# Inverse magnetic catalysis in nonlocal chiral quark models

## V P Pagura<sup>1</sup>, D Gómez Dumm<sup>2,3</sup>, S Noguera<sup>1</sup> and N N Scoccola<sup>3,4,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Departamento de Física Teórica and IFIC, Centro Mixto Universidad de Valencia-CSIC, E-46100 Burjassot (Valencia), Spain

<sup>2</sup> IFLP, CONICET – Departamento de Física, Fac. de Cs. Exactas, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, C.C. 67, (1900) La Plata, Argentina

<sup>3</sup> CONICET, Rivadavia 1917, (1033) Buenos Aires, Argentina

<sup>4</sup> Physics Department, Comisión Nacional de Energía Atómica,

Av. Libertador 8250, (1429) Buenos Aires, Argentina

<sup>5</sup> Universidad Favaloro, Solís 453, (1078) Buenos Aires, Argentina

E-mail: Valeria.Pagura@uv.es

Abstract. We study the behavior of strongly interacting matter under an external magnetic field in the context of nonlocal Polyakov-Nambu-Jona-Lasinio (PNJL) -like models. We find that at zero temperature the condensates display the well-known Magnetic Catalysis effect, showing a good quantitative agreement with lattice QCD results. Moreover, when extended to finite temperature we find that the Inverse Magnetic Catalysis effect is naturally incorporated.

#### 1. Introduction

Over the last years the understanding of the behavior of strongly interacting matter under extremely intense magnetic fields has attracted increasing attention, due to its relevance for subjects such as the physics of magnetars [1], the analysis of heavy ion collisions at very high energies [2] or the study of the first phases of the Universe [3]. Consequently, considerable work has been devoted to study the structure of the QCD phase diagram in the presence of an external magnetic field [4]. From most low-energy effective models of QCD it was generally expected that, at zero chemical potential, the magnetic field would lead to an enhancement of the chiral condensate ("magnetic catalysis"), independently of the temperature of the system. However, LQCD calculations [5,6] show that, whereas at low temperatures one finds indeed such an enhancement, close to the critical chiral restoration temperature light quark condensates exhibit a nonmonotonic behavior as functions of the external magnetic field, which results in a decrease of the transition temperature when the magnetic field is increased. This effect is known as inverse magnetic catalysis (IMC). Although many scenarios have been considered in the last few years to account for the IMC [7-22], the mechanism behind this effect is not yet fully understood. With this motivation, we study the behavior of strongly interacting matter under an external magnetic field in the framework of nonlocal chiral quark models, theories that are proposed as nonlocal extensions of the well-known (P)NJL model, intending to go a step further towards a more realistic effective approach to QCD [23–30].

Content from this work may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 licence. Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI. Published under licence by IOP Publishing Ltd 1

#### 2. Theoretical formalism

Let us start by stating the Euclidean action for our nonlocal NJL-like two-flavor quark model,

$$S_E = \int d^4x \left\{ \bar{\psi}(x) \left( -i\partial \!\!\!/ + m_c \right) \psi(x) - \frac{G}{2} j_a(x) j_a(x) \right\} . \tag{1}$$

Here  $m_c$  is the current quark mass, equal for u and d quarks. The nonlocal currents are given by  $j_a(x) = \int d^4z \,\mathcal{G}(z) \,\bar{\psi}(x + \frac{z}{2}) \,\Gamma_a \,\psi(x - \frac{z}{2})$ , where  $\Gamma_a = (\mathbb{1}, i\gamma_5 \vec{\tau})$ , and  $\mathcal{G}(z)$  is a nonlocal form factor. In order to study the influence of an external magnetic field we introduce in Eq. (1) a coupling to an electromagnetic gauge field  $\mathcal{A}_{\mu}$ . This can be done by performing appropriate changes in the covariant derivative and in the nonlocal currents (see Refs. [32,33] for details). We restrict to the case of a constant and homogeneous magnetic field along the 3-axis. Next we perform a standard bosonization, introducing scalar and pseudoscalar fields  $\sigma(x)$  and  $\vec{\pi}(x)$ . Within the mean field approximation (MFA), pseudoscalar field vacuum expectation values (VEVs) vanish, and we assume the VEV of the scalar field,  $\bar{\sigma}$ , to be homogeneous in coordinate space. In this way, following the Ritus eigenfunction method [31] we find the corresponding action,  $S_{\text{bos}}^{\text{MFA}}$  [32].

