

Emerging canonical spin tensor in the chiral symmetric hot QCD

Matteo Buzzegoli^{1,2,*} and Andrea Palermo^{3,†}

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Iowa State University, 2323 Osborn Drive, Ames, IA 50011, U.S.A.*

²*Department of Physics, West University of Timișoara,*

Bd. Vasile Pârvan 4, Timișoara 300223, Romania

³*Center for Nuclear Theory, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, New York 11794-3800, USA*

The spin tensor is fundamental to relativistic spin hydrodynamics, but its definition is ambiguous due to the pseudogauge symmetry. We show that in the Nambu-Jona-Lasinio model with spin-spin interactions this ambiguity is resolved. We prove that the mean field limit of this theory is equivalent to the non-dissipative spin hydrodynamics with a canonical spin tensor. Finally, we propose to detect the spin potential by performing experiments with collisions of polarized ions.

Introduction - There is currently an intense debate concerning the proper definition of the Spin Tensor (ST), which is of fundamental importance in spin hydrodynamics [1–31]. Spin hydrodynamics builds upon the inclusion of independent spin degrees of freedom in a hydrodynamic description, by adding an additional equation for the ST to those of the energy-momentum tensor and currents. In the quark-gluon plasma (QGP) produced in heavy-ion collisions spin hydrodynamics could be relevant to several measurements related to spin, see also the reviews [32, 33]. The description of spin dynamics is also crucial for magnetic materials and for developing a spin electronics, see for instance the review [34].

However, the ST of a relativistic field theory is not uniquely defined. Changing the ST can be seen as a different way of defining the angular momentum density in a material endowed with a finite angular momentum-boost charge $J^{\mu\nu}$. Different definitions of the spin tensor can be given by means of Noether theorems [35–38], setting the theory in a curved background (minimal or non-minimal couplings to gravity) [39–42], employing effective lagrangians [43], or simply constructed by hand [44]. More generally, the ST can be changed by means of *pseudogauge transformations* (defined later, see Eq. (2)), which are transformations that can map any of the mentioned prescriptions into any other one. However, there is no criterion as for the choice of the ST, so its definition is ambiguous. The same ambiguity is also found in the definitions of the gravitational form factors for relativistic hadrons [45–47] and in how to split the total angular momentum of a composite particle, such as the proton, into separate quark and gluon contributions, and into spin and orbital components [46, 48, 49].

In this work we consider a plasma of quarks described by the NJL model. Observing that rotation and magnetic field induce a mean canonical spin tensor, we prove that the effects of spin-spin interactions in the mean field approximation are equivalent of those of a canonical spin tensor in ideal spin hydrodynamics. This suggests that a canonical spin tensor is dynamically generated in the QGP through the chiral separation effect and the axial vortical effect [50], identifying a mechanism that could

favor a theory of spin hydrodynamics with the canonical spin tensor. We conclude clarifying the distinction between a fundamental definition of the spin tensor relevant for gravitational physics and a phenomenological definition in effective theories such as hydrodynamics. We also discuss analogies between the inclusion of a spin tensor in hydrodynamics and the Landau theory for magnetization, and conjecturing a possible way to observe the effects of spin hydrodynamics unambiguously.

We use natural units where $c = \hbar = k_B = 1$.

Spin tensor and spin potential- In special relativity, the conserved currents associated to the translation and Lorentz invariance are the energy-momentum tensor $\hat{T}^{\mu\nu}$ and the total angular momentum-boost operator

$$\hat{\mathcal{J}}^{\lambda,\mu\nu} = x^\mu \hat{T}^{\lambda\nu} - x^\nu \hat{T}^{\lambda\mu} + \hat{\mathcal{S}}^{\lambda,\mu\nu}, \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ is the *spin tensor* (ST), which is anti-symmetric in the last two indices. A *pseudo-gauge* (PG) transformation is defined as [51]

$$\hat{T}'^{\mu\nu} = \hat{T}^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla_\lambda \left(\hat{\Phi}^{\lambda,\mu\nu} - \hat{\Phi}^{\mu,\lambda\nu} - \hat{\Phi}^{\nu,\lambda\mu} \right), \quad (2a)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}'^{\lambda,\mu\nu} = \hat{\mathcal{S}}^{\lambda,\mu\nu} - \hat{\Phi}^{\lambda,\mu\nu} + \nabla_\rho \hat{Z}^{\mu\nu,\lambda\rho}, \quad (2b)$$

where $\hat{\Phi}$ and \hat{Z} are arbitrary tensors obeying $\hat{\Phi}^{\lambda,\mu\nu} = -\hat{\Phi}^{\lambda,\nu\mu}$ and $\hat{Z}^{\mu\nu,\lambda\rho} = -\hat{Z}^{\nu\mu,\lambda\rho} = -\hat{Z}^{\mu\nu,\rho\lambda}$. In what follows, we will confine ourselves to the case where $\hat{Z} = 0$. PG transformations represent an ambiguity in the definition of $\hat{T}^{\mu\nu}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{S}}^{\lambda,\mu\nu}$ because the transformed tensors obey $\nabla_\mu \hat{T}'^{\mu\nu} = \nabla_\mu \hat{T}^{\mu\nu} = 0$ and $\nabla_\lambda \hat{\mathcal{S}}'^{\lambda,\mu\nu} = \nabla_\lambda \hat{\mathcal{S}}^{\lambda,\mu\nu} = 0$, so the total momentum and angular momentum-boost operators are not affected by the transformation.

