${\tt Q}\ {\tt uark}\ {\tt C}\ {\tt onden}\ {\tt sates}\ {\tt and}\ {\tt M}\ {\tt om}\ {\tt entum}\ {\tt -} {\tt D}\ {\tt ependent}\ {\tt Q}\ {\tt uark}\ {\tt M}\ {\tt asses}\ {\tt in}$

a Nonlocal Nambu {Jona-Lasinio Model

Bing He, Hu Li, Qing Sun, and C M. Shakin Department of Physics and Center for Nuclear Theory Brooklyn College of the City University of New York Brooklyn, New York 11210 (Dated: January, 2002)

Abstract

The Nambu{Jona-Lasinio (NJL) model has been extensively studied by many researchers. In previous work we have generalized the NJL model to include a covariant model of con nement. In the present work we consider further modi cation of the model so as to reproduce the type of Euclidean-space m om entum -dependent quark m ass values obtained in lattice simulations of QCD. Thism ay be done by introducing a nonlocal interaction, while preserving the chiral sym m etry of the Lagrangian. In other work on nonlocalm odels, by other researchers, the momentum dependence of the quark self-energy is directly related to the regularization scheme. In contrast, in our work, the regularization is independent of the nonlocality we introduce. It is of interest to note that the value of the condensate ratio, hssi=hudi, is about 1.7 when evaluated using chiral perturbation theory and is only about 1.1 in standard applications of the NJL model. We nd that our nonlocal model can reproduce the larger value of the condensate ratio when reasonable values are used for the strength of the 't Hooft interaction. (In an earlier study of the (547) and '(958) m esons, we found that use of the larger value of the condensate ratio led to a very good to the mixing angles and decay constants of these mesons.) We also study the density dependence of both the quark condensate and the momentum -dependent quark mass values. W ithout the addition of new parameters, we reproduce the density dependence of the condensate given by a well-known model-independent expression valid for sm all baryon density. The generalization of our model to include a model of con nem ent required the introduction of an additional parameter. The further generalization to obtain a nonlocal model also requires additional parameters. However, we believe our results are of su cient interest so as to compensate for the introduction of the additional parameters in our form alism .

PACS num bers: 12.39 Fe, 12.38 Aw, 14.65 Bt

em ailcasbc@ cunyvm .cuny.edu

I. IN TRODUCTION

The Nambu{Jona-Lasinio model has been extensively studied for several decades [1-3]. In recent years there has been strong interest in the study of quark matter at high densities, using the NJL model and related models. In particular, one nds color superconductivity under certain conditions and it has been suggested that som e com pact stars m ight be m ade of superconducting quark m atter [4-10]. It is our belief that in such studies one should use a model which reproduces, as well as possible, know features of QCD. In this work we wish to generalize the SU (3)- avor version of the NJL model to be consistent with the type of m om entum -dependent quark masses found in lattice simulations of QCD [11]. For example, in Figs. 1 and 2 we show some of the results obtained in Ref. [11]. It may be seen from these gures that, in Euclidean space, the quark mass goes over to the current mass for Euclidean momentum k & 2 GeV. On the other hand, the NJL model, in the standard analysis [1], gives rise to a constant value for the constituent quark mass. As we will see, the form of the nonlocality used here is di erent from that used in Refs. [6, 12-16]. For example, in reference [12] the qq vertex is modied by a form factor which depends on the relative momentum of the quark and antiquark, while, in another scheme, a form factor is associated with each quark line appearing in a diagram . In the latter procedure no further regularization is needed. However, for the problem considered in this work, the nonlocal models that appear in the literature are of limited applicability, since, in the limit of zero current quark m ass, the quark self-energy is proportional to the form factors used to de ne the nonlocality [12]. In contrast, in the current work, we calculate the form of the quark self-energy after introducing a regulator and a nonlocal quark interaction. We stress that the procedure used here di ers from any that appears in the literature.

The organization of our work is as follows. In Section II we review the standard analysis for the condensates and \gap equation" of the SU (3)- avor NJL model [1]. We then go on to review a procedure for including the contribution to the quark self-energy due to the addition of a con ning interaction for the case of the SU (2)- avor model. In Section III we introduce a nonlocal interaction in the SU (3)- avor NJL model while maintaining the separable nature of the interaction. We also describe the approximation used for the 't H ooff interaction in the nonlocal model. In Section IV and V we present some of the results of our numerical calculations. In Section V I we discuss the density dependence of the quark

3



FIG.1: Quark m ass values obtained in Ref. [11] for various current quark m asses: $m^0 = 91 \text{ M eV}$ [circles], $m^0 = 54 \text{ M eV}$ [crosses] and $m^0 = 35 \text{ M eV}$ [diam onds].

condensate and the momentum dependent quark mass. Finally, Section VII contains some additional discussion and conclusions.

