



CERN-PH-EP-2016-040

24 November 2016

# Systematic studies of correlations between different order flow harmonics in Pb–Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 2.76$ TeV

ALICE Collaboration\*

5

## Abstract

10

15

The correlations between event-by-event fluctuations of amplitudes of anisotropic flow harmonics in Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 2.76$  TeV were measured with the ALICE detector at the Large Hadron Collider. The results were obtained with the multi-particle cumulant method. The method is robust against systematic biases originating from non-flow effects. The centrality dependence of correlation between the higher Fourier harmonics ( $v_3$ ,  $v_4$ ,  $v_5$ ) and the lower harmonics ( $v_2$ ,  $v_3$ ) as well as the transverse momentum dependence of  $v_3$ – $v_2$  and  $v_4$ – $v_2$  correlations are presented. Comparisons are made to predictions from viscous hydrodynamics and A Multi-Phase Transport model (AMPT) models. The comparisons to viscous hydrodynamic models demonstrate that the different order Fourier harmonic correlations respond differently to the initial conditions or  $\eta/s$  and the small  $\eta/s$  regardless of initial conditions is favored and the small  $\eta/s$  with the AMPT initial condition is closest to the results. Together with the existing measurements of individual flow harmonics the presented results provide further constraints on initial conditions and the transport properties of the system produced in heavy-ion collisions.

## 1 Introduction

The main emphasis of the ultra-relativistic heavy ion collisions at the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC) and the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) is to study deconfined phase of the strongly interacting matter, the Quark-Gluon Plasma (QGP). This matter exhibits strong collective and anisotropic flow in the transverse plane driven by the pressure gradients, with more particles emitted in the direction of the largest gradients. The large elliptic flow discovered at RHIC energies [1] continuous to increase also in LHC energies [2, 3]. This has been predicted by calculations utilising viscous hydrodynamics [4–9]. These calculations also demonstrated that the shear viscosity to the entropy density ratio ( $\eta/s$ ) of strongly interacting matter is close to a universal lower bound  $1/4\pi$  [10] in heavy ion collisions at RHIC and LHC energies.

The temperature dependence of the  $\eta/s$  has some generic features that most of the known fluids obey. One such general behavior is that the ratio typically reaches its minimum value close to the phase transition region [11]. It was shown, using kinetic theory and quantum mechanical considerations [12] that  $\eta/s > 1/15$  would be an order of magnitude for the lowest possible shear viscosity to entropy ratio in nature. Later it was found that one can calculate an exact lower bound  $(\eta/s)_{\min} = 1/4\pi \approx 0.08$  using the AdS/CFT correspondence [10]. Hydrodynamical simulations supports as well the view that the QGP matter indeed is close to that limit [8]. This in turn may have an important implications to other fundamental physics goals. It is argued that such a low value might imply that thermodynamic trajectories for the expanding matter would lie close to the QCD critical end point, which is another subject of intensive experimental quest [11].

Anisotropic flow is traditionally quantified with harmonics  $v_n$  and corresponding symmetry plane angles  $\Psi_n$  in the Fourier series decomposition of particle azimuthal distribution in the plane transverse to the beam direction [13]:

$$E \frac{d^3N}{dp^3} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{d^2N}{p_T dp_T d\eta} \left\{ 1 + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} v_n(p_T, \eta) \cos[n(\varphi - \Psi_n)] \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where  $E$ ,  $N$ ,  $p$ ,  $p_T$ ,  $\varphi$  and  $\eta$  are the energy, particle yield, total momentum, transverse momentum, azimuthal angle and pseudorapidity of particles, respectively, and  $\Psi_n$  is the azimuthal angle of the symmetry plane of the  $n^{\text{th}}$ -order harmonic. The  $n^{\text{th}}$ -order flow coefficients are denoted as  $v_n$  and can be derived as  $v_n = \langle \cos[n(\varphi - \Psi_n)] \rangle$ , where the brackets denote an average over all particles in all events. The anisotropic flow is understood as hydrodynamic response to spatial deformation of the initial density profile. This profile fluctuates event to event due to quantum fluctuations of the positions of the constituents inside the colliding nuclei, which implies that the flow also fluctuates [14, 15]. The recognition of the importance of flow fluctuation has led to triangular flow and higher harmonics [16, 17] as well as the correlations between different Fourier harmonics [18]. As the result from ATLAS experiments, it shows that higher order harmonics are sensitive to the  $\eta/s$  [19]. And the  $v_n$  distributions carry detailed information about the initial density profile [20, 21].

However, difficulties on extracting the shear viscosity in heavy ion has been realized since it strongly depends on the specific choice of the initial conditions [4, 19, 22]. The viscous effects reduce the magnitude of the elliptic flow. Furthermore, the magnitude of  $\eta/s$  used in these calculations should be considered as an average over the temperature history of the expanding fireball while as it is known that  $\eta/s$  of other fluids depends on temperature. In addition, part of the elliptic flow also can originate from the hadronic phase [23–25]. Therefore, knowledge of both the temperature dependence and the relative contributions from the partonic and hadronic phases should be understood better to quantify  $\eta/s$  of the partonic fluid.

The higher harmonics ( $n > 3$ ) are understood as superpositions of linear and nonlinear responses, through which they are correlated with lower-order harmonics [26, 27]. When the harmonic order is large,

the nonlinear response contribution in viscous hydrodynamics is dominant [26, 27]. The magnitude of the viscous corrections as a function of  $p_T$  for  $v_4$  and  $v_5$  are sensitive to ansatz used for the viscous distribution function,  $\delta f$ , a small correction for the equilibrium distribution at hadronic freeze-out when QGP phase has become cool and dilute [28]. Hence the studies of the higher order ( $n > 3$ ) to lower order ( $v_2$  or  $v_3$ ) harmonic correlations and their  $p_T$  dependence can help to understand the viscous correction to the momentum distribution at hadronic freeze-out which is probably the least understood part of hydrodynamic calculations [26, 29].

Recently we measured for the first time the new multiparticle observables, the Symmetric 2-harmonic 4-particle Cumulants (SC), which quantify the relationship between event-by-event fluctuations of two different flow harmonics. The new observables are particularly robust against few-particle non-flow correlations and they provide orthogonal information to recently analysed symmetry plane correlators [30]. It was demonstrated that they are sensitive to the  $\eta/s$  of the expanding medium and simultaneous descriptions of different order harmonic correlations would constrain both the initial conditions and the medium properties. In this article, we have extended the analysis to higher order Fourier harmonic (up to 5th order) correlations as well as  $p_T$  dependence of correlations for the lower order harmonic ( $v_3$ - $v_2$  and  $v_4$ - $v_2$ ). We also include a systematic comparison to hydrodynamic and AMPT models. In Sec. 2 we present the details of the analysis methods. The experimental setting and measurements is described in Sec. 2.2 and the sources of systematic uncertainties are explained in Sec. 2.3. The results of the measurements are presented in Sec. 4. In Sec. 5 we present comparisons to theoretical calculations. Sec. 6 summarizes our findings.

