

# Saturation of nuclear matter in the relativistic Brueckner Hartree-Fock approach with a leading order covariant chiral nuclear force

Wei-Jiang Zou,<sup>1</sup> Jun-Xu Lu,<sup>2,3</sup> Peng-Wei Zhao,<sup>1</sup> Li-Sheng Geng,<sup>3,4,5,6,\*</sup> and Jie Meng<sup>1,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology,  
School of Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

<sup>2</sup>School of Space and Environment, Beihang University, Beijing 102206, China

<sup>3</sup>School of Physics, Beihang University, Beijing 102206, China

<sup>4</sup>Beijing Key Laboratory of Advanced Nuclear Materials and Physics, Beihang University, Beijing 102206, China

<sup>5</sup>Peng Huanwu Collaborative Center for Research and Education, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China

<sup>6</sup>Southern Center for Nuclear-Science Theory (SCNT), Institute of Modern Physics,  
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Huizhou 516000, China

(Dated: December 28, 2023)

Nuclear saturation is a crucial feature in nuclear physics that plays a fundamental role in understanding various nuclear phenomena, ranging from properties of finite nuclei to those of neutron stars. However, a proper description of nuclear saturation is highly nontrivial in modern nonrelativistic *ab initio* studies because of the elusive three-body forces. In this letter, we calculate the equation of state for nuclear matter in the relativistic Brueckner-Hartree-Fock framework with the leading order covariant chiral nuclear force. We show that a simultaneous description of the nucleon-nucleon scattering data and the saturation of the symmetric nuclear matter can be achieved. In this regard, the relativistic effects nicely explain the saturation of nuclear matter. As a result, the present study provides a new perspective on one of the most salient features in nuclear physics.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Nuclear matter is an ideal nuclear system of uniform density consisting of infinite neutrons and protons. The saturation of symmetric nuclear matter (SNM), i.e., the energy per nucleon reaches a minimum of about  $-16$  MeV around a density of  $0.16 \text{ fm}^{-3}$  neglecting the Coulomb interaction, plays a vital role in our understanding of nuclear physics [1–4]. The historical success of some of the early phenomenological models, such as the semi-empirical mass formula [5, 6] and the liquid drop model [7], lies in the fact that a nucleus can be treated as an incompressible quantum liquid drop with a constant density  $\rho_0$  at first approximation. This fact alone tells that any microscopic theory of atomic nuclei should be able to describe nuclear matter satisfactorily [8].

Given that the volume term is the most important one in the liquid drop model of nuclear binding energies, one may argue that saturation is a bulk property and theoretically should be independent of fine details of the nucleon-nucleon interaction. Nevertheless, a proper description of the empirical saturation properties of SNM remains a highly nontrivial task in modern nonrelativistic *ab initio* approaches. That is, one needs to supplement the two-body *NN* forces (2NF) with the three-body *NNN* forces (3NF) to reasonably describe the saturation of SNM [9–15]. However, the 3NF is highly uncertain. In particular, the development of consistent microscopic 3NF for the two extreme systems, finite nuclei, and nuclear matter, remains a matter of current research [16]. More recently, many *ab initio* calculations of nuclear structure employing chiral two- and three-nucleon interactions (at  $N^2\text{LO}$  and  $N^3\text{LO}$ ) found that the bulk properties of medium-mass

nuclei and nuclear matter saturation cannot be consistently described [8, 17, 18]. This prompted the development of interactions that use nuclear structure data of medium-mass nuclei or the saturation properties of SNM to constrain the nucleon-nucleon interaction. One such example is the  $N^2\text{LO}_{\text{SAT}}$  interaction [12] that simultaneously fitted the ground-state energies and radii of oxygen isotopes to obtain an *NN+3N* interaction at  $N^2\text{LO}$ . Though very successful phenomenologically, such efforts seem to deviate from the conventional definition of *ab initio* studies, as argued in, e.g., Refs. [8, 19, 20].

