limit

Here we outline the analytic and numerical treatment of the case where $Z \neq N$ in the chiral limit. The approach may be summarized as follows:

1. The starting point is the zeroth order solution for the case $Z = N$ which determines the coupling constants C_S^2 and C_V^2 for a given Fermi level and binding energy as in the previous section.
2. All proton and neutron specific quantities are expanded in a Taylor series;
3. The general rule is: quantities vanishing in zeroth order have a first order variation while those not vanishing in zeroth order have only a second order variation; thus all terms up to second order must be retained;
4. The vanishing of pressure to second order provides an additional equation which allows all variations to be expressed in terms of the first order change in density only;
5. Since there appears no way to infer separately the value of $\overline{C_{200}^S}$ we follow Nix and co-workers [71] and set this constant to zero. This leads to significant simplification. In particular, changes in the proton and neutron reduced masses are equal in first order.
6. We then solve for $\overline{C_{200}^V}$ by setting the asymmetry energy of the liquid model to the second order variation in the Thomas-Fermi energy.

In this section we use the following notation for the number and scalar densities:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_p &\equiv p^\dagger p; & \rho_n &\equiv n^\dagger n; & \rho_\pm &= \rho_p \pm \rho_n. \\ \rho_{Sp} &\equiv \overline{p} p; & \rho_{Sn} &\equiv \overline{n} n; & \rho_{S\pm} &= \rho_{Sp} \pm \rho_{Sn}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.26})$$

We define the changes in densities as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} d\rho_p - d\rho_n &= \epsilon d\rho_- \\ d\rho_p + d\rho_n &= \epsilon^2 d\rho_+ \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.27})$$

where ϵ is merely a placeholder for the order of the variation. It then follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_p &= \frac{1}{2}\rho_+ + \frac{\epsilon}{2}d\rho_- + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}d\rho_+ \\ \rho_n &= \frac{1}{2}\rho_+ - \frac{\epsilon}{2}d\rho_- + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}d\rho_+. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.28})$$

Since the number density for each species is given by the first of (D.5) we get the following expansions for the Fermi levels:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta k_{Fp} - \delta k_{Fn} &= \epsilon \frac{2k_F}{3\rho_+} \delta\rho_-, \\ \delta k_{Fp} + \delta k_{Fn} &= \epsilon^2 \left(\frac{2k_{Fp}}{3\rho_+} \delta\rho_+ - \frac{2k_F}{9\rho_+^2} \delta\rho_-^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.29})$$

It is convenient to introduce the notation:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{*8} &= \frac{1}{2}(m_{*p} + m_{*n}) \\ m_{*3} &= \frac{1}{2}(m_{*p} - m_{*n}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.30})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{*8} &= \frac{1}{2}(\mu_{*p} + \mu_{*n}) \\ \mu_{*3} &= \frac{1}{2}(\mu_{*p} - \mu_{*n}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.31})$$

with

$$\mu_{*p,n} = \sqrt{m_{*p,n}^2 + k_{Fp,n}^2}. \quad (\text{D.32})$$

In our notation the reduced masses (D.6) are written:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{*,p} &= m_N + \frac{C_{200}^S}{f_\pi^2}(\rho_{S,p} + \rho_{S,n}) - \frac{\overline{C_{200}^S}}{f_\pi^2} \rho_{S,p} \\ m_{*,n} &= m_N + \frac{C_{200}^S}{f_\pi^2}(\rho_{S,p} + \rho_{S,n}) - \frac{\overline{C_{200}^S}}{f_\pi^2} \rho_{S,n}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.33})$$

from which it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} m_N - m_{*8} &= C_S^2 \rho_{S+} \\ m_{*3} &= \frac{\overline{C_{200}^S}}{2f_\pi^2} \rho_{S-}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.34})$$

where we used the second of (D.18). We now enforce $\overline{C_{200}^S} = 0$: it follows immediately from the second of (D.34) that $m_{*3} = \delta m_{*3} = 0$ with a drastic simplification in the resulting equations.

First, $\delta \mu_{*3}$ is a linear function of $\delta \rho_-$ only; i.e.,

$$\delta \mu_{*3} = \frac{\pi^2}{2k_F \mu_{*8}} \delta \rho_-. \quad (\text{D.35})$$

Second, $\delta \mu_{*8}$ is also simplified:

$$\delta \mu_{*8} = \frac{m_{*8}}{\mu_{*8}} \delta m_{*8} + \frac{\pi^2}{2\mu_{*8} k_{Fp}} \delta \rho_+ - \frac{\pi^4}{8k_F^4 \mu_{*8}^3} (m_{*8}^2 + 2k_F^2) \delta \rho_-^2. \quad (\text{D.36})$$

(As noted, $\delta \mu_{*3}$ is first order, while $\delta \mu_{*8}$ is second order.) The variation in the first of (D.34) gives:

$$\delta \rho_{S+} = -\frac{\delta m_{*8}}{C_S^2}, \quad (\text{D.37})$$

where the variation in ρ_{S+} is obtained using:

$$\delta\rho_{Sp,n} = 3 \left(\frac{\rho_{Sp,n}}{m_{*p,n}} - \frac{\rho_{p,n}}{\mu_{*p,n}} \right) \delta m_{*p,n} + \frac{m_{*p,n} k_{Fp,n}^2}{\mu_{*p,n} \pi^2} \delta k_{Fp,n}. \quad (\text{D.38})$$