Different PGs describe different energy-momentum densities and angular momentum density, but the difference appears only as a quantum correction [3]. Yet, such a difference becomes extremely relevant to describe spin polarization. Indeed, in the context of heavy ion collisions, the measurement of the Λ polarization spurred the development of spin hydrodynamics, which describes the macroscopic effects of spin by including a ST and a *spin potential* in the equations of relativistic hydrodynamics.

In this framework, different STs lead to different spin-hydrodynamic theories and conclusions [1–3]. In fact, the relation of polarization with thermal vorticity, thermal shear and spin potential is PG-dependent [4]. This observation leads to questioning which ST is physical or how to choose it [2, 4–7, 35]. Indeed, different versions of spin hydrodynamics have been proposed based on different STs: the Belinfante [6], the canonical [8, 30, 36], the de Groot-van Leeuwen-van Weert [9, 44], and the Hilgevoord-Wouthuysen [31, 52]. In our opinion, no decisive argument favoring any PG over the others has yet been shown. We will try to fill this gap.

A relativistic spin hydrodynamic theory based on an underlying microscopic quantum field theory can be obtained with the Zubarev formalism for the non-equilibrium statistical operator [53–55]. The covariant form of the statistical operator $\hat{\rho}$ is obtained by maximizing the total entropy for fixed energy-momentum and boost-angular momentum densities [56–60]. These constraints boil down to the two equations (neglecting conserved charges)

$$n_\lambda \text{tr} \left[\hat{\rho} \hat{T}^{\lambda\nu} \right] = n_\lambda T^{\lambda\nu}, \quad n_\lambda \text{tr} \left[\hat{\rho} \hat{S}^{\lambda,\mu\nu} \right] = n_\lambda \mathcal{S}^{\lambda,\mu\nu}, \quad (3)$$

where n is the normal vector to the space-like hypersurface Σ where local equilibrium is achieved. The resulting statistical operator is [2, 5]

$$\hat{\rho} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \exp \left[- \int_\Sigma d\Sigma n_\lambda \hat{T}^{\lambda\nu} \beta_\nu + \int_\Sigma d\Sigma n_\lambda \frac{\mathfrak{S}^{\mu\nu}}{2} \hat{S}^{\lambda,\mu\nu} \right] \quad (4)$$

where β is the four-temperature $\beta^\mu = u^\mu/T$ and \mathfrak{S} is the *spin potential*, which is an anti-symmetric tensor used as Lagrange multiplier to impose the constraint associated to the average ST in Eq. (3). Since the ST and the energy-momentum tensor operators on the LHS of Eq. (3) are arbitrary, the statistical operator, and the quantities derived with it, are generally PG dependent [2].

At global equilibrium, the spin potential must be equal to the constant thermal vorticity $\varpi_{\mu\nu} = -(1/2)(\nabla_\mu \beta_\nu - \nabla_\nu \beta_\mu)$ [2, 5]. When the spin potential deviates from vorticity, the statistical operator describes an hydrodynamic theory where spin degrees of freedom are independent, corresponding to a relaxation rate of the spin density smaller than the frequency of hydro modes [30] or to phenomena like the spin polarization of (anti)particles in absence of thermal vorticity [3].

Partition function with spin potential- We now derive the partition function of the statistical operator (4) for a Dirac field in the canonical pseudogauge, meaning that the energy-momentum tensor and the spin tensor in (4) are the canonical one. The canonical spin tensor, which

is the one obtained directly from the Noether’s theorem, is completely antisymmetric, and reads:

$$\hat{S}_C^{\lambda,\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \bar{\psi} \{ \gamma^\lambda, \Sigma^{\mu\nu} \} \psi = \epsilon^{\lambda\mu\nu\rho} \bar{\psi} \gamma_\rho \gamma^5 \psi \quad (5)$$

with $\Sigma_{\mu\nu} = (i/4)[\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu]$. The second equality describes the duality between the spin tensor and the axial current \hat{j}_5 . It is convenient to rewrite the (canonical) statistical operator in terms of the Belinfante energy-momentum tensor $\hat{T}_B^{\mu\nu}$; one obtains [2, 4]:

$$\hat{\rho} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \exp \left\{ - \int_\Sigma d\Sigma n_\mu \left[\hat{T}_B^{\mu\nu} \beta_\nu + \frac{1}{2} (\varpi - \mathfrak{S})_{\rho\sigma} \hat{S}_C^{\mu,\rho\sigma} \right] \right\}. \quad (6)$$

The partition function of this operator can be written as an Euclidean path integral in a emergent thermal space-time constructed from the thermodynamic fields as described in [61, 62]. For instance, in the case of a rotating fluid, the thermal spacetime is described by rotating coordinates, as used in several studies [63–66].

