Introduction. The Λ-nucleus potential depth provides an important constraint in ongoing attempts to resolve the ‘hyperon puzzle’, i.e., whether or not dense neutron-star matter contains hyperons, primarily Λs besides nucleons [1]. Fig. 1 presents compilation of most of the known Λ hypernuclear binding energies (BΛ) across the periodic table, fitted by a three-parameter Woods-Saxon (WS) attractive potential. As $A \to \infty$, a limiting value of $B_{\Lambda}(A) \to 30$ MeV is obtained. This updates the value 28 MeV from the 1988 first theoretical analysis [2] of the BNL-AGS ($\pi^+, K^+$) data [4], and 27±3 MeV [5] 27.2±1.3 MeV [6] from earlier mid 1960s observations of $\pi^-$ decays of heavy spallation hypernuclei formed in silver and bromine emulsions. Interestingly, studies of density dependent Λ-nuclear optical potentials motivated by three-body $\Lambda NN$ interactions provide a large repulsive (positive) contribution to the Λ-nuclear potential depth $D_{\Lambda}$ at nuclear-matter density $\rho_0$: $D_{\Lambda}^{(3)} \approx 30$ MeV. This repulsive component of $D_{\Lambda}$ is more than just compensated at $\rho_0$ by a roughly twice larger attractive depth value, $D_{\Lambda}^{(2)} \approx -60$ MeV, motivated by a two-body $\Lambda N$ interaction. Note that $D_{\Lambda} = D_{\Lambda}^{(2)} + D_{\Lambda}^{(3)}$ is defined as $V_\Lambda(\rho_0)$ in the limit $A \to \infty$ at a given nuclear-matter density $\rho_0$, with a value 0.17 fm$^{-3}$ assumed here.

Most hyperon-nucleon potential models overbind Λ hypernuclei, yielding values of $D_{\Lambda}^{(2)}$ deeper than $-30$ MeV. Whereas such overbinding amounts to only few MeV in the often used Nijmegen soft-core model versions NSC97e,f [7] it is considerably stronger, by more than 10 MeV, in the recent Nijmegen extended soft-core model ESC16 [8]. A similar overbinding arises at leading order in chiral effective field theory ($\chi$EFT) [9]. The situation at next-to leading order (NLO) is less clear owing to a strong dependence of $D_{\Lambda}^{(2)}$ on the momentum cutoff scale [10]. Apparently, version NLO13 [11] slightly underbinds, while version NLO19 [12] overbinds. Finally, recent Quantum Monte Carlo (QMC) calculations [13] [14], using a $\Lambda N + \Lambda NN$ interaction model designed to bind correctly $\Lambda$ He, result in a strongly attractive $D_{\Lambda}^{(2)}$ of order $-100$ MeV and a correspondingly large repulsive (positive) $D_{\Lambda}^{(3)}$, reproducing the overall potential depth $D_{\Lambda} \approx -30$ MeV.

Invoking repulsive three-body $\Lambda NN$ interactions goes beyond just providing solution of the overbinding problem: as nuclear density is increased beyond nuclear matter density $\rho_0$, the balance between attractive $D_{\Lambda}^{(2)}$ and repulsive $D_{\Lambda}^{(3)}$ tilts towards the latter, making the equation of state of neutron-star matter perhaps sufficiently stiff to expel Λ hyperons from neutron-star matter, thereby providing a possible solution to the ‘hyperon puzzle’. The larger $D_{\Lambda}^{(3)}$ is, the more likely it is a solution [15]. However, there is no guarantee that three-body $\Lambda NN$ interactions are universally repulsive. For a recent discussion of this problem within an SU(3) ‘decuplet dominance’ approach practised in modern $\chi$EFT studies at NLO, see Ref. [16].
Our aim in the present phenomenological study is to check to what extent properly chosen Λ hypernuclear binding energy data, with minimal extra assumptions, imply positive values of $D_{A}^{(3)}$, and how large it is. To do so, we follow the optical potential approach applied by Dover-Hüfner-Lemmer to pions in nuclear matter [17]. Applied to the Λ-nucleus system, it provides expansion in powers of the nuclear density $ρ(r)$, consisting of a linear term induced by a two-body ΛN interaction plus two higher-power density terms: (i) a long-range Pauli correlations term starting at $ρ^{4/3}$, and (ii) a short-range $NN$ interaction term dominated in the present context by three-body $ΛNN$ interactions, starting at $ρ^2$. As will become clear below, the contribution of the Pauli correlations term is non negligible, propagating to higher powers of density terms than just $ρ^{4/3}$, such as the $ρ^2$ $ΛNN$ interaction term. This explains why the value derived here, $D_{A}^{(3)} = (13.9 ± 1.4)$ MeV, differs from any of those suggested earlier in Ref. [2] and in Skyrme Hartree Fock studies [18] where Pauli correlations were disregarded. Our value of $D_{A}^{(3)}$ strongly disagrees with the much larger value inferred in QMC calculations [14]. We comment on this discrepancy below.

