

# Electromagnetic responses of a nonextensive quark-gluon plasma

Bing-feng Jiang,<sup>1,\*</sup> Jun Chen,<sup>1</sup> and De-fu Hou<sup>2,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup> College of Intelligent Systems Science and Engineering,  
Hubei Minzu University, Enshi 445000, People's Republic of China

<sup>2</sup>Key Laboratory of Quark and Lepton Physics (MOE) and Institute of Particle Physics,  
Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079, People's Republic of China

(Dated: August 30, 2024)

According to the nonextensive distribution functions and the gluon polarization tensor obtained from kinetic theory, we derive the longitudinal and transverse gluon self-energies for the quark-gluon plasma. The electric permittivity  $\varepsilon$  and the magnetic permeability  $\mu_M$  are evaluated from the gluon self-energies, through which the real part of the square of the refraction index  $\text{Re } n^2$  and the Depine-Lakhtakia index  $n_{DL}$  are investigated. The real part of  $\varepsilon$  displays a frequency pole  $\omega_d = p$ , which is just the position of the frequency inflexion of the imaginary part of  $\varepsilon$ . The nonextensive parameter  $q$  significantly affects the real and imaginary parts of  $\varepsilon$  in the space-like region  $\omega < p$ . While the frequency pole  $\omega_d = p$  remains unchanged as  $q$  increases. The magnetic permeability,  $\text{Re } n^2$  and the Depine-Lakhtakia index  $n_{DL}$  diverge at frequency  $\omega_m$ . As  $q$  increases, the pole frequency  $\omega_m$  shifts to large frequency region. The Depine-Lakhtakia index  $n_{DL}$  becomes negative in a quite large frequency region  $\omega \in [\omega_c, \omega_m]$ . When  $q$  increases, the frequency range for  $n_{DL} < 0$  becomes wider. Nevertheless, there are no propagating modes for the negative refraction. In addition, as momentum  $p$  increases, the electric permittivity, the magnetic permeability,  $\text{Re } n^2$  and  $n_{DL}$  are sensitive to the change of  $p$ , which indicates the importance of the spatial dispersion in the electromagnetic responses of the QGP.

PACS numbers: 12.38.Mh

## I. INTRODUCTION

People in heavy ion community have expected to seek a special state of matter—quark-gluon plasma(QGP) predicted in quantum chromodynamics(QCD) by colliding two heavy nuclei in terrestrial laboratories. Some groups have applied viscous hydrodynamics to simulate the evolution of the hot dense nuclear matter produced in relativistic heavy ion collisions. The hydrodynamic simulations successfully fit the observables at RHIC and LHC, such as the elliptic flow, the particle spectra, etc.[1–5]. Later, viscous effects on diverse aspects of QGP, such as dilepton production[6], jet quenching[7–10] and the related wakes[11–14], heavy quarkonia dissociation[15], heavy quark transport coefficients[16], chiral magnetic effect[17–19], quark polarization[20] and the related anomalous transport phenomena[21–23], phase transition dynamics[24] and dielectric properties[25, 26], have been extensively addressed in recent years.

However, the hadron spectra in heavy ion collisions are well described by hydrodynamic model at low transverse momentum  $p_T \leq 1.5\text{GeV}$ , especially in peripheral collisions[27]. At high transverse momentum, hydrodynamic simulations predict an exponential behavior, while the experimental data of spectra show up a power-law tail. It is argued that the thermal distributions, asymptotically of exponential in nature, are attributed to the difference in hadron spectra between the hydrodynamic

simulations and the experimental data at high transverse momentum[27].

There has been a great achievement in describing the observables for all considered momentum regions in relativistic heavy ion collisions by applying nonextensive statistics in recent years. The nonextensive statistics has reproduced the hadron spectra the exponential form at low transverse momentum and the power-law tail at high transverse momentum perfectly. It is impressive that the nonextensive approach can describe the experimental data of spectra covering 14 or 15 orders of magnitude from the lowest to the considered highest transverse momentum by using only three input parameters[28–30].

The Boltzmann-Gibbs statistics, which has long been used as a basic and standard framework for thermal physical systems, is inapplicable to systems with long range interactions and correlations, long-time memories, and fractal space-time structure[31, 32]. The nonextensive statistics, also called the nonextensive Tsallis statistics, has been proposed to apply to such systems[33, 34]. In that novel statistics, entropy is not an additive quantity. And  $q$  is the nonextensive parameter, the deviation of  $q$  from unit characters the extent of the nonextensivity of a system. Systems subject to long range interactions and correlations will lead to a nonextensive particle distribution away from the equilibrated thermal distribution[32]. It is reported that the distribution of particles in space plasmas and laboratory plasmas in some cases is indeed not exactly Maxwellian distribution[35–37].

In the context of relativistic heavy ion collisions, the achieved temperature at RHIC and LHC reaches several times of the critical temperature  $T_c$  of transition from the QGP phase to the hadronic phase and vice

\*Electronic address: jiangbf@mails.cnu.edu.cn

†Electronic address: houdf@mail.cnu.edu.cn

versa. At such temperature, quarks will be liberated from the hadron bags, but residual color-Coulomb interaction between constituents lead to a strongly interacting QGP[31, 38–40], where memory effects may not be negligible[31]. In addition, color long-range interaction will cause non-Markovian processes[31]. It is argued in Ref.[41] that there are two-particle long range correlations in heavy ion collisions which result in ridge structure in particle multiplicity distributions. In view of facts mentioned above, there is a natural conjecture that the nonextensive statistics becomes involved in describing the QGP properties.

Though the study on implication of the nonextensive statistics in relativistic heavy ion collisions has become one of hot topics in recent years, the aims have mainly been focused on the nonextensive effects on transverse momentum spectra, radial flow, the EOS of hadronic matter and the QGP, the transition from hadron phase to quark matter phase etc[28, 29, 42–62]. It is of great significance to apply nonextensive distribution functions in the dynamic models to study the properties of the QGP. In recent years, there has been a considerable amount of work that has been carried out along that line. Some groups have derived hydrodynamic equations according to the nonextensive distributions and the kinetic theory[63–65]. It is found that there is a correspondence between the ideal nonextensive hydrodynamics and the usual dissipative hydrodynamics[63]. Then, some people have investigated the shear viscosity, bulk viscosity and other transport coefficients according to the nonextensive hydrodynamics and studied the nonextensive effects on them[63–65]. Alqahtani et al. have developed an anisotropic nonextensive hydrodynamics and studied the time evolution of fluid equations. They found that the nonextensive effects significantly affected the bulk pressure evolution[27]. In addition, the propagation of the nonlinear wave induced by perturbations in QGP has been investigated with the relativistic second order ideal and dissipative hydrodynamics with a nonextensive equation of state[66, 67]. Within the framework of kinetic theory incorporated with the nonextensive distribution functions, Rath et al. have investigated the nonextensive effects on the transport coefficients and the viscous properties of a magnetized hot and dense QCD matter[68, 69]. In spite of the above mentioned achievements, the study of the QGP properties in terms of the dynamical model combined with the nonextensive statistics should be strengthened further.

