

Stiffening of matter in quark-hadron continuity: a mini-review

Toru Kojo

Theory Center, IPNS, High Energy Accelerator Research Organization (KEK), 1-1 Oho, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305-0801, Japan
Department of Physics, Tohoku University, Aoba-yama, Sendai, Miyagi, 980-8578, Japan

ABSTRACT

Recent observations of neutron stars, combined with causality, thermodynamic stability, and nuclear constraints, indicate rapid stiffening of QCD matter at density slightly above nuclear saturation density ($n_0 \simeq 0.16 \text{ fm}^{-3}$). The evolution of the stiffening is quicker than expected from purely nucleonic models with many-body repulsion. Taking into account the quark substructure of baryons, we argue that the saturation of quarks states occur at $\sim 2\text{-}3n_0$, driving the quark matter formation even before baryonic cores of the radii $\sim 0.5 \text{ fm}$ spatially overlap. We describe the continuous transitions from hadronic to quark matter are described within a quarkyonic matter model in which gluons are assumed to be confining at density of interest. To obtain analytic insights for the transient regime, we construct an ideal model of quarkyonic matter, IdylliQ model, in which one can freely switch from baryonic to quark languages and vice versa.

1. Introduction

The properties of highly compressed matter are one of central topics in quantum chromodynamics (QCD). The most basic quantities are equations of state (EOS) of matter (Oertel, Hempel, Klähn and Typel, 2017; Baym, Hatsuda, Kojo, Powell, Song and Takatsuka, 2018). They are directly related to the neutron star (NS) structure, especially the mass-radius (M - R) relations. The M - R relations have one-to-one correspondence with the pressure-energy density (P - ϵ) relations, and can be categorized by the stiffness of EOS. For stiff (soft) EOS, P is large (small) at a given ϵ , and the former (latter) leads to larger (smaller) radii and masses.

One of crucial discoveries from NS observations is the rapid evolution of the stiffness. A useful measure to characterize the density evolution of the stiffening is the sound speed, $c_s = (dP/d\epsilon)^{1/2}$, whose behaviors are strongly correlated with the shape of M - R curves (Tan, Dexheimer, Noronha-Hostler and Yunes, 2022; Kojo, 2021a). Recent NS observations for $1.4M_\odot$ - and $2.1M_\odot$ NS (M_\odot : the solar mass), together with causality, thermodynamic stability, and nuclear constraints at low density $\sim n_0$ ($n_0 \simeq 0.16 \text{ fm}^{-3}$: nuclear saturation density) (Drischler, Holt and Wellenhofer, 2021b), suggest that the stiffness evolves rapidly, see the Bayesian inference (Han, Huang, Tang and Fan, 2023; Marczenko, McLerran, Redlich and Sasaki, 2023; Brandes and Weise, 2024). The rapid stiffening begins to occur slightly above n_0 , and considerable pressure is developed already at density of $2\text{-}3n_0$.

One of key questions is how to interpret such rapid stiffening. In the language of nucleonic matter, stiffening is typically achieved by two- and three-body repulsion, see, e.g., Akmal, Pandharipande and Ravenhall (1998). We parametrize the EOS as (a is a coefficient universal for

kinetic energies)

$$\epsilon_N(n_B) = m_N n_B + a \frac{n_B^{5/3}}{m_N} + b n_B^N, \quad (1)$$

where the first term is from the mass energy, the second from the non-relativistic kinetic energy, and the third from N -body interaction whose coefficient b is taken positive. This sort of matter is very soft unless the interaction dominates over the other terms. Indeed, computing the pressure $P = n_B^2 \partial(\epsilon/n_B)/\partial n_B$, we find

$$P_N = \frac{2a}{3} \frac{n_B^{5/3}}{m_N} + b(N-1)n_B^N. \quad (2)$$

We note that the leading mass term, which dominates the energy density at moderate density, drops out of the pressure. The kinetic energy is suppressed by the nucleon mass. Hence the pressure is dominated by interactions. If we extrapolate the present parametrization to high density, the N -body terms blow up and would dominate over the mass energy. In such limit, let us keep only the N -body term for both the energy and pressure. Then we get $P_N(\epsilon)$ and c_s^2 at large n_B ,

$$P_N \sim (N-1)\epsilon_N \rightarrow c_s^2 \sim N-1. \quad (3)$$

The c_s^2 asymptotically approaches $N-1$; in the two-body case, $c_s^2 \rightarrow 1$; in the three-body case, $c_s^2 \rightarrow 2$, violating the causality bound $c_s^2 \leq c^2$ with $c = 1$ being the light speed in the natural unit. While many-body repulsion offers the stiffness necessary to explain the existence of $2M_\odot$ NS, there are at least two problems: firstly the importance of two-body and three-body forces raise questions concerning the convergence of many-body expansion; secondly the power growth of the stiffness is rather slow and the radius of $2M_\odot$ tends to be smaller than the radius constraint of $2.1M_\odot$ NS (Kojo et al., 2022).