**Optical Potential.** The optical potential employed in this work, $V_{A}^{\text{opt}}(ρ) = V_{A}^{(2)}(ρ) + V_{A}^{(3)}(ρ)$, consists of terms representing two-body $ΛN$ and three-body $ΛNN$ interactions, respectively:

$$V_{A}^{(2)}(ρ) = -\frac{4π}{2μ_{A}} f_{A} C_{\text{Pauli}}(ρ) b_{0}ρ,$$

(1)

$$V_{A}^{(3)}(ρ) = +\frac{4π}{2μ_{A}} f_{A} B_{0} \frac{ρ^{2}}{ρ_{0}},$$

(2)

with $b_{0}$ and $B_{0}$ strength parameters in units of fm ($h = c = 1$). In these expressions, $A$ is the mass number of the nuclear core, $ρ_{0} = 0.17$ fm$^{-3}$ stands for nuclear matter density, $μ_{A}$ is the Λ-nucleus reduced mass, $f_{A}$ is a kinematical factor transforming $b_{0}$ from ΛN c.m. to Λ-nucleus c.m., and $C_{\text{Pauli}}(ρ)$ for $α_{ρ} = 1$ is a density dependent Pauli correlations factor:

$$f_{A} = 1 + A - 1 \frac{μ_{A}}{m_{N}}; \quad C_{\text{Pauli}}(ρ) = (1 + α_{ρ} \frac{3k_{F}}{2π} f_{A}b_{0})^{-1},$$

(3)

with Fermi momentum $k_{F} = (3π^{2} ρ / 2)^{1/3}$ corresponding to nuclear density $ρ$ normalized to $A$. The form of $f_{A}$ above coincides with the way it is used for $V_{A}^{(2)}$ in atomic and nuclear hadron-nucleus-bound-state problems [19] and its $A$ dependence provides good approximation for $V_{A}^{(3)}$. The parameter $α_{ρ}$, Eq. (3), switches off ($α_{ρ} = 0$) or on ($α_{ρ} = 1$) Pauli correlations in a form suggested in Ref. [20] and practised in $K^-$ atoms studies [21]. As stated above and shown below, inclusion of $C_{\text{Pauli}}(ρ)$ in $V_{A}^{(2)}$ affects strongly the balance between the derived potential depths $D_{A}^{(2)}$ and $D_{A}^{(3)}$. However, introducing it also in $V_{A}^{(3)}$ is found to make little difference, which is why it is skipped in Eq. (2). Finally we note that the low-density limit of $V_{A}^{\text{opt}}$ requires according to Ref. [17] that $b_{0}$ is identified with the c.m. $ΛN$ spin-averaged scattering length (positive in our sign convention). We now specify the $B_{A}$ data dealt with in the present analysis and the nuclear densities $ρ(r)$ used for constructing the density dependent optical potential $V_{A}(ρ)$, Eqs. (1,2).

**$B_{A}$ Input.** The present work does not attempt to reproduce the full range of $B_{A}$ data shown in Fig. 1. It is limited to $1s_{A}$ and $1p_{A}$ states. We fit to such states in one of the nuclear $p$-shell hypernuclei where the $1s_{A}$ state is bound by over 10 MeV, while the $1p_{A}$ state has just become bound. This helps to resolve the density dependence of $V_{A}^{\text{opt}}$ by setting a good balance between its two components, $V_{A}^{(2)}(ρ)$ and $V_{A}^{(3)}(ρ)$, and follow it throughout the periodic table up to the heaviest hypernucleus of $^{208}$Pb marked in Fig. 1. Among the relevant $A = 12, 13, 16$ $p$-shell hypernuclei, we chose to fit the $1\Lambda$N precise $B_{A}^{\text{exp}}(1s, 1p)$ values, partly because of the extremely simple $1p$ proton hole structure of its nuclear core which removes most of the uncertainty arising from spin-dependent residual $ΛN$ interactions [22].