After some algebra and substituting the variations in μ_{*3} and μ_{*8} from (D.35) and (D.36), we find:

$$3 \left(\frac{\rho_{S+}}{m_{*8}} - \frac{\rho_+}{\mu_{*8}} + \frac{1}{C_S^2} \right) \delta m_{*8} + \frac{m_{*8}}{\mu_{*8}} \delta \rho_+ - \frac{m_{*8} \pi^2}{\mu_{*8}^3 k_F} \frac{\delta \rho_-^2}{4} = 0. \quad (\text{D.39})$$

We must also enforce the vanishing of the Fermi pressure. The first order term of the Fermi pressure vanishes identically. After some algebra (considerably simplified by the assumption $\overline{C_{200}^S} = 0$) we find that the second order term is:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta P_2^N = & \frac{1}{4} \rho_+ \delta \mu_{*8} + \frac{1}{4} \mu_{*8} \delta \rho_+ + \frac{1}{4} \delta \mu_{*3} \delta \rho_- + C_V^2 \rho_+ \delta \rho_+ \\ & - \frac{\overline{C_{200}^V}}{4 f_\pi^2} \delta \rho_-^2 + \frac{1}{4 C_S^2} (3m_N - 2m_{*8}) \delta m_{*8}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.40})$$

After using (D.35) and (D.36), the zero pressure equation becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{3m_N - 2m_{*8}}{4C_S^2} + \frac{\rho_+ m_{*8}}{2\mu_{*8}} \right) \delta m_{*8} + \left(\frac{\mu_{*8}}{4} + C_V^2 \rho_+ + \frac{k_F^2}{12\mu_{*8}} \right) \delta \rho_+ \\ + \left(\frac{\pi^2 (5m_{*8}^2 - 4k_F^2)}{48 k_F \mu_{*8}^3} - \frac{\overline{C_{200}^V}}{4 f_\pi^2} \right) \delta \rho_-^2 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.41})$$

Equations (D.39) and (D.41) are solved to express δm_{*8} and $\delta \rho_+$ in terms of $\delta \rho_-^2$. To determine $\overline{C_{200}^V}$ we need the second variation in the energy density \mathcal{E} . This quantity is discussed below.

D.3 Calibration of $\overline{C_{200}^V}$

We start with the vanishing of the pressure and the relationship:

$$\epsilon^N + P^N = \mu_p \rho_p + \mu_n \rho_n = \mu_8 \rho_+ + \mu_3 \rho_- \quad (\text{D.42})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_8 = & \mu_{*8} + C_V^2 \rho_+, \\ \mu_3 = & \mu_{*3} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\overline{C_{200}^V}}{f_\pi^2} \rho_-. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.43})$$

The zeroth order energy density when $Z = N$ follows at once:

$$\epsilon_0^N = \mu_{*8} \rho_+ + C_V^2 \rho_+^2. \quad (\text{D.44})$$




Figure 4: Graph of $\overline{C_{200}^V}$ against the Fermi level expressed in fm^{-1} . The behavior is roughly linear in the range considered corresponding to a one-third power of the number density.

The first order energy term vanishes. The second order term is:

$$\delta\epsilon_2^N = \rho_+ \delta\mu_{*8} + \mu_{*8} \delta\rho_+ + \delta\mu_{*3} \delta\rho_- + 2C_V^2 \rho_+ \delta\rho_+ - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\overline{C_{200}^V}}{f_\pi^2} \delta\rho_-^2. \quad (\text{D.45})$$

Finally, we can express $\delta\rho_-$ in terms of the relative neutron excess as:

$$\delta\rho_- = \frac{Z - N}{Z + N} \rho_+ \quad (\text{D.46})$$

The parameter $\overline{C_{200}^V}$ can be calibrated in two ways. In the first, we merely ascribe all of the second order energy to the asymmetry term in the liquid drop formula (40); for $\overline{C_{200}^V}$:

$$\delta\epsilon_2^N = a_{Asymmetry} \left(\frac{Z - N}{Z + N} \right)^2 \rho_+ = a_{Asymmetry} \frac{\delta\rho_-^2}{\rho_+} \quad (\text{D.47})$$

where $a_{Asymmetry}$ is fit to SEMF observation. In the second approach, we calibrate directly to the binding energies of isotopes, possibly using the liquid drop formula to correct for effects that we have ignored in this paper such as the Coulomb and surface terms. Both approaches give comparable results. Figure 4 shows the behaviour of $\overline{C_{200}^V}$ for different values of k_F .

Appendix E Pionless EFT and 2-nucleon systems

Pionless EFT (\not{EFT}) and Static χNL are compatible and complementary nuclear theories. We regard \not{EFT} as providing important corrections to our work

here, but only for momenta $\leq \Lambda_{\#}^A < m_\pi$. Momenta less than $\sim 6^{1/3} k_F^{NuclearMatter} \simeq 500 MeV \gg k_F^{NuclearMatter} \simeq 280 MeV$ belong to Static χ NLs.