A different line of research is to treat atomic nuclei and nuclear matter as relativistic systems. In Ref. [21], with 2NF only, it was shown that the relativistic Brueckner-Hartree-Fock (RBHF) approach could yield saturation properties closer to the empirical value, in contrast with the non-relativistic BHF theory. Such studies hinted that nuclear matter saturation might be a relativistic effect, as pointed out in the 1980s [22]. In recent years, this line of research has gained much more momentum following the overcoming of several long-standing technical problems [23–26]. However, the two-body bare *NN* interaction used in these studies is based on the phenomenological meson exchange picture, i.e., Bonn A, B, and C [27], which does not allow a systematic improvement for the description of SNM. From this perspective, a relativistic nuclear force more closely related to the theory of the strong interaction, i.e., Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD), is needed to gain further insight into the role of relativity in the saturation of nuclear matter. The present work aims to fill this gap.

Chiral effective field theory ( $\chi\text{EFT}$ ), as the low-energy effective theory of QCD, can provide microscopic and QCD-based nucleon-nucleon interactions [28, 29] needed in *ab initio* studies. In the past, most studies focused on non-relativistic nucleon-nucleon interactions [30, 31]. Recently, it was proposed that one can derive a relativistic chiral nucleon-nucleon interaction based on the covariant  $\chi\text{EFT}$  [32–34],

\* lisheng.geng@buaa.edu.cn

† mengj@pku.edu.cn

which provides the much-needed microscopic  $NN$  forces needed in the RBHF studies [35].

In this letter, we study the properties of SNM in the RHF theory. We employ the relativistic chiral nuclear force to demonstrate how relativity allows one to achieve saturation already with the leading order (LO) two-body force, indicating that saturation can indeed be seen as originating from relativistic effects and is undoubtedly a bulk property less affected by the fine details of the nucleon-nucleon interaction. This letter is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we briefly introduce the theoretical framework of the RBHF theory based on the LO covariant chiral nuclear force. We analyze the results in Sec. III, followed by a summary and outlook in Sec. IV.

## II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In the RBHF theory, one employs the Dirac equation to describe the single-particle motion of the nucleon in nuclear matter:

$$(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \beta M + \beta \mathcal{U})u(\mathbf{p}, \lambda) = E_{\mathbf{p}}u(\mathbf{p}, \lambda), \quad (1)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  and  $\beta$  are the Dirac matrices,  $u(\mathbf{p}, \lambda)$  is the Dirac spinor with momentum  $\mathbf{p}$ , single-particle energy  $E_{\mathbf{p}}$  and helicity  $\lambda$ ,  $M$  is the mass of the free nucleon, and  $\mathcal{U}$  is the single-particle potential operator, providing the primary medium effects. Due to time-reversal invariance, one can neglect the spacelike component of the vector fields, and as a result, the single-particle potential operator can be expressed as [21, 36]:

$$\mathcal{U} = U_S + \gamma^0 U_0, \quad (2)$$

The momentum dependence of the scalar field ( $U_S$ ) and the timelike component of the vector fields ( $U_0$ ) is weak and therefore neglected.

The in-medium Dirac equation can be expressed in the form of the free Dirac equation:

$$(\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \beta M^*)u(\mathbf{p}, \lambda) = E_{\mathbf{p}}^*u(\mathbf{p}, \lambda), \quad (3)$$

by introducing the following effective quantities:

$$M^* = M + U_S, \quad E_{\mathbf{p}}^* = E_{\mathbf{p}} - U_0, \quad (4)$$

whose solution reads

$$u(\mathbf{p}, \lambda) = \sqrt{\frac{E_{\mathbf{p}}^* + M^*}{2M^*}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2\lambda p \\ E_{\mathbf{p}}^* + M^* \end{pmatrix} \chi_{\lambda}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\chi_{\lambda}$  is the Pauli spinor helicity basis. The covariant normalization is  $\bar{u}(\mathbf{p}, \lambda)u(\mathbf{p}, \lambda) = 1$ .