## 2 Data Analysis

### 2.1 Experimental observables

While from existing measurements an estimate can be placed on the average value of QGP's  $\eta/s$ , both at RHIC and LHC energies, what remains completely unknown is how the  $\eta/s$  of QGP depends on temperature ( $T$ ). This study has been just initiated by the theorists in Ref. [29], where the first (and only rather qualitative) possibilities were investigated (see Fig. 1 therein). The emerging consensus of late is that it is unlikely that the study of individual flow harmonics  $v_n$  will reveal the details of  $\eta/s(T)$  dependence. In fact, it was demonstrated already in the initial study [29] that different  $\eta/s(T)$  parameterizations can lead to the same centrality dependence of individual flow harmonics. In Ref. [31] new flow observables were introduced by the theorists, which quantify the degree of correlation between two different harmonics  $v_m$  and  $v_n$ . The initial success of these new observables was attributed to their potential to discriminate for the first time the two respective contributions to anisotropic flow development—from initial conditions and from the transport properties of the QGP [31]. Therefore their measurement in turn would enable the experimental verification of theoretical predictions for individual stages of heavy-ion evolution independently. Besides this advantage, it turned out that correlations of different flow harmonics are sensitive to the details of  $\eta/s(T)$  dependence [30], to which individual flow harmonics are nearly insensitive [29].

For technical reasons, discussed in detail in Refs. [30, 32], the correlations between different flow harmonics cannot be studied experimentally with the same set of observables introduced by the theorists in Ref. [31]. Instead, in [32] the new flow observables obtained from multiparticle correlations, so-called *Symmetric Cumulants* (SC), were introduced to quantify in the most reliable way (i.e. nearly insensitivity to nonflow) the correlation of amplitudes of two different flow harmonics. The technical details are elaborated in Ref. [32], while the first measurements of SC observables were recently released by ALICE Collaboration in Ref. [30].

SC( $m,n$ ) can be normalized with the product  $\langle v_m^2 \rangle \langle v_n^2 \rangle$  to obtain *normalized* symmetric cumulants [30,

33], which we denote by  $\text{NSC}(m,n)$ , i.e.

$$\text{NSC}(m,n) \equiv \frac{\text{SC}(m,n)}{\langle v_m^2 \rangle \langle v_n^2 \rangle}. \quad (2)$$

Normalized symmetric cumulants reflect only the degree of the correlation which is expected to be insensitive to the magnitudes of  $v_m$  and  $v_n$ , while  $\text{SC}(m,n)$  contains both the degree of the correlation and individual  $v_n$  harmonics. In Eq. (2) the products in the denominator are obtained with two-particle correlations and using a pseudorapidity gap of  $|\Delta\eta| > 1.0$  to suppress biases from few-particle nonflow correlations. On the other hand, in the two two-particle correlations which appear in the definition of  $\text{SC}(m,n)$  the pseudorapidity gap is not needed, since nonflow is suppressed by construction in SC observable, as the study based on HIJING model has clearly demonstrated in Ref. [30].

The first measurements of SC observables have revealed that fluctuations of  $v_2$  and  $v_3$  are anti-correlated, while fluctuations of  $v_2$  and  $v_4$  are correlated in all centralities [30]. However, the details of the centrality dependence differ in the fluctuation-dominated (most central) and the geometry-dominated (mid-central) regimes [30]. Most importantly, the centrality dependence of  $\text{SC}(4,2)$  cannot be captured with the constant  $\eta/s$  dependence, indicating clearly that the temperature plays an important role in describing QGP's  $\eta/s$  dependence in various stages of heavy-ion evolution. These results were also used to discriminate between different parameterizations of initial conditions and it was demonstrated that in the fluctuation-dominated regime (in central collisions) MC-Glauber initial conditions with binary collisions weights are favored over wounded nucleon weights [30].

[\[Review of recent theoretical papers which discuss SC.\]](#) The SC observables provide orthogonal information to recently measured symmetry plane correlators in Refs. [17, 18, 34]. This statement does not exclude the possibility that both set of observables can be sensitive to the same physical mechanisms. In the recent theoretical study [33] it was pointed out that the mechanism giving rise to symmetry plane correlations (nonlinear coupling) can also contribute to symmetric cumulants. As a concrete example it was discussed that the existing correlation due to hydrodynamic evolution between  $V_4$  and  $V_2^2$  (which are vectors in the transverse plane) implies that both the angles and the magnitudes are correlated [33].

Interpretation of flow results obtained with multiparticle correlation techniques in small colliding systems, like pp and p-Pb at LHC, remains a challenge. The underlying difficulty stems from the fact that when anisotropic flow harmonic  $v_n$  is estimated with  $k$ -particle correlator, the statistical spread of that estimate scales to leading order as  $\sigma_{v_n} \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \frac{1}{M^{k/2}} \frac{1}{v_n^{k-1}}$ , where  $M$  is the number of particles in an event (multiplicity) and  $N$  is total number of events. This generic scaling ensures that multiparticle correlations are precision method only in heavy-ion collisions, characterized both with large values of multiplicity and flow. To leading order the measurements in small systems [35–39] and the measurements in heavy-ion collisions resemble the same features, which can be attributed to collective anisotropic flow in both cases. However, such interpretation is challenged by the outcome of recent Monte Carlo study [40] for  $e^+e^-$  systems in which collective effects are not expected. Nonetheless, in this study to leading order multiparticle correlations exhibit yet again the similar universal trends first seen in heavy-ion collisions, both for elliptic and triangular flow. Therefore, it seems unlikely that the analysis of individual flow harmonics with multiparticle techniques will answer whether collective effects can develop and QGP be formed in small systems—instead new observables, like SC, might provide the final answer due to their better sensitivity [30, 31].

## 2.2 Event and Track Selection

The data sample recorded by ALICE during the 2010 heavy-ion run at the LHC is used for this analysis. Detailed descriptions of the ALICE detector can be found in [41–43]. The Time Projection Chamber (TPC) was used to reconstruct charged particle tracks and measure their momenta with full azimuthal

coverage in the pseudo-rapidity range  $|\eta| < 0.8$ . Two scintillator arrays (V0) which cover the pseudo-rapidity ranges  $-3.7 < \eta < -1.7$  and  $2.8 < \eta < 5.1$  were used for triggering, and the determination of centrality [44]. The trigger conditions and the event selection criteria are identical to those described in [2, 44]. Approximately  $10^7$  minimum-bias Pb-Pb events with a reconstructed primary vertex within  $\pm 10$  cm from the nominal interaction point in the beam direction are used for this analysis. Charged particles reconstructed in the TPC in  $|\eta| < 0.8$  and  $0.2 < p_T < 5$  GeV/c were selected. The charged track quality cuts described in [2] were applied to minimize contamination from secondary charged particles and fake tracks. The charged particle track reconstruction efficiency and contamination were estimated from HIJING Monte Carlo simulations [45] combined with a GEANT3 [46] detector model, and found to be independent of the collision centrality. The reconstruction efficiency increases from 70% to 80% for particles with  $0.2 < p_T < 1$  GeV/c and remains constant at  $80 \pm 5\%$  for  $p_T > 1$  GeV/c. The estimated contamination by secondary charged particles from weak decays and photon conversions is less than 6% at  $p_T = 0.2$  GeV/c and falls below 1% for  $p_T > 1$  GeV/c. With this choice of low  $p_T$  cut-off we are reducing event-by-event biases from smaller reconstruction efficiency at lower  $p_T$ , while the high  $p_T$  cut-off was introduced to reduce the contribution to the anisotropies from jets. Reconstructed tracks were required to have at least 70 TPC space points (out of a maximum of 159). Only tracks with a transverse distance of closest approach (DCA) to the primary vertex less than 3 mm, both in longitudinal and transverse direction, are accepted to reduce the contamination from secondary tracks (for instance the charged particles produced in the detector material, particles from weak decays, etc.). Tracks with kinks (the tracks that appear to change direction due to multiple scattering,  $K^\pm$  decays) were rejected.