The geometry of the space-like hypersurface Σ embedded in the (flat) space-time and parametrized by a constant time coordinate $\bar{t}(x)$ and space coordinates $\bar{\mathbf{x}}(x)$, can be described with the Arnowitt-Deser-Misner (ADM) metric constructed with the ADM decomposition $t^\mu = N n^\mu + N^\mu$, where $t^\mu = \partial_{\bar{t}} x^\mu(\bar{t}, \bar{\mathbf{x}})$ is the local direction of time. The transformation to new thermal coordinates \tilde{x} , such that $t^\mu(x) = \beta^\mu(x)/B$, with B a scale for the inverse temperature, defines the induced thermal metric $g_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}}$ and the vielbein $e_{\tilde{\mu}}^a$ used to describe the Dirac field in a curved background, as

$$g_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} = \eta_{\rho\sigma} \frac{\partial x^\rho}{\partial \tilde{x}^{\tilde{\mu}}} \frac{\partial x^\sigma}{\partial \tilde{x}^{\tilde{\nu}}} = e_{\tilde{\mu}}^a e_{\tilde{\nu}}^b \eta_{ab}. \quad (7)$$

Integrals over the constant time hypersurface are then written as

$$\int_\Sigma d\Sigma n_\lambda = \int d^3 \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \sqrt{g} n_{\tilde{\lambda}}. \quad (8)$$

Consequently, the partition function is obtained as the path integral involving the euclidean action of the field theory [61, 62]:

$$\mathcal{Z} = \int \mathcal{D}[\psi, \psi^\dagger] e^{-S_E - S_\Theta}, \quad (9)$$

where S_E is the euclidean action with imaginary time τ and euclidean emergent thermal space-time \tilde{g}_E , and S_Θ is a “spin action”:

$$S_E = \int_0^B d\tau d^3 \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \sqrt{\tilde{g}_E} \left[\bar{\psi} \left(\frac{\overleftarrow{D}}{2} + m \right) \psi + V(x) \right], \quad (10a)$$

$$S_\Theta = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^B d\tau d^3 \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \sqrt{\tilde{g}_E} n_{\tilde{\mu}} \Theta_{\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\sigma}} \hat{S}_C^{\tilde{\mu},\tilde{\rho}\tilde{\sigma}}, \quad (10b)$$

where we defined $\Theta = (\varpi - \mathfrak{S})$ and we are using euclidean gamma matrices. The external covariant derivative is $\vec{D}_0 = \partial_0 + (1/2)\varpi_0^{ab}\Sigma_{ab}$, $\vec{D}_i = \partial_i - (1/2)\varpi_i^{ab}\Sigma_{ab}$ and $\vec{D}_i = \overleftarrow{D}_i = \partial_i$ and we defined $\overleftrightarrow{D}_i = e_a^\mu \gamma^a \vec{D}_\mu - \overleftarrow{D}_\mu e_a^\mu \gamma^a$. The spin connection ϖ of the thermal space-time is related to the thermal vorticity (in the new coordinates) as [62]:

$$\varpi_{0ij} = -\frac{1}{2B} \left(\partial_i \beta_j - \partial_j \beta_i \right). \quad (11)$$

For the spin action, due to antisymmetry, we can rewrite:

$$\frac{1}{2} S_C^{\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} n_{\tilde{\lambda}} \Theta_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} = \frac{1}{6} S_C^{\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} (n_{\tilde{\lambda}} \Theta_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} - n_{\tilde{\mu}} \Theta_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\nu}} - n_{\tilde{\nu}} \Theta_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\lambda}}), \quad (12)$$

where we have made the tensor contracting $S_C^{\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}}$ completely antisymmetric. Therefore one can introduce a pseudo-vector field $f^{\tilde{\sigma}}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{6} (n_{\tilde{\lambda}} \Theta_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} - n_{\tilde{\mu}} \Theta_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\nu}} - n_{\tilde{\nu}} \Theta_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\lambda}}) = \frac{1}{6} \epsilon_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\sigma}} f^{\tilde{\sigma}} \quad (13)$$

which is solved for

$$f^{\tilde{\sigma}} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\rho}} \Theta_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} n_{\tilde{\rho}} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\rho}} (\varpi_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} - \mathfrak{S}_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}}) n_{\tilde{\rho}}, \quad (14)$$

where ϵ is the Levi-Civita tensor. Furthermore, using the above equation, the Eq. (10b) reads:

$$S_\Theta = - \int_0^B d\tau d^3 \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \sqrt{\tilde{g}_E} j_5^\mu f_\mu. \quad (15)$$

This observation will be useful later on.

