## Astrophysics and Nuclear Physics Informed Interactions in Dense Matter: Insights from PSR J0437-4715

Tuhin Malik,<sup>1</sup> V. Dexheimer,<sup>2</sup> and Constança Providência<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>CFisUC, Department of Physics, University of Coimbra, P-3004 - 516 Coimbra, Portugal <sup>2</sup>Department of Physics, Kent State University, Kent, OH 44243, USA

(Dated: April 12, 2024)

We investigate how vector and isovector interactions can be determined within the density regime of neutron stars, while fulfilling nuclear and astrophysics constrains. We make use of the Chiral Mean Field (CMF) model, a SU(3) nonlinear realization of the sigma model within the mean-field approximation, for the first time within a Bayesian analysis framework. We show that neutron-matter  $\chi$ EFT constraints at low density are only satisfied if the vector-isovector mixed interaction term is included, e.g., a  $\omega^2 \rho^2$  term. We also show the behavior of the model with respect to the conformal limit. We demonstrate that the CMF model is able to predict a value for the parameter  $d_c$  related to the trace anomaly and its derivative takes values below 0.2 above four times saturation density within a hadronic model that does not include a phase transition to deconfined matter. We compare these effects with results from other (non-chiral) Relativistic Mean Field models to assess how different approaches to incorporating the same physical constraints affect predictions of neutron-star properties and dense matter equations of state. We also include data from the gravitation wave event GW230529 detected by the LIGO-Virgo-Kagra collaboration and the most recent radius measurement of PSR J0437-4715 from the NASA NICER mission. Our analysis reveals that this new NICER measurement leads to an average reduction of approximately  $\sim 0.15$  km radius in the posterior of the neutron-star mass-radius relationship.

**Introduction-** Neutron stars, which are remnants of supernova explosions, serve as celestial markers that shed light on the boundaries of physical principles [1]. These objects, known for their extremely high density,  $\sim 4-5$  times nuclear saturation density, provide a natural setting for investigating the fundamental characteristics of matter in extreme environments [2, 3]. The equation of state (EoS) of neutron-star matter, crucial for unraveling the enigmas surrounding these cosmic entities, explains the relationships among their physical attributes such as density, pressure, and temperature. Theoretical modeling of EoS plays a vital role in understanding the inner composition and behavior of neutron stars [4–8].

We examine the EoS of neutron-star matter using the Chiral Mean Field (CMF) model within the framework of the SU(3) nonlinear sigma model, implemented in the mean-field approximation. This approach enables a detailed examination of vector and isovector interactions, which are crucial factors in describing the repulsion component of the strong force and consequently shaping the EoS of neutron stars. This model incorporates meson exchange interactions to describe hadronic systems, with a keen focus on maintaining chiral invariance [9, 10], an important characteristic of Quantum chromodynamics (QCD). This ensures that particle masses, emerging from interactions within the medium, approach zero under extreme conditions, aligning with the properties of high-density and/or high-temperature environments. The model distinguishes itself by exploring various self-interactions among vector mesons [11-13], adhering strictly to chiral invariance principles, and investigating the delta meson's influence on predicted microscopic and macroscopic observables [14-17]. Through these considerations, the updated model aims to align closely with the latest empirical data and theoretical insights into nuclear physics, thereby enhancing its predictive power and relevance to current astrophysical and nuclear physics research.

In this work, we utilize for the first time advanced param-

eter estimation techniques using Bayesian inference to investigate the CMF model in the setting of high-density environments commonly found in neutron stars. Bayesian inference, a widely recognized statistical technique for improving parameter estimates based on prior information, offers a statistical approach to understanding the EoS of neutron-star matter [18–27]. By employing this approach, our goal is to methodically investigate the impacts of vector and isovector interactions, ultimately advancing our understanding of the underlying physics that governs the interior of neutron stars.

A key focus in this letter is to highlight the importance of vector self-interaction and mixed terms, specifically the  $\omega^2 \rho^2$ terms, and their significant impact on matching pure neutronmatter requirements at low densities. These terms are essential components of the model and affect the density variation of the symmetry energy and the speed of sound squared, which is crucial for neutron stars. Our results highlight the essential nature of including these terms correctly to align with the observed behavior of neutron stars. Here, we focus solely on nucleonic degrees of freedom and investigate how chiral symmetry is restored within an astrophysics and nuclear physics informed interactions in dense matter. Our goal is to perform an inference analysis using a chiral effective field theory ( $\chi$ EFT) [28] informed prior, and apply constraints derived from perturbative QCD (pQCD) [29], and astrophysical observations including NASA's Neutron star Interior Composition Explorer (NICER) [30-34] and LIGO-VIRGO Collaboration (LVC) data [35], see also [28, 36].