The trend of nuclear many-body forces is difficult to infer within nuclear models. For example in order to avoid the causality violation in models with three-body repulsions, we

 torukojo@post.kek.jp (T. Kojo)
ORCID(s): 0000-0003-2815-0564 (T. Kojo)




Figure 1: Examples of M - R relations (upper panel) and c_s^2 as a function of n_B/n_0 (lower panel) for the crossover (QHC21 models (Kojo et al., 2022)) and hadronic models (ChEFTex (Hensh et al., 2024) and Togashi (Togashi et al., 2017)). The bands in the M - R plots are from observational constraints with the 68% confidence interval. The hadronic models include three-body forces which stiffen EOS but its extrapolation toward high density violates the causality constraint around $\simeq 5$ - $6n_0$. The figures are taken from Hensh et al. (2024).

must include more-body forces with negative signs to temper the growth of c_s^2 . The cancellations among large positive and large negative terms are what we would like to avoid in constructing theories. To handle this sort of problems at fundamental level, we need quark descriptions.

2. Quark descriptions

The simplest quark EOS is a free massless quark gas

$$\varepsilon(n) = a' n^{4/3} + \mathcal{B}, \quad (4)$$

where a' is some constant and \mathcal{B} is the normalization constant for the EOS. After computing pressure and eliminate a' using ε , we find $P = \varepsilon/3 - 4\mathcal{B}/3$ from which the conformal value $c_s^2 = 1/3$ is deduced. We note that, depending on the value of \mathcal{B} , the EOS can be very stiff or very soft. In fact the maximum mass M_{\max} and the corresponding $R|_{M_{\max}}$ can be

expressed as a function of \mathcal{B} as (Witten, 1984)

$$M_{\max}/M_{\odot} = 2.03 M_{\odot} \left(\frac{56 \text{ MeV/fm}^3}{\mathcal{B}} \right)^{1/2},$$

$$R|_{M_{\max}} = 10.7 \text{ km} \times \frac{M_{\max}}{2.0 M_{\odot}}. \quad (5)$$

With $\mathcal{B} \lesssim 56 \text{ MeV/fm}^3$, the $2M_{\odot}$ constraint can be passed; relativistic kinetic energy of quarks can yield large pressure. But we often choose a model which yields large \mathcal{B} suitable for hybrid hadron-to-quark matter models.

If we trust nuclear matter at low density as the true ground state, the above argument draws our attention to the interplay between nuclear and quark matter. Instead of considering massless quark matter, we here consider matter of non-relativistic quarks to separate discussions on the mass reduction at high density. We assume $M_N \simeq N_c M_q$ where $M_q \simeq 300 \text{ MeV}$ is the constituent quark mass. The energy density for two-flavor matter is parametrized as

$$\varepsilon_q(n_B) = N_c M_q n_B + a \times N_c \frac{n_B^{5/3}}{M_q} + \dots, \quad (6)$$

where the constant a is the same as in Eq. (1) and we take the quark Fermi momentum to be $\sim n_B^{1/3}$ since the quark density of a given color should be equal to the baryon density, i.e., $n_q^{\text{red}} = n_q^{\text{green}} = n_q^{\text{blue}} = n_B$. The corresponding pressure is

$$P_q = \frac{2a}{3} \times N_c \frac{n_B^{5/3}}{M_q} + \dots. \quad (7)$$

We emphasize that the first term in ε is similar for nucleonic and quark descriptions since $N_c M_q \simeq m_N$. However, the coefficients of the kinetic energies are different; for nuclear models $\sim 1/N_c$ while for quark models $\sim N_c$. There is about $N_c^2 \sim 10$ difference. Accordingly the pressure originating from the kinetic energy is about 10 times larger in quark descriptions than in nuclear ones without many-body repulsion. In order to construct the stiff EOS with $P \sim \varepsilon$, the pressure of $O(N_c)$ is needed; for nuclear models the necessary pressure comes from the interactions, while in quark models it can be supplied by kinetic energies.

Note that, if we take Eqs. (1) and (6) literally, we would get either of the following conclusions; (i) if nuclear forces are neglected in Eq. (1), then $\varepsilon_N < \varepsilon_q$ holds because of the large kinetic energy in quark matter descriptions. As a result the quark matter never shows up and the EOS remains soft; (ii) if nuclear repulsive forces are included, then at sufficiently large density ε_N exceeds ε_q . Also the extrapolated P_N eventually becomes greater than P_q at large density. Before these excesses indeed happen there should be a first order phase transition at which the chemical potential becomes equal, $\mu_B = \partial \varepsilon_N / \partial n_B = \partial \varepsilon_q / \partial n_B$. After the phase transition EOS becomes softer. This would give impressions that quark matter EOS is soft.

