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Abstract

We investigate the phase diagram on temperature-chemical potential plane in the Nambu–Jona-Lasinio model with the dimensional regularization. While the structure of the resulting diagram shows resemblance to the one in the frequently used cutoff regularization, some results of our study indicate striking differences between these regularizations. The diagram in the dimensional regularization exhibits strong tendency of the first order phase transition.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The phase diagram of the quark matter has been actively investigated for decades \cite{1}. Quarks are confined inside hadrons and cannot be observed as free particles at low energy. On the other hand, at high energy, quarks become free particles due to the asymptotic freedom of the strong interaction. Therefore, it is expected that quarks undergo the phase transition between confined and deconfined states which is one of the most important issues in the theoretical and experimental particle physics.

The fundamental theory to describe quark matter is quantum chromodynamics (QCD), the theory of strong interaction. It is, however, not practical to extract reliable predictions at low energy due to the necessity of complicated nonperturbative calculations in this area. For this reason, some effective approaches are used such as the Nambu–Jona-Lasinio (NJL) model \cite{2} and its Polyakov-loop incorporated version, the PNJL model \cite{3}, the linear sigma model \cite{4}, the chiral perturbation theory \cite{5}, the lattice QCD simulations \cite{6}.

In this letter, we will consider the NJL model known as a low-energy effective theory of QCD (for reviews, see, \cite{7, 8, 9, 10}). At low temperature, \( T \), and chemical potential, \( \mu \), constituent quarks are heavy due to the chiral symmetry spontaneous breaking while they are expected to be light at high \( T \) and/or \( \mu \) where the chiral symmetry is getting restored. Thus the quark system is closely related to the phenomenon of the chiral phase transition. The NJL model actually predicts the chiral symmetry breaking at low energy and its restoration at high energy. Many investigations of the phase diagram are based on the NJL and PNJL models (see, e.g., \cite{11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20} and \cite{21, 22, 23, 24, 25}).

Since the NJL model is not renormalizable, the model predictions inevitably depend on a regularization procedure applied. The most frequently used method is probably the three-momentum cutoff regularization which introduces the cutoff scale \( \Lambda \). The model in the cutoff scheme may miss an important contribution when the quark density becomes comparable to the cutoff scale. There is an alternative method, the dimensional regularization (DR), to avoid the issue \cite{26}. In the DR, divergences coming from fermion loop integrals are regularized by lowering the dimension of the integration through an analytic continuation in the dimension variable. Using various regularization ways is interesting, because we believe that the regularization scheme is a dynamical part of the NJL model, it is related to the size and shape of the
effective quark interaction as discussed in [27]. It was found that the model with the DR nicely describes
quark systems at low energy, such characteristics as the phase structure and meson properties [26, 27, 28, 29].

We shall study in this article the phase diagram in the three flavor NJL model with the DR. It is interesting because the recent work by the present authors [27] indicates that the phase structure, especially
the order of the transition, may differ drastically from the one in the cutoff regularization.

The structure of this letter is following: In Sec. 2, the three flavor NJL model and its parameters are
presented. Sec. 3 is devoted to the explanation on the procedure of drawing the phase diagram. We then
display the resulting phase diagram of the model in Sec. 4. The concluding remarks are given in Sec. 5.

2. Three flavor NJL model

2.1. The model

The Lagrangian of the three flavor model is

\[ \mathcal{L}_{\text{NJL}} = \sum_{i,j} \bar{q}_i (i\partial - \tilde{m}) q_j + \mathcal{L}_4 + \mathcal{L}_6, \]  

where \( \tilde{m}_{ij} \) represents the diagonal mass matrix \( \text{diag}(m_u, m_d, m_s) \) with flavor indices \( i, j \). \( G \) and \( K \) are the four- and six-fermion couplings, \( \lambda_6 \) are the Gell-Mann matrices in flavor space with \( \lambda_0 = \sqrt{2/3} \cdot \mathbf{1} \). The determinant in \( \mathcal{L}_6 \) runs over flavor space, so this leads to the six-point interaction known as Kobayashi-
Maskawa ‘t Hooft (KMT) term [30].