*Microscopic EoS*- For this work we use the nucleonic version of the model [37] (with protons and neutrons only) and relax all the vector interaction parameters, which are now freely varied. The scalar interactions remain fitted to reproduce nucleon masses, as well as meson masses and decay constants (see Ref. [38] for details). The CMF Lagrangian density can be written as:  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\rm Kin} + \mathcal{L}_{\rm Int} + \mathcal{L}_{\rm Self} + \mathcal{L}_{\rm SB}$ , with terms for the kinetic energy, for the interactions between nucleons

and vector and scalar mesons, self interactions of scalar and vector mesons, and explicit chiral symmetry breaking, the latter being responsible for producing the masses of the pseudoscalar mesons. As there is no strangeness included in the system, we do not include mesons with hidden strangeness. This leaves the vector-isoscalar  $\omega$  and vector-isovector  $\rho$ , the scalar-isoscalar  $\sigma$  and scalar-isovector  $\delta$  to mediate the strong force. The isovector mesons affect isospin-asymmetric matter and, thus, are important to describe neutron-star physics.

As in other chiral models, the effective masses for the nucleons *i* are mainly generated by the scalar mesons,  $M_i^* = g_{i\sigma}\sigma + g_{i\delta}\tau_3\delta + \Delta m_i$ , with a small explicit mass term  $\Delta m_i$ , whose possible values we explore. We start by describing the different chiral invariant possibilities for the vector self-interaction terms:

$$2\text{Tr}(V^4)$$
,  $((\text{Tr}(V^2))^2$ ,  $((\text{Tr}(V))^4/4$ , (1)

where V is the vector-meson multiplet matrix, which reduces to a diagonal matrix in the mean-field approximation:  $V = \text{diag}((\omega + \rho)/\sqrt{2} \quad (\omega - \rho)/\sqrt{2} \quad 0)$ . The different self-interaction terms of the vector mesons shown above correspond, respectively, to the coupling schemes C1, C3, and C4 in the following. We also include the coupling schemes C2 and for the first time C5, which are linear combination of the others:

• For C4: 
$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{vec}}^{\text{Self}} = g_{4,4}(\omega^4)$$
;

• For C5: 
$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{vec}}^{\text{Self}} = C1 - C2 = g_{4.5}(\omega^2 \rho^2)$$
.

Note that in the past we used either only one of the terms C1, C2, C3, C4 [39], or we used C4 and added non-chiral invariant terms [38, 40, 41], always including the meson with hidden strangeness  $\phi$ . Here we study C5 in detail, together with all linear combinations of C4 and C5, and all linear combinations of C2, C3, and C4.

Bayesian Likelihood- The parameters of the CMF model are determined through the Bayesian Inference framework. We enforce minimal nuclear saturation properties (NMP): (i) the nuclear saturation density  $\rho_0 = 0.16 \pm 0.005 \text{ fm}^{-3}$ , the binding energy per nucleon  $\epsilon_0 = -16.1 \pm 0.2$  MeV, and the symmetry energy  $J_0 = 30 \pm 2$  MeV at saturation density, (ii) constraints on low-density neutron matter from various  $\chi EFT$ calculations regarding the energy per particle at 4 intermediate densities: 0.05, 0.1, 0.15, and 0.20 fm<sup>-3</sup> [28], (iii) constraints derived from pQCD at seven times the saturation density for the highest renormalizable scale X=4 [42], (iv) astrophysical constraints such as mass-radius measurements from PSR J0030+0451 [30, 32, 43] and PSR J0740+6620 [31, 33, 44], and tidal deformability from GW170817 [35]. We also discuss recent mass-radius NICER results for PSR J0437-4715 [34].

Bayesian probability functions are defined as the probability of observation data specified in the statistical model and parameterized by a set of parameters ( $\theta$ ). The probability of a set of constraints and the posterior distribution of astrophysical observations can be calculated as follows:

(i) nuclear saturation properties (NMP) and low density  $\chi$ EFT: with  $D_{\text{NMP, PNM}} \pm \sigma$  representing the desired value or the value to be fitted (where the data follows a symmetric Gaussian distribution) and  $D(\theta)$  representing the predicted value for that quantity for a given parameter set, the likelihood is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{NMP,PNM}}|\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} exp(\frac{-(D(\theta) - D_{\text{NMP,PNM}})^2}{2\sigma^2})$$
$$= \mathcal{L}^{\text{NMP,PNM}}; \qquad (2)$$

(ii) perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics (pQCD): with  $d_{pQCD}$  representing a constant probability distribution throughout the area enclosed in the energy density and pressure plane at 7 times the saturation density calculated for the renormalizable scale X=4, the likelihood is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}(d_{pQCD}|\theta) = P(d_{pQCD}|\theta) = \mathcal{L}^{pQCD}, \qquad (3)$$

where  $P(d_{pQCD}|\theta) = 1$  if it is within  $d_{pQCD}$ ; otherwise, it is zero;

