



# Azimuthal correlation studies from ALICE



Panos Christakoglou (Nikhef)



 $\star$ 

### From the Big-Bang to the Little-Bangs...





QCD: Phase transition beyond a critical temperature (~170 MeV) and energy density (~0.5 GeV/fm<sup>3</sup>)  $\rightarrow$ accessible in the laboratory  $\rightarrow$  heavy-ion collisions

Can we constrain the equation of state and the transport properties of QGP?





M. Roirdan and W. Zajc, Scientific American 34A May (2006)

### **EVIDENCE FOR A DENSE LIQUID**

Two phenomena in particular point to the quark-gluon medium being a dense liquid state of matter: jet quenching and elliptic flow. Jet quenching implies the quarks and gluons are closely packed, and elliptic flow would not occur if the medium were a gas.





### The "perfect liquid" at RHIC and LHC





🚺 SHARE 🔒 🖓

👔 Ma 🛄 🔠 🔝 🔝 🖨 Print

Contacts: Kaner. McNulty Waleh. (631) 344-8350 or Pater Genzer. (631) 344-3174

### RHIC Scientists Serve Up "Perfect" Liquid

New state of matter more remarkable than predicted -- raising many new questions

Monday, April 18, 2005

TAMPA, FL – The four detector groups conducting research at the <u>Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider</u> (RHIC) – a glant atom "smasher" located at the U.S. Department of Energy's Brookhaven National Laboratory – say they've created a new state of hot, dense matter out of the quarks and gluons that are the basic particles of atomic nuclei, but it is a state quite different and even more remarkable than had been predicted. In <u>peer-reviewed papers</u> summarizing the first three years of RHIC findings, the scientists say that instead of behaving like a gas of free quarks and gluons, as was expected, the matter created in RHIC's heavy ion collisions appears to be more like a liquid. First Indirect Evidence of So-Far Undetected Strange Baryons

Other RHIC News

RHIC Featured in 'How The Universe Works' on the Science Channel

A New Look for RHIC & Sharper View of QCD: Looking Back at the 2014 RHIC-AGS Users' Meeting

RHIC Run 14: A Flawless 'Run of Firsts'



RHIC

0.0

 $(T-T_0)/T_0$ 

 $H_2O$ 

QGP

1.0

0.5



### The "perfect liquid" at RHIC and LHC





🛐 Ya 🏧 📑 📴 💁 🔒 Print



🟮 shikks 🔮 () 🏘 \_

\_

### Contacts: Karen McNulty Walah. (631) 344-8350 or Pater Genzer. (631) 344-3174

### RHIC Scientists Serve Up "Perfect" Liquid

New state of matter more remarkable than predicted -- raising many new questions

Monday, April 18, 2005

TAMPA, FL – The four detector groups conducting research at the <u>Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider</u> (RHIC) – a glant atom "smasher" located at the U.S. Department of Energy's Brookhaven National Laboratory – say they've created a new state of hot, dense matter out of the quarks and gluons that are the basic particles of atomic nuclei, but it is a state quite different and even more remarkable than had been predicted. In <u>peer-reviewed papers</u> summarizing the first three years of RHIC findings, the scientists say that instead of behaving like a gas of free quarks and gluons, as was expected, the matter created in RHIC's heavy ion collisions appears to be more like a liquid. First Indirect Evidence of So-Far Undetected Strange Baryons

Other RHIC News

RHIC Featured in 'How The Universe Works' on the Science Channel

A New Look for RHIC & Sharper View of QCD: Looking Back at the 2014 RHIC-AGS Users' Meeting

RHIC Run 14: A Flawless Run of Firsts







- Heavy ions are not point-like objects
- Collisions can create systems with different properties depending on whether they are head-on (i.e. large overlap region) or if the nuclei graze each other (i.e. small overlap region)
- Centrality defined geometrically by the impact parameter b
  - The two nuclei Distance between the centers of the two nuclei
  - $\star$  Perpendicular to the beam axis
- Centrality related to the fraction of the geometrical cross-section that overlaps







































Superposition of independent pp collisions













![](_page_13_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_2.jpeg)

Superposition of independent pp collisions

![](_page_13_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_2.jpeg)

Superposition of independent pp collisions

![](_page_14_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_3.jpeg)

Development as a bulk system

![](_page_15_Figure_5.jpeg)

high density and pressure at the center of the fireball

![](_page_15_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Figure_4.jpeg)

high density and pressure at the center of the fireball

 $\varepsilon = \frac{\langle y^2 - x^2 \rangle}{\langle y^2 + x^2 \rangle}$ 

![](_page_17_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_2.jpeg)

Superposition of independent pp collisions

![](_page_18_Picture_4.jpeg)

N -0 π/4 π/2 3π/4 π  $φ-Ψ_2 (rad)$ 

Development as a bulk system

![](_page_18_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_3.jpeg)

 $\langle p_x^2 - p_y^2 \rangle$  $v_2 =$  $\langle p_x^2 + p_y^2 \rangle$ 

 $v_2(p_T,\eta) = \langle cos[2(\varphi - \Psi_2)] \rangle$ 

![](_page_20_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_3.jpeg)

Different methods are affected in a different way by the background. We have to use as many as possible!

