### Constraints on phase transitions in neutron star matter

Special thanks to Gabriele Erkelenz, Ulf Meißner and the prize committee Supervisors: Wolfram Weise and Norbert Kaiser

Dr. Klaus Erkelenz Prize Colloquium

Len Brandes 14.11.2023









### Phases of strongly interacting matter

- ► QCD vacuum:
  - · Confinement of quarks and gluons in hadrons
  - Spontaneously broken chiral symmetry
- ► Crossover at *T* ~ 155 MeV to quark-gluon plasma [Bazavov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D 90 (2014)]
- Nuclear liquid-gas phase transition at  $\mu = 923 \text{ MeV}$ [Elliott, Lake, Moretto and Phair, Phys. Rev. C 87 (2013)]
- Chirally restored phase at asymptotic densities [Schäfer and Wilczek, Phys. Rev. D 60 (1999)]

### $\rightarrow$ Unknown transition from nuclear to quark matter



### **Nucleon-nucleon potential**

### CURRENT STATUS OF THE RELATIVISTIC TWO-NUCLEON ONE BOSON EXCHANGE POTENTIAL

#### K. ERKELENZ

Institut für Theoretische Kernphysik, Bonn, W.-Germany

Received April 1974

[Erkelenz, Phys. Rept. 13 (1974)]

- Describe nucleon-nucleon interactions via boson exchanges
  - $\rightarrow$  Further developed into Bonn potential

[Machleidt and Holinde, Phys. Rept. 149 (1987)]

► Good agreement with nucleon-nucleon data

[Machleidt, Phys. Rev. C 63 (2001)]

- ► **Repulsive core** at *r*<sub>hard-core</sub> ~ 0.5 fm
  - → Relevance for dense baryonic matter in neutron stars average distance between baryons:  $d \propto n^{-1/3}$



### **Neutron stars**



- Stars remain stable by fusing light elements to heavier elements
- At some point no light elements left in core
  - $\rightarrow$  Resulting implosion leads to supernova
- Collapsed core forms neutron star

### **Neutron stars**



- Masses  $M \sim 1 2M_{\odot}$ , radii  $R \sim 11 13$  km
  - → High baryon densities in core beyond terrestrial experiments
- Recent substantial extension of observational data base
- Phase transition in dense neutron star matter?

### **Description of neutron stars**

► Internal structure described by Tolman-Oppenheimer-Volkoff (TOV) equations

$$\frac{\partial P(r)}{\partial r} = -\frac{G_N}{r^2} \left( \varepsilon(r) + P(r) \right) \left( m(r) + 4\pi r^3 P(r) \right) \left( 1 - \frac{2G_N m(r)}{r} \right)^{-1} ,$$
  
$$\frac{\partial m(r)}{\partial r} = 4\pi r^2 \varepsilon(r)$$
 [Tolman, Phys. Rev. 55 (1939)] [Oppenheimer and Volkoff, Phys. Rev. 55 (1939)]

- ► Solved given equation of state (EoS)  $P(\varepsilon)$  and central energy density  $\varepsilon(r = 0) = \varepsilon_c$ 
  - $\rightarrow$  Solution for different  $\varepsilon_c$  yields (*M*, *R*)-relation
- Each EoS has maximum density  $\varepsilon_{c,max}$  corresponding to maximum supported mass  $M_{max}$



### **Description of neutron stars**

► Internal structure described by Tolmann-Oppenheimer-Volkoff (TOV) equations

$$\frac{\partial P(r)}{\partial r} = -\frac{G_N}{r^2} \left( \varepsilon(r) + P(r) \right) \left( m(r) + 4\pi r^3 P(r) \right) \left( 1 - \frac{2G_N m(r)}{r} \right)^{-1} ,$$
  
$$\frac{\partial m(r)}{\partial r} = 4\pi r^2 \varepsilon(r) \qquad \text{[Tolman, Phys. Rev. 55 (11)]}$$

[Tolman, Phys. Rev. 55 (1939)] [Oppenheimer and Volkoff, Phys. Rev. 55 (1939)]

- ► Solved given equation of state (EoS)  $P(\varepsilon)$  and central energy density  $\varepsilon(r = 0) = \varepsilon_c$
- Simultaneously solve for tidal deformability  $\Lambda$ 
  - $\rightarrow$  Relevant for neutron stars in binary systems