A geometrical interpretation of the spin potential is obtained by rewriting the spin action as follows

$$\begin{aligned} S_\Theta &= \int_0^B d\tau d^3 \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \sqrt{\tilde{g}_E} \hat{S}_C^{\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} \frac{1}{2} n_{\tilde{\lambda}} \Theta_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \int_0^B d\tau d^3 \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \sqrt{\tilde{g}_E} e_a^{\tilde{\lambda}} \tilde{\psi} \{ \gamma^a, \Sigma_{bc} \} \psi \omega_{\tilde{\lambda}}^{bc} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^B d\tau d^3 \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \sqrt{\tilde{g}_E} \tilde{\psi} \left[e_a^\mu \gamma^a \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_\mu - \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_\mu e_a^\mu \gamma^a \right] \psi, \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where we defined

$$\omega_{\tilde{\lambda}}^{bc} = \frac{1}{2} e_\mu^b e_\nu^c n_{\tilde{\lambda}} \Theta^{\mu\nu}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_\mu = \frac{1}{2} \omega_{\mu ab} \Sigma^{ab}, \quad (17)$$

and $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_\mu = -\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_\mu$. Note that in the thermal coordinates the only non-vanishing components of $\omega_{\tilde{\lambda}}^{bc}$ have $\tilde{\lambda} = 0$. Comparing with Eq. (10a), the integrand of S_Θ can be reabsorbed in the Lagrangian by changing the covariant derivative $D_{\tilde{\mu}} \rightarrow D_{\tilde{\mu}} + \tilde{\mathbf{s}}_{\tilde{\mu}}$, meaning that the total spin connection becomes $\omega' = \varpi + \Theta = 2\varpi - \mathfrak{S}$, acquiring a part which is independent of the metric. This is in agreement with the proper definition of the canonical ST in general relativity being obtained in space-times

with torsion [5, 30] (Einstein-Cartan theory [67–70]). For $\Theta = 0$ the connection equals the thermal vorticity, so the global equilibrium with the canonical pseudogauge coincides with the Belinfante pseudogauge, as it should be.

Spin potential generation- We now show that the same partition function induced by the ST is obtained from the Nambu-Jona-Lasinio (NJL) model at finite temperature and rotation. We consider the well known NJL Lagrangian [71, 72]

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{NJL}} = \bar{q} \left(\frac{i}{2} \overleftrightarrow{\not{D}} - \hat{m} \right) q + G_A (\bar{q} \gamma_\mu \gamma^5 q) (\bar{q} \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 q) + \dots, \quad (18)$$

where the flavors of the quarks are contained in q , and \hat{m} is the mass matrix of the quarks in flavor space. Additional interaction terms are not relevant for our discussion. The quartic interaction through the iso-singlet axial current $j_5^\mu = \bar{q} \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 q$ can also be seen as (canonical) spin-spin interactions thanks to Eq. (5). Therefore this model is relevant when one is interested in describing spin-dependent properties, like polarization.

The partition function of the rotating plasma is written as the Euclidean path integral in the thermal metric background, that is

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\text{NJL}} = \int \mathcal{D}[q, q^\dagger] e^{-S_{\text{NJL}}[q, \bar{q}; e_a^\mu]}, \quad (19)$$

where the action is written as in Eq. (10a) with the NJL Lagrangian (18).

We follow the standard approach [72] and we make an Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation to introduce a pseudo-vector field f_μ , corresponding to the quark-antiquark singlet axial current:

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\text{NJL}} = \int \mathcal{D}[q, q^\dagger] \mathcal{D}f e^{-S_f[q, \bar{q}, f_\mu; e_a^\mu]} \quad (20)$$

with

$$S_f = \int_0^B d\tau \int d^3 \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \sqrt{\tilde{g}_E} \left[\mathcal{L}_0 + \frac{1}{4G_A} f_\mu f^\mu + \mathcal{L}_f \right] \quad (21)$$

where \mathcal{L}_0 is the free Dirac Lagrangian and \mathcal{L}_f reads:

$$\mathcal{L}_f = -j_5^\sigma f^{\tilde{\sigma}} = -\frac{1}{6} e_a^{\tilde{\lambda}} S_C^{a,bc} e_b^\mu e_c^\nu \epsilon_{\tilde{\sigma}\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} f^{\tilde{\sigma}}, \quad (22)$$

where we have used the duality between the axial current and the canonical spin tensor.

Comparing Eq. (22) with Eq. (15), we realize that the field f generates the same action as the canonical spin potential in spin hydrodynamics. The equivalence between the models is realized at its full in the mean field approximation, where the mass term of the f field is integrated out. In this case the partition function of the NJL model is precisely the same as the one of local

equilibrium with a canonical spin potential according to the correspondence (14). Hence, the field f describes the difference between thermal vorticity and spin potential. This proves that the interacting theory given by Eq. (18) in the mean field approximation is equivalent to a free theory at local-equilibrium with the canonical spin tensor.