Once  $U_S$  and  $U_0$  of the single-particle potential operator are determined, the in-medium Dirac equation can be solved analytically. To achieve this, the matrix element of  $\mathcal{U}$  is constructed following Refs. [21, 37] as

$$\Sigma(p) = \bar{u}(\mathbf{p}, 1/2)\mathcal{U}u(\mathbf{p}, 1/2) = U_S + \frac{E_{\mathbf{p}}^*}{M^*}U_0 \quad (6)$$

where the direction of  $\mathbf{p}$  is taken along the  $z$  axis.

Once  $\Sigma$  is obtained,  $U_S$  and  $U_0$  can be determined via the following relations,

$$\Sigma(p_1) = U_S + \frac{E_{p_1}^*}{M^*}U_0, \quad (7a)$$

$$\Sigma(p_2) = U_S + \frac{E_{p_2}^*}{M^*}U_0, \quad (7b)$$

where  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  describe two momenta that are in the Fermi sea.

On the other hand, the matrix elements of  $\mathcal{U}$  in Eq. (6) can be calculated as the integrals of the effective  $G$  matrix

$$\Sigma(p) = \sum_{\lambda'} \int_0^{k_F} \frac{d^3p'}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{M^*}{E_{\mathbf{p}'}} \langle \bar{u}(\mathbf{p}, 1/2)\bar{u}(\mathbf{p}', \lambda')|\bar{G}|u(\mathbf{p}, 1/2)u(\mathbf{p}', \lambda') \rangle, \quad (8)$$

where  $\bar{G}$  is the antisymmetrized  $G$  matrix. In the *no-sea* approximation [38], the integral is only performed for the single-particle states in the Fermi sea.

In the RBHF theory, the  $G$  matrix is obtained by solving the in-medium relativistic scattering equation. One of the most widely used scattering equations in the RBHF theory is the Thompson equation [39], a relativistic three-dimensional reduction of the Bethe-Salpeter equation [40]. To include medium effects, the Thompson equation in the rest frame of

nuclear matter reads,

$$G(\mathbf{q}', \mathbf{q}|\mathbf{P}, W) = V(\mathbf{q}', \mathbf{q}|\mathbf{P}) + \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} V(\mathbf{q}', \mathbf{k}|\mathbf{P}) \times \frac{M^{*2}}{E_{\mathbf{P}+\mathbf{k}}^* E_{\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{k}}^*} \frac{Q(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{P})}{W - E_{\mathbf{P}+\mathbf{k}} - E_{\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{k}}} \times G(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}|\mathbf{P}, W), \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{P} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2)$  is the center-of-mass momentum, and  $\mathbf{k} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{k}_2)$  is the relative momentum of the two interacting nucleons with momenta  $\mathbf{k}_1$  and  $\mathbf{k}_2$ , and  $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'$ , and  $\mathbf{k}$  are the initial, final, and intermediate relative momenta of the two nucleons scattering in nuclear matter, respectively.  $W = E_{\mathbf{P}+\mathbf{q}} + E_{\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{q}}$  is used to describe the starting

energy.  $M^*$  and  $E_{\mathbf{P}\pm\mathbf{k}}^*$  are effective masses and energies. The Pauli operator  $Q(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{P})$  only allows the scattering of nucleons to un-occupied states, i.e.,

$$Q(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{P}) = \begin{cases} 1, & |\mathbf{P} + \mathbf{k}|, |\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{k}| > k_F \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (10)$$

where  $k_F$  is the Fermi momentum.

One key feature of the RBHF theory is that the  $V$  in

Eq. (9) should be a bare  $NN$  interaction of covariant form. This work adopts the LO covariant chiral nuclear force [33, 41]. In this order, the relativistic potential  $V$  is the sum of a contact term and the one-pion-exchange diagram,