### Speed of sound

Determine EoS from speed of sound

$$c_s^2(\varepsilon) = \frac{\partial P(\varepsilon)}{\partial \varepsilon}$$

- Causality & thermodynamic stability:  $0 \le c_s \le 1$
- Measure of coupling strength in matter
  - → Characteristic signature of phase structure:
    - Nucleonic: monotonously rising sound speed
    - First-order phase transition: coexistence interval with zero sound speed c<sub>s</sub><sup>2</sup> ~ 0
    - Crossover: peaked behaviour

[McLerran and Reddy, Phys. Rev. Lett. 122 (2019)]



### **Parametrization**

Introduce general parametrization by segment-wise linear interpolations

$$c_{s}^{2}(\varepsilon,\theta) = \frac{(\varepsilon_{i+1} - \varepsilon)c_{s,i}^{2} + (\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{i})c_{s,i+1}^{2}}{\varepsilon_{i+1} - \varepsilon_{i}}$$
[Annala *et al.*, Nature Phys. 16, 907 (2020)]

- Can describe wide range of possible phase transitions and crossovers
- Previous analyses: similar results to non-parametric representations [Annala et al., arXiv:2303.11356 (2023)]
- Constrain parameters  $\theta = (\varepsilon_i, c_{s,i}^2)$  based on available data
  - $\rightarrow$  Analyse for signatures of **possible phase transitions**



### **Bayesian inference**

► Constrain parameters of  $c_s^2(\varepsilon, \theta)$  via **Bayesian inference** based on **data**  $\mathscr{D}$ 

 $\Pr(\theta|\mathscr{D}) \propto \Pr(\mathscr{D}|\theta) \Pr(\theta)$ 

- Compute posterior probability  $Pr(\theta|\mathscr{D})$  for parameters  $\theta$ :
  - Compute likelihood  $\Pr(\mathcal{D}|\theta)$  for each data  $\mathcal{D}$
  - Choose prior ranges for parameters  $Pr(\theta)$
- ► Compute median and credible bands at 68% or 95% level
  - → Here: more prior support at small sound speeds to analyse phase transitions [LB, Weise and Kaiser, Phys. Rev. D 107 (2023)]



[LB, Weise and Kaiser, Phys. Rev. D 108 (2023)]

### **Bayesian inference**

► Constrain parameters of  $c_s^2(\varepsilon, \theta)$  via **Bayesian inference** based on data  $\mathscr{D}$ 

 $\Pr(\theta|\mathscr{D}) \propto \Pr(\mathscr{D}|\theta) \Pr(\theta)$ 

- Compute posterior probability  $Pr(\theta|\mathscr{D})$  for parameters  $\theta$ :
  - Compute likelihood  $\Pr(\mathcal{D}|\theta)$  for each data  $\mathcal{D}$
  - Choose prior ranges for parameters  $Pr(\theta)$
- ► Quantify evidence for hypothesis H<sub>0</sub> vs. H<sub>1</sub> with **Bayes factors**

$$\mathscr{B}_{H_0}^{H_1} = \frac{\Pr(\mathscr{D}|H_1)}{\Pr(\mathscr{D}|H_0)}$$

 $\rightarrow$  Comparison to classification scheme for statistical conclusions

[Lee and Wagenmakers, *Bayesian Cognitive Modeling* (Cambridge University Press, 2014)] [Jeffreys, *Theory of Probability* (Oxford University Press, 1961)]



[LB, Weise and Kaiser, Phys. Rev. D 108 (2023)]

### **Perturbative QCD**

- Strong coupling decreases at high densities
  - → Perturbative QCD calculations in terms of quark and gluon degrees of freedom
- Asymptotic boundary condition at  $n \ge 40 n_0$  (with  $n_0 = 0.16 \text{ fm}^{-3}$ )
- Speed of sound reaches **conformal limit**  $c_s^2 = 1/3$  from below
  - → Interpolation to asymptotic pQCD with  $0 \le c_s \le 1$ constrains EoS at smaller densities

[Komoltsev and Kurkela, Phys. Rev. Lett. 128 (2022)]

Exclude EoS where matching to asymptotic pQCD is not possible



## Chiral effective field theory

 ChEFT: systematic expansion of nuclear forces at low momenta with controlled uncertainties



