

# Supercurrent Flow in $NJL_{2+1}$ at High Baryon Density

Simon Hands and Avtar Singh Sehra

Department of Physics, University of Wales Swansea,  
Singleton Park, Swansea SA2 8PP, U.K.

**Abstract:** We present results of numerical simulations of the  $2+1d$  Nambu–Jona-Lasinio model with non-zero baryon chemical potential and spatially-varying complex diquark source strength  $j$ . By choosing  $\arg(j)$  to vary smoothly through  $2\pi$  across the spatial extent of the lattice, a baryon number current is induced which in the high density phase remains non-vanishing as  $j \rightarrow 0$ ; we are hence able to extract a quantity characteristic of a superfluid known as the helicity modulus. We also study supercurrent flow at non-zero temperature and estimate the critical temperature at which the normal phase is restored, which is consistent with the conventional picture for thin- $^3$ He superfluids in which the transition is viewed in terms of vortex–anti-vortex unbinding.

## 1 Introduction

There are unfortunately rather few quantum field theories amenable to study using lattice Monte Carlo techniques in the presence of a non-zero chemical potential, or more specifically with  $\mu = T = 1$ . Many important theories, including QCD, cannot be studied because their path integral measure with  $\mu \neq 0$  is not real on analytic continuation to Euclidean metric, making Monte Carlo importance sampling inoperative. Of those with positive definite measure, the Nambu–Jona-Lasinio (NJL) model with  $N_f = 2$  quark flavors [1] is one of the most interesting. At  $\mu = 0$  the theory exhibits dynamical chiral symmetry breaking, with the generation of a constituent quark mass scale much larger than the bare mass  $m$ . For  $\mu > \mu_c$ , chiral symmetry is restored, and the ground state is a degenerate fermi system with  $\mu = E_F = k_F$  [2]. In  $d+1$  dimensions the baryon density in this case is  $n_B = 4N_f \mu^d / (2\pi)^d = (4/\pi^d) \mu^d$ .

The precise nature of the ground state at high density depends on  $d$ . For the realistic case  $d = 3$ , lattice simulations suggest that condensation of diquark pairs at the Fermi surface takes place leading to spontaneous breakdown of the  $U(1)_B$  baryon number symmetry [3]. An energy gap  $\Delta > 0$  to excite fermionic quasiparticles develops; for phenomenologically-motivated lattice parameters the simulations predict  $\Delta = 0.15$ , in good agreement with self-consistent model calculations of the gap in superconducting quark matter [4]. In this case the NJL model appears to behave as an orthodox BCS superfluid; there is long-range ordering of the ground state signalled by the non-vanishing

condensate  $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle \neq 0$ , and a dynamically-generated mass scale  $\Lambda$ . Since a  $U(1)_B$  symmetry has been spontaneously broken, there is a massless scalar qq bound state in the spectrum, which is associated with long-range interactions between vortex excitations in the superfluid, and with a collective propagating mode for  $T > 0$  known as second sound.

However, both for obvious numerical convenience, and for a more formal reason, namely the existence of an interacting continuum limit, lattice simulations were first applied to the NJL model with  $\mu = 0$  in 2+1 dimensions [5, 6, 7]. In this case the physics appears radically different. Whilst there is evidence for long-range coherence of diquark correlation functions [5], there is no long-range order, and apparently no gap. Rather, the condensate vanishes non-analytically with the diquark source strength,  $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle / j$ , with  $0 < \nu < 1$  [6]. The results were interpreted in terms of a critical phase for all  $T > T_c$ , in which the diquark correlator decays algebraically,  $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi(0)\bar{\psi}\psi(r) \rangle \sim 1/r$  [7]. Since all simulations are performed on finite systems, and therefore necessarily at  $T > 0$ , the absence of long-range order is consistent with the Coleman-Mermin-Wagner theorem for 2d systems [8]. The situation is analogous to the low- $T$  phase of the 2d X-Y model, one of whose physical applications is the description of superfluidity in thin films [9].