$$V_{\text{LO}} = V_{\text{CTP}} + V_{\text{OPEP}}, \quad (11)$$

where the contact potential (CTP) is

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{CTP}}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) = & C_S [\bar{u}(\mathbf{p}', \lambda'_1)u(\mathbf{p}, \lambda_1)] [\bar{u}(-\mathbf{p}', \lambda'_2)u(-\mathbf{p}, \lambda_2)] \\ & + C_V [\bar{u}(\mathbf{p}', \lambda'_1)\gamma_\mu u(\mathbf{p}, \lambda_1)] [\bar{u}(-\mathbf{p}', \lambda'_2)\gamma^\mu u(-\mathbf{p}, \lambda_2)] \\ & + C_{AV} [\bar{u}(\mathbf{p}', \lambda'_1)\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 u(\mathbf{p}, \lambda_1)] [\bar{u}(-\mathbf{p}', \lambda'_2)\gamma^\mu\gamma_5 u(-\mathbf{p}, \lambda_2)] \\ & + C_T [\bar{u}(\mathbf{p}', \lambda'_1)\sigma_{\mu\nu} u(\mathbf{p}, \lambda_1)] [\bar{u}(-\mathbf{p}', \lambda'_2)\sigma^{\mu\nu} u(-\mathbf{p}, \lambda_2)], \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where  $C_{S,V,AV,T}$  are low-energy constants (LECs) to be determined by fitting to the nucleon-nucleon scattering phase shifts. The one-pion-exchange potential (OPEP) reads

$$V_{\text{OPEP}}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) = \frac{g_A^2}{4f_\pi^2} \frac{[\bar{u}(\mathbf{p}', \lambda'_1)\boldsymbol{\tau}_1\gamma^\mu\gamma_5 q_\mu u(\mathbf{p}, \lambda_1)] [\bar{u}(-\mathbf{p}', \lambda'_2)\boldsymbol{\tau}_2\gamma^\nu\gamma_5 q_\nu u(-\mathbf{p}, \lambda_2)]}{(E_{\mathbf{p}'} - E_{\mathbf{p}})^2 - (\mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p})^2 - m_\pi^2}, \quad (13)$$

where the pion decay constant  $f_\pi = 92.4$  MeV, the axial vector coupling  $g_A = 1.29$  [42].  $m_\pi$  is the pion mass,  $q = (E_{\mathbf{p}'} - E_{\mathbf{p}}, \mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p})$  represents the four momentum transferred, and  $\boldsymbol{\tau}_1, \boldsymbol{\tau}_2$  are the isospin Pauli matrix.

Furthermore, the potential has to be regularized to avoid ultraviolet divergences and facilitate numerical calculations. Here, we choose the commonly used separable cutoff function [43, 44]:

$$V_{\text{LO}} \rightarrow V_{\text{LO}}^{\text{Reg.}} = V_{\text{LO}} \exp\left(\frac{-\mathbf{p}^{2n} - \mathbf{p}'^{2n}}{\Lambda^{2n}}\right), \quad (14)$$

where  $n = 2$  and  $\Lambda$  is the cutoff momentum. Equations. (3),(7),(8), and (9) constitute a set of coupled equations that need to be solved self-consistently. Starting from arbitrary initial values of  $U_S^{(0)}, U_0^{(0)}$ , one solves the in-medium Dirac equation (3) to obtain the Dirac spinors. Next, one solves the Thompson equation (9) to obtain the  $G$  matrix and uses the integrals in Eq. (8) to get  $\Sigma$ . With Eq. (7), one obtains a new set of fields,  $U_S^{(1)}, U_0^{(1)}$ , to be used in the next iteration.

When  $U_S$  and  $U_0$  of the single-particle potential converge, the binding energy per nucleon in SNM can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} E/A = & \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{\lambda} \int_0^{k_F} \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{M^*}{E_{\mathbf{p}}^*} \langle \bar{u}(\mathbf{p}, \lambda) | \boldsymbol{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{p} + M | u(\mathbf{p}, \lambda) \rangle \\ & + \frac{1}{2\rho} \sum_{\lambda, \lambda'} \int_0^{k_F} \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \int_0^{k_F} \frac{d^3p'}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{M^*}{E_{\mathbf{p}}^*} \frac{M^*}{E_{\mathbf{p}'}} \\ & \times \langle \bar{u}(\mathbf{p}, \lambda) \bar{u}(\mathbf{p}', \lambda') | \bar{G}(W) | u(\mathbf{p}, \lambda) u(\mathbf{p}', \lambda') \rangle - M, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where the isospin indexes are suppressed. The starting en-

ergy  $W = E_p + E_{p'}$ . The density  $\rho$  is related to the Fermi momentum  $k_F$  through  $\rho = 2k_F^3/3\pi^2$ .

