

Dual symmetries of dense isotopically and chirally asymmetric QCD

K. G. Klimenko and R. N. Zhokhov

NRC "Kurchatov Institute"—IHEP, Protvino, 142281, Russian Federation

In the present paper, the dual symmetries of dense quark matter phase diagram found in some massless three- and two-color NJL models in the mean field approximation have been shown to exist at a more fundamental level as a dual transformations of fields and chemical potentials leaving the Lagrangian invariant. As a result, the corresponding dual symmetries of the full phase diagram can be shown without any approximation. And it has been shown not only in the NJL models, but also in framework of two- and three-color massless QCD itself. This is quite interesting, since one might say that it is not very common to show something completely non-perturbatively in QCD.

Introduction.—At present, there is a reasonable confidence that dense quark matter can be formed in heavy ion collisions or in the cores of neutron stars. Its properties are described by quantum chromodynamics (QCD), effective Nambu-Jona-Lasinio (NJL) models, etc [1–3]. Phase diagram of QCD with its various phenomena of condensations has been investigated rather intensively in the recent decades. Depending on the values of such physical parameters as baryon μ_B and isospin μ_I , as well as chiral μ_5 and chiral isospin μ_{I5} chemical potentials, in dense quark matter formed only by u and d quarks the color superconducting [3, 4], charged pion condensation [5–8] and the phases with chiral and chiral-isospin asymmetries [9–12], etc. can be observed. At the same time, it becomes obvious that the greater the number of chemical potentials, and therefore exotic phases, are involved in considering the properties of the phase structure of dense quark matter, the more and more complicated this task becomes even within the framework of the simplest analytical approaches, not to mention the fundamental lattice QCD approach to the problem. However, one circumstance was recently discovered that suggests that the task of studying the phase structure of real dense quark matter is not so hopeless.

Indeed, within the framework of the simplest NJL model, it was discovered that in the mean field approximation (or in the leading order of the $1/N_c$ expansion, where N_c is the number of colors) the chiral symmetry breaking (CSB) and charged pion condensation (PC) phases are dually conjugate to each other [13]. It means that there is symmetry of the phase diagram with respect to the rearrangement of the order parameters, namely of chiral and charged pion condensates, as well as the simultaneous transformation of chemical potentials $\mu_I \leftrightarrow \mu_{I5}$. Let us note that duality was found in the case when current quark mass is zero, i.e. in the chiral limit. However, in the physical point, i.e. at physical values of (nonzero) current quark masses, duality is approximate, but it holds with very good approximation and quite robust under influence of temperature, etc [14]. Moreover, as it turned out, the duality between CSB and charged PC is not just interesting and beautiful mathematical feature of QCD phase diagram, which is undoubtedly true, but a rather useful tool of investigating phase diagram or at least facilitating its research. For example, using only

the duality mapping and known (μ_B, μ_I) -phase structure of quark matter, its (μ_B, μ_{I5}) -phase portrait with new inhomogeneous phases has been obtained without any calculations [15], etc.

The duality between CSB and charged PC phases has been shown for the first time in the framework of the (1+1)-dimensional massless two-flavor NJL model in the leading order of $1/N_c$ approximation [16] (see also in [17]). The possibility for duality correspondence between other physical phenomena, e.g., CSB and superconductivity, has been also investigated earlier in the framework of low dimensional quantum field theories with four-fermion interactions in [18–20].

Then the story continued, and the gaze was drawn to the two-color QCD. And quite recently, in the papers [21] it was shown that in dense isotopically and chirally asymmetric baryon matter, which is formed of two-color quarks and described by the massless two-flavor and two-color NJL model, two another dual symmetries of its mean-field thermodynamic potential (TDP) appear. As a result, the dualities between CSB and baryon superfluid (BSF), or diquark condensation, phases as well as between charged PC and BSF phenomena appear, in addition to the above-mentioned duality between CSB and charged PC. In this NJL model, which is a low-energy effective model of the two-color QCD with two flavors, the investigation of dense quark matter was also performed only in the mean-field approximation.

Moreover, in a more involved three-color and two-flavor NJL model with additional diquark interaction channel [4] the same dual symmetry between CSB and charged PC phases have been observed in the chiral limit and also using the mean-field approximation as in the simplest NJL model [13]. Hence, we see that two different three-color NJL models that effectively describe (in the general case, different) low-energy QCD regions have TDPs that are invariant in the chiral limit and in the mean-field approximation under the same dual transformation relating the phenomena CSB and charged PC.

