Light clusters in hot nuclear matter: calibrating the interaction with heavy-ion collisions (arXiv:2407.02307 [nucl-th])

Tiago Custódio¹, Alex Rebillard-Soulié², Rémi Bougault², Diégo Gruyer², Francesca Gulminelli², Tuhin Malik¹, Helena Pais¹ and Constança Providência¹

> ¹CFisUC, University of Coimbra ²LPC, Caen

Motivation

- Light nuclei might be present in both Core-Collapse Supernova and Binary Neutron Star Mergers
- Their presence influences the dynamics of these astrophysical events
- Accounting for in-medium modifications to the light clusters is essential to determine their correct abundances

• In Relativistic Mean-Field Theory, the interactions are mediated via the exchange of virtual mesons:

 σ, ω, ρ (1)

• In Relativistic Mean-Field Theory, the interactions are mediated via the exchange of virtual mesons:

$$
\sigma, \omega, \rho \tag{1}
$$

• The Lagrangian density for matter made of protons, neutrons and light clusters is:

$$
\mathcal{L} = \sum_{b=n,p} \mathcal{L}_b + \sum_{m=\sigma,\omega,\rho} \mathcal{L}_m + \sum_{\substack{i=^2 \text{H}, ^3 \text{H}, \\ ^3 \text{He}, ^4 \text{He}}} \mathcal{L}_i
$$
 (2)

• In Relativistic Mean-Field Theory, the interactions are mediated via the exchange of virtual mesons:

$$
\sigma, \omega, \rho \tag{1}
$$

• The Lagrangian density for matter made of protons, neutrons and light clusters is:

$$
\mathcal{L} = \sum_{b=n,p} \mathcal{L}_b + \sum_{m=\sigma,\omega,\rho} \mathcal{L}_m + \sum_{\substack{i=^2 \text{H}, ^3 \text{H}, \\ ^3 \text{He}, ^4 \text{He}}} \mathcal{L}_i
$$
 (2)

• The Lagrangian density for the **nucleons** is:

$$
\mathcal{L}_b = \bar{\Psi}_b(x) \left[i \gamma_\mu D_b^\mu - m_b^* \right] \Psi_b(x) , \qquad (3)
$$

$$
iD_b^{\mu} = i\partial^{\mu} - g_{\omega b}\omega^{\mu} - g_{\rho b}\vec{I}_b \cdot \vec{\rho^{\mu}}
$$
\n(4)

$$
m_b^* = m_b - g_{\sigma b} \sigma \tag{5}
$$

• In Relativistic Mean-Field Theory, the interactions are mediated via the exchange of virtual mesons:

$$
\sigma, \omega, \rho \tag{1}
$$

• The Lagrangian density for matter made of protons, neutrons and light clusters is:

$$
\mathcal{L} = \sum_{b=n,p} \mathcal{L}_b + \sum_{m=\sigma,\omega,\rho} \mathcal{L}_m + \sum_{\substack{i=^2 \text{H}, ^3 \text{H}, \\ ^3 \text{He}, ^4 \text{He}}} \mathcal{L}_i
$$
 (2)

• The Lagrangian density for the **nucleons** is:

$$
\mathcal{L}_b = \bar{\Psi}_b(x) \left[i \gamma_\mu D_b^\mu - m_b^* \right] \Psi_b(x) , \qquad (3)
$$

$$
iD_b^{\mu} = i\partial^{\mu} - g_{\omega b}\omega^{\mu} - g_{\rho b}\vec{I}_b \cdot \vec{\rho^{\mu}}
$$
\n(4)

$$
m_b^* = m_b - g_{\sigma b} \sigma \tag{5}
$$

• Calibrated to experimental nuclear parameters (e.g. FSU)

• Light clusters can be included as point-like independent quasi-particles, in the same way as nucleons, taking into account their corresponding spins

$$
\mathcal{L}_i = \bar{\Psi}_i \left[\gamma_\mu i D_i^\mu - M_i^* \right] \Psi_i, \ i = {}^3\mathrm{H}, {}^3\mathrm{He} \tag{6}
$$

• Light clusters can be included as point-like independent quasi-particles, in the same way as nucleons, taking into account their corresponding spins

$$
\mathcal{L}_{i} = \bar{\Psi}_{i} \left[\gamma_{\mu} i D_{i}^{\mu} - M_{i}^{*} \right] \Psi_{i}, i = {}^{3}H, {}^{3}He
$$
\n
$$
\mathcal{L}_{i} = \frac{1}{2} \left(i D_{i}^{\mu} \Psi_{i} \right)^{*} \left(i D_{\mu i} \Psi_{i} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \Psi_{i}^{*} (M_{i}^{*})^{2} \Psi_{i}, i = {}^{4}He
$$
\n(7)

