## Landau Ginzburg Theory and Nuclear Matter at Finite Temperature<sup>\*</sup>

R. A. Ritchie<sup>a,c</sup>, H. G. Miller<sup>a,b†</sup> and F. C. Khanna<sup>a,c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Theoretical Physics Institute, Department of Physics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2J1

<sup>b</sup> Department of Physics, University of Pretoria, Pretoria 0002, South Africa

<sup>c</sup> TRIUMF, 4004 Wesbrook Mall, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V6T 2A3

## Abstract

Based on recent studies of the temperature dependence of the energy and specific heat of liquid nuclear matter, a phase transition is suggested at a temperature  $\sim .8$  MeV. We apply Landau Ginzburg theory to this transition and determine the behaviour of the energy and specific heat close to the critical temperature in the condensed phase.

The existence of an energy gap in the spectrum of even-even nuclei due to paired states of either protons or neutrons [1] similar to that described by Bardeen, Cooper and Schrieffer (BCS) for electrons in a superconductor [2] has led to the suggestion that nuclear matter should also exist in a condensed phase for some range of temperatures [3]. The properties of this superfluid phase in both nuclear and neutron matter have been studied in the BCS approximation using a variety of phenomenological forces [4] as well as more realistic interactions [5]. Remarkably, all calculations yield qualitatively similar results for  ${}^{1}S_{0}$ pairing, namely that neutron matter exists in a condensed phase for  $k_{F}$  less than about 1.3 - 1.5 fm<sup>-1</sup>. Recent calculations, using the Paris potential [6], by the Catania group [7] have shown that only slight deviations occur in nuclear matter. Such modifications, which can be characterized by the use of a smaller nuclear effective mass in the case of nuclear matter, are known to give rise to a slight decrease in the gap,  $\Delta$ . Although such calculations suggest that such a low temperature phase should exist in both nuclear as well as neutron matter this has not been taken into account in, for example, astrophysical calculations since it is thought that it may be masked by other instabilities [8].

In field theoretic language BCS theory is considered as the spontaneous symmetry breaking of phase symmetry. The condensed phase, *e.g.* the superconducting phase, is charac-

<sup>\*</sup>We dedicate this paper to Prof. R. H. Lemmer on the occassion of his 65<sup>th</sup> birthday.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Permanent Address

E-Mail: rritchie@phys.ualberta.ca hmiller@scientia.up.ac.za khanna@phys.ualberta.ca

terized by an order parameter,  $(\Delta)$ , which is zero at the critical temperature,  $T_c$ . It has been established that the order parameter and the critical temperature fulfill the following approximate relationship [9]

$$\frac{\Delta_0}{T_c} \approx 1.76\tag{1}$$

where  $\Delta_0$  is the value of the energy gap at T = 0 and here we have taken the Boltzmann constant  $k_B = 1$ . In the normal phase the order parameter is zero. Interestingly enough the same relationship has been found to hold in the aforementioned calculations in nuclear matter [7]. Furthermore, it has been pointed out that the same relation between  $\Delta_0$  and  $T_c$ also describes spontaneous symmetry breaking of chiral symmetry in QCD if  $T_c$  is taken to be  $2f_{\pi}$  [10], where  $f_{\pi}$  is the pion decay constant. In all of the aforementioned cases the order parameter is obtained from a gap-like equation with appropriate quasiparticle interactions.

Recent studies of nuclear matter have suggested that the origin of collective states may ultimately be linked to symmetry rearrangement [11]. This leads to a BCS-like condensed phase, separated from the normal phase, which has an order parameter that goes to zero at the critical temperature. Calculations in finite nuclei at finite temperature suggest that this provides a reasonable description of the vanishing of the collective degrees of freedom [12].

Recently it has been demonstrated that the low temperature behavior of the specific heat of symmetric nuclear matter could be obtained from a finite temperature extension of the semi-empirical mass formula [13]. The temperature dependence of the coefficients in the semi-empirical mass formula [14] was determined by fitting to the canonical ensemble average of the excitation energy of over 300 nuclei for temperatures  $T \leq 4$  MeV, using experimental information of the energy spectra of nuclei in the mass region  $22 \leq A \leq 250$ . The volume term was then used to determine the temperature dependence of the energy per nucleon and specific heat of nuclear matter. This displayed some rather interesting aspects: A structure in both the energy and the specific heat was observed at temperatures between .5 and 1.3 MeV (the structure in the specific heat is of course more pronounced). Below this temperature the behaviour of the specific heat was quite different from that expected for a Fermi gas of free nucleons [13]. This is not unexpected as the low lying energy spectra of most nuclei are predominantly collective in nature. Above 1.3 MeV, the specific heat was essentially linear in temperature as is the case for a Fermi gas, but with the somewhat surprising feature that the slope coefficient was considerably larger than that suggested by the Fermi gas bulk level density parameter,