Now, two questions naturally arise. (i) Whether the dual relations between various physical phenomena are inherent in the above-mentioned dense NJL models as a whole, and not only in their mean-field approximations. In addition, (ii) one can pose the question even more broadly and try to clarify the situation with the dual

symmetries within the dense QCD themselves, both with two and three colors of quarks. The present paper is devoted to the consideration of these questions.

We show that massless QCD and QCD-like effective NJL Lagrangians are invariant with respect to some duality transformations. Due to this fact, the confidence appears that the corresponding full TDPs are dually symmetric, i.e. the dualities between different phenomena, which were previously observed in the mean-field or large- N_c approximations, are inherent in the QCD or the corresponding NJL models itself, on the basis of which dense quark matter is studied.

The case of two-color models.—Our starting point is the Lagrangian for the quark sector of two-color massless QCD extended by four chemical potential terms

$$L_{QC_2D} = i\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu D_\mu\psi + \bar{\psi}\mathcal{M}\psi, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{M} = \frac{\mu_B}{2}\gamma^0 + \frac{\mu_I}{2}\gamma^0\tau_3 + \frac{\mu_{I5}}{2}\gamma^0\gamma^5\tau_3 + \mu_5\gamma^0\gamma^5$. In (1) and below, quark field $\psi(x)$ is a flavor doublet, i.e. $\psi^T = (u^T, d^T)$, and each of u, d is a color doublet and four-component Dirac spinor. $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - ig\sigma_a A_\mu^a(x)$ (here σ_a ($a = 1, 2, 3$) are three 2×2 color Pauli matrices). As it was shown in [22, 23], at $\mathcal{M} = 0$ the Lagrangian (1) is invariant under $SU(4)$ symmetry group, since in this case it can be presented in the form $L_{QC_2D} = i\bar{\Psi}\gamma^\mu D_\mu\Psi$, where $\Psi(x)$ is an auxiliary spinor field, $\Psi^T = (u_L^T, d_L^T, \sigma_2(u_R^C)^T, \sigma_2(d_R^C)^T)$, $\bar{\Psi} = (\bar{u}_L, \bar{d}_L, \bar{u}_R^C\sigma_2, \bar{d}_R^C\sigma_2)$,

and it belongs to fundamental representation of $SU(4)$ group.

Let us now consider two-color NJL model. Its kinetic term explicitly invariant under $SU(4)$ group could be easily written as $i\bar{\Psi}\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu\Psi$. The invariant with respect to $SU(4)$ interaction terms of the 2-color NJL Lagrangian can be constructed from the two $SU(4)$ -invariant structures, $|\bar{\Psi}^C\vec{\Sigma}\Psi|^2$ and $(\bar{\Psi}^C\vec{\Sigma}\Psi)^2 + \text{H.c.}$ (for detail, see in [24]), where $\vec{\Sigma}$ are explicitly: $\Sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\Sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \tau_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_2 \end{pmatrix}$, $\Sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i\tau_1 \\ -i\tau_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\Sigma_4 = \begin{pmatrix} i\tau_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -i\tau_2 \end{pmatrix}$, $\Sigma_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i\tau_2 \\ -i\tau_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\Sigma_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i\tau_3 \\ -i\tau_3 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Note that $\bar{\Psi}^C\vec{\Sigma}\Psi$ transforms as a fundamental representation of $SO(6)$ group. Moreover, there is an isomorphism $SU(4)/Z_2 = SO(6)$, i.e. up to Z_2 these groups, $SU(4)$ and $SO(6)$, are isomorphic. Next, we will consider the simplest version of the $SU(4)$ symmetric QC_2D -like effective four-fermion model, which in terms of $\psi(x)$ fields has the following Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}_{NJL_2} &= i\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu\psi + G[(\bar{\psi}\psi)^2 \\ &+ (i\bar{\psi}\vec{\tau}\gamma^5\psi)^2 + (i\bar{\psi}\sigma_2\tau_2\gamma^5\psi^C)(i\bar{\psi}^C\sigma_2\tau_2\gamma^5\psi)]. \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