In the following we develop arguments in which nuclear models without interactions are forced to transform into

quark matter as the density increases. During the transformation changes in the energy density is modest and continuous but the pressure increases rapidly. The roles of nuclear many-body interactions is mentioned briefly but their primary role is to smooth out the transition behaviors by filling the gap between nuclear and quark EOS.

3. A quarkyonic matter model

In the last ten years or so, models describing a crossover from hadronic to quark matter have been developed as templates including the constraints from astrophysics, nuclear physics, causal and thermodynamic stability conditions (Masuda, Hatsuda and Takatsuka, 2013a,b; Kojo, Powell, Song and Baym, 2015). The models are mostly based on phenomenological interpolations but have succeeded in extracting some general trends such as the sound speed peak, weaker impacts of the strangeness in quark matter than in hadronic matter, the importance of pairing effects, and so on. Meanwhile explicit descriptions for the crossover regime have not been worked out until recently. Below we discuss one of the concrete realizations of the crossover using the quarkyonic matter concept.

3.1. Sum rules and quark saturation

In order to describe a crossover in a unified setup, we need to start with quarks in a single baryon, and then consider quarks in a many-baryon system. Needless to say it is difficult to directly deal with quantum many-body states. Hence we consider a coarse-grained description. We describe the system by specifying how baryonic and quark states are occupied in many-body systems. Writing a quark momentum distribution in a baryons as φ , the occupation probabilities of baryons and quarks as f_B and f_Q , respectively, we consider the following simple sum rule ($\int_p \equiv \int d^3\mathbf{p}/(2\pi)^3$) (Kojo, 2021b)

$$f_Q(q) = \int_k f_B(\mathbf{k})\varphi(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k}/N_c), \quad (8)$$

where f_Q is quark distributions for a given color; explicitly $f_Q^{\text{red}} = f_Q^{\text{green}} = f_Q^{\text{blue}} \equiv f_Q$. The RHS simply sums quark states in baryons. The average momentum of quark in a baryon with the momentum k is given by k/N_c . The normalization of φ is $\int_q \varphi(q) = 1$. We assume the width of the distribution φ is $\sim \Lambda \sim 0.2 - 0.4$ GeV so that the proton radius is $\sim 0.5-1.0$ fm.

The sum rule has the following general properties; (i) if we integrate over q , we find $\int_q f_Q = n_B = \int_k f_B$. The number of quarks in a given color is the same as the baryon number, as it should; (ii) if we hold k fixed at a low momentum and then take $q \rightarrow \infty$, the asymptotic behavior is $f_Q(q) \sim \varphi(q) \int_k f_B(k) = n_B \varphi(q)$; (iii) if we regard N_c as large and assume $k/N_c \ll \Lambda$, we find f_Q scales as $f_Q(q) \sim \varphi(q) \int_k f_B(k) = n_B \varphi(q)$.

The last point (iii) calls special attention. The probability f_Q overall grows as a function of n_B so that f_Q eventually reaches the upper bound 1, first occurring at $q = 0$. We call it

quark saturation (Kojo, 2021b). This indicates that at some n_B it becomes impossible to regard k/N_c in φ as small. To be more explicit about the problem, we consider $q = 0$ and rescale the variable as $k/N_c = k'$ to write

$$f_Q(0) = N_c^3 \int_{k'} f_B(N_c k')\varphi(k'), \quad (9)$$

with the constraint $n_B = \int_k f_B(k) = N_c^3 \int_{k'} f_B(N_c k')$. The overall factor N_c^3 apparently violates the Pauli constraint $f_Q \leq 1$, but it depends on the range of the integrand determined by f_B . Writing the range of $|\mathbf{k}|$ as $[0, k_{\text{max}}]$, the range of $|\mathbf{k}'|$ shrinks to $[0, k_{\text{max}}/N_c]$ and hence the phase space is reduced by a factor $1/N_c^3$, cancelling the overall factor in front of the integral. But once k_{max} becomes $O(N_c)$, the phase space for k' becomes $O(1)$ and the overall factor N_c^3 cannot be cancelled. In order not to violate the Pauli principle, we need $f_B(k) \sim 1/N_c^3$ for the majority of the range $[0, k_{\text{max}}]$ (Kojo, 2019). Quark states are saturated from low momenta and such saturated domain expands as the density increases. This saturation forces baryons to occupy low momentum state only with small probability. Meanwhile, with high enough momenta, we suppose baryons become free from the quark saturation. These considerations lead us to the picture of the momentum shell in the baryonic distribution, which we derive explicitly using an ideal model of quarkyonic matter.