Physically, a mean f_μ is expected if the state explicitly breaks parity and Lorentz symmetry, such that the singlet axial current $\langle \bar{q}\gamma_\mu\gamma^5 q \rangle$ is non-vanishing. This is the case if magnetic field and rotation are present: an axial current is induced by magnetic field and rotation by the chiral separation effect (CSE) and the axial vortical effect (AVE) [50]. We expect that both the CSE and the AVE will lead to a spin potential generation. We stress that these effects do not require a chiral imbalance and local CP violations. The CSE has been observed in first principle lattice QCD calculations [73], where it was shown that the CSE conductivity is non-vanishing in the hot chiral symmetric phase of QCD. In the low energy limit, the field f_μ emerging in this way from the NJL model represents the isospin-singlet axial mesons. Due to charge conjugation properties, f_μ is interpreted as the f_1 meson if the field is induced by rotation or the h_1 meson if induced by magnetic fields.

We point out that the derivation presented here is valid even if the magnetic field or the rotation are vanishing. However, in that case one would need to assume a different mechanism to justify a non-vanishing mean axial vector field f_μ .

Discussion- The dynamical generation of ST in the NJL model described above is reminiscent to the emergence of magnetization in ferromagnetism. Considering an Ising model with infinite range interactions given by an Hamiltonian of N spins with interactions $\hat{H} = -(J/2N) \sum_{i,j} S_i S_j$ [74], the Hubbard-Stratonovich identity yields the statistical operator

$$\hat{\rho} = \sqrt{\frac{N\beta J}{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\mu \exp \left[-\frac{N\beta J}{2} \mu^2 + \beta J \mu \hat{M} \right], \quad (23)$$

where the magnetization $\hat{M} = \sum_i S_i$, coupled to the polarization μ , is generated just like the spin tensor coupled to the spin potential (14) in the NJL model.

Furthermore, spin hydrodynamics can be interpreted as analogue to the phenomenological Landau theory for magnetization. Indeed, the partition function with ST can be seen as the Landau function L . Given a coarse graining scale Λ and the observation of an inhomogeneous magnetization $M_\Lambda(\mathbf{x})$, the Landau function is obtained from the statistical operator $\exp(-\beta\hat{H})$ by fixing the magnetization, i.e. by tracing out the configurations of spins $\{S_i\}$ resulting in a different magnetization as

follows [74]

$$e^{-\beta L\{M_\Lambda(\mathbf{x})\}} = \text{tr} \left\{ e^{-\beta\hat{H}\{S_i\}} \delta \left[\sum_{i \in \mathbf{x}} S_i - M_\Lambda(\mathbf{x}) \right] \right\}. \quad (24)$$

Similarly, in the relativistic spin hydrodynamics we obtained the statistical operator by imposing the constraint in Eq. (3). This suggests that we can use spin hydrodynamics as a phenomenological theory and choose the spin tensor that best describes the spin properties of the system at the desired scale. In fact, the magnetization itself is subject to pseudogauge ambiguity. In a relativistic context, the conserved electric current can be redefined as

$$\hat{j}^\mu = \hat{j}^\mu + \nabla_\lambda \hat{\mathcal{M}}^{\lambda\mu}, \quad \hat{\mathcal{M}}^{\lambda\mu} = -\hat{\mathcal{M}}^{\mu\lambda}, \quad (25)$$

where $\nabla_\lambda \hat{\mathcal{M}}^{\lambda\mu}$ is interpreted as a bound current and the arbitrary magnetization $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$ is chosen to best describe the material. This analogy indicates that for a macroscopic spin hydrodynamics theory, one can give up a fundamental interpretation of the ST, and instead use the ST and the spin potential as an effective description of emerging spin properties of the system. In this connotation the PG dependence is not a problem to be solved. However, in the absence of non-vanishing boundary terms these currents are impossible to detect.

The fact that observable quantities, such as the spin polarization measured in heavy-ion collisions [75], depend on the choice of the ST [4] is a consequence of the PG dependence of the statistical operator $\hat{\rho}$ (4), see ref. [3]. Such a PG dependence can not always be reabsorbed into a redefinition of the thermodynamic fields. Indeed, evaluating the average spin polarization vector of particles with momentum p in linear response theory and with the statistical operator in different PGs, the results are linearly-independent functions of the momentum. This fact makes it impossible to reconcile the different results for every value of p with a redefinition of the thermodynamic fields [4].

One may wonder if it is currently possible to detect a spin potential and the onset of spin hydrodynamics in heavy ion collisions. Indeed, an attempt to detect a spin potential from the available polarization data of heavy ion collisions seems difficult. The reason is that the the Belinfante pseudogauge, where the spin tensor is vanishing, gives a good description of the polarization data, especially since the theoretical predictions depend rather strongly on the details of initial conditions, transport coefficients and equation of state [76–79]. However, it is possible that *colliding polarized heavy ion* could give an indication of the existence of the spin potential.

In peripheral collisions the initial spin of nuclei would be dwarfed by the orbital angular momentum, but confining the analysis to ultra-central collisions in this setting,

and assuming an hydrodynamic stage to take place, the only source that can produce a global spin polarization is a non vanishing spin potential. Such a spin potential should keep track of the initial spin orientation of the colliding nuclei, that in current experiments is averaged out. In this case, we expect sizable differences between the predictions of ordinary hydrodynamics and spin hydrodynamics. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that a similar experiment is proposed. The LHCSpin program includes the possibility of polarizing the target [80], although this kind of measurement will not be possible there. However, modifications and improvement of the LHCSpin setup in future experiments could attempt the measurement proposed.

