

Upsilon suppression in PbPb collisions at the LHC

Georg Wolschin

Heidelberg University

Institut für Theoretische Physik

Philosophenweg 16
D-69120 Heidelberg




NN_2015

Topics

1. Introduction: Upsilon suppression in the Quark-Gluon Plasma
2. Model for bottomium suppression
 - 2.1 Complex potential: Screening and damping
 - 2.2 Gluon-induced dissociation
 - 2.3 Hydrodynamic expansion
 - 2.4 Feed-down cascade
3. Comparison with CMS data for 2.76 TeV PbPb
4. Prediction for 5.125 TeV PbPb
5. Conclusion

1. Introduction: Upsilon Suppression in PbPb @ LHC



Y suppression as a sensitive probe for the QGP

- No significant effect of regeneration
- $m_b \approx 3m_c \rightarrow$ cleaner theoretical treatment
- More stable than J/ ψ


$$E_B(\Upsilon_{1S}) \approx 1.10 \text{ GeV}$$
$$E_B(J/\psi) \approx 0.64 \text{ GeV}$$

CMS Collab., CMS-PAS-HIN-10-006 (2011)

NN_2015

$Y(nS)$ states are suppressed in PbPb @ LHC:

CMS



A clear QGP indicator

1. $Y(1S)$ ground state is suppressed in PbPb:

$$R_{\text{AA}}(Y(1S)) = 0.56 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.07 \text{ in min. bias}$$

2. $Y(2S, 3S)$ states are > 4 times stronger suppressed in PbPb than $Y(1S)$

$$R_{\text{AA}}(Y(2S)) = 0.12 \pm 0.04 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 0.02 \text{ (syst.)}$$

$$R_{\text{AA}}(Y(3S)) = 0.03 \pm 0.04 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 0.01 \text{ (syst.)}$$

$$R_{\text{AA}} = \frac{N_{\text{PbPb}}(Q\bar{Q})}{N_{\text{coll}} N_{\text{pp}}(Q\bar{Q})}$$

CMS Collab., PRL 109, 222301 (2012)
[Plot from CMS database]

NN_2015

2. The model: Screening, Gluodissociation and Collisional broadening of the Y(nS) states

- Debye screening of all states involved: **Static suppression**
- The **imaginary part** of the potential (effect of collisions) contributes to the broadening of the Y(nS) states: **damping**
- Gluon-induced dissociation: **dynamic suppression**, in particular of the Y(1S) ground state due to the large thermal gluon density
- Reduced feed-down from the excited Y/χ_b states to Y(1S) substantially modifies the populations: **indirect suppression**

F. Vaccaro, F. Nendzig and GW, *Europhys.Lett.* 102, 42001 (2013); J. Hoelck and GW, unpublished
F. Nendzig and GW, *Phys. Rev. C* 87, 024911 (2013); *J. Phys. G* 41, 095003 (2014)
F. Brezinski and GW, *Phys. Lett.B* 70, 534 (2012)

2.1 Screening and damping in a nonrelativistic potential model

$$V_{nl}(r, T) = -\frac{\sigma}{m_D(T)} e^{-m_D(T)r} - C_F \alpha_{nl}(T) \left(\frac{e^{-m_D(T)r}}{r} + iT \phi(m_D(T)r) \right)$$

$$\phi(x) = \int_0^\infty \frac{dz}{(1+z^2)^2} \left(1 - \frac{\sin xz}{xz} \right), m_D(T) = T \sqrt{4\pi \alpha_s(2\pi T) \frac{2N_c + N_f}{6}}$$

From the literature

Screened potential: m_D = Debye mass,

$\alpha_{nl}(T)$ the strong coupling constant;


$C_F = (N_c^2 - 1) / (2N_c)$

$\sigma \approx 0.192$ the string tension (Jacobs et al.; Karsch et al.)

Imaginary part: Collisional damping (Laine et al. 2007, Beraudo et al. 2008, Brambilla et al. 2008) for $2\pi T \gg \langle 1/r \rangle$; different form for $2\pi T \ll \langle 1/r \rangle$.