3.2. IdylliQ model

Now we construct a dynamical model which includes the sum rule as a constraint. To derive analytic insights, we consider the following idealization (Fujimoto, Kojo and McLerran, 2024b): (i) The model neglects all interactions but the forces confining quarks. The confinement is effectively implemented by demanding quarks as parts of baryons. Then the energy density is simply

$$\varepsilon[f_B] = \int_k E_B(k)f_B(k). \quad (10)$$

(ii) The density dependence of the distribution φ is neglected. In reality we expect that the width of φ in momentum space becomes smaller as baryons swell in matter. (iii) We choose a special momentum distribution with which one can invert the sum rule and calculate f_B as a functional of f_Q . Explicitly we take

$$\varphi(q) = \frac{2\pi^2}{\Lambda^3} \frac{e^{-q/\Lambda}}{q/\Lambda}, \quad (11)$$




which is the inverse of the operator

$$L = -\nabla_q^2 + \frac{1}{\Lambda^2}, \quad L[\varphi(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p})] = (2\pi)^3 \delta(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}). \quad (12)$$

With this we can express f_B as

$$f_B(N_c q) = \frac{\Lambda^2}{N_c^3} L[f_Q(q)]. \quad (13)$$

For instance, in a domain where quark states are saturated, i.e., $f_Q(q) = 1$, then the derivative term drops and we find $f_B(N_c q) = 1/N_c^3$.


Figure 2: f_B and f_Q before quark saturation.

Figure 3: f_B and f_Q at quark saturation.

Figure 4: f_B and f_Q after quark saturation.

Here one might wonder why the last (iii) is needed; the Yukawa form of the distribution φ looks unrealistic. The answer is that we would like to know the qualitative trend of f_B at high density. At high density we have physical intuitions for quark descriptions; we expect the quark Fermi sea at high density. We are now interested in the density which is high but still not too high to be far away from the crossover regime. Meanwhile for low density we have some intuition about f_B and can calculate f_Q using the sum rule. Hence, with the assumption (iii) we can describe a matter from low to high density using two different languages at the same time. This should bring us to more stable conclusions than those based on single description.

Now the rest is straightforward; we simply minimize ε by optimizing f_B at each momentum. While the logic is straightforward the methodology deserves some explanations. First we need to fix n_B during the optimization of $f_B(k)$. This constraint can be implemented if we always pair up the variation at different point of the momentum space

$$\delta f_B(\mathbf{k}_1) + \delta f_B(\mathbf{k}_2) = 0. \quad (14)$$

The corresponding variation in the energy density is

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \varepsilon &= E_B(k_1) \delta f_B(\mathbf{k}_1) + E_B(k_2) \delta f_B(\mathbf{k}_2) \\ &= [E_B(k_1) - E_B(k_2)] \delta f_B(\mathbf{k}_1). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

It simply means that the relocation of a particle from \mathbf{k}_2 to \mathbf{k}_1 reduces the energy if $|\mathbf{k}_2| > |\mathbf{k}_1|$. Now we define

k_{sh} as the largest momentum of the optimized distribution. Then we conclude that $f_B(k)$ goes to zero for $k > k_{sh}$ while is maximized for $k \leq k_{sh}$. The maximally possible f_B depends on the sum rule constraint. If none of quark states are saturated, f_B simply reaches 1, forming the ideal gas distribution $f_B^{ideal}(k) = \Theta(k_{sh} - k)$. If some domain of quark momentum is saturated, however, f_B cannot reach 1 but is limited by $1/N_c^3$ which is dual to $f_Q(q) = 1$.

The last question is how to patch the distributions $f_B(k) = 1$ or 0 and $f_B(k) = 1/N_c^3$ for different domains. It turns out that we need to take the following form

$$f_B(k) = \frac{1}{N_c^3} \Theta(k_{bu} - k) + \Theta(k_{sh} - k) \Theta(k - k_{bu}). \quad (16)$$

The domain $k \leq k_{bu}$ is dual to $f_Q = 1$. For the domain $k_{bu} \leq k \leq k_{sh}$, baryons are free from the quark saturation constraint and hence can take $f_B = 1$. When k is too large $f_B(k)$ drops to zero.

The above $f_B(k)$ is dual to (we define $N_c q_{bu} \equiv k_{bu}$ and $N_c q_{sh} \equiv k_{sh}$)

$$\begin{aligned} f_Q(q) &= \Theta(q_{bu} - q) \\ &+ f_Q^{f_B=1}(q) \Theta(q_{sh} - q) \Theta(q - q_{bu}) \\ &+ f_Q^{f_B=0}(q) \Theta(q - q_{sh}). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The solution of f_Q for $f_B = 0$ is linear combination of functions g_{\pm} that satisfy $L[g_{\pm}] = 0$. Explicitly the form is $f_Q^{f_B=0} = c_+ g_+(q) + c_- g_-(q)$. Similarly the solution of f_Q for $f_B = 1$ is given by $f_Q^{f_B=1} = d_+ g_+(q) + d_- g_-(q) + N_c^3$. The large term of $O(N_c^3)$ must be canceled by the first two terms. We have four coefficients but one of them (c_+) can be eliminated by demanding $f_Q(q \rightarrow \infty) \rightarrow 0$. Then the three coefficients and q_{bu} (or k_{bu}) are the parameters to be fixed.

