# Neutron Stars as Nuclear and Particle Physics Laboratories

Sanjay Reddy, University of Washington, Seattle

- Introduction & motivation
- Mass, radius, ChiEFT & sound speed
- The dark side of neutron stars
- Open issues in ChiEFT & new 3NFs



**INSTITUTE** for NUCLEAR THEORY







## **Neutron Stars and Big Questions**







Nature of matter at extreme density?

### Origin of cosmic explosions?

### Nature of dark matter?

Synthesis of heavy elements?

## **Neutron Stars and Big Questions**







Nature of matter at extreme density?

### Origin of cosmic explosions?

### Synthesis of heavy elements?

### Nature of dark matter?



Measuring and interpreting neutron star properties has far reaching implications.



### (Relevant to probe its interior)



Neutrinos	<b>Gravitational Waves</b>



# Neutron Star Structure: Observations



2 M<sub> $\odot$ </sub> neutron stars exist. PSR J1614-2230: M=1.93(2) Demorest et al. (2010) PSR J0348+0432: M=2.01(4) M<sub> $\odot$ </sub> Anthoniadis et al. (2013) MSP J0740+6620: M=2.17(10) M<sub> $\odot$ </sub> Cromartie et al. (2019)

# Neutron Star Structure: Observations



### NS radii are difficult to measure:

Poorly understood systematic errors, preclude the determination of NS radius using x-ray observations of surface thermal emission.

2  $M_{\odot}$  neutron stars exist. PSR J1614-2230: M=1.93(2) Demorest et al. (2010) PSR J0348+0432: M=2.01(4) M<sub>☉</sub> Anthoniadis et al. (2013) MSP J0740+6620: M=2.17(10) M<sub>☉</sub> Cromartie et al. (2019)



# NICER: Radii from Hot Spots

Emission from rotating neutron stars with hot spots is sensitive to space-time geometry.

X-ray pulse profiles contain information about the source compactness.

NASA's NICER mission has acquired data from a couple of neutron stars. Modeling of hot spots and their x-ray emission favors radii in the 12-14 km range. Riley et al. (2019,2021), Miller et al. (2019,2021)









# NICER: Radii from Hot Spots

Emission from rotating neutron stars with hot spots is sensitive to space-time geometry.

X-ray pulse profiles contain information about the source compactness.

NASA's NICER mission has acquired data from a couple of neutron stars. Modeling of hot spots and their x-ray emission favors radii in the 12-14 km range. Riley et al. (2019,2021), Miller et al. (2019,2021)



PSR J0030:  $M = 1.44 \pm 0.15 M_{\odot}$  $R_e = 12.0 - 14.3 \text{ km}$ Miller et al. (2019), Riley et al. (2019)

PSR J0740:  $M = 2.08 \pm 0.07 M_{\odot}$  $R_e = 12.2 - 16.3 \text{ km}$  Miller et al. (2021)  $R_e = 12.4^{+1.3}_{-1.0} \text{ km}$  Riley et al. (2021)





### $R_{orbit} \lesssim 10 \; R_{NS}$



Tidal forces deform neutron stars. Induces a quadrupole moment.





tidal deformability

external field

-2

### $\mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{orbit}} \lesssim 10 \; \mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{NS}}$

Tidal forces deform neutron stars. Induces a quadrupole moment.



tidal deformability



external field

Tidal interactions change the rotational phase:  $\delta \Phi = -\frac{117}{256} v^5 \frac{M}{\mu} \tilde{\Lambda}$ 

-2

### ${\sf R}_{\sf orbit} \lesssim 10 \; {\sf R}_{\sf NS}$

Tidal forces deform neutron stars. Induces a quadrupole moment.



tidal deformability

external field

Tidal interactions change the rotational phase:  $\delta \Phi = -\frac{117}{256} v^5 \frac{M}{u} \tilde{\Lambda}$ 

Dimensionless binary tidal deformability:  $\tilde{\Lambda} = \frac{16}{13} \left( \left( \frac{M_1}{M} \right)^5 \left( 1 + \frac{M_2}{M_1} \right) \Lambda_1 + 1 \leftrightarrow 2 \right)$ 

### $\mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{orbit}} \lesssim 10 \; \mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{NS}}$