![](_page_21_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_2.jpeg)

- Correlations not connected to the reaction plane (resonances, jets, HBT,...)
- Suppression using multi-particle correlation techniques, η-gap analyses, different charge combinations,...

2-particle correlations

![](_page_21_Picture_6.jpeg)

4- (multi-) particle correlations

$$C_{n} \{4\} = \left\langle \left\langle 4 \right\rangle \right\rangle - 2 \left\langle \left\langle 2 \right\rangle \right\rangle^{2} =$$

$$= \left\langle v_{n}^{4} \right\rangle + 4 \left\langle v_{n}^{2} \right\rangle \delta_{2} + 2 \delta_{2}^{2} - 2 \left( \left\langle v_{n}^{2} \right\rangle + \delta_{2} \right)^{2} + \delta_{4} =$$

$$= - \left\langle v_{n}^{4} \right\rangle + \delta_{4}$$

 $\delta_2 \propto 1/M \Rightarrow V_n >> 1/M^{1/2}$ 

$$\delta_4 \propto 1/M^3 \Rightarrow V_n >> 1/M^{3/4}$$

- For a typical Pb-Pb collision at LHC energies in 30-40% centrality, M ~ 425
  - $\star$  v<sub>n</sub> >> 4.8% for the 2-particle correlation technique
  - $\star$  v<sub>n</sub> >> 1.1% for the 4-particle correlation technique

A. Bilandzic, R. Snellings, S. Voloshin, Phys. Rev. C83, 044913 (2011)

![](_page_22_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_2.jpeg)

- Originating from the fluctuations in the initial collision geometry.
  - ★ Fluctuations of initial energy/pressure distributions lead to "irregular" shapes that fluctuate event-by-event

$$\left\langle \mathbf{V}_{2}^{2} \right\rangle = \left\langle \mathbf{V}_{2} \right\rangle^{2} + \sigma_{v}^{2}$$
$$\left\langle \mathbf{V}_{2}^{4} \right\rangle = \left\langle \mathbf{V}_{2} \right\rangle^{4} + 6\sigma_{v}^{2} \left\langle \mathbf{V}_{2} \right\rangle^{2}$$
$$\left\langle \mathbf{V}_{2}^{6} \right\rangle = \left\langle \mathbf{V}_{2} \right\rangle^{6} + 15\sigma_{v}^{2} \left\langle \mathbf{V}_{2} \right\rangle^{4}$$

![](_page_22_Figure_6.jpeg)

$$\mathbf{v}_{2}\left\{2\right\} = \sqrt{\left\langle \mathbf{v}_{2}^{2}\right\rangle} = \dots = \left\langle \mathbf{v}_{2}\right\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\sigma^{2}}{\left\langle \mathbf{v}_{2}\right\rangle} \qquad \mathbf{v}_{2}\left\{4\right\} = \sqrt{2\left\langle \mathbf{v}_{2}^{2}\right\rangle^{2} - \left\langle \mathbf{v}_{2}^{4}\right\rangle} = \dots = \left\langle \mathbf{v}_{2}\right\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\sigma^{2}}{\left\langle \mathbf{v}_{2}\right\rangle}$$
$$\mathbf{v}_{2}\left\{6\right\} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{4}\left(\left\langle \mathbf{v}_{2}^{6}\right\rangle - 9\left\langle \mathbf{v}_{2}^{2}\right\rangle\left\langle \mathbf{v}_{2}^{4}\right\rangle + 12\left\langle \mathbf{v}_{2}^{2}\right\rangle^{3}\right)} = \dots = \left\langle \mathbf{v}_{2}\right\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\sigma^{2}}{\left\langle \mathbf{v}_{2}\right\rangle}$$

![](_page_23_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Charged particles:** p<sub>T</sub>-differential v<sub>2</sub>

![](_page_25_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_3.jpeg)

Hydrodynamic calculations describe the data fairly well!