 $\rightarrow$  Employ only up to  $n \le 1.3 n_0$ 

[Essick et al., Phys. Rev. C 102 (2020)]

### Shapiro time delay

- ► Neutron stars with strong magnetic fields emit synchroton radiation
- ► If magnetic and rotation axis not aligned, double cone of radiation rotates (→ pulsars)
- Binary systems: gravitational field of companion changes pulsar signal
- ► Extract **neutron star masses** with high precision (68% level):

PSR J0348+0432	$M$ = 2.01 $\pm$ 0.04 $M_{\odot}$	[Antoniadis et al., Science 340 (2013)
PSR J0740+6620	$M = 2.08 \pm 0.07  M_{\odot}$	[Fonseca et al., Astrophys. J. Lett. 915 (2021)

 $\rightarrow$  Matter must be sufficiently stiff to support such high masses



[Demorest et al., Nature 467 (2010)]

### Pulse profile modelling

PSR J0030+0451

PSR J0740+6620

► Hot spots form on magnetic polar caps of rapidly rotating neutron stars

 $R = 12.71^{+1.14}_{-1.19}$  km

 $R = 12.39^{+1.30}_{-0.98}$  km

 $M = 1.34^{+0.15}_{-0.16} M_{\odot}$ 

 $M = 2.072^{+0.067}_{-0.066} M_{\odot}$ 

- ► Thermal X-ray emission modulated by gravitational effects
  - $\rightarrow$  Measured by **NICER** telescope on ISS
- Model hot spots and neutron star atmosphere
  - → Infer **mass and radius** from X-ray measurements (68% level):



[Riley et al., Astrophys. J. Lett. 887 (2019)]

[Riley et al., Astrophys. J. Lett. 918 (2021)]

 $\rightarrow$  Very similar radii for 1.34 and 2.07  $M_{\odot}$  neutron stars

### **Neutron star mergers**

- Binary neutron star mergers produce gravitational waves
- Compare observed LIGO and Virgo signal to waveform models
- Waveform depends on M<sub>2</sub>/M<sub>1</sub> and combination of tidal deformabilities

$$\bar{\Lambda} = \frac{16}{13} \frac{(M_1 + 12M_2)M_1^4\Lambda_1 + (M_2 + 12M_1)M_2^4\Lambda_2}{(M_1 + M_2)^5}$$



[Dietrich, Hinderer and Samajdar, Gen. Rel. Grav. 53 (2021)]

• Two binary neutron star mergers detected so far (90% level):

 $\begin{array}{ll} \mbox{GW170817} & \Bar{\Lambda} = 320^{+420}_{-230} \\ \mbox{GW190425} & \Bar{\Lambda} \leq 600 \end{array}$ 

[Abbott et al. (LIGO and Virgo Collaborations), Phys. Rev. X 9 (2019)]

[Abbott et al. (LIGO and Virgo Collaborations), Astrophys. J. Lett. 892 (2020)]

### New data: black widow pulsar

- Black widow pulsars accrete most of mass from companion
  - $\rightarrow$  Determine mass via observation of companion
- PSR J0952-0607 heaviest neutron star observed so far

 $M = 2.35 \pm 0.17 M_{\odot}$  [Romani *et al.*, ApJL 934 (2022)]

- Simpler heating model compared to other black widows
- Second fastest known pulsar T = 1.41 ms
  - $\rightarrow$  Rotation correction via empirical formula

[Konstantinou and Morsink, Astrophys. J. 934, 139 (2022)]



[W.M. Keck Observatory, Roger W. Romani, Alex Filippenko]



- Steep increase of speed of sound around  $\varepsilon \sim 250 600 \,\mathrm{MeV \, fm^{-3}}$ 
  - $\rightarrow$  Required to support black-widow (BW) heavy mass measurement
- Conformal bound  $c_s^2 \le 1/3$  exceeded inside neutron stars
  - $\rightarrow$  Strongly repulsive correlations at high densities
- ► Slight **tension** between ChEFT at  $n \simeq 2 n_0$  and astro data

Previous + BW

[LB, Weise and Kaiser, Phys. Rev. D 108 (2023)]

[Altiparmak, Ecker and Rezzolla, Astrophys. J. Lett. 939 (2022)] [Legred, Chatziioannou, Essick, Han and Landry, Phys. Rev. D 104 (2021)]

