

Christian Drischler

Bayesian Inference in Subatomic Physics | September 17, 2019

### This [...] Symposium will facilitate

- **cross-communication** and **potential collaboration** on statistical applications among researchers from mathematics, statistics, and nuclear/particle physics [...]
- try to fill a knowledge gap and provide a unique opportunity for physicists who are unfamiliar with Bayesian methods to start applying them to new problems

Unterstützt von / Supported by

Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung/Foundation







#### **Christian Drischler**

Bayesian Inference in Subatomic Physics | September 17, 2019



(First) Direct detection of gravitational waves



ligo.caltech.edu



multi-messenger astronomy

+ Virgo + GEO600

Nobel Prize 2017



**Binary Neutron-Star Merger** 

 $n \sim (1-10) n_0$ 

Neutron stars



e.g., Watts et al., Rev. Mod. Phys. 88, 021001

#### 1 OUTER CRUST

NUCLEI ELECTRONS

#### 2 | INNER CRUST

NUCLEI ELECTRONS SUPERFLUID NEUTRONS

#### 3 | CORE

SUPERFLUID NEUTRONS SUPERCONDUCTING PROTONS HYPERONS? DECONFINED QUARKS? COLOR SUPERCONDUCTOR?

*R* ~ (10–14) km *M* ~ (1.4–2.0) *M*<sub>sun</sub>

3

 $n_0 \sim 2.7 \cdot 10^{14} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ 



Erler et al., Nature 486, 509–512





see also Hebeler et al., ARNPS 65, 457





Next-generation supercomputers



202 752 CPU Cores 27 648 NVIDIA GPUs 122.3 peta flops

Summit @ ORNL

Truncation errors in effective field theory for infinite nuclear matter Central quantity



### Equation Of State

ground-state energy per particle of a system

$$rac{E}{A}\left(n,\,eta,\,T
ight)$$

total density neutron excess temperature

#### consisting of **Neutron** and **protons**

$$n = n_n + n_p$$

neutron | proton density

$$\beta = \frac{n_n - n_p}{n}$$



Homogeneous nuclear matter



theoretical **testbed** for nuclear forces with important consequences for EOS

saturation point ( $n_0 \sim 0.16 \text{ fm}^{-3}$ ,  $a_v \sim 16 \text{ MeV}$ )

incompressibility (K ~ 240 MeV)

**symmetry energy** ( $E_{sym} \sim 32 \text{ MeV}$ ) and its **slope** ( $L \sim 55 \text{ MeV}$ ) at  $n_0$ 

$$11.1 \,\mathrm{km} \leqslant R_{1.4 \,\mathrm{M}_{\odot}} \leqslant 12.7 \,\mathrm{km}$$

```
Hagen et al., Nat. Phys. 12, 186
```

$$\frac{E}{A}(\beta, n) = \frac{E}{A}(\beta = 0, n) + \beta^2 E_{\text{sym}}(n)$$



Homogeneous nuclear matter







see, e.g., Greif et al., MNRAS 485, 4



#### Mass-radius relation



see, e.g., Greif et al., MNRAS 485, 4







see also Hoppe, CD, Hebeler et al., PRC 100, 024318





Derived quantities: pressure



September 17, 2019 | Bayesian Inference in Subatomic Physics | Christian Drischler | 14

Leonhardt, Pospiech, Schallmo, Braun, CD, Hebeler, Schwenk, arXiv:1907.05814

Acquisition (arbitrary units)

0.20

0.25

0.30

0.15

gp density

0.10

 $P(n, \beta) = n^2 \frac{\partial E/A}{\partial n}(n, \beta)$ 

### EFT seems to match first constraints from QCD at intermediate densities

**Truncation errors in effective field theory for infinite nuclear matter** Hierarchy of nuclear forces in chiral EFT



e.g., Machleidt, Entem, Phys. Rep. 503, 1



#### modern approach to nuclear forces:

- QCD is nonperturbative at the low-energy scales of nuclear physics
- use relevant instead of the fundamental degrees of freedom: *e.g.*, **nucleons** and **pions**
- pion exchanges and short-range contact interactions (∝ LEC)
- systematic expansion enables improvable uncertainty estimates

$$Q = \max\left(\frac{p}{\Lambda_b}, \frac{m_\pi}{\Lambda_b}\right) \sim \frac{1}{3}$$

Weinberg, van Kolck, Kaplan, Savage, Wise, Epelbaum, Kaiser, Krebs, Machleidt, Meißner, ...