The non-relativistic effective \not{EFT} Lagrangian, including LO and NLO [155] for primary orbital angular momentum $L = 0$, and spin-isospin states $s = {}^1S_0$ and ${}^3S_1 - {}^3D_1$, is obtained²⁰ by eliminating all terms dependent on pions:

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{Fleming}^{NLO\not{EFT}} &= L_{\chi Symmetric} + L_{\chi Breaking} \\
L_{\chi Symmetric} &= L_{\chi Symmetric}^{2-N} + L_{\chi Symmetric}^{4-N} \\
L_{\chi Symmetric}^{2-N} &= N^\dagger \left(i\partial_0 + \frac{\vec{\partial}^2}{2M_N} + \dots \right) N \\
L_{\chi Symmetric}^{4-N} &= -\frac{1}{2} C_0^{(s)} \mathcal{O}_0^{(s)} + \frac{1}{16} C_2^{(s)} \mathcal{O}_2^{(s)} - \frac{1}{2} C_2^{(SD)} \mathcal{O}_2^{(SD)} \\
L_{\chi Breaking} &= L_{\chi Breaking}^{4-N} \\
L_{\chi Breaking}^{4-N} &= -\frac{1}{2} D_2^{(s)} m_\pi^2 \mathcal{O}_0^{(s)} + \frac{1}{16} E_4^{(s)} m_\pi^2 \mathcal{O}_2^{(s)}
\end{aligned} \tag{E.1}$$

with 4-nucleon operators with spin-isospin projection operators

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}_0^{(s)} &= (N^T \vec{P}^{(s)} N)^\dagger \cdot (N^T \vec{P}^{(s)} N) \\
\mathcal{O}_2^{(s)} &= (N^T \vec{P}^{(s)} N)^\dagger \cdot (N^T \vec{P}^{(s)} \overleftrightarrow{\nabla}^2 N) + h.c. \\
\mathcal{O}_2^{(SD)} &= (N^T \vec{P}^{(3S_1)} N)^\dagger \cdot (N^T \vec{P}^{(3D_1)} N) + h.c. \\
\vec{P}^{(3S_1)} &= \frac{\vec{P}_\sigma P_\tau}{2\sqrt{2}}; \quad \vec{P}^{(1S_0)} = \frac{P_\sigma \vec{P}_\tau}{2\sqrt{2}} \\
P_\sigma &= i\sigma_2; \quad \vec{P}_\tau = i\tau_2 \vec{\tau}; \quad P_\tau = i\tau_2; \quad \vec{P}_\sigma = i\sigma_2 \vec{\sigma}; \\
\vec{P}_i^{(3D_1)} &= \frac{n}{4\sqrt{n-1}} \left(\overleftrightarrow{\nabla}_i \overleftrightarrow{\nabla}_j - \frac{\delta_{ij}}{n} \overleftrightarrow{\nabla}^2 \right) \vec{P}_j^{(3S_1)}
\end{aligned} \tag{E.2}$$

with nucleon doublet N with degenerate mass M_N , $\overleftrightarrow{\nabla} = \overleftarrow{\nabla} - \overrightarrow{\nabla}$, spin $\vec{s} = \frac{1}{2} \vec{\sigma}$, isospin $\vec{t} = \frac{1}{2} \vec{\tau}$ and $d = n+1$ space-time dimensions in dimensional regularization. After renormalization and softening of singular potentials in nuclei, all these \not{EFT} coefficients are to be determined by experiment. E_4 is not independent, but is determined entirely in terms of lower-order couplings after renormalization and softening of $\mathcal{O}_2^{(s)}$.

We are interested in estimating the magnitude of the corrections (E.1) make to our Static χ NL picture of heavy even-even nuclei because they are both made entirely of nucleons²¹ and their domains of applicability overlap,

$$\Lambda_{\#}^A < m_\pi \ll \Lambda_{Static\chi NL}^A = \Lambda_{\chi SB} \sim 1 GeV. \tag{E.3}$$

²⁰ In order to connect to the notation of [156], Fleming *et al.*'s [157] $L_{\chi Symmetric}^{4-N}$ and $L_{\chi Breaking}^{4-N}$ have been multiplied by $\frac{1}{2}$.

²¹ Inclusion of pions, having survived at LO and NLO, is in trouble at NNLO (Next-to-Next-to-Lowest-Order) [155, 157–159] and the subject of intense research. $\mathcal{O}(Q^2/M_{NN}^2)$ is, to

E.1 Lessons from Positronium for EFT

In this section of the appendix, we discuss a number of lessons that one learns from the study of positronium in bound-state QED: renormalization at Coulomb-ladder bound-state poles is gauge-dependent and usually non-causal; gauge-independent retarded Liénard-Wiechert potentials restore causality; there is a huge hadronic (dispersion-relation) contribution to renormalized running of $\alpha_{QED}(q^2)$; powerful unitarity cancellations occur, especially at resonance peaks; running $\alpha_{QED}(q^2)$ across a bound-state or resonance pole is tricky. It is crucial to these lessons that QED is a unitary and renormalizable theory. The analogies of these all go wrong in Nuclear EFT's, which are only pseudo-renormalizable and non-unitary.

Minimal content QED (electrons and photons) is properly renormalizable and unitary. After a one-time renormalization of the electron mass m_e and electromagnetic coupling α_{QED} , QED scattering and bound-state processes are unitary and UV (and IR) finite.