The $B_{A}^{\text{exp}}(1s, 1p)$ values considered in the present work are those shown in Fig. 1 for $12 ≤ A ≤ 208$, as listed in Table IV of Ref. [3] and remarked on in the related text. Most of these values are from $(π^+, K^+)$ reactions. Older ($K^-, π^-$) data for $^{32}S$ were included to enhance the only $(π^+, K^+)$ data available in the $2s$-$1d$ shell, for $^{28}Si$. For $A = 12, 16$ we used the more precise $B_{A}^{\text{exp}}(1s, 1p)$ values extracted in $(e, e' K^+)$ reactions at JLab [23], $^{12}B$ in preference to $^{12}C$ and $^{16}N$ instead of $^{16}O$. Whereas the $^{12}C$ values agree with the $^{12}B$ respective values within measurement uncertainties, this is not the case for the $A = 16$ species where the $1s$ values differ by 0.8±0.3 MeV. However, a more recent ($K_{\pi}\text{opt}, π^-$) measurement on $^{16}O$ reports $B_{A}^{\text{exp}}(16^N)=13.4±0.4$ MeV [24] consistently within its uncertainty range with the $(e, e' K^+)$ value $B_{A}^{\text{exp}}(16^N)=13.76±0.16$ MeV [25] used here. We comment below on the sensitivity of our calculational results to this difference.

**Nuclear Densities.** In optical model applications similar to the one adopted here, it is crucial to ensure that the radial extent of the densities, e.g., their r.m.s. radii follow closely values derived from experiment. With $ρ(r) = ρ_p(r) + ρ_n(r)$, the sum of proton and neutron density distributions, respectively, we relate the proton densities to the corresponding charge densities where the finite size of the proton charge and recoil effects are included. This approach is equivalent to assigning some finite size of the proton charge and recoil effects are included. This approach is equivalent to assigning some finite size of the proton charge and recoil effects are included. This approach is equivalent to assigning some finite size of the proton charge and recoil effects are included.
three-parameter Fermi distributions normalized to $Z$ for protons and $N = A - Z$ for neutrons, derived from nuclear charge distributions assembled in Ref. [27]. For medium-weight and heavy nuclei, the r.m.s. radii of neutron density distributions assume larger values than those for proton density distributions, as practiced in analyses of exotic atoms [19]. Furthermore, once neutrons occupy single-nucleon orbits beyond those occupied by protons, it is useful to represent the nuclear density $\rho(r)$ as

$$\rho(r) = \rho_{\text{core}}(r) + \rho_{\text{excess}}(r),$$

where $\rho_{\text{core}}$ refers to the $Z$ protons plus the charge symmetric $Z$ neutrons occupying the same nuclear ‘core’ orbits, and $\rho_{\text{excess}}$ refers to the $(N - Z)$ ‘excess’ neutrons associated with the nuclear periphery.

**Results and Discussion.** A-nuclear potential depths $D_{\Lambda}^{(2)}$, $D_{\Lambda}^{(3)}$ from our optical-potential calculations, and their sum $D_{\Lambda}$, are listed in Table I for several choices of $\Lambda$-nuclear potential depths specified in detail below. Calculated $1s_\Lambda$ and $1p_\Lambda$ binding energies in hypernuclei from $^{12}_\Lambda$B to $^{208}_\Lambda$Pb are shown in Fig. 2 for models P,Q, and in Fig. 3 for models X,Y, in comparison to $B_{\Lambda}^{\text{exp}}(1s, 1p)$ data.