(iii) gravitational-wave (GW) observation: information about EoS parameters comes from the masses  $m_1, m_2$  of the two binary components and the corresponding tidal deformabilities,  $\Lambda_1$  and  $\Lambda_2$ . In this case, the likelihood is [45]:

$$P(d_{\rm GW}|\rm EoS) = \int_{m_2}^{M_{\rm U}} dm_1 \int_{M_{\rm L}}^{m_1} dm_2 P(m_1, m_2|\rm EoS) \\ \times P(d_{\rm GW}|m_1, m_2, \Lambda_1(m_1, \rm EoS), \Lambda_2(m_2, \rm EoS)) \\ = \mathcal{L}^{\rm GW},$$
(4)

where P(m|EoS) [24, 46–48] can be written as:

$$P(m|\text{EoS}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{M_{\text{U}} - M_{\text{L}}} & \text{if } M_{\text{L}} \le m \le M_{\text{U}}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(5)

In our calculation we set  $M_{\rm L} = 1.36 \, {\rm M}_{\odot}$  and  $M_{\rm U} = 1.6 \, {\rm M}_{\odot}$ ;

(iv) X-ray observation (NICER) : these give simultaneously mass and radius measurements of neutron stars. Therefore, the corresponding evidence takes the following form,

$$P(d_{\rm X-ray}|\rm EoS) = \int_{M_{\rm min}}^{M_{\rm max}} dm P(m|\rm EoS) \\ \times P(d_{\rm X-ray}|m, R(m, \rm EoS)) \\ = \mathcal{L}^{\rm NICER} .$$
(6)

Since the posterior information for PSR J0437–4715 is not yet accessible to the public, we utilize the constrained radius  $R^{J0437}$  (M=1.418 M<sub> $\odot$ </sub>) = 11.36<sup>+0.95</sup><sub>-0.63</sub> km reported by the NICER group during the April APS meeting [34]. In our calculation, we include the likelihood for this specific pulsar  $\mathcal{L}^{J0437}$  in a manner akin to the NMP likelihood, with  $\sigma$  set to 0.63 km for radii less than 11.36 km and 0.95 km for radii greater than 11.36 km. The final likelihood for the calculation is then given by

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}^{\text{NMP,PNM}} \mathcal{L}^{\text{pQCD}} \mathcal{L}^{\text{GW}} \mathcal{L}^{\text{NICERI}} \mathcal{L}^{\text{NICERII}}.$$
 (7)

NICER I and NICER II correspond to the mass-radius measurements of PSR J0030+0451 [49] and PSR J0740+6620 [50], respectively. When, the NICER PSR J0437-4715 constraints on radius are incorporated, the term  $\mathcal{L}^{J0437}$  enters Eq. 7.

**Results-** Withing the CMF model, we explore various chiral invariant scenarios for the vector self-interaction term within the Bayesian Inference framework, supported by the selection of nuclear and astrophysical constraints already discussed. We perform three different identical inference analyzes using different linear combinations of the C1-C5 terms: Set 1 (C5 term), Set 2 (all combinations of C4 and C5 terms), and Set 3 (all combinations of C2, C3, and C4 terms). Note that the terms C5  $\equiv \omega^2 \rho^2$ , and C4  $\equiv \omega^4$ , have a direct effect on, respectively, the symmetry energy and on the softness of the EoS at large densities [51]. Their effect on the neutron-star mass radius properties is to decrease the radius of low-mass stars (C5 with a positive coupling) and to decrease the maximum mass and the radius of high mass stars (C4 with a positive coupling) [52-54]. We have also considered the combination C1-C4  $\equiv \omega^2 \rho^2 + \rho^4$ , however the results were almost coincident with the ones obtained with C5, and, therefore, in the following this combination is not considered.

In Fig. 1, the probability distributions of the value of the log likelihood has been plotted for all the three sets; in each case we allow for all linear combinations of the different chiral invariant terms. They reflect the freedom of the CMF considering the number of terms. Set 3 with three terms shows the broadest distribution, while set 1, with the smallest number of terms presents the most localized distribution.