Previous + BW

[Essick et al., Phys. Rev. C 102 (2020)]



### Mass-radius & tidal deformability

- Good agreement with data **not included** in Bayesian analysis:
  - Thermonuclear burster 4U 1702-429

[Nättilä et al., Astron. & Astrophys. 608 (2017)]

•  $R(M = 1.4 M_{\odot})$  from quiescent low mass X-ray binaries (qLMXBs)

[Steiner et al., Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 476 (2018)]

- Median with almost constant radius R ~ 12.3 km
- ► Good agreement with other GW170817 analyses:
  - Masses and tidal deformabilities of two neutron stars

[Fasano, Abdelsalhin, Maselli, and Ferrari, Phys. Rev. Lett. 123 (2019)]

•  $\Lambda(M = 1.4 M_{\odot})$  from universal relations

[Abbott et al. (LIGO and Virgo Collaborations), Phys. Rev. Lett. 121 (2018)]





### Pressure & coexistence interval

- Significantly increased pressure compared to previous EoS
- Maxwell construction of first-order phase transition: constant pressure in phase coexistence region
  - $\rightarrow$  Width  $\Delta n$  measure of phase transition 'strength'
- Maximum possible interval within posterior credible band

 $\left(\frac{\Delta n}{n}\right)_{\max} \le 0.2$  at 68% level

[LB, Weise and Kaiser, Phys. Rev. D 108 (2023)]

► Compare to 'strong' nuclear liquid-gas phase transition

 $\frac{\Delta n}{n} > 1$  [Fiorilla, Kaiser and Weise, Nucl. Phys. A 880 (2012)]

### $\rightarrow$ Only weak first-order phase transitions <code>possible</code>





### Small sound speeds

- Quantify evidence of small sound speeds inside neutron star cores with Bayes factor
  - $\mathscr{B}^{c_{s,\min}^2>0.1}_{c_{s,\min}^2\leq 0.1}$

 $\rightarrow c_{s,\min}^2 \! \leq \! 0.1$  perquisite for first-order phase transition

- Previous analyses: c<sup>2</sup><sub>s</sub> > 0.1 in neutron stars with M ≤ 2M<sub>☉</sub> [Ecker and Rezzolla, Astrophys. J. Lett. 939 (2022)] [Annala *et al.*, arXiv:2303.11356 (2023)]
- Heavy mass measurement increases Bayes factor
- Strong evidence against c<sup>2</sup><sub>s,min</sub> ≤ 0.1 in cores of neutron stars with M ≤ 2.1 M<sub>☉</sub> [LB, Weise and Kaiser, Phys. Rev. D 108 (2023)]

# $\rightarrow$ Strong first-order phase transitions unlikely based on empirical data



### **Possible interpretation**

- ▶ **Central densities** in neutron stars (68%):  $n_c < 5 n_0$  for  $M \le 2.3 M_{\odot}$ 
  - $\rightarrow$  Average distance between baryons:  $d > 1.0 \,\text{fm} \gg r_{\text{hard-core}} \sim 0.5 \,\text{fm}$
- Chiral nucleon-meson model: nucleons interacting via exchange of effective mesons [Floerchinger and Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. A 890–891 (2012)] [Drews and Weise, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 93 (2017)]
- ► Mean-field (MF) approximation: first-order order phase transition to chirally restored phase
- ► Extended mean-field (EMF): fermionic vacuum fluctuations stabilize order parameter



### Summary

- ► Unknown transition from nucleons to quarks and gluons at high densities
- Bayesian inference of sound speed in neutron star matter based on:
  - Shapiro time-delays
  - NICER X-ray measurements
  - Gravitational waves from binary neutron star mergers

- ChEFT results at small densities
- Perturbative QCD calculations at asymptotically high densities
- (New) black widow pulsar  $M = 2.35 \pm 0.17 M_{\odot}$
- Maximum possible phase coexistence interval  $(\Delta n/n)_{\text{max}} \le 0.2$
- ▶ Strong evidence against  $c_{s,\min}^2 \le 0.1$  in cores of neutron stars with  $M \le 2.1 M_{\odot}$
- Central densities  $n_c < 5 n_0$  for  $M \le 2.3 M_{\odot}$ : average distance between baryons still > 1 fm
  - → Strong first-order phase transitions unlikely based on empirical data
  - → Fluctuations stabilize hadronic phase?