The construction of the bound states of positronium follows section 125 of [162]. In the low energy Coulomb gauge S-matrix element $e^-e^+ \rightarrow e^-e^+$ with initial-state momenta $p^- = (p_0^-, \vec{p})$, $p^+ = (p_0^+, -\vec{p})$ respectively, the tree-level 1-photon-rung 'ladder' diagram $\sim (m_e^2 \alpha_{QED})^{-1}$. The 1-loop 2-photon-rung ladder diagram can be non-perturbative in α_{QED} , because the contribution of a certain region of d^4q loop-integration, $|\vec{q}| \sim m_e \alpha_{QED}$ and $|q_0 - m_e| \sim m_e \alpha_{QED}^2$, forces the fermion propagators to almost overlap,

$$S_{e^-}(q) \approx \frac{1}{2}(1 + \gamma^0) \left[q_0 - m_e - \frac{\vec{q}^2}{2m_e} + i0^+ \right]^{-1} \quad (\text{E.4})$$

$$S_{e^+}(q - p^+ - p^-) \approx \frac{1}{2}(-1 + \gamma^0) \left[q_0 - p_0^+ - p_0^- + m_e + \frac{\vec{q}^2}{2m_e} - i0^+ \right]^{-1}$$

and naive finite power-counting in α_{QED} breaks down. The 2-Coulomb-photon-rung ladder diagram is of same order as the 1-Coulomb-photon-rung ladder

quote Hammer, Konig and van Kolck [156],

"... a crucial test of this (the KSW [160] perturbative pion) expansion, since it is the first manifestation of iterated OPE (One-Pion-Exchange). It was demonstrated by Fleming *et al.* [157,158] that, while the expansion works well at small momenta in the low spin-triplet partial waves where the OPE tensor force is attractive, it fails for momenta $Q \sim 100 \text{ MeV}$ the breakdown of perturbative pions is consistent with an expansion in Q/M_{NN} , where $M_{NN} \sim f_\pi \dots$. In the real world, this version of Chiral EFT does not seem to work much beyond the validity of \not{EFT} ($\Lambda_\chi^A < m_\pi$)."

Worryingly, Birse [161] estimates that the tensor part of the ${}^3S_1 - {}^3D_1$ OPE must be treated non-perturbatively for $\Lambda_{\text{Partly Perturbative Pions}}^A > 66 \text{ MeV}$. In both perturbative and partly perturbative pions, the iterated OPE Yukawa potential introduces new linear and logarithmic singularities near the origin $r = 0$ in its Green's function [160]. Since Static χNL are composed entirely of nucleons, we have no need here to address the crucial open questions of power counting with pions and the softening of singular pion potentials. We also worry that (in analogy with positronium) inclusion of pions in 2-nucleon Nijmegen phase shifts must include nuclear causality and retardation effects at some accuracy.

diagram,

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(e^+e^- : 1 - \text{Rungladder}) &\sim \alpha_{QED} \frac{1}{(m_e \alpha_{QED})^2} \sim \frac{1}{m_e^2 \alpha_{QED}} \\ \Gamma(e^+e^- : 2 - \text{RungLadder}) &\sim \alpha_{QED}^2 \frac{(m_e \alpha_{QED})^3}{(m_e \alpha_{QED})^4} \frac{1}{m_e \alpha_{QED}^2} \sim \frac{1}{m_e^2 \alpha_{QED}}\end{aligned}\quad (\text{E.5})$$

and is therefore non-perturbative. This signals the existence of "...a pole in the exact amplitude of mutual scattering of 2 particles", i.e., a bound state [162]. Because QED is properly renormalizable and unitary, the 2-rung ladder is UV finite, and so are all higher-rung ladders. Re-summation of all such Coulomb ladder diagrams yields the 1-particle (Schroedinger) Bethe-Salpeter bound state equation [163]

$$\left[-\frac{\nabla^2}{m_e} - \frac{4\pi\alpha_{QED}}{r} - (E + 2m_e) \right] \Psi_{e^+e^-}(\vec{r}) = 0 \quad (\text{E.6})$$

For $E < 0$, bound-state positronium emerges with $E_n^{\text{Binding}} = -m_e \alpha_{QED}^2 / n^2$.²² $E > 0$ are Coulomb scattering states. Inclusion of imaginary parts in this picture gives positronium lifetime, photon emission decay rates, e^+e^- annihilation rates and complex Bhabha scattering.

This picture, built around super-non-relativistic E , has limited applicability for higher energies because (E.6) is gauge-dependent. Coulomb gauge leaves an artifact, a static Gauss's law: i.e. static instantaneous action at infinite distance, in violation of QED causality and retardation, carries the main force. Inclusion of QED transverse photons cancels Gauss's law exactly, and replaces it with gauge-independent retarded waves in a Liénard-Wiechert potential strictly obedient to causality.

How to calibrate the precise value of α_{QED} to experimental measurement? We could have chosen to renormalize it to the non-perturbative ground state of positronium $[e^+e^-]$, i.e. $\alpha_{QED} \left([e^+e^-]_{\text{State}}^{\text{Ground}} \right)$. But running that up to Thomson scattering at $\alpha_{QED}(q^2 = 0)$ at high precision is non-trivial, and requires, among other complications, integrating over all non-perturbative $[e^+e^-]$ excited states and their decays and annihilations. To see how running α_{QED} across those excited $[e^+e^-]$ bound-states must work, it is simplest, for pedagogical clarity, to remind the reader of an analogous problem: how running Standard $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ Model coupling "constants" across the Z -pole peak is properly treated for high-accuracy LEP1/SLC physics.