The vacuum of the model is determined by the minimum of the thermodynamic potential
\( \Omega = -\ln Z/(\beta V) \) with the partition function \( Z \), the inverse temperature \( \beta = 1/T \), and the volume of the system \( V \). Applying
the mean-field approximation, we can calculate the potential \( \Omega \) in the imaginary time formalism,

\begin{align*}
\Omega &= \Omega_v + \Omega_0 + \Omega_T, \\
\Omega_v &= 2G(\phi_u^2 + \phi_d^2 + \phi_s^2) - 4K\phi_u\phi_d\phi_s, \\
\Omega_0 &= -\frac{g^{D/2}N_c}{2} \int \frac{d^{D-1}p}{(2\pi)^{D-1}} [E_u + E_d + E_s], \\
\Omega_T &= -\frac{g^{D/2}N_c}{2} \int \frac{d^{D-1}p}{(2\pi)^{D-1}} \sum_{i, \pm} \ln \left[ 1 + e^{-\beta E_i^\pm} \right].
\end{align*}

Here \( \Omega_v \) corresponds to the vacuum contribution by the chiral condensates, \( \Omega_0 \) and \( \Omega_T \) denote the temperature independent and dependent contributions, \( \phi_i (\equiv \langle \bar{i}i \rangle) \) is the chiral condensate for each quark which is
the order parameter of the model, \( N_c (=3) \) is the number of colors. \( D \) denotes dimensions in the fermion
loop integral, \( E_i = (p^2 + m_i^2)^{1/2} \) is the energy of the quasi-particle with the constituent quark mass \( m_i \),
\( E_i^\pm = E_i \pm \mu \) with a quark chemical potential \( \mu (= \mu_u = \mu_d = \mu_s) \).

The fermion loop integral in Eq. (4) diverges, therefore we will perform the analytic continuation in \( D \)
to regularize it by decreasing the dimension \( D \) as discussed in [26, 27]. In the cutoff scheme, the divergent
contribution is dropped by introducing the momentum cutoff \( \Lambda \). To be more precise, the regularization in
the DR and cutoff schemes are performed by the following replacements

\begin{align*}
\int \frac{d^{D-1}p}{(2\pi)^{D-1}} &\rightarrow \frac{2(4\pi)^{-(D-1)/2}}{\Gamma((D-1)/2)} \int_0^\infty dp \, p^{D-2}, \\
\int \frac{d^{D-1}p}{(2\pi)^{D-1}} &\rightarrow \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int_0^\Lambda dp \, p^2.
\end{align*}
where $M_0$ is the renormalization scale which is needed to render physical quantities correct mass dimensions.

As mentioned in the introduction, the constituent quark mass

$$m_i^* = m_i - 4G\phi_i + 2K\phi_j\phi_k, \quad (i \neq j \neq k) \quad (10)$$

is closely related to the chiral symmetry breaking, namely to the value of $\phi_i$. The self-consistent gap equations (10) are obtained as the condition for the thermodynamic potential to be at the extremum, $\partial\Omega/\partial\phi_i = 0$. Eqs (10) explicitly show that the difference between constituent and current quark masses is due to the underlying chiral symmetry breaking.

2.2. Model parameters

The NJL model with the dimensional regularization has 7 free parameters: current quark mass $m_u, m_d, m_s$, the four- and six-point couplings $G, K$, the dimension $D$, and the renormalization scale $M_0$.

We consider, for simplicity, the isospin symmetric case, $m_d = m_u$, and set several values for $m_u (= 3, 4, 5, 5.5, 6 \text{MeV})$. We then fix the remaining parameters by choosing 5 physical quantities among listed below:

$$m_\pi = 138\text{MeV}, \quad f_\pi = 92\text{MeV},$$
$$m_K = 495\text{MeV}, \quad m_{\eta^{'}} = 958\text{MeV},$$
$$m_\eta = 548\text{MeV}, \quad \chi^{1/4} = 170\text{MeV}. \quad (11)$$

Following [27], we name the parameter sets as Case $m^\text{LD}$, $m_\eta$ and $\chi$, depending on which quantities are selected. The Case $m^\text{LD}$ is fitted by \{$m_\pi, f_\pi, m_K, m_{\eta^{'}}$, $\chi (m_\eta)$\}. The parameter setting was performed in [29], and we shall employ three parameter sets, Case $m_\eta^\text{LD}$, $m_\eta$ and $\chi$, which are shown in Tabs. 1, 2 and 3. Note that

| Table 1: Case $m_\eta^\text{LD}$. |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| $m_u$ | $m_s$ | $G$ | $K$ | $M_0$ | $D$ |
| 3.0 | 84.9 | $-0.0195$ | $9.02 \times 10^{-7}$ | 118 | 2.29 |