II. THE QUARK SELF-ENERGY IN THE NJL MODEL

In order to best introduce the nonlocal model, we will rst review the calculation of the quark self-energy in the local SU (3) – avor N JL model and then proceed to add a con nement interaction, as was done in an earlier study of the quark self-energy [17]. We consider the generalization to a model with nonlocal short-range and 't Hooft interactions in the next section. The Lagrangian of the model is

$$L = q(ig m^{0})q + \frac{G_{S}}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{X^{8}} [(q^{i}q)^{2} + (qi_{5}^{i}q)^{2}] + \frac{G_{D}}{2} fdet[q(1 + 5)q] + det[q(1 5)q]g; \qquad (2.1)$$

Here m⁰ is the matrix of quark current masses, m⁰ = diag (m⁰_u; m⁰_d; m⁰_s) and the ⁱ(i = 1; ;8) are the Gell-M ann matrices. Further, = $p = \frac{1}{2=3} 1$, with 1 being the unit matrix in the avor space.



FIG.2: Quark m ass values obtained in Ref. [11] using an extrapolation of the current quark m ass to zero. (The sm all dip at k 1:6 GeV is not statistically signi cant [11].

The quark propagator is written as

is
$$(k) = \frac{1}{k} (k) + 1$$
; (2.2)

with

$$(k) = A (k^{2}) + B (k^{2}) k'$$
: (2.3)

Wemayde ne

$$M_{u}(k^{2}) = \frac{A_{u}(k^{2})}{1 - B_{u}(k^{2})}; \qquad (2.4)$$

and

$$Z_{u}(k^{2}) = \frac{1}{1 - B_{u}(k^{2})}; \qquad (2.5)$$

with similar de nitions for M $_{\rm d}\,(\!k^2)\,;\!M_{\rm s}\,(\!k^2)\,;\!Z_{\rm d}\,(\!k^2)$ and $Z_{\rm s}\,(\!k^2)\,.$

In the absence of a con nem ent model, we have $B(k^2) = 0; A_u(k^2) = A_d(k^2) = m_u$ and $A_s(k^2) = m_s$, where m_u and and m_s are constants. (Here, we have take $m_u^0 = m_d^0$.) In this

case we have [2]

$$m_{u} = m_{u}^{0} \quad 2G_{s} huui \quad G_{D} hddihssi; \qquad (2.6)$$

$$m_{d} = m_{d}^{0} \quad 2G_{s} hddi \quad G_{D} huuihssi; \qquad (2.7)$$

$$m_s = m_s^0 \quad 2G_s hssi \quad G_D huuihddi:$$
 (2.8)

These equations are depicted in Fig. 3a, where the last term represents the 't Hooft interaction. The up quark vacuum condensate is given by

huui =
$$N_{c}i \frac{d^{4}k}{(2)^{4}} \operatorname{Tr} \frac{C(k^{2})}{k m_{u} + i}$$
; (2.9)

$$= 4N_{c}i \frac{d^{4}k}{(2)^{4}} \frac{m_{u}C(k^{2})}{k^{2} m_{u}^{2} + i} : \qquad (2.10)$$

Here, C (k^2) is a function needed to regulate the integral. In this work we will use the Pauli-V illars procedure and evaluate the integral in Euclidean space, as was done in Ref. [17]. In the general case we may write

huui =
$$4N_{c}i \frac{d^{4}k}{(2)^{4}} \frac{Z_{u}(k^{2})M_{u}(k^{2})C(k^{2})}{k^{2} M_{u}^{2}(k^{2}) + i}$$
; (2.11)

where Z_u (k²) and M_u^2 (k²) were de ned in Eqs. (2.4) and (2.5).

In the appendix of Ref. [17] we considered Lorentz-vector con nem ent, with

$$\overline{V^{c}}(k_{E} \quad k_{E}^{0}) = (1) \quad (2)V^{c}(k_{E} \quad k_{E}^{0})$$
 (2.12)

and

$$V^{\circ}(k_{\rm E} \quad k_{\rm E}^{0}) = 8 \qquad \frac{1}{[(k_{\rm E} \quad k_{\rm E}^{0})^{2} + {}^{2}]^{2}} \quad \frac{4^{2}}{[(k_{\rm E} \quad k_{\rm E}^{0})^{2} + {}^{2}]^{3}} ; \qquad (2.13)$$