### 2.3 Systematic uncertainties

The systematic uncertainties are estimated by varying the event and track selection criteria. All systematic checks described here are performed independently. Each results of  $SC(m,n)$  with a selected criterion are compared to ones from the default event and track selection described in the previous section. The differences between the default results and the ones obtained from the variation of the selection criteria are taken as systematic uncertainty of each individual source. The contributions from different sources were then added in quadrature to obtain the final value of the systematic uncertainty.

The event centrality was determined by the V0 detectors [47] with better than 2% resolution of centrality determination. The systematic uncertainty from centrality determination was evaluated by using Time Projection Chamber (TPC) and Silicon Pixel Detector (SPD) [48] detectors instead of the default, V0 detectors. The systematic uncertainties from the centrality determinations were about 3% both for  $SC(5,2)$  and  $SC(4,3)$ , 8% for  $SC(5,3)$ .

Because of limited acceptance of ALICE detector, primary vertex position along the longitudinal direction is important to ensure for the uniform pseudo-rapidity distribution over all events. As described in Sec. 2.2, the reconstructed vertex position in beam axis (z-vertex) is required to be located within 10 cm of interaction point (IP). We measured the results with 8cm cut and the differences in the final results were less than 3%.

The analyzed events were recorded with two settings of the magnetic field polarities and they have almost the same number of events. Both magnetic polarization events were used for the default analysis and the systematic uncertainties were evaluated from the results from each of two polarized magnetic field settings. Moreover, because of incompleteness of track reconstruction, correction steps are necessary to trace back from reconstructed tracks to the originally generated particles from the collisions. The effects from  $p_T$  dependence reconstruction efficiency were taken into systematic uncertainty. Magnetic polarizations, reconstruction efficiency effects are relatively small and difference from the default settings were less than 2%.

The systematic uncertainty due to the track reconstruction was estimated using two additional tracking, one relying on the so-called standalone TPC tracking with the same parameters described in Sec. 2.2, and

the second that relies on the combination of the TPC and the ITS detectors with tighter selection criteria. Since some parts of the SPD were switched off during some run periods, inefficient regions for common track reconstruction are apparent. To recover non-uniform azimuthal acceptance due to dead zones in SPD, and to get the best transverse momentum resolution, approach of hybrid selection with SPD hit and/or ITS refit tracks combine with TPC were used. The each track reconstruction were evaluated by varying the threshold on parameters used to select the tracks at the reconstruction level. The systematic difference up to 12% was observed in  $SC(m,n)$  results from the different track selections. In addition, we applied the like-sign technique to estimate non-flow correlation effects on  $SC(m,n)$ . The difference between all charged combinations and like-sign combinations were largest contribution to the systematic uncertainty and they were 7% for  $SC(4,3)$  and 20% for  $SC(5,3)$ .

One of the other largest contributions to the systematic uncertainty originates from the non-uniform reconstruction efficiency. In order to estimate the effects on the measurements of these azimuthal correlators for various detector inefficiencies, we use the AMPT models (see the details in Sec. 5) which have flat uniform distribution of azimuthal angles. Then we force to have detector inefficiencies by imposing non-uniform azimuthal distribution from the data. For the observables,  $SC(5,2)$ ,  $SC(5,3)$  and  $SC(4,3)$ , the uncertainty from the non-uniform distribution of azimuthal angles were 9%, 17% and 11%, respectively. Generally, systematics uncertainties are large for the  $SC(5,3)$  and  $SC(5,2)$  than the lower harmonics of  $SC(m,n)$ , because smaller values of  $v_n$  are sensitive to azimuthal modulation and  $v_n$  is decrease with  $n$ . Furthermore, the various AMPT models (see the details in Sec. 5) were used to check the sensitivities of the observables due to the strength of the signals we are measuring, it turned out that the effect is negligible.

### 3 Theoretical models

We have used various models in this article. The HIJING model [45, 49] was utilized to obtain the  $p_T$ -weights [32] which were used to estimate systematic bias due to non-uniform reconstruction efficiency. Secondly, the HIJING model was used to estimate the strength of non-flow correlations (typically few-particle correlations insensitive to the collision geometry).


We have compared the centrality dependence of our observables with theoretical model from [29], where the initial energy density profiles are calculated using a next-to-leading order perturbative-QCD+saturation model [50, 51]. The subsequent spacetime evolution is described by relativistic dissipative fluid dynamics with different parametrizations for the temperature dependence of the shear viscosity to entropy density ratio  $\eta/s(T)$ . Each of the  $\eta/s(T)$  parametrizations is adjusted to reproduce the measured  $v_n$  from central to mid-peripheral collisions.

The VISH2+1 [52] is an event-by-event theoretical framework model for relativistic heavy-ion collision based on (2+1)-dimensional viscous hydrodynamics which describes both the QGP fluid and the highly dissipative and even off-equilibrium late hadronic stage with fluid-dynamics. With well tuned transport coefficients, decoupling temperature and some well-chosen initial conditions (like AMPT [53–55] etc.), it could fit many related soft hadron data, such as the  $p_T$  spectra and different flow harmonics at RHIC and the LHC [5, 54, 56, 57]. Three different initial conditions (MC-Glauber, MC-KLN and AMPT) along with different constant  $\eta/s$  parametrizations are used in the model. Traditionally, the Glauber model constructs the initial entropy density of the QGP fireball from a mixture of the wounded nucleon and binary collision density profiles [58], and the KLN model assumes the initial entropy density is proportional to the initial gluon density calculated from the corresponding  $k_T$  factorization formula [59]. In the Monte-Carlo versions (MC-Glauber and MC-KLN) [60–62], additional initial state fluctuations are introduced through the position fluctuations of individual nucleons inside the colliding nuclei. For the AMPT initial conditions [53–55], the fluctuating energy density profiles are constructed from the energy decompositions of individual partons, which fluctuate in both momentum and position space. Compared

with the MC-Glauber and MC-KLN initial conditions, the additional Gaussian smearing parameter in the AMPT initial conditions makes the typical initial fluctuation scales changeable which gives rise to non-vanishing initial local flow velocities [55].

Finally, we provide an independent estimate of the centrality dependence of our observables by utilizing the AMPT model [63–65]. Even though thermalization could be achieved in collisions of very large nuclei and/or at extremely high energy, the dense matter created in heavy ion collisions may not achieve full thermal or chemical equilibrium as a result of its finite volume and energy. To address such non-equilibrium many-body dynamics, AMPT has been developed, which includes both initial partonic and final hadronic interactions and the transition between these two phases of matter. For the initial conditions, the AMPT model uses the spatial and momentum distributions of hard minijet partons and soft strings from the HIJING model [45, 49]. The AMPT model can be run in two main configurations, the default and the string melting model. In the default version, partons are recombined with their parent strings when they stop interacting. The resulting strings are later converted into hadrons using the Lund string fragmentation model [66, 67]. In the string melting version, the initial strings are melted into partons whose interactions are described by the ZPC parton cascade model [68]. These partons are then combined into the final-state hadrons via a quark coalescence model. In both configurations, the dynamics of the subsequent hadronic matter is described by a hadronic cascade based on a Relativistic Transport (ART) model [69] which also includes resonance decays. The third version presented in this article is based on the string melting configuration, in which the hadronic rescattering phase is switched off to study its influence to the development of anisotropic flow. The input parameters used in both configurations are:  $\alpha_s = 0.33$ , a partonic cross-section of 1.5 mb, while the Lund string fragmentation parameters were set to  $\alpha = 0.5$  and  $b = 0.9 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ . Even though the string melting version of AMPT [65, 70] reasonably reproduces particle yields,  $p_T$  spectra, and  $v_2$  of low- $p_T$  pions and kaons in central and mid-central Au–Au collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200 \text{ GeV}$  and Pb–Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2760 \text{ GeV}$  [71], it was seen clearly in the recent study [72] that it fails to quantitatively reproduce the measurements. It turns out that the radial flow in AMPT is 25% lower than the measured value at the LHC, which indicates that the unrealistically low radial flow in AMPT is responsible for the quantitative disagreement. The detail configurations on AMPT settings used for this article and the comparisons of  $p_T$  differential  $v_n$  for pions, kaons and protons to the data can be found in [72].