In order to study dense quark matter in the framework of this 2-color NJL model, one should add to the Lagrangian (2) the chemical potential term $\bar{\psi}\mathcal{M}\psi$ (see in (1)), i.e. consider $L_{NJL_2} \equiv \tilde{L}_{NJL_2} + \bar{\psi}\mathcal{M}\psi$. This term breaks $SU(4)$ symmetry, but it is quite insightful to rewrite it with the use of auxiliary spinor fields Ψ ,

$$\bar{\psi}\mathcal{M}\psi = \frac{\mu_B}{2}\Psi^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \Psi + \frac{\mu_I}{2}\Psi^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \tau_3 & 0 \\ 0 & -\tau_3 \end{pmatrix} \Psi + \frac{\mu_{I5}}{2}\Psi^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \tau_3 & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_3 \end{pmatrix} \Psi + \mu_5\Psi^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \Psi. \quad (3)$$

• Now having in L_{QC_2D} and L_{NJL_2} terms with chemical potentials written in the form (3), one can notice that if we change the order of the second and third components in Ψ field, i.e. make the transformation $d_L \leftrightarrow \sigma_2 u_R^C$, then the fermion structure of terms with chemical potential μ_{I5} and μ_B , i.e. first and the third one in (3), transforms one into another. And if we in addition transform the chemical potential $\mu_B \leftrightarrow \mu_{I5}$ then these terms stays intact. Besides, one can show that other terms with chemical potentials μ_I and μ_5 are invariant with respect to this transformation. Kinetic and interaction parts of Lagrangians are also invariant. One could write this (dual) transformation in the following matrix form

$$\mathcal{D}_{III} : \begin{pmatrix} d_L \\ \sigma_2 u_R^C \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow i\tau_2 \begin{pmatrix} d_L \\ \sigma_2 u_R^C \end{pmatrix}; \mu_B \leftrightarrow \mu_{I5}. \quad (4)$$

• Let us see that if we change the order of first and third components in Ψ field then the structure of terms with chemical potentials μ_I and μ_B (first and second term in (3)) transforms one into the other. And if, in addition, one make the transformation $\mu_B \leftrightarrow \mu_I$, then both these terms and the Lagrangians L_{QC_2D} and L_{NJL_2} as a whole

will remain unchanged. This dual transformation has the form

$$\mathcal{D}_{II} : \begin{pmatrix} d_L \\ \sigma_2 d_R^C \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow i\tau_1 \begin{pmatrix} d_L \\ \sigma_2 d_R^C \end{pmatrix}; \mu_B \leftrightarrow \mu_I. \quad (5)$$

• Now let us further observe that if we change last two components of the Ψ field and make at the same time a rearrangement $\mu_I \leftrightarrow \mu_{I5}$, then two-color Lagrangians (1) and (2) will also remain unchanged. In the matrix form this dual transformation looks like

$$\mathcal{D}_I : \begin{pmatrix} u_R \\ d_R \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow i\tau_1 \begin{pmatrix} u_R \\ d_R \end{pmatrix}; \mu_I \leftrightarrow \mu_{I5}. \quad (6)$$

We emphasize that during dual transformations, not only the field variables change, but also the free parameters of the model (in our case, these are chemical potentials). Whereas with conventional symmetry transformations of the model, only the fields vary.

Thus, we have shown that at $\mathcal{M} \neq 0$ the Lagrangians of the two-color QCD and NJL models are invariant under the dual transformations (4)-(6). Since in this case discrete field transformations are from $SU(4)$ group (which

is not anomalous), the dualities are not to be broken by anomaly.

As a consequence, the full TDP Ω of any of the QCD and QCD-like models also has this property, which is not difficult to give a more physical interpretation. Indeed, TDP depends both on chemical potentials μ_B, \dots and on a number of order parameters. In our case these are the following ground state expectation values:

$$\sigma \equiv \langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle, \bar{\pi} \equiv \langle \bar{\psi}i\gamma^5\bar{\tau}\psi \rangle, \delta \equiv \langle \psi^T C i\gamma^5 \sigma_2 \tau_2 \psi \rangle. \quad (7)$$

However, in the chiral limit the number of order parameters is reduced, and the full TDP is indeed a function vs M, Π and Δ , where $M = \sqrt{\sigma^2 + \pi_0^2}$, $\Pi = \sqrt{\pi_1^2 + \pi_2^2}$, $\Delta = \sqrt{\delta^* \delta}$ (for details, see in [21]), i.e. $\Omega = \Omega(\mu_B, \dots; M, \Pi, \Delta)$. Note that the form of the global minimum point (GMP) of this TDP vs M, Π, Δ defines the phase structure of the model. So if the GMP looks like $(M_0, 0, 0)$, then CSB phase is realized in the model, if it has the form $(0, \Pi_0, 0)$ – we have charged PC phase, and the GMP of the form $(0, 0, \Delta_0)$ corresponds to the BSF phase [21].

