

Fluctuations and initial state granularity in heavy ion collisions and their effects on observables from hydrodynamics *

R.P.G.ANDRADE, A.L.V.R.DOS REIS, F.GRASSI, Y.HAMA, W.L.QIAN

Instituto de Física-Universidade de São Paulo

AND

T.KODAMA

Instituto de Física-Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro

AND

J.-Y.OLLITRAULT

Institut de Physique Théorique-Saclay

A comparison is made between results obtained using smooth initial conditions and event-by-event initial conditions in the hydrodynamical description of relativistic nuclear collisions. Some new results on directed flow are also included.

PACS numbers: 25.75.-q, 24.10.Nz, 24.60.-k, 25.75.Ld

1. Objective

Hydrodynamics has been rather successful at describing data obtained in relativistic nuclear collisions at RHIC. Usually, smooth initial conditions are assumed (see e.g. fig.1 in [1] and fig.3 in [2]). On the other side, microscopic codes such as NeXus predict initial conditions event-by-event, which are quite irregular as shown in fig.1.

The question we address here is whether such structures (hot spots or more precisely hot tubes) can have a sizable effect on variables.

To solve the hydro equations with very irregular initial conditions, we use the SPHERIO code. This code is based on the method of Smoothed

* Presented at IV WPCF, Krakow 09/2008




Fig.1. $\eta = 0$ slice for initial energy density of a RHIC collision in the 6-15 % centrality window.

Particle Hydrodynamics, originally developed in astrophysics and adapted to relativistic heavy ion collisions in [3]. The version of NeXSPheRIO used here has initial conditions provided by NeXus [4] and normalized by an η -dependent factor to reproduce $dN_{ch}/d\eta$ in each centrality window [5]. The equation of state has a critical point [6]. $T_{f.out}$ is fixed (mostly) by $dN_{ch}/p_t dp_t$ and depends on the centrality window (i.e. number of participants). Centrality windows are defined using participant number and not impact parameter [7]. An ideal fluid is assumed, a code with Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics and dissipation is under development [8].

2. Comparison between fluctuating and average IC

In the following, we present a summary of results obtained using smooth initial conditions and running once the SPheRIO hydro code (standard approach) or using a set of NeXuS initial conditions, running for each initial conditions the SPheRIO hydro code and computing averages over the set for various observables (event-by-event hydrodynamics).

2.1. p_t distribution

As can be seen in figure 2 (left), the high p_t part is lifted. This is expected since hot tubes must expand more violently, producing more high p_t particles [9, 10].

2.2. elliptic flow

$v_2(p_t)$ is flatter as seen in figure 2 (centre). This is also expected as the isotropic expansion of hot tubes produces more high p_t particles and lowers $v_2(p_t)$ [9, 10]. In addition, $v_2(\eta)$ has no shoulder [11] as seen in figure 2




Fig. 2. Left: charged particle p_t distribution. Solid line: e-by-e initial conditions. Dashed: smooth initial conditions. Data: [12]. Center: p_t dependence of $\langle v_2 \rangle$. Data: [13]. Right: η dependence of $\langle v_2 \rangle$. Data: [13].

(right). The effects (isentropic expansion) of the hot tubes are more visible in regions of lower matter density present at larger η 's [9, 10].

2.3. Other comparisons

In [14], we argued that the hot tubes should manifest themselves giving smaller HBT radii. However, the situation might be more complicated.

Another observable where hot tubes might manifest themselves is the ridge, a structure observed in the 2 particle correlations, plotted as function of pseudorapidity difference $\Delta\eta$ and azimuthal angle difference $\Delta\phi$ between a high p_t trigger hadron and its associated hadrons (see e.g. [15]). The structure is $\Delta\eta$ independent. In NeXSPheRIO, the hot tubes can lead to such a ridge for the e-by-e initial conditions and not the smooth ones [16].

Finally, the fluctuations in the e-b-e initial conditions also manifest themselves in fluctuations of v_2 (as well as v_1). The predicted values for v_2 at 130 A GeV [17] and estimates at 200 A GeV [5] are in agreement with data [18, 19]. Improvements to remove the non-flow effects have been reported by STAR and PHOBOS, see e.g. [20].

3. New results on directed flow

In this section, we present some new *preliminary* results obtained with NeXSPheRIO on directed flow.

3.1. What is directed flow and what is expected

If a nucleus-nucleus collision is a number of independent nucleon-nucleon collisions, the momentum distribution is isotropic. If instead, it leads to thermalized matter in the overlap region, the momentum distribution is stretched along the impact parameter direction, v_2 is a measure of this stretching (so teaches about IC, thermalization, etc). There is also the

possibility that the momentum distribution be shifted/deformed towards one of the sides in the x-y plane, v_1 is a measure of this shift.

At some energy, a “wobble” in $v_1(\eta)$ is predicted. In some microscopical models such as RQMD and UrQMD, this could be the case for nucleons at RHIC energy [21, 22]. In hydro models, this could be the case for the fluid, if a QGP phase occurs [23, 24, 25, 26].