| Table 2: Case $m_\eta$. |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| $m_u$ | $m_s$ | $G$ | $K$ | $M_0$ | $D$ |
| 3.0 | 79.0 | $-0.0130$ | $2.29 \times 10^{-7}$ | 107 | 2.37 |
| 4.0 | 106 | $-0.00748$ | $8.26 \times 10^{-8}$ | 92.0 | 2.52 |
| 5.0 | 134 | $-0.00357$ | $1.99 \times 10^{-8}$ | 73.2 | 2.69 |
| 5.5 | 147 | $-0.00231$ | $8.40 \times 10^{-9}$ | 62.4 | 2.77 |
| 6.0 | 162 | $-0.00142$ | $3.23 \times 10^{-9}$ | 50.9 | 2.87 |

| Table 3: Case $\chi$. |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| $m_u$ | $m_s$ | $G$ | $K$ | $M_0$ | $D$ |
| 3.0 | 77.1 | $-0.0168$ | $2.23 \times 10^{-7}$ | 120 | 2.28 |
| 4.0 | 106 | $-0.0143$ | $2.11 \times 10^{-7}$ | 116 | 2.36 |
| 5.0 | 134 | $-0.0119$ | $1.80 \times 10^{-7}$ | 112 | 2.43 |
| 5.5 | 150 | $-0.0109$ | $1.62 \times 10^{-7}$ | 110 | 2.47 |
| 6.0 | 166 | $-0.00992$ | $1.48 \times 10^{-7}$ | 109 | 2.50 |

the Case $m_\eta$ has two parameter sets for $m_u = 3 \text{MeV}$; to distinguish between them we use the superscript LD (lower dimension).

For the sake of comparison we also align the parameters of the cutoff case in Tab. 4. In the cutoff case, we fix 4 parameters, $m_s, G, K$ and $\Lambda$ with \{$m_\pi, f_\pi, m_K, m_{\eta^{'}}$\}. Unfortunately, there is no solution to simultaneously reproduce the above listed quantities for $m_u \gtrsim 5.87 \text{MeV}$. 

3
### 3. Critical behavior

In this section we explain how to draw the phase diagram of the model through the analysis of the thermodynamical potential and the gap equations.

A critical temperature \( T_c \) or chemical potential \( \mu_c \) are given by the maxima of

\[
\frac{\partial \phi_u}{\partial t} \quad (t = T \text{ or } \mu).
\]

In fact we apply \( t = T(\mu) \) for low \( \mu \) \((T)\) in crossover region. The above quantity becomes infinite at \( T_c(\mu_c) \) when the transition is of the first order. In this case we determine the transition boundary by the point where the discontinuous change of the chiral condensate \( \phi_u \) occurs by directly searching the minimum of the thermodynamic potential. It is obvious that this procedure is consistent with the criterion of Eq. \( (12) \), because a divergent point coincides the maximum point.

#### 3.1. Thermodynamic potential

To see the tendency of the phase transition, we show the behavior of \( \Omega(=\Omega(\phi_u, \phi_s) - \Omega(0,0)) \) for the Case \( m_\eta \) and Cutoff with \( m_u = 4\text{MeV} \) near the transition boundary in Fig. 1. The curves are plotted along

\[
\phi_s = 0.36\phi_u + 0.83\phi^0_u \quad \text{for} \quad T = 10, 75, 85\text{MeV} \quad \text{with} \quad \mu = 480\text{MeV}. 
\]

Right panel: \( 100 \cdot \Omega/\Lambda^4 \) along the line \( \phi_s = 0.103\phi_u + 1.43\phi^0_u \) in the Case Cutoff with \( m_u = 4\text{MeV} \) for \( T = 10, 20, 30\text{MeV} \) and \( \mu = 290\text{MeV} \). The circles indicate the global minima.

The striking difference is observed between these figures. There exists a bump between two stable minima in the DR case, which means that the transition is of the first order between \( T = 75 \) and \( 85\text{MeV} \). On the other hand the cutoff case (right panel) produces rather monotonous curves with no bump, which leads

\begin{table}[h]
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c c c c c}
\hline
\( m_u \) & \( m_s \) & \( GA^4 \) & \( KA^0 \) & \( \Lambda \) \\
\hline
3.0 & 89.5 & 1.55 & 8.34 & 960 \\
4.0 & 110 & 1.60 & 8.38 & 797 \\
5.0 & 128 & 1.71 & 8.77 & 682 \\
5.5 & 136 & 1.81 & 9.17 & 630 \\
5.87 & 139 & 2.09 & 10.1 & 580 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\end{table}