## 4 Results



**Fig. 1:** The result of  $SC(m,n)$  (left figure) and  $NSC(m,n)$  (right figure) with flow harmonic order up to 5th in Pb–Pb  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76 \text{ TeV}$ . Note that the lower order harmonic correlations ( $SC(4,2)$ ,  $SC(3,2)$ ) are scaled down by factor of 10 and only statistical errors are shown in the figure.

The centrality dependence of  $SC(4,2)$  and  $SC(3,2)$  are presented in Fig. 1 as shadow bands which are the


same as the published results [30]. Positive values of  $SC(4,2)$  are observed for all measured centralities. This suggests a positive correlation between the event-by-event fluctuations of  $v_2$  and  $v_4$ . It also indicates that finding  $v_2$  larger than average( $\langle v_2 \rangle$ ) in an event enhances the probability of finding  $v_4$  larger than average( $\langle v_4 \rangle$ ) in that event. On the other hand, the negative results of  $SC(3,2)$  over all measured centralities show the anti-correlation between  $v_2$  and  $v_3$  flow harmonic magnitudes, which further implies that finding  $v_2$  larger than average( $v_2 > \langle v_2 \rangle$ ) enhancing the probability of finding smaller  $v_3$  than average( $v_3 < \langle v_3 \rangle$ ).

The centrality dependence of the higher order harmonic correlations ( $SC(4,3)$ ,  $SC(5,2)$  and  $SC(5,3)$ ) are presented in Fig. 1 and compared to the lower order harmonic correlations ( $SC(4,2)$ ,  $SC(3,2)$ ). The correlation between  $v_3$  and  $v_4$  is negative as similarly as  $v_3$  and  $v_2$  while the others are all positive. The higher order flow harmonic correlations ( $SC(4,3)$ ,  $SC(5,2)$  and  $SC(5,3)$ ) are much smaller compared to the lower order harmonics ( $SC(3,2)$  and  $SC(4,2)$ ). Especially  $SC(5,2)$  is 10 times smaller than  $SC(4,2)$  and  $SC(4,3)$  is about 20 times smaller than  $SC(3,2)$ .

However, unlike  $SC(m,n)$ ,  $NSC(m,n)$  results with the higher order flow harmonics show almost same order of the correlation strength as the lower order flow harmonic correlations ( $NSC(3,2)$  or  $NSC(4,2)$ ).  $NSC(4,3)$  is comparable to  $NSC(3,2)$  and one finds that a hierarchy  $NSC(5,3) > NSC(4,2) > NSC(5,2)$  holds for most of centrality ranges within the errors. These results indicate that the lower order harmonic correlations ( $SC(3,2)$  and  $SC(4,2)$ ) are larger than higher order harmonic correlations ( $SC(4,3)$ ,  $SC(5,2)$  and  $SC(5,3)$ ), not only because of the correlation strength itself but also the individual flow strength.  $SC(5,2)$  is stronger than  $SC(5,3)$ , but as for  $NSC$ , the correlation between  $v_5$  and  $v_3$  is stronger than the correlation between  $v_5$  and  $v_2$ .

To obtain the  $p_T$  dependence of  $SC(m,n)$  results, we apply minimum  $p_T$  cuts, instead of  $p_T$  bin-by-bin interval in order to avoid large statistical fluctuations in the results. The various minimum  $p_T$  cuts from 0.2 to 1.5 are applied. The results of  $p_T$  dependence with  $SC(3,2)$  and  $SC(4,2)$  for minimum  $p_T$  cuts,  $0.2 < p_T < 0.7$ , are shown on the left top in Fig. 2. The strength of  $SC(m,n)$  correlation becomes larger as the minimum  $p_T$  increases. This indicates that the relationship between event-by-event fluctuation of two different flow harmonics  $v_m$  and  $v_n$  is stronger for high  $p_T$  particles. This  $p_T$  dependence correlations have much stronger centrality dependence, where  $SC(m,n)$  gets much larger as the centrality or  $p_T$  increase.  $NSC(3,2)$  and  $NSC(4,2)$  with different minimum cuts are shown on the right in Fig. 2. The strong  $p_T$  dependence observed in  $SC(m,n)$  is not clearly seen in  $NSC(m,n)$ .  $NSC(m,n)$  results are aligned all together and consistent in errors for all minimum  $p_T$  cuts. This suggests that the  $p_T$  dependence of  $SC(m,n)$  does not solely result from the correlation between flow harmonics but results from the different values of  $p_T$  dependent individual  $v_n$  values. The minimum  $p_T$  cuts are extended from 0.8 to 1.5  $GeV/c$  and the results are shown on the bottom in Fig. 2. As for  $SC(m,n)$ , the similar trends are observed as similarly as  $p_T < 0.8$ , however  $NSC(m,n)$  tends to decrease as the minimum  $p_T$  or the centrality increase. The  $p_T$  dependence for  $NSC(3,2)$  is not clearly seen and it is consistent with no  $p_T$  dependence within the current statistical and systematic errors except for 40-50% centrality and  $NSC(4,2)$  shows a moderate decreasing trend for increasing  $p_T$  (see further discussions in Sec. 5.3). This might be an indication of possible viscous corrections for the equilibrium distribution at hadronic freeze-out [28].






**Fig. 2:**  $SC(3,2)$  and  $SC(4,2)$  with various minimum  $p_T$  cuts (Left) and results of normalized  $SC(3,2)$  and  $SC(4,2)$  (Right). The upper panels show the results for minimum  $p_T$  range,  $0.2 < p_T < 0.7$  GeV/c and the bottom panels are for minimum  $p_T$  range,  $0.8 < p_T < 1.5$  GeV/c.

## 5 Model comparisons

### 5.1 Low order harmonic correlations

SC(3,2) and SC(4,2) are compared to several theoretical calculations. First, the fluid hydrodynamic predictions with the different parameterizations for the temperature dependence of the shear viscosity to entropy ratio  $\eta/s(T)$  are shown on the left in Fig. 3. Roughly the hydrodynamic calculations capture qualitatively the centrality dependence, but not quantitatively. Both SC(3,2) with data and hydrodynamics have negative values for all centralities, while SC(4,2) results have positive values over all measured centralities. However, there is no single centrality for which a given  $\eta/s(T)$  parameterization describes both SC(3,2) and SC(4,2) simultaneously. On the other hand, the same hydrodynamic calculations capture the centrality dependence of the individual  $v_n$  quantitatively [73].