Hierarchy of nuclear forces in chiral EFT



e.g., Machleidt, Entem, Phys. Rep. 503, 1





Many new potentials available!



Efficient Monte Carlo framework



CD, Hebeler, Schwenk, PRL 122, 042501



 computational beast: controlled computation of arbitrary interaction or many-body diagrams

Number of diagrams in MBPT



Stevenson, Int. J. Mod. Phys. C 14, 1135

The number of diagrams increases rapidly!



Integer sequence A064732:

Number of labeled Hugenholtz diagrams with *n* nodes.

Number of diagrams in MBPT



Stevenson, Int. J. Mod. Phys. C 14, 1135

The number of diagrams increases rapidly!



Integer sequence A064732:

Number of labeled Hugenholtz diagrams with *n* nodes.



see also Hebeler et al., ARNPS 65, 457



#### Truncation errors in effective field theory for infinite nuclear matter Neutron and nuclear matter at N<sup>3</sup>LO



#### CD, Hebeler, Schwenk, PRL 122, 042501



Neutron and nuclear matter at N<sup>3</sup>LO



CD, Hebeler, Schwenk, PRL 122, 042501



September 17, 2019 | Bayesian Inference in Subatomic Physics | Christian Drischler | 23

Truncation error analysis:  $\Lambda = 450 \text{ MeV}$ 





#### with Melendez, Furnstahl, Phillips



#### Symmetric matter



September 17, 2019 | Bayesian Inference in Subatomic Physics | Christian Drischler | 24

Truncation error analysis:  $\Lambda = 450 \text{ MeV}$ 





with Melendez, Furnstahl, Phillips



Truncation errors in effective field theory for infinite nuclear matter Questions for discussion(s) I



What is the physical interpretation of the correlation length in nuclear matter? Is there a 1:1 mapping from the incompressibility to that correlation length? How could we make use of that information?

Our analysis infers a most probable **expansion parameter**. **Should** one then assume a momentum scale (e.g.,  $k_F$ ) to convert this to a breakdown scale? Or, should one assume a breakdown scale (e.g.,  $\Lambda_b$ ) from an NN analysis and convert the expansion parameter to a momentum scale in infinite matter?

**HOW** should uncertainties from the EOS be propagated to derived quantities, *e.g.*, pressure or speed of sound? Will the use of GPs as interpolants for the EFT coefficients mean that it is easy to reconstruct such quantities which are computed as **derivatives of the EOS**?

Questions for discussion(s) II



What is the 2D 68% confidence region on the saturation point? How does this change if that region is conditioned not just on EDFs, but also on information from *ab initio* calculations?

What would it take to include data on the empirical saturation point, or constraints on the neutron-matter EOS from neutron-star observations, in fits of nuclear forces from chiral EFT?

**HOW** should we **SCORE** different chiral EFT forces against such data? How many orders are enough given the current accuracy of *experimental* constraints on infinite matter? What degrees of freedom, *e.g.*, delta-full vs. chiral EFT, do we need to consider?

**HOW** should we deal with soft potentials that cause suppressed contributions from odd chiral orders? Separate expansions for even | odd orders? What are the implications for truncation errors?



Summary and outlook



Unterstützt von / Supported by

Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung/Foundation



Collaborators: R. Furnstahl J. Melendez D. Phillips K. Hebeler K. McElvain A. Schwenk

