# Properties of quark stars based on the density-dependent MIT bag model

Min Ju,<sup>1, \*</sup> Pengcheng Chu,<sup>2,†</sup> Xuhao Wu,<sup>3,‡</sup> and He Liu<sup>2,§</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Science, China University of Petroleum(East China), Qinqdao 266580, China

Qingdao University of Technology, Qingdao 266033, China

<sup>3</sup>Key Laboratory for Microstructural Material Physics of Hebei Province,

School of Science, Yanshan University, Qinhuangdao 066004, China

In this study, we extend the MIT bag model by incorporating the vector interaction among quarks and introducing a density-dependent bag pressure. Then we proceed to investigate the thermodynamic properties of strange quark matter (SQM) and pure up-down quark matter (udQM) in quark stars. The results demonstrate that the vector interaction among quarks and the density-dependent bag pressure have significant impacts on the equation of state for both SQM and udQM. The inclusion of  $G_V$ , which represents the strength of vector interactions, results in a stiffening of equation of state while maintaining causality. This allows for the description of massive compact stars such as those observed in GW190814 and PSR J0740+6620 as quark stars. Ultimately, we utilize the vMIT bag model to derive a series of mass-radius relations of quark stars (QSs) which is consistent with the astronomical observations from HESS J1731-347, 4U 1702-429, PSR J0740+6620, GW170817 and GW190814.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

According to the quantum chromodynamics (QCD) theory, the deconfinement of quark matter is anticipated to occur at high temperatures and high densities. At zero or low temperatures, deconfined quark matter may exist in the core of massive compact stars, such as neutron stars (NSs), where it becomes energetically favorable over hadronic matter. Moreover, Bodmer and Witten proposed that the ordinary matter we know, composed of protons and neutrons may be only meta-stable [1]. The true ground state of strongly interacting matter would therefore consist of strange quark matter (SQM), which in turn is composed of deconfined up, down and strange quarks [2, 3]. If this is true, once the core of the star transitions to the quark phase, the entire star will undergo a conversion into what is known as a QS in a short time [4].

Hundreds of works on the phenomenological models of strongly interacting matter have been done during the past decades [5–7], which have traditionally involved a degree of model dependence. From the recent astronomical observations, massive pulsars [8, 9] (whose star mass is larger than 2  $M_{\odot}$ ) have been detected, which implies that the EOS of the star matter should be very stiff. In 2021, the mass of PSR J0740+6620 which as the most massive precisely observed pulsar, has been updated as 2.08 ± 0.07  $M_{\odot}$  [10–12]. In 2020, the LIGO/Virgo Collaborations declared that the mass of the secondary component in the newly discovered compact binary merger GW190814 [13] could range from 2.50  $M_{\odot}$  to 2.67  $M_{\odot}$  at a 90% credible level. This imposes stringent constraints on equation of state (EOS) of strongly interacting matter, especially when considering the secondary component of GW190814 as a candidate for a compact star. The observational constraints on the mass and radius are critical for our investigation into the properties of compact stars. The circumferential radius and gravitational mass of the compact star in 4U 1702-429 are estimated as  $R = 12.4 \pm 0.4$  km and  $M = 1.9 \pm 0.3 M_{\odot}$ , respectively [14]. In a very recent study from Ref. [15], the authors provide estimates for the radius and mass of the central compact object within the supernova remnant HESS J1731-347 as  $R = 10.4^{+0.86}_{-0.78}$  km and  $M = 0.77^{+0.20}_{-0.17} M_{\odot}$ , based on Gaia observations. Compact stars typically encompass neutron star (NS), quark stars (QS), and hybrid star (HS). We can not rule out any of them based on our current observational constraints. If one considered the supermassive compact stars as QSs, the observations may rule out some of the conventional phenomenological models of quark matter, whereas there still exist some other models which are able to reproduce massive QSs [16-20]. The possible existence of QS is still one of the most important fields of modern nuclear physics and astrophysics [21, 22].

There have been some models used to approach the Bodmer and Witten conjecture, the first of them being the original MIT bag model [23, 24]. More sophisticated treatments for SQM, based on the Nambu-Jona-Lasinio (NJL) [25–27] and the quark-mass density dependent (QMDD) [28, 29] models have also been used to this same purpose. Regarding the original version of the MIT bag model, it was shown it is not able to reproduce massive stars. Some modifications have been made to address this limitation, including the incorporation of a repulsive interaction [30–35]. This modification aims to better describe the properties of massive NS detected in the last decade or so, and it is referred to as the vector MIT (vMIT) bag model. It is well known that the MIT

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>The Research Center for Theoretical Physics, Science School,

<sup>\*</sup>Electronic address: jumin@upc.edu.cn

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Electronic address: kyois@126.com

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>‡</sup>Electronic address: wuhaoysu@ysu.edu.cn

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>§</sup>Electronic address: liuhe@qut.edu.cn

bag model is characterized by the bag pressure B which is actually the energy density difference between the perturbative vacuum and the true vacuum [36, 37]. From Refs. [38, 39], the bag constant, which plays a pivotal role in providing the confinement of quarks at low density, is set as  $B^{1/4} \sim (100\text{-}300)$  MeV, while  $B^{1/4} \sim 210$  MeV is predicted by Lattice QCD (LQCD) calculations in [40]. Moreover,  $B^{1/4}$  is constrained by the tidal deformability from GW170817 observation as  $B^{1/4} = (134.1 - 141.4)$ MeV and  $B^{1/4} = (126.1 - 141.4)$  MeV for the low-spin case and high-spin case within MIT bag model, respectively [41]. As density increases, an anticipated deconfinement transition from hadrons to quarks is expected which implies that the bag constant B should be densitydependent in order to vanish the bag pressure at high density.