Dimensionless binary tidal deformab

 $R_i^5$ Tidal deformations are large for a large NS:  $\Lambda_i = \frac{\lambda_i}{M_i^5}$ 

2

Tidal forces deform neutron stars. Induces a quadrupole moment.



tidal deformability

 $\partial x \partial y$ external field

Tidal interactions change the rotational phase:  $\delta \Phi = -\frac{117}{256} v^5 \frac{M}{\mu} \tilde{\Lambda}$ 

pility: 
$$\tilde{\Lambda} = \frac{16}{13} \left( \left( \frac{M_1}{M} \right)^5 \left( 1 + \frac{M_2}{M_1} \right) \Lambda_1 + 1 \leftrightarrow 2 \right)$$

# Radius constraints from GW170817



De et al. PRL (2018) See also LIGO and Virgo Scientific Collaboration arXiV:1805.11581v1

**Double Neutron Stars** Galactic Neutron Stars

フ

0

.61

 $\bigcirc$ 

 $\mathbf{O}$ 

2.115

Tidal deformations (not) observed in GW170817 implies a small NS radius: R < 13 km

One can combine additional information from nuclear physics and electromagnetic observations to improve the constraint.



# Radius constraints from GW170817



Capano, Tews, Brown, Margalit, De, Kumar, Brown, Krishnan, Reddy (2020)



### **Cosmic Explorer, USA**





### Einstein Telescope, EU









# Golden Age for Compact Object Astrophysics

- We anticipate a wealth of new data relating to compact object mergers during the next 10-20 years.
- GW astronomy is poised to detect all mergers with staggering event rates!



Next-generation GW detectors will detect > 20,000 BNS/year

About 100 events/year will be provide precise (error < 10%) measurements of NS masses and radii.

pact object mergers during the next 10-20 years. staggering event rates!

Animation Credit: NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center/CI Lab

# Golden Age for Compact Object Astrophysics

- We anticipate a wealth of new data relating to compact object mergers during the next 10-20 years.
- GW astronomy is poised to detect all mergers with staggering event rates!



Next-generation GW detectors will detect > 20,000 BNS/year

About 100 events/year will be provide precise (error < 10%) measurements of NS masses and radii.

pact object mergers during the next 10-20 years. staggering event rates!

Animation Credit: NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center/CI Lab



### $P(\varepsilon) + \text{Gen.Rel.} = M(R)$



### $P(\varepsilon) + \text{Gen.Rel.} = M(R)$





### $P(\varepsilon) + \text{Gen.Rel.} = M(R)$



## $P(\varepsilon) + \text{Gen.Rel.} = M(R)$

A small radius and large maximum mass implies a rapid transition from low pressure to high pressure with density.



1 1			
0	15	20	25
R (kr	n)		







If Oppenheimer's calculation of the maximum mass was correct neutron stars would not exist ! Neither would supernova !



0	15	20	25
R (kr	m)		

Chandrashekar had already shown that electron degeneracy pressure would support an







If Oppenheimer's calculation of the maximum mass was correct neutron stars would not exist ! Neither would supernova !



# **Inside Neutron Stars**







## General Constraints on the Equation of State















The potential between two neutrons at low energy is well constrained by scattering data but interactions at short distances are model dependent.

Constraints on the three-neutron potential are weaker.



Constraints on the three-neutron potential



Constraints on the three-neutron potential

& Equation of State



Beane, Bedaque, Epelbaum, Kaplan, Machliedt, Meisner, Phillips, Savage, van Klock, Weinberg, Wise ...



Beane, Bedaque, Epelbaum, Kaplan, Machliedt, Meisner, Phillips, Savage, van Klock, Weinberg, Wise ...



Beane, Bedaque, Epelbaum, Kaplan, Machliedt, Meisner, Phillips, Savage, van Klock, Weinberg, Wise ...
# Chiral-EFT: The Good, the Bad, and the Power-Counting Ugly



operators to estimate errors.



# remains difficult to quantify.



Incorporates symmetries and provides an expansion of

The connection to QCD, particularly to the quark masses,

The cut-off needed to regulate loop-integrals can only be varied over a small range. Not RG invariant.



#### Equation of State of Dense Nuclear Matter

Quantum many-body calculations of neutron matter and nuclear matter using EFT potentials show convergence up to about twice nuclear saturation density.