• Light clusters can be included as point-like independent quasi-particles, in the same way as nucleons, taking into account their corresponding spins

$$
\mathcal{L}_{i} = \bar{\Psi}_{i} [\gamma_{\mu} i D_{i}^{\mu} - M_{i}^{*}] \Psi_{i}, i = {}^{3}H, {}^{3}He
$$
\n
$$
\mathcal{L}_{i} = \frac{1}{2} (i D_{i}^{\mu} \Psi_{i})^{*} (i D_{\mu i} \Psi_{i}) - \frac{1}{2} \Psi_{i}^{*} (M_{i}^{*})^{2} \Psi_{i}, i = {}^{4}He
$$
\n
$$
\mathcal{L}_{i} = \frac{1}{4} (i D_{i}^{\mu} \Psi_{i}^{\nu} - i D_{i}^{\nu} \Psi_{i}^{\mu})^{*} (i D_{\mu i} \Psi_{\nu i} - i D_{\nu i} \Psi_{\mu i})
$$
\n
$$
- \frac{1}{2} \Psi_{i}^{\mu*} (M_{i}^{*})^{2} \Psi_{\mu i}, i = {}^{2}H
$$
\n(8)

• Light clusters $(i = {}^{2}H, {}^{3}H, {}^{3}He, {}^{4}He)$ will have their own cluster-meson couplings:

$$
g_{\sigma i} = x_s A_i g_{\sigma N} \tag{9}
$$

$$
g_{\omega i} = A_i g_{\omega N} \tag{10}
$$

$$
g_{\rho i} = g_{\rho N} \tag{11}
$$

• Light clusters $(i = {}^{2}H, {}^{3}H, {}^{3}He, {}^{4}He)$ will have their own cluster-meson couplings:

$$
g_{\sigma i} = x_s A_i g_{\sigma N} \tag{9}
$$

$$
g_{\omega i} = A_i g_{\omega N} \tag{10}
$$

$$
g_{\rho i} = g_{\rho N} \tag{11}
$$

• $x_s(\rho, T)$ is a way of accounting for in-medium modification of the clusters self-energies

Projectile target central collision

 $136,124$ Xe+ $124,112$ Sn (32MeV/nucleon)

• Only central collisions selected (most violent)

Projectile target central collision

Angular selection : mid-velocity products Credits: Alex Rebillard-Soulié

Projectile target central collision

 $136,124$ Xe+ $124,112$ Sn (32MeV/nucleon)

- Only central collisions selected (most violent)
- Particles emitted from three main sources:
	- \rightarrow Target remnant
	- \rightarrow Projectile remnant
	- \rightarrow Mid-velocity products

Projectile target central collision

Angular selection: mid-velocity products Credits: Alex Rebillard-Soulié

Projectile target central collision

 $136,124$ Xe $+$ $124,112$ Sn (32MeV/nucleon)

- Only central collisions selected (most violent)
- Particles emitted from three main sources:
	- \rightarrow Target remnant
	- \rightarrow Projectile remnant
	- \rightarrow Mid-velocity products
- Angular selection to reduce secondary decays from other sources

Projectile target central collision

Angular selection: mid-velocity products Credits: Alex Rebillard-Soulié

• Data sorted in bins of the average Coulomb-corrected particle velocities v_{surf}

Credits: Alex Rebillard-Soulié

- Data sorted in bins of the average Coulomb-corrected particle velocities v_{surf}
- \bullet v_{surf} is the velocity of the emerging particle at the nuclear surface, prior to Coulomb acceleration

Credits: Alex Rebillard-Soulié

- Data sorted in bins of the average Coulomb-corrected particle velocities v_{surf}
- v_{surf} is the velocity of the emerging particle at the nuclear surface, prior to Coulomb acceleration
- v_{surf} correlated to the dynamics of the expansion, and therefore to the effective temperature of the source [Qin et al. (2012)]

Credits: Alex Rebillard-Soulié

- Data sorted in bins of the average Coulomb-corrected particle velocities v_{surf}
- v_{surf} is the velocity of the emerging particle at the nuclear surface, prior to Coulomb acceleration
- v_{surf} correlated to the dynamics of the expansion, and therefore to the effective temperature of the source [Qin et al. (2012)]
- Associate a statistical ensemble to each v_{surf} with corresponding particle mass fractions (nucleons and light clusters)

Credits: Alex Rebillard-Soulié

• T and ρ estimated considering an ideal gas of clusters in the grand canonical ensemble

[Bougault et al. (2020)]

• T and ρ estimated considering an ideal gas of clusters in the grand canonical ensemble

[Bougault et al. (2020)]