In the present work, we develop the MIT bag model to describe QSs while the effective bag constant B is considered to have density dependence, following a Gaussian distribution as in Refs. [42, 43]. The dependence involves the values of  $B_{as}$  at asymptotic densities and the damped exponential  $\beta$ . In Ref. [37], the parameters are fixed by considering the result of the energy density from the hadron-quark transition predicted by European Organization for Nuclear Research-Super Proton Synchrotron (CERN-SPS). Obviously, the parameter values considered in the context of hadron-quark phase transition, are not suitable for explaining the EOS of QSs [37]. In our investigation, we concentrate primarily on examining the impact of a density-dependent bag pressure and the vector interactions among quarks on the properties of QSs.

This paper is organized in the following way. The framework of vMIT bag model and the details to calculate the properties of QSs are presented in Section II. The effects of density-dependent bag pressure and the vector interaction strength are shown and discussed in Section III. Finally, the conclusions are provided at the end of the manuscript.

## **II. THE THEORETICAL FORMALISM**

#### A. Vector MIT model

The MIT bag model is employed to describe pure quark matter where the quarks are confined within the "colorless" region commonly referred to as the "bag" that corresponds to an infinity potential. A key feature of this model is a specific bag constant which is often taken as a free parameter whose value has a wide variation in literature. However, it is already known that the original MIT bag model with constant bag pressure cannot satisfy the observational constraints from massive pulsars in case of QSs [35] unless repulsive or perturbative corrections are included.

In this work, we consider the vMIT bag model by including the vector interaction with a vector meson of mass  $m_V$ , which can be inferred from the  $\omega$  meson from Quantum Hadron Dynamics (QHD) [44]. The Lagrangian density of vMIT bag model in the mean-field approximation is expressed as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=u,d,s} \left[ \bar{\psi}_i \left( i \gamma_\mu \partial^\mu - m_i - g_{iiV} \gamma_\mu V^\mu \right) \psi_i + \frac{1}{2} m_V^2 V_\mu V^\mu - B \right] \Theta(\bar{\psi}_i \psi_i) + \sum_{l=e,\mu} \bar{\psi}_l \left( i \gamma_\mu \partial^\mu - m_l \right) \psi_l, \qquad (1)$$

where  $m_i$  is the mass of the quark *i* of flavor *u*, *d* and *s*. Here we use the current quark masses  $m_u = m_d = 5.5$  MeV and  $m_s = 95$  MeV in our calculations;  $\psi_i$  is the Dirac quark field, *B* is the vacuum pressure, and  $\Theta(\bar{\psi}_i\psi_i)$  is the Heaviside step function to assure that the quarks only exist confined to the bag. Leptons are added to account for the  $\beta$  equilibrium matter. The interaction among quarks is mediated by the massive vector channel  $V_{\mu}$ .

Then we can get the eigenvalue energy of quarks and the equation of motion for the V field, respectively,

$$\epsilon_i = \sqrt{m_i^2 + k^2} + g_{iiV}V^0, \qquad (2)$$

$$m_V^2 V^0 = \sum_{i=u,d,s} g_V \langle \bar{\psi}_i \gamma^0 \psi_i \rangle.$$
 (3)

where the term  $\langle \bar{\psi}_i \gamma^0 \psi_i \rangle$  can be interpreted as the number density  $n_i$  for each *i* flavor of quarks. Regarding the introduction, we have utilized density-dependent bag constants, as outlined in the Refs. [36, 37] which introduces density dependence in the bag pressure. Then the density dependent bag pressure, denoting as  $B(n_b)$ , assumes finite values  $B_0$  at  $n_b = 0$  and  $B_{as}$  at asymptotic densities. The density dependence of *B* is modeled by Gaussian distribution parameterized by  $B_0$ ,  $B_{as}$  and  $\beta$ ,

$$B(n_b) = B_0 - (B_0 - B_{as})(1 - \exp(\beta(\frac{n_b}{n_0})^2)), \quad (4)$$

where the parameter  $\beta$  governs the gradual decrease of B as density increases.  $n_0$  is the empirical nuclear matter saturation point and we set  $n_0 = 0.15 \text{ fm}^{-3}$  in our calculation in order to describe the weak charge and baryon density profiles of <sup>208</sup>Pb as well as its experimental charge density profile, based on the PREX-2 result as in the Ref. [45]. The utilization of Gaussian function to capture the density dependence invokes the asymptotic behavior of the quarks at high densities which may significantly affect the the structural properties of QSs. The potential of *i* quark is given by

$$\mu_{i} = \sqrt{k_{Fi}^{2} + m_{i}^{2}} + g_{iiV}V_{0}$$
  
-  $2\beta(B_{0} - B_{as})\frac{n_{b}}{3n_{0}^{2}}e^{-\beta(\frac{n_{b}}{n_{0}})^{2}}.$  (5)