Hebeler and Schwenk (2009), Gandolfi, Carlson, Reddy (2010), Gezerlis et al. (2013), Tews, Kruger, Hebeler, Schwenk (2013), Holt Kaiser, Weise (2013), Hagen et al. (2013), Roggero, Mukherjee, Pederiva (2014), Wlazlowski, Holt, Moroz, Bulgac, Roche (2014), Tews et al. (2018), Drischler et al., (2020).

Three-nucleon forces at N<sup>2</sup>LO play a key role. They provide the repuslion needed for saturation the pressure needed to hold up neutron stars.

Drischler et al. used Bayesian methods to systematically estimate the EFT truncation errors in neutron and nuclear matter.

Drischler, Furnstahl, Melendez, Phillips, (2020).



#### Equation of State of Neutron Star Matter

In neutron stars, matter is in equilibrium with respect to weak interactions and contains a small fraction (about 5-10%) of protons, electrons and muons:

Many-body perturbation theory and Bayesian estimates of the EFT truncation errors predict:

 $P_{\rm NSM}(n_B = 0.16 \text{ fm}^{-3}) = 3.0 \pm 0.4 \text{ MeV/fm}^3$  $P_{\rm NSM}(n_B = 0.34 \text{ fm}^{-3}) = 20.0 \pm 5 \text{ MeV/fm}^3$ 



**Christian Drischler** 



Sophia Han



Tianqi Zhao





EFT predictions for the EOS can be combined with extremal high-density EOS (with  $c_s^2 = 1$ ) to derive robust bounds on the radius of a NS of any mass.

The lower limit on the NS maximum mass obtained from observations strengthen these bounds:

- $M_{\rm max} > 2.0 M_{\odot}$ , 9.2 km < R<sub>1.4</sub> < 13.2 km
- $M_{\rm max} > 2.6 M_{\odot}$ , 11.2 km < R<sub>1.4</sub> < 13.2 km

If  $R_{1.4 is}$  small (<11.5 km) or large (>12.5 km), it would imply a very large speed of sound in the cores of massive neutron stars.





EFT predictions for the EOS can be combined with extremal high-density EOS (with  $c_s^2 = 1$ ) to derive robust bounds on the radius of a NS of any mass.

The lower limit on the NS maximum mass obtained from observations strengthen these bounds:

- $M_{\rm max} > 2.0 M_{\odot}$ , 9.2 km < R<sub>1.4</sub> < 13.2 km
- $M_{\rm max} > 2.6 M_{\odot}$ , 11.2 km < R<sub>1.4</sub> < 13.2 km

If  $R_{1.4 is}$  small (<11.5 km) or large (>12.5 km), it would imply a very large speed of sound in the cores of massive neutron stars.





EFT predictions for the EOS can be combined with extremal high-density EOS (with  $c_s^2 = 1$ ) to derive robust bounds on the radius of a NS of any mass.

The lower limit on the NS maximum mass obtained from observations strengthen these bounds:

- $M_{\rm max} > 2.0 M_{\odot}$ , 9.2 km < R<sub>1.4</sub> < 13.2 km
- $M_{\rm max} > 2.6 M_{\odot}$ , 11.2 km < R<sub>1.4</sub> < 13.2 km

If  $R_{1.4 is}$  small (<11.5 km) or large (>12.5 km), it would imply a very large speed of sound in the cores of massive neutron stars.





EFT predictions for the EOS can be combined with extremal high-density EOS (with  $c_s^2 = 1$ ) to derive robust bounds on the radius of a NS of any mass.

The lower limit on the NS maximum mass obtained from observations strengthen these bounds:

- $M_{\rm max} > 2.0 M_{\odot}$ , 9.2 km < R<sub>1.4</sub> < 13.2 km
- $M_{\rm max} > 2.6 M_{\odot}$ , 11.2 km < R<sub>1.4</sub> < 13.2 km

If  $R_{1.4 is}$  small (<11.5 km) or large (>12.5 km), it would imply a very large speed of sound in the cores of massive neutron stars.























# Speed of Sound in Dense Matter

<u>d</u>  $\partial \epsilon$ 

Large maximum mass and observed radii, combined with neutron matter calculations suggests a rapid increase in pressure in the neutron star core.

This implies a large and nonmonotonic sound speed in dense QCD matter.

Suggests the existence of a strongly interacting phase of relativistic matter.