Figure 1: Left panel: \( 0.1 \cdot \Omega/M^4 \) along the line \( \phi_s = 0.36\phi_u + 0.83\phi^0_u \) in the Case \( m_\eta \) with \( m_u = 4\text{MeV} \) for \( T = 10, 75, 85\text{MeV} \) and \( \mu = 480\text{MeV} \). Right panel: \( 100 \cdot \Omega/\Lambda^4 \) along the line \( \phi_s = 0.103\phi_u + 1.43\phi^0_u \) in the Case Cutoff with \( m_u = 4\text{MeV} \) for \( T = 10, 20, 30\text{MeV} \) and \( \mu = 290\text{MeV} \). The circles indicate the global minima.
to a smooth crossover. The difference stems from the fact that the ratio of the thermal contribution (μ dependence) ΩT/(Ωv + Ω0) in the DR case is larger than that in the cutoff case at low T. Thus we confirm the stronger tendency of the first order phase transition in the DR scheme.

4. Phase diagram

We are now ready to discuss the phase structure of the NJL model with the DR.

4.1. Transition on φu

Fig. 3 displays the typical structure of the phase diagram in the model with the DR in the Case mηLD. This is a reasonable picture of a system in the chiral symmetry broken phase at low T and μ, and in the chiral symmetry restored phase at high T and/or μ. The solid (dashed) line represents the first order (crossover) transition. The circle indicates the critical point.
transition, and the circle indicates the critical point. Note that the transition temperature, $T_c = 184$ MeV for $\mu = 0$, is comparable with the lattice QCD prediction, $150 - 200$ MeV. The critical point is located at $(T_{CP}, \mu_{CP}) = (99$ MeV, $239$ MeV), and it is interesting to see that $T_{CP}$ is close to one obtained in the PNJL model with the cutoff regularization, $T_{CP} = 102$ MeV, for frequently used parameter set of [8], whereas $T_{CP} = 48$ MeV in the NJL model [24]. Note that the obtained critical point is close to one obtained in a NJL type model with the smooth form factor [20], $(T_{CP}, \mu_{CP}) = (101$ MeV, $211$ MeV), and in the linear sigma model [31], $(T_{CP}, \mu_{CP}) = (99$ MeV, $207$ MeV). Below we make more detailed comparison between the DR and the cutoff schemes.

Fig. 4 shows the phase diagrams in the Cases $m_\eta$ and $\chi$ for various $m_u$. We note that in the Case $m_\eta$, the region of chiral symmetry broken phase becomes smaller with choosing the smaller value of $m_u$. On the other hand the Case $\chi$ produces similar curves for different $m_u$. The different behavior can be explained by the fact that the constituent quark mass $m_u^*$ gets smaller with decreasing $m_u$ in the Case $m_\eta$, while it almost does not change in the Case $\chi$ as discussed in [29]. In the cutoff case (Fig. 5) the region of the chiral symmetry broken state shrinks when $m_u$ is lowered as observed in the Case $m_\eta$. It is very interesting to note that the critical point disappears below $m_u = 5$ MeV, where the transition is crossover for all $T$ and $\mu$.

A striking difference between the two regularizations is in that the critical point moves towards higher temperature with decreasing $m_u$ in the DR, while it moves to the opposite direction in the cutoff case. The difference may be understood by observing the value of the six-point coupling $K$ which becomes larger (smaller) with decreasing $m_u$ in the DR (cutoff) procedure, since the KMT term shown in Eq. (3) tends to
drive the first order phase transition \cite{24}.

4.2. Partial transition on $\phi_s$

As discussed in \cite{27}, the constituent quark masses undergo two discontinuous changes at low $T$ in the DR scheme. Fig. 6 displays the typical behavior of $|m_u^*|$ and $|m_s^*|$ as functions of $\mu$ at low $T$ ($= 10\text{MeV}$), plotted in the Case $m_\eta^\text{LD}$ with $m_u = 3\text{MeV}$. One clearly observes two gaps: one is located around $\mu_c^{(u)} \simeq 300\text{MeV}$ and the other is around $\mu_c^{(s)} \simeq 365\text{MeV}$. Here we call these discontinuities as first and second gaps for lower and higher chemical potential, respectively. The first gap comes from the effect of the approximate SU_L(2) $\otimes$ SU_R(2) restoration and the second one comes from that of the partial SU_L(3) $\otimes$ SU_R(3) restoration. Thus it may be interesting to study the phase structure concerning the second transition as well.