Neglect initial-state and final-state QED radiation, and study s-channel $e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$. We suppress QCD for pedagogical simplicity. Suppressing photon exchange and neglecting various other smaller corrections, the dominant "oblique" vector-particle self-energy corrections [152, 166, 167] near the Z peak

²² Higher order corrections to $\delta E^{\text{Binding}}$ are confirmed experimentally to $\mathcal{O}(m_e \alpha_{QED}^2 \bullet \alpha_{QED}^5 \ln(\alpha_{QED}))$ accuracy, with similar theoretical accuracies in positronium decay and annihilation rates [164], [165]

are embedded in an effective neutral-current matrix element

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_{NC} &\simeq \frac{e_*^2}{s_*^2 c_*^2} \frac{(I_3 - s_*^2 Q)(I'_3 - s_*^2 Q')}{\left(s - \frac{e_*^2}{s_*^2 c_*^2} \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}G_{\mu^*}\rho_*} + i\sqrt{s}\Gamma_* \right)} \\
M_Z^2 &= \left[\frac{e_*^2}{s_*^2 c_*^2} \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}G_{\mu^*}\rho_*} \right]_{s=M_Z^2} = 91.1876 \text{ GeV}; \\
\Gamma_* &= \frac{e_*^2}{s_*^2 c_*^2} \dots; \quad \Gamma_Z = [\Gamma_*]_{s=M_Z^2} \\
\alpha_{QED}(M_Z^2) &= \left[\frac{e_*^2}{4\pi} \right]_{s=M_Z^2}; \quad \alpha_{QED}(0) = \left[\frac{e_*^2}{4\pi} \right]_{s=0} = \frac{1}{137.036\dots}; \\
G_{\mu^*}(0) &= G_\mu = 1.1663787 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2} \\
\rho_*(0) &\sim \frac{3}{16\pi c_*^2} \left(\frac{m_{top}^2}{s_*^2 M_Z^2} - \frac{m_{Higgs}^2}{M_Z^2} \right) \tag{E.7}
\end{aligned}$$

with $e_*^2, s_*^2, G_{\mu^*}, \rho_*$ four Real running electro-weak (EW) couplings, and $c_* = \sqrt{1 - s_*^2} \equiv \cos \theta_*$ the cosine of the EW mixing angle. (I_3, Q) are e^- quantum numbers, while (I'_3, Q') are μ^- quantum numbers. Because the SM is both renormalizable and unitary (i.e its Real and Imaginary parts satisfy the S-Matrix optical theorem $S^\dagger S = 1$):

- Powerful unitarity cancellations at the Z peak then force the cross section to contain only ratios of partial widths.

$$\sigma_{e^+e^- \rightarrow Z \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-} \sim \frac{\Gamma_{e^+e^- \rightarrow Z}}{\sum_k \Gamma_{Z \rightarrow k}} \frac{\Gamma_{Z \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-}}{\sum_k \Gamma_{Z \rightarrow k}} \tag{E.8}$$

with $\Gamma_Z = \sum_k \Gamma_{Z \rightarrow k}$ the total Z width to all channels k . The complicated overall quantity $\left[\frac{e_*^2}{s_*^2 c_*^2} \right]_{s=M_Z^2}$ has cancelled! (In abject contrast, unitarity is not a feature of low-energy EFTs: i.e. both Static $\chi N L$ s and \not{EFT} specifically exclude the necessary higher-energy Imaginary parts.)

- The complicated functions, $e_*^2(s), s_*^2(s), G_{\mu^*}(s)$ and $\rho_*(s)$, appearing in (E.7) are universal, i.e. the same for all neutral current SM physical processes. (In stark contrast, the EFT coefficients $\tilde{C}_0^{(s)}$ and $\tilde{C}_2^{(s)}$ are *not* related to each-other by renormalizability constraints.)
- For the invisible channels $k = \nu\bar{\nu}$ in (E.8), the Z line shape proved there are only 3 light neutrinos. Z -peak asymmetries confirmed the 1985 predictions of the top-quark [66] and Higgs' masses [66], [67] by later discovery of those particles, contributing to the 1999 and 2013 Nobel Prizes in physics.

Running α_{QED} over positronium resonant states in QED would be a directly analogous task, e.g. taking into account $[e^+e^-]$ para- and ortho-positronium

decays to 2 and 3 photons respectively. For simplicity and accuracy, positronium [e^+e^-] calculations are instead renormalized at, and calibrated to, Thomson scattering $\alpha_{QED}(q^2 = 0) \simeq (137.036)^{-1}$. Still, to run that Thomson scattering value up to $\alpha_{QED}(q^2 = M_Z^2) = (127.995 \pm 0.010)^{-1}$ on the Z-pole, with sufficient accuracy for LEP1/SLC calculations of $e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$, $e^+e^-_{Polarized} \rightarrow hadrons$ asymmetries, as well as s and t -channel Bhabha scattering, is a highly non-trivial task. Aside from perturbative delta-like $Z - \gamma$ mixing, non-RGE non-perturbative α_{QED} running included [168], [169], unitarity properties of the Z pole [152], and a huge non-perturbative contribution $\delta\alpha_{QED}^{Hadrons}(q^2 = M_Z^2) = 0.02764 \pm 0.00007$ from dispersion integrals over $e^+e^- \rightarrow hadrons$ data.