NSC(3,2) and NSC(4,2) are also compared to the same model on the right in Fig. 3. While NSC(3,2) doesn't show sensitivity to different  $\eta/s(T)$  parameterizations, NSC(4,2) exhibit much better sensitivity than NSC(3,2) observable and the individual flow harmonics [29]. These findings indicate that NSC(3,2) observable is sensitive mainly to the initial conditions, while NSC(4,2) observable is sensitive to both the initial conditions and the system properties, which is consistent with the prediction from [31]. However, the sign of NSC(3,2) is positive in the models in 0-10% central collisions while it is negative in data. In the most central collisions the anisotropies originate mainly from fluctuations, i.e. the initial ellipsoidal geometry characteristic for mid-central collisions plays little role in this regime. Hence this observation will help to understand the fluctuations in initial conditions better. NSC(4,2) observable shows better sensitivity for different  $\eta/s(T)$  parameterizations, i.e. medium property but the model cannot describe the centrality dependence nor the absolute values. These observed distinct discrepancies between data and models might indicate that the current understanding of initial conditions used in the model need to be revisited to further constrain the  $\eta/s(T)$ , considering the difficulties on separating the role of the  $\eta/s$  from the initial condition to the final state particle anisotropies [4, 22]. Hence the use of SC( $m,n$ ) and NSC( $m,n$ ) can provide new constraints on the detailed modeling of the initial-state condition and the fluctuations of the medium created in heavy ion collisions and the better constraints on the initial-state conditions will certainly improve the uncertainties of determining  $\eta/s(T)$ .




**Fig. 3:** Results from SC( $m,n$ ) in Pb-Pb  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV are compared to hydrodynamic calculations. The dashed lines are hydrodynamic predictions with various  $\eta/s(T)$  parametrizations [29].

The results with the comparison to VISH2+1 calculation are shown in Fig. 4. All the models with the large share viscosity regardless of the initial conditions ( $\eta/s=0.2$  for MC-KLN and MC-Glauber initial conditions and  $\eta/s=0.16$  for AMPT initial condition) failed to capture the centrality dependence of SC(3,2) and SC(4,2). And among the models with small shear viscosities ( $\eta/s=0.08$ ), the one with the AMPT initial condition describes the data better both for SC(3,2) and SC(4,2) but they cannot describe


the data quantitatively for most of the centrality ranges. As similarly as the above mentioned hydrodynamic calculations [29], the sign of the normalised NSC(3,2) in these models is opposite to the data in 0-10% central collisions. NSC(3,2) don't show sensitivity to neither initial conditions nor  $\eta/s$  parametrizations and cannot be described by these models quantitatively. However, for NSC(4,2), it is sensitive both to initial conditions and  $\eta/s$  parametrizations. Even though NSC(4,2) is flavoured both by AMPT initial condition with  $\eta/s=0.08$  and MC-Galuber initial condition with  $\eta/s=0.20$ , SC(4,2) can be only described by smaller  $\eta/s$  from AMPT and MC-Glauber initial conditions. Therefore the Galuber initial condition with  $\eta/s=0.20$  model can be ruled out and we come to a conclusion based on the tested model parameters that  $\eta/s$  should be small and AMPT initial condition is flavoured by the data.

Finally, the extracted results from particle level AMPT simulations in the same way as for the data are compared to the data in Fig. 5. As for SC(3,2), neither of the settings can describe the data and somewhat the setting with the default AMPT model follows the trend of the data closest. The same setting can describe NSC(3,2) fairly well and also the sign of NSC(3,2) is well reproduced by this setting while all the hydrodynamic calculations in this article failed to describe the sign of the observable in most central collisions. Interestingly the string melting AMPT model can't capture the data well where the strength of the correlation is weaker than the default model. The third version based on the string melting configuration with the hadronic rescattering phase off is also shown to study its influence. This late hadronic rescattering stage makes both SC(3,2) and NSC(3,2) stronger in the string melting AMPT model but it is not enough to describe the data. Further we investigated why the default AMPT model can describe NSC(3,2) fairly well but underestimates the data. By taking the differences in the individual flow harmonics ( $v_2$  and  $v_2$ ) between the model and data into account, we was able to recover the data. The discrepancy in SC(3,2) can be explained by the overestimated individual  $v_n$  values reported in [72] in all the centrality ranges.

In case of SC(4,2), the string melting AMPT model can fairly describe the data while the default model underestimates it. NSC(4,2) is slightly overestimated by the same setting which can describe SC(4,2) but the default AMPT model can describe the data better. The influence of the hadronic rescattering phase for NSC(4,2) is opposite to other observables (SC(3,2), NSC(3,2) and SC(4,2)), where the hadronic rescattering make NSC(4,2) slightly smaller. It should be noted that the better agreement for SC( $m,n$ ) should not be overemphasized since there are discrepancies in the individual  $v_n$  between AMPT and data as it was demonstrated for SC(3,2). Hence the simultaneous description of SC( $m,n$ ) and NSC( $m,n$ ) should give better constrains to the parameters in AMPT.



**Fig. 4:** Results of SC(3,2) and SC(4,2) are compared to various VISH2+1 calculations with different settings. Three initial conditions from AMPT, MC-KLN, and MC-Glauber are drawn as different colors and markers. The  $\eta/s$  parameters are shown as different line styles, the small shear viscosities ( $\eta/s=0.08$ ) are shown as solid lines, and large shear viscosities ( $\eta/s=0.2$  for MC-KLN and MC-Glauber, 0.16 for AMPT) are drawn as dashed lines. Upper panels are the result of SC( $m,n$ ) and lower panels are the results of NSC( $m,n$ ).




**Fig. 5:** Results of SC(3,2) and SC(4,2) are compared to various AMPT simulations. Upper panels are the results of SC( $m,n$ ) and the lower panels are the results of NSC( $m,n$ ). The details of the AMPT configurations can be found in Sec. 3.


## 5.2 Higher order harmonic correlations

The higher order harmonics correlations (SC(4,3), SC(5,2) and SC(5,3)) are compared to VISH2+1 calculation, shown in Fig. 6. All the models with the large share viscosity regardless of the initial conditions ( $\eta/s=0.2$  for MC-KLN and MC-Glauber initial conditions, and  $\eta/s = 0.16$  for AMPT) failed to capture the centrality dependence of SC(5,2), SC(5,2) and SC(5,3), more clearly than lower order harmonic correlations (SC(3,2), SC(4,2)). And among the models with small shear viscosity ( $\eta/s=0.08$ ), the one from the AMPT initial condition describes the data much better than the other initial conditions. A quite clear separation between different initial conditions is observed for these higher order harmonics correlations compared to the lower order harmonic correlations. NSC(5,2) and SC(5,3) are quite sensitive to both the initial conditions and the  $\eta/s$  parametrizations. As similarly as the above mentioned hydrodynamic calculations [29], the sign of the normalised NSC(4,3) in these models is opposite to the data in 0-10% central collisions. NSC(4,3) shows sensitivity to both initial conditions and  $\eta/s$  parametrizations while NSC(3,2) didn't show sensitivity to neither initial conditions nor  $\eta/s$  parametrizations. SC(4,3) data is clearly flavoured by smaller  $\eta/s$  but NSC(4,3) cannot be described by these models quantitatively.

The extracted results from particle level AMPT simulations in the same way as for the data are compared to the data in Fig. 7. The string melting AMPT model describes SC(5,2) and SC(5,3) well. The same setting describes only NSC(5,3) but it overestimates NSC(5,2). However the default AMPT model can describe NSC(5,3) and NSC(5,2) fairly well as similarly as NSC(3,2) and NSC(4,2). In case of SC(4,3), neither of the settings can describe the data but the default AMPT model follows the data closest. The string melting AMPT model fails to describe SC(4,3) and NSC(4,3). In summary, the default AMPT model describes the normalized SC (NSC( $m,n$ )) from lower to higher order harmonic correlation while the string melting AMPT model overestimates NSC(5,2) and underestimates (or very weak correlations) NSC(4,3).