In Fig. 2, we plot the results of our Bayesian inference calculation, in particular, the posteriors for the energy per particle of neutron matter as a function of the baryonic density (left), for the mass-radius distributions (middle) and for the mass tidal deformability distributions (right) acquired within a 90% confidence interval (CI) for three different sets of CMF cases, Set 1 (C5), Set 2 (C4, C5), and Set 3 (C2, C3, and C4). In the panel for the neutron-matter energy per particle, the prediction from several  $\chi$ EFT calculations as given in [28] is also shown in light pink. Set 3, the combination C2, C3, and C4, is not able to reproduce the low density results of  $\chi$ EFT. However, set 1 corresponding to the term that affects the symmetry is already quite successful in satisfying  $\chi$ EFT results. The extra term in set 2 (with respect to set 1) gives more freedom and improves even more the fulfillment of the  $\chi$ EFT constraints, as also seen from the probability distributions of the value of the log likelihood shown in Fig. 1.

Solving the Tolmann-Oppenheimer-Volkoff equations [58, 59] to determine the mass and radius of static spherical neutron stars, we have obtained the mass-radius distributions shown in the middle panel of Fig. 2 for the three sets. In the same figure, we have also included the GW170817 data from the LIGO-Virgo collaboration [35], together with the 2D posterior distribution in the mass-radius domain for the millisecond pulsars PSR J0030+0451 [30, 32] and PSR J0740+6620



FIG. 1. The probability distributions of the value of the log likelihood for the three sets analyzed including in each one all linear combinations of the different chiral invariant terms.

[31, 33] from the NICER X-ray data. We also illustrate the most recent mass-radius measurements from NICER for PSR J0437-4715 [34] (orange dot with error bars). For reference, the 90% CI region obtained in a previous study using RMF and nonlinear mesonic interactions in [55] is marked with a black dashed line. Finally, we also show the very recent data predicted using the BSK24 neutron-star EoS [60] from the GW230529 event detected by the LIGO-Virgo-KAGRA (LVK) collaboration and identified as the merger of two compact objects with masses of  $2.5-4.5~M_{\odot}$  and  $1.2-2.0~M_{\odot}$ [56]. This event has been interpreted by the LVK collaboration as most likely a neutron star-black hole merger. Finally, we have also shown the 90% CI obtained in [55] using a RMF description of nuclear matter with non-linear meson terms (RMF-NL). While all sets seem to agree with the observations of NICER and GW170817, set 3, which predicts the largest radii, is somewhat in tension with the results derived from GW230529 using the BSK24 EoS. On the other hand, both sets 1 and 2 are consistent with this last data, in particular, the M-R  $1\sigma$  distribution obtained for GW230529 lies completely inside the set 2 distribution. As expected, in comparison with set 1, set 2 spans a larger region in the M-R diagram and predicts larger radii for the low mass stars. Comparing with other approaches as in [55], sets 1 and 2 are compatible with RMF-NL although spanning a narrower region. Note that the M-R range associated with sets 1 and 2 also marginally meets the  $1\sigma$  range of PSR J0437 - 4715. In addition, we performed an inference analysis for Set 2, incorporating all the constraints defined above along with PSR J0437 - 4715, which showed a slight effect on the minimum of the M-R posterior, resulting in an average decrease of about 0.15 km for masses ranging from 1.3 to 1.8  $M_{\odot},$  as shown by the dash-dotted red line.

Finally, in the right panel we have plotted the mass in terms of the tidal deformability for the three sets, and include the existing constraints from GW170817 and the ones deduced using the BSK24 EoS from the recent GW230529 event, and for the last constraint both the  $1\sigma$  and the  $2\sigma$  CI are shown. Set 3 is only marginally compatible with GW170817 but compat-



FIG. 2. The posteriors acquired within the 90% confidence interval (CI) for three different sets of CMF interactions: (Left) The neutron-matter energy per particle is shown as a function of density. The envelope includes constraints from various many-body calculations utilizing  $\chi$ EFT interactions [28]. (Middle) The mass-radius domain is displayed. Gray lines represent the constraints derived from the binary components of GW170817, including their 90% and 50% CI. 1 $\sigma$  (68%) CI for the 2D posterior distribution in the mass-radius domain for the millisecond pulsar PSR J0030+0451 (in pastel blue and soft green) [30, 32] and PSR J0740+6620 (in blush pink) [31, 33] from the NICER X-ray data are depicted. The black dashed area represents the 90% CI obtained in a previous study using RMF and nonlinear mesonic interaction [55]. The green dotted region indicates the inferred 90% CI from GW230529 with BSK24 [56]. The recent NASA NICER data for PSR J0437 are also shown (orange dot with error bars)[34]. The red dash-dotted line defines the 90% CI obtained with set 2 when the constraint from J0437-4715 is included. (Right) The dimensionless tidal deformability for neutron-star (NS) masses is shown. The blue bar represent the tidal deformability constraints at 1.36  $M_{\odot}$  [35]. The green dashed and doted region is the posterior 1 $\sigma$ , and 2 $\sigma$  obtained for the secondary component in GW230529 using BSK24 [56].