The total energy density and and pressure in quark mat-

ter are calculated as follows:

$$\varepsilon_{\rm QP} = \sum_{i=u,d,s} \varepsilon_{\rm FG}^{i} + \sum_{l=e,\mu} \varepsilon_{\rm FG}^{l} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{g_{iiV}}{m_V}\right)^2 (n_u + n_d + n_s)^2 + B, \quad (6)$$

$$P_{\rm QP} = \sum_{i=u,d,s} P_{\rm FG}^{i} + \sum_{l=e,\mu} P_{\rm FG}^{l}$$

$$P_{\rm FG} = \sum_{i=u,d,s} P_{\rm FG}^{*} + \sum_{l=e,\mu} P_{\rm FG}^{*} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{g_{iiV}}{m_V}\right)^2 (n_u + n_d + n_s)^2 - B, \quad (7)$$

where  $\varepsilon_{FG}^{i}$  and  $P_{FG}^{i}$  denote the Fermi gas contributions of species *i* with a mass  $m_i$  and degeneracy  $N_i$ ,

$$\varepsilon_{\rm FG}^{i} = N_{i} \int_{0}^{k_{F}^{i}} \frac{d^{3}k}{(2\pi)^{3}} \sqrt{k^{2} + m_{i}^{2}},$$
(8)

$$P_{\rm FG}^{i} = \frac{N_i}{3} \int_0^{k_F^{i}} \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{k^2}{\sqrt{k^2 + m_i^2}}.$$
 (9)

For the quark flavor i, the degeneracy  $N_i = 6$  arises from the spin and color degrees of freedom while for leptons,  $N_i = 2$  only from the spin degrees of freedom. The energy per baryon is expressed by

$$E/A = \frac{\varepsilon_{\rm QP}}{n_b}.$$
 (10)

Two other important quantities  $X_V$  and  $G_V$ , as suggested in Ref. [35], are defined as,

$$X_V = \frac{g_{ssV}}{g_{uuV}}, \quad G_V = \left(\frac{g_{uuV}}{m_V}\right)^2. \tag{11}$$

 $X_V$  is related to the strength of the vector field with the s quark in relation to u and d quarks.  $X_V = 1.0$  is usually found in Refs. [33, 35, 46, 47] which supports more massive QSs. Meanwhile the vector interactions among quarks which is denoted by  $G_V$ , are crucial for high density EOS of QSs. Furthermore, we vary the vector coupling  $G_V = 0, 0.1, 0.2$  and 0.3 fm<sup>2</sup> in order to examine the impact of vector interactions.

### B. Quark Star

In the present work, we select  $B_{as}$  and  $\beta$  as free parameters to investigate their influence on the properties of QSs. The Bodmer-Written conjecture posits that at high density, the presence of strange quark turns the deconfined quark matter into the true ground state of strong interaction by reducing its binding energy. This conjecture can be succinctly summarized as ensuring the binding energy of iron is lower than that of pure u, d quark matter (udQM), but higher than that of strange quark matter (SQM). When these constraints are imposed on the parameters  $B_{as}$  and  $\beta$ , they provide with the stability window of the model.

$$n_e + n_\mu = \frac{1}{3}(2n_u - n_d - n_s),$$
 (12)

$$\mu_d = \mu_s = \mu_u + \mu_e; \quad \mu_e = \mu_\mu.$$
(13)

To calculate the structures and tidal deformability of QSs, we briefly introduce the relevant equations. To derive the structural properties of QSs, one must solve the Tolman-Oppenheimer-Volkov (TOV) equations,

$$\frac{dP}{dr} = -\frac{[P(r) + \varepsilon(r)][M(r) + 4\pi r^3 P(r)]}{r(r + 2GM(r))},$$
(14)

with the subsidiary condition,

$$\frac{dM(r)}{dr} = 4\pi r^2 \varepsilon(r). \tag{15}$$

Dimensionless tidal deformability is denoted as

$$\Lambda = \frac{2}{3}k_2C^{-5},\tag{16}$$

where  $C = \frac{M}{R}$  is the compactness and  $k_2$  is the gravitational Love number with its value usually in the range of 0.2-0.3 [48–50]. Then we could get the maximum mass of QSs numerically which is closely related to the speed of sound.  $c_s^2 = \partial P(r)/\partial \varepsilon(r)$  denotes the squared speed of sound which provides valuable insights into the microscopic description of dense matter. As recently pointed out in Ref. [1] the speed of sound of the quark matter is strongly associated with the mass and radius of the quark core in hybrid stars.

# **III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

In this section, we explore the properties of QS using the density-dependent vMIT bag model, with a Gaussian distribution for the bag constant  $B(n_b)$  following Eq. (4). Three key parameters, namely  $B_0$ ,  $B_{as}$  and  $\beta$ , govern the variations in this model. We start with concentrating on the density dependent scenario of bag pressure. In Fig. 1 we show the variation of bag pressure  $B(n_b)$  with densities for different values of  $B_{as}$  and  $\beta$ , individually. As mentioned in the above section, we mainly choose  $B_0^{1/4}$ = 210.854 MeV which is predicted from LQCD calculation, the same is reflected in Fig. 1. In the left panel of Fig. 1, we show the bag pressure as a function of  $n_b$  at  $B_{as}$ =40 MeV fm<sup>-3</sup> with different  $\beta$ . As the parameter  $\beta$  increases, the rate of decay for  $B(n_b)$  speeds up at low densities. In particular, the bag pressure can even decrease to the asymptotic freedom bag constant  $B_{as}$  at  $n_b \approx 0.3 \text{ fm}^{-3}$  when  $\beta = 1.2$ , which indicates a very strong density dependence of the bag pressure with  $\beta$  in vMIT bag model. When  $B_{as}$  is fixed,  $\beta$  causes a more pronounced change in  $B(n_b)$  at lower densities while