**Fig. 6:** Results of  $SC(5,2)$ ,  $SC(5,3)$  and  $SC(4,3)$  are compared to various VISH2+1 calculations. Three initial conditions from AMPT, MC-KLN and MC-Glauber are drawn as different colors and markers. The  $\eta/s$  parameters are shown as different line styles, the small shear viscosity ( $\eta/s=0.08$ ) are shown as solid lines, and large shear viscosities ( $\eta/s=0.2$  for MC-KLN and MC-Glauber, 0.16 for AMPT) are drawn as dashed lines. Upper panels are the results of  $SC(m,n)$  and lower panels are the results of  $NSC(m,n)$ .




**Fig. 7:** Results of  $SC(5,2)$ ,  $SC(5,3)$  and  $SC(4,3)$  are compared to various AMPT simulations. Upper panels are the results of  $SC(m,n)$  and the lower panels are the results of  $NSC(m,n)$ . The details of the AMPT configurations can be found in Sec. 3.

### 5.3 Transverse momentum dependence of Low order harmonic correlations

NSC(3,2) and NSC(4,2) as a function of different minimum  $p_T$  cuts are compared to the AMPT simulations in Fig. 8. As discussed in Sec. 4 in higher minimum  $p_T$  cuts, the  $p_T$  dependence for NSC(3,2) and NSC(4,2) in mid central collisions is seen also in AMPT simulations. The other AMPT configurations except for the default AMPT model give very strong  $p_T$  dependence above 1  $GeV/c$  and cannot describe the magnitude of the data both for NSC(3,2) and NSC(4,2). In case of NSC(3,2), the default AMPT model describes the magnitude and  $p_T$  dependence well in all collision centralities except for 40 – 50% where the model underestimates the data and have stronger  $p_T$  dependence than the data. As for NSC(4,2), the same model which describe NSC(3,2) well and also can reproduce the data well expect for 10 – 20% and 40 – 50% centralities where some deviations from the data both for the magnitude and  $p_T$  dependence are observed. When the string melting AMPT model are compared to the same model with the hadronic rescattering off, it is observed that the very strong  $p_T$  dependence as well as the correlation strength gets weaker by the hadronic rescattering. This might imply the hadronic interactions is the source of this observed  $p_T$  dependence even though the relative contributions from partonic and hadronic stage in the final state particle should be studied further. These observed moderate  $p_T$  dependence in mid central collisions both for NSC(3,2) and NSC(4,2) might be an indication of possible viscous corrections for the equilibrium distribution at hadronic freeze-out predicted in [28] when QGP phase has become cool and dilute.





**Fig. 8:** NSC(3,2)(Top) and SC(4,2)(Bottom) as a function of minimum  $p_T$  cuts. The AMPT results are drawn as color bands for comparison. The details of the AMPT configurations can be found in Sec. 3.

## 6 Summary

In summary, we have measured the Symmetric 2-harmonic 4-particle Cumulants (SC), which quantify the relationship between event-by-event fluctuations of two different flow harmonics. The observables are particularly robust against few-particle non-flow correlations and they provide orthogonal information to recently analysed symmetry plane correlators. We have found that fluctuations of  $v_2$  and  $v_3$  ( $v_3$  and  $v_4$ ) are anti-correlated in all centralities and fluctuations of  $v_2$  and  $v_4$  ( $v_2$  and  $v_5$ ,  $v_3$  and  $v_5$ ) are correlated for all centralities. This feature was explored to discriminate between various hydro model calculations with different initial conditions as well as different parametrizations of the temperature dependence of  $\eta/s$ . We have found that the different order harmonic correlations have different sensitivities to the initial conditions and the system properties. Therefore they have discriminating power on separating the role of the  $\eta/s$  from the initial condition to the final state particle anisotropies. Furthermore, the sign of  $v_3$ - $v_2$  correlation in the model in 0-10% central collisions found to be different between data and hydro model calculations. In the most central collisions the anisotropies originate mainly from fluctuations, i.e. the initial ellipsoidal geometry characteristic for mid-central collisions plays little role in this regime. Hence this observation might help to understand the details of the fluctuations in initial conditions. The comparisons to VISH2+1 calculation show that all the models with the large share viscosity regardless of the initial conditions failed to capture the centrality dependence of higher order correlations, more clearly than lower order harmonic correlations and based on the tested model parameters that the  $\eta/s$  should be small and AMPT initial condition is favored by the data. A quite clear separation of the correlation strength between different initial conditions is observed for these higher order harmonics correlations compared to the lower order harmonic correlations. Finally we have found that  $v_3$ - $v_2$  and  $v_4$ - $v_2$  correlations have moderate  $p_T$  dependence in mid central collisions. This might be an indication of possible viscous corrections for the equilibrium distribution at hadronic freeze-out. The results presented in this article can be used to further optimize model parameters and put better constraints on the initial conditions and the transport properties in ultra-relativistic heavy-ion collisions.

## Acknowledgements

## References

- [1] **STAR** Collaboration, K. H. Ackermann *et al.*, “Elliptic flow in Au + Au collisions at  $(S(NN))^{1/2} = 130$  GeV,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** (2001) 402–407, arXiv:nuc1-ex/0009011 [nucl-ex].
- [2] **ALICE** Collaboration, K. Aamodt *et al.*, “Elliptic flow of charged particles in Pb-Pb collisions at 2.76 TeV,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010) 252302, arXiv:1011.3914 [nucl-ex].
- [3] **ALICE** Collaboration, J. Adam *et al.*, “Anisotropic flow of charged particles in Pb-Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** no. 13, (2016) 132302, arXiv:1602.01119 [nucl-ex].
- [4] P. Romatschke and U. Romatschke, “Viscosity Information from Relativistic Nuclear Collisions: How Perfect is the Fluid Observed at RHIC?,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99** (2007) 172301, arXiv:0706.1522 [nucl-th].
- [5] C. Shen, U. Heinz, P. Huovinen, and H. Song, “Radial and elliptic flow in Pb+Pb collisions at the Large Hadron Collider from viscous hydrodynamic,” *Phys. Rev.* **C84** (2011) 044903, arXiv:1105.3226 [nucl-th].
- [6] B. Schenke, S. Jeon, and C. Gale, “Elliptic and triangular flows in 3 + 1D viscous hydrodynamics with fluctuating initial conditions,” *J. Phys.* **G38** (2011) 124169.
- [7] P. Bozek and I. Wyskiel-Piekarska, “Particle spectra in Pb-Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV,” *Phys. Rev.* **C85** (2012) 064915, arXiv:1203.6513 [nucl-th].