In the present paper, we will investigate the nonextensive effects on the electric permittivity  $\epsilon$ , the magnetic permeability  $\mu_M$  and the refractive properties of the QGP. By applying the nonextensive distribution functions to the polarization tensor formula derived from the QGP kinetic theory[70], we can obtain the longitudinal and transverse gluon self-energies, through which the electric permittivity, the magnetic permeability, the square of the refractive index  $n^2$  and the Depine-Lakhtakia index  $n_{DL}$  can be derived. Through the se-

quent derivation, the nonextensive parameter  $q$  is embedded in the expressions of these electromagnetic quantities of the QGP. Therefore, one can study the effects of nonextensivity on them.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we will briefly review the formulism for the electric permittivity, the magnetic permeability, the square of the refractive index  $n^2$  and the Depine-Lakhtakia index  $n_{DL}$  in a plasma. In Section 3, in terms of the nonextensive distribution functions and the polarization tension obtained from the QGP kinetic theory, we will derive the electric permittivity, the magnetic permeability,  $n^2$  and  $n_{DL}$ . We will investigate the nonextensive effects on the electromagnetic properties of the QGP in Section 4. Section 5 is summary and remarks.

The natural units  $k_B = \hbar = c = 1$ , the metric  $g_{\mu\nu} = (+, -, -, -)$  and the following notations  $P = (\omega, \mathbf{p})$  are used in the paper.

## II. THE ELECTROMAGNETIC RESPONSES IN A PLASMA

In order to covariantly investigate the electric and magnetic properties in a relativistic plasma, one should introduce a pair of four-vectors  $\tilde{E}^\mu, \tilde{B}^\mu$  in terms of the fluid four-velocity  $u^\nu$

$$\tilde{E}^\mu = u_\nu F^{\nu\mu}, \quad \tilde{B}^\mu = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\nu\lambda\rho\mu} F_{\nu\lambda} u_\rho \quad (1)$$

and

$$F^{\mu\nu} = u^\mu \tilde{E}^\nu - \tilde{E}^\mu u^\nu + \epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} \tilde{B}_\lambda u_\rho, \quad (2)$$

where the Greek index  $\mu$  is not confused with the magnetic permeability  $\mu_M$ . According to Eqs.(1) and (2), one can obtain the Fourier-transformed free action

$$S_0 = -\frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^4 P}{(2\pi)^4} \{ \tilde{E}^\mu(P) \tilde{E}_\mu(-P) - \tilde{B}^\mu(P) \tilde{B}_\mu(-P) \}. \quad (3)$$

Taking into account the finite temperature, quantum correction, the action correction is

$$S_{int} = -\frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^4 P}{(2\pi)^4} A^\mu(-P) \Pi_{\mu\nu}(P) A^\nu(P), \quad (4)$$

where  $A^\mu(P)$  is vector boson field in momentum space, and  $\Pi_{\mu\nu}(P)$  is polarization tensor which embodies the medium effects of plasma. In homogeneous and isotropic medium, the polarization tensor can be divided into longitudinal and transverse parts  $\Pi_{\mu\nu}(P) = \Pi_L(P) P_{\mu\nu}^L(P) + \Pi_T(P) P_{\mu\nu}^T(P)$  with projectors defined as  $P_{00}^T = P_{0i}^T = P_{i0}^T = 0$ ,  $P_{ij}^T = \delta^{ij} - \frac{p^i p^j}{p^2}$ ,  $P_{\mu\nu}^L = \frac{p^\mu p^\nu}{p^2} - g^{\mu\nu} - P_{\mu\nu}^T$  [71, 72]. Thus, the effective action including medium effects is

$$S_{eff} = S_0 + S_{int}, \quad (5)$$

which also can be described as

$$S_{eff} = -\frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^4 P}{(2\pi)^4} [\varepsilon \tilde{E}^\mu(P) \tilde{E}_\mu(-P) - \frac{1}{\mu_M} \tilde{B}^\mu(P) \tilde{B}_\mu(-P)]. \quad (6)$$

In (6),  $\varepsilon$  and  $\mu_M$  represent the electric permittivity and the magnetic permeability respectively which can describe the difference of the electric and magnetic properties of the vector field in the medium and in the vacuum. According to Eqs.(3),(4) and (6), one can obtain the electric permittivity and the magnetic permeability in plasma as following:

$$\varepsilon(\omega, p) = 1 - \frac{\Pi_L(\omega, p)}{P^2}, \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{1}{\mu_M(\omega, p)} = 1 + \frac{P^2 \Pi_T(\omega, p) - \omega^2 \Pi_L(\omega, p)}{p^2 P^2}. \quad (8)$$

We have briefly reviewed the electromagnetic properties in a homogeneous and isotropic plasma, for the detailed derivation, please refer to Refs.[25, 73–76].

The refraction index is a square definition of the electric permittivity and the magnetic permeability as  $n^2 = \varepsilon(\omega, p) \mu_M(\omega, p)$ . The simultaneous change of positive  $\varepsilon$  and  $\mu_M$  to negative  $-\varepsilon$  and  $-\mu_M$  does not change  $n^2$ . Veselago proposed that it corresponds to the transformation of the refraction index from one branch  $n = \sqrt{\varepsilon(\omega, p) \mu_M(\omega, p)}$  to the other  $n = -\sqrt{\varepsilon(\omega, p) \mu_M(\omega, p)}$ , ie, the turn from the general refraction index to the negative one[77]. The physical nature of the negative refraction is that the electromagnetic phase velocity propagates opposite to the energy flow[77–79]. The electric permittivity and the magnetic permeability are generally complex-valued functions of  $\omega$  and  $k$ , such as  $\varepsilon(\omega, p) = \varepsilon_r(\omega, p) + i\varepsilon_i(\omega, p)$ ,  $\mu_M(\omega, p) = \mu_r(\omega, p) + i\mu_i(\omega, p)$ , so does the refraction index  $n$ . According to the phase velocity propagating antiparallel to the energy flow, some authors have derived the criterion for the negative refraction [80]

$$n_{DL} = \varepsilon_r |\mu_M| + \mu_r |\varepsilon| < 0, \quad (9)$$

where  $n_{DL}$  is called Depine-Lakhtakia index.  $n_{DL} < 0$  implies  $\text{Re } n < 0$ , otherwise we will have a normal refraction index. In recent years, there is a number of work has addressed the refractive index in the QGP[25, 75, 76] as well as in strongly coupled and correlation systems[81–93].