FIG. 1: (Color online) (a) Variation of bag pressure  $B(n_b)$  with respect to density  $n_b$  for different  $\beta$  by fixing  $B_{as} = 40$  MeV fm<sup>-3</sup>. (b) Variation of bag pressure with density for different values of  $B_{as}$  fixing  $\beta = 0.5$  and  $B_0^{1/4} = 210.854$  MeV for both panels.

its effect on  $B(n_b)$  becomes minimal at higher densities (specifically after  $n_b$  surpasses 0.52 fm<sup>-3</sup>). Furthermore, when  $\beta$  exceeds 0.8, the impact on  $B(n_b)$  at lower densities also becomes less significant. In the right panel, we show the results from different  $B_{as} = 20$ , 30, 40 and 50 MeV fm<sup>-3</sup> when fixing  $\beta = 0.5$ . We found that the decrease in  $B(n_b)$  occurs more rapidly as the value of  $B_{as}$ decreases. Moreover,  $B_{as}$  exerts a pronounced effect on  $B(n_b)$  particularly when the value of  $n_b$  exceeds 0.2 fm<sup>-3</sup>. In summary, both parameters ( $B_{as}$  and  $\beta$ ) contribute to a variation of  $B(n_b)$  as  $n_b$  increases.

In Fig. 2, we present the energy per baryon (E/A) and the pressure (P) for both SQM and udQM as functions of baryon number density  $(n_b)$  with the vector couping  $G_V = 0.3 \text{ fm}^2$ . The black solid line represents the results for udQM while the red dashed lines represent for SQM. According to the Bodmer-Witten conjecture, if the true ground state of strongly interacting matter consists of SQM, this implies that the minimum energy per baryon for SOM is lower than the energy of udOM. From Fig. 2. it's evident that the baryon density where the minimum energy per baryon occurs corresponds exactly to the zeropressure point density across all cases, ensuring thermodynamic self-consistency. In the left panel, with  $B_{as} = 30$ MeV fm<sup>-3</sup> and  $\beta = 0.45$ , the minimum energy per baryon for SQM is approximately 930 MeV. This is attributed to the fact that  $\beta\,=\,0.45$  represents the lower limit in the case of  $B_{as} = 30 \text{ MeV fm}^{-3}$ , as will be illustrated in Fig. 3. Furthermore, it can be discerned that the minimum energy per baryon of SQM with  $G_V = 0$  is notably less than when  $G_V = 0.3 \text{ fm}^2$  which implies that the presence of interaction among quarks leads to a significant stiffening of EOS. As depicted in the middle panel, the upper limit is denoted by  $\beta = 1.05$ , the minimum energy per baryon for udQM is approximately 930 MeV which

means the upper limitation of  $\beta$  for  $B_{as} = 30 \text{ MeV fm}^{-3}$ case. In comparing the left two panels, the results indicate that one can adjust  $\beta$  from the lower limitation case (when the minimum energy of the SQM increases to 930 MeV) to the upper limitation (when the minimum energy per baryon of the udQM decreases to 930 MeV), which is consistent with the result that  $B(n_b)$  decreases with  $\beta$  from Fig. 1. In addition,  $\beta$  has a obvious effect on the zero-pressure point density. Furthermore, one can also find that the energy per baryon for both SQM and udQM increases with  $B_{as}$  from the middle and right panels where  $\beta$  is fixed at 1.05, which is consistent with the analytic form of the energy density in Eq. (6), and the baryon density of the zero pressure point (which can also be considered as the surface density of QSs) hardly increases with the increment of  $B_{as}$ .

In Fig. 3, we draw the stability region for  $\beta$  and  $B_{as}$  based on the conditions which require the energy per baryon in charge neutral 3 flavor SQM is lower than that in 2 flavor udQM. Furthermore, we also show the vector interaction effects in two scenarios,  $B_0^{1/4} = 210.854$  MeV and  $B_0^{1/4} = 180$  MeV in the two panels. It can be seen from Fig. 3 that the stability window acts very differently with  $G_V$  in both panels, moving towards the top left from  $G_V = 0.2$  fm<sup>2</sup> to  $G_V = 0.3$  fm<sup>2</sup>. As the value of  $B_0^{1/4}$  transitions from 180 to 210.854 MeV, the stability region moving upwards with the increment of  $B_0^{1/4}$ . Moreover, we also find the left boundary of the "forbidden region" for the absolutely stable condition with  $B_{as}$  and  $\beta$ . For the case with  $B_0^{1/4} = 210.854$  MeV and  $G_V = 0.3$  or 0.2 fm<sup>2</sup>, the right boundary of the stability region for  $B_{as}$  is 58 MeV or 64 MeV.

In Fig. 4, we present the EOSs of QS by systematically varying  $B_{as}$ ,  $\beta$ , which is reside within the stability win-



FIG. 2: (Color online) Energy per baryon defined as Eq. (10) and pressure as functions of baryon number density based on the vMIT bag model with density dependent bag pressure for different parameters  $B_{as}$  and  $\beta$  when we set  $B_0^{1/4} = 210.854$  MeV and  $G_V = 0.3$  fm<sup>2</sup>. The black solid line represents the results for udQM while the red dashed line represents for SQM. The purple dot line in the left panel is the result for SQM in the case  $G_V = 0$  when  $B_{as}=30$  MeV fm<sup>-3</sup> and  $\beta=0.45$ . The vertical dash-dot and the dash-dot-dot lines correspond to the lowest energy point of the udQM and SQM, respectively.

dow. The EOS is obtained, and we rigorously examine the structural properties of QSs by varying one parameter at a time while keeping the other one fixed. One can find the EOS becomes stiffer with the decrement of  $B_{as}$ when  $\beta$  is fixed, while the baryon density of the zero pressure point decreases with the increment of  $\beta$  at a fixed  $B_{as}$ . To further illustrate this process, we present the results of the structural properties of QSs, highlighting select combinations of  $(B_{as}, \beta)$  that have been carefully chosen for analysis.