To draw the phase diagram on the second transition, we set the criterion of the transition by using the following quantity

$$\frac{\partial \phi_s}{\partial t}, \quad (t = T \text{ or } \mu). \quad \text{(13)}$$

Then below $\mu_{CP}$, namely in the crossover region, the above quantity has only one maximum, which determines the crossover transition on $\phi_s$. While above $\mu_{CP}$ the quantity $\partial \phi_s/\partial \mu$ shows non-trivial behavior; it becomes infinite at $\mu_c^{(s)}$, and has second maximum at $\mu_c^{(s)}$. So $\partial \phi_s/\partial \mu$ has typical two maxima at $\mu_c^{(s)}$ and $\mu_c^{(s)}$ below $T_{CP}$ as seen in Fig. 6. Here we call the transition point corresponding to the second maximum, $\mu_c^{(s)}$, “the second phase boundary”. To distinguish between the two phase transitions, we call the transition line on $\phi_u$ discussed in the previous subsection “the first phase boundary”.

In the phase diagram on the 1st and 2nd phase boundaries (Fig. 7) the dashed and dotted lines represent the crossover transition on $\phi_u$ and $\phi_s$, respectively. The solid line for lower (higher) chemical potential indicates the discontinuous change on the first (second) gap. We see that the crossover line on $\phi_s$ is observed at a bit lower temperature than that on $\phi_u$ for $\mu < \mu_{CP}$. It should be noticed that the critical curves on $\phi_u$ and $\phi_s$ intersect at the critical end point $(T_{CP}, \mu_{CP})$ on $\phi_u$. Because the value of $\phi_s$ is affected by $\phi_u$, as is clearly seen from Fig. 6 $\phi_s$ shows discontinuous change at the point where $\phi_u$ has a gap. Then $\partial \phi_s/\partial t$ blows up and approaches to infinity near the critical point where $\partial \phi_u/\partial t$ is divergent. Below $T_{CP}$, $\partial \phi_u/\partial \mu$ has two maxima appearing at the first gap and higher chemical potential. The first maximum coincides with the red solid line and the second one is plotted by the blue line in Fig. 6. The transition on the second gap also has the critical point whose location is exhibited by the blue circle at higher chemical potential.

We also studied the other Cases, $m_\eta$ and $\chi$, with various $m_u$, and found that the qualitative behavior does not show remarkable difference; the critical point on $\phi_s$ moves toward higher temperature with decreasing $m_u$ as seen in the $\phi_u$ case. Therefore, we only displayed the Case $m_\eta^\text{LD}$ here.

![Figure 6: Constituent quark mass $|m_u^*|$ and $|m_s^*|$ for $T = 10\text{MeV}$ in the Case $m_\eta^\text{LD}$ with $m_u = 3\text{MeV}$.

Figure 6: Constituent quark mass $|m_u^*|$ and $|m_s^*|$ for $T = 10\text{MeV}$ in the Case $m_\eta^\text{LD}$ with $m_u = 3\text{MeV}$.
5. Concluding remarks

We studied the phase diagram of the NJL model with the DR and cutoff regularization. We found that the phase diagram on the $T - \mu$ plane in the NJL model with the DR shows a stronger tendency of the first order phase transition. The tendency is confirmed by the shapes of the thermodynamic potential shown in Fig. 4 where we find a bump in the DR, and rather monotonous behaviour in the cutoff case.

We have also studied the phase structure on the change of $\phi_u$ in Sec. 4.2., where we found that the approximate $SU_L(2) \otimes SU_R(2)$ symmetry and the partial $SU_L(3) \otimes SU_R(3)$ symmetry restore at a similar temperature for low chemical potential, $\mu < \mu_{CP}$. It may be difficult to distinguish between the two lines experimentally, because the transitions are smooth crossover at low chemical potential.

From the obtained phase diagrams, we conclude that the first order phase transition persists for low $m_u$ in the model with the DR method. The finding is consistent with the current symmetry analysis based consensus stating that the chiral phase transition is of the first order in the chiral limit, $m_{u,d,s} \to 0$. This tendency may be understood by the following reasoning. The loop contribution from the lower integration momenta is enhanced by lowering dimension. It introduces non-locality in the model with the DR. The infrared behavior of the loop integral is important for thermal corrections. It can rise the critical end point temperature, $T_{CP}$.

Finally, because the parameter difference crucially affects the location of the critical point as confirmed in this article, we think it is interesting to study the related issues, such as the case with the chiral limit, and the $m_u,m_s$ dependence on the order of the chiral transition in the context of the Columbia plot.
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