![](_page_26_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_3.jpeg)

Bulk of particle production: described in terms of hydrodynamics

![](_page_28_Figure_0.jpeg)

## Identified particles $v_2$ at the LHC: intermediate $p_T$

![](_page_28_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_0.jpeg)

# Identified particles $v_2$ at the LHC: high $p_T$

![](_page_29_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Identified particles $v_2$ at the LHC: low $p_T$

![](_page_30_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_1.jpeg)

# Comparison with hydrodynamic calculations

![](_page_32_Picture_3.jpeg)

hydro curves from: H. Song, S. Bass and U. Heinz arXiv:1311.0157 [nucl-th]

Panos.Christakoglou@nikhef.nl

![](_page_33_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Comparison with VISHNU**

![](_page_33_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Looking at the details...: $\pi$ , p, $\Lambda$

![](_page_34_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Figure_3.jpeg)

- Pion v<sub>2</sub> systematically underestimated for central events (for peripheral events the agreement is improved)
- Proton v<sub>2</sub> underestimated (i.e. extra push expected in hydro) for both centralities
- $\Lambda v_2$  overestimated (i.e. less push expected in hydro) for central events

![](_page_35_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Looking at the details...: K, $\phi$ , $\Xi$

![](_page_35_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_3.jpeg)

 $\phi$  v<sub>2</sub> overestimated for both centralities: not enough hadronic interactions?






Mass ordering not preserved!!!





## VISHNU

- Couples VISH2+1 to UrQMD
- MC-KLN density profiles
- δ η/s = 0.16
- <sup>a</sup> τ<sub>0</sub> = 0.9 fm/*c*

H. Song, S. A. Bass, U. Heinz, T. Hirano and C. Shen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106 (2011) 192301 [Erratum-ibid. 109 (2012) 139904] [arXiv: 1011.2783 [nucl-th]].

H. Song, S. A. Bass, U. Heinz, T. Hirano and C. Shen, Phys. Rev. C 83 (2011) 054910 [Erratum-ibid. C 86 (2012) 059903] [arXiv: 1101.4638 [nucl-th]].

H. Song, S. Bass and U. W. Heinz, arXiv: 1311.0157 [nucl-th].

## VISH2+1

- 2+1 hydro without hadronic cascade
- Glauber density profiles
- η/s = 0.08
- τ<sub>0</sub> = 0.6 fm/*c*

H. Song and U. W. Heinz, Phys. Lett. B 658 (2008) 279 [arXiv:0709.0742 [nucl-th]].

H. Song and U. W. Heinz, Phys. Rev. C 77 (2008) 064901 [arXiv:0712.3715 [nucl-th]].

H. Song and U. W. Heinz, Phys. Rev. C 78 (2008) 024902 [arXiv:0805.1756 [nucl-th]].







Not a clear trend:  $\pi$ , K similar for both centralities,  $\varphi$  similar for central events but different for peripheral, some baryons (e.g. p,  $\Lambda$ ) "pushed" to higher  $p_T$ , while others (e.g.  $\Xi$ ) to lower  $p_T$ 







Mass ordering preserved









## Identified particles $v_2$ at the LHC: high $p_T$











- Probing the path length dependence of energy loss
  - particles flying in-plane have to travel through less (more) medium
  - expect to see an azimuthal dependence of jets and high p⊤ particles









Significant v<sub>2</sub> for all particle species at high  $p_T$  with no significant particle species dependence for  $p_T > 10$  GeV/c









## Identified particles $v_2$ at the LHC: intermediate $p_T$











- Number of constituent quark (NCQ) scaling holding with good accuracy at RHIC
  - ★ quarks coalesce forming hadrons?
  - NCQ scaling was considered as "evidence" of partonic degrees of freedom



J. Adams *et al.*, (STAR Collaboration), Nucl.Phys. **A757** (2005) 102 K. Adcox *et al.*, (PHENIX Collaboration), Nucl. Phys. **A757**, (2005) 184













Intermediate  $p_T$ : scaling at an approximate level







Theory was already based on approximations  $\rightarrow$  need for refinement (e.g. how does hadronic rescattering affect the scaling?)