Conclusions- Pseudogauge symmetry curses relativistic spin hydrodynamics. In this paper we have proposed a new interpretation where a microscopic mechanism based on quantum field theory selects the form of the spin tensor.

We have analysed the spin-spin interactions in the NJL model, explicitly proving that the partition function of this theory, in the mean field approximation, is equivalent to the one of a free theory at local equilibrium with a canonical spin tensor. In this framework, the mean axial field induces a non-equilibration of spin. An equivalence of this kind may exist also in QCD, and more studies in this sense are desirable. Going beyond the tree-level and the mean field approximation, as well as performing a similar study as in Ref. [81] to investigate the relevance of the spin-spin coupling employed in this work at different values of rotation, will be objects of future studies.

In heavy ion collisions, the mean axial field required for the spin potential generation is induced by the explicit parity and Lorentz symmetry breaking due to rotation or magnetic field, namely the axial vortical effect and the chiral separation effect. Spontaneous symmetry breaking of the Lorentz and CPT symmetry, introduced in extensions of the standard model [82–86], might also induce a mean field as described here.

Finally, we have proposed an experiment to observe spin hydrodynamics effects based on polarized heavy ion collisions. Experiments with polarized targets will be performed already in the near future by LHCSpin program, and similar experiments may shed light on the existence of a spin potential.

Acknowledgments- M.B. is grateful to K. Tuchin for many fruitful discussions. A.P. acknowledges useful discussions with S. Bhadury, D. Kharzeev, F. Murgana and M. Stephanov. We are also grateful to A. Abanov, F. Becattini, E. Grossi, and D. Teaney. Our work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under Grants No. DE-SC0023692 (M.B.) and DE-FG88ER40388 (A.P.) and partially by (M.B.) the European Union - NextGenerationEU through grant No. 760079/23.05.2023, funded

by the Romanian Ministry of Research, Innovation and Digitization through Romania’s National Recovery and Resilience Plan, call no. PNNR-III-C9-2022-I8..

-
- * matteo.buzzegoli@e-uvt.ro
 † andrea.palermo@stonybrook.edu
- [1] F. Becattini and L. Tinti, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 025013 (2011), arXiv:1101.5251 [hep-th].
 - [2] F. Becattini, W. Florkowski, and E. Speranza, *Phys. Lett. B* **789**, 419 (2019), arXiv:1807.10994 [hep-th].
 - [3] F. Becattini, *Nucl. Phys. A* **1005**, 121833 (2021), arXiv:2003.01406 [nucl-th].
 - [4] M. Buzzegoli, *Phys. Rev. C* **105**, 044907 (2022), arXiv:2109.12084 [nucl-th].
 - [5] E. Speranza and N. Weickgenannt, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **57**, 155 (2021), arXiv:2007.00138 [nucl-th].
 - [6] K. Fukushima and S. Pu, *Phys. Lett. B* **817**, 136346 (2021), arXiv:2010.01608 [hep-th].
 - [7] A. Das, W. Florkowski, R. Ryblewski, and R. Singh, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, L091502 (2021), arXiv:2103.01013 [nucl-th].
 - [8] S. Dey, W. Florkowski, A. Jaiswal, and R. Ryblewski, *Phys. Lett. B* **843**, 137994 (2023), arXiv:2303.05271 [hep-th].
 - [9] W. Florkowski, A. Kumar, and R. Ryblewski, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **108**, 103709 (2019), arXiv:1811.04409 [nucl-th].
 - [10] S. Li, M. A. Stephanov, and H.-U. Yee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 082302 (2021), arXiv:2011.12318 [hep-th].
 - [11] D. She, A. Huang, D. Hou, and J. Liao, *Sci. Bull.* **67**, 2265 (2022), arXiv:2105.04060 [nucl-th].
 - [12] R. Biswas, A. Daher, A. Das, W. Florkowski, and R. Ryblewski, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 014024 (2023), arXiv:2304.01009 [nucl-th].
 - [13] W. Florkowski, B. Friman, A. Jaiswal, and E. Speranza, *Phys. Rev. C* **97**, 041901 (2018), arXiv:1705.00587 [nucl-th].
 - [14] W. Florkowski, B. Friman, A. Jaiswal, R. Ryblewski, and E. Speranza, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 116017 (2018), arXiv:1712.07676 [nucl-th].
 - [15] W. Florkowski, E. Speranza, and F. Becattini, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **49**, 1409 (2018), arXiv:1803.11098 [nucl-th].
 - [16] N. Weickgenannt, X.-L. Sheng, E. Speranza, Q. Wang, and D. H. Rischke, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 056018 (2019), arXiv:1902.06513 [hep-ph].
 - [17] S. Bhadury, W. Florkowski, A. Jaiswal, A. Kumar, and R. Ryblewski, *Phys. Lett. B* **814**, 136096 (2021), arXiv:2002.03937 [hep-ph].
 - [18] N. Weickgenannt, E. Speranza, X.-l. Sheng, Q. Wang, and D. H. Rischke, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 052301 (2021), arXiv:2005.01506 [hep-ph].
 - [19] S. Shi, C. Gale, and S. Jeon, *Phys. Rev. C* **103**, 044906 (2021), arXiv:2008.08618 [nucl-th].