### Outlook

- Fourth observation run of LIGO, Virgo and KAGRA started on May 4<sup>th</sup>
- ► Four more objects to be measured by NICER telescope
- Moment-of-inertia measurement of PSR J0737-3039 in next few years
- Extract more information with novel statistical tools from Machine Learning

[Farrell et al., arXiv:2305.07442 (2023)]

[Landry and Kumar, Astrophys. J. 868 (2018)]

→ Many more future measurements will put even tighter constraints on phase structure at high densities

nature	
The golden age of neutron-star physics has arrived	
These stellar remnants are some of the Universe's most enigmatic objects – and they are finally starting to give up their secrets.	
Adam Mann	

Constraints on phase transitions in neutron star matter | Len Brandes

[Greif et al., MNRAS 485 (2019)]

# Supplementary material

### **Twin stars**

- Strong phase transitions can lead to mass-radius relations with multiple stable branches ('twin stars')
- Bayes factor gives extreme evidence against multiple stable branches [Gorda et al., arXiv:2212.10576 (2022)]
- ► Without likelihood from ChEFT 'only' strong evidence:

 $\mathscr{B}_{N_{\text{branches}} \geq 1}^{N_{\text{branches}} = 1} = 12.97$ 

[Essick, Legred, Chatziioannou, Han and Landry, arXiv:2305.07411 (2023)]

• Disconnection takes place at  $M \sim 0.8 M_{\odot}$ 

 $\rightarrow$  Unlikely based on nuclear phenomenology



### Possible impact of HESS J1731-347

► Central compact object within supernova remnant HESS J1731-347:

 $M = 0.77^{+0.20}_{-0.17} M_{\odot}$  $R = 10.4^{+0.86}_{-0.78} \text{ km}$ 

[Doroshenko et al., Nat. Astron. 6 (2022)]

- Unusually light neutron star with very low radius
  - → Neutron star mass  $M < 1.17 M_{\odot}$  in contradiction with known formation mechanisms [Suwa *et al.*, MNRAS 481 (2018)]

→ Strange star?

Systematic uncertainty: larger masses and radii might be possible

[Alford and Halpern, Astrophys. J. 944 (2023)]

Tension between HESS and current astrophysical data

[Jiang, Ecker and Rezzolla, arXiv:2211.00018 (2022)]



 $R \,[\mathrm{km}]$ 

### **General EoS parametrization**

Determine EoS from speed of sound

$$c_s^2(\varepsilon) = \frac{\partial P(\varepsilon)}{\partial \varepsilon}$$

Parametrize by segment-wise linear interpolations

$$C_{s}^{2}(\varepsilon,\theta) = \frac{(\varepsilon_{i+1} - \varepsilon)C_{s,i}^{2} + (\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{i})C_{s,i+1}^{2}}{\varepsilon_{i+1} - \varepsilon_{i}}$$
[Annala *et al.*, Nature Phys. 16, 907 (2020)]

- Matching to BPS crust at low densities  $(c_{s,0}^2, \varepsilon_0) = (c_{s,crust}^2, \varepsilon_{crust})$  [G. Baym, C. Pethick, and P. Sutherland, Astrophys. J. 170 (1971)]
- ► Constant speed of sound  $c_s^2(\varepsilon, \theta) = c_{s,N}^2$  beyond last point  $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_N$
- Choose N = 5 corresponding to 7 segments and 10 free parameters
- Priors sampled logarithmically

$$c_{s,i}^2 \in [0,1]$$
  $\varepsilon_i \in [\varepsilon_{crust}, 4 \,\mathrm{GeV}\,\mathrm{fm}^{-3}]$ 

Parametrizations with only 4 segments leads to comparable results as non-parametric Gaussian process

[Annala et al., arXiv:2303.11356 (2023)]

### **Bayesian inference**

► Bayes theorem:

 $\mathsf{Pr}(\theta|\mathscr{D},\mathscr{M}) = \frac{\mathsf{Pr}(\mathscr{D}|\theta,\mathscr{M})\,\mathsf{Pr}(\theta|\mathscr{M})}{\mathsf{Pr}(\mathscr{D}|\mathscr{M})}$ 