where $k_E^0 = k_E^0$ denotes the Euclidean-space m on entum transfer. Here, is a smallparam eter introduced to soften the m on entum -space singularities. Note that the form

$$\nabla^{\circ}(\mathbf{\tilde{k}} \quad \mathbf{\tilde{k}}^{0}) = 8 \quad \left(\frac{1}{[(\mathbf{\tilde{k}} \quad \mathbf{\tilde{k}}^{0})^{2} + {}^{2}]^{2}} \quad \frac{4^{2}}{[(\mathbf{\tilde{k}} \quad \mathbf{\tilde{k}}^{0})^{2} + {}^{2}]^{3}} ; \quad (2.14)$$

represents the Fourier transform of $V^{c}(r) = re^{r}$, so that for small ; $V^{c}(r)$ approximates a linear potential over the relevant range of r. In Fig. 3b we show the equation for the self-energy when the con ning eld is included. In Ref. [17] we obtained the following coupled equations in the case of the SU (2)- avor model

$$A(k^{2}) = i \frac{d^{4}k^{0}}{(2)^{4}} \frac{[4V^{\circ}(k-k^{0}) + 4N_{\circ}n_{f}G_{s}]A(k^{02})}{k^{02}[1-B(k^{02})]^{2} - A^{2}(k^{02}) + i};$$
(2.15)

$$k^{2}B(k^{2}) = i \frac{d^{4}k^{0}}{(2)^{4}} \frac{2(k-k)[1-B(k^{02})]V^{\circ}(k-k^{0})}{k^{02}[1-B(k^{02})]^{2}-A^{2}(k^{02})+i} :$$
(2.16)

These equations were solved after passing to Euclidean space and including a Pauli-Villars regulator of the form

$$C(k_{\rm E}^{2}) = \frac{2^{4}}{[k_{\rm E}^{2} + A^{2}(k_{\rm E}^{2}) + 2^{2}][k_{\rm E}^{2} + A^{2}(k_{\rm E}^{2}) + 2^{2}]}$$
(2.17)

in Euclidean space. Note that the form

$$\mathfrak{E}(\mathbf{k}_{\rm E}^2) = \frac{2^{-4}}{\left|\mathbf{k}_{\rm E}^2 \left(1 - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{k}_{\rm E}^2)\right)^2 + \mathbf{A}^2(\mathbf{k}_{\rm E}^2) + 2^{-2}\right]\left|\mathbf{k}_{\rm E}^2 \left(1 - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{k}_{\rm E}^2)\right)^2 + \mathbf{A}^2(\mathbf{k}_{\rm E}^2) + 2^{-2}\right|}$$
(2.18)

m ay also be used. (In Eqs. (2.15) and (2.16) V° appears with a sign opposite to that given in Ref. [17], since, in that work, we used a negative value of . For the present work we use a positive value of to be consistent with all of our other publications.)

III. A NONLOCALNJLMODEL

In this section we describe the procedures we use to create a nonlocal version of our generalized NJL model. We consider the second term of Eq. (2.1) and make the replacement

$$\frac{G_{S}}{2} = \frac{X^{8}}{\sum_{i=0}^{i=0}} [(q(x)_{i}q(x))^{2} + (q(x)i_{5}_{i}q(x))^{2}]$$
(31)
$$\frac{G_{S}}{2} = \frac{X^{8}}{\sum_{i=0}^{i}} f[q(x)_{i}f(x)q(x)_{i}q(y)^{i}f(y)q(y) + [q(x)i_{5}_{i}f(x)q(x)_{i}q(y)i_{5}_{i}f(y)q(y)]g;$$

This replacement corresponds to the use of a separable interaction V (x y) = $G_S f(x) f(y)$.

A related modi cation may be made for the 't Hooft interaction. It is useful, however, to describe these modi cations as they a ect momentum -space calculations. W ith reference



FIG. 3: a)A diagram m atic representation of the equation for the self-energy for a quark of m om entum k. The rst term on the right is the contribution of the current quark m ass m⁰. The second term corresponds to the term proportional to G_S in Eqs. (3.6) { (3.8) and the last term represents the 't H ooff interaction. b)The self-energy equation in the presence of a con ming interaction (w avy line.) W ithout the 't H ooff interaction, we have a representation of SU (2)- avor m odel studied in Ref. [17]. (See Eqs. (2.15) and (2.16).)

to Fig. 4, we replace G_s by $f(k_1 \quad k_2)G_sf(k_3 \quad k_4)$: In the evaluation of the second term of Fig. 2 we need $G_s(k \quad k^0) = f(k \quad k^0)G_sf(k \quad k^0)$ and choose to write

$$G_{s}(k \ k^{0}) = \exp[(k \ k^{0})^{2n} = 2]G_{s} \exp[(k \ k^{0})^{2n} = 2]$$
(32)
= $G_{s} \exp[(k \ k^{0})^{2n} =]:$

In this work we take n = 4 and $= 20 \text{ GeV}^8$. In Fig. 5 we exhibit the function F (k^2) = exp[k^{2n} =]. It is clear that m any other functions m ay be chosen.