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The unknown LECs are determined in Refs. [33, 34] by performing a simultaneous fit to the  $J \leq 1$  Nijmegen partial wave phase shifts of the  $np$  channel up to the laboratory kinetic energy ( $E_{\text{lab}}$ ) of 100 MeV at six energies [45]. In the fitting process, the  $\chi^2 = \sum_i (\delta^i - \delta_{\text{PWA93}}^i)^2$  [33] is minimized.

In Refs. [33, 34], a sharp cutoff is used. In the present work, we adopt the exponential regulator in Eq. (14), which is more amenable for RBHF studies. In addition, to study the impact of the cutoff on the results, we vary  $\Lambda$  from 450 MeV to 600 MeV.<sup>1</sup> The corresponding LECs  $C_{S,V,AV,T}$  are listed in Table I. In the following discussion, we employ the four LO covariant chiral nuclear forces listed in Table I to calculate phase shifts and properties of SNM.

<sup>1</sup> We realized in retrospect that the cutoff dependence of the potential can be exacerbated in nuclear matter compared to that in vacuum, similar to the nonrelativistic case[13].

TABLE I. Values of the LO LECs (in units of  $\text{GeV}^{-2}$ ) with the cutoff ranging from 450 MeV to 600 MeV.

$\Lambda(\text{MeV})$	$C_S$	$C_V$	$C_{AV}$	$C_T$	$\tilde{\chi}^2/N$
450	-497.51	422.09	-122.29	-54.24	7.43
550	-561.94	532.56	-164.86	-68.12	4.66
567	-578.05	560.43	-174.54	-71.32	4.25
600	-619.06	631.96	-198.56	-79.55	3.57




FIG. 1. (Color online) Neutron-proton phase shifts for partial waves of  $J \leq 1$ . The red bands are those of the LO covariant chiral nuclear force, with the cutoff ranging from 450 MeV to 600 MeV. The solid dotted lines represent the  $np$  phase shift analyses of Nijmegen [45]. The gray backgrounds denote the energy regions where the theoretical results are predicted.

With the four sets of LECs, the description of the Nijmegen multi-energy  $np$  phase shifts up to  $E_{\text{lab}} = 300$  MeV are shown in Fig. 1. The red bands cover the variations from the best-fit results obtained with the cutoff ranging from 450 MeV to 600 MeV. The LO covariant NN force can provide a reasonable description of the  $np$  phase shifts of  $^1S_0$ ,  $^3P_0$ ,  $^1P_1$  and  $^3S_1$ , but the description of the phase shifts of  $^3P_1$ ,  $^3D_1$ ,  $\epsilon_1$  is not very satisfactory at higher energies. Furthermore, the cutoff variation from 450 MeV to 600 MeV does not qualitatively change the overall picture.




FIG. 2. (Color online) Energy per nucleon ( $E/A$ ) in SNM as a function of the density  $\rho$  in the RBHF theory with a leading order covariant chiral nuclear force[33], in comparison with the results with the Bonn A potential (magenta dash line) [21]. The pentagrams denote the saturation point. The shaded area indicates the empirical values [46, 47].

In Fig. 2, we show the corresponding equations of state (EOS) for SNM. We note that the EOSs become more and more repulsive as the cutoff  $\Lambda$  decreases. At low densities, we observe a weak cutoff dependence for these potentials in SNM. In contrast, at higher densities, the energy per particle of SNM strongly depends on the momentum cutoff  $\Lambda$ . We further note that with a  $\Lambda$  of 567 MeV, the binding energy per nucleon obtained in the RBHF theory is  $-15.82$  MeV, in good agreement with the empirical value of  $-16 \pm 1$  MeV, and the saturation density  $\rho_0$  is  $0.16 \text{ fm}^{-3}$  which is also in good agreement with the empirical one of  $0.16 \pm 0.01 \text{ fm}^{-3}$ . On the other hand, compared with the results obtained with the Bonn A potential, at densities  $\rho > \rho_0$ , the EOSs of SNM are much stiffer, although they agree with each other at lower densities. This might be traced to the fact that the LO covariant chiral nuclear force provides a relatively poor description of the phase shifts of  $P$  partial waves. We anticipate that the EOSs will be softened at higher chiral orders.