Tews, Carlson, Gandolfi and Reddy (2018) Steiner & Bedaque (2016)



# Speed of Sound in Dense Matter

<u>dP</u>  $\partial \epsilon$ 

Large maximum mass and observed radii, combined with neutron matter calculations suggests a rapid increase in pressure in the neutron star core.

This implies a large and nonmonotonic sound speed in dense QCD matter.

Suggests the existence of a strongly interacting phase of relativistic matter.



Tews, Carlson, Gandolfi and Reddy (2018) Steiner & Bedaque (2016)



# Speed of Sound in Dense Matter

<u>oP</u>  $\partial \epsilon$ 

Large maximum mass and observed radii, combined with neutron matter calculations suggests a rapid increase in pressure in the neutron star core.

This implies a large and nonmonotonic sound speed in dense QCD matter.

Suggests the existence of a strongly interacting phase of relativistic matter.



Tews, Carlson, Gandolfi and Reddy (2018) Steiner & Bedaque (2016)





Drischler, Han, Lattimer, Prakash, Reddy, Zhao (2020)



of next-generation GW detectors.





Drischler, Han, Lattimer, Prakash, Reddy, Zhao (2020)



of next-generation GW detectors.





Drischler, Han, Lattimer, Prakash, Reddy, Zhao (2020)



of next-generation GW detectors.





Drischler, Han, Lattimer, Prakash, Reddy, Zhao (2020)



tidal deformability per year is within reach of next-generation GW detectors.





Drischler, Han, Lattimer, Prakash, Reddy, Zhao (2020)



tidal deformability per year is within reach of next-generation GW detectors.



# The Dark Side of Neuton stars

Neutron stars are great places to look for dark matter

They accrete and trap dark matter.

$$M_{\chi} < 10^{-14} M_{\odot} \left( \frac{\rho_{\chi}}{1 \text{ GeV/cm}^3} \right) \frac{t}{\text{Gyr}}$$

Produce dark matter due to its high density.

$$M_{\chi} \lesssim M_{\odot}$$
 for  $m_{\chi} < 2$  GeV

 Produce dark matter due to high temperatures at birth or during mergers.

$$M_{\chi} \lesssim 10^{-1} M_{\odot}$$
 for  $m_{\chi} < 100$  MeV



#### Black-Holes in the Neutron Star Mass-Range

Idea: Accretion of asymmetric bosonic dark matter can induce the collapse of an NS to a BH. Goldman & Nussinov (1989)

$$M_{\chi} \approx 10^{-14} M_{\odot} \text{ Min}$$

The maximum mass of weakly Interacting bosons is negligible:

$$M_{\rm Bosons} \approx 10^{-18} M_{\odot} \left( \frac{{\rm GeV}}{m_{\chi}} \right)$$

The existence of old neutron stars in the Milkyway with estimated age ~ Gyr provides strong constraints on asymmetric DM.

For a concise reviews see Kouvaris (2013) and Zurek (2013)

$$\frac{\sigma}{10^{-45} \text{cm}^2}, 1 \left[ \left( \frac{\rho_{\chi}}{1 \text{ GeV/cm}^3} \right) \frac{t}{\text{Gyr}} \right]$$



m, (

### Time Scale for Converting NSs into BHs

For dark matter in the 1-10<sup>6</sup> GeV mass range, black hole formation is complex and involves several timescales.

Capture time is typically the limiting step. But, thermalization can be slow in exotic superfluid phases and depends on processes in the inner core!

C. Kouvaris and P. Tinyakov (2011) S. D. McDermott, H.-B. Yu, and K. M. Zurek, (2012)B. Bertoni, A. E. Nelson, and S. Reddy (2013) + many more, more refined recent analyses.



Divya Singh, Gupta, Berti, Reddy, Sathyaprakash (2024)



### Time Scale for Converting NSs into BHs

For dark matter in the 1-10<sup>6</sup> GeV mass range, black hole formation is complex and involves several timescales.

Capture time is typically the limiting step. But, thermalization can be slow in exotic superfluid phases and depends on processes in the inner core!

C. Kouvaris and P. Tinyakov (2011) S. D. McDermott, H.-B. Yu, and K. M. Zurek, (2012)B. Bertoni, A. E. Nelson, and S. Reddy (2013) + many more, more refined recent analyses.