We now rewrite Eqs. (2.15) and (2.16) for the up, down and strange quarks. For example, for the SU (3)- avor case

$$A_{u}(k^{2}) = m_{u}^{0} + i \frac{d^{4}k^{0}}{(2)^{4}} \frac{[4V^{c}(k + k^{0}) + 8N_{c}G_{s}(k + k^{0})]A_{u}(k^{02})}{k^{02}[1 + B_{u}(k^{02})]^{2} + A_{u}^{2}(k^{02}) + i}; \quad (3.3)$$

$$k^{2}B_{u}(k^{2}) = i \frac{d^{4}k^{0}}{(2)^{4}} \frac{2(k-k)[1-B_{u}(k^{02})]V^{c}(k-k^{0})}{k^{02}[1-B_{u}(k^{02})]^{2} - A_{u}^{2}(k^{02}) + i};$$
(3.4)

with similar equations for $A_d(k^2)$; $B_d(k^2)$; etc. Again, these equations are solved after passing to Euclidean space and introducing regulator functions: $C_u(k^2)$; $C_d(k^2)$ and $C_s(k^2)$. In



FIG. 4: The gure indicates the replacement of the local quark interaction, iG_S, by the nonlocal (separable) term, iG_S ($k_1 \quad k_2$; $k_3 \quad k_4$) = iG_S f ($k_1 \quad k_2$) f ($k_3 \quad k_4$). The distinction between our separable model and that of Ref. [12], for example, is that in Ref. [12] the alternative replacement iG_S ! iG_S ($k_2 + k_4$; $k_1 + k_3$) = iG_S f ($k_2 + k_4$) f ($k_1 + k_3$) was used.



FIG.5: The correlation function F (k) = exp[k^{2n} =] is shown for n = 4 and = 20 G eV⁸.

Euclidean space we write

$$C_{u}(k^{2}) = \frac{2^{4}}{[k^{2} + A_{u}^{2}(k^{2}) + 2][k^{2} + A_{u}^{2}(k^{2}) + 2^{2}]};$$
(3.5)

etc. Note that without the 't Hooff interaction the equations for the up, down and strange quarks are uncoupled.

O ur treatm ent of the 't H ooft interaction is based upon a generalization of the last term in Eqs. (2.6)-(2.8). W ith reference to the third term on the right in Fig. 6, we introduce a correlation between the quark of momentum k and the quark of momentum k^0 . We



FIG. 6: The quark self-energy equation is depicted, with nonlocal terms replacing G_S and G_D . [See Fig. 4.]

also include a correlation between the quark of momentum k and that of momentum k^{00} . (Therefore, our procedure does not introduce a correlation between the two quarks in the separate condensates. At this stage of the development of our model that seems to be a reasonable approximation and avoids having to de ne a three-quark correlation function, f (k k^{0} ; k^{0} k^{00} ; k k^{00}):) For example, we generalize the term G_{D} hddihssi to obtain the contribution to A_{U} (k):

$$A_{u}^{t}(\mathbf{k}) = G_{D} \qquad 4N_{c}i \frac{d^{4}k^{0}}{(2)^{4}} \frac{C_{d}(\mathbf{k}^{02})Z_{u}(\mathbf{k}^{02})M_{u}(\mathbf{k}^{02})f^{2}(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}^{0})}{k^{02}[1-B_{u}(\mathbf{k}^{02})]^{2}-A_{u}^{2}(\mathbf{k}^{02})} \qquad (3.6)$$

$$\frac{Z}{4N_{c}i} \frac{d^{4}k^{0}}{(2)^{4}} \frac{C_{s}(\mathbf{k}^{02})Z_{s}(\mathbf{k}^{02})M_{s}(\mathbf{k}^{02})f^{2}(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}^{0})}{k^{02}[1-B_{s}(\mathbf{k}^{02})]^{2}-A_{s}^{2}(\mathbf{k}^{02})}$$

in M inkowski space. This expression is then evaluated in Euclidean space and added to the right-hand side of Eq. (3.3). In a similar fashion, we calculate $A_d^t(k)$ and $A_s^t(k)$.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS: CONDENSATES AND CONSTITUENT MASS VALUES