Applying L on this expression, we find the requirement that f_Q at q_{sh} and q_{bu} must be continuous up to the first derivative, otherwise the condition $0 \leq f_B \leq 1$ is violated by the δ -functions and their derivatives; the coefficients in front of these δ - and δ' -functions must be cancelled. We have two conditions at each of q_{bu} and q_{sh} , so the four conditions in total can fix all the unknown parameters. The explicit form is given in Fujimoto et al. (2024b).

We have just derived the momentum shell solution for f_B which is dual to the quark Fermi sea plus diffused Fermi surface for f_Q . The matter is characterized by the quark Fermi sea in the bulk but the baryonic Fermi surface. This is the concrete realization of the quarkyonic matter concept proposed by McLerran and Pisarski (McLerran and Pisarski, 2007). The momentum shell of baryons was first conjectured in McLerran and Reddy (2019) to achieve rapid stiffening of the EOS. For seminal works in this direction, see, e.g., Jeong, McLerran and Sen (2020); Duarte, Hernandez-Ortiz and Jeong (2020b,a); Zhao and Lattimer (2020).

It is often insisted that the low momentum part should be dominated by baryons and high momentum part by quarks. See arguments in Koch and Vovchenko (2023) for instance. Our model calculations found the opposite. It seems that




Figure 5: Stiffening associated with a transition from baryonic to quark matter. The transition is triggered by the quark saturation. Baryon-baryon interactions mediated by quark exchanges make the transition smoother.

whether we look at states at low or high energy are not key issues here. Instead we focus on the availability of the phase space to interpret the results of IdylliQ model in physical term.

At high density, using the ground state baryons to form baryonic matter is unnatural, since to make composite particles we need to superpose several quantum state of quarks. Such superposition is optimized to minimize the energy, but such arrangement is possible only when sufficient phase space is available to develop specific superposition of states. When the quark states are highly occupied, however, we no longer have liberty to choose optimized combinations. Eventually quark states are fully occupied and it is not appropriate to stick to the baryonic picture.

In contrast, near the Fermi surface, the phase space is available and we naturally expect a optimized superposition of quark states. We note that the saturated quark Fermi sea is color-singlet because of full occupation of colored states, while in the unsaturated domain not all superposition of quark states satisfy the color-singlet condition. Obvious candidates forming the color-singlet Fermi surface are baryonic states. Whether such baryonic objects form more complicated paired states are not remains to be analyzed.

3.3. Equations of state

EOS in quarkyonic matter rapidly stiffens from the pre- to post-saturation regime. Before the quark saturation baryonic matter is in the non-relativistic regime. After the saturation baryons are pushed away from the low momentum phase space and become relativistic. We note that if baryons could occupy momentum to p_F with the probability 1, the relativistic regime $p_F \sim M_B$ would be reached at $n_B \sim M_B^3 \sim 100n_0$. Taking the quark Pauli blocking constraint into account, however, baryons occupy low momentum states only with the probability $\sim 1/N_c^3$ so that relativistic baryons can emerge already at $n_B \sim M_B^3/N_c^3 \sim \Lambda^3 \sim 5n_0$.

The explanation of stiff EOS within baryonic descriptions looks highly exotic. Indeed it seems very difficult to generate such baryon distributions from nuclear models even

if we add many-body repulsions. Alternatively, one can use quark descriptions to describe the evolution of the stiffness. Let us assume the baryon energy can be expressed as

$$E_B(k) = N_c \int_q E_Q(\mathbf{q}) \varphi(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k}/N_c). \quad (18)$$

In the IdylliQ model one can derive the expression of E_Q explicitly by applying the operator L , but we proceed within the present abstract form.

As an example let us look at the non-relativistic baryon energy. Expanding in powers of k/N_c ,

$$E_B(k) = N_c \langle E_Q \rangle|_{k=0} + \left\langle \frac{\partial^2 E_Q}{\partial q_i \partial q_j} \right\rangle|_{k=0} \frac{k_i k_j}{2N_c} + \dots, \quad (19)$$

where we defined $\langle O \rangle \equiv \int_q O \varphi(\mathbf{q})$. The first term is the baryon mass and the second is the kinetic energy of baryons plus some corrections. The term linear in k vanishes because of the angle average.