We extend the analysis of the model to a system at finite T by using the standard Matsubara formalism. In order to account for confinement effects, we include the coupling of fermions to the Polyakov loop (PL) assuming that quarks move on a constant color background field  $\phi = ig \,\delta_{\mu 0} \,G_a^{\mu} \lambda^a/2$ , where  $G_a^{\mu}$  are the SU(3) color gauge fields. We will work in the so-called Polyakov gauge, in which the matrix  $\phi$  is given a diagonal representation  $\phi = \phi_3 \lambda_3 + \phi_8 \lambda_8$ , taking the traced Polyakov loop  $\Phi = \frac{1}{3}$ Tr  $\exp(i\phi/T)$  as an order parameter of the deconfinement transition. We include effective gauge field self-interactions through a PL potential. In this work we consider two alternative forms proposed in the literature: a potential given by a polynomial function based on a Ginzburg-Landau ansatz (Poly) [35], and the so-called "improved" PL potential proposed in Ref. [36], in which the full QCD potential is related to a Yang-Mills potential (Poly Imp). Then, the MFA thermodynamical potential  $\Omega_{B,T}^{MFA}$  and the associated gap equations can be obtained. It is seen that  $\Omega_{B,T}^{MFA}$  turns out to be divergent, we regularize it following Ref. [26]. By deriving  $\Omega_{B,T}^{MFA}$  with respect to  $m_c$  we get the magnetic field dependent quark condensate for each flavor

$$\langle \bar{\psi}_{f} \psi_{f} \rangle_{B,T}^{\text{reg}} = -\frac{|q_{f}B|T}{\pi} \sum_{c} \int \frac{dp_{3}}{2\pi} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \\ \begin{cases} \frac{M_{k,p_{\parallel nc}}^{-,f} \left[ p_{\parallel nc}^{2} + 2k|q_{f}B| + (M_{k,p_{\parallel nc}}^{+,f})^{2} \right] + (+ \leftrightarrow -)}{\left( 2k|q_{f}B| + p_{\parallel nc}^{2} + M_{k,p_{\parallel nc}}^{-,f} M_{k,p_{\parallel nc}}^{+,f} \right)^{2} + p_{\parallel nc}^{2} \left( M_{k,p_{\parallel nc}}^{+,f} - M_{k,p_{\parallel nc}}^{-,f} \right)^{2}} \\ - \frac{2m_{c}}{p_{\parallel nc}^{2} + 2k|q_{f}B| + m_{c}^{2}} \\ - \frac{N_{c}m_{c}^{3}}{4\pi^{2}} \left[ \frac{\ln\Gamma(x_{f})}{x_{f}} - \frac{\ln 2\pi}{2x_{f}} + 1 - \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2x_{f}} \right) \ln x_{f} \right] \\ + \frac{|q_{f}B|}{\pi} \sum_{c} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{k} \int \frac{dp}{2\pi} \frac{m_{c}}{\epsilon_{kp}^{f} \left[ 1 + \exp(\epsilon_{kp}^{f}/T + i\phi_{c}) \right]} ,$$

$$(2)$$

where the color index c runs over r, g, b and the color background fields are  $\phi_r = -\phi_g = \phi_3$ ,  $\phi_b = 0$ . We have defined  $p_{\parallel nc} = (p_3, [(2n+1)\pi T + \phi_c])$  where n is associated to the Matsubara frequencies,  $x_f = m_c^2/(2|q_f B|)$ ,  $\alpha_k = 2 - \delta_{k0}$  and  $\epsilon_{kp}^f = \sqrt{2k|q_f B| + p^2 + m_c^2}$ . We have also defined

$$M_{k,p_{\parallel nc}}^{\lambda,f} = (-1)^{k - \frac{1 - \lambda s_f}{2}} \int_0^\infty dr \, r \, \exp(-r^2/2) \left[ m_c + \bar{\sigma} \, g \left( \frac{|q_f B|}{2} r^2 + p_{\parallel nc}^2 \right) \right] \, L_{k - \frac{1 - \lambda s_f}{2}}(r^2). \tag{3}$$