The defining property of a superfluid is that the flux density of conserved charge, or supercurrent  $\mathcal{J}$ , is related to the spatial variation of the phase angle  $\theta$  of the  $U(1)$ -valued order parameter field (in this case  $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$ ) via

$$\mathcal{J} = \frac{\hbar}{M} \nabla \theta \quad (1)$$

The constant of proportionality  $\hbar/M$  is known as the helicity modulus. For a textbook non-relativistic superfluid such as  $^4\text{He}$  it is given by

$$\frac{\hbar}{M} = \frac{\hbar^2}{M} n_s \quad (2)$$

where  $M$  is the mass of the helium atom and  $n_s$  is a parameter called the superfluid density, which need not coincide with the charge density of the condensate. For a relativistic system  $\hbar/M$  is best thought of as a phenomenological parameter in its own right, rather like  $f^2$  in  $(d+1)$ -dimensional chiral model [10]. One way of understanding superfluidity in the absence of long-range order in a 2d system is to observe that the only way to change the quantised circulation  $\oint \mathcal{J} \cdot d\mathbf{l}$  around one direction of a finite torus is to excite a vortex-anti-vortex pair, and transport one member of the pair around the other direction of the torus before re-annihilation. The energy required to do this scales as  $\ln L$  where  $L$  is the size of the system [9]: hence in the thermodynamic limit circulation patterns are topologically stable.

This Letter will present further support for this scenario in  $\text{NJL}_{2+1}$  by extracting  $\mathcal{J}$  via a calculation of the induced baryon number current  $\mathcal{J} = \hbar \nabla \theta$  in response to a spatially varying diquark source. As well as providing direct verification of superfluid behaviour in a fermionic model, we will also study the behaviour of  $\mathcal{J}$  as temperature  $T$  is increased, and find the transition to "normal" behaviour at a critical  $T_c$  consistent with analytic expectations.

## 2 Method

The lattice NJL model studied is identical to that of [5, 7]:

$$S_{\text{NJL}} = \sum_x \bar{\psi}_x M [\psi]_{xy} \psi_y + j \sum_x \text{tr} \psi_x^\dagger \psi_x + \left| \sum_x \text{tr} \psi_x^\dagger \psi_x \right|^2 + \frac{1}{g^2} \sum_x \text{tr} \tilde{\psi}_x^\dagger \tilde{\psi}_x; \quad (3)$$

where  $\psi, \tilde{\psi}$  are isodoublet staggered lattice fermion fields,  $\tilde{\psi} = (1 + i\gamma_5)\psi$  is an auxiliary bosonic field defined on the dual lattice sites  $x$ , and the matrix  $M$  is

$$M_{xy}^{pq} = \sum_{\mu=0,1,2} \frac{1}{2} \left[ e^{i\mu \cdot (x-y)} \gamma_\mu^{pq} + e^{-i\mu \cdot (x-y)} \gamma_\mu^{pq} \right] + \sum_{\langle x;x \rangle} m^{pq} + \frac{1}{8} \sum_{\langle x;x \rangle} \left[ \tilde{\psi}_x^{pq} + i \tilde{\psi}_x^\dagger \tilde{\psi}_x^{pq} \right]; \quad (4)$$

Here  $\langle x;x \rangle$  denotes the set of 8 dual sites  $x$  surrounding  $x$ ,  $\gamma_\mu = (1\gamma_\mu)^{\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2}$  is the Kawamoto-Smit phase required for a Lorentz covariant continuum limit, and  $\tilde{\psi}_x = (1\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2)$ . A full description of the symmetries of (3) and the numerical simulation method is given in [7]. The only novelty in the current study is that the diquark source strengths  $j, \left| \right|$  are now specified to be spatially varying, or "twisted":

$$j = j_0 \exp(i \cdot x); \quad \left| \right| = j_0 \exp(-i \cdot x) \quad (5)$$

with  $j_0$  a real constant. To ensure homogeneity and single-valuedness on an  $L_s^2 \times L_t$  lattice we demand

$$\frac{2}{L_s} (n_1 x_1 + n_2 x_2) \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \tilde{r} = \frac{2}{L_s} (n_1; n_2); \quad (6)$$