- [20] S. Bhadury, W. Florkowski, A. Jaiswal, A. Kumar, and R. Ryblewski, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 014030 (2021), arXiv:2008.10976 [nucl-th].
- [21] R. Singh, G. Sophys, and R. Ryblewski, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 074024 (2021), arXiv:2011.14907 [hep-ph].
- [22] H.-H. Peng, J.-J. Zhang, X.-L. Sheng, and Q. Wang, *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **38**, 116701 (2021), arXiv:2107.00448 [hep-th].
- [23] X.-L. Sheng, N. Weickgenannt, E. Speranza, D. H. Rischke, and Q. Wang, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 016029 (2021), arXiv:2103.10636 [nucl-th].
- [24] N. Weickgenannt, D. Wagner, E. Speranza, and D. H. Rischke, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, L091901 (2022), arXiv:2208.01955 [nucl-th].
- [25] A. D. Gallegos and U. Gürsoy, *JHEP* **11** (2020), 151, arXiv:2004.05148 [hep-th].
- [26] M. Garbiso and M. Kaminski, *JHEP* **12** (2020), 112, arXiv:2007.04345 [hep-th].
- [27] D. Montenegro, L. Tinti, and G. Torrieri, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 056012 (2017), [Addendum: *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 079901 (2017)], arXiv:1701.08263 [hep-th].
- [28] D. Montenegro, L. Tinti, and G. Torrieri, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 076016 (2017), arXiv:1703.03079 [hep-th].
- [29] Y.-C. Liu and X.-G. Huang, *Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron.* **65**, 272011 (2022), arXiv:2109.15301 [nucl-th].
- [30] M. Hongo, X.-G. Huang, M. Kaminski, M. Stephanov, and H.-U. Yee, *JHEP* **11** (2021), 150, arXiv:2107.14231 [hep-th].
- [31] N. Weickgenannt, D. Wagner, E. Speranza, and D. H. Rischke, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 096014 (2022), arXiv:2203.04766 [nucl-th].
- [32] F. Becattini, M. Buzzegoli, T. Niida, S. Pu, A.-H. Tang, and Q. Wang, review article as a book chapter for QGP6 (2024), arXiv:2402.04540 [nucl-th].
- [33] F. Becattini and M. A. Lisa, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **70**, 395 (2020), arXiv:2003.03640 [nucl-ex].
- [34] S. Maekawa, S. O. Valenzuela, E. Saitoh, and T. Kimura, eds., *Spin Current*, 2nd ed., Series on Semiconductor Science and Technology (Oxford University Press, London, England, 2017).
- [35] A. Daher, A. Das, W. Florkowski, and R. Ryblewski, *Phys. Rev. C* **108**, 024902 (2023), arXiv:2202.12609 [nucl-th].
- [36] K. Hattori, M. Hongo, X.-G. Huang, M. Matsuo, and H. Taya, *Phys. Lett. B* **795**, 100 (2019), arXiv:1901.06615 [hep-th].
- [37] Z. Cao, K. Hattori, M. Hongo, X.-G. Huang, and H. Taya, *PTEP* **2022**, 071D01 (2022), arXiv:2205.08051 [hep-th].
- [38] R. Singh, On the non-uniqueness of the energy-momentum and spin currents (2024), arXiv:2406.02127.
- [39] F. Belinfante, *Physica* **6**, 887 (1939).
- [40] S. Floerchinger and E. Grossi, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 085015 (2022), arXiv:2102.11098 [hep-th].
- [41] A. D. Gallegos, U. Gürsoy, and A. Yarom, *JHEP* **05** (2023), 139, arXiv:2203.05044 [hep-th].
- [42] A. D. Gallegos, U. Gürsoy, and A. Yarom, *SciPost Phys.* **11**, 041 (2021), arXiv:2101.04759 [hep-th].
- [43] J. Hilgevoord and S. Wouthuysen, *Nuclear Physics* **40**, 1 (1963).
- [44] S. R. De Groot, W. A. Van Leeuwen, and C. G. Van Weert, *Relativistic Kinetic Theory. Principles and Applications* (North-holland, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 1980).
- [45] G. A. Miller, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **60**, 1 (2010), arXiv:1002.0355 [nucl-th].
- [46] E. Leader and C. Lorcé, *Phys. Rept.* **541**, 163 (2014), arXiv:1309.4235 [hep-ph].
- [47] Y. Li, Q. Wang, and J. P. Vary, preprint (2024), arXiv:2405.06892 [hep-ph].
- [48] K. F. Liu *et al.*, *PoS LATTICE2011*, 164 (2011), arXiv:1203.6388 [hep-ph].
- [49] N. Brambilla *et al.*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74**, 2981 (2014), arXiv:1404.3723 [hep-ph].
- [50] D. E. Kharzeev, J. Liao, S. A. Voloshin, and G. Wang, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **88**, 1 (2016), arXiv:1511.04050 [hep-ph].
- [51] F. W. Hehl, *Rept. Math. Phys.* **9**, 55 (1976).
- [52] J. Hilgevoord and E. De Kerf, *Physica* **31**, 1002 (1965).
- [53] A. Hosoya, M.-a. Sakagami, and M. Takao, *Annals Phys.* **154**, 229 (1984).
- [54] F. Becattini, L. Bucciantini, E. Grossi, and L. Tinti, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75**, 191 (2015), arXiv:1403.6265 [hep-th].
- [55] F. Becattini, M. Buzzegoli, and E. Grossi, *Particles* **2**, 197 (2019), arXiv:1902.01089 [cond-mat.stat-mech].
- [56] D. N. Zubarev, *Sov. Phys. Doklady* **10**, 850 (1966).
- [57] D. N. Zubarev, A. V. Prozorkevich, and S. A. Smolyanskii, *Theoretical and Mathematical Physics* **40**, 821 (1979).
- [58] C. G. van Weert, *Annals of Physics* **140**, 133 (1982).
- [59] D. N. Zubarev and M. V. Tokarchuk, *Teor. Mat. Fiz.* **88N2**, 286 (1991).
- [60] V. G. Morozov and G. Ropke, *Condensed Matter Physics* **1**, 673 (1998).
- [61] T. Hayata, Y. Hidaka, T. Noumi, and M. Hongo, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 065008 (2015), arXiv:1503.04535 [hep-ph].
- [62] M. Hongo, *Annals Phys.* **383**, 1 (2017), arXiv:1611.07074 [hep-th].
- [63] V. E. Ambrus and E. Winstanley, *Phys. Lett. B* **734**, 296 (2014), arXiv:1401.6388 [hep-th].
- [64] H.-L. Chen, K. Fukushima, X.-G. Huang, and K. Mameda, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 104052 (2016), arXiv:1512.08974 [hep-ph].
- [65] K. Mameda and A. Yamamoto, *PTEP* **2016**, 093B05 (2016), arXiv:1504.05826 [hep-th].
- [66] M. Buzzegoli, J. D. Kroth, K. Tuchin, and N. Vijayakumar, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, L051901 (2023), arXiv:2209.02597 [hep-ph].
- [67] F. W. Hehl, P. Von Der Heyde, G. D. Kerlick, and J. M. Nester, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **48**, 393 (1976).
- [68] F. W. Hehl, *Found. Phys.* **15**, 451 (1985).
- [69] F. W. Hehl and Y. N. Obukhov, *Annales Fond. Broglie* **32**, 157 (2007), arXiv:0711.1535 [gr-qc].
- [70] M. Blagojevic, *Gravitation and Gauge Symmetries* (CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2001).
- [71] Y. Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, *Phys. Rev.* **122**, 345 (1961).