There is a good deal of exibility in choosing the regulators $C_u(k^2)$, $C_d(k^2)$, and $C_s(k^2)$. A loo, various form s could be chosen for the correlation functions, $f(k = k^0)$. P reviously, in our M inkow ski-space studies of the m esons we used $G_s = 11.84 \text{ GeV}^2$ and G_D ' 200 GeV ⁵ [18]. However, in that work we used a G aussian regulator in M inkow ski space so that a direct comparison with the present study can not be made. On the other hand, we do not expect to nd radically di erent parameters, if the constituent masses in the two calculations are similar. For example, in our earlier work, in which m_u and m_s were parameters, we used $m_u = 0.364 \text{ GeV}$, which can be compared to the value of M_u (0) calculated here. We have also used either $m_s = 0.565 \text{ GeV}$ [19-23] or $m_s = 0.585 \text{ GeV}$ [18], values which may be compared to M_s (0).

To proceed, we take = 1.0 GeV, $G_s = 13.30 \text{ GeV}^2$, = 0.055 GeV², $m_u^0 = 0.0055$ GeV, $m_s^0 = 0.130 \text{ GeV}$, = 0.010 GeV and = 20.0 GeV⁸. We then consider values of $G_D = 0$, $G_D = 20G_s$, $G_D = 30G_s$ and $G_D = 40G_s$. The results of our calculations are given in Table I. Recall that the function F (k) does not appear in our expression for the condensates. The calculation of the condensates includes the Pauli-V illars regulators, C_u (k²), C_d (k²) and C_s (k²), however. [See Eqs. (2.9)–(2.11).] In our calculation of the properties of the mesons [18] we had $G_D = G_s$ ' 15 18, since we used G_D values in the range 180 GeV⁵ G_s 220 GeV⁵ in that work.

In order to specify a value of G_D for this work, we note that a calculation based upon chiral perturbation theory yields hssi=huui = 1:689 [24]. Inspection of Table I suggests that the values of G_D , other than $G_D = 0$, given in Table I are acceptable. For $G_D = 266$ GeV ⁵ we have $M_u(0) = 0:377$ GeV and $M_s(0) = 0:555$ GeV, which are reasonably close to the phenom enological parameters $m_u = 0:364$ GeV and $m_s = 0:565$ GeV used in our earlier work [19-23].

It is worth noting that, in standard application of the SU (3)- avor NJL model, one nds hssi=huui 1:1 [1], so that the results shown in Table I are encouraging, given that the value for hssi=huui obtained using chiral perturbation theory is about 1.7 [24], as noted above.

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS: MOMENTUM DEPENDENCE OF THE CONSTITUENT QUARK MASSES

In Fig. 7 we show $M_u(k)$, where k is the magnitude of the Euclidean momentum. The dashed line exhibits the result without the con ning interaction (= 0). It is interesting to see that inclusion of con nement improves the shape of the curve when we compare our results to the lattice results shown in Figs. 1 and 2. We note that $M_u(k)$ goes over to

G_D [GeV ⁵]	0.0	-266.0	-399.0	-532.0
M _u (0) [G eV]	0.334	0.377	0.396	0.416
M _s (0) [G eV]	0.538	0.555	0.564	0.575
huui ¹ 3 [GeV]	-0.207	-0.215	-0.217	-0.220
hssi ¹ / ₃ [GeV]	-0.2605	-0.261	-0.261	-0,261
hssi huui	2.00	1.80	1.73	1.68
A _u (0) [GeV]	0.447	0.481	0.496	0.512
В _и (0)	-0.335	-0.276	-0.253	-0.233
A _s (0) [GeV]	0.614	0.628	0.636	0.645
B _s (0)	-0.139	-0.131	-0.127	-0.122

TABLE I: C alculated values for the condensates and for A (0); B (0); and M (0) are given for the up and strange quarks for four values of G_D . The parameters $m_u^0 = 0.0055 \text{ GeV}$, $m_s^0 = 0.130 \text{ GeV}$, $= 0.055 \text{ GeV}^2$, $= 20 \text{ GeV}^8$, = 0.010 GeV, = 1.0 GeV, $G_S = 13.30 \text{ GeV}^2$ were used. The values of and were xed in earlier work [18-23]. Values of huui' hddi' (0.240 0.025 GeV)³ have been suggested [28], so we see that our calculated values are at, or near, the lower lim it for that quantity.