E.2 The deuteron and shallow resonance; 2-nucleon scattering Nijmegen phase shifts; pseudo-renormalization and no unitarity in EFTs

Unlike QED, $SU(2)\chi PT$ and \not{EFT} are neither renormalizable nor unitary, i.e. the imaginary parts of certain diagrams are *NOT* related exactly to the real parts of certain lower-order (in \hbar) diagrams, to all orders. Since they are regularization-scheme-dependent, control and softening of the singularities, in the $r \rightarrow 0$ UV limit, introduced by the effective $\delta^3(\vec{r})$ potential from the contact interaction, is replaced with the concept of an applicability cut-off $\Lambda_{\not{\pi}}^A$ as in (E.3), for energies above which the theory cannot be applied. \not{EFT} calculates physics at a scale M_{Low} , to better and better approximation based on power-counting in momenta Q , where the theory is no longer applicable well above M_{High} at $\Lambda_{\not{\pi}}^A$.

The large (i.e. much larger than $m_\pi^{-1} \simeq 1.4 fm$) non-perturbative 2-nucleon scattering lengths $a^{1S_0} \simeq -23.7 fm = -(7.09 MeV)^{-1}$ and $a^{3S_1} \simeq 5.4 fm = (31.1 MeV)^{-1}$ are resonance and bound deuteron states. To quote H.-W Hammer et.al. [156] "... a (perturbative) Taylor expansion of $T^{(s)}$ in k^2 , as in (E.9), will only converge up to the nearest pole in any direction in the complex plane. Thus, the presence of the NN bound states limits the range for a perturbative description of NN scattering [156]. (See also [170].)

These set the scale in a Taylor expansion of the on-shell scattering amplitude T in terms of momentum k^2 :

$$T^{(s)} = -\frac{4\pi}{M_N} \sum_l \frac{(2l+1)P_l(\cos\theta)}{k \cot \delta_l^{(s)}(k) - ik}$$

$$k^{2l+1} \cot \delta_l^{(s)}(k) = -\frac{1}{a_l^{(s)}} + \frac{r_l^{(s)}}{2} k^2 + \mathcal{O}(k^4) \quad (E.9)$$

where $P_l, \theta, E = \frac{k^2}{M_N}, \delta_l^{(s)}(k), a_l^{(s)}, r_l^{(s)}$ are Legendre polynomials, energy in the center-of-mass frame, scattering phase shift in the l -th partial wave, the corresponding scattering length and effective range, for $s = 1, 3, 1$, respectively.

We now focus on very low energy 2-nucleon scattering near the deuteron bound states. Pionless EFT uses Lowest-Order (LO), Next-to-Lowest-Order

(NLO) and Next-to-Next-to-Lowest-Order (NNLO) power-counting in momentum $Q < \Lambda_{\#}^A$. Then, for nucleon propagators $\sim m_N Q^2$ and reducible loop integrals $\sim (4\pi M_N)^{-1} Q^5$, the 2 nucleon propagators almost overlap

$$\begin{aligned} S_{Proton}(q) &\approx \frac{1}{2}(1+\gamma^0) \left[q_0 - M_N - \frac{\vec{q}^2}{2M_N} + i0^+ \right]^{-1} \\ S_{Neutron}(q - p^+ - p^0) &\approx \frac{1}{2}(1+\gamma^0) \left[q_0 - p_0^+ - p_0^0 + M_N + \frac{\vec{q}^2}{2M_N} - i0^+ \right]^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(1+\gamma^0) \left[q_0 - E - M_N + \frac{\vec{q}^2}{2M_N} - i0^+ \right]^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.10})$$

where $p^+ = (p_0^+, \vec{p})$, $p_0^+ = M_N + E/2$; $p^0 = (p_0^0, -\vec{p})$, $p_0^0 = M_N + E/2$ in the CM frame.

The crucial insight is that the poles of the nucleon propagators are on opposite sides of the real line and, for non-relativistic nucleons, quite close to each other

$$\begin{aligned} I(E) &\sim \int^{\Lambda_{\#}^A} \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4 i} S_{Proton}(q) S_{Neutron}(q - p^+ - p^0) \\ &= \int^{\Lambda_{\#}^A} \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \left(\frac{1+\gamma^0}{2} \right)_{Proton} \left(\frac{1+\gamma^0}{2} \right)_{Neutron} \left[-E + \frac{\vec{q}^2}{M_N} - i0^+ \right]^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.11})$$

in direct analogy with positronium. Because Pionless EFT (unlike positronium) is only pseudo-renormalizable and lacks unitarity, $I(E)$ is formally divergent. After integration over q_0 , with $E = \vec{k}^2/M_N$ with $|E| \ll \Lambda_{\#}^A$, $I(k)$, and \vec{k} the input scattering momentum, $I(k) \sim \Lambda_{\#}^A$. With regularization using a cut-off dependent function $f(x)$ [156].

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}(k, \Lambda_{\#}^A) &= M_N \int^{\Lambda_{\#}^A} \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{f\left(\frac{\vec{q}^2}{\Lambda_{\#}^{A,2}}\right)}{\vec{k}^2 - \vec{q}^2 + i0^+} \\ &= -\frac{M_N}{4\pi} \left[\theta_1 \Lambda_{\#}^A - \sqrt{-\vec{k}^2 - i0^+} + \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{\vec{k}^2 + i0^+}{\Lambda_{\#}^{A,2}}\right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.12})$$

where \mathcal{F} is a certain function with $\mathcal{F}(0) = 0$ and θ_1 is a dimensionless number. Both θ_1, \mathcal{F} are regularization-scheme-dependent: e.g. $\theta_1 = 2/\pi$ for a step function.