Here  $s_f = \text{sign}(q_f B)$ , while  $g(p^2)$  is the Fourier transform of  $\mathcal{G}(z)$ ,  $L_k(x)$  are the Laguerre polynomials, and the index k labels the Landau levels.

Finally, to make contact with the LQCD results quoted in Ref. [6] we define the normalized quark condensate

$$\Sigma_{B,T}^{f} = \frac{2m_c}{S^4} \left[ \langle \bar{\psi}_f \psi_f \rangle_{B,T}^{\text{reg}} - \langle \bar{\psi}_f \psi_f \rangle_{0,0}^{\text{reg}} \right] + 1 , \qquad (4)$$

where the scale S is given by  $S = (135 \times 86)^{1/2}$  MeV. We also introduce the definitions  $\Delta \Sigma_{B,T}^f = \Sigma_{B,T}^f - \Sigma_{0,T}^f$  and  $\Delta \bar{\Sigma}_{B,T} = (\Delta \Sigma_{B,T}^u + \Delta \Sigma_{B,T}^d)/2$ , which correspond to the subtracted normalized flavor condensate and the normalized flavor average condensate, respectively.

For definiteness we consider the case of a Gaussian form factor  $g(p^2) = \exp(-p^2/\Lambda^2)$ . Thus the model parameters are  $m_c$ , G, and  $\Lambda$ , that we fix so as to reproduce empirical values of  $f_{\pi}, m_{\pi}$ and a given value of the quark condensate at zero T and B,  $\Phi_0 \equiv (-\langle \bar{\psi}_f \psi_f \rangle_{0,0}^{\text{reg}})^{1/3}$  (details can be found in Ref. [27]), in addition to the parameters related to the PL potentials considered.

#### 3. Numerical Results

Numerical results at T = 0 are shown in Fig. 1. In the left panel we quote the predictions for  $\Delta \bar{\Sigma}_{B,0}$  as function of eB for various model parametrizations, found to be very similar for all cases considered and in very good agreement with LQCD results from Ref. [6]. The results for  $\Sigma_{B,0}^u - \Sigma_{B,0}^d$ , shown in the right panel, present an overall good agreement with LQCD calculations, however, the dependence on the model parametrization is somewhat larger.



Figure 1. Normalized condensates as functions of eB at T = 0. The curves correspond to different parametrizations identified by  $\Phi_0$ . Full square symbols correspond to LQCD results of Ref. [6]. Left panel: subtracted flavor average; right panel: flavor difference.

We turn now to our results for the case of finite temperature. In Fig. 2 we quote the values obtained for  $\Delta \bar{\Sigma}_{B,T}$  as a function of eB, for some representative values of T. All values correspond to the parametrization leading to  $\Phi_0 = 230$  MeV considering the polynomial PL potential, yet qualitatively similar results are found for the other parametrizations. In contrast to what happens at zero temperature, the quantity  $\Delta \bar{\Sigma}_{B,T}$  does not display a monotonous increase with eB when one approaches the chiral transition temperature [for this parameter set one has  $T_c(eB = 0) = 179$  MeV]. In fact, the curves reach a maximum after which  $\Delta \bar{\Sigma}_{B,T}$  starts to decrease with increasing eB, implying that the present nonlocal model naturally exhibits the IMC effect found in LQCD. This feature can also be seen from the results displayed in Fig. 3. In the upper pannel we show  $(\Sigma_{B,T}^u + \Sigma_{B,T}^d)/2$  and  $\Phi$  as a functions of T for some selected values of eB, while in the lower pannel we present the associated susceptibilities defined as  $\chi_{cond} = \partial [(\Sigma_{B,T}^u + \Sigma_{B,T}^d)/2]/\partial T$  and  $\chi_{\Phi} = \partial \Phi/\partial T$ . As expected, for all values of eB it is found a crossover transition from the chiral symmetry broken phase to the (partially) restored one as the temperature increases. However, contrary to what happens e.g. in the standard local NJL