### III. THE ELECTRIC PERMITTIVITY AND THE MAGNETIC PERMEABILITY: THE NONEXTENSIVE APPROACH

#### A. The nonextensive distribution functions

In nonextensive statistics, in the case of the vanish chemical potential, the single particle distribution func-

tions for fermions (quarks and antiquarks) and Bosons (gluons) in the QGP can be expressed as[27, 31, 41, 66–69]

$$n_{q,\bar{q}} = \frac{1}{[1 + (q-1)\beta E_k]^{\frac{1}{q-1}} + 1}, \quad (10)$$

$$n_g = \frac{1}{[1 + (q-1)\beta E_k]^{\frac{1}{q-1}} - 1}. \quad (11)$$

$E_k = \sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + m^2}$  is single particle energy with mass  $m$  and  $\beta = \frac{1}{T}$ . The nonextensive distribution is also considered as a nonequilibrium distribution and the nonextensive parameter  $q$  measures the extent of deviation from equilibrated thermal distribution[27, 63, 66–69]. If  $q = 1$ , the nonextensive distribution functions turn to the usual Fermi-Dirac distribution and Bose-Einstein distribution and the entropy recovers the usual additive one.

In relativistic heavy ion collisions, low transverse momentum hadrons show up exponential decay in energy which are produced with the normal kinetic and chemical equilibrium. While high transverse momentum hadrons which are secondary showering products in hard scatterings exhibit power-law tail because of the asymptotic freedom of QCD[28, 30]. Kapusta argued that though the nonextensive single particle distribution functions have been not derived from QCD, they can interpolate between an exponential at low transverse momentum, reflecting the thermal equilibrium, to a power law at high transverse momentum, reflecting the asymptotic freedom of QCD[30].

At high temperature, the usual Fermi-Dirac distribution and Bose-Einstein distribution behaves like the Boltzmann distribution. Eqs.(10)(11) can approximate as[27, 68]

$$n_{q,\bar{q},g} = [1 + (q-1)\beta E_k]^{-\frac{1}{q-1}}. \quad (12)$$

By expanding Eq.(12) around  $q = 1$ , one can get

$$n_{q,\bar{q},g} = e^{-\beta E_k} + \frac{1}{2}(q-1)\beta^2 E_k^2 e^{-\beta E_k} + \dots \quad (13)$$

When  $q = 1$ , Eq.(13) leaves behind the first term which is the Boltzmann distribution exactly.

#### B. The gluon polarization tensor in Kinetic theory

Mrowczynski and Thoma have derived the gluon polarization tensor within the framework of the QGP kinetic theory, which is applicative to a relativistic plasma either in equilibrium but anisotropy caused by external fields or out of equilibrium[70],

$$\Pi^{\mu\nu}(P) = g^2 \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3 2E_k} k^\mu \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{k})}{\partial k_l} [g^{l\nu} - \frac{p^l k^\nu}{k^\sigma p_\sigma + i0^+}]. \quad (14)$$

Because a system in the nonextensive particle distribution can be regarded as some stationary state near the usual equilibrium state[63, 65, 68, 69], (14) should be applicable to a nonextensive QGP system.

In Eq.(14),  $f(\mathbf{k})$  relates to the distribution functions of quark, antiquark and gluon  $n_q(\mathbf{k}), n_{\bar{q}}(\mathbf{k}), n_g(\mathbf{k})$

$$f(\mathbf{k}) = 2N_c n_g(\mathbf{k}) + N_f(n_q(\mathbf{k}) + n_{\bar{q}}(\mathbf{k})). \quad (15)$$

At high temperature, the masses of the medium particles are much less than the temperature, we omit them in the following consideration for simplicity. Therefore, the four momentum of medium particles can be expressed as  $K = (k, \mathbf{k})$  with  $k = |\mathbf{k}|$  and  $V = (1, \frac{\mathbf{k}}{k})$ .

The space parts of the gluon polarization tensor read

$$\Pi^{ij}(P) = -g^2 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} v^i \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{k})}{\partial k^l} [\delta^{lj} + \frac{p^l v^j}{\omega - \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{v} + i0^+}]. \quad (16)$$

There is a large number of literature (please refer to references in reviews[94, 95]) which has focused on the properties of the anisotropic QGP by combining Eq.(16) and Eq.(15) with anisotropic distribution functions. In addition, some people have employed Eq.(16) and Eq.(15) with a distribution function modified by viscosity to study the bulk properties of heavy quark[96–98].

### C. The gluon self-energies and the electromagnetic properties of the QGP

If the expanded nonextensive distribution functions in Eq.(13) are employed in Eq.(15), one can prove

$$\frac{\partial f(\mathbf{k})}{\partial k^l} = \frac{k^l}{k} \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{k})}{\partial k} = v^l \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{k})}{\partial k}. \quad (17)$$

According to Eq.(17), Eq.(16) can be expressed as

$$\Pi^{ij}(P) = m_D^2 \int \frac{d\Omega}{4\pi} v^i v^l \cdot [\delta^{lj} + \frac{p^l v^j}{\omega - \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{v} + i0^+}], \quad (18)$$

$m_D^2$  is the square of Debye mass which is defined as

$$m_D^2 = -\frac{g^2}{2\pi^2} \int_0^\infty k^2 dk \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{k})}{\partial k}. \quad (19)$$

If the nonextensive distribution functions Eq.(13) are adopted in  $f(\mathbf{k})$  in Eq.(19), one can get an analytical result

$$m_{DE}^2 = \frac{2(1 + 3(q-1))(N_c + N_f)}{\pi^2} g^2 T^2. \quad (20)$$

For the detailed derivation please refer to Appendix A. While the usual Fermi-Dirac and Bose-Einstein distribution functions are used in  $f(\mathbf{k})$  in Eq.(19), one can obtain the familiar result of the square of Debye mass

$$m_{DH}^2 = \frac{(2N_c + N_f)}{6} g^2 T^2. \quad (21)$$

The gluon longitudinal and transverse self-energies can be derived in terms of  $\Pi^{ij}(P)$  and the projectors

$$\Pi_L(P) = -\frac{P^2}{p^2} \Pi^{00}(P) = \frac{P^2}{\omega^2} \cdot \frac{p^i p^j}{p^2} \cdot \Pi^{ij}(P), \quad (22)$$

$$\Pi_T(P) = \frac{1}{2} (\delta^{ij} - \frac{p^i p^j}{p^2}) \Pi^{ij}(P). \quad (23)$$