- Choose **Priors** for parameters  $Pr(\theta|\mathcal{M})$
- ► Likelihood  $Pr(\mathcal{D}|\theta, \mathcal{M})$ : probability of data  $\mathcal{D}$  to occur for  $\theta$  and model  $\mathcal{M}$
- $(M, R, \Lambda)$  can be deterministically determined for  $\theta$

 $\Pr(\mathcal{D}|\theta,\mathcal{M}) = \Pr(\mathcal{D}|M,R,\Lambda,\mathcal{M})$ 

 $\rightarrow$  For computational feasibility assume (valid for flat Priors in  $(M,R,\Lambda))$ 

 $\mathsf{Pr}(\mathcal{D}|M,R,\Lambda,\mathcal{M}) \propto \mathsf{Pr}(M,R,\Lambda|\mathcal{D},\mathcal{M})$ 

[Riley, Raaijmakers and Watts, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 478 (2018)] [Raaijmakers et al., ApJL 918 (2021)]

### **Bayesian inference**

Bayes theorem:

 $\mathsf{Pr}(\theta|\mathscr{D},\mathscr{M}) = \frac{\mathsf{Pr}(\mathscr{D}|\theta,\mathscr{M})\,\mathsf{Pr}(\theta|\mathscr{M})}{\mathsf{Pr}(\mathscr{D}|\mathscr{M})}$ 

• Evidence  $Pr(\mathcal{D}|\mathcal{M})$ : determined via normalization of the posterior

$$\Pr(\mathcal{D}|\mathcal{M}) = \int d\theta \ \Pr(\mathcal{D}|\theta, \mathcal{M}) \Pr(\theta|\mathcal{M})$$

- $\rightarrow$  High-dimensional integral, use sampling techniques
- Credible bands: determine  $P(\varepsilon_i, \theta)$  on grid  $\{\varepsilon_i\}$  for posterior samples to get  $\Pr(P|\varepsilon_i, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M})$

 $\rightarrow$  Compute credible interval [*a*,*b*] with probability  $\alpha$  at  $\varepsilon_i$ 

$$\alpha = \int_{a}^{b} dP \operatorname{Pr}(P|\varepsilon_{i}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{M})$$

 $\rightarrow$  Combine credible intervals at all  $\varepsilon_i$  to posterior credible band  $P(\varepsilon)$ 

### Trace anomaly measure

Trace anomaly measure as signature of conformality

$$\Delta = \frac{g_{\mu\nu}T^{\mu\nu}}{3\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{3} - \frac{P}{\varepsilon}$$

[Fujimoto, Fukushima, McLerran and Praszałowicz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 129 (2022)]

- Median becomes negative around  $\varepsilon \sim 700 \, \text{MeV} \, \text{fm}^{-3}$ 
  - $\rightarrow$  Moderate evidence for  $\Delta$  turning **negative** inside neutron stars

Bayes factor  $\mathscr{B}_{\Delta\geq 0}^{\Delta<0} = 8.11$ 

[Ecker and Rezzolla, Astrophys. J. Lett. 939 (2022)] [Annala *et al.*, arXiv:2303.11356 (2023)] [Marczenko, McLerran, Redlich and Sasaki, Phys. Rev. C 107 (2023)]

► At higher energy densities again positive ∆ to reach asymptotic pQCD limit



## Impact of pQCD

• Matching to pQCD at  $n_{c,max}$  has only **negligible impact** 

[Somasundaram, Tews and Margueron, arXiv:2204.14039 (2022)]

- ► Change matching to asymptotic pQCD from *n<sub>c,max</sub>* to 10 *n*<sub>0</sub>
  - $\rightarrow$  Much smaller  $c_s^2$  at high energy densities

[Gorda, Komoltsev, and Kurkela, arXiv:2204.11877 (2022)] [Komoltsev and Kurkela, Phys. Rev. Lett. 128 (2022)]

- $\rightarrow$  Few changes in mass-radius, properties of 2.3  $M_{\odot}$  neutron star change only slightly
- EoS beyond  $n_{c,max}$  no longer constrained by astrophysical data
  - → Impact depends unconstrained interpolation to high densities [Essick, Legred, Chatziioannou, Han and Landry, arXiv:2305.07411 (2023)]