**TABLE I: Strength parameters:** (i) $b_0, B_0$ (fm), Eqs. (12), in models P,Q,X,Y of the present work, or (ii) $c_0, C_0$ (MeV fm$^3$, MeV fm$^4$) for $V_{\Lambda}(r) = -c_0\rho + C_0\rho^2$ from Ref. [2]; plus their respective potential depths $D_{\Lambda}^{(2)}$, $D_{\Lambda}^{(3)}$ and sum $D_{\Lambda}$ (MeV) at nuclear matter density $\rho_0 = 0.17$ fm$^{-3}$. Pauli correlations are switched off (on) using $\alpha_P = 0 (1)$ in Eq. (3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\alpha_P$</th>
<th>$b_0$ or $c_0$</th>
<th>$B_0$ or $C_0$</th>
<th>$D_{\Lambda}^{(2)}$</th>
<th>$D_{\Lambda}^{(3)}$</th>
<th>$D_{\Lambda}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>-31.3</td>
<td>-31.3</td>
<td>-31.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>-57.6</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>340.0</td>
<td>1087.5</td>
<td>-57.8</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X,Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Model P, the optical potential $V_{\Lambda}(\rho)$ consists of just a linear-density $V_{\Lambda}^{(2)}(\rho)$ term, disregarding Pauli correlations ($\alpha_P=0$). Its only strength parameter $b_0$ is fitted to $B_{\Lambda}^{1s}\left(_{18}^{16}\Lambda\right)_N = 13.76 \pm 0.16$ MeV. This and other $B_{\Lambda}(1s, 1p)$ values calculated in Model P are plotted in the upper part of Fig. 2. The model does well for $1s_\Lambda$ states below $^{16}_\Lambda$N and then in $^{208}_\Lambda$Pb, but not in between. For $1p_\Lambda$ states it misses seriously the measured binding energies below $^{28}_\Lambda$Si, while doing fairly well in heavier species.

The potential depth $D_{\Lambda}$ (here at $\rho_0 = 0.17$ fm$^{-3}$) associated with Model P is $-34.1$ MeV ($-32.1$ MeV at $\rho_0 = 0.16$ fm$^{-3}$), decreasing in size to $-31.3$ MeV upon switching on Pauli correlations ($\alpha_P=1$, Model P’ in the table). The roughly 10% decrease in size of $D_{\Lambda}$ is comparable to the decrease in size of $D_{\Xi}$ found recently for $\Xi^-$ hyperons [28].

In Model Q, a $V_{\Lambda}^{(3)}(\rho)$ $\rho^2$ component is added to the $V_{\Lambda}^{(2)}(\rho)$ linear-density component, but still with no Pauli correlations ($\alpha_P=0$). The two strength parameters $b_0, B_0$ are obtained by fitting to $B_{\Lambda}^{1s}\left(_{18}^{16}\Lambda\right)_N = 13.76 \pm 0.16$ MeV and $B_{\Lambda}^{1p}\left(_{16}^{18}\Lambda\right)_N = 2.84 \pm 0.18$ MeV. These and other $B_{\Lambda}(1s, 1p)$ values calculated in Model Q are plotted in the lower part of Fig. 2. The overall fit quality is a bit improved with respect of that in Model P, but some underbinding appears to develop upon increasing the mass number $A$, noticed clearly in the three heaviest $1s_\Lambda$ and two heaviest $1p_\Lambda$ states. The resulting $\Lambda$ potential depth $D_{\Lambda} = -27.4$ MeV reflects a sizable cancellation between a strongly attractive two-body potential depth $D_{\Lambda}^{(2)}$ and a strongly repulsive three-body potential depth $D_{\Lambda}^{(3)}$ listed in Table I. Interestingly, these two partial depths almost coincide with those listed in the following line of the table marked MDG after Ref. [2].

Pauli correlations are switched on ($\alpha_P=1$) in Models X and Y. Model X uses the same densities $\rho(r)$ and $\rho^2(r)$ used in Models P,Q. We note in Table I the steady increase of the fitted two-body strength parameter $b_0$ by roughly factor of two going from Model P to P’, where Pauli correlations were switched on, or to Q where a three-body $\rho^2(r)$ term was introduced, and finally by roughly factor of four in Model X upon including both Pauli correlations and a three-body term. The fitted value in Model X, $b_0 = 1.60$ fm, is close to the spin averaged value of the $\Lambda N$ scattering length indicated by experiments (e.g., $1.65$ fm [29] or $1.78$ fm [30]). This indicates that once both Pauli correlations and a three-body term are taken into account, the present optical potential form satisfies approximately its $\rho \to 0$ constraint. We
also note that the fitted three-body strength parameter $B_0$ is down by more than factor of two from its fitted value in Model Q where Pauli correlations were disregarded. It is a simple matter to check that the density expansion of $C_{\text{Pauli}}(\rho)$ produces repulsion at order $\rho^2$ which substitutes then for part of the value of $B_0$ in Model Q. Yet, Model X is unsatisfactory with respect to its calculated $B_1(Ls, Lp)$ values plotted in the upper part of Fig. 3. The slight $1s_\Lambda$ underbinding observed in Model Q for $A \gtrsim 90$ has become substantial, beginning already with $A \gtrsim 50$, joined there now by substantial $1p_\Lambda$ underbinding. To address these shortcomings we introduce Model Y.