A measurement of the tidal deformability will allow us to distinguish BBH from BNS to infer the collape time in next generation detectors.



Divya Singh, Gupta, Berti, Reddy, Sathyaprakash (2024)

#### Constraining Dark Baryons

Dark sectors could contain particles in the MeV-GeV mass range that mix with baryons.

There was speculation that a dark baryon with mass  $m_{\chi}$  between  $n \rightarrow \chi + \dots$ 937.76 - 938.78 MeV might explain the discrepancy between neutron lifetime measurements. Fornal & Grinstein (2018)

$$\tau_n^{\text{bottle}} = 879.6 \pm 0.6 \text{ s} - - \text{counts neutrons}$$

 $\tau_n^{\text{beam}} = 888.0 \pm 2.0 \text{ s} - \text{counts protons}$ 

A model for hidden baryons that mix with the neutron:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \bar{n} \left( i \not\partial - \right)$$

Mixing angle:  $\theta = \frac{\delta}{1 + \delta}$  $\Delta M$ 

An explanation of the anomaly requires  $\theta \simeq 10^{-9}$ 

Neutron stars can probe much smaller mixing angles:  $\theta \simeq 10^{-18}$ 

$$Br_{n \to \chi} = 1 - \frac{\tau_n^{\text{bottle}}}{\tau_n^{\text{beam}}} = (0.9 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-10}$$

 $m_n$ )  $n + \bar{\chi} (i \partial - m_{\chi}) \chi - \delta (\bar{\chi} n + \bar{n} \chi)$ 



#### Weakly Interacting Dark Baryons Destabilize Neutron Stars



Neutron decay lowers the nucleon density at a given energy density.

When dark baryons are weakly interacting the equation of state is soft ~ similar to that of a free fermi gas.

Mckeen, Nelson, Reddy, Zhou (2018) Baym,

Baym, Beck, Geltenbort, Shelton (2018)



#### This lowers the maximum mass of neutron stars.

Motta, Guichon and Thomas (2018)



### Self-interacting Dark Matter Using Gravitational Waves to Discover Hidden Sectors

Self-interacting dark matter can be stable and bound to neutron stars - a new class of compact dark objects.

Gravitational wave observations of binary compact objects whose masses and tidal deformability's differ from those expected from neutron stars and stellar black holes would provide conclusive evidence for a strongly self-interacting dark sector:

> Mass  $< 0.1 M_{solar}$ Tidal Deformability > 600

Nelson, Reddy, & Zhou (2018) Horowitz & Reddy (2018)



#### NS + dark-halo

**Compact Dark Objects** 



# Dark Halos Alter Tidal Interactions

Trace amount of light dark matter ~  $10^{-4}$ - $10^{-2}$  M<sub>solar</sub> is adequate to enhance the tidal deformability  $\Lambda > 800!$ 

Self-Interactions of "natural-size" can provide adequate repulsion.

 $g_{\chi}/m_{\Phi} = (0.1/MeV) \text{ or } (10^{-6}/eV)$ 



# Dark Halos Alter Tidal Interactions

Trace amount of light dark matter ~  $10^{-4}$ - $10^{-2}$  M<sub>solar</sub> is adequate to enhance the tidal deformability  $\Lambda > 800$  !

Self-Interactions of "natural-size" can provide adequate repulsion.

 $g_{\chi}/m_{\Phi} = (0.1/MeV) \text{ or } (10^{-6}/eV)$ 







C. Drischler, R. J. Furnstahl, J. A. Meleldez, D. R. Phillips (2021)



I. Tews, R. Somasundaram, D. Lonardoni, H. Göttling, R. Seutin, J. Carlson S. Gandolfi, K. Hebeler, A. Schwenk (2024)
C. Drischler, R. J. Furnstahl, J. A. Meleldez, D. R. Phillips (2021)



I. Tews, R. Somasundaram, D. Lonardoni, H. Göttling, R. Seutin, J. Carlson S. Gandolfi, K. Hebeler, A. Schwenk (2024)







#### **Renormalization requires** $D_2$ :

Kaplan, Savage, Wise (1998)

