Dense QCD EoS: Conformal limit and weak-coupling results

Yuki Fujimoto

(University of Washington)



INSTITUTE for NUCLEAR THEORY

Based on: [1] <u>Y. Fujimoto</u>, K. Fukushima, L. McLerran, M. Praszalowicz, PRL129, 2207.06753 [nucl-th]; [2] <u>Y. Fujimoto</u>, to appear in PRD, 2312.11443 [hep-ph]; [3] <u>Y. Fujimoto</u>, in preparation, 2404.????

March 18, 2024 - cond-mat.QCD @ YITP, Kyoto U



- 1. Conformal limit in dense QCD
- 2. Confronting weak-coupling vs lattice QCD results at finite isospin density



1. Conformal limit in dense QCD

 Confronting weak-coupling vs lattice QCD results at finite isospin density

Dense matter equation of state (EoS)



The effect of pQCD on the NS EoS

Gorda,Komoltsev,Kurkela (2022); Komoltsev,Somasundaram et al. (2023)



Conformal limit

Coupling goes to $\alpha_s \to 0$ when $\varepsilon \to \infty$:

$$\varepsilon - 3P \sim \beta_0 \mu^4 \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}\right)^2 \to 0$$

$$v_s^2 = \frac{dP}{d\varepsilon} \sim \frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{1 + \beta_0 \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}\right)^2} \to \frac{1}{3}$$

At the intermediate density, $\varepsilon - 3P = 0$ and $v_s^2 = 1/3$ are different conditions

Conformal limit for v_s^2

Bedaque, Steiner (2014); Tews, Carlson, Gandolfi, Reddy (2018); Annala+ (2019); Altiparmak, Ecker, Rezzolla (2022); Brandes, Weise, Kaiser (2022), and so on...

Crosses the limit $v_s^2 = 1/3$ at intermediate density



Ingredients: ChEFT, $2M_{\odot}$ & NICER pulsars, tidal deformability, pQCD

Conformal limit for ε – 3P

Fujimoto, Fukushima, McLerran, Praszalowicz (2022); Annala+ (2023) and so on...

Does not cross the limit $\varepsilon - 3P = 0$ at intermediate density



Rapid approach to $\varepsilon - 3P \rightarrow 0$ drives the peak in $v_s^2 \rightarrow$ Signature of conformality in neutron star?



- 1. Conformal limit in dense QCD
- 2. Confronting weak-coupling vs lattice QCD results at finite isospin density

QCD at finite isospin density

- Isospin chemical potential (conjugate to I_3):

$$\mu_u = \frac{\mu_I}{2}, \quad \mu_d = -\frac{\mu_I}{2} \dots$$
 Fermi surface of $u \& \bar{d}$

Alford, Kapustin, Wilczek (1999);

Kogut, Sinclair (2002-); Beane, Detmold, Savage+ (2007-); Endrodi+ (2014-)...

- No sign problem \rightarrow can be simulated on the lattice!



Lattice data at finite isospin density

Abbott, Detmold, Romero-López+ (2023)

- Equation of state (EoS) is pinned down up to $\mu_I \sim 3 \,\, {
m GeV}$



Notation

- QCD_B: QCD at nonzero μ_B and zero μ_I

- QCD_I: QCD at nonzero μ_I and zero μ_B

Cooper pairing gap in weak coupling

Son (1998); Schäfer,Wilczek (1999); Pisarski,Rischke (1999); Brown,Liu,Ren (1999); Wang,Rischke (2001); ...

- Color-superconducting gap up to next to leading order:

$$\ln\left(\frac{\Delta}{\mu}\right) = -\frac{\sqrt{3}\pi}{2\sqrt{c_R}} \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{5}{2} \ln\left(N_f \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}\right) + \ln\frac{2^{\frac{13}{2}}}{\pi}$$
$$-\frac{\pi^2 + 4}{12c_R} - \zeta + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^{\frac{1}{2}})$$
$$c_R = 2/3 \text{ for } \mathbf{\bar{3}}, c_R = 4/3 \text{ for } \mathbf{1} \text{ channel}, \zeta = \frac{1}{3} \ln 2 \text{ for CFL}, \zeta = 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

... this formula is universal for QCD_B (color superconductivity) and QCD_I (pion condensation-like Cooper pairing) <u>Fujimoto</u> (2023)

Cooper pairing gap in weak coupling

Son (1998); Schäfer, Wilczek (1999); Pisarski, Rischke (1999); Brown, Liu, Ren (1999); Wang, Rischke (2001); ...

- Color-superconducting gap up to next to leading order:

$$\ln\left(\frac{\Delta}{\mu}\right) = -\frac{\sqrt{3}\pi}{2\sqrt{c_R}} \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{5}{2} \ln\left(N_f \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}\right) + \ln\frac{2^{\frac{13}{2}}}{\pi}$$
$$-\frac{\pi^2 + 4}{12c_R} - \zeta + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^{\frac{1}{2}})$$
$$c_R = 2/3 \text{ for } \mathbf{\bar{3}}, c_R = 4/3 \text{ for } \mathbf{1} \text{ channel}, \zeta = \frac{1}{3} \ln 2 \text{ for CFL}, \zeta = 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

- Folklore: only applicable at very large μ ^{e.g.} $\mu \sim 10^8$ MeV [Rajagopal,Shuster (2000)]
- Standard perturbative QCD: valid up to $\mu \sim 10^3 \text{ MeV}$

What is the applicability of this weak-coupling formula?

Weak-coupling results vs lattice data



Weak-coupling results vs lattice data



Weak-coupling results vs lattice data



Is the gap the only correction?

Alford, Braby, Paris, Reddy (2004)

$$P = a_4 \mu^4 + a_2 \mu^2 - B$$

- *a*₄: Ideal gas behavior + pQCD correction (Dominant)
- a_2 : Gap correction $a_2 \propto \Delta^2$ (large), Quark mass $a_2 \propto - m_f^2$ (small, ~1%)
- *B*: Bag constant, typically $B^{1/4} \simeq 200$ MeV (small, ~0.5%) Instantons, suppressed by $\frac{m_f}{\Lambda_{\rm QCD}} \sim 10^{-3}$

Shuryak; Kallman; Abrikosov; de Carvalho; Chemtob; Baluni (late 70s - early 80s)

Implication to color superconductivity <u>Fujimoto, in prep.</u> (2024)

Weak-coupling Cooper pairing gap formula is reliable down to $\mu \sim 10^3 {
m ~MeV}$



Finite-density lattice simulations

Fujimoto, in prep. (2024)

Want to know

Already known

Can in principle know



Finite-density lattice simulations

Already known



Finite-density lattice simulations

Can in principle know

... Can the simulation extended up to perturbative μ ?



Summary

- **QCD**_{*I*}: a testing ground for QCD_{*B*}. Lattice simulation feasible

- Weak-coupling results matches well with lattice QCD_I: Empirical evidence for the Cooper-pairing gap formula to be applicable down to $\mu \sim 10^3~{
 m MeV}$
- Matching the error with lattice QCD_I : a prescription for fixing the ambiguity in the weak-coupling formula with less errors
- In principle, another crosscheck with lattice-QCD can be provided in $N_c=2$