Model Y differs from Model X by the form of $\rho^2$ used in nuclei where excess neutrons occupy shell-model orbitals than those occupied by protons. This situation occurs in Fig. 3 for the four hypernuclei with $A \gtrsim 50$. We recall that the $\Lambda NN$ interaction underlying the $V_\Lambda^{(3)}$ $\rho^2$ term arises in $\chi$EFT models [16] from intermediate $\Sigma NN$ and $\Sigma^*(1385)NN$ states, yielding a $\tilde{\tau}_1 \cdot \tilde{\tau}_2$ isospin factor for the two nucleons [31,32]. Extending the discussion in Ref. [33], it can be shown that direct three-body $\Lambda NN$ contributions involving one ‘core’ nucleon and one ‘excess’ nucleon vanish upon summing on the $T=0$ ‘core’ closed-shell nucleons, while their exchange partners renormalize the two-body $\Lambda N$ interaction. To modify $\rho^2$ accordingly, we discard the bilinear term $\rho_{\text{core}} \rho_{\text{excess}}$, thereby replacing $\rho^2$ in $V_\Lambda^{(3)}$, Eq. [2], by

$$\rho_{\text{core}}^2 + \rho_{\text{excess}}^2 \rightarrow (2 \rho_p)^2 + (\rho_n - \rho_p)^2 \quad (5)$$

in terms of the available densities $\rho_p$ and $\rho_n$. This prescription does not impact the five hypernuclei lighter than $^{40}\text{Ca}$ in Fig. 3 and it appears to work well as seen by the significant improvement in the $B_\Lambda$ values calculated beyond $^{40}\text{Ca}$ in Model Y, lower part of Fig. 3 compared to those in Model X in the upper part of the figure.

Potential depth values derived in models discussed above are listed in Table I. Model Y in particular gives $D_\Lambda^{(2)} = -39.9$ MeV, $D_\Lambda^{(3)} = 13.9$ MeV. To estimate uncertainties, we act as follows: (i) decreasing the input value of $B_\Lambda^{(1)}(\Lambda N)$ fitted to by 0.2 MeV, thereby getting halfway to the central value of $B_\Lambda^{(1)}(\Lambda N)=13.4\pm0.4$ MeV for $^{16}\text{O}$ [24], the charge symmetric partner of $^{16}\Lambda N$, results in approximately 10% larger value of $D_\Lambda^{(3)}$, and (ii) applying Pauli correlations to $V_\Lambda^{(3)}$ too reduces $D_\Lambda^{(3)}$ roughly by 10%. In both cases $D_\Lambda^{(2)}$ increases moderately by $\leq 1$ MeV. Our final values are (in MeV)

$$D_\Lambda^{(2)} = -(40.4 \pm 0.6), \quad D_\Lambda^{(3)} = (13.9 \pm 1.4), \quad (6)$$

and $D_\Lambda = -26.5 \pm 1.5$ MeV. Two remarks are in order:

- Sidestepping $O(A^{-1})$ corrections generally expected in optical potential applications to light hypernuclei, we did apply Model Y to the $1s_\Lambda$ ground states $^3\text{Li}$ and $^3\text{He}$. The resulting $B_\Lambda(^3\text{Li})=5.56$ MeV is in excellent agreement with $B_\text{exp}(^3\text{Li})=5.36$ MeV for the $(2J + 1)$ average of the $(\frac{1}{2}^+ \cdot \frac{3}{2}^+)$ g.s. doublet levels [2]. The same $B_\Lambda$ value was obtained for $^\Lambda\text{He}$, about 1.4 MeV larger than $B_\text{exp}(^\Lambda\text{He})=3.12\pm0.02$ MeV. Interestingly, our $\Lambda NN$ motivated $V_\Lambda^{(3)}$ component of $V_\text{opt}$ fails to resolve the overbinding of $^\Lambda\text{He}$ discussed often in the literature, e.g., Ref. [33].