$$a_v \approx \frac{1}{15} \frac{m^*}{m},\tag{2}$$

where it was assumed  $m^* = (0.7-1.2)m$  [15]. We propose that the larger slope might in fact be quite reasonable, based upon comparison with the case of liquid <sup>3</sup>He. It is well known that at low temperatures, normal liquid <sup>3</sup>He may be treated as a Fermi gas of quasi-particles. However, due to the strength of the interactions in the liquid, constants such as the quasiparticle mass are not easily calculated, and rather are determined from experiment. For liquid <sup>3</sup>He an effective mass of  $m^* \sim 3m$  [16] is obtained by measurement of the specific heat. Following a similar procedure, noting the similarity between the free interactions of <sup>3</sup>He and of nucleons, one anticipates that the normal liquid of nuclear matter would exhibit properties that are quite similar to those of normal liquid <sup>3</sup>He. In particular, an effective mass of  $m^* \sim 2m$  is required to fit the specific heat given in [13]. It is important to note that in the treatment of liquid nuclear matter, it is usually assumed that the liquid may be replaced by a gas of quasi-particles with the mass of the quasi-particles being equal to that of free nucleons. Then the effect of nucleon-nucleon interactions leads to a new effective mass of the quasi-particle to be  $\sim 0.7 - 0.8$ . It is to be stressed that the procedure followed in the case of normal liquid <sup>3</sup>He, namely to use the experimental data on specific heat to deduce the effective mass, is more satisfying.

In this paper, we propose that there is a second order phase transition in liquid nuclear matter with a critical temperature  $T_c$  and an order parameter  $\eta$ . We apply Landau Ginzburg theory to determine the thermodynamic properties of the condensed phase close to  $T_c$ , from information about the normal phase. We follow the procedure used for liquid helium to determine the normal phase, namely modelling the system as a Fermi gas of quasi-particles with an effective mass  $m^* \sim 2m$ , determined from the specific heat. We find that the behaviour of the energy per nucleon and specific heat across the phase transition with  $T_c \sim .8$  MeV to be consistent with that shown in [13].

Landau and Ginzburg have provided a simple theory of phase transitions which approximates the free energy in the region around  $T_c$  and is most useful in analyzing the thermodynamics in this region. In particular, using only knowledge about the uncondensed phase one is able to make predictions about quantities in the condensed phase, such as specific heat, magnetic susceptibility and compressability. Moreover, Landau Ginzburg theory can be derived from microscopic calculations [9].

Following the Landau Ginzburg formulation it is necessary first to determine an expression for the free energy per nucleon f(T) in both phases. In what follows the subscript 1 will refer to the lower temperature (condensed) phase, and 2 to the higher temperature (uncondensed) phase. For the uncondensed phase, we take a quadratic form for the energy per nucleon which follows from a low temperature Fermi gas approximation of a normal Fermi liquid,

$$W_2(T) = a_2 + k_2 T^2, (3)$$

where  $a_2$  and  $k_2$  are constants. From the relations for the specific heat per nucleon in terms of W and the entropy per nucleon s,

$$c_V = \frac{\partial W}{\partial T} = T \frac{\partial s}{\partial T},\tag{4}$$

we are able to deduce the entropy per nucleon in the uncondensed phase,

$$s_2(T) = C_2 + 2k_2T, (5)$$

where  $C_2$  is an unknown integration constant which later cancels out of the calculation. From eqs. (3) and (5) the free energy per nucleon in the higher temperature phase is given by

$$f_2(T) = a_2 - C_2 T - k_2 T^2. (6)$$

To determine the free energy per nucleon in the condensed phase, we make use of the Landau expansion [17] for the free energy per nucleon in terms of an order parameter  $\eta$ ,

which goes to zero at the transition to the uncondensed phase. This order parameter is related to the presence of pairing expected at lower temperatures and vanishes with the pairing gap  $\Delta$  at some critical temperature  $T_c$ . The free energy per nucleon expansion to order  $\eta^4$  is

$$f_1(T,\eta) = f_2 + A\eta^2 + B\eta^4.$$
(7)

Here A and B are functions of temperature. The order parameter is determined by requiring the condensed phase to be stable below  $T_c$  (i.e.  $f_1$  should be minimized w.r.t.  $\eta$ ). This leads to

$$f_1 = f_2 - \frac{A^2}{4B}.$$
 (8)

Further, since A is of opposite sign in the condensed and uncondensed phases, whilst B is strictly positive [17], the lowest order expansion of A in  $T - T_c$  can be parametrized as

$$A(T) = a(T - T_c) 2\sqrt{B(T_c)}.$$
(9)

Note especially that a > 0 is an essential requirement following from the phase diagram [17]. Substituting for A(T), the free energy per nucleon near  $T_c$  is given by

$$f_1(T) = (a_2 - aT_c^2) + (2aT_c - C_2)T - (k_2 + a)T^2,$$
(10)

where  $f_2$  is taken from eq. (6).