 $m_u^0 = 0.0055 \text{ GeV}$ for large k. In Fig. 8 we show $B_u(k)$. (Recall that $Z_u(k) = [1 \quad B_u(k)]^1$.) We remark that $B_u(k) = 0$ when = 0. In Figs. 9 and 10 we show $M_s(k)$ and $B_s(k)$, respectively. As expected, we not that $M_s(k)$ goes over to $m_s^0 = 0.130 \text{ GeV}$ when k is large.

VI. DENSITY DEPENDENCE OF THE QUARK MASSAND QUARK CONDEN-SATE

As stated earlier, the behavior of the NJL model for nite values of the baryon density is an extensively explored topic [1, 25, 26], with particular recent emphasis on color superconductivity [4-10]. In this section we explore the behavior of our model at nite baryon density. (It should be noted that the nature of the phase transition describing chiral sym metry restoration at nite density is quite model dependent. For example, the inclusion of



FIG. 7: Values of M_u (k) are shown for the parameters $m_u^0 = 0.0055 \text{ GeV}$, $m_s^0 = 0.130 \text{ GeV}$, = 0.055 GeV², = 0.010 GeV, = 1.0 GeV, = 20 GeV⁸, G_S = 13.3 GeV², and G_D = 266 GeV⁵. The dashed line shows the result without con nement (= 0).

current quark masses can change a strong rst-order transition to a smooth second-order transition [26].)

A comprehensive study of the therm odynam ics of the three- avor NJL model has been reported in Ref. [27]. There it is found that the up, down and strange quark masses are essentially constant up to the density where a rst-order phase transition appears. At that point, the up and down quark masses drop from a value of about 380 M eV to about 30 M eV. That behavior di ers from the behavior expected at low density. For example, we have the well-known relation between the value of the condensate and the baryon density of nuclear matter

$$\frac{\text{hqqi}}{\text{hqqi}_0} = 1 \quad \frac{N}{f^2 m^2}; \tag{6.1}$$

where $_{\rm N}$ is the pion-nucleon sign a term . This relation is valid to rst-order in the density. It may be derived, in the case of nuclear matter, by writing

$$hqqi = hqqi_0 + hN jqqjN i_B$$
 (6.2)

and making use of the de nition of the pion-nucleon sigm a term , $_{\rm N}$, and the Gell-M ann { O akes{Renner relation. If we put $_{\rm N}$ = 0.045 GeV, we have hqqi =hqqi_0 = 1 0.273 $_{\rm B}$,



FIG.8: Values of B_u (k) are shown. (See caption to Fig. 7.)



FIG.9: Values of M $_{\rm s}$ (k) are shown. (See caption to Fig. 7.)

where $_{\rm B}$ is in GeV³ units. For nuclear matter $_{\rm B} = (0.109 \text{ GeV})^3$, so we see that the condensate is reduced by about 35%, if we evaluate Eq. (6.1) at nuclear matter density. We can check whether the density dependence given by Eq. (6.1) is reproduced in our model, since it should not matter whether the scalar density of the background matter is generated by quarks in nucleons or by the presence of free quarks. In the form er case, we may write,



FIG.10: Values of B_s (k) are shown. (See caption to Fig. 7.)

for the baryon density,

$$_{\rm B} = 4 \frac{{}^{\rm Z} {}_{\rm k_{\rm F}} {\rm d}^{3} {\rm k}}{(2)^{3}}$$
(6.3)

where the factor of 4 is arises from the product of the spin and isospin factors. In the case of quarks, we have

$$_{\rm B} = 4N_{\rm c} \quad \frac{1}{3} \qquad \frac{Z_{\rm k_{\rm F}}}{(2)^3} \tag{6.4}$$

where, in this case, the factor of 4 again arises from the spin and isospin factor. (Both up and down quarks are present in equal numbers.) The color factor, $N_c = 3$, is cancelled by the baryon number of 1/3 of each quark.

We need to modify the equations for the quark self-energy to take into account the presence of the Ferm iseas of up and down quarks whose Ferm imomentum is k_F . We take one Ferm isea to be composed of on-mass-shell up quarks with constituent mass M_u (0). The following term is then added to the equation for A_u (k).

$$A_{u}^{()}(k) = (2G_{S})N_{c}2 \frac{\sum_{k_{F}} d^{3}k^{0}}{(2)^{3}} \frac{M_{u}(0)}{E_{u}(k)}f^{2}(k-k^{0})$$
(6.5)

where $E_u(k) = \frac{h}{\kappa^2 + M_u^2(0)} \frac{i_{\frac{1}{2}}}{k}$. The second factor of 2 in Eq. (6.5) relects the spin degeneracy. We note that $M_u(0)$ is density-dependent and could be written as $M_u(0; \cdot)$ in keeping



FIG.11: The values of M (k;) are shown for $=_{NM} = 0.26$ [dotted line], $=_{NM} = 0.52$ [dashed line], and $=_{NM} = 0.78$ [dash-dot line].

with the labelling of Fig. 11, where $M_u(k;)$ is used. Also, if $f(k = 1, A_u^{()}(k)$ would then represent $2G_{S-S}$, where S is the scalar density associated with the up-quark Ferm i sea.