After some algebra, we can obtain the gluon longitudinal and the transverse self-energies

$$\Pi_L(P) = \frac{2(1 + 3(q-1))(N_c + N_f)}{\pi^2} g^2 T^2 \cdot \frac{P^2}{p^2} \cdot [-1 + \frac{\omega}{2p} (\ln |\frac{\omega+p}{\omega-p}| - i\pi\delta(p^2 - \omega^2))], \quad (24)$$

$$\Pi_T(P) = \frac{(1 + 3(q-1))(N_c + N_f)}{\pi^2} g^2 T^2 \cdot [\frac{\omega^2}{p^2} + \frac{\omega(p^2 - \omega^2)}{2p^3} \cdot (\ln |\frac{\omega+p}{\omega-p}| - i\pi\delta(p^2 - \omega^2))]. \quad (25)$$

Substituting the longitudinal and transverse self-energies Eqs.(24)(25) into Eqs.(7)(8), we can obtain the electric permittivity and the magnetic permeability

$$\varepsilon(\omega, p) = 1 + \frac{2(1 + 3(q-1))(N_c + N_f)}{\pi^2} g^2 T^2 \cdot \frac{1}{p^2} [1 - \frac{\omega}{2p} (\ln |\frac{\omega+p}{\omega-p}| - i\pi\delta(p^2 - \omega^2))], \quad (26)$$

$$\mu_M(\omega, p) = \frac{4p^4}{4p^4 + 6m_{DE}^2 \omega^2 + m_{DE}^2 (p^2 - 3\omega^2) \frac{\omega}{p} (\ln |\frac{\omega+p}{\omega-p}| - i\pi\delta(p^2 - \omega^2))}. \quad (27)$$

We have briefly reviewed the determination of the electric permittivity and the magnetic permeability of the




FIG. 1: (color online) The real part of the electric permittivity of a nonextensive QGP. The red, green, dashed-green, blue and dashed-blue curves are for the cases of  $q = 1, 1.05, 1.1, 1.15, 1.2$  respectively. Top panel:  $p = 0.2m_{DH}$ , Middle panel:  $p = 0.25m_{DH}$ , Bottom panel:  $p = 0.3m_{DH}$ .

QGP according to the polarization tensor derived from kinetic theory associated with the nonextensive distribution functions. Through the derivation, the nonextensive parameter  $q$  is encoded in the gluon self-energies, the electric permittivity and the magnetic permeability. Combining with Eqs. (26), (27) and (9), we can study the nonextensive effects on the electromagnetic response properties of the QGP.

#### IV. THE NONEXTENSIVE EFFECTS ON THE ELECTROMAGNETIC PROPERTIES: NUMERICAL RESULTS

In the following, we will regard the nonextensive parameter  $q$  as an input parameter to study its effects on the electromagnetic properties of the QGP. With dif-




FIG. 2: (color online) The imaginary part of the electric permittivity of a nonextensive QGP. The red, green, dashed-green, blue and dashed-blue curves are for the cases of  $q = 1, 1.05, 1.1, 1.15, 1.2$  respectively. Top panel:  $p = 0.2m_{DH}$ , Middle panel:  $p = 0.25m_{DH}$ , Bottom panel:  $p = 0.3m_{DH}$ .

ferent versions of nonextensive distribution and model, people found to fit the RHIC and the LHC experimental data perfectly, the non-extensive parameter  $q$  deviates from unit slightly,  $q \sim [1, 1.22]$ [65]. Numerical results of the electromagnetic responses of the QGP are presented with explicit values of  $q$  in that range. In addition, in numerical analysis, such momenta  $p = 0.2m_{DH}, 0.25m_{DH}, 0.3m_{DH}$  are used to study the  $\omega$ -dependent behavior of the electric permittivity, the magnetic permeability, the real part of the square of the refractive index  $n^2$  and the Depine-Lakhtakia index  $n_{DL}$ .

We plot the real part of the electric permittivity in Fig.1. It is clear that there is a pole for  $\text{Re } \varepsilon$  at frequency  $\omega_d = p$ . In the space-like region  $\frac{\omega}{p} < 1$ , for a small  $\omega$ , the real part of the electric permittivity increases as the increase of the nonextensive parameter  $q$ .  $q$  influences  $\text{Re } \varepsilon$  significantly. As the increase of  $\omega$ , the difference between




FIG. 3: (color online) The real part of the magnetic permeability of a nonextensive QGP. The red, green, dashed-green, blue and dashed-blue curves are for the cases of  $q = 1, 1.05, 1.1, 1.15, 1.2$  respectively. Top panel:  $p = 0.2m_{DH}$ , Middle panel:  $p = 0.25m_{DH}$ , Bottom panel:  $p = 0.3m_{DH}$ .

several nonextensive curves of  $\text{Re } \varepsilon$  becomes smaller and several curves overlap each other for  $\omega$  approaching  $p$ . In the time-like region  $\frac{\omega}{p} > 1$ ,  $\text{Re } \varepsilon$  reduces as the increase of  $q$ .  $q$  has appreciated effects on  $\text{Re } \varepsilon$  for small frequency. As  $\omega$  increases, all  $\text{Re } \varepsilon$  curves turn to unit asymptotically. It should be noted that  $q$  does not change the frequency position of the pole  $\omega_d = p$ . In addition, as shown from top panel to bottom panel, one can see  $\text{Re } \varepsilon$  significantly decreases as momentum increases from  $0.2m_{DH}$  to  $0.3m_{DH}$ . At the frequency pole, the relation  $\frac{\omega}{p} = 1$  remains unchanged when  $p$  varies.

We present the imaginary part of the electric permittivity in Fig.2.  $\varepsilon$  has a nonzero imaginary part in the space-like region  $\frac{\omega}{p} < 1$  which comes from Landau damping. In the time-like region  $\frac{\omega}{p} > 1$ ,  $\text{Im } \varepsilon = 0$ . There is a frequency inflexion for  $\text{Im } \varepsilon$  located at  $\omega_d = p$  which




FIG. 4: (color online) The imaginary part of the magnetic permeability of a nonextensive QGP. The red, green, dashed-green, blue and dashed-blue curves are for the cases of  $q = 1, 1.05, 1.1, 1.15, 1.2$  respectively. Top panel:  $p = 0.2m_{DH}$ , Middle panel:  $p = 0.25m_{DH}$ , Bottom panel:  $p = 0.3m_{DH}$ .

is just the pole frequency of  $\text{Re } \varepsilon$ . In the space-like region  $\frac{\omega}{p} < 1$ , the nonextensive parameter  $q$  enhances the imaginary part of the electric permittivity. While in the time-like region  $\frac{\omega}{p} > 1$ ,  $\text{Im } \varepsilon$  remains zero when  $q$  changes. In addition,  $q$  does not change the inflexion frequency of  $\text{Im } \varepsilon$ . From the top panel to the bottom panel in Fig.2, one can see that as the real part,  $\text{Im } \varepsilon$  significantly decreases in the space-like region as momentum increases. But momentum  $p$  does not change the relation  $\frac{\omega}{p} = 1$  at the frequency inflexion of  $\text{Im } \varepsilon$ .