Using the sum rule and the energy density Eq. (10), we may express the energy density as

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &= N_c \int_{k,q} E_Q(q) \varphi(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k}/N_c) f_B(k) \\ &= N_c \int_q E_Q(q) f_Q(q). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Before the quark saturation, $f_Q(q)$ scales like $\sim n_B \varphi(q)$ (see the last section) and increases the amplitude but does not change typical momenta. Then $\varepsilon \sim n_B N_c \int_q E_Q \varphi \sim n_B M_B$ as it should. Here $\varepsilon/n_B \sim O(1/N_c)$ so the pressure is small, $P \sim O(1/N_c)$. After the saturation, f_Q behaves as

$$f_Q(q) = \Theta(q_{\text{bu}} - q) + f_Q^{\text{sh}}(q). \quad (21)$$

where $f_Q^{\text{sh}}(q) \propto \Theta(q - q_{\text{bu}})$. Unlike the pre-saturation regime, the evolution of f_Q evolves toward higher momentum. The corresponding energy density is

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &= N_c \int_q E_Q(q) \Theta(q_{\text{bu}} - q) + N_c \int_q E_Q(q) f_Q^{\text{sh}}(q) \\ &= N_c \int_q E_Q(q) \Theta(q_{\text{bu}} - q) + N_c \bar{E}_Q^{\text{sh}}(n_B - n_{\text{bu}}), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $n_{\text{bu}} = \int_k \Theta(q_{\text{bu}} - q)$ and $\bar{E}_Q^{\text{sh}} \sim E_Q(q_{\text{bu}})$ is the average energy for $q \geq q_{\text{bu}}$. Now we examine the energy per particle, ε/n_B , to study the pressure. We first consider the case just after the saturation where most of n_B is carried by the shell part. The energy per particle is $\varepsilon/n_B \simeq N_c \bar{E}_Q^{\text{sh}}$ with which

$$P \simeq N_c n_B^2 \frac{\partial \bar{E}_Q^{\text{sh}}}{\partial n_B}. \quad (23)$$

The pressure is $O(N_c)$ since the derivative of \bar{E}_Q^{sh} is $O(1)$ as q_{bu} grows with n_B . If we instead consider the case that most of n_B is carried by n_{bu} , the energy density scales as in the standard quark matter with the degenerate Fermi sea. Here $q_{\text{bu}} \sim n_B^{1/3}$ and the pressure is $O(N_c)$.

The above-mentioned arguments suggest that the quark saturation drives inevitable and rapid stiffening of EOS, increasing the pressure from $O(1/N_c)$ to $O(N_c)$. During this transition the energy density remains $O(N_c)$; before the saturation it is primarily carried by the baryon mass and after the saturation by the quark kinetic energy.

We note that the quark kinetic energy is always present but before the saturation it does not contribute to the thermodynamic pressure. The confinement does not allow quarks to individually contribute to the thermodynamics. In other words the mechanical pressure inside of baryons cancel each other. After the saturation, however, the quark Fermi sea demands some orientation for collectively moving quarks and they contribute to the pressure.

4. Summary

The scenario of rapid stiffening in this article is based on the observation that quarks can give stiff EOS. This might not be too surprising as the kinetic energy of quarks can be much larger than the nucleon's. What makes the situation obscure is confinement; it prevents quarks from contributing to the pressure while allows them to participate in the energy density through the masses of baryons. Such regime does not continue forever even if we assume the confinement persists to very high density. The quark saturation effects set in anyway and quark matter scaling of EOS is inevitable.

It is surprising to us that quarks play very important roles already at densities slightly above the nuclear saturation density. For reasonable choices of the scale Λ for φ , the density for the quark saturation is found to be roughly a half of the density for baryons to spatially overlap. If baryons are assumed to overlap at $\sim 5-6n_0$, the quark saturation occurs at $\sim 2-3n_0$. Using the lattice results for QCD-like theories such as two-color or isospin QCD (Brandt, Cuteri and Endrodi, 2023; Abbott, Detmold, Romero-López, Davoudi, Illa, Parreño, Perry, Shanahan and Wagman, 2023; Iida, Itou, Murakami and Suenaga, 2024), we have examined the overlap density of diquarks or pions from their radii, reaching the similar estimate (Kojo and Suenaga, 2022; Chiba and Kojo, 2024; Kojo, Suenaga and Chiba, 2024). We note that, the mechanism of soft deconfinement (Fukushima, Kojo and Weise, 2020), which is characterized by the overlap of meson clouds around baryons, also suggests the beyond-nuclear regime at $\sim 2n_0$. It seems to us that all the above arguments are related to the breakdown scale $\sim 2n_0$ (or even lower density) estimated in the chiral effective theory calculations (Drischler, Han, Lattimer, Prakash, Reddy and Zhao, 2021a). There are also attempts to interpret nuclear saturation properties at n_0 as the consequence of the quark saturation (Koch, McLerran, Miller and Vovchenko, 2024; McLerran and Miller, 2024).

Considerations based on the quark degrees of freedom also affect our baryonic descriptions with strangeness. Nucleons, hyperons, and possible excitations such as Δ and so on, share quarks and hence cannot be treated individually. For neutron star matter there are large number of neutrons

and they saturate the down-quark states first. With the saturated down-quark Fermi sea, hyperons such as Σ_0 , Λ_0 , and so on, as well as some of the decuplet such as Δ_+ , Δ_0 , Δ_- , are energetically disfavored since we need to remove neutrons at low momenta to open the phase space or put massive baryons to the high momentum domain. Quark descriptions mitigate the softening associated with strangeness (Fujimoto, Kojo and McLerran, 2024a).