In Fig. 11 we show M (k;) calculated for four values of and in Fig. 12 we show M (0) as a function of k_F^3 . Since the quarks in the Ferm i sea are taken to be on-m ass-shell, we would, in principle, require M_u(k;) in M inkowski space. However, since $k_F = 0.268 \text{ GeV}$ for the case of nuclear matter, only a very modest extrapolation of the curves shown in Fig. 11 is needed for the densities considered in this work. In Fig. 13 we show the value of the up quark condensate as a function of k_F^3 . (N ote that $k_F^3 = 192$ 10³ GeV³ represents the density of nuclear matter.) It is seen that, for small values of the density, the density dependence of the condensate reproduces what is expected from Eq. (6.1). (If we extrapolate the curve using a linear approximation, the condensate is reduced by about 30% at nuclear matter density.)



FIG.12: Values of M (0) are shown as a function of k_F^3 . Note that $_B = (2=3^{-2})k_F^3$:



FIG.13: The values of the up quark condensate are given as a function of k_F^3 . Note that $_B$ = (2=3 $^2)k_F^3$:

VII. DISCUSSION

We have remarked earlier in this work that the large values of the condensate ratio hssi=huui seen in Table I play a role in obtaining a good t to the mixing angles of the (947) and 0(958) m esons [18]. To understand this remark we note that the elective singlet-octet coupling constants for pseudoscalar states are [3]

$$G_{00}^{P} = G_{S} \frac{2}{3}(++)\frac{G_{D}}{2};$$
 (7.1)

$$G_{88}^{P} = G_{S} \frac{1}{3} (2 2) \frac{G_{D}}{2};$$
 (7.2)

and

$$G_{08}^{P} = -\frac{P_{-2}}{6}(2) + \frac{G_{D}}{2};$$
 (7.3)

where = huui, = hddi and = hssi. W e take = , so that

$$G_{08}^{P} = \frac{P_{-2}}{3} ()\frac{G_{D}}{2} :$$
 (7.4)

If = 1:7, the result for G $_{08}^{P}$ is six times larger than when = 1:1.

In addition to the e ects of G $_{08}^{P}$, singlet-octet m ixing is induced by the quantity [18]

$$E_{08}(k) = \frac{2^{p} \overline{2}}{3} [E_{u}(k) - E_{s}(k)]; \qquad (7.5)$$

where $E_u(k) = k^2 + m_u^2$, etc. It is found that, since G_{08}^P and $E_{08}(k)$ tend to cancel in our form alism, the signi cant singlet-octet m ixing generated by $E_{08}(k)$ is reduced by the values of G_{08}^P obtained for the larger value of the ratio hssi=huui, with the result that we reproduce the values of the m ixing angles found in other studies that m ake use of experimental data to obtain values for the m ixing angles [18].

In our earlier work, which was carried out in M inkowski space, the values of $m_u = m_d$ and m_s were taken as parameters. Inspection of our gures which exhibit values of M_u (k) and M_s (k) suggests that an extrapolation into M inkowski space m ay be m ade if k^2 is not too large. The fact that M_u (0) and M_s (0) are close to our phenom enological parameters for $G_D = 266 \text{ GeV}^{-5}$ is encouraging and suggests that some support for our choice of quark m ass parameters m ay be found in our Euclidean-space analysis.

The full consequences of separating the speci cation of the nonlocality of the quark interaction from the choice of the regulator of the theory should be explored m ore fully. A lthough that feature of our m odel introduces greater exibility, that com es with the disadvantage of having to introduce other parameters in the m odel. We have m ade only limited variation of the form of the nonlocality and the regulator. For further applications it m ay be of interest to explore a more comprehensive parameter variation. It is also necessary to extend the calculations reported in Figs. 11{13 to larger values of the density than those considered here. That step will require more complex methods for solving our nonlinear equations for the self-energy than the simple iteration scheme we have used thus far.