- [8] “Event-by-event anisotropic flow in heavy-ion collisions from combined Yang-Mills and viscous fluid dynamics,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** no. 1, (2013) 012302, arXiv:1209.6330 [nucl-th].
- 465 [9] T. Hirano, P. Huovinen, and Y. Nara, “Elliptic flow in Pb+Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV: hybrid model assessment of the first data,” *Phys. Rev.* **C84** (2011) 011901, arXiv:1012.3955 [nucl-th].
- [10] P. Kovtun, D. T. Son, and A. O. Starinets, “Viscosity in strongly interacting quantum field theories from black hole physics,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94** (2005) 111601, arXiv:hep-th/0405231
- 470 [hep-th].
- [11] R. A. Lacey, N. N. Ajitanand, J. M. Alexander, P. Chung, W. G. Holzmann, M. Issah, A. Taranenko, P. Danielewicz, and H. Stoecker, “Has the QCD Critical Point been Signaled by Observations at RHIC?,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** (2007) 092301, arXiv:nucl-ex/0609025 [nucl-ex].
- 475 [12] P. Danielewicz and M. Gyulassy, “Dissipative phenomena in quark-gluon plasmas,” *Phys. Rev. D* **31** (Jan, 1985) 53–62. <http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.31.53>.
- [13] S. Voloshin and Y. Zhang, “Flow study in relativistic nuclear collisions by Fourier expansion of Azimuthal particle distributions,” *Z. Phys.* **C70** (1996) 665–672, arXiv:hep-ph/9407282 [hep-ph].
- 480 [14] M. Miller and R. Snellings, “Eccentricity fluctuations and its possible effect on elliptic flow measurements,” arXiv:nucl-ex/0312008 [nucl-ex].
- [15] **PHOBOS** Collaboration, B. Alver *et al.*, “System size, energy, pseudorapidity, and centrality dependence of elliptic flow,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** (2007) 242302, arXiv:nucl-ex/0610037 [nucl-ex].
- 485 [16] B. Alver and G. Roland, “Collision geometry fluctuations and triangular flow in heavy-ion collisions,” *Phys. Rev.* **C81** (2010) 054905, arXiv:1003.0194 [nucl-th]. [Erratum: *Phys. Rev.* **C82**, 039903(2010)].
- [17] **ALICE** Collaboration, K. Aamodt *et al.*, “Higher harmonic anisotropic flow measurements of charged particles in Pb-Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}}=2.76$  TeV,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** (2011) 032301, arXiv:1105.3865 [nucl-ex].
- 490 [18] **ATLAS** Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, “Measurement of event-plane correlations in  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV lead-lead collisions with the ATLAS detector,” *Phys. Rev.* **C90** no. 2, (2014) 024905, arXiv:1403.0489 [hep-ex].
- [19] M. Luzum and J.-Y. Ollitrault, “Extracting the shear viscosity of the quark-gluon plasma from flow in ultra-central heavy-ion collisions,” *Nucl. Phys.* **A904-905** (2013) 377c–380c, arXiv:1210.6010 [nucl-th].
- 495 [20] T. Renk and H. Niemi, “Constraints from  $v_2$  fluctuations for the initial-state geometry of heavy-ion collisions,” *Phys. Rev.* **C89** no. 6, (2014) 064907, arXiv:1401.2069 [nucl-th].
- [21] L. Yan, J.-Y. Ollitrault, and A. M. Poskanzer, “Azimuthal Anisotropy Distributions in High-Energy Collisions,” *Phys. Lett.* **B742** (2015) 290–295, arXiv:1408.0921 [nucl-th].
- 500 [22] C. Shen, S. A. Bass, T. Hirano, P. Huovinen, Z. Qiu, H. Song, and U. Heinz, “The QGP shear viscosity: Elusive goal or just around the corner?,” *J. Phys.* **G38** (2011) 124045, arXiv:1106.6350 [nucl-th].

- [23] P. Bozek, “Flow and interferometry in 3+1 dimensional viscous hydrodynamics,” *Phys. Rev.* **C85** (2012) 034901, arXiv:1110.6742 [nucl-th].
- [24] J.-B. Rose, J.-F. Paquet, G. S. Denicol, M. Luzum, B. Schenke, S. Jeon, and C. Gale, “Extracting the bulk viscosity of the quark-gluon plasma,” *Nucl. Phys.* **A931** (2014) 926–930, arXiv:1408.0024 [nucl-th].
- [25] S. Ryu, J. F. Paquet, C. Shen, G. S. Denicol, B. Schenke, S. Jeon, and C. Gale, “Importance of the Bulk Viscosity of QCD in Ultrarelativistic Heavy-Ion Collisions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115** no. 13, (2015) 132301, arXiv:1502.01675 [nucl-th].
- [26] D. Teaney and L. Yan, “Non linearities in the harmonic spectrum of heavy ion collisions with ideal and viscous hydrodynamics,” *Phys. Rev.* **C86** (2012) 044908, arXiv:1206.1905 [nucl-th].
- [27] L. V. Bravina, B. H. Bruchheim Johansson, G. K. Eyyubova, V. L. Korotkikh, I. P. Lokhtin, L. V. Malinina, S. V. Petrushanko, A. M. Snigirev, and E. E. Zabrodin, “Hexagonal flow  $v_6$  as a superposition of elliptic  $v_2$  and triangular  $v_3$  flows,” *Phys. Rev.* **C89** no. 2, (2014) 024909, arXiv:1311.0747 [hep-ph].
- [28] M. Luzum and J.-Y. Ollitrault, “Constraining the viscous freeze-out distribution function with data obtained at the BNL Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC),” *Phys. Rev.* **C82** (2010) 014906, arXiv:1004.2023 [nucl-th].
- [29] H. Niemi, K. J. Eskola, and R. Paatelainen, “Event-by-event fluctuations in a perturbative QCD + saturation + hydrodynamics model: Determining QCD matter shear viscosity in ultrarelativistic heavy-ion collisions,” *Phys. Rev.* **C93** no. 2, (2016) 024907, arXiv:1505.02677 [hep-ph].
- [30] ALICE Collaboration, J. Adam *et al.*, “Correlated event-by-event fluctuations of flow harmonics in Pb-Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV,” arXiv:1604.07663 [nucl-ex].
- [31] H. Niemi, G. S. Denicol, H. Holopainen, and P. Huovinen, “Event-by-event distributions of azimuthal asymmetries in ultrarelativistic heavy-ion collisions,” *Phys. Rev.* **C87** no. 5, (2013) 054901, arXiv:1212.1008 [nucl-th].
- [32] A. Bilandzic, C. H. Christensen, K. Gulbrandsen, A. Hansen, and Y. Zhou, “Generic framework for anisotropic flow analyses with multiparticle azimuthal correlations,” *Phys. Rev.* **C89** no. 6, (2014) 064904, arXiv:1312.3572 [nucl-ex].
- [33] G. Giacalone, L. Yan, J. Noronha-Hostler, and J.-Y. Ollitrault, “Symmetric cumulants and event-plane correlations in Pb + Pb collisions,” *Phys. Rev.* **C94** no. 1, (2016) 014906, arXiv:1605.08303 [nucl-th].
- [34] PHENIX Collaboration, A. Adare *et al.*, “Measurements of Higher-Order Flow Harmonics in Au+Au Collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** (2011) 252301, arXiv:1105.3928 [nucl-ex].
- [35] ATLAS Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, “Measurement with the ATLAS detector of multi-particle azimuthal correlations in p+Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV,” *Phys. Lett.* **B725** (2013) 60–78, arXiv:1303.2084 [hep-ex].
- [36] ALICE Collaboration, B. B. Abelev *et al.*, “Multiparticle azimuthal correlations in p-Pb and Pb-Pb collisions at the CERN Large Hadron Collider,” *Phys. Rev.* **C90** no. 5, (2014) 054901, arXiv:1406.2474 [nucl-ex].
- [37] CMS Collaboration, V. Khachatryan *et al.*, “Evidence for Collective Multiparticle Correlations in p-Pb Collisions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115** no. 1, (2015) 012301, arXiv:1502.05382 [nucl-ex].