model [4], it is seen that within the present model the transition temperature decreases as the magnetic field increases. Moreover, both chiral restoration and deconfinement transitions are observed simultaneously, as predicted by PNJL-like models at eB = 0 [28].



Figure 2. Subtracted normalized flavor average condensate as a function of eB for different representative temperatures. All results correspond to  $\Phi_0 = 230$  MeV and polynomial PL potential, also in Fig. 3.



Figure 3. Normalized flavor average condensate and PL (up) and corresponding susceptibilities (down) as functions of T for representative values of eB.

To be more specific, let us define the critical temperature as the value of T at which  $\chi_{cond}$  reaches a maximum. In Fig. 4, the relative quantity  $T_c(B)/T_c(0)$  is displayed as a function of eB together with LQCD results from Ref. [6]. It is seen that all parameter sets considered here lead to a decrease of the critical temperature when eB gets increased, i.e. in all cases the IMC effect is observed. On the other hand, the strength of the IMC effect is rather sensitive to the parametrization. In the case whitout coupling to the PL the decrease of the  $T_c$  is small compared with LQCD estimates, however, this is cured once the PL is included.



Figure 4. Normalized chiral restoration temperatures as functions of eB for various model parametrizations for the two PL potentials considered. For comparison results obtained excluding the coupling to the PL are also displayed. LQCD results of Ref. [6] are indicated by the grey band.

#### Acknowledgments

This work has been supported in part by CONICET and ANPCyT (Argentina), grants PIP14-492, PIP12-449, and PICT14-03-0492, by the UNLP (Argentina), Project No. X718,

by the Mineco (Spain), contract FPA2013-47443-C2-1-P, by Centro de Excelencia Severo Ochoa Programme grant SEV-2014-0398, and by Generalitat Valenciana (Spain), grant PrometeoII/2014/066.

### References

- [1] Duncan R C and Thompson C 1992 Astrophys. J. **392** L9
- Kouveliotou C et al 1998 Nature **393** 235
- Kharzeev D E, McLerran L D and Warringa H J 2008 Nucl. Phys. A 803 227
   Skokov V, Illarionov A Y, and Toneev V 2009 Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 24 5925
   Voronyuk V, Toneev V, Cassing W, Bratkovskaya E, Konchakovski V, and Voloshin S 2011 Phys. Rev. C 83 054911
- [3] Vachaspati T 1991 Phys. Lett. B 265 258
- Enqvist K and Olesen P 1993 Phys. Lett. B **319** 178
- [4] Kharzeev D E, Landsteiner K, Schmitt A and Yee H U 2013 Lect. Notes Phys. 871 1 Andersen J O, Naylor W R and Tranberg A 2016 Rev. Mod. Phys. 88 025001 Miransky V A and Shovkovy I A 2015 Phys. Rept. 576 1
- [5] Bali G S, Bruckmann F, Endrodi G, Fodor Z, Katz S D, Krieg S, Schafer A and Szabo K K 2012 JHEP 1202 044
- [6] Bali G S, Bruckmann F, Endrodi G, Fodor Z, Katz S D and Schafer A 2012 Phys. Rev. D 86 071502
- [7] Fraga E S, Noronha J and Palhares L F 2013 Phys. Rev. D 87 114014
- [8] Bruckmann F, Endrodi G and Kovacs T G 2013 JHEP 1304 112
   Bali G S, Bruckmann F, Endrodi G, Gruber F and Schaefer A 2013 JHEP 1304 130
- [9] Fukushima K and Hidaka Y 2013 Phys. Rev. Lett. 110 031601
- [10] Chao J, Chu P and Huang M 2013 Phys. Rev. D 88 054009
- [11] Fraga E S, Mintz B W and Schaffner-Bielich J 2014 Phys. Lett. B 731 154
- [12] Ferreira M, Costa P , Menezes D P, Providência C and Scoccola N 2014 Phys. Rev. D 89 016002
- [13] Farias R L S, Gomes K P, Krein G I and Pinto M B 2014 Phys. Rev. C 90 025203
- [14] Ayala A, Loewe M and Zamora R 2015 Phys. Rev. D 91 016002