A constant supercurrent of the form (1) is therefore specified by a pair of integers  $(n_1; n_2)$ . It remains to define the conserved baryon number current  $J$ :

$$J_x = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left[ \psi_x^\dagger \psi_{x+\hat{x}} + \psi_x^\dagger \psi_{x-\hat{x}} \right]; \quad (7)$$

The timelike component of (7) is none other than the baryon charge density  $n_B$  reported in [5, 7]. Here we shall use the same stochastic technique to estimate the quantum expectation value of the spacelike components  $\tilde{J}(j; \tilde{r}) = (L_s^2 L_t)^{-1} \sum_x \tilde{J}_x(j; \tilde{r})$  to demonstrate behaviour of the form (1). The strategy will be to compute  $\tilde{J}$  for fixed  $(n_1; n_2)$  for a range of  $j_0$  and extrapolate  $j_0 \rightarrow 0$ . Behaviour consistent with (1) in this limit is deemed to be superfluid.

We used the same simulation parameters as [5, 7], namely  $g^2 = 2.0a$ ,  $ma = 0.01$ , which at  $\beta = 0$  yields a dynamically-generated constituent mass, which in effect sets the scale, of  $a = 0.71$ . As  $\beta$  is raised, there is a sharp transition from a chirally broken vacuum with  $\langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle \neq 0$ ,  $n_B \neq 0$  to a chirally restored phase with  $n_B = 0$  at  $\beta_c \approx 0.65$ . Studies of the fermion dispersion relation in the phase  $\beta > \beta_c$  are consistent with a sharp Fermi surface with  $k_F \neq 0$  and vanishing gap  $\Delta \rightarrow 0$  [6, 7].

### 3 Results

#### 3.1 $T = 0$




Figure 1:  $J_2$  vs.  $j_0$  on a  $16^2 \times L_t$  lattice for two different values of  $\mu$ .

In Fig. 1 we plot  $J_2$  (strictly its imaginary part) as a function of  $j_0$  for lattices of various temporal extent  $L_t$  at two representative values of  $\mu$ :  $\mu = 0.2$  lies in the chirally-broken low density phase, and  $\mu = 0.8$  in the high density phase, where  $n_B a^2 \approx 0.25$  [7]. In all the plots shown here we have chosen  $(n_1; n_2) = (0; 1)$  to minimise lattice artifacts, and from now on we set the lattice spacing  $a = 1$ .

The contrast between the two phases is quite dramatic. For  $\mu = 0.2$   $J_2$  appears to vary approximately quadratically with  $j_0$ , and extrapolate to zero as  $j_0 \rightarrow 0$ . There is no significant effect as  $L_t \rightarrow \infty$ , or alternatively as  $T \rightarrow 0$ . At  $\mu = 0.8$  the small- $j_0$  behaviour depends very sensitively on  $L_t$ ; as  $T \rightarrow 0$  the data accumulate on a straight line which clearly extrapolates to a non-zero value as  $j_0 \rightarrow 0$ .

This behaviour is readily explained by writing the order parameter (diquark) field as  $\psi = \psi_0 e^{i\theta}$ , with  $\psi_0$  approximately constant. A natural effective Hamiltonian for long wavelength order parameter fluctuations at low temperature is then

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{2} (\dot{\theta})^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \theta)^2 \quad (8)$$

The corresponding Noether current is  $\mathcal{J} = \frac{1}{2} [ \dot{\theta} \nabla \theta ]$ . For  $\mu < \mu_c$ ,

it is natural to postulate  $J_2(j_0)$  proportional to  $j_0$ , leading to  $J_2(j_0) / j_0^2$ . For  $\mu > \mu_c$ , if we assume that  $\lim_{j_0 \rightarrow 0} J_2(j_0) \neq 0$  we recover (1) with  $\mu = \frac{2}{3}$ .