At SPS energy (40 A GeV and 158 A GeV), it was shown [27] that pions and protons behave oppositely. Pion directed flow as function of rapidity has no wiggle and crosses $y=0$ with a negative slope while nucleon directed flow has no wiggle and crosses $y=0$ with a positive slope (except perhaps at the higher energy, in the more peripheral bin, where there is a hint of wiggle).

3.2. RHIC results on directed flow

At RHIC, directed flow for charged particles is rather similar to what was obtained at SPS for pions: it crosses $\eta = 0$ with a negative slope [28, 29, 30]. This is understandable since charged particles are mostly pions, the fluid directed flow must be dominated by pions. The turnover in $v_1(\eta)$ occurs for different values of η in PHOBOS and in STAR (see below).

Results for identified particles are becoming available [31].

In addition, comparison of results for directed flow in Cu+Cu and Au+Au collisions show no system-size dependence [30].

3.3. NeXSPheRIO results on directed flow

NeXSPheRIO results are in qualitative agreement with PHOBOS for all η 's and quantitative agreement for $|\eta| < 3$ (figure 3 left). They are in qualitative agreement with STAR for $|\eta| < 3$ but turnover occurs for smaller η than for STAR (figure 3 right).




Fig. 3. Comparison of charged particle $\langle v_1 \rangle$ for NeXSPheRIO with (left) PHOBOS [28] and (right) STAR [30].

$v_1(\eta)$ from NeXSPheRIO for various centrality windows for Au+Au and Cu+Cu at 200 A GeV is shown in figure 4. Little dependence on A is seen in the windows 6-15% to 45-55%. Statistics must be improved.




Fig. 4. Comparison of $\langle v_1 \rangle$ obtained in Cu+Cu and Au+Au, from NeXSPheRIO.

Figure 5 (left) illustrates particle dependence. In NeXSPheRIO, protons have a big wiggle, pions have a plateau (left). A similar result was obtained using UrQMD [22]. In figure 5 (right), it is seen that $v_1(\eta)$ has a plateau for fluctuating initial conditions and a somewhat stronger negative inclination for smooth initial conditions.




Fig. 5. Left: $\langle v_1 \rangle$ for pions and protons. Right: $\langle v_1 \rangle$ for e-by-e and smooth initial conditions.

4. Summary

A short review of possible effects of fluctuating initial conditions, rather than smooth ones, was presented. In addition to providing a reasonable

description of various observables, as is possible with smooth initial conditions, some new effects were listed, most notably the ridge effect and the v_2 fluctuations, which do not appear when using the smooth initial conditions.

REFERENCES

- [1] T.Hirano Phys.Rev.C65 (2001) 011901R
- [2] C.Nonaka and S.Bass Phys.Rev.C75 (2007) 014902
- [3] C.E.Aguiar, T.Kodama, T.Osada & Y.Hama, J.Phys.G27(2001)75; Y.Hama, T.Kodama & O.Socolowski Jr. Braz.J.Phys. 35(2005)24
- [4] H.J. Drescher, F.M. Liu, S. Ostrapchenko, T. Pierog and K. Werner, Phys. Rev. C65 (2002) 054902
- [5] Y.Hama et al. Phys. At. Nucl. 71 (2008) 1558
- [6] Y. Hama et al. Nucl.Phys. A774 (2006) 169
- [7] R.Andrade et al. Braz.J.Phys. 34 (2004) 319
- [8] G.S.Denicol, T.Kodama, Ph.Mota in progress.
- [9] R.P.G. Andrade et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 101 (2008) 112301
- [10] Y.Hama, these proceedings
- [11] R.P.G. Andrade et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 97 (2006) 20230
- [12] B.B.Back et al. (PHOBOS) Phys. Lett. B578 (2004)297
- [13] B.B. Back et al. (PHOBOS) Phys. Rev. C72 (2005) 051901
- [14] O.Socolowski Jr. et al. Phys.Rev.Lett. 93 (2004) 182301
- [15] J.Putschke et al. (STAR) J.Phys. G34 (2007) S679
- [16] J.Takahashi et al. in progress.
- [17] C.E.Aguiar et al. Nucl. Phys. A698 (2002) 639c
- [18] C.Loizides et al. (PHOBOS) J. Phys. G34 (2007) S907
- [19] P.Sorensen et al. (STAR) J. Phys. G34 (2007) S897
- [20] B.Wosiek, these proceedings.
- [21] Snellings et al. Phys.Rev.Lett. 84 (2000) 2804
- [22] Bleicher and Stöcker Phys.Lett.B526 (2002) 309
- [23] Csernai and Röhlich, Phys.Lett.B458 (1999) 454
- [24] Brachmann et al. Phys.Rev.C61 (2000) 024909
- [25] Rischke et al. Heavy Ion Phys. 1 (1995) 309
- [26] Ivanov et al. Acta Phys. Hung. 15 (2002) 117
- [27] C.Alt et al. (NA49) Phys. Rev. C68 (2003) 034903
- [28] (PHOBOS) Phys. Rev. Lett. 97 (2006) 012301
- [29] J.Adams et al. (STAR) Phys. Rev. Lett. 92 (2004) 062301
- [30] B.I. Abelev et al. (STAR) arXiv:0807.1518
- [31] J. Chen et al. (STAR) J. Phys. G35 (2008) 044072