From the free energy per nucleon given by eq. (10), we can now determine the energy per nucleon in the condensed phase near  $T_c$ ,

$$W_1(T) = (a_2 - aT_c^2) + (a + k_2)T^2$$
(11)

$$= a_1 + k_1 T^2. (12)$$

Comparing this to the uncondensed phase (eq. (3)) we note that the T dependence is also quadratic, but has a larger coefficient. Thus the specific heat is discontinuous across the phase transition, and is necessarily larger  $(k_1 > k_2)$  in the condensed phase.

We now compare the structure of  $W_1(T)$  and  $W_2(T)$  to what has been determined from the finite temperature extension of the semi-emperical mass formula [13]. Before proceeding, it should be noted that the energy per nucleon in nuclear matter is obtained from the volume term of the binding energy for finite sized nuclei. It may be anticipated that any sharp features (e.g. kink in the energy per nucleon and discontinuity in specific heat  $\Delta c_V$ ) will appear smoothed out. Thus whilst comparison is still possible at a qualitative level, it is difficult to obtain quantitative estimates for the critical temperature and the discontinuity in the specific heat.

In the region (.5 - 1.3 MeV) the energy per nucleon from [13] is observed to show a peak above the simple  $T^2$  behavior. This is in good agreement with what might be expected from a smoothed out downwards kink in W at  $T_c$ , which follows from eqs. (3) and (12). Furthermore, the specific heat in [13] shows a sharp drop in the region (.5 - 1.3 MeV) which agrees well with a smoothed out discontinuous drop  $(= (k_1 - k_2)T_c)$ . It should be noted that the specific heat above 1.3 MeV is very nearly linear, supporting the use of a quadratic temperature dependence of  $W_2$ , and that the slope below .5 MeV is greater than that above 1.3 MeV, which is in good agreement with our prediction that  $k_1 > k_2$ .

If we treat the uncondensed phase as a Fermi gas of quasi-particles with effective mass  $m^* \sim 2m$ , as suggested earlier based on the linear behaviour of the specific heat, we can estimate this jump in specific heat at the transition to a condensed phase, where there is pairing with an associated energy gap  $\Delta$ . This is given by [9],

$$\Delta c_V \approx 2.43 c_V \tag{13}$$

where  $c_V$  is the specific heat per nucleon in the uncondensed phase. The uncondensed phase parameters for the energy per nucleon given in eqn (3) have been fitted in [13], giving  $k_2 = 1/6.7 \text{ MeV}^{-1}$  and  $a_2 = -16 \text{ MeV}$ . Using this value for  $k_2$  and assuming  $T_c \sim .8 \text{ MeV}$  we find  $\Delta c_V \sim .6 \text{ MeV}$ , which is consistent with the behaviour of the specific heat per nucleon given in [13].

At temperatures considerably higher than  $T_c$ , the energy per particle given by eq. (3) will become positive. It is reasonable to identify this with a transition from a Fermi liquid to a Fermi gas, at temperature  $T_{\rm LG}$ . Using eq. (3) with the fitted parameters  $a_2$  and  $k_2$  taken from [13], we estimate this transition temperature to be at  $T_{\rm LG} \approx 10$  MeV. This compares favourably with  $T_{\rm LG} \approx 15 - 20$  MeV in [18] and  $T_{\rm LG} \approx 5$  MeV (finite nuclei) [19].

In summary, following suggestions of a pairing transition in nuclear matter, we have applied Landau Ginzburg theory to provide estimates for the thermodynamical properties across such a phase transition. For information on the uncondensed phase, we assume a quadratic temperature dependence for the energy per nucleon. We find that the behaviour of the energy per nucleon and specific heat across the phase transition with  $T_c \sim .8$  MeV is consistent with that observed from the fit of finite nuclei. Following an analogy with liquid <sup>3</sup>He, we suggest that the essentially linear temperature behaviour of the specific heat observed in [13] is indicative that nuclear matter in the uncondensed (normal Fermi liquid) phase may be considered as a Fermi gas of quasi-particles with an effective mass  $m^* \sim 2m$ . Such observation appears quite reasonable.