Fig.3 and Fig.4 display the real and imaginary parts of the magnetic permeability for different values of the nonextensive parameter. Both the real and imaginary parts of the magnetic permeability demonstrate a pole at frequency  $\omega_m$ . It is easy to see that the pole frequency  $\omega_m$  shifts to large frequency region with the increase of  $q$ .  $\mu_M$  has a nonzero imaginary part in the frequency




FIG. 5: (color online) The real part of  $n^2$  of a nonextensive QGP. The red, green, dashed-green, blue and dashed-blue curves are for the cases of  $q = 1, 1.05, 1.1, 1.15, 1.2$  respectively. Top panel:  $p = 0.2m_{DH}$ , Middle panel:  $p = 0.25m_{DH}$ , Bottom panel:  $p = 0.3m_{DH}$ .

region  $\frac{\epsilon}{p} < 1$ , and  $q$  has a trivial impact on it. As to the real part, in the frequency region  $\frac{\epsilon}{p} < 1$ , several  $q$ -curves coincide with each other. While in the frequency region  $\frac{\epsilon}{p} > 1$ ,  $q$  has an important impact on  $\text{Re } \mu_M$  only in frequency region  $1 < \frac{\epsilon}{p} < 4$ . When momentum  $p$  increases from  $0.2m_{DH}$  to  $0.3m_{DH}$ , pole frequency  $\omega_m$  turns to small frequency values.

We present  $\text{Re } n^2$  and the Depine-Lakhtakia index  $n_{DL}$  in Fig.5 and in Fig.6 respectively. Because  $n^2$  and  $n_{DL}$  are defined by the electric permittivity and the magnetic permeability, the properties of  $n^2$  and  $n_{DL}$  are determined by  $\epsilon$  and  $\mu$ .  $\text{Re } n^2$  and  $n_{DL}$  diverge at frequency  $\omega_m$ , which is just the pole of  $\mu_M$ . When  $q$  increases, as discussed in the last paragraph, the pole frequency  $\omega_m$  of  $\text{Re } n^2$  and  $n_{DL}$  turns to large values.  $\text{Re } n^2$  and  $n_{DL}$  have a frequency inflexion located at  $\omega_d = p$  which is just




FIG. 6: (color online) The Depine-Lakhtakia index  $n_{DL}$  of a nonextensive QGP. The red, green, dashed-green, blue and dashed-blue curves are for the cases of  $q = 1, 1.05, 1.1, 1.15, 1.2$  respectively. Top panel:  $p = 0.2m_{DH}$ , Middle panel:  $p = 0.25m_{DH}$ , Bottom panel:  $p = 0.3m_{DH}$ .

the pole frequency of the real part of the electric permittivity. When  $\omega < \omega_d$ ,  $q$  has no any effect on  $\text{Re } n^2$  and  $n_{DL}$  hardly, while for  $\omega > \omega_d$ ,  $q$  significantly influences  $\text{Re } n^2$  and  $n_{DL}$ .

We depict  $\text{Re } n^2$  and  $n_{DL}$  in the same plots in Fig.7 for different  $q$  values for the case  $p = 0.2m_{DH}$ . From five plots in Fig.7, it is easy to see  $\text{Re } n^2$  and  $n_{DL}$  intersect at frequency  $\omega = \omega_g$ . As shown in Fig.6 and Fig.7, in frequency regions  $\omega < \omega_c$  and  $\omega > \omega_g$ ,  $n_{DL} > 0$ , one can obtain a general refractive index. In the frequency region  $\omega \in [\omega_m, \omega_g]$ ,  $n_{DL} = 0$  but  $\text{Re } n^2 < 0$  which implies a pure imaginary refractive index, electromagnetic wave does not propagate due to severe damping[75]. There is a frequency region  $\omega \in [\omega_c, \omega_m]$  in which  $n_{DL} < 0$ . In terms of discussion in Sec.II, the refractive index seems negative in that frequency region. With the increase of  $q$ , the frequency range for  $n_{DL} < 0$  becomes wider. In




FIG. 7: (color online). The Depine-Lakhtakia index  $n_{DL}$  and the real part of  $n^2$  of a nonextensive QGP.

addition, as shown in top, middle and bottom panels in Fig.6, when the momentum  $p$  increases, the frequency range for  $n_{DL} < 0$  becomes narrower.

The start point  $\omega_c$  of the frequency region  $\omega \in [\omega_c, \omega_m]$  for  $n_{DL} < 0$  is around the electric permittivity pole, while the magnetic permeability pole  $\omega_m$  determines the end point[25, 76]. As shown in Fig.6, when  $\omega < \omega_d$ , the several nonextensive curves of the Depine-Lakhtakia index  $n_{DL}$  superpose each other,  $q$  does not change the position of  $\omega_c$ . While as  $q$  increases, the pole frequency  $\omega_m$  of  $\mu_M$  turns to large values. These facts lead to an enlargement of the frequency range for  $n_{DL} < 0$ . When momentum  $p$  increases, the change of momentum does not influence the position of  $\omega_c$ , as shown from top panel to bottom panel in Fig.6. While the frequency  $\omega_m$  of  $\mu_M$  pole significantly reduces as momentum  $p$  increases. As a result, the frequency range for  $n_{DL} < 0$  becomes narrower as

the increase of the momentum.

The criterion (9)  $n_{DL} < 0$  has been widely used to judge the existence of the negative refraction in a medium. However, some people have argued that besides that criterion, the propagating mode should satisfy the dispersion relation  $n^2\omega^2 = p^2$  simultaneously[75]. In terms of the longitudinal and transverse gluon self-energies (24)(25), we can obtain the longitudinal and transverse dispersion relations by following formula  $p^2 - \omega_{L,T}^2 + \Pi_{L,T}(\omega = \omega_{L,T}) = 0$ . The solutions to dispersion relations are shown in Fig.8. As we can see in that figure, both the longitudinal and transverse gluons have one stable propagating mode above the light cone  $\omega > p$ . Therefore, one should examine the potential propagating modes for the negative refractive index in the frequency region  $\omega > p$ . It is instructive to combine  $\text{Re}n^2$  and the Depine-Lakhtakia index  $n_{DL}$  in the same plots in






FIG. 8: (color online) The dispersion relations  $\omega(p)$  for the longitudinal (blue curve) and transverse (red curve) gluons in unit of  $m_{ge} = \frac{m_{DE}}{\sqrt{3}}$ . The dotted line is the light cone  $\omega = p$ .