FIG. 3. Posterior obtained within the 90% confidence interval (CI) for three distinct groups of CMF instances: (C5), (C4 and C5), and (C2, C3, and C4) symmetry energy with respect to baryon density. We also compare the constraints from IAS [57].

ible with GW230529. The other two sets describe well both events.

Next we analyze the nuclear matter properties associated with the three sets. In Fig. 3, the symmetry energy is plotted as a function of the baryonic density for all the sets, together with the constraints from isospin analogue states (IAS) determined in [57]. All sets satisfy the IAS constraints, however, clearly set 3 predicts a much harder symmetry energy. This is confirmed looking at the corner plot shown in Fig. 4. While for all sets the symmetry energy at saturation is very similar, set 3 has a much larger symmetry energy slope, and curvature at saturation,  $L_{\rm sym0}$  and  $K_{\rm sym0}$ . It is also interesting to analyze the symmetric nuclear matter parameters  $K_0$  and  $Q_0$ . Set 1 shows a very restricted distribution peaked at quite high values , respectively,  $\sim 350$  MeV and  $\sim -110$  MeV, which translates the smaller freedom of this model. Set 2 shows an equal large incompressibility but more spread than set 1. This large value was necessary to allow the description of massive stars, compensating the quite soft symmetry energy.

Recently, it has been frequently discussed in the literature how a phase transition to quark matter could be identified [8, 61–66]. These studies use agnostic descriptions of the EoS, both parametric and non-parametric, and discuss quantities that could reflect a first order phase transition, such as, the speed of sound  $c_s$ , the polytropic index  $\gamma = \frac{d \ln p}{d \ln \epsilon}$  [61], where p and  $\epsilon$  are respectively the pressure and the energy density, the trace anomaly  $\Delta = 1/3 - p/\epsilon$ , which approaches zero in the conformal limit [64], or other quantities derived from these ones. An example of the latter is the quantity  $d_c = \sqrt{\Delta^2 + \Delta'^2}$ , where  $\Delta' = c_s^2 (1/\gamma - 1)$  is the logarithmic derivative of  $\Delta$  [67]. In the conformal limit  $c_s^2$  and  $\gamma$  approach respectively 1/3 and 1. It was was proposed that  $d_c \leq 0.2$  would identify the proximity of the conformal limit since for this to happen both  $\Delta$  and its derivative should be small [67]. Since it is expected that quark matter shows an approximate conformal symmetry, a small value of  $d_c$  could identify the presence of quark matter.

In Fig. 5 the speed of sound squared and the quantity  $d_c$  are plotted for the three sets. It is interesting to note that set 3 has a rather narrow distribution for both quantities: at high densities it shows the smallest values of the speed of sound squared, approaching values  $\sim 0.35 - 0.45$  at densities of the





FIG. 4. Corner plots for the three distinct sets of CMF posteriors using the Bayesian approach. The marginalized posterior distributions of the nuclear matter parameters and specific neutron-star characteristics are displayed on the diagonal. Confidence ellipses for the two-dimensional posterior distributions are depicted with intervals of  $1\sigma$ ,  $2\sigma$ , and  $3\sigma$  on the off-diagonal. The uncertainties are reported at a confidence level of 90%.

order of seven times the saturation density, but also the largest values in the range of densities  $\rho_0 - 2\rho_0$ ; it predicts the smallest  $d_c$  values, which fall below 0.2 at  $\sim 4\rho_0$ . The properties shown by set 3 reflect the chiral symmetry of the model. Set 1, which also showing very narrow distributions, gives the highest values for the speed of sound at high density and the lowest values close to the saturation density. Moreover, for this set  $d_c$  always remains well above 0.2. Concerning set 2, although having larger  $c_s^2$  and  $d_c$  values than set 3, for set 2  $d_c$  also drops below 0.2 and the speed of sound takes values of the order of 0.4-0.5 at  $7\rho_0$ .

**Conclusions-** We have analyzed, using a Bayesian inference approach, how vector self-interacting terms could affect the description of nuclear matter in the framework of the nucleonic version of the Chiral Mean Field (CMF) model [37], a nonlinear realization of the sigma model within the mean-field approximation. Different combinations of the vector self-interacting terms were considered and it was shown that the largest effects are due to the term mixing the  $\omega$  and  $\rho$ mesons and the quartic  $\omega$  term. These two terms have often been used in a relativistic mean-field description of nuclear matter to control the density dependence of the equation of state, in particular, the symmetry energy and the high-density behavior of the energy density.