The current version of the model is still primitive and there remains a lot of issues to be clarified. To complete descriptions of the crossover it is necessary to discuss how baryon-baryon interactions are related to the quark dynamics. The most relevant in baryon interactions seems to be the quark exchanges which become meson exchanges at long distance and typically yield hard core repulsion at short distance. Another important issue is the structural changes of hadrons triggered by quark exchanges. Further studies of the crossover are called for.

Acknowledgments

I thank G. Baym and T. Hatsuda with whom the arguments in the first half of this manuscript have been developed. The content related to quarkyonic matter is based on the collaboration with Y. Fujimoto and L. McLerran. The estimate for the density of the quark saturation is largely based on the collaboration with R. Chiba and D. Suenaga. This work is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant No. 23K03377 and No. 18H05407 and by the Graduate Program on Physics for the Universe (GPPU) at Tohoku University.

References

- Abbott, R., Detmold, W., Romero-López, F., Davoudi, Z., Illa, M., Parreño, A., Perry, R.J., Shanahan, P.E., Wagman, M.L. (NPLQCD), 2023. Lattice quantum chromodynamics at large isospin density. *Phys. Rev. D* 108, 114506. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.108.114506, arXiv:2307.15014.
- Akmal, A., Pandharipande, V.R., Ravenhall, D.G., 1998. The Equation of state of nucleon matter and neutron star structure. *Phys. Rev. C* 58, 1804–1828. doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.58.1804, arXiv:nuc1-th/9804027.
- Baym, G., Hatsuda, T., Kojo, T., Powell, P.D., Song, Y., Takatsuka, T., 2018. From hadrons to quarks in neutron stars: a review. *Rept. Prog. Phys.* 81, 056902. doi:10.1088/1361-6633/aaae14, arXiv:1707.04966.
- Brandes, L., Weise, W., 2024. Implications of latest NICER data for the neutron star equation of state arXiv:2412.05923.
- Brandt, B.B., Cuteri, F., Endrodi, G., 2023. Equation of state and speed of sound of isospin-asymmetric QCD on the lattice. *JHEP* 07, 055. doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2023)055, arXiv:2212.14016.
- Chiba, R., Kojo, T., 2024. Sound velocity peak and conformality in isospin QCD. *Phys. Rev. D* 109, 076006. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.109.076006, arXiv:2304.13920.
- Drischler, C., Han, S., Lattimer, J.M., Prakash, M., Reddy, S., Zhao, T., 2021a. Limiting masses and radii of neutron stars and their implications. *Phys. Rev. C* 103, 045808. doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.103.045808, arXiv:2009.06441.
- Drischler, C., Holt, J.W., Wellenhofer, C., 2021b. Chiral Effective Field Theory and the High-Density Nuclear Equation of State. *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* 71, 403–432. doi:10.1146/annurev-nucl-102419-041903, arXiv:2101.01709.
- Duarte, D.C., Hernandez-Ortiz, S., Jeong, K.S., 2020a. Excluded-volume model for quarkyonic matter. II. Three-flavor shell-like distribution of baryons in phase space. *Phys. Rev. C* 102, 065202. doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.102.065202, arXiv:2007.08098.