Fig.7 to perform the analysis. In the frequency region  $\omega \in [\omega_d, \omega_m]$ ,  $\omega > p$  and  $n_{DL} < 0$ . While it is clear that  $\text{Re} n^2 > 1$  in the same frequency region, as shown in plots in Fig.7. There are no solutions for  $n^2\omega^2 = p^2$  in that frequency range. In a word, there are no propagating modes for the negative refractive index.

There exists not only temporal dispersion, but also spatial dispersion in a plasma. Usually, the spatial dispersion is small in an isotropic medium. Therefore, people have studied the frequency behavior of electromagnetic properties but omitted the spatial dispersion[75]. However, as shown from Fig.1 to Fig.6, when momentum  $p$  increases from  $0.2m_{DH}$  to  $0.3m_{DH}$ , momentum  $p$  significantly influences the electric permittivity, the magnetic permeability,  $\text{Re} n^2$  and  $n_{DL}$ . These facts indicate that the spatial dispersion is important in the electromagnetic responses of the QGP. As a matter of fact, though the authors in Ref.[75] have not investigated the effects of the spatial dispersion on the electromagnetic responses of the QGP explicitly, the comparison of Fig1. ( $k = 0$ ) with Fig2. ( $k = 0.2m_D$ ) in that literature implies the importance of the spatial dispersion on the Depine-Lakhtakia index  $n_{DL}$ .

## V. SUMMARY

We have worked out the electric permittivity  $\varepsilon(\omega, k)$  and the magnetic permeability  $\mu_M(\omega, k)$  in terms of the nonextensive distribution functions associated with the polarization tensor derived from kinetic theory, through which we have derived the real part of the square of the refractive index  $\text{Re} n^2$  and the Depine-Lakhtakia index  $n_{DL}$ . We have investigated the effects of nonextensivity on the electromagnetic responses of the QGP. The real and imaginary parts of the electric permittivity have changed noticeably in the space-like region as  $q$  increases, but the pole frequency of the real part and inflexion frequency of the imaginary part remain unchanged.  $\mu_M(\omega, k)$ ,  $\text{Re} n^2$  and  $n_{DL}$  diverge at the frequency  $\omega_m$  which shifts to large frequency region as the nonexten-

sive parameter  $q$  increases. There is a quite large frequency range  $\omega \in [\omega_c, \omega_m]$  in which  $n_{DL} < 0$ . And that frequency range becomes wider as  $q$  increases. Though  $n_{DL} < 0$  in the frequency region  $\omega \in [\omega_c, \omega_m]$ , there are no propagating modes for the negative refractive index.

In addition, momentum  $p$  reduces the real and imaginary parts of the electric permittivity in the space-like region. Whereas at the frequency pole of the electric permittivity, the relation  $\frac{\omega}{p} = 1$  does not change as momentum  $p$  varies. On the other hand, pole frequency of  $\mu_M(\omega, k)$ ,  $\text{Re} n^2$  and  $n_{DL}$  turns to small frequency region remarkably as momentum  $p$  increases. These facts indicate that the spatial dispersion has important effects on the electromagnetic responses of the QGP.

We have performed an attempt to address the electromagnetic responses of the QGP in terms of the gluon longitudinal and transverse self-energies incorporated the nonextensive effects. The refractive index can directly relate to some aspects of the phenomenology of ultrarelativistic heavy-ion collisions. For example, based on the refractive index at finite temperature or density (or under magnetic background), some groups have studied the Cherenkov gluon radiation[99, 100], the radiation energy loss[101], the elliptic flow and higher-order harmonics of prompt photons in ultrarelativistic heavy-ion collisions[102]. In addition, as discussed in Ref.[76] that besides the combination of the electric permittivity  $\varepsilon$  and the magnetic permeability  $\mu_M$ , the longitudinal and transverse dielectric functions  $\varepsilon_L, \varepsilon_T$  are usually used to describe the electromagnetic properties in plasma alternatively. The combination  $(\varepsilon_L, \varepsilon_T)$  can be related to  $\varepsilon$  and  $\mu_M$ . Therefore, based on the gluon longitudinal and transverse self-energies,  $\varepsilon_L$  and  $\varepsilon_T$  derived in the dynamical model incorporating the nonextensive effects, one can study diverse aspects of the QGP property, such as, Debye screening, Landau damping, dissociation of heavy quarkonia, photon and dilepton production, jet quenching and the related wakes. These are interesting issues deserving further comprehensive studies.

**Acknowledgment** We are very grateful to Wen-chao Zhang, Hua Zheng and Li-lin Zhu for helpful discussion. They drew us attention to Refs.[28, 29] which motivate the research. This work is supported in part by the National Key Research and Development Program of China under Contract No. 2022YFA1604900. This work is also partly supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under Grant Nos. 12265013, 12435009 and 12275104.

## Appendix A: A detailed derivation of the square of Debye mass Eq.(20)

According to the expanded nonextensive distribution functions (13), one can obtain

$$\frac{\partial n_{q,\bar{q},g}}{\partial k} = -\beta e^{-\beta k} + (q-1)\beta^2 k e^{-\beta k} \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2}(q-1)\beta^2 k^2 e^{-\beta k}(-\beta).$$

nonextensive hot QGP

In terms of the definition of the Debye mass (19),(15) and Eq.(A1), one can arrive the square of the Debye mass in

$$m_{DE}^2 = -\frac{g^2}{2\pi^2} \int_0^\infty k^2 dk \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{k})}{\partial k} \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$= -\frac{g^2 N_c}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty k^2 \{-\beta e^{-\beta k} + (q-1)\beta^2 k e^{-\beta k} - \frac{1}{2}(q-1)\beta^3 k^2 e^{-\beta k}\} dk$$

$$- \frac{g^2 N_f}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty k^2 \{-\beta e^{-\beta k} + (q-1)\beta^2 k e^{-\beta k} - \frac{1}{2}(q-1)\beta^3 k^2 e^{-\beta k}\} dk$$

$$= \frac{g^2(N_c + N_f)}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty k^2 \beta e^{-\beta k} dk - \frac{g^2(N_c + N_f)}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty (q-1)\beta^2 k^3 e^{-\beta k} dk$$

$$+ \frac{g^2(N_c + N_f)}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{2}(q-1)\beta^3 k^4 e^{-\beta k} dk \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$= \frac{2g^2 T^2(N_c + N_f)}{\pi^2} - \frac{6g^2 T^2(q-1)(N_c + N_f)}{\pi^2} + \frac{12g^2 T^2(q-1)(N_c + N_f)}{\pi^2}$$

$$= \frac{2(N_c + N_f)(1 + 3(q-1))g^2 T^2}{\pi^2} \quad (\text{A4})$$

which is just Eq.(20).