Our work may be compared to that of A kofer, W atson and W eigel [29] who have solved the Schwinger-Dyson equation using a gluon propagator whose low-momentum behavior is enhanced by a G aussian function. (That modi cation requires the introduction of two phenom enological parameters [30].) The behavior found for A (k) and B (k) in Euclidean space is similar to that obtained in this work. (See Fig. 1 of Ref. [29].) Those authors also solve the Bethe-Salpeter equation to obtain the properties of various qq m esons with generally satisfactory results. It is of interest to note that the M inkowski space solution for A (k) and B (k) is such that the quark can go on-m ass-shell. That feature may be related to our work [18-23] in which we use on-m ass-shell quarks with m asses m_u = m_d = 0.364 G eV and m_s = 0.565 G eV (or 0.585 G eV [18]) when solving the Bethe-Salpeter equation in our study of qq m esons.

References

- [1] S.P.K levansky, Rev.M od.Phys. 64, 649 (1992).
- [2] U.Vogland W.Weise, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 27, 195 (1991).
- [3] T.Hatsuda and T.Kunihiro, Phys. Rep. 247, 221 (1994).
- [4] For reviews, see K.Rajagopal and F.W iloek, in B.L. Io e Festscrift, At the Frontier of Particle Physics/Handbook of QCD, M.Shifm an ed. (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 2001);
 M.Alford, hep-ph/0102047.
- [5] M. Alford, J. Berges and K. Rajagopal, Nucl. Phys. B 558, 219 (1999);
 J. Kundu and K. Rajagopal, hep-ph/0112206 (2002).
- [6] C.Gocke, D.Blaschke, A.Khalatyan and H.Grigoria, hep-ph/0104183-v2 (2002).
- [7] I.A. Shovkovy, hep-ph/0110352 (2002).
- [8] M.Alford, R.Rajagopal and F.W ilcek, Phys. Lett. B 422, 247 (1998).
- [9] D.T.Son, Phys. Rev. D 59, 094019 (1999).
- [10] T.Shafer, E.V.Shuryak and M.Velkovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 53 (1998).

- [11] J.Skullerud, D.B.Leinweber, and A.G.W illiam s, Phys. Rev. D 64, 074508 (2001).
- [12] H. Ito, W. W. Buck and F. Gross, Phys. Rev. C 43, 2483 (1991); C 45, 1918 (1992).
- [13] S.Schm idt, D.Blaschke, Y.L.Kalinovsky, Phys. Rev.C 50, 435 (1994).
- [14] R.S.Plant and M.C.Birse, Nucl. Phys. A 628, 607 (1998).
- [15] R.D.Bowler and M.C.Birse, Nucl. Phys. A 582, 655 (1995).
- [16] R.S.Plant and M.C.Birse, hep-ph/0007340 and references therein.
- [17] L.S.Celenza, X iang-D ong Li, and C.M. Shakin, Phys. Rev. C 55, 1492 (1997). In this reference a negative value of was used. Therefore, the sign on the right-hand sides of Eqs. (2.4) and (2.5), appearing in this reference, should be corrected to be positive.
- [18] C.M. Shakin and Huangsheng W ang, Role of the 't Hooft interaction in the calculation of the mixing angles of the (547) and ⁰(958) m esons, Brooklyn College Report No.BCCNT:01/082/307 (2001). To be published in Physical Rev. C [DH8173].
- [19] C.M. Shakin and Huangsheng W ang, Phys. Rev. D 63, 014019 (2000).
- [20] L.S.Celenza, Huangsheng W ang, and C.M.Shakin, Phys. Rev. C 63, 025209 (2001).
- [21] C.M. Shakin and Huangsheng W ang, Phys. Rev. D 63, 074017 (2001).
- [22] C.M. Shakin and Huangsheng W ang, Phys. Rev. D 63, 114007 (2001).
- [23] C.M. Shakin and Huangsheng W ang, Phys. Rev. D 64, 094020 (2001).
- [24] G.Amoros, J.Bijnens, and P.Talavera, Nucl. Phys. B 602, 87 (2001).
- [25] M . A sakawa and K . Yazaki, Nucl. Phys. A 504, 668 (1989).
- [26] V.Bernard, Ulf-G.Meissner, and I.Zahed, Phys.Rev.D 36, 819 (1987).
- [27] F.Gastineau, R.Nebauer, and J.Aichelin, hep-ph/0101289 (2001).
- [28] M. Shifman, A. Vainstein and V. Zakarov, Nucl. Phys. B 147, 385 (1979); 448 (1979);
 L. Reinders, H. Rubinstein and Y. Yazaki, Phys. Rep. 127, 2 (1985).
- [29] R.Alkofer, P.W atson and H.W eigel, hep-ph/0202053 (2002).
- [30] P.M aris and P.C.Tandy, Phys. Rev. C 60, 055214 (1999).