In order to soften the $\Lambda_{\#}^A \rightarrow \infty$ limit, Pionless EFT works with "pseudo-renormalized" couplings. We show for simplicity only C_0 . Pseudo-renormalization compatible with (E.12) would be [156]:

$$C_0^{(s)} \rightarrow \tilde{C}_0^{(s)} \left(1/a^{(s)}, \Lambda_{\#}^A \right) = \frac{4\pi}{M_N} \frac{1}{1/a^{(s)} - \theta_1 \Lambda_{\#}^A} \quad (\text{E.13})$$

In the resultant power-counting – i.e. nucleon propagators $\sim m_N Q^2$, reducible loop integrals $\sim (4\pi M_N)^{-1} Q^5$ – the 2-contact-interaction-rung ladder diagram then scales like the tree-level diagram $\times Q/M_{Low}$, the 3-contact-interaction-rung ladder diagram scales like the tree-level diagram $\times (Q/M_{Low})^2$, etc., in analogy with positronium. \tilde{C}_0, \tilde{I} must therefore be treated non-perturbatively. The resulting T-matrix (E.9) is then finite as $\Lambda_{\vec{k}}^A \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\begin{aligned}
T^{(s)}(k, \Lambda_{\vec{k}}^A) &= \tilde{C}_0^{(s)} + \tilde{C}_0^{(s)} \tilde{I} \tilde{C}_0^{(s)} + \tilde{C}_0^{(s)} \tilde{I} \tilde{C}_0^{(s)} \tilde{I} \tilde{C}_0^{(s)} + \tilde{C}_0^{(s)} \tilde{I} \tilde{C}_0^{(s)} \tilde{I} \tilde{C}_0^{(s)} \tilde{I} \tilde{C}_0^{(s)} + \dots \\
&= \left[\frac{1}{\tilde{C}_0} - \tilde{I} \right]^{-1} \\
&= \frac{4\pi}{M_N} \left[\frac{1}{a^{(s)}} - \sqrt{-\vec{k}^2 - i0^+} + \mathcal{F} \left(\frac{\vec{k}^2 + i0^+}{\Lambda_{\vec{k}}^{A,2}} \right) \right]^{-1}
\end{aligned} \tag{E.14}$$

Then $T^{1S_0}(0, \Lambda_{\vec{k}}^A) = \frac{4\pi}{M_N} a^{1S_0}$ for the shallow resonance and $T^{3S_1}(0, \Lambda_{\vec{k}}^A) = \frac{4\pi}{M_N} a^{3S_1}$ for the deuteron. Bound-state resonance and deuteron poles then appear at momenta $\vec{k}_{1S_0 Pole}^2, \vec{k}_{3S_1 Pole}^2$ respectively

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Resonance :} \quad & \sqrt{-\vec{k}_{1S_0 Pole}^2 - i0^+} - \mathcal{F} \left(\frac{\vec{k}_{1S_0 Pole}^2 + i0^+}{\Lambda_{\vec{k}}^{A,2}} \right) = \frac{1}{a^{1S_0}} \\
\text{Deuteron :} \quad & \sqrt{-\vec{k}_{3S_1 Pole}^2 - i0^+} - \mathcal{F} \left(\frac{\vec{k}_{3S_1 Pole}^2 + i0^+}{\Lambda_{\vec{k}}^{A,2}} \right) = \frac{1}{a^{3S_1}}
\end{aligned} \tag{E.15}$$

Eq. (E.15) confirms that the $1S_0$ channel of Pionless EFT is pseudo-renormalized at the resonance pole $k_{1S_0 Pole}$ on the negative $Im(k)$ axis in Figure 1, while its $3S_1$ channel is pseudo-renormalized at the bound-state pole $k_{3S_1 Pole}$ on the positive $Im(k)$ axis there.

Calculations in direct analogy with positronium yield the 1-particle (Schroedinger) Bethe-Salpeter [163] equation:

$$\left[-\frac{\nabla^2}{M_N} + \tilde{C}_0^{3S_1} \delta^3(\vec{r}) - E \right] \Psi_{NN}^{3S_1}(\vec{r}) = 0 \tag{E.16}$$

For $Re(E) < 0$ the bound-state deuteron emerges with $E^{Binding} = -2.22452$ MeV. $Re(E) \geq 0$ gives 2-nucleon scattering in the $3S_1$ channel properly compared to Nijmegen data. Similarly

$$\left[-\frac{\nabla^2}{M_N} + \tilde{C}_0^{1S_0} \delta^3(\vec{r}) - E \right] \Psi_{NN}^{1S_0}(\vec{r}) = 0 \tag{E.17}$$

contains the shallow resonance and 2-nucleon Nijmegen scattering in the $1S_0$ channel.

$\tilde{C}_0^{(s)}$ softens the singular $\delta^3(\vec{r})$ potential in (E.16), (E.17).

There are an infinite number of ways to regulate divergences, which results in regulator-scheme-dependence [160, 171] in this and other non-renormalizable effective field theories²³. Power Divergence Subtraction [160] advocates explicit subtraction of the poles in 3 dimensions in the \overline{MS} or dimensional regularization schemes, introducing a new adjustable scale μ and replacing $\theta_1 \Lambda_{\#}^{A,2} \rightarrow \mu$ above, with renormalization group μ to be chosen freely. Picking $\mu \sim Q$ makes power counting manifest with $\tilde{C}_0 \sim Q^{-1}$ and $\tilde{T} \sim Q$.