Ayala A, Cobos-Martnez J J, Loewe M, Tejeda-Yeomans M E and Zamora R 2015 Phys. Rev. D 91 016007

- $[15]\,$  Fayazbakhsh S and Sadooghi N 2014 Phys. Rev. D  $\mathbf{90}$  105030
- [16] Andersen J O, Naylor W R and Tranberg A 2015 JHEP 1502 042
- $[17]\,$  Mueller N and Pawlowski J M 2105 Phys. Rev. D  $\mathbf{91}$  116010
- [18] Ferrer E J, de la Incera V and Wen X J 2015 Phys. Rev. D 91 054006
- $\left[19\right]$  Braun J, Mian W A and Rechenberger S 2016 Phys. Lett. B  $\mathbf{755}$  265
- [20] Rougemont R, Critelli R and Noronha J 2016 Phys. Rev. D 93 045013
- [21] Ayala A, Dominguez C A, Hernandez L A, Loewe M and Zamora R 2016 Phys. Lett. B 759 99
- [22] Mao S 2016 Phys. Lett. B **758** 195
- [23] Noguera S and Scoccola N N 2008 Phys. Rev. D 78 114002
- [24] General I, Gomez Dumm D and Scoccola N N 2001 Phys. Lett. B 506 267
- Gomez Dumm D and Scoccola N N 2002 Phys. Rev. D 65 074021
- [25] Scarpettini A, Gomez Dumm D and Scoccola N N 2004 Phys. Rev. D 69 114018
- [26]~ Gomez Dumm D and Scoccola N N 2005 Phys. Rev. C  $\mathbf{72}$  014909
- [27] Gomez Dumm D, Grunfeld A G and Scoccola N N 2006 Phys. Rev. D 74 054026
- [28] Contrera G A, Gomez Dumm D and Scoccola N N 2008 Phys. Lett. B 661 113 Contrera G A, Gomez Dumm D and Scoccola N N 2010 Phys. Rev. D 81 054005 Contrera G A, Orsaria M and Scoccola N N 2010 Phys. Rev. D 82 054026 Carlomagno J P, Gomez Dumm D and Scoccola N N 2013 Phys. Rev. D 88 074034
- [29] Gomez Dumm D, Noguera S and Scoccola N N 2011 Phys. Lett B 698 236 Gomez Dumm D, Noguera S and Scoccola N N 2012 Phys. Rev. D 86 074020
- [30] Blaschke D, Buballa M, Radzhabov A E and Volkov M K 2008 Yad. Fiz. 71, 2012 (2008) [Phys. Atom. Nucl. 71, 1981 (2008)].
- [31] Ritus V I 1978 Sov. Phys. JETP 48 788
- [32] Pagura V P, Gomez Dumm D, Noguera S and Scoccola N N 2017 Phys. Rev. D 95 no. 3 034013
- [33] Gomez Dumm D, Izzo Villafañe M F, Noguera S, Pagura V P and Scoccola N N (in press) Phys. Rev. D (Preprint hep-ph/04742)
- [34] Dumitru A, Pisarski R D and Zschiesche D 2005 Phys. Rev. D 72 065008
- [35] Ratti C, Thaler M A and Weise W 2006 Phys. Rev. D 73 014019
- [36] Haas L M, Stiele R, Braun J, Pawlowski J M and Schaffner-Bielich J 2013 Phys. Rev. D 87 076004