We have shown that the  $\chi$ EFT constraints for neutron matter at low density are only satisfied if the vector self-

FIG. 5. 90% confidence intervals are shown for the square of the speed of sound  $(c_s^2)$ , the association between  $d_c$  and  $\rho$  across three groups of posterior CMF. The  $d_c = \sqrt{\Delta^2 + \Delta'^2}$ , where  $\Delta' = c_s^2 (1/\gamma - 1)$ , is the logarithmic derivative of  $\Delta$ , where  $\Delta = 1/3 - P/\epsilon$ , with respect to the energy density, which approaches zero in the conformal limit [67].

interacting terms are included in a correct combination, in particular the  $\omega^2 \rho^2$  and  $\omega^4$  terms; These two vector selfinteracting terms are important to make the CMF model compatible with very recent NS observations, the GW230529 event by the LVK collaboration [56] and the mass-radius prediction for the pulsar PSR J0437-4715 by NICER [34], by shifting the mass-radius distributions to lower radii and the mass-tidal deformability distributions to lower tidal deformabilities.

It was shown that compatibility with the  $\chi$ EFT constraint implied a softer symmetry energy, with values of the symmetry energy slope and curvature at saturation of the order of 54 MeV and -140 MeV, respectively. As a consequence, the incompressibility was found to be quite high,  $\sim 300 - 350$ MeV (but still within the experimental range - see review [68]). We have also studied the behavior of the model with respect to the conformal limit. It was shown that the speed of sound increases monotonically with the baryon density and that the vector self-interacting terms have a noticeable effect on both the  $c_s^2$  and the trace anomaly related quantity  $d_c$ , which may indicate an approach to conformality when taking values smaller than 0.2 [67]. Taking a linear combination of the different chiral invariant possibilities for the vector selfinteraction terms designed by Set 3, the model showed a behavior compatible with the approach to conformal symmetry. However, this was the combination that did not reproduce the  $\chi$ EFT constraint and that showed some tension with the very recent NS observations. Using a different combination of vector self-interaction terms, we have constructed set 2 and we have shown that it is possible to satisfy the  $\chi EFT$  constraints,

observations and predict a value of  $d_c < 0.2$  above  $4\rho_0$  within an hadronic model that does not include a phase transition to deconfined matter, only chiral symmetry restoration.

Acknowledgments- This work was partially supported by national funds from FCT (Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P, Portugal) under projects UIDB/04564/2020 and UIDP/04564/2020, with DOI identifiers 10.54499/UIDB/04564/2020 and 10.54499/UIDP/04564/2020, respectively, and the project 2022.06460.PTDC with the associated DOI identifier

- M. Oertel, M. Hempel, T. Klähn, and S. Typel, Rev. Mod. Phys. 89, 015007 (2017), arXiv:1610.03361 [astro-ph.HE].
- [2] N. K. Glendenning, Compact Stars (Springer-Verlag, 1996).
- [3] G. F. Burgio, H. J. Schulze, I. Vidana, and J. B. Wei, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **120**, 103879 (2021), arXiv:2105.03747 [nucl-th].
- [4] P. Haensel, A. Y. Potekhin, and D. G. Yakovlev, *Neutron Stars* 1: Equation of State and Structure, Vol. 326 (Springer, New York, 2007).
- [5] H. Tan, J. Noronha-Hostler, and N. Yunes, Phys. Rev. Lett. 125, 261104 (2020), arXiv:2006.16296 [astro-ph.HE].
- [6] H. Tan, V. Dexheimer, J. Noronha-Hostler, and N. Yunes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 161101 (2022), arXiv:2111.10260 [astroph.HE].
- [7] M. Marczenko, L. McLerran, K. Redlich, and C. Sasaki, EPJ Web Conf. 274, 07014 (2022), arXiv:2212.10165 [nucl-th].
- [8] S. Altiparmak, C. Ecker, and L. Rezzolla, Astrophys. J. Lett. 939, L34 (2022), arXiv:2203.14974 [astro-ph.HE].
- [9] P. Papazoglou, D. Zschiesche, S. Schramm, J. Schaffner-Bielich, H. Stoecker, and W. Greiner, Phys. Rev. C 59, 411 (1999), arXiv:nucl-th/9806087.
- [10] L. Bonanno and A. Drago, Phys. Rev. C 79, 045801 (2009), arXiv:0805.4188 [nucl-th].
- [11] A. W. Steiner, M. Hempel, and T. Fischer, Astrophys. J. 774, 17 (2013), arXiv:1207.2184 [astro-ph.SR].
- [12] M. Dutra, O. Lourenço, S. S. Avancini, B. V. Carlson, A. Delfino, D. P. Menezes, C. Providência, S. Typel, and J. R. Stone, Phys. Rev. C 90, 055203 (2014), arXiv:1405.3633 [nuclth].
- [13] D. Bizarro, A. Rabhi, and C. Providência, Effect of the symmetry energy and hyperon interaction on neutron stars (2015), arXiv:1502.04952 [nucl-th].
- [14] S. Kubis and M. Kutschera, Phys. Lett. B 399, 191 (1997), arXiv:astro-ph/9703049.
- [15] B. Liu, V. Greco, V. Baran, M. Colonna, and M. Di Toro, Phys. Rev. C 65, 045201 (2002), arXiv:nucl-th/0112034.
- [16] R. O. Gomes, V. Dexheimer, S. Schramm, and C. A. Z. Vasconcellos, Astrophys. J. 808, 8 (2015), arXiv:1411.4875 [astroph.SR].
- [17] D. P. Menezes and C. Providencia, Phys. Rev. C 70, 058801 (2004).
- [18] S. M. A. Imam, N. K. Patra, C. Mondal, T. Malik, and B. K. Agrawal, Phys. Rev. C 105, 015806 (2022), arXiv:2110.15776 [nucl-th].
- [19] T. Malik, B. K. Agrawal, and C. Providência, Phys. Rev. C 106, L042801 (2022), arXiv:2206.15404 [nucl-th].
- [20] M. W. Coughlin and T. Dietrich, Phys. Rev. D 100, 043011 (2019), arXiv:1901.06052 [astro-ph.HE].
- [21] S. Wesolowski, N. Klco, R. J. Furnstahl, D. R. Phillips, and A. Thapaliya, J. Phys. G 43, 074001 (2016), arXiv:1511.03618