To better understand the EOSs of SNM, we show the contributions of different partial waves to the potential energy in Fig. 3. One can see that the  $^1S_0$  and  $^3S_1$ - $^3D_1$  channels generate most of the attraction, and these two channels have a stronger dependence on the momentum cutoff  $\Lambda$  compared with other channels. On the other hand, the  $^3P_0$ ,  $^1P_1$ , and  $^3P_1$  channels provide repulsive contributions, where the  $^3P_1$  channel contributes the most. Compared with the results obtained with the Bonn A potential, at densities  $\rho > \rho_0$ , the  $P$  wave contributions to the potential energy are more significant. This may explain why the EOSs of SNM




FIG. 3. (Color online) Partial wave contributions to the potential energy in SNM with the LO chiral nuclear force, in comparison with the results with the Bonn A potential (magenta dash line).

obtained with the LO covariant chiral nuclear force are much stiffer at densities  $\rho > \rho_0$ .

Next, we compare in Fig. 4 the RBHF results with the BHF results obtained with the non-relativistic LO, NLO, and N<sup>2</sup>LO chiral nuclear forces [14]. The solid line shows the EOS obtained with the LO covariant chiral nuclear force and a  $\Lambda = 567$  MeV cutoff. There is no saturation in the BHF results up to NLO. In Refs. [13, 14, 33], it is shown that the NLO non-relativistic chiral nuclear force can provide a reasonable description of the  $np$  phase shifts of partial waves of  $J \leq 1$  similar to the LO covariant chiral nuclear force. On the other hand, the NLO non-relativistic chiral nuclear force cannot provide nuclear matter saturation in the BHF framework and all other non-relativistic frameworks. Only at N<sup>2</sup>LO, when 3NF is considered, a reasonable description of nuclear matter saturation can be achieved. On the other hand, the RBHF theory with the LO covariant chiral nuclear force is sufficient to provide a decent description of the saturation properties of SNM, which indicates that nuclear matter saturation can indeed be understood as a relativistic effect [21, 22] and is independent of the fine details of the nucleon-nucleon interaction. Although the  $P$  wave contributions to the EOS are pretty different in the calculations with the LO covariant chiral nuclear

force and the Bonn A potential, nuclear matter saturation can be achieved in both calculations without needing 3NF.

#### IV. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

In summary, we have studied the equation of state in the relativistic Brueckner-Hartree-Fock theory with the LO covariant chiral nuclear force. We found that the saturation properties of symmetric nuclear matter can be reasonably described with a cutoff of  $\Lambda = 567$  MeV. This contrasts with the nonrelativistic Brueckner-Hartree-Fock theory, where reasonable saturation can only be achieved at N<sup>2</sup>LO (with 3NF). On the other hand, in the RBHF theory, the saturation properties of symmetric nuclear matter can be reasonably described already at leading order, indicating that nuclear matter saturation can indeed be viewed as a relativistic effect, reinforcing the long-held belief [21–26]. In addition, we can achieve a simultaneous description of the  $np$  phase shifts and the saturation properties of symmetric nuclear matter at leading order without explicitly introducing three-body forces. In this respect, the results of the present work are consistent with the recent works seeking the essential elements of nuclear bind-




FIG. 4. (Color online) Energy per nucleon ( $E/A$ ) in SNM as a function of the density  $\rho$  with relativistic LO chiral nuclear force (red solid line), in comparison with the nonrelativistic LO, NLO, and  $N^2$ LO chiral nuclear force (black dashed line, blue dotted dash and green dot-dot-dashed) [14]. The shaded area indicates the empirical values [46, 47].

ing [48, 49], but in a relativistic framework and highlights the unique role played by consistently treating relativistic degrees of freedom.