Screened real part of potential, T-dep. imag. part

Constrain $\text{Re}V_s(r)$ by lattice QCD data on the singlet free energy



Screening

Take $\text{Im}V_s(r)$ from pQCD calculations




From: A. Mocsy et al.

Damping


Screened real part of potential, T-dep. imag. part

Constrain $\text{Re}V_s(r)$ by lattice QCD data on the singlet free energy



Screening

Take $\text{Im}V_s(r)$ from pQCD calculations




From: A. Mocsy et al.

Damping

Radial wave function of Y(1S) at temperatures T

Solutions of the Schoedinger equation with complex potential $V(r, T, \alpha_s)$ for the radial wave functions $g_{nl}(r, T)$,


$$[H(r, T, \alpha_s) - E + i\Gamma/2]g(r) = 0$$



From: J. Hoelck and
GW, unpublished

NN_2015

Radial wave functions of $Y(nS)$, $\chi_b(nP)$ states



Calculate the damping widths
 $\Gamma_{\text{damp}}(T)$ for all six states

$Y(nS)$, $\chi_b(nP)$, $n = 1, 2, 3$

NN_2015

2.2 Cross section for gluodissociation

Born amplitude for the interaction of gluon clusters according to Bhanot&Peskin in dipole approximation / Operator product expansion, extended to include the screened coulombic + string eigenfunctions as outlined in Brezinski and Wolschin, PLB 70, 534 (2012)

$$\sigma_{diss}^{nS}(E) = \frac{2\pi^2 \alpha_s E}{9} \int_0^\infty dk \delta \left(\frac{k^2}{m_b} + \epsilon_n - E \right) |w^{nS}(k)|^2$$
$$w^{nS}(k) = \int_0^\infty dr r g_{n0}^s(r) g_{k1}^a(r)$$

for the Gluodissociation cross section of the $Y(nS)$ states, and correspondingly for the $\chi_b(nP)$ states.

Gluodissociation cross section




Figure 3. Gluodissociation cross section σ_{diss} (left scale) of the $\Upsilon(1S)$ and $\Upsilon(2S)$ and the thermal gluon distribution (right scale) plotted for temperature $T = 170$ (solid curves) and 250 MeV (dotted curves) as functions of the gluon energy E_g .

F. Nendzig and GW, J. Phys. G41, 095003 (2014)

NN_2015

Thermal gluodissociation cross section

Average the gluodissociation cross section over the Bose-Einstein distribution of the thermal gluons in the QGP to obtain the dissociation width at temperature T for each of the six bottomia states involved


$$\Gamma_{\text{diss, } nl}(T) \equiv \frac{g_d}{2\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{dE_g E_g^2 \sigma_{\text{diss, } nl}(E_g)}{e^{E_g/T} - 1}$$

(g_d = 16)

With rising temperature, the peak of the gluon distribution moves to larger gluon energies E_g, whereas the dissociation cross sections move to smaller E_g, giving rise to a maximum in the gluodissociation width for fixed coupling α_s.
(Larger cross sections at higher temperatures due to **running coupling** counteract.)

Damping and gluodissociation widths for six bottomia states

$$\Gamma_{\text{tot}}(T) = \Gamma_{\text{damp}}(T) + \Gamma_{\text{diss}}(T)$$




F. Nendzig and GW, J. Phys. G41, 095003 (2014) ; arXiv:1406.5103

NN_2015

2.3 Hydrodynamic expansion (ideal)

Temperature profile for central collisions at different times τ

Use total decay widths $\Gamma_{\text{tot}}(b, x, y)$ of the bottomia states for each impact parameter b and time step t in the transverse (x^1, x^2) plane



Dynamical fireball evolution

Dependence of the local temperature T on impact parameter b , time t , and transverse coordinates x, y evaluated in ideal hydrodynamic calculation with transverse expansion

$$T(b, \tau_{init}, x^1, x^2) = T_0 \left(\frac{N_{mix}(b, x^1, x^2)}{N_{mix}(0, 0, 0)} \right)^{1/3}$$

$$N_{mix} = \frac{1-f}{2} N_{part} + f N_{coll}, \quad f = 0.145$$

The number of produced $b\bar{b}$ -pairs is proportional to the number of binary collision, and the nuclear overlap


$$N_{b\bar{b}}(b, x, y) \propto N_{coll}(b, x, y) \propto T_{AA}(b, x, y)$$

QGP suppression factor (without feed-down and CNM effects):


$$R_{AA}^{QGP} = \frac{\int d^2b \int dx dy T_{AA}(b, x, y) e^{-\int_{t_F}^{\infty} dt \Gamma_{tot}(b, t, x, y)}}{\int d^2b \int dx dy T_{AA}(b, x, y)}$$