In Fig. 5, we present a series of EOSs based on the vMIT bag model under the case  $B_0^{1/4} = 210.854$  MeV and  $G_V = 0.3$  fm<sup>2</sup>. In each subgraph, the red dash-dot line represents the outcomes corresponding to the lower limit of  $\beta$ , while the black solid line corresponds to the upper limit of  $\beta$ . The green dot line corresponds to the minimum value of  $\beta$  which could satisfy the constraints from HESS J1731-347. Once this curve crosses the HESS J1731-347 constraint, it will satisfy the constraint from

4U 1702-429 based on our model. One can see from Fig. 5 that the maximum mass of QSs increases with  $\beta$  in all the cases, and the maximum mass we listed are all larger than 2.4  $M_{\odot}$ , which indicates that we can employ the vMIT bag model to describe extremely large QS mass by varying  $B_{as}$  and  $\beta$ . Comparing to the parameter space condition showed in the Fig. 3, we find that not all parameters recommended for absolute stability meet the HESS J1731-347 constraint. For instance, the mass-radius lines of QSs cannot pass through the region of HESS J1731-347 until  $\beta$  becomes larger than 0.7 for the case  $B_{as} = 30$ MeV fm<sup>-3</sup> and  $G_V = 0.3$  fm<sup>2</sup>. Meanwhile one should also consider the mass-radius region constraints from the experimental observations labled in Fig. 5; for instance GW170817, 4U 1702-429, and PSR J0740+6620 in this work. In our current study, we demonstrate that the mass-radius relation predicted by the vMIT bag model successfully intersects with the observation-constrained mass region of GW190814, which indicates that one can



FIG. 3: (Color online) The stable parameter space of  $\beta$  and  $B_{as}$  for two choices of  $G_V$  ( $G_V = 0.2, 0.3 \text{ fm}^2$ ) based on the vMIT bag model. The left panel displays the outcomes for  $B_0^{1/4} = 210.854$  MeV, while the right panel corresponds to the results from  $B_0^{1/4} = 180$  MeV.



FIG. 4: (Color online) EOSs of QS matter with density dependent values of bag pressure for various  $(B_{as}, \beta)$ .

describe the secondary component of GW190814 as a QS within vMIT bag model by considering the vector interactions.

The main properties of QS when  $G_V = 0.3 \text{ fm}^2$  are shown in Tab. I, it is easy to find  $\beta$  has a positive effect on the maximum mass of QS while  $B_{as}$  causes an opposite effect. This can be explained from the Fig. 1,  $B(n_b)$  descends more steeply with bigger  $\beta$  and smaller  $B_{as}$ . The EOS becomes more stiffer with faster declined  $B(n_b)$ . We got the maximum value of QS  $(M_{\rm max} \approx 2.88 M_{\odot})$  when  $G_V = 0.3 \text{ fm}^2$  with  $B_{as} = 20 \text{ MeV fm}^{-3}$  and  $\beta = 0.75$ . All the parameter sets we displayed at least support a massive QS heavier than ~  $2.40 M_{\odot}$ . Furthermore, our results also indicates that the central baryon density of the maximum mass of QSs decreases with the increment of the star mass, which is consistent with the conclusion from Ref. [20]. In the subsequent discussion, we explore the impact of varying  $B_{as}$ ,  $B_0$ , and  $G_V$  as depicted in Fig. 6. Notably, smaller values of  $B_{as}$  result in an increased maximum mass of QSs. In the case of  $\beta = 0.7$ , one can find that it does not satisfy the constraint imposed by HESS J1731-347 but still within the constraints from 4U 1702-429, PSR J0740+6620, GW170817 and GW190814 when  $B_{as} > 30 \text{ MeV fm}^{-3}$ . The results from different  $B_0$  are presented in the middle panel, revealing that smaller values of  $B_0$  lead to the formation of larger QS which can be explained from Eq. (4). Additionally, we display the influence from different vector interaction strength  $G_V = 0.0, 0.1, 0.2$  and  $0.3 \text{ fm}^2$  in the right panel. Our results reveal that as the vector coupling  $G_V$ increases, the maximum mass of QS also increases. This can be easily understood from Eq. (9), where the EOS becomes stiffer with a larger  $G_V$  which contributes to the formation of more massive QSs. It is worth mentioning that in the case  $(B_{as} = 30 \text{ MeV fm}^{-3}, \beta = 0.8)$ , the maximum mass of QSs can reach 2.3  $M_{\odot}$  even not considering the vector interaction among quarks.



FIG. 5: (Color online) Mass-radius relations of QSs based on vMIT bag model with varying parameters  $B_{as}$  and  $\beta$  within the stability window. All the results are under the case when  $B_0^{1/4} = 210.854$  MeV and  $G_V = 0.3$  fm<sup>2</sup>. Observational limits imposed from PSR J0740+6620 on maximum mass and radius [11, 12] are also indicated. The mass constraint from GW190814 [13] is depicted by the pink horizontal bar. The red horizontal line with x mark at both ends represents the constraint on R<sub>1.4</sub> inferred from GW170817 [54]. The constraints on M-R plane prescribed from HESS J1731-347 [15, 55] and 4U 1702-429 [14] are also shown for comparison.