In section 5 we argue that the momentum-independent couplings in Pionless EFT are currently unrelated to those in Static χNL , and cannot be experimentally calibrated to each-other!

What about the correspondence between Pionless EFT momentum-dependent couplings in (E.1) and those of Static χNL in (28)? Can experimental measurement calibrate Static χNL to Pionless EFT contact interactions. We use the usual 4-nucleon contact-interaction Lorentz structure S, V, T, A, P naming convention in subscripts.

1. For $Z + N \leq 4$, Pionless EFT has no exchange terms analogous with $\frac{C_{200}^S}{C_{200}^V}$.
2. Let's try an imagined correspondence

$$\begin{aligned} C_2^{(s)} \mathcal{O}_2^{(s)} + E_4^{(s)} m_\pi^2 \mathcal{O}_2^{(s)} \\ \stackrel{?}{\leftrightarrow} C_{200}^S \left\{ \langle \overline{NN} \rangle \langle \overline{NN} \rangle - \langle N^\dagger N \rangle \langle N^\dagger N \rangle \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.18})$$

2a) But Pionless EFT coupling constants capture the spin structure of the deuteron and therefore contain tensor interactions $C_{2,T}, E_{4,T}$ which are absent in spin-independent Static χNL .

2b) Further, spontaneously broken Static χNL cannot contain operators proportional to $m_\pi^2 E_4^{1S_0}$ or $m_\pi^2 E_4^{3S_1}$, which must instead arise from explicit $SU(2)_{L-R}$ breaking.

3. Pionless EFT couplings $\tilde{C}_2^{(s)}, \tilde{E}_4^{(s)}$ are pseudo-renormalized at the bound-state poles $k_{(s)Pole}$ corresponding to the anomalously large scattering lengths $a^{(s)}$, while the couplings in Static χNL are instead pseudo-renormalized (to all analytic loops) at $\Lambda_{\chi SB}$ within naive dimensional power counting.
4. In consequence, while Pionless EFT is not a valid self-consistent theory for $Q \gg \Lambda_{\#}^A$, Static χNL (after truncation) is valid and self-consistent up to about $6 \times$ nuclear density, or for momenta $0 \leq k \lesssim 6^{1/3} k_F$ with $6^{1/3} k_F \simeq 500 \text{ MeV} \gg \Lambda_{\#}^A$, i.e. momentum-dependent couplings in Pionless EFT and Static χNL are pseudo-renormalized at different momenta in completely different ways!

²³ Renormalization of the $SU(3)_C \times SU(3)_L \times U(1)_Y$ Standard Model is regulator-scheme-independent because it is renormalizable and unitary.

5. The softening of the static singular $\delta^3(\vec{r})$ potential in Pionless EFT requires that its couplings be cut-off dependent at scale $\simeq \Lambda_{\#}^A < m_{\pi}$ [78]: $\widetilde{C}_2^{1S_0}(a^{1S_0}, \Lambda_{\#}^A)$ and $\widetilde{C}_2^{3S_1}(a^{3S_1}, \Lambda_{\#}^A)$ are then regularization-scheme-dependent. There is no singular potential and no regularization-scheme-dependence in *Static χ NL*.
6. Even if we imagined a possible one-to-one correspondence, say

$$\widetilde{C}_2^{(s)} \mathcal{O}_2^{(s)} \stackrel{?}{\leftrightarrow} C_{200}^S \left\{ \langle \overline{N}N \rangle \langle \overline{N}N \rangle - \langle N^{\dagger}N \rangle \langle N^{\dagger}N \rangle \right\} \quad (\text{E.19})$$

we need to run $\widetilde{C}_2^{(s)}$ from $\Lambda_{\#}^A < m_{\pi}$ all the way up to near $\Lambda_{\chi SB}$. In direct analogy with running $\alpha_{QED}(q^2 = 0)$ up to $\alpha_{QED}(q^2 = M_Z^2)$ at LEP1/SLC discussed in Appendix E.1, a complicated strong-interaction dispersion relation capturing *all* appropriate $m_{\pi} \leq \text{HadronPhysics} \leq \Lambda_{\chi SB} \sim 1\text{GeV}$ is necessary: i.e. it must incorporate, among other things, ≤ 4 real pions, and the real and virtual effects of $\gamma s, \pi s, \sigma, \omega_{\mu}, \vec{\rho}_{\mu}, \vec{\delta}$, etc. We are unaware of the construction of such running in the current literature so, in practice, no correspondence like (E.19) can be currently calibrated.

It follows that the momentum-dependent couplings in Pionless EFT are currently unrelated to those in *Static χ NL*; they cannot currently be experimentally calibrated to one another.

Since both momentum-independent and momentum-dependent couplings and operators in Pionless EFT, such as (56) or (E.19), cannot be calibrated to those of *Static χ NL*, those nuclear theories are compatible and complementary to each other. We regard Pionless EFT as providing important corrections to our work here, but only for momenta $\leq \Lambda_{\#}^A < m_{\pi}$. Momenta less than $\sim 6^{1/3} k_F^{\text{NuclearMatter}} \simeq 500\text{MeV} \gg k_F^{\text{NuclearMatter}} \simeq 280\text{MeV}$ belong to *Static χ NLs*.