In the future, we would like to perform studies with higher-order covariant chiral nuclear forces and check the convergence of our results. In addition, we would like to extend such studies to pure neutron matter, whose EOS plays an essential role in heavy-ion physics as well as in models of neutron stars, gravitational collapse supernovae, and neutron star mergers.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Wei-Jiang Zou thanks Xiu-lei Ren, Si-bo Wang, and Yi-long Yang for the helpful discussions. We thank Shi-Hang Shen for the enlightening communications. This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants No.11935003, No.11975031, No.12141501, No.12070131001, No.11735003, No.11975041, No.11961141004, the National Key R&D Program of China under Grant No.2023YFA1606700, and the State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University No.NPT2023ZX01.

- 
- [1] B. D. Day, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **50**, 495 (1978).  
[2] H. A. Bethe, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **21**, 93 (1971).  
[3] J. M. Lattimer and M. Prakash, *Phys. Rept.* **333**, 121 (2000), arXiv:astro-ph/0002203.  
[4] A. Sorensen *et al.*, (2023), arXiv:2301.13253 [nucl-th].  
[5] C. F. V. Weizsacker, *Z. Phys.* **96**, 431 (1935).  
[6] W. D. Myers and W. J. Swiatecki, *Nucl. Phys.* **81**, 1 (1966).  
[7] G. Gamow, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **126**, 632 (1930).  
[8] R. Machleidt, *Few Body Syst.* **64**, 77 (2023), arXiv:2307.06416 [nucl-th].  
[9] C. Drischler, K. Hebeler, and A. Schwenk, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 042501 (2019), arXiv:1710.08220 [nucl-th].  
[10] Z. H. Li, U. Lombardo, H. J. Schulze, and W. Zuo, *Phys. Rev. C* **77**, 034316 (2008).  
[11] G. Hagen, T. Papenbrock, M. Hjorth-Jensen, and D. J. Dean, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **77**, 096302 (2014), arXiv:1312.7872 [nucl-th].  
[12] A. Ekström, G. R. Jansen, K. A. Wendt, G. Hagen, T. Papenbrock, B. D. Carlsson, C. Forssén, M. Hjorth-Jensen, P. Navrátil, and W. Nazarewicz, *Phys. Rev. C* **91**, 051301 (2015), arXiv:1502.04682 [nucl-th].  
[13] F. Sammarruca, L. Coraggio, J. W. Holt, N. Itaco, R. Machleidt, and L. E. Marcucci, *Phys. Rev. C* **91**, 054311 (2015), arXiv:1411.0136 [nucl-th].  
[14] F. Sammarruca and R. Millerson, *Phys. Rev. C* **104**, 064312 (2021), arXiv:2109.01985 [nucl-th].  
[15] D. Lonardonì, I. Tews, S. Gandolfi, and J. Carlson, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 022033 (2020), arXiv:1912.09411 [nucl-th].  
[16] K. Hebeler, *Phys. Rept.* **890**, 1 (2021), arXiv:2002.09548 [nucl-th].  
[17] J. Hoppe, C. Drischler, K. Hebeler, A. Schwenk, and J. Simonis, *Phys. Rev. C* **100**, 024318 (2019), arXiv:1904.12611 [nucl-th].  
[18] T. Hübner, K. Vobig, K. Hebeler, R. Machleidt, and R. Roth, *Phys. Lett. B* **808**, 135651 (2020), arXiv:1911.04955 [nucl-th].  
[19] D. R. Entem and R. Machleidt, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **610**, 366 (2002).  
[20] E. Epelbaum, W. Glockle, and U.-G. Meissner, *Nucl. Phys. A* **747**, 362 (2005), arXiv:nucl-th/0405048.  
[21] R. Brockmann and R. Machleidt, *Phys. Rev. C* **42**, 1965 (1990).  
[22] M. R. Anastasio, L. S. Celenza, and C. M. Shakin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45**, 2096 (1980).  
[23] G. E. Brown and W. Weise, *Comments Nucl. Part. Phys.* **17**, 39 (1987).  
[24] Z.-y. Ma and L. Liu, *Phys. Rev. C* **66**, 024321 (2002), arXiv:nucl-th/0207021.  
[25] E. N. E. van Dalen, C. Fuchs, and A. Faessler, *Nucl. Phys. A* **744**, 227 (2004), arXiv:nucl-th/0407070.  
[26] S. Wang, Q. Zhao, P. Ring, and J. Meng, *Phys. Rev. C* **103**, 054319 (2021), arXiv:2103.12960 [nucl-th].  
[27] R. Machleidt, *Adv. Nucl. Phys.* **19**, 189 (1989).  
[28] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Lett. B* **251**, 15 (1990).  
[29] S. Weinberg, *Nucl. Phys. B* **363**, 30 (1990).  
[30] E. Epelbaum, H.-W. Hammer, and U.-G. Meissner, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 1773 (2009), arXiv:0811.1338 [nucl-th].  
[31] R. Machleidt and D. R. Entem, *Phys. Rept.* **503**, 1 (2011), arXiv:1105.2919 [nucl-th].  
[32] E. Epelbaum and J. Gegelia, *Phys. Lett. B* **716**, 338 (2012), arXiv:1207.2420 [nucl-th].