Figure 2:  $J_2$  vs.  $j_0$  on a  $16^2 \times 64$  lattice for various  $\mu$ .

With confidence that  $L_t = 64$  suffices to determine the phase, in Fig. 2 we plot  $J_2(j_0)$  for various  $\mu$ . There is a sharp change between values of  $\mu = 0.65$ , which display the low density quasi-quadratic behaviour and smoothly extrapolate to zero as  $j_0 \rightarrow 0$ , and  $\mu = 0.68$  which show a negative curvature characteristic of the high density phase. We thus determine the critical chemical potential for the onset of superfluidity  $0.65 < \mu_c < 0.68$ , in good agreement with the critical value for chiral symmetry restoration. Since as yet we have no systematic method of extrapolating to  $j_0 \rightarrow 0$  for  $\mu > \mu_c$  to obtain an estimate for  $J_2(0)$  as an "order parameter", we can make no decisive statement about the nature of the transition, but note that the behaviour of  $J_2(j_0)$  varies much more sharply across the transition than the diquark condensate  $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle(j)$ , either in this model (Cf. Figure 2 of [7]), or even in  $NJL_{3+1}$  (Cf. Figure 4 of [3]). This matches the sharp drop in the chiral order parameter  $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$  and corresponding rise in  $n_B$  at  $\mu = \mu_c$  [5, 7], and is consistent with the analytic prediction of a strong first order transition in the large- $N_f$  limit [11].

From now on we work exclusively at  $\mu = 0.8$  in an attempt to understand the superfluid phase further. In Fig. 3 we plot  $\mu = J_2 L_s = 2$  versus  $j_0$  on  $L_s^2 \times 64$  lattices. Just as for the  $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle(j)$  data [7], it turns out that the data are well-fitted by  $(j_0) = A + B/L_s$ , resulting in the  $L_s \rightarrow \infty$  extrapolation shown in the plot. Recall that as well as genuine finite-size effects in this case there may also be some discretisation artifacts, since as  $L_s$  increases the gradient operator in (6) becomes better-approximated by the finite




Figure 3:  $Y$  vs.  $j_0$  on a  $L_s^2 = 64$  lattice for  $a = 0.8$ .

difference. Finally the  $(j_0)$  data in the thermodynamic limit are extrapolated to  $j_0 \rightarrow 0$  with a remarkably simple linear fit, resulting in  $Y = 0.1413(14)$ . We thus quote a result for the helicity modulus of  $Y = 0.200(2)$  at  $a = 0.8$ .

It is interesting to pause and ask what value might be expected for  $Y$  in a conventional symmetry-breaking scenario. Let us define diquark operators  $qq = \frac{1}{2}(\text{tr}_2 \text{tr}_2^T)$  and source strengths  $j = j_+ |$ , so that the diquark terms in the action (3) read  $j_+ qq + j_- qq$ . In the limit  $j_- = 0$  the equation of motion for the current is then

$$J = 2j_+ qq : \quad (9)$$

In the same limit the  $U(1)_B$ -equivalent of the axial Ward identity reads

$$\langle qq_+ \rangle = j_+ \int_x \langle qq(0)qq(x) \rangle = \frac{j_+}{M^2} \langle 0 | j_+ j_- | 0 \rangle : \quad (10)$$

where the second equality assumes that the correlation function is dominated by a pseudo-Goldstone pole of the form  $(k^2 + M^2)^{-1}$ , and  $j_- |$  denotes a one-Goldstone state. We now introduce the  $U(1)_B$ -equivalent form of the PCAC hypothesis:

$$\langle 0 | j_- J j_+ | 0 \rangle = P M^2 = 2j_+ \langle 0 | j_+ j_- | 0 \rangle \quad (11)$$

where we have used the relation  $f^2 = P$  derived in [10], and the second equality follows from (9). Combining (10) and (11) leads to the equivalent of the "Gell-Mann-Oakes-Renner" relation:

$$M^2 = 8j_+ \langle qq_+ \rangle : \quad (12)$$

This can be compared with numerical data for  $h_{q_i}(j)$  and  $M_{\text{GMOR}}(j)$  in [7]. At  $j = 0.3$ ,  $M_{\text{GMOR}} = 0.95$ ,  $h_{q_i} = 0.72$  yielding  $\beta_{\text{GMOR}} = 1.9$ ; at  $j = 0.1$ ,  $M_{\text{GMOR}} = 0.4$ ,  $h_{q_i} = 0.52$  yielding  $\beta_{\text{GMOR}} = 2.6$ . We conclude  $\beta_{\text{GMOR}}$ , consistent with our hypothesis that no symmetry breaking occurs, but that the dynamics are dominated by long-range phase fluctuations of the order parameter field, described by a strongly-interacting scalar diquark field rather than a weakly-interacting Goldstone mode.

### 3.2 $T > 0$

In this section for the first time we explore the superfluid phase at non-zero temperature. We expect a restoration to the normal phase at some critical  $T_c$ . In a comparable numerical study of  $NJL_{3+1}$  which exhibits superfluidity via orthodox symmetry breaking [3], the value of  $T_c$  could be estimated from the zero temperature gap via the BCS prediction  $\beta T_c = 1.76$ . Since this implied that  $L_t$  had to exceed 35a for the system to be superfluid, an unambiguous extrapolation  $j \rightarrow 0$  to permit a systematic study of  $T > 0$  was not possible. In the current case we shall see that although the  $j \rightarrow 0$  extrapolation still remains a problem, attaining  $T < T_c$  is well within reach of the simulation.

First let us review a heuristic argument for the expected value of  $T_c$ , starting from the Hamiltonian  $H_{\text{eff}}$  (8) with  $\beta_0 = 9$ . The phase field  $\varphi(\mathbf{x})$  may be disrupted by topologically non-trivial vortex excitations of the form  $\varphi = q\theta$ , for  $j = q/r$ , where  $q$  is integer and  $\theta$  is written  $(r; \theta)$ . The energy of a single vortex is thus

$$E = \frac{1}{2} \int_a^{L_s} 2\pi r dr \frac{q^2}{r^2} = q^2 \ln \frac{L_s}{a} : \quad (13)$$

Since a vortex can be located on any of  $L_s^2$  lattice sites, the entropy

$$S = 2 \ln \frac{L_s}{a} : \quad (14)$$

The free energy  $F = E - TS$  thus changes sign for  $q = 1$  vortices at a critical temperature

$$T_c = \frac{1}{2} : \quad (15)$$

The interpretation is that a phase transition separates a low- $T$  superfluid phase in which vortices are confined to bound dipole pairs, and a high- $T$  normal phase in which the vortex-anti-vortex plasma screens the long-range interactions responsible for the divergent energy in (13). The relation (15) remains valid in a more sophisticated renormalisation group treatment, except that  $a$  is now  $T$ -dependent and should be replaced by its value  $(T_c)$  exactly at the transition [12].

Combining our result for  $\beta$  with (15) yields an estimate  $L_t = 4.5$  for the temporal lattice extent where a transition to the normal phase might be expected at  $\beta = 0.8$ . Fig. 4 shows  $J_2(j_0)$  on  $32^2 \times L_t$  lattices with  $L_t$  ranging from 64 all the way down to 2. At the extremes  $L_t = 32, L_t = 4$  the data are reminiscent of those characterising respectively the




Figure 4:  $J_2$  vs.  $j_0$  on a  $32^2$   $L_t$  lattice at  $\beta = 0.8$  for various  $L_t$ .

high and low baryon density phases in Fig. 1. For intermediate temperatures, however,  $J_2(j_0)$  shows positive curvature near the origin followed by negative curvature at larger  $j_0$ , and once again means of extrapolating  $j_0 \rightarrow 0$  to determine whether superfluidity




Figure 5:  $J_2$  vs.  $L_t$  on a  $32^2$   $L_t$  lattice at  $\beta = 0.8$  for fixed  $j_0 = 0.025$ .



persists is unclear.