## And there is even more...: higher harmonics!









## Yes, We Can!













# Backup







- Radial flow pushes particles to higher  $p_T \rightarrow$  depletion at lower  $p_T$ 
  - ★ heavier particles "feel" more the boost → the higher the mass the larger the low  $p_T$  depletion









- Radial flow pushes particles to higher  $p_T \rightarrow$  depletion at lower  $p_T$ 
  - ★ heavier particles "feel" more the boost → the higher the mass the larger the low  $p_T$  depletion









- Radial flow pushes particles to higher  $p_T \rightarrow$  depletion at lower  $p_T$ 
  - ★ heavier particles "feel" more the boost → the higher the mass the larger the low  $p_T$  depletion









- Radial flow pushes particles to higher  $p_T \rightarrow$  depletion at lower  $p_T$
- ★ heavier particles "feel" more the boost → the higher the mass the larger the low  $p_T$  depletion









- Radial flow pushes particles to higher  $p_T \rightarrow$  depletion at lower  $p_T$ 
  - ★ heavier particles "feel" more the boost → the higher the mass the larger the low  $p_T$  depletion

## B. Abelev et al. (ALICE Collaboration), Phys. Rev. C88, (2013) 044910



## Collision data





## Azimuthally asymmetric system

Toy model



- Larger "push" in-plane than out-of-plane as a function of mass
  - ★ larger low-p<sub>T</sub> depletion inplane than out-of-plane → lower v<sub>2</sub> in a mass dependent way



$$v_2 \sim \frac{N_{in-plane} - N_{out-of-plane}}{N_{in-plane} + N_{out-of-plane}}$$





## Azimuthally asymmetric system



Heavy particles have lower  $v_2$ at a fixed  $p_T$  than light particles



- Larger "push" in-plane than out-of-plane as a function of mass
  - larger low- $p_T$  depletion inplane than out-of-plane  $\rightarrow$ lower v<sub>2</sub> in a mass dependent way





## Azimuthally asymmetric system



Heavy particles have lower  $v_2$ at a fixed  $p_T$  than light particles



- Larger "push" in-plane than out-of-plane as a function of mass
  - larger low- $p_T$  depletion inplane than out-of-plane  $\rightarrow$ lower v<sub>2</sub> in a mass dependent way





## Azimuthally asymmetric system



Heavy particles have lower  $v_2$ at a fixed  $p_T$  than light particles



- Larger "push" in-plane than out-of-plane as a function of mass
  - larger low- $p_T$  depletion inplane than out-of-plane  $\rightarrow$ lower v<sub>2</sub> in a mass dependent way





## Azimuthally asymmetric system



Heavy particles have lower  $v_2$ at a fixed  $p_T$  than light particles

ALICE 10-50% Pb-Pb $\sqrt{s_{NN}}$  = 2.76 TeV





- Larger "push" in-plane than out-of-plane as a function of mass
  - larger low-*p*<sub>T</sub> depletion inplane than out-of-plane → lower v<sub>2</sub> in a mass dependent way





## Azimuthally asymmetric system



- Larger "push" in-plane than out-of-plane as a function of mass
  - larger low- $p_T$  depletion inplane than out-of-plane  $\rightarrow$ lower v<sub>2</sub> in a mass dependent way

## Hydrodynamical calculations



Mass ordering expected by hydrodynamical calculations









## Identified particles $v_2$ at the LHC: high $p_T$











- Probing the path length dependence of energy loss
  - particles flying in-plane have to travel through less (more) medium
  - expect to see an azimuthal dependence of jets and high p⊤ particles









Significant v<sub>2</sub> for all particle species at high  $p_T$  with no significant particle species dependence for  $p_T > 10$  GeV/c









## Identified particles $v_2$ at the LHC: intermediate $p_T$











- Number of constituent quark (NCQ) scaling holding with good accuracy at RHIC
  - quarks coalesce forming hadrons?
  - NCQ scaling was considered as "evidence" of partonic degrees of freedom



J. Adams *et al.*, (STAR Collaboration), Nucl.Phys. **A757** (2005) 102 K. Adcox *et al.*, (PHENIX Collaboration), Nucl. Phys. **A757**, (2005) 184












Intermediate  $p_T$ : scaling at an approximate level







Theory was already based on approximations  $\rightarrow$  need for refinement (e.g. how does hadronic rescattering affect the scaling?)





B. Abelev et al. (ALICE Collaboration: Phys. Lett. B726, (2013) 164



Not only in A-A it seems but also for smaller systems!







Not only in A-A it seems but also for smaller systems!

Τα πάντα ρει

Ηράκλειτος (Heraclitus) ~535 - 475 BC



## **QCD** on the lattice and phase transition



P. Huovinen, P. Petreczky, Nucl.Phys. A837, (2010) 26-53



★ Need observables that are sensitive to the EOS

## NIKHEF High p<sub>T</sub> pions, kaons, protons @ LHC: nuclear modification factor



B. Abelev et al. (ALICE Collaboration), arXiv:1401.1250