- 
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>[1] U. Heinz, in Relativistic Heavy Ion Physics, Landolt-Boernstein New Series, Vol. I/23, edited by R. Stock, Springer Verlag, New York, 2010, arXiv:0901.4355[nucl-th].</p> <p>[2] D. Teaney, in Quark-gluon plasma 4, edited by R.Hwa and Xin-nian Wang, World Scientific, Singapore, 2010, arXiv:0905.2433 [nucl-th].</p> <p>[3] P. Romatschke, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E <b>19</b>, 1 (2010).</p> <p>[4] C. Gale, S. Jeon and B. Schenke, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A <b>28</b>, 1340011 (2013).</p> <p>[5] W. Florkowski, M. P. Heller and M. Spalinski, Rep. Prog. Phys <b>81</b>, 046001 (2018).</p> <p>[6] K. Dusling and Shu Lin, Nucl. Phys. A <b>809</b>, 246 (2008).</p> <p>[7] A. Majumder, B. Muller and Xin-Nian Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett <b>99</b>,192301(2007).</p> <p>[8] K. Dusling, G. Moore and D. Teaney, Phys. Rev. C <b>81</b>, 034907 (2010).</p> <p>[9] Bing-feng Jiang, De-fu Hou and Jia-rong Li, J. Phys. G <b>42</b>, 085107 (2015).</p> <p>[10] S. Sarkar, C. Chattopadhyay and S. Pal, Phys. Rev. C <b>97</b>, 064916 (2018).</p> <p>[11] I. Bouras, E. Molnar, H. Niemi, Zhe Xu, A. El, O. Fochler, C. Greiner and D. Rischke, Phys. Rev. Lett <b>103</b>, 032301 (2009).</p> <p>[12] R. Neufeld, B. Muller and J. Ruppert, Phys. Rev. C <b>78</b>, 041901 (2008).</p> <p>[13] Bing-feng Jiang and Jia-rong Li, J. Phys. G <b>39</b>, 025007 (2012).</p> | <p>[14] Bing-feng Jiang and Jia-rong Li, Nucl. Phys. A <b>856</b>, 121 (2011).</p> <p>[15] J. Noronha and A. Dumitru, Phys. Rev. D <b>80</b>, 014007 (2009).</p> <p>[16] A. Shaikh, M. Kurian, S. Das, V. Chandra, S. Dash and B. Nandi, Phys. Rev. D <b>104</b>, 034017(2021).</p> <p>[17] Yin Jiang, Shu-zhe Shi, Yi Yin and Jin-feng Liao, Chin. Phys. C <b>42</b>, 011001(2018).</p> <p>[18] Y. Hidaka and Di-Lun Yang, Phys. Rev. D <b>98</b>, 016012 (2018).</p> <p>[19] An-ping Huang, Yin Jiang, Shu-zhe Shi, Jin-feng Liao and Peng-fei Zhuang, Phys. Lett. B <b>777</b>, 177(2018).</p> <p>[20] Xu-guang Huang, P. Huovinen and Xin-nian Wang, Phys. Rev. C <b>84</b>, 054910(2011).</p> <p>[21] Bao-chi Fu, Shuai Y. F. Liu, Long-gang Pang, Hui-chao Song and Yi Yin, Phys. Rev. Lett <b>127</b>,142301(2021).</p> <p>[22] Shuai Y. F. Liu and Yi Yin, JHEP <b>07</b>, 188(2021).</p> <p>[23] F. Becattini, M. Buzzegoli and A. Palermo, Phys. Lett. B <b>820</b>, 136519(2021).</p> <p>[24] Bo-hao Feng, C. Greiner, Shu-zhe Shi and Zhe Xu, Phys. Lett. B <b>782</b>, 262 (2018).</p> <p>[25] Bing-feng Jiang, De-fu Hou, Jia-rong Li and Yan-jun Gao, Phys. Rev. D <b>88</b>, 125027(2013).</p> <p>[26] Bing-feng Jiang and Jia-rong Li, Nucl. Phys. A <b>847</b>, 268 (2011).</p> <p>[27] M. Alqahtani, N. Demir and M. Strickland, Eur. Phys. J. C <b>82</b>, 973 (2022).</p> <p>[28] C. -Y. Wong, G. Wilk, L. Cirto and C. Tsallis, Phys.</p> |
|--|---|