In Fig. 5 we try a different tactic, plotting  $J_2$  for every even  $L_t \in [2; 64]$  for fixed  $j_0 = 0.025$ . A linear fit  $J_0 = a_0 L_t + a_1$  through data with  $L_t \leq 42$  seems quite reasonable, yielding  $a_0 = 0.00212(25)$ ,  $a_1 = -0.01537(9)$ . If we identify the intercept on the  $L_t$ -axis with the transition, we deduce  $L_{tc} = 7.25(95)$  and hence  $\beta T_c = 1.02(13)$ , to be compared with the theoretical value 0.637 from (15).

## 4 Summary

In this short study of the response of the system to a twisted diquark source forcing a baryon number current, we have provided direct evidence for the superfluid nature of the ground state of  $NJL_{2+1}$  at high baryon density, and quantified it at one representative value of  $\mu$  via the helicity modulus. It should be stressed that the "physical" value  $\mu = \mu' / 0.2$  quoted is still to be extrapolated to the continuum limit. It is probably more important to note that the numerical value of  $\mu$  is an order of magnitude smaller than might be expected in an orthodox symmetry breaking scenario, and is consistent with the non-Goldstone, strongly self-interacting nature of the scalar diquark excitations above the ground state.

We also studied the response of the system to non-zero temperature. Whilst we were unable to extrapolate to the zero source limit in a controlled way, by studying fixed  $j_0$  we were able to estimate a critical temperature  $T_c$  for breakdown of superfluidity of the same order of magnitude as, and only slightly smaller than, the Kosterlitz-Thouless prediction for a 2d system with  $U(1)$  global symmetry, which follows from characterising the superfluid/normal transition as arising from vortex pair unbinding. More refined simulations would be required to determine whether  $T_c$  actually has the KT value, or whether  $NJL_{2+1}$ , which in addition to the scalar diquark excitations contains massless fermion degrees of freedom, actually lies in a different universality class, as suggested by estimates of the critical exponent [7].

## Acknowledgements

SJH was supported by a PPARC Senior Research Fellowship. We are grateful to Costas Strouthos for valuable insight in the early stages of the project.

## References

- [1] Y. Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, Phys. Rev. 122 (1961) 345; *ibid* 124 (1961) 246.
- [2] S.P. Levansky, Rev. Mod. Phys. 64 (1992) 649.
- [3] S.J. Hands and D.N. Walters, Phys. Rev. D 69 (2004) 076011.

- [4] K .Rajagopal and F .W ilczek, in Handbook of QCD (W orld Scienti c, 2001), ch. 35,  
arXiv:hep-ph/0011333; M .G .Alford, Ann.Rev.Nucl.Part.Sci. 51 (2001) 131.
- [5] S .J .Hands and S .E .M orrison, Phys.Rev.D 59 (1999) 116002.
- [6] S .J .Hands, B .Lucini and S .E .M orrison, Phys.Rev.Lett. 86 (2001) 753.
- [7] S .J .Hands, B .Lucini and S .E .M orrison, Phys.Rev.D 65 (2002) 036004.
- [8] N .D .M ermin and H .W agner, Phys.Rev.Lett. 17 (1966) 1133;  
S .C olem an, Comm .M ath.Phys. 31 (1973) 259.
- [9] J .M .K osterlitz and D .J .Thouless, J.Phys.C 6 (1973) 1181.
- [10] P .H asenfratz and H .Leutwyler, Nucl.Phys.B 343, 241 (1990).
- [11] K .G .K lim enko, Z.Phys.C 37 (1988) 457;  
B .Rosenstein, B .J .W arr and S .H .Park, Phys.Rev.D 39 (1989) 3088.
- [12] D .R .Nelson and J .M .K osterlitz, Phys.Rev.Lett. 39 (1977) 1201;  
D .R .Nelson, in Phase Transitions and Critical Phenom ena, Vol 7 (1983) p.1, eds.  
C .D omb and J .L .Lebow itz (A cadem ic P res, London).