- To understand why $D_\Lambda^{(2)}$ and $D_\Lambda^{(3)}$ values deduced in QMC calculations [13,14] are much larger than the corresponding values derived here, Eq. (6), one notes that the QMC nuclear densities $\rho_{\text{QMC}}(r)$ are much too compact with respect to our realistic densities, with nucleon r.m.s. radii $r_N(\text{QMC})$ 0.80 of the known r.m.s. charge radii in $^{16}\text{O}$ and $^{40}\text{Ca}$ [35]. Since $\rho$ scales as $r_N^{-3}$, applying it to the density dependence of our $V_\text{opt}$ would transform $D_\Lambda^{(2)}$ and $D_\Lambda^{(3)}$ of Eq. (6) to $D_\Lambda^{(2)}(\text{QMC})=-78.9\pm 1.2$ MeV and $D_\Lambda^{(3)}(\text{QMC})=53.0\pm 5.3$ MeV, their sum $D_\Lambda(\text{QMC})=-25.9\pm 5.4$ MeV agreeing within uncertainties with ours. Other factors such as the choice of fitted $B_\Lambda$ values may contribute to increase further the size of these QMC partial depth values to come closer to as large sizes as of $O(100)$ MeV reached in these works.

Concluding Remarks. In summary, we have presented a straightforward optical-potential analysis of $1s_\Lambda$ and $1p_\Lambda$ binding energies across the periodic table, $12 \leq A \leq 208$, with $V_\text{opt}$ parameterized by constants $b_0$ and $B_0$ in front of two-body $\Lambda N$ and three-body $\Lambda NN$ interaction terms. These parameters were fitted to pre-
cise $B_{\Lambda}^{\exp}(1s, 1p)$ values in $^{16}\text{N}$ and then used to evaluate $B_{\Lambda}(1s, 1p)$ values in the other hypernuclei considered here. Pauli correlations were found essential to establish a correct balance between $b_0$ and $B_0$, as judged by $b_0$ coming out in the final Model Y analysis close to the value of the $\Lambda NN$ spin-averaged $s$-wave scattering length. Good agreement was reached in this model between the calculated $B_{\Lambda}^{\exp}(1s, 1p)$ values and their corresponding $B_{\Lambda}^{\text{calc}}$ values. Although values of $\ell_\Lambda$ other than 1 and 1 were disregarded, we checked that $B_{\Lambda}^{d,1s,1p}(^{208}\text{Pb})$ values calculated in Model Y come out reasonably well within 1-2 error bars of the experimental values shown in Fig. 1. Additional, nonlocal (gradient) terms need to be added to $V_{\Lambda}^{\text{opt}}$ to achieve better agreement [2], but this affects little the local terms considered here, possibly increasing $D_{\Lambda}^{(3)}$ by less than 2 MeV, bearing little effect on the ‘hyperon puzzle’ issue.

The potential depth $D_{\Lambda}^{(3)}$ derived here, Eq. (5), suggests that the three-body $\Lambda NN$ contribution in symmetric nuclear matter (SNM) is repulsive and potentially of sufficient strength to resolve unambiguously the ‘hyperon puzzle’ in neutron-star purely neutron matter (PNM). Indeed, our derived depth of $D_{\Lambda}^{(3)} = (13.9 \pm 1.4)$ MeV in SNM is larger by a few MeV than the one yielding $\mu(\Lambda) > \mu(n)$ in PNM for $\Lambda$ and neutron chemical potentials under a ‘decuplet dominance’ construction for the underlying $\Lambda NN$ interaction terms within a $\chi$EFT(NLO) model [16]. This confirms that the strength of the corresponding repulsive $V_{\Lambda}^{(3)}$ optical potential component, as constrained in the present work by data, is sufficient to expel $\Lambda$ hyperons from playing active role in neutron star matter, thereby resolving the ‘hyperon puzzle’ [11].
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