### **Perturbative QCD**

• Connection of  $(\mu_{NS}, n_{NS}, P_{NS})(\theta)$  to  $(\mu_{pQCD}, n_{pQCD}, P_{pQCD})$ 

$$\int_{\mu_{\rm NS}}^{\mu_{\rm pQCD}} d\mu \ n(\mu) = P_{\rm pQCD} - P_{\rm NS} = \Delta P$$

 Causality and thermodynamic stability imply minimum and maximum values

$$\Delta P_{\min} = \frac{\mu_{pQCD}^2 - \mu_{NS}^2}{2\mu_{NS}} n_{NS} \quad \Delta P_{\max} = \frac{\mu_{pQCD}^2 - \mu_{NS}^2}{2\mu_{pQCD}} n_{pQCD}$$

Likelihood

$$\Pr(\mathcal{D}_{pQCD} | \Delta P(\theta), \mathcal{M}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \Delta P(\theta) \in [\Delta P_{\min}(\theta), \Delta P_{\max}(\theta)] \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$



[Komoltsev and Kurkela, Phys. Rev. Lett. 128 (2022)]



[Gorda, Komoltsev, and Kurkela, arXiv:2204.11877 (2022)]

### **Chiral nucleon-meson model**

• Interactions of fermions via the exchange of effective mesons: Nambu-Goldstone boson  $\pi$  and heavy  $\sigma$ 

 $\rightarrow$  Short distance dynamics modelled by massive vector fields

[Floerchinger and Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. A 890-891 (2012)]

► Boson self-interactions and explicit symmetry breaking term

$$\mathscr{U}(\sigma, \pi) = (\pi, \sigma) + \cdots + m_{\pi}^{2} t_{\pi} (\sigma - t_{\pi})$$

- Expectation value  $\langle \sigma \rangle$  dynamically creates nucleon mass

 $\rightarrow \langle \sigma \rangle / \langle \sigma \rangle_{vac} = \langle \sigma \rangle / f_{\pi}$  order parameter for chiral symmetry

### **Mean-field approximation**

\_

• Mean-field (MF) approximation: replace chiral boson fields by expectation values  $\langle \sigma \rangle$  and  $\langle \pi \rangle = 0$ 

→ Diverging fermionic vacuum contribution: 
$$\delta \Omega_{\text{vac}} = -4 \int \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3} E$$

- ► Compute with dimensional regularisation in extended mean-field (EMF) approach [Skokov et al., Phys. Rev. D 82 (2010)]
- ► Adjust model parameters to reproduce empirical nuclear properties, i.e., liquid-gas phase transition

[Elliot et al., Phys. Rev. C 87 (2013)]



[LB, Kaiser and Weise, Eur. Phys. J. A 57 (2021)]

### **Functional Renormalization Group**

- Additional fluctuations beyond vacuum contribution (chiral boson and nucleon loops)
  - → Include using non-perturbative Functional Renormalization Group (FRG) approach

[Drews and Weise, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 93 (2017)]

- ► Initialize scale-dependent effective action  $\Gamma_k[\Phi]$  at  $k_{UV} \sim 4\pi f_{\pi}$
- Evolution  $k \rightarrow 0$  governed by Wetterich's flow equation

$$k \frac{\partial \Gamma_k[\Phi]}{\partial k} = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} \left[ k \frac{\partial R_k}{\partial k} \cdot \left( \Gamma_k^{(2)}[\Phi] + R_k \right)^{-1} \right]$$

[Wetterich, Phys. Lett. B 301 (1993)]

•  $\Gamma_k[\Phi]$  contains all **fluctuations** with  $p^2 \ge k^2$  through regulator  $R_k(p)$ 



 $\Gamma_{k=0}[\Phi]=\Gamma[\Phi]$ 

### **Phase structure**

- *Mean-field:* unphysical **first-order order phase transition** to chirally restored phase
- ► Extended mean-field: vacuum contribution stabilizes order parameter
- ► FRG: further stabilization through additional fluctuations
  - $\rightarrow$  **Smooth crossover** at densities  $n > 6 n_0$  (with  $n_0 = 0.16 \text{ fm}^{-3}$ )
  - $\rightarrow$  No phase transition in neutron star matter?