Generally speaking, construction of a phase portrait in the above-mentioned 2-color models is a rather difficult task. But it is significantly simplified if we take into account the dual symmetries (4)-(6) of the Lagrangians (1) and (2). As a consequence, the complete TDP of each of the models must be invariant under the following transformations: (i) $\mathcal{D}_{\text{III}} : M \leftrightarrow \Delta, \mu_B \leftrightarrow \mu_{I5}$, (ii) $\mathcal{D}_{\text{II}} : \Delta \leftrightarrow \Pi, \mu_B \leftrightarrow \mu_I$, (iii) $\mathcal{D}_{\text{I}} : M \leftrightarrow \Pi, \mu_I \leftrightarrow \mu_{I5}$. It means that if at some chemical potential point $(\mu_B = A, \mu_I = B, \mu_{I5} = C, \mu_5)$ we have, e.g., the CSB phase, then at the point $(\mu_B = C, \mu_I = B, \mu_{I5} = A, \mu_5)$ the BSF phase is realized, whereas at the point $(\mu_B = A, \mu_I = C, \mu_{I5} = B, \mu_5)$ the charged PC is placed, etc.

Three-color models.—Let us consider duality invariance of the massless 2-flavor QCD and corresponding NJL effective models when $N_c = 3$. In this case the QCD Lagrangian L_{QCD} has the form (1), where $D_\nu = \partial_\nu + ig\lambda_a A_\nu^a$ (summation over $a = 1, \dots, 8$ is implied), and minor replacement $\mu_B/2 \rightarrow \mu_B/3$ should be done. Dual properties of the simplest NJL model,

$$L_{NJL} = \bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \psi + \bar{\psi}M\psi + G\{(\bar{\psi}\psi)^2 + (i\bar{\psi}\bar{\tau}\gamma^5\psi)^2\} + H \sum_{a=2,5,7} (i\bar{\psi}\lambda_a \tau_2 \gamma^5 \psi^C)(i\bar{\psi}^C \lambda_a \tau_2 \gamma^5 \psi), \quad (8)$$

are also established here. Let us note that dualities \mathcal{D}_{II} and \mathcal{D}_{III} of the two-color QCD are defined with the use of the two-color structures (explicitly consist of σ_2). But if we take a look at the \mathcal{D}_{I} duality (6), it does not contain two-color structures in its definition, and if one try to perform this transformation in three-color QCD and NJL models, then it could be evident that L_{QCD} and L_{NJL} (8) are invariant under this transformation. Indeed, some of chemical potential terms are invariant under \mathcal{D}_{I} , $\bar{\psi}\gamma^0\psi \leftrightarrow \bar{\psi}\gamma^0\psi$ and $\bar{\psi}\gamma^0\gamma^5\psi \leftrightarrow \bar{\psi}\gamma^0\gamma^5\psi$. But the remaining two transform into each other, $\psi\gamma^0\gamma^5\tau_3\psi \leftrightarrow \bar{\psi}\gamma^0\tau_3\psi$,

so one needs $\mu_I \leftrightarrow \mu_{I5}$. Moreover, since the bilinear fermion structures of both Lagrangians are transformed by \mathcal{D}_{I} in the following way: $\bar{\psi}\psi \leftrightarrow i\bar{\psi}\gamma^5\tau_1\psi$, $i\bar{\psi}\gamma^5\tau_2\psi \leftrightarrow i\bar{\psi}\gamma^5\tau_3\psi$ and $i\bar{\psi}^C\lambda_a\tau_2\gamma^5\psi \leftrightarrow i\bar{\psi}^C\lambda_a\tau_2\gamma^5\psi$, one can conclude that L_{QCD} and L_{NJL} (8) are invariant under the duality transformation \mathcal{D}_{I} (6). The field transformation in (6) lies in $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ and the dual \mathcal{D}_{I} symmetry can be shown indeed not just for the simplest NJL model (8), but for any effective QCD model invariant under $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$. Since this group is not anomalous, the duality \mathcal{D}_{I} is not to be broken by anomaly in 3-color QCD and corresponding QCD-like models.