- [33] X.-L. Ren, K.-W. Li, L.-S. Geng, B.-W. Long, P. Ring, and J. Meng, *Chin. Phys. C* **42**, 014103 (2018), arXiv:1611.08475 [nucl-th].
- [34] J.-X. Lu, C.-X. Wang, Y. Xiao, L.-S. Geng, J. Meng, and P. Ring, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 142002 (2022), arXiv:2111.07766 [nucl-th].
- [35] S. Shen, H. Liang, W. H. Long, J. Meng, and P. Ring, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **109**, 103713 (2019), arXiv:1904.04977 [nucl-th].
- [36] H. Tong, X.-L. Ren, P. Ring, S.-H. Shen, S.-B. Wang, and J. Meng, *Phys. Rev. C* **98**, 054302 (2018), arXiv:1808.09138 [nucl-th].
- [37] M. R. Anastasio, L. S. Celenza, W. S. Pong, and C. M. Shakin, *Phys. Rep.* **100**, 327 (1983).
- [38] J. D. Walecka, *Annals Phys.* **83**, 491 (1974).
- [39] R. H. Thompson, *Phys. Rev. D* **1**, 110 (1970).
- [40] E. E. Salpeter and H. A. Bethe, *Phys. Rev.* **84**, 1232 (1951).
- [41] Y. Xiao, L.-S. Geng, and X.-L. Ren, *Phys. Rev. C* **99**, 024004 (2019), arXiv:1812.03005 [nucl-th].
- [42] C. Patrignani *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *Chin. Phys. C* **40**, 100001 (2016).
- [43] E. Epelbaum, W. Gloeckle, and U.-G. Meissner, *Nucl. Phys. A* **671**, 295 (2000), arXiv:nucl-th/9910064.
- [44] X.-L. Ren, C.-X. Wang, K.-W. Li, L.-S. Geng, and J. Meng, *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **38**, 062101 (2021), arXiv:1712.10083 [nucl-th].
- [45] V. G. J. Stoks, R. A. M. Klomp, M. C. M. Rentmeester, and J. J. de Swart, *Phys. Rev. C* **48**, 792 (1993).
- [46] H. A. Bethe, *Rev. Nucl. Sci.* **21**, 93 (1971).
- [47] D. W. L. Sprung, *Adv. Nucl. Phys.* **5**, 225 (1972).
- [48] B.-N. Lu, N. Li, S. Elhatisari, D. Lee, E. Epelbaum, and U.-G. Meißner, *Phys. Lett. B* **797**, 134863 (2019), arXiv:1812.10928 [nucl-th].
- [49] A. Gnech, B. Fore, and A. Lovato, (2023), arXiv:2308.16266 [nucl-th].