10.54499/2022.06460.PTDC. The authors acknowledge the Laboratory for Advanced Computing at the University of Coimbra for providing HPC resources that have contributed to the research results reported within this paper, URL: https://www.uc.pt/lca. V. D. acknowledges support from the Fulbright U.S. Scholar Program and the National Science Foundation under grants PHY1748621, MUSES OAC-2103680, and NP3M PHY-2116686.

[nucl-th].

- [22] R. J. Furnstahl, N. Klco, D. R. Phillips, and S. Wesolowski, Phys. Rev. C 92, 024005 (2015), arXiv:1506.01343 [nucl-th].
- [23] G. Ashton *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Suppl. **241**, 27 (2019), arXiv:1811.02042 [astro-ph.IM].
- [24] P. Landry, R. Essick, and K. Chatziioannou, Phys. Rev. D 101, 123007 (2020), arXiv:2003.04880 [astro-ph.HE].
- [25] C. Huang, G. Raaijmakers, A. L. Watts, L. Tolos, and C. Providência, (2023), arXiv:2303.17518 [astro-ph.HE].
- [26] P. Char, C. Mondal, F. Gulminelli, and M. Oertel, Phys. Rev. D 108, 103045 (2023), arXiv:2307.12364 [nucl-th].
- [27] S. M. A. Imam, T. Malik, C. Providência, and B. K. Agrawal, (2024), arXiv:2401.06018 [nucl-th].
- [28] S. Huth *et al.*, Nature **606**, 276 (2022), arXiv:2107.06229 [nucl-th].
- [29] A. Kurkela, E. S. Fraga, J. Schaffner-Bielich, and A. Vuorinen, Astrophys. J. 789, 127 (2014), arXiv:1402.6618 [astro-ph.HE].
- [30] T. E. Riley *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Lett. **887**, L21 (2019), arXiv:1912.05702 [astro-ph.HE].
- [31] T. E. Riley *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Lett. **918**, L27 (2021), arXiv:2105.06980 [astro-ph.HE].
- [32] M. C. Miller *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Lett. **887**, L24 (2019), arXiv:1912.05705 [astro-ph.HE].
- [33] M. C. Miller *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Lett. **918**, L28 (2021), arXiv:2105.06979 [astro-ph.HE].
- [34] D. Choudhury, T. Salmi, S. Vinciguerra, T. E. Riley, Y. Kini, A. L. Watts, B. Dorsman, S. Bogdanov, S. Guillot, P. S. Ray, D. Reardon, R. A. Remillard, A. V. Bilous, D. Huppenkothen, J. M. Lattimer, Z. Arzoumanian, K. Gendreau, S. M. Morsink, and W. C. Ho, Astrophysical Journal Letters, submitted (2024).
- [35] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), Phys. Rev. Lett. 121, 161101 (2018), arXiv:1805.11581 [gr-qc].
- [36] C. Y. Tsang, M. B. Tsang, W. G. Lynch, R. Kumar, and C. J. Horowitz, Nature Astronomy 8, 328 (2024).
- [37] V. Dexheimer and S. Schramm, Astrophys. J. 683, 943 (2008), arXiv:0802.1999 [astro-ph].
- [38] R. Kumar, Y. Wang, N. C. Camacho, A. Kumar, J. Noronha-Hostler, and V. Dexheimer, Modern nuclear and astrophysical constraints of dense matter in a renormalized chiral approach (2024), arXiv:2401.12944 [nucl-th].
- [39] V. Dexheimer, R. Negreiros, and S. Schramm, Phys. Rev. C 92, 012801 (2015), arXiv:1503.07785 [astro-ph.HE].
- [40] V. Dexheimer, R. de Oliveira Gomes, S. Schramm, and H. Pais, J. Phys. G 46, 034002 (2019), arXiv:1810.06109 [nucl-th].
- [41] V. Dexheimer, R. O. Gomes, T. Klähn, S. Han, and M. Salinas, Phys. Rev. C 103, 025808 (2021), arXiv:2007.08493 [astroph.HE].
- [42] O. Komoltsev and A. Kurkela, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 202701 (2022), arXiv:2111.05350 [nucl-th].