• For ρ an in-medium correction to the ideal gas was considered [Pais et al. (2020)]

• T and ρ estimated considering an ideal gas of clusters in the grand canonical ensemble

[Bougault et al. (2020)]

• For ρ an in-medium correction to the ideal gas was considered [Pais et al. (2020)]

• With these estimated values for particle densities, chemical equilibrium constants (Kc) were calculated:

$$
Kc_i=\frac{\rho_i}{\rho_n^{N_i}\rho_p^{Z_i}}
$$

• T and ρ estimated considering an ideal gas of clusters in the grand canonical ensemble

[Bougault et al. (2020)]

• For ρ an in-medium correction to the ideal gas was considered [Pais et al. (2020)]

• With these estimated values for particle densities, chemical equilibrium constants (Kc) were calculated:

$$
Kc_i=\frac{\rho_i}{\rho_n^{N_i}\rho_p^{Z_i}}
$$

• x_s has been calibrated by roughly considering the values that best fit the data visually

• If in-medium effects are important, considering an ideal gas should be a bad approximation

• If in-medium effects are important, considering an ideal gas should be a bad approximation

• Reanalysis of T, ρ , x_s avoiding the ideal gas assumption, and without considering any a-priori values

- If in-medium effects are important, considering an ideal gas should be a bad approximation
- Reanalysis of T, ρ , x_s avoiding the ideal gas assumption, and without considering any a-priori values
- The statistical ensembles will be described using RMF theory

- If in-medium effects are important, considering an ideal gas should be a bad approximation
- Reanalysis of T, ρ , x_s avoiding the ideal gas assumption, and without considering any a-priori values
- The statistical ensembles will be described using RMF theory
- For each system and v_{surf} bin, we carry out an independent Bayesian inference on the measured mass fractions $(4N_v = 52)$

$$
p_i(\theta|\{\omega_{AZ}\}) = \frac{p_\theta}{Z} \mathcal{L}_g(\{\omega_{AZ}\}_i|\theta), \quad \theta = \{T, \rho, x_s(\rho, T)\} \tag{12}
$$

Mass Fractions

Calibrated Temperatures and Densities

- Temperature evolution similar to the ideal gas estimation
- Results compatible with a single density ~ 0.015 fm⁻³: chemical freeze-out density at the surface of the emitting source (?)

Calibrated $x_s(T)$

- x_s is temperature dependent
- Interaction weakens with T
- $x_s(T)$ compatible for all four entrance channels

• Limited ρ range cannot provide information on possible x_s dependence on ρ

Table: Parameter estimates a, b, c with 1, 2σ uncertainties for the quadratic fit $x_s = aT^2 + bT + c$

Consequences of $x_s(T)$ for light cluster abundances

• Above $T \sim 8$ MeV abundances are systematically lower than the predictions of modified ideal gas

• Smaller x_s corresponds to weaker cluster- σ coupling, resulting in less bound clusters and, consequently, smaller abundances

• Previously, T and ρ were estimated considering an ideal gas of clusters

- Previously, T and ρ were estimated considering an ideal gas of clusters
- x_s was then estimated through chemical equilibrium constants

Summary

- Previously, T and ρ were estimated considering an ideal gas of clusters
- x_s was then estimated through chemical equilibrium constants
- In this work, a Bayesian inference was performed with a RMF model using mass fractions to determine temperature, density and cluster couplings

Summary

- Previously, T and ρ were estimated considering an ideal gas of clusters
- x_s was then estimated through chemical equilibrium constants
- In this work, a Bayesian inference was performed with a RMF model using mass fractions to determine temperature, density and cluster couplings
- T shows same increasing behaviour as before but the density turned out to be constant: chemical freeze-out (?)

Summary

- Previously, T and ρ were estimated considering an ideal gas of clusters
- x_s was then estimated through chemical equilibrium constants
- In this work, a Bayesian inference was performed with a RMF model using mass fractions to determine temperature, density and cluster couplings
- T shows same increasing behaviour as before but the density turned out to be constant: chemical freeze-out (?)
- x_s shows a dependence on T, weakening the clusters binding and abundances

• Repeat the analysis for different RMF nuclear models

- Repeat the analysis for different RMF nuclear models
- Study different Heavy-Ion reaction mechanisms and entrance channels to explore a wider range of temperatures and densities
- Repeat the analysis for different RMF nuclear models
- Study different Heavy-Ion reaction mechanisms and entrance channels to explore a wider range of temperatures and densities
- Employ this x_s parameterization for general purpose EoS
- Repeat the analysis for different RMF nuclear models
- Study different Heavy-Ion reaction mechanisms and entrance channels to explore a wider range of temperatures and densities
- Employ this x_s parameterization for general purpose EoS

Thank you!