### Likelihoods

- EoS supports masses between  $M_{\min}$  and  $M_{\max}(\theta)$
- Choose flat mass prior and  $M_{\rm min} = 0.5 M_{\odot}$

$$\Pr(M(\theta)) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{M_{\max}(\theta) - M_{\min}} & \text{if } M \in [M_{\min}, M_{\max}(\theta)] \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

[Landry, Essick and Chatziioannou, Phys. Rev D 101 (2020)]

- When number of data increases incorporate mass population
  - $\rightarrow$  Wrong population model causes a bias

[Mandel, Farr and Gair, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 486 (2019)]

► Assume Shapiro mass measurements Gaussian to compute likelihood

$$\Pr(M(\theta) | \mathscr{D}_{\text{Shapiro}}, \mathscr{M}) = \int_{M_{\min}}^{M_{\max}(\theta)} dM \, \mathscr{N}(M, \langle M \rangle, \sigma_M) \Pr(M(\theta))$$
$$\approx \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{M_{\max}(\theta) - \langle M \rangle}{\sqrt{2}\sigma_M}\right) \right] \Pr(M(\theta))$$

### Likelihoods

- ► Data available as samples, approximate underlying probability with Kernel Density Estimation (KDE)
- ► Solve TOV equations to obtain  $R(M, \theta)$  and  $\Lambda(M, \theta)$
- NICER likelihood:

$$\Pr((M,R)(\theta) | \mathcal{D}_{\text{NICER}}, \mathcal{M}) = \int_{M_{\min}}^{M_{\max}(\theta)} dM \text{ KDE}(M,R(M,\theta)) \Pr(M(\theta))$$

GW likelihood:

$$\Pr((M,\Lambda)(\theta)|\mathscr{D}_{\mathsf{GW}},\mathscr{M}) = \int \mathsf{d}M_1 \int \mathsf{d}M_2 \; \mathsf{KDE}(M_1,M_2,\Lambda(M_1,\theta),\Lambda(M_2,\theta))$$

- Do not assume neutron star-neutron star merger events
  - $\rightarrow$  GW likelihood not weighted by mass prior and  $\Lambda(M) = 0$  for black holes
- Do not assumed fixed chirp mass  $M_{\text{chirp}} = (M_1 M_2)^{3/5} (M_1 + M_2)^{-1/5}$

### **Conformal limit**

- Derived from naive dimensional analysis and asymptotic limit

$$\mu \gg \Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \implies P \propto \mu^{d+1}$$
$$c_s^2 = \frac{\partial P}{\partial \varepsilon} \sim \frac{1}{d}$$

[Hippert, Fraga and Noronha, Phys. Rev. D 104 (2021)]

Expected to hold in all conformal field theories

[Bedaque and Steiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 114 (2015)]

• Recent Bayesian analyses found speeds of sound  $c_s^2 > 1/3$  inside neutron stars

[Landry, Essick and Chatziioannou, Phys. Rev. D 101 (2020)] [Gorda, Komoltsev, and Kurkela, arXiv:2204.11877 (2022)] [Altiparmak, Ecker, and Rezzolla, arXiv:2203.14974 (2022)] [Leonhardt *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 125 (2020)]

 $\rightarrow$  Also  $c_s^2 > 1/3$  in recent  $N_C = 2$  **lattice QCD** 

[lida and Itou, PTEP 2022 (2022)]

Hard Dense Loop resummation methods: conformal limit may be approached asymptotically from above

[Fujimoto and Fukushima, Phys. Rev. D 105 (2022)]

### **Parametrization dependence**

- 'Old' segment-wise parametrisation: different ChEFT constraint,  $c_s^2 = 1/3$  reached asymptotically from below
- Compared to skewed Gaussian plus logistic function to reach asymptotic limit  $c_s^2 = 1/3$

$$c_{s}^{2}(x,\theta) = a_{1} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2} \frac{(x-a_{2})^{2}}{a_{3}^{2}}\right] \left(1 + \exp\left[\frac{a_{6}}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{x-a_{2}}{a_{3}}\right]\right) + \frac{1/3 - a_{7}}{1 + \exp\left[-a_{5}(x-a_{4})\right]} + a_{7}$$

[Greif et al,, MNRAS 485, 5363 (2019)] [Tews, Margueron and Reddy, EPJA 55, 97 (2019)]

Very similar findings, results robust against change of parametrization and Prior