FIG. 6: (Color online) Mass-radius relations under different parameter sets of  $B_{as}$ ,  $B_0$  and  $G_V$ .



FIG. 7: (Color online) Dimensionless tidal parameter as a function of the gravitational mass for different parameter combinations  $(B_{as}, \beta)$ . The red vertical line is the constraint  $\Lambda_{1.4} < 800$  from GW170817 [53] observations for the 1.4  $M_{\odot}$ .

In Fig. 7, we present the tidal deformability of QSs within the vMIT bag model from different combinations  $(B_{as}, \beta)$  when fixing  $B_0^{1/4} = 210.854$  MeV and  $G_V = 0.3$  fm<sup>2</sup>. One can find that the impact of the parameters  $B_{as}$  and  $\beta$  on the tidal deformability is noticeable primarily for smaller mass QSs while it becomes indistinguishable once the mass of QSs exceeds 1.6  $M_{\odot}$ . Clearly, the tidal deformability of QSs all satisfy the constraint  $\Lambda_{1.4} < 800$  which is predicted from GW170817 [53]. The consistent outcome was also reported in Ref. [56]. The constraint obtained from GW170817 which allows values between 70 and 580 is not very restrictive to constrain QSs [54].

We illustrate the speed of sound varying with baryon number density in various cases in Fig. 8. In the model presented in this paper, the contribution to EOS is composed of three parts: the quark degeneracy and Fermi kinetic energy, vector interaction potential, and bag pressure  $B(n_b)$ . At high densities, the first part tends towards the conformal limit, while the second part deviates from the conformal limit (gradually increasing). The first two parts both increase with density. On the other hand, the contribution of  $B(n_b)$  decreases with increasing density but is significant at low densities (indeed, the change in EOS is more pronounced at low densities). Therefore, quark confinement seems more like a surface effect rather than an interaction. As we found in Fig. 8,  $B_0$  mainly affects of the speed of sound at low density, while the strength of the vector interaction influences the value of



FIG. 8: (Color online) The speed of sound relative to light with different parameter sets  $(B_{as}, \beta)$ .

| $G_V \ (\mathrm{fm}^2)$ | $B_{as} \; ({\rm MeV} \; {\rm fm}^{-3})$ | $\beta$ | $n_s \ (\mathrm{fm}^{-3})$ | $n_c \ (\mathrm{fm}^{-3})$ | $\epsilon_c \; ({\rm MeV \; fm^{-3}})$ | $M_{\rm max}~(M_\odot)$ | $R_{\rm max}~({\rm km})$ | $R_{1.4}$ (km) | $R_{2.0}$ (km) |
|-------------------------|--|---------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| 0.3                     | 10                                       | 0.30    | 0.42                       | 0.75                       | 820.70                                 | 2.40                    | 11.12                    | 9.73           | 10.78          |
|                         | 10                                       | 0.60    | 0.33                       | 0.70                       | 735.28                                 | 2.90                    | 12.99                    | 10.77          | 12.20          |
| 0.3                     | 20                                       | 0.35    | 0.40                       | 0.87                       | 1024.00                                | 2.47                    | 11.11                    | 9.76           | 0.92           |
|                         | 20                                       | 0.65    | 0.33                       | 0.71                       | 785.78                                 | 2.80                    | 12.74                    | 10.77          | 12.10          |
|                         | 20                                       | 0.75    | 0.31                       | 0.69                       | 745.25                                 | 2.88                    | 13.13                    | 11.11          | 12.4           |
| 0.3                     | 30                                       | 0.45    | 0.37                       | 0.83                       | 975.11                                 | 2.50                    | 11.38                    | 10.09          | 11.29          |
|                         | 30                                       | 0.70    | 0.32                       | 0.76                       | 856.08                                 | 2.69                    | 12.39                    | 10.78          | 12.03          |
|                         | 30                                       | 0.80    | 0.31                       | 0.72                       | 795.77                                 | 2.75                    | 12.73                    | 11.00          | 12.25          |
|                         | 30                                       | 1.05    | 0.29                       | 0.68                       | 734.88                                 | 2.86                    | 13.37                    | 11.46          | 12.78          |
| 0.3                     | 40                                       | 0.60    | 0.34                       | 0.81                       | 945.65                                 | 2.50                    | 11.61                    | 10.35          | 11.52          |
|                         | 40                                       | 0.80    | 0.31                       | 0.76                       | 866.08                                 | 2.60                    | 12.18                    | 10.78          | 11.97          |
|                         | 40                                       | 1.20    | 0.27                       | 0.69                       | 765.25                                 | 2.71                    | 12.94                    | 11.39          | 12.67          |
|                         | 40                                       | 1.90    | 0.24                       | 0.67                       | 724.44                                 | 2.79                    | 13.57                    | 12.05          | 13.50          |
| 0.3                     | 50                                       | 0.85    | 0.32                       | 0.80                       | 935.84                                 | 2.45                    | 11.74                    | 10.63          | 11.77          |
|                         | 50                                       | 1.00    | 0.30                       | 0.77                       | 896.05                                 | 2.50                    | 11.98                    | 10.86          | 12.02          |
|                         | 50                                       | 1.50    | 0.27                       | 0.75                       | 856.04                                 | 2.56                    | 12.43                    | 11.37          | 12.54          |
|                         | 50                                       | 2.00    | 0.24                       | 0.73                       | 835.94                                 | 2.58                    | 12.65                    | 11.67          | 12.83          |

TABLE I: QS main properties for different values of  $B_{as}$  and  $\beta$  in the case  $B_0^{1/4} = 210.854$  MeV.  $n_s$  represents the surface density of the QS, while  $n_c$  and  $\epsilon_c$  denote the central density and the central energy density, respectively.

the speed of sound at high density. Furthermore we discuss the effects from different  $\beta$  and  $B_{as}$ . We found a larger value of  $\beta$  leads to a smaller density associated with the minimum the speed of sound. Simultaneously, the influence of  $B_{as}$  on the speed of sound is only at lower densities and is indistinguishable.

# IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this study, we developed the vMIT bag model by incorporating a density-dependent bag pressure where the Gaussian distribution was used to investigate the properties of QSs. There are three key parameters,  $B_0$ ,  $B_{as}$ and  $\beta$ , which mainly control the density-dependence of the bag pressure. At low densities, the bag pressure is mainly controlled by  $\beta$  while at high densities is primarily affected by  $B_{as}$ . The energy per baryon and the pressure for both SQM and udQM were presented in the Fig. 2. We found that  $B_{as}$  has a positive effect on the energy per baryon while hardly affects the surface density. Then we give the stability window of parameter,  $B_{as}$  and  $\beta$  in Fig. 3 based on the Bodmer-Witten conjecture. We find that there is a maximum boundary of stability region for  $B_{as}$  which is 58 MeV (64 MeV) for the case with  $B_0^{1/4} = 210.854$  MeV and  $G_V = 0.3$  fm<sup>2</sup>  $(0.2 \text{ fm}^2)$ . Moreover we found strong interaction among quarks would make the EOS more stiffer which can also be demonstrated in Fig. 4, and it tends to shift the stability window to upper left corner, corresponding to a larger value of  $\beta$  and smaller  $B_{as}$ .

In Fig. 5, we present a series of EOSs based on the vMIT bag model. There are numerous parameter sets  $(B_{as}, \beta)$  can simultaneously fulfil all the astro-

- E. Annala, T. Gorda, A. Kurkela, J. Nättilä and A. Vuorinen, Nature Phys. 16, 907-910 (2020).
- [2] A. R. Bodmer, Phys. Rev. D 4, 1601-1606 (1971).
- [3] E. Witten, Phys. Rev. D **30**, 272-285 (1984).
- [4] A. V. Olinto, Phys. Lett. B 192, 71 (1987).
- [5] A. W. Steiner, S. Gandolfi, F. J. Fattoyev and W. G. Newton, Phys. Rev. C 91, 015804 (2015).
- [6] J. M. Lattimer and M. Prakash, Phys. Rept. 442, 109-165 (2007).
- [7] F. Özel and P. Freire, Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. 54, 401-440 (2016).
- [8] J. Antoniadis, P. C. C. Freire, N. Wex, T. M. Tauris, R. S. Lynch, et al. Science **340**, 6131 (2013).
- [9] Z. Arzoumanian *et al.* [NANOGrav], Astrophys. J. Suppl. 235, 37 (2018).
- [10] E. Fonseca, H. T. Cromartie, T. T. Pennucci, P. S. Ray, A. Y. Kirichenko, *et al.* Astrophys. J. Lett. **915**, L12 (2021).
- [11] M. C. Miller, F. K. Lamb, A. J. Dittmann, S. Bogdanov, Z. Arzoumanian, *et al.* Astrophys. J. Lett. **918**, L28 (2021).
- [12] T. E. Riley, A. L. Watts, P. S. Ray, S. Bogdanov, S. Guil-

physical constraints while keeping the thermodynamic self-consistency. It is evident that massive QSs prefer a smaller  $B_{as}$  and bigger  $\beta$  in Fig. 5. We got the maximum value of QS  $(M_{\rm max} \approx 2.88 M_{\odot})$  when  $G_V = 0.3$  fm<sup>2</sup> with  $B_{as} = 20$  MeV fm<sup>-3</sup> and  $\beta = 0.75$ . All the parameter sets we displayed at least support a massive QS which heavier than  $\sim 2.40 M_{\odot}$ , according to the Table. I. Furthermore, we explore the impact of varying  $B_{as}$ ,  $B_0$ , and  $G_V$  as depicted in Fig. 6. Significantly, lower values of  $B_{as}$  lead to an increased maximum mass of QSs and similar effects arise from smaller values of  $B_0$ . To complete our analyses, we calculated the tidal deformability of QSs. We saw that the canonical star (with 1.4  $M_{\odot}$ ), if faced as a QS, presents a very small tidal deformability  $(\Lambda_{1.4})$ . In all of our parameter combinations, the tidal deformability is lower than  $150\,$ which satisfys the constraint  $\Lambda_{1.4} < 800$ . As we found in Fig. 8, the variation of the speed of sound is mainly controlled by the bag pressure  $B(n_b)$ .  $B_0$  mainly affects speed of sound at low density, while the strength of  $G_V$ determines the final value of the speed of sound.

#### Acknowledgment

This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants No. 12305148, 11975132, 12205158; the Shandong Natural Science Foundation No. ZR2023QA112, ZR2022JQ04, ZR2021QA037, ZR2019YQ01; Hebei Natural Science Foundation No. A2023203055; Youth Innovation Team Plan Project for Higher Education Institution of Shandong Province No. 2023KJ072.

lot, et al. Astrophys. J. Lett. 918, L27 (2021).