- Rev. D **91**, 114027 (2015).
- [29] Hua Zheng, Li-lin Zhu and A. Bonasera, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 074009 (2015).
- [30] J. Kapusta, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **30**, 2130006 (2021).
- [31] W. Alberico and A. Lavagno, Eur. Phys. J. A **40**, 313 (2009).
- [32] E. Saberian and A. Esfandyari-Kalejahi, Phys. Rev. E **87**, 053112 (2013).
- [33] C. Tsallis, J. Stat. Phys **52**, 479 (1988).
- [34] C. Tsallis, Introduction to Nonextensive Statistical Mechanics, Springer, New York, 2009.
- [35] J. M. Liu, J. S. De Groot, J. P. Matte, T. W. Johnston and R. P. Drake, Phys. Rev. Lett **72**, 2717 (1994).
- [36] V. Pierrard and M. Lazar, Solar Phys. **267**, 153 (2010).
- [37] M. Maksimovic, V. Pierrard and P. Riley, Geophys. Res. Lett **24**, 1151 (1997).
- [38] E. Shuryak and I. Zahed, Phys. Rev. C **70**, 021901 (2004)(R).
- [39] M. H. Thoma, J. Phys. G **31**, L7 (2005).
- [40] A. Peshier and W. Cassing, Phys. Rev. Lett **94**, 172301 (2004).
- [41] S. Mitra, Eur. Phys. J. C **78**, 66 (2018).
- [42] T. Biro, G. Purcsel and K. Urmosy, Eur. Phys. J. A **40**, 325 (2009).
- [43] J. Costa, I. Aguiar, J. Barauna, E. Megias, A. Deppman, T. da Silva and D. Menezes, Phys. Lett. B **854**, 138727 (2024).
- [44] C. -Y. Wong and G. Wilk, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 114007 (2013).
- [45] Ze-bo Tang, Yi-chun Xu, Li-juan Ruan, Gene van Buren, Fu-qiang Wang and Zhang-bu Xu, Phys. Rev. C **79**, 051901 (2009)(R).
- [46] J. Cleymans, G. Lykasov, A. Parvan, A. Sorin, O. Teryaev and D. Worku, Phys. Lett. B **723**, 351 (2013).
- [47] Bao-chun Li, Ya-zhou Wang, Fu-hu Liu, Xin-jian Wen and You-er Dong, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 054014 (2014).
- [48] Hua Zheng and Li-lin Zhu, Adv. High Energy Phys **2016**, 9632126 (2016).
- [49] Hua Zheng and Li-lin Zhu, Adv. High Energy Phys **2015**, 180491 (2015).
- [50] L. Marques, J. Cleymans and A. Deppman, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 054025 (2015).
- [51] T. Bhattacharyya, J. Cleymans, A. Khuntia, P. Pareek and R. Sahoo, Eur. Phys. J. A **52**, 30 (2016).
- [52] S. Tripathy, T. Bhattacharyya, P. Garg, P. Kumar, R. Sahoo and J. Cleymans, Eur. Phys. J. A **52**, 289 (2016).
- [53] M. Azmi and J. Cleymans, Eur. Phys. J. C **75**, 430 (2015).
- [54] S. Grigoryan, Phys. Rev. D **95**, 056021 (2017).
- [55] M. Azmi, T. Bhattacharyya, J. Cleymans and M. Paradza, J. Phys. G **47**, 045001 (2020).
- [56] R. Rath, A. Khuntia, R. Sahoo and J. Cleymans, J. Phys. G **47**, 055111 (2020).
- [57] G. Biro, G. Barnafoldi and T. Biro, J. Phys. G **47**, 105002 (2020).
- [58] G. Che, J. Gu, W. Zhang and H. Zheng, J. Phys. G **48**, 095103 (2021).
- [59] Jin-biao Gu, Chen-yan Li, Qiang Wang, Wen-chao Zhang and Hua Zheng, J. Phys. G **49**, 115101 (2022).
- [60] T. Bhattacharyya, J. Cleymans and S. Mogliacci, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 094026 (2016).
- [61] K. Kyan and A. Monnai, Phys. Rev. D **106**, 054004 (2022).
- [62] Ya-peng Zhao, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 096006 (2020).
- [63] T. Osada and G. Wilk, Phys. Rev. C **77**, 044903 (2008).
- [64] T. Biro and E. Molnar, Eur. Phys. J. A **48**, 172 (2009).
- [65] T. Biro and E. Molnar, Phys. Rev. C **85**, 024905 (2012).
- [66] T. Bhattacharyya and A. Mukherjee, Eur. Phys. J. C **80**, 656 (2020).
- [67] G. Sarwar, Md. Hasanujjaman, T. Bhattacharyya, M. Rahaman, A. Bhattacharyya and J-e. Alam, Eur. Phys. J. C **82**, 189 (2022).
- [68] S. Rath and S. Dash, Eur. Phys. J. C **83**, 867 (2023).
- [69] S. Rath and S. Dash, Eur. Phys. J. A **60**, 29 (2024).
- [70] S. Mrowczynski and M. Thoma, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 036011 (2000).
- [71] J. I. Kapusta, Finite-Temperature Field Theory, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1989.
- [72] M. Le Bellac, Thermal Field Theory, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [73] H. A. Weldon, Phys. Rev. D **26**, 1394 (1982).
- [74] Jin Meng and Jia-rong Li, Nucl. Phys. A **730**, 97 (2004).
- [75] Juan Liu, M. J. Luo, Qun Wang and Hao-jie Xu, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 125027 (2011).
- [76] Bing-feng Jiang, De-fu Hou and Jia-rong Li, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 074026 (2016).
- [77] V. G. Veselago, Sov. Phys. Usp **10**, 509 (1968).
- [78] J. B. Pendry, Phys. Rev. Lett **85**, 3966 (2000).
- [79] D. R. Smith and N. Kroll, Phys. Rev. Lett **85**, 2933 (2000).
- [80] R. A. Depine and A. Lakhtakia, Microw. Opt. Technol. Lett **41**, 315 (2004).
- [81] A. Amariti, D. Forcella, A. Mariotti and G. Policastro, JHEP **04**, 036 (2011).
- [82] A. Amariti, D. Forcella, A. Mariotti, G. Policastro and M. Siani, JHEP **10**, 104 (2011).
- [83] A. Amariti, D. Forcella and A. Mariotti, JHEP **01**, 105 (2013).
- [84] Xian-hui Ge, Kwanghyun Jo and Sang-Jin Sin, JHEP **03**, 104 (2011).
- [85] Xin Gao and Hong-bao Zhang, JHEP **08**, 075 (2010).
- [86] P. Phukon and T. Sarkar, JHEP **09**, 102 (2013).
- [87] S. Mahapatra, P. Phukon and T. Sarkar, JHEP **01**, 135 (2014) 135.
- [88] D. Forcella, A. Mezzalana and D. Musso, JHEP **11**, 153 (2014).
- [89] S. Mahapatra, JHEP **01**, 148 (2015).
- [90] D. Forcella, J. Zaanen, D. Valentini and D. van der Marel, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 035143 (2014).
- [91] C. A. A. de Carvalho, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 105005 (2016).
- [92] Manman Sun, Dong Wang, Qiyuan Pan and Jiliang Jing, Eur. Phys. J. C **79**, 145 (2019).
- [93] Jun Cheng, Qiyuan Pan, Hongwei Yu and Jiliang Jing, Eur. Phys. J. C **78**, 239 (2018).
- [94] M. Mandal and P. Roy, Adv. High Energy Phys **2013**, 371908 (2013).
- [95] S. Mrowczynski, B. Schenke and M. Strickland, Phys. Rept **682**, 1 (2017).
- [96] Qianqian Du, A. Dumitru, Yun Guo and M. Strickland, JHEP **01**, 123 (2017).
- [97] L. Thakur, N. Haque and Yuji Hirono, JHEP **06**, 071 (2020).
- [98] L. Thakur and Yuji Hirono, JHEP **02**, 207 (2022).
- [99] V. Koch, A. Majumder and Xin-Nian Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett **96**, 172302 (2006).
- [100] I. M. Dremin, Nucl. Phys. A **767**, 233(2006).

- [101] M. Bluhm, P. B. Gossiaux and J. Aichelin, Phys. Rev. Lett **107** (2011) 265004.
- [102] A. Monnai, Nucl. Phys. A **995**, 121679(2020).