To obtain a scattering amplitude that is independent of regularization or cut-off  $\Lambda$  requires:

$$\Lambda \frac{d}{d\Lambda} \left( \frac{D_2}{C_0^2} \right)_{\text{KSW}} = \frac{g_A^2 m_N^2}{64\pi^2 f_\pi^2}$$

$$\frac{g_A^2}{4f_\pi^2} \frac{\sigma_1 \cdot \mathbf{q} \ \sigma_2 \cdot \mathbf{q}}{\mathbf{q}^2 + m_\pi^2} \ \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2$$





$$\frac{|D_2|}{C_0^2} \approx \frac{g_A^2 m_N^2}{64\pi^2 f_\pi^2} \simeq \frac{1}{4}$$



#### **Renormalization requires** $D_2$ :

Kaplan, Savage, Wise (1998)

To obtain a scattering amplitude that is independent of regularization or cut-off  $\Lambda$  requires:

$$\Lambda \frac{d}{d\Lambda} \left( \frac{D_2}{C_0^2} \right)_{\text{KSW}} = \frac{g_A^2 m_N^2}{64\pi^2 f_\pi^2}$$

Analysis of 2-nucleon scattering in Lattice QCD for different values  $m_{\pi}$  could, in principle, determine  $D_2$  but systematics are too large at this time.

$$\frac{g_A^2}{4f_\pi^2} \frac{\sigma_1 \cdot \mathbf{q} \ \sigma_2 \cdot \mathbf{q}}{\mathbf{q}^2 + m_\pi^2} \ \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2$$







#### **Renormalization requires** $D_2$ :

Kaplan, Savage, Wise (1998)

To obtain a scattering amplitude that is independent of regularization or cut-off  $\Lambda$  requires:

$$\Lambda \frac{d}{d\Lambda} \left( \frac{D_2}{C_0^2} \right)_{\text{KSW}} = \frac{g_A^2 m_N^2}{64\pi^2 f_\pi^2}$$

Analysis of 2-nucleon scattering in Lattice QCD for different values  $m_{\pi}$  could, in principle, determine  $D_2$  but systematics are too large at this time. Beane, Bedaque, Detmold, Savage (NPLQCD), Walker-Loud (Cal-Lat), Aoki, Hatsuda, Ishii (HAL QCD Collaboration), ....

$$\frac{g_A^2}{4f_\pi^2} \frac{\sigma_1 \cdot \mathbf{q} \ \sigma_2 \cdot \mathbf{q}}{\mathbf{q}^2 + m_\pi^2} \ \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2$$





## $D_2$ and Coupling to Pions

#### Chiral symmetry requires that pion mass terms only appear in a specified form:

This induces a coupling of pions to two-nucleons:





## Two more enhanced pion-two-nucleon couplings: $E_2$ and $F_2$

B. Borasoy and H. W. Griesshammer (2001), (2003)





 $D_{2}, E_{2}, \& F_{2}$  are enhanced for the same reason and are apriori expected to be of similar size.

Typical size of these LECs:

Note, in Naive Dimensional Analysis:  $D_2 \approx E_2 \approx F_2 \approx rac{1}{\Lambda 4}$ 

$$P_2 \approx E_2 \approx F_2 \approx \frac{1}{5f_\pi^4}$$



Vincenzo Cirigliano, Maria Dawid, Wouter Dekens and Sanjay Reddy (2024)

3NF due to pion coupling to two nucleons are large because:

•  $D_2 \& F_2$  are enhanced by the large n-n scattering length. • Enhanced loop contribution due to small nucleon kinetic energy.

$$V_{ijk}^{i'j'k'}(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3) = -\frac{9g_A^2 D_2 m_\pi^3}{128\pi f_\pi^4} \kappa_{ij}^{i'j'} \delta_{kk'} \,\mathcal{I}\left(\frac{\vec{q}_3^2}{4m_\pi^2}\right) \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{I}(b) = \frac{2}{3} \left(1 + \left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{b}} + \sqrt{b}\right) \cot^{-1}(1/\sqrt{b})\right)$$
$$V_{ijk}^{i'j'k'}(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3) = -\frac{15F_2 g_A^2 m_\pi^3}{16\pi f_\pi^4} \delta_{kk'} \left(\bar{f}_2^S \delta_{ii'} \delta_{jj'} + \bar{f}_2^T \vec{\sigma}_{i'i} \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{j'j}\right) \mathcal{J}\left(\frac{\vec{q}_3^2}{4m_\pi^2}\right) \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{J}(b) = \frac{3}{5} \left((1 + 2b)\mathcal{J}(b) + \frac{2}{3}\right)$$