- [13] R. Abbott *et al.* [LIGO Scientific and Virgo], Astrophys. J. Lett. **896**, L44 (2020).
- [14] J. Nättilä, M. C. Miller, A. W. Steiner, J. J. E. Kajava, V. F. Suleimanov, *et al.* Astron. Astrophys. **608**, A31 (2017).
- [15] V. Doroshenko, V. Suleimanov, G. Pühlhofer, A. Santangelo, Nat. Astron. 6, 1444 (2022).
- [16] M. Alford and S. Reddy, Phys. Rev. D 67, 074024 (2003).
- [17] N. Ippolito, M. Ruggieri, D. Rischke, A. Sedrakian and F. Weber, Phys. Rev. D 77, 023004 (2008).
- [18] M. G. Paoli and D. P. Menezes, Eur. Phys. J. A 46, 413-420 (2010).
- [19] P. C. Chu, Y. Y. Jiang, H. Liu, Z. Zhang, X. M. Zhang, et al. Eur. Phys. J. C 81, 569 (2021).
- [20] P. C. Chu, Q. Cao, H. Liu, X. H. Li, M. Ju, et al. Eur. Phys. J. C 83, 858 (2023).
- [21] M. Herzog and F. K. Ropke, Phys. Rev. D 84, 083002 (2011).
- [22] D. Ivanenko and D. F. Kurdgelaidze, Lett. Nuovo Cim. 2, 13-16 (1969).
- [23] A. Chodos, R. L. Jaffe, K. Johnson, C. B. Thorn and

V. F. Weisskopf, Phys. Rev. D 9, 3471-3495 (1974).

- [24] A. Chodos, R. L. Jaffe, K. Johnson and C. B. Thorn, Phys. Rev. D 10, 2599 (1974).
- [25] Y. Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, Phys. Rev. **122**, 345-358 (1961).
- [26] Y. Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, Phys. Rev. 124, 246-254 (1961).
- [27] D. P. Menezes and C. Providencia, Phys. Rev. C 69, 045801 (2004).
- [28] G. N. Fowler, S. Raha and R. M. Weiner, Z. Phys. C 9, 271 (1981).
- [29] P. C. Chu, Y. N. Wang, X. H. Li, H. Liu and J. W. Zhang, Phys. Rev. C 105, 045806 (2022).
- [30] L. L. Lopes, C. Biesdorf, K. D. Marquez and D. P. Menezes, Phys. Scripta 96, 065302 (2021).
- [31] T. Klahn and T. Fischer, Astrophys. J. 810, 134 (2015).
- [32] M. Cierniak, T. Fischer, N. U. Bastian, T. Klähn and M. Salinas, Universe 5, 186 (2019).
- [33] R. O. Gomes, V. Dexheimer, S. Han and S. Schramm, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 485, 4873-4877 (2019).
- [34] R. O. Gomes, P. Char and S. Schramm, Astrophys. J. 877, 139 (2019).
- [35] L. L. Lopes, C. Biesdorf and D. é. P. Menezes, Phys. Scripta 96, 065303 (2021).
- [36] G. F. Burgio, M. Baldo, P. K. Sahu, A. B. Santra and H. J. Schulze, Phys. Lett. B 526, 19-26 (2002).
- [37] G. F. Burgio, M. Baldo, P. K. Sahu and H. J. Schulze, Phys. Rev. C 66, 025802 (2002).
- [38] G. Baym, T. Hatsuda, T. Kojo, P. D. Powell, Y. Song, et al., Rept. Prog. Phys. 81, 056902 (2018).
- [39] M. Buballa, Phys. Rept. 407, 205-376 (2005).
- [40] O. Benhar and R. Rubino, Astron. Astrophys. 434, 247

(2005).

- [41] E. P. Zhou, X. Zhou and A. Li, Phys. Rev. D 97, 083015 (2018).
- [42] G. H. Bordbar, F. Sadeghi, F. Kayanikhoo and A. Poostforush, Indian J. Phys. 95, 1061-1067 (2021).
- [43] T. Miyatsu, M. K. Cheoun and K. Saito, Astrophys. J. 813, 135 (2015).
- [44] B. D. Serot, Rept. Prog. Phys. 55, 1855-1946 (1992).
- [45] T. Miyatsu, M. K. Cheoun, K. Kim and K. Saito, [arXiv:2209.02861 [nucl-th]].
- [46] D. P. Menezes, M. B. Pinto, L. B. Castro, P. Costa and C. Providência, Phys. Rev. C 89, 055207 (2014).
- [47] L. L. Lopes and D. P. Menezes, Eur. Phys. J. A 56, 122 (2020).
- [48] T. Damour and A. Nagar, Phys. Rev. D 80, 084035 (2009).
- [49] T. Hinderer, B. D. Lackey, R. N. Lang and J. S. Read, Phys. Rev. D 81, 123016 (2010).
- [50] S. Postnikov, M. Prakash and J. M. Lattimer, Phys. Rev. D 82, 024016 (2010).
- [51] P. Bedaque and A. W. Steiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 114, 031103 (2015).
- [52] I. Tews, J. Carlson, S. Gandolfi and S. Reddy, Astrophys. J. 860, 149 (2018).
- [53] B. P. Abbott *et al.* [LIGO Scientific and Virgo], Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 161101 (2017).
- [54] B. P. Abbott *et al.* [LIGO Scientific and Virgo], Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 161101 (2018).
- [55] B. Hong and Z. Ren, Phys. Rev. D 109, 023002 (2024).
- [56] S. Podder, S. Pal, D. Sen and G. Chaudhuri, Nucl. Phys. A 1042, 122796 (2024).