- Duarte, D.C., Hernandez-Ortiz, S., Jeong, K.S., 2020b. Excluded-volume model for quarkyonic Matter: Three-flavor baryon-quark Mixture. *Phys. Rev. C* 102, 025203. doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.102.025203, arXiv:2003.02362.
- Fujimoto, Y., Kojo, T., McLerran, L., 2024a. Quarkyonic matter pieces together the hyperon puzzle arXiv:2410.22758.
- Fujimoto, Y., Kojo, T., McLerran, L.D., 2024b. Momentum Shell in Quarkyonic Matter from Explicit Duality: A Dual Model for Cold, Dense QCD. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 132, 112701. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.132.112701, arXiv:2306.04304.
- Fukushima, K., Kojo, T., Weise, W., 2020. Hard-core deconfinement and soft-surface delocalization from nuclear to quark matter. *Phys. Rev. D* 102, 096017. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.096017, arXiv:2008.08436.
- Han, M.Z., Huang, Y.J., Tang, S.P., Fan, Y.Z., 2023. Plausible presence of new state in neutron stars with masses above 0.98MTOV. *Sci. Bull.* 68, 913–919. doi:10.1016/j.scib.2023.04.007, arXiv:2207.13613.
- Hensh, S., Huang, Y.J., Kojo, T., Baiotti, L., Takami, K., Nagataki, S., Sotani, H., 2024. Neutron-quark stars: Discerning viable alternatives for the higher-density part of the equation of state of compact stars arXiv:2407.09446.
- Iida, K., Itou, E., Murakami, K., Suenaga, D., 2024. Lattice study on finite density QC₂D towards zero temperature. *JHEP* 10, 022. doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2024)022, arXiv:2405.20566.
- Jeong, K.S., McLerran, L., Sen, S., 2020. Dynamically generated momentum space shell structure of quarkyonic matter via an excluded volume model. *Phys. Rev. C* 101, 035201. doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.101.035201, arXiv:1908.04799.
- Koch, V., McLerran, L., Miller, G.A., Vovchenko, V., 2024. Examining the possibility that normal nuclear matter is quarkyonic. *Phys. Rev. C* 110, 025201. doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.110.025201, arXiv:2403.15375.
- Koch, V., Vovchenko, V., 2023. Quarkyonic or baryquark matter? On the dynamical generation of momentum space shell structure. *Phys. Lett. B* 841, 137942. doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2023.137942, arXiv:2211.14674.
- Kojo, T., 2019. Delineating the properties of matter in cold, dense QCD. *AIP Conf. Proc.* 2127, 020023. doi:10.1063/1.5117813, arXiv:1904.05080.
- Kojo, T., 2021a. QCD equations of state and speed of sound in neutron stars. *AAPS Bull.* 31, 11. doi:10.1007/s43673-021-00011-6, arXiv:2011.10940.
- Kojo, T., 2021b. Stiffening of matter in quark-hadron continuity. *Phys. Rev. D* 104, 074005. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.074005, arXiv:2106.06687.
- Kojo, T., Baym, G., Hatsuda, T., 2022. Implications of NICER for Neutron Star Matter: The QHC21 Equation of State. *Astrophys. J.* 934, 46. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ac7876, arXiv:2111.11919.
- Kojo, T., Powell, P.D., Song, Y., Baym, G., 2015. Phenomenological QCD equation of state for massive neutron stars. *Phys. Rev. D* 91, 045003. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.91.045003, arXiv:1412.1108.
- Kojo, T., Suenaga, D., 2022. Peaks of sound velocity in two color dense QCD: Quark saturation effects and semishort range correlations. *Phys. Rev. D* 105, 076001. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.076001, arXiv:2110.02100.
- Kojo, T., Suenaga, D., Chiba, R., 2024. Isospin QCD as a Laboratory for Dense QCD. *Universe* 10, 293. doi:10.3390/universe10070293, arXiv:2406.11059.
- Marczenko, M., McLerran, L., Redlich, K., Sasaki, C., 2023. Reaching percolation and conformal limits in neutron stars. *Phys. Rev. C* 107, 025802. doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.107.025802, arXiv:2207.13059.
- Masuda, K., Hatsuda, T., Takatsuka, T., 2013a. Hadron-Quark Crossover and Massive Hybrid Stars with Strangeness. *Astrophys. J.* 764, 12. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/764/1/12, arXiv:1205.3621.
- Masuda, K., Hatsuda, T., Takatsuka, T., 2013b. Hadron-quark crossover and massive hybrid stars. *PTEP* 2013, 073D01. doi:10.1093/ptep/ptt045, arXiv:1212.6803.
- McLerran, L., Miller, G.A., 2024. Quark Pauli principle and the transmutation of nuclear matter. *Phys. Rev. C* 110, 045203. doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.110.045203, arXiv:2405.11074.
- McLerran, L., Pisarski, R.D., 2007. Phases of cold, dense quarks at large N(c). *Nucl. Phys. A* 796, 83–100. doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2007.08.013, arXiv:0706.2191.
- McLerran, L., Reddy, S., 2019. Quarkyonic Matter and Neutron Stars. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 122, 122701. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.122701, arXiv:1811.12503.
- Oertel, M., Hempel, M., Klähn, T., Typel, S., 2017. Equations of state for supernovae and compact stars. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 89, 015007. doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.89.015007, arXiv:1610.03361.
- Tan, H., Dexheimer, V., Noronha-Hostler, J., Yunes, N., 2022. Finding Structure in the Speed of Sound of Supranuclear Matter from Binary Love Relations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 128, 161101. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.128.161101, arXiv:2111.10260.
- Togashi, H., Nakazato, K., Takehara, Y., Yamamuro, S., Suzuki, H., Takano, M., 2017. Nuclear equation of state for core-collapse supernova simulations with realistic nuclear forces. *Nucl. Phys. A* 961, 78–105. doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2017.02.010, arXiv:1702.05324.
- Witten, E., 1984. Cosmic Separation of Phases. *Phys. Rev. D* 30, 272–285. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.30.272.
- Zhao, T., Lattimer, J.M., 2020. Quarkyonic Matter Equation of State in Beta-Equilibrium. *Phys. Rev. D* 102, 023021. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.023021, arXiv:2004.08293.