## **A New Class of Three Nucleon Forces**







Maria Dawid



Vincenzo Cirigliano, Maria Dawid, Wouter Dekens and Sanjay Reddy (2024)

3NF due to pion coupling to two nucleons are large because:

•  $D_2 \& F_2$  are enhanced by the large n-n scattering length. • Enhanced loop contribution due to small nucleon kinetic energy.

$$V_{ijk}^{i'j'k'}(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3) = -\frac{9g_A^2 D_2 m_\pi^3}{128\pi f_\pi^4} \kappa_{ij}^{i'j'} \delta_{kk'} \,\mathcal{I}\left(\frac{\vec{q}_3^2}{4m_\pi^2}\right) \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{I}(b) = \frac{2}{3} \left(1 + \left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{b}} + \sqrt{b}\right) \cot^{-1}(1/\sqrt{b})\right)$$
$$V_{ijk}^{i'j'k'}(\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3) = -\frac{15F_2 g_A^2 m_\pi^3}{16\pi f_\pi^4} \delta_{kk'} \left(\bar{f}_2^S \delta_{ii'} \delta_{jj'} + \bar{f}_2^T \vec{\sigma}_{i'i} \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{j'j}\right) \mathcal{J}\left(\frac{\vec{q}_3^2}{4m_\pi^2}\right) \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{J}(b) = \frac{3}{5} \left((1 + 2b)\mathcal{J}(b) + \frac{2}{3}\right)$$

## **A New Class of Three Nucleon Forces**





## $D_2$ and $F_2$ Contributions to the Energy are Large

In neutron and nuclear matter, the leading 3NF plays a critical role.



The new 3NF can be large enough to compete with the NNLO forces currently employed in Chiral EFT.

The uncertainty is large because  $D_2 \& F_2$  are not yet known.

Nuclear structure and pion-nucleus scattering data can independently constrain  $D_2 \& F_2$ .



- Independent determinations would test the convergence of EFT and estimates of truncation errors.

V. Cirigliano, M. Dawid, W. Dekens, S. Reddy (2024)





## **Neutron Matter: Underestimating Errors?**



#### **Current Paradigm:**

Leading 3NF is determined by pionnucleon scattering data. Independent of multinucleon information. Errors are small becasue there are no 3NF shortdistance contributions.

#### **Our calculation:**

Pion coupling to twonucleons can play a role. Information about twonucleon dynamics influences 3NF to ensure proper renormalization. Error estimates will likely need revision.

# Chiral EFT at N<sup>2</sup>L0 predicts $P(n_{sat}) = 3.1 \pm 0.5 \text{ MeV/fm}^3$

C. Drischler, R. J. Furnstahl, J. A. Meleldez, D. R. Phillips (2021)

## $P(n_{sat}) = 2.2 \pm 0.4 \text{ (MeV/fm}^3)$

I. Tews, R. Somasundaram, D. Lonardoni, H. Göttling, R. Seutin, J. Carlson S. Gandolfi, K. Hebeler, A. Schwenk (2024)

#### We estimate the contribution to the pressure from our new 3NFs to be:

$$\delta P_{3\rm NF} = \left[ 0.7 \left( \frac{D_2}{D_2^{\rm ref}} \right) + 8.8 \left( \frac{F_2}{F_2^{\rm ref}} \right) \right]$$

 $|D_2^{\text{ref}}| = |F_2^{\text{ref}}| = \frac{1}{5f_\pi^4}$ where

V. Cirigliano, M. Dawid, W. Dekens, S. Reddy (2024)

# MeV fm<sup>3</sup>

## **Simple Error Estimates with Empirical Constraints**

δP (MeV/fm<sup>3</sup>)

Energy of neutron matter at  $E_{NM}(n_B = n_{sat}) = -16 \pm 0.4 + S_0$  MeV where the symmetry energy

$$S_0 = 32 \pm 2 \text{ MeV}$$

We correlate  $D_2$  and  $F_2$  assuming that these new 3NFs contribute  $\delta S_0$  to the symmetry energy. This allows us to estimate the error in the pressure of neutron matter.

Binding energy and radii of light and medum mass nuclei can constrain  $D_2$  and  $F_2$ . Several groups are currently working on it.