- [72] D. Ebert and H. Reinhardt, Nucl. Phys. B **271**, 188 (1986).
- [73] B. B. Brandt, G. Endrődi, E. Garnacho-Velasco, and G. Markó, JHEP **02** (2024), 142, arXiv:2312.02945 [hep-lat].
- [74] N. Goldenfeld, *Lectures on Phase Transitions and the Renormalization Group*, (CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2018).
- [75] L. Adamczyk *et al.* (STAR), Nature **548**, 62 (2017), arXiv:1701.06657 [nucl-ex].
- [76] S. Ryu, V. Jovic, and C. Shen, Phys. Rev. C **104**, 054908 (2021), arXiv:2106.08125 [nucl-th].
- [77] S. Alzhrani, S. Ryu, and C. Shen, Phys. Rev. C **106**, 014905 (2022), arXiv:2203.15718 [nucl-th].
- [78] X.-Y. Wu, C. Yi, G.-Y. Qin, and S. Pu, Phys. Rev. C **105**, 064909 (2022), arXiv:2204.02218 [hep-ph].
- [79] A. Palermo, E. Grossi, I. Karpenko, and F. Becattini, preprint (2024), arXiv:2404.14295 [nucl-th].
- [80] C. A. A. et al., The lhcs spin project (2019), arXiv:1901.08002 [hep-ex].
- [81] M. Leonhardt, and M. Pospiech, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 036004 (2020), arXiv:1909.06298 [hep-ph].
- [82] V. A. Kostecky and S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. D **39**, 683 (1989).
- [83] V. A. Kostecky and R. Potting, Nucl. Phys. B **359**, 545 (1991).
- [84] D. Colladay and V. A. Kostecky, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 6760 (1997), arXiv:hep-ph/9703464.
- [85] D. Colladay and V. A. Kostecky, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 116002 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9809521.
- [86] S. R. Coleman and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 116008 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9812418.