- [43] S. Vinciguerra *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **961**, 62 (2024), arXiv:2308.09469 [astro-ph.HE].
- [44] T. Salmi *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **941**, 150 (2022), arXiv:2209.12840 [astro-ph.HE].
- [45] LVK collaboration, https://dcc.ligo.org/ LIGO-P1800115/public.
- [46] M. Agathos, J. Meidam, W. Del Pozzo, T. Li, M. Tompitak, J. Veitch, S. Vitale, and C. Van Den Broeck, Physical Review D 92, 10.1103/physrevd.92.023012 (2015).
- [47] D. Wysocki, R. O'Shaughnessy, L. Wade, and J. Lange, arXiv e-prints (2020).
- [48] B. Biswas, P. Char, R. Nandi, and S. Bose, Phys. Rev. D 103, 103015 (2021), arXiv:2008.01582 [astro-ph.HE].
- [49] https://zenodo.org/records/4697625.
- [50] https://zenodo.org/records/4670689.
- [51] H. Mueller and B. D. Serot, Nucl. Phys. A 606, 508 (1996), arXiv:nucl-th/9603037.
- [52] J. Carriere, C. J. Horowitz, and J. Piekarewicz, Astrophys. J. 593, 463 (2003), arXiv:nucl-th/0211015.
- [53] F. J. Fattoyev and J. Piekarewicz, Phys. Rev. C 82, 025805 (2010), arXiv:1003.1298 [nucl-th].
- [54] R. Cavagnoli, D. P. Menezes, and C. Providencia, Phys. Rev. C 84, 065810 (2011), arXiv:1108.1733 [hep-ph].
- [55] T. Malik, M. Ferreira, M. B. Albino, and C. Providência, Phys. Rev. D 107, 103018 (2023), arXiv:2301.08169 [nucl-th].
- [56] L.-V.-K. Collaboration, LIGO Document P2300352-v9 (2024).
- [57] P. Danielewicz and J. Lee, Nucl. Phys. A 922, 1 (2014),

arXiv:1307.4130 [nucl-th].

- [58] R. C. Tolman, Phys. Rev. 55, 364 (1939).
- [59] J. R. Oppenheimer and G. M. Volkoff, Phys. Rev. 55, 374 (1939).
- [60] S. Goriely, N. Chamel, and J. M. Pearson, Phys. Rev. C 88, 061302 (2013).
- [61] E. Annala, T. Gorda, A. Kurkela, J. Nättilä, and A. Vuorinen, Nature Phys. 16, 907 (2020), arXiv:1903.09121 [astro-ph.HE].
- [62] E. Annala, T. Gorda, E. Katerini, A. Kurkela, J. Nättilä, V. Paschalidis, and A. Vuorinen, Multimessenger constraints for ultra-dense matter (2021), arXiv:2105.05132 [astro-ph.HE].
- [63] R. Somasundaram, I. Tews, and J. Margueron, Perturbative QCD and the Neutron Star Equation of State (2022), arXiv:2204.14039 [nucl-th].
- [64] Y. Fujimoto, K. Fukushima, L. D. McLerran, and M. Praszalowicz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **129**, 252702 (2022), arXiv:2207.06753 [nucl-th].
- [65] C. A. Raithel and E. R. Most, Phys. Rev. Lett. 130, 201403 (2023), arXiv:2208.04294 [astro-ph.HE].
- [66] R. Essick, I. Legred, K. Chatziioannou, S. Han, and P. Landry, Phys. Rev. D 108, 043013 (2023), arXiv:2305.07411 [astroph.HE].
- [67] E. Annala, T. Gorda, J. Hirvonen, O. Komoltsev, A. Kurkela, J. Nättilä, and A. Vuorinen, Nature Commun. 14, 8451 (2023), arXiv:2303.11356 [astro-ph.HE].
- [68] J. R. Stone, N. J. Stone, and S. A. Moszkowski, Phys. Rev. C 89, 044316 (2014), arXiv:1404.0744 [nucl-th].