Integrand
in the
transverse
plane

$b = 0 \text{ fm}$





$b = 8 \text{ fm}$



$p_T = 0$



$\Upsilon(1S)$



$p_T = 12 \text{ GeV}/c$

$p_T = 0$


$\Upsilon(2S)$



$p_T = 12 \text{ GeV}/c$

2.4 Feed-down cascade including χ_{nP} states

Relative initial populations in pp computed using an inverted cascade from the final populations measured by CMS and CDF(χ_b)
 $[N_{\text{final}}(1S)=1]$



3. Theoretical vs. exp. (CMS) Suppression factors


- Screening (potential model)
- Gluodissociation (OPE with string tension included)
- Collisional damping (imaginary part of potential)
- Reduced feed-down from excited states

2.76 TeV PbPb


t_F : Y formation time

t_{QGP} : QGP lifetime

T_{max} @ t_F : 200-800 MeV



Recent model upgrades



2014/15: Substantial improvements of the model


- Consider running of the coupling
- Transverse momentum of the Y included
- Relativistic Doppler effect
- Improved initial conditions
- $T_c = 160$ MeV

$$\alpha_s(Q) = \frac{\alpha(\mu)}{1 + \alpha(\mu)b_0 \ln \frac{Q}{\mu}}, \quad b_0 = \frac{11N_c - 2N_f}{6\pi}$$

F. Nendzig and GW, J. Phys. G41, 095003 (2014)

$\alpha_{nl}(T)$ depends on the solution $g_{nl}(r,T)$ of the Schrödinger eq.: Iterative solution

Theoretical vs. exp. (CMS) Suppression factors



2014/15: Substantial improvements of the model


$t_F = 0.4 \text{ fm/c}$: Y formation time
 $T_{\max} = 550 \text{ MeV}$: central temp.
at $b = 0$ and $t = t_F$

2.76 TeV PbPb

Room for additional suppression mechanisms for the excited states:
Hadronic dissociation, mostly by pions, is one possibility. Thermal pions are insufficient; direct pions may contribute, and magnetic dissociation.

F. Nendzig and GW, J. Phys. G41, 095003 (2014); J. Hœlck and GW, unpublished

Dependence on T_c at 2.76 TeV PbPb




Enhanced suppression
for smaller T_c : QGP-induced
dissociation processes act
longer. But: the effect is small.

< 5% higher suppression for
 $T_c = 160 \text{ MeV}$ vs 170 MeV

F. Hoelck and GW, unpublished

Transverse momentum dependence of Y(nS) suppression in PbPb at 2.76 TeV




Less suppression at high transverse momenta p_T :

Fast Y's escape QGP phase without dissociation

($t_F = 0.4$ fm/c)

F. Nendzig and GW, unpublished

4. Prediction for $\Upsilon(1S)$ suppression at 5.125 TeV PbPb (LHC run Nov. 2015)



5. Conclusion Upsilon suppression

- ❖ The suppression of the $\Upsilon(1S)$ ground state in PbPb collisions at LHC energies through gluodissociation, damping, screening, and reduced feed-down has been calculated for min. bias, and as function of centrality, and is found to be in good agreement with the CMS result. Screening is not decisive for the $1S$ state except for central collisions.
- ❖ The enhanced suppression of the $\Upsilon(2S, 3S)$ relative to the $1S$ state in PbPb as compared to pp collisions at LHC energies (CMS) leaves room for additional suppression mechanisms, in particular for peripheral collisions where discrepancies to the CMS data persist. Hadronic and/or magnetic dissociation of the excited states may be relevant.



Thank you for your attention !

NN_2015



25