Lack of experimental data on nuclear matter at finite temperature makes further refinement of the model difficult. Experimental determination of the thermodynamic properties in heavy ion collisions would be extremely helpful for understanding the properties of nuclear matter at finite temperature. Clearly the energy per nucleon obtained in [13] at temperatures above 1.3 MeV is much stiffer than that of a Fermi gas of free nucleons, which is often used in many astrophysical calculations [8] which in turn should affect neutrino production rates in stars. As this is the major cooling mechanism in these objects it would be interesting to see precisely how important this deviation is.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Prof. J. A. Tuszynski for several very useful discussions about Landau Ginzburg theory. The research is supported in part by the Natural Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada. H.G.M. acknowledges the support of the Foundation for Research Development, South Africa. H.G.M. expresses his gratitude to the Theoretical Physics Institute of the U. of Alberta for their warm hospitality.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A.Bohr, B. Mottelson and D. Pines, Phys. Rev. **110**, 936 (1958).
- [2] J. Bardeen, L. N. Cooper and J. R. Schrieffer, Phys. Rev. 108, 1175 (1959).
- [3] V. J. Emery and A. M. Sessler, Phys. Rev. **114**, 1377 (1960).
- [4] V. L. Ginzburg, J. Stat. Phys. 1, 3 (1969);
  - G. Baym, C. Pethick, D. Pines and M. Ruderman, Nature 224, 872 (1969);
  - J. W. Clark and N. C. Chao, Lett. Nuovo Cim. 2, 185 (1969);
  - J. W. Clark, Phys. Rev. Lett. 23, 1463 (1969);
  - E. Østgaard, Nucl. Phys. A154, 202 (1970);
  - E. Østgaard, Z. Phys. 243, 79 (1971);
  - C. H. Yang and J. W. Clark, Nucl. Phys. A174, 49 (1971);
  - N. Chao, J. W. Clark and C. H. Yang, Nucl. Phys. A179, 320 (1972);
  - T. Tatsuka, Prog. Theor. Phys 48, 1517 (1972);
- L. Amundsen and E. Østgaard, Nucl. Phys. A437, 487 (1985).
- [5] E. Krotscheck and J. W. Clark, Nucl. Phys. A333, 77 (1980);
   J. W. Clark C.-G. Källman, C.-H. Yang and D. A. Chakkalakal, Phys. Lett. B61, 331 (1976);
  - J. M. C. Chen, J. W. Clark E. Krotscheck and R. A. Smith, Nucl. Phys. A451, 509 (1986).
- [6] M. Lacombe et al., Phys. Rev. C21, 861 (1980).
- [7] M. Baldo, J. Cugnon, A. Lejeune and U. Lombardo Nucl. Phys. A515, 409 (1990).
- [8] J. M. Lattimer and D. G. Ravenhall, Astrophys. J. **223**, 314 (1978).
- [9] E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Statistical Physics II* (Pergamon, Oxford, 1980) § 40.
- [10] D. Bailin, J. Cleymans and M. D. Scadron, Phys. Rev. **D31**, 164 (1985).
- [11] H. He, F. C. Khanna and H. Umezawa, Ann. Phy. (N.Y.) **256**, 144 (1997).
- [12] F. C. Khanna, H. G. Miller and R. M. Quick, Phys. Rev. C54, 1133 (1996).
- [13] N. J. Davidson, S. S. Hsiao, J. Markram, H. G. Miller and Yiharn Tzeng, Phys. Lett. B315, 12 (1993).
- [14] P. Seeger, Nucl. Phys. 25, 1 (1961).
- [15] D. Vautherin and D. Brink, Phys. Rev. C5, 626 (1972);
  F. Tondeur, M. Brack, M. Farine and J. M. Pearson, Nucl. Phys. A420 297 (1984);
  F. Tondeur, Nucl. Phys. A442, 460 (1985);
  M. Barranco and J. Treiner, Nucl. Phys. A351, 269 (1981).
- [16] A. L. Fetter and J. D. Walecka, Quantum Theory of Many Particle Systems, (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971) 148.
- [17] E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Statistical Physics I* (Pergamon, Oxford, 1980) § 143.
- [18] H. Jaqaman, A. Z. Mekjian and L. Zamick, Phys. Rev. C27, 2782 (1983); ibid. C29, 2067 (1984).
- [19] J. Pochodzalla et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1040 (1995).