Notice that the full TDP Ω in both 3-color models is indeed a function of order parameters $\sigma, \bar{\pi}$ (see in (7)) and $\Delta_a = \langle i\bar{\psi}^C\lambda_a\tau_2\gamma^5\psi \rangle$, $a = 2, 5, 7$. However, in the chiral limit (see the discussion in [4]) it is effectively depends on M, Π and Δ quantities, where M and Π are the same as in the two-color case, and $\Delta = \sqrt{|\Delta_2|^2 + |\Delta_5|^2 + |\Delta_7|^2}$. The above-established \mathcal{D}_{I} -invariance of each of the 3-color Lagrangians L_{QCD} and L_{NJL} means that the complete TDP in each of the models is symmetric with respect to the corresponding transformation of the order parameters and chemical potentials. It is easy to see that it looks like $\mathcal{D}_{\text{I}} : M \leftrightarrow \Pi, \mu_I \leftrightarrow \mu_{I5}$. Thanks to this circumstance, the study of the complete phase diagram of quark matter is greatly simplified, since CSB and charged PC phases should always be located dually conjugate, i.e. symmetrically, to each other in the phase portrait. In addition, if we know, e.g., that at the point $(\mu_B, \mu_I = A, \mu_{I5} = B, \mu_5)$ a phase with color superconductivity (in which $\Delta \neq 0, M = \Pi = 0$) is realized in the system, then, without any calculations, it can be argued that at the chemical potential point of the form $(\mu_B, \mu_I = B, \mu_{I5} = A, \mu_5)$ we observe the same phase.

Conclusions.—Due to very extensive $SU(4)$ symmetry group of two-color QCD, it has been realized in our paper on the basis of formalism with auxiliary spinor fields Ψ that there are three different (duality) transformations (4)-(6) of fields and chemical potentials such that L_{QC_2D} and L_{NJL_2} Lagrangians stay invariant. In this case fermion bilinear structures corresponding to the condensation phenomena transform between themselves. Hence these duality transformations leads to the dual symmetries of the full phase diagram. One can mention that it is another example that consideration of two-color QCD is quite fruitful. Then we have seen that one of them, \mathcal{D}_{I} , could be defined in three-color case and checked that this dual symmetry transformation takes place in this case as well, so studying two-color QCD we make an observation of three-color one.

After the proof of dual symmetries of QCD, they became the first principle method so rarely available in QCD phase diagram studies, and on top of that it is fully analytic method that does not need complicated calculation. It does not require any truncation or renormalization procedure and could not lead to any artifacts on its own or any other numeric complications.

Dualities already proved to be rather useful tool for

studying QCD phase diagram. In three-color QCD duality connects isospin μ_I (without sign problem) and chiral μ_{I5} chemical potentials (present sign problem). So QCD at μ_{I5} is the only known example with sign problem, where full phase diagram could be obtained by dual mapping of the QCD at μ_I , so maybe it might shed new light on solving sign problem and one can test different methods in real situation plagued by sign problem having the exact result.

Dual symmetries of QCD phase portrait has been shown from first principles and true at any energy scales, at any values of chemical potentials, as real-valued as well as imaginary ones, that could find some applications. Dualities can be easily used for obtaining new results, as it was already done in [10]. Moreover, because of them, we recently discovered that new inhomogeneous phases (at $\mu_B = 0$ but with other nonzero chemical potentials) are present both in three- and two-color QCD – this result will be published elsewhere soon.

As dualities have been shown from first principles, all physical phenomena at one chemical potential are dually

conjugated to the ones at other chemical potentials, including confinement/deconfinement phase transition (absent in NJL model), topological properties etc. Just to illustrate, let us show that there was discussion that speed of sound could violate the conformal limit at nonzero baryon density. First example of this violation from first principle lattice QCD was obtained at nonzero isospin density, i.e. at $\mu_I \neq 0$, in [25]. And by using duality one can immediately obtain without any (extremely time costly and even impossible in this case) numerical calculations that it takes place in quark matter with chiral imbalance at $\mu_{I5} \neq 0$ (also first principle result now). There was also shown that this violation occurs also in two-color QCD at nonzero baryon chemical potential (see in [26, 27]). By exploiting the rich duality structure of QC_2D , it is clear that it takes place at $\mu_I \neq 0$ and $\mu_{I5} \neq 0$ as well. So maybe the violation of conformal limit in QCD is a natural phenomenon. In our opinion, these are only a few number of examples demonstrating that QCD dual symmetries are a fundamental tool for studying the properties of dense quark matter.

-
- [1] S. P. Klevansky, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **64**, 649 (1992).
 [2] M. Asakawa and K. Yazaki, *Nucl. Phys. A* **504**, 668 (1989); P. Zhuang, J. Hufner and S. P. Klevansky, *Nucl. Phys. A* **576**, 525 (1994).
 [3] M. Buballa, *Phys. Rep.* **407**, 205 (2005); I. A. Shovkovy, *Found. Phys.* **35**, 1309 (2005); M. G. Alford, A. Schmitt, K. Rajagopal, and T. Schäfer, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 1455 (2008); E. J. Ferrer and V. de la Incera, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **871**, 399 (2013).
 [4] T. G. Khunjua, K. G. Klimenko and R. N. Zhokhov, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, no.12, 125011 (2023).
 [5] D. T. Son and M. A. Stephanov, *Phys. Atom. Nucl.* **64**, 834 (2001); D. C. Duarte, R. L. S. Farias and R. O. Ramos, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 083525 (2011).
 [6] L. He, M. Jin, and P. Zhuang, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 116001 (2005); D. Ebert and K. G. Klimenko, *J. Phys. G* **32**, 599 (2006); *Eur. Phys. J. C* **46**, 771 (2006); C.f. Mu, L.y. He and Y.x. Liu, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 056006 (2010).
 [7] J. O. Andersen and T. Brauner, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 014030 (2008); J. O. Andersen and L. Kyllingstad, *J. Phys. G* **37**, 015003 (2009); P. Adhikari, J. O. Andersen and P. Kneschke, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 874 (2019).
 [8] D. Ebert, T. G. Khunjua, K. G. Klimenko and V. C. Zhukovsky, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **27**, 1250162 (2012); N. V. Gubina, K. G. Klimenko, S. G. Kurbanov and V. C. Zhukovsky, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 085011 (2012).
 [9] R. Gatto and M. Ruggieri, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 054013 (2012); L. Yu, H. Liu and M. Huang, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 074009 (2014); M. Ruggieri and G. X. Peng, *J. Phys. G* **43**, no. 12, 125101 (2016); A. A. Andrianov, V. A. Andrianov and D. Espriu, *Particles* **3**, no. 1, 15 (2020).
 [10] T. G. Khunjua, K. G. Klimenko and R. N. Zhokhov, *JHEP* **06**, 006 (2019).
 [11] J. Chao, *Chin. Phys. C* **44**, no.3, 034108 (2020).
 [12] F. X. Azeredo, D. C. Duarte, R. L. S. Farias, G. Krein and R. O. Ramos, arXiv:2406.04900 [hep-ph].
 [13] T. G. Khunjua, K. G. Klimenko and R. N. Zhokhov, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, no.5, 054036 (2018); *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, no.5, 054030 (2018).
 [14] T. G. Khunjua, K. G. Klimenko and R. N. Zhokhov, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, no.2, 151 (2019); *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **1390**, no.1, 012015 (2019).
 [15] T. G. Khunjua, K. G. Klimenko and R. N. Zhokhov, *Particles* **3**, no. 1, 62 (2020).
 [16] T. G. Khunjua, K. G. Klimenko and R. N. Zhokhov, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, no.11, 116016 (2016).
 [17] T. G. Khunjua, K. G. Klimenko and R. N. Zhokhov, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, no.3, 034009 (2019); M. Thies, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, no.1, 014010 (2020); *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, no.9, 096006 (2020).
 [18] M. Thies, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 047703 (2003); *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, no.10, 105017 (2014).
 [19] D. Ebert, T. G. Khunjua, K. G. Klimenko and V. C. Zhukovsky, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, no.4, 045021 (2014); *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, no.10, 105022 (2016).
 [20] G. Cao, L. He and P. Zhuang, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, no.5, 056005 (2014).
 [21] T. G. Khunjua, K. G. Klimenko and R. N. Zhokhov, *JHEP* **06**, 148 (2020); *Phys. Part. Nucl.* **53**, no.2, 461 (2022); *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, no.4, 045008 (2022).
 [22] J. B. Kogut, M. A. Stephanov and D. Toublan, *Phys. Lett. B* **464**, 183-191 (1999); J. B. Kogut, M. A. Stephanov, D. Toublan, J. J. M. Verbaarschot and A. Zhitnitsky, *Nucl. Phys. B* **582**, 477 (2000).
 [23] K. Splittorff, D. T. Son and M. A. Stephanov, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 016003 (2001).
 [24] J. O. Andersen and T. Brauner, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 096004 (2010).
 [25] B. B. Brandt, F. Cuteri and G. Endrodi, *JHEP* **07**, 055 (2023).
 [26] E. Itou and K. Iida, *PoS LATTICE2023*, 111 (2024).
 [27] R. Abbott *et al.* [NPLQCD], *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, no.11, 114506 (2023).