- [38] **STAR** Collaboration, L. Adamczyk *et al.*, “Long-range pseudorapidity dihadron correlations in  $d+Au$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV,” *Phys. Lett. B* **747** (2015) 265–271, arXiv:1502.07652 [nucl-ex].
- [39] **PHENIX** Collaboration, A. Adare *et al.*, “Measurements of elliptic and triangular flow in high-multiplicity  $^3\text{He}+Au$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115** no. 14, (2015) 142301, arXiv:1507.06273 [nucl-ex].
- [40] C. Loizides, “Experimental overview on small collision systems at the LHC,” in *Proceedings, 25th International Conference on Ultra-Relativistic Nucleus-Nucleus Collisions (Quark Matter 2015): Kobe, Japan, September 27-October 3, 2015*. 2016. arXiv:1602.09138 [nucl-ex].  
https://inspirehep.net/record/1424892/files/arXiv:1602.09138.pdf.
- [41] **ALICE** Collaboration, K. Aamodt *et al.*, “The ALICE experiment at the CERN LHC,” *JINST* **3** (2008) S08002.
- [42] **ALICE** Collaboration, P. Cortese *et al.*, “ALICE: Physics performance report, volume I,” *J. Phys. G* **30** (2004) 1517–1763.
- [43] **ALICE** Collaboration, P. Cortese *et al.*, “ALICE: Physics performance report, volume II,” *J. Phys. G* **32** (2006) 1295–2040.
- [44] **ALICE** Collaboration, K. Aamodt *et al.*, “Centrality dependence of the charged-particle multiplicity density at mid-rapidity in Pb-Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106** (2011) 032301, arXiv:1012.1657 [nucl-ex].
- [45] X.-N. Wang and M. Gyulassy, “HIJING: A Monte Carlo model for multiple jet production in p p, p A and A A collisions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **44** (1991) 3501–3516.
- [46] “GEANT Detector Description and Simulation Tool,”.
- [47] **ALICE** Collaboration, E. Abbas *et al.*, “Performance of the ALICE VZERO system,” *JINST* **8** (2013) P10016, arXiv:1306.3130 [nucl-ex].
- [48] **ALICE** Collaboration, G. Dellacasa *et al.*, “ALICE technical design report of the inner tracking system (ITS),”.
- [49] M. Gyulassy and X.-N. Wang, “HIJING 1.0: A Monte Carlo program for parton and particle production in high-energy hadronic and nuclear collisions,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **83** (1994) 307, arXiv:nucl-th/9502021 [nucl-th].
- [50] R. Paatelainen, K. J. Eskola, H. Holopainen, and K. Tuominen, “Multiplicities and  $p_T$  spectra in ultrarelativistic heavy ion collisions from a next-to-leading order improved perturbative QCD + saturation + hydrodynamics model,” *Phys. Rev. C* **87** no. 4, (2013) 044904, arXiv:1211.0461 [hep-ph].
- [51] R. Paatelainen, K. J. Eskola, H. Niemi, and K. Tuominen, “Fluid dynamics with saturated minijet initial conditions in ultrarelativistic heavy-ion collisions,” *Phys. Lett. B* **731** (2014) 126–130, arXiv:1310.3105 [hep-ph].
- [52] X. Zhu, Y. Zhou, H. Xu, and H. Song, “Correlations of flow harmonics in 2.76A TeV Pb–Pb collisions,” arXiv:1608.05305 [nucl-th].
- [53] H.-j. Xu, Z. Li, and H. Song, “High-order flow harmonics of identified hadrons in 2.76A TeV Pb + Pb collisions,” *Phys. Rev. C* **93** no. 6, (2016) 064905, arXiv:1602.02029 [nucl-th].

- [54] R. S. Bhalerao, A. Jaiswal, and S. Pal, “Collective flow in event-by-event partonic transport plus hydrodynamics hybrid approach,” *Phys. Rev.* **C92** no. 1, (2015) 014903, arXiv:1503.03862 [nucl-th].
- [55] L. Pang, Q. Wang, and X.-N. Wang, “Effects of initial flow velocity fluctuation in event-by-event (3+1)D hydrodynamics,” *Phys. Rev.* **C86** (2012) 024911, arXiv:1205.5019 [nucl-th].
- [56] Z. Qiu, C. Shen, and U. Heinz, “Hydrodynamic elliptic and triangular flow in Pb-Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 2.76$  ATeV,” *Phys. Lett.* **B707** (2012) 151–155, arXiv:1110.3033 [nucl-th].
- [57] C. Shen, U. Heinz, P. Huovinen, and H. Song, “Systematic parameter study of hadron spectra and elliptic flow from viscous hydrodynamic simulations of Au+Au collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV,” *Phys. Rev.* **C82** (2010) 054904, arXiv:1010.1856 [nucl-th].
- [58] P. F. Kolb, J. Sollfrank, and U. W. Heinz, “Anisotropic transverse flow and the quark hadron phase transition,” *Phys. Rev.* **C62** (2000) 054909, arXiv:hep-ph/0006129 [hep-ph].
- [59] D. Kharzeev and M. Nardi, “Hadron production in nuclear collisions at RHIC and high density QCD,” *Phys. Lett.* **B507** (2001) 121–128, arXiv:nucl-th/0012025 [nucl-th].
- [60] M. L. Miller, K. Reygers, S. J. Sanders, and P. Steinberg, “Glauber modeling in high energy nuclear collisions,” *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **57** (2007) 205–243, arXiv:nucl-ex/0701025 [nucl-ex].
- [61] H. J. Drescher and Y. Nara, “Effects of fluctuations on the initial eccentricity from the Color Glass Condensate in heavy ion collisions,” *Phys. Rev.* **C75** (2007) 034905, arXiv:nucl-th/0611017 [nucl-th].
- [62] T. Hirano and Y. Nara, “Eccentricity fluctuation effects on elliptic flow in relativistic heavy ion collisions,” *Phys. Rev.* **C79** (2009) 064904, arXiv:0904.4080 [nucl-th].
- [63] B. Zhang, C. M. Ko, B.-A. Li, and Z.-w. Lin, “A multiphase transport model for nuclear collisions at RHIC,” *Phys. Rev.* **C61** (2000) 067901, arXiv:nucl-th/9907017 [nucl-th].
- [64] Z.-w. Lin, S. Pal, C. M. Ko, B.-A. Li, and B. Zhang, “Charged particle rapidity distributions at relativistic energies,” *Phys. Rev.* **C64** (2001) 011902, arXiv:nucl-th/0011059 [nucl-th].
- [65] Z.-W. Lin, C. M. Ko, B.-A. Li, B. Zhang, and S. Pal, “A Multi-phase transport model for relativistic heavy ion collisions,” *Phys. Rev.* **C72** (2005) 064901, arXiv:nucl-th/0411110 [nucl-th].
- [66] B. Andersson, G. Gustafson, and B. Nilsson-Almqvist, “A Model for Low p(t) Hadronic Reactions, with Generalizations to Hadron - Nucleus and Nucleus-Nucleus Collisions,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B281** (1987) 289–309.
- [67] B. Nilsson-Almqvist and E. Stenlund, “Interactions Between Hadrons and Nuclei: The Lund Monte Carlo, Fritiof Version 1.6,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **43** (1987) 387.
- [68] B. Zhang, “ZPC 1.0.1: A Parton cascade for ultrarelativistic heavy ion collisions,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **109** (1998) 193–206, arXiv:nucl-th/9709009 [nucl-th].
- [69] B. Li, A. T. Sustich, B. Zhang, and C. M. Ko, “Studies of superdense hadronic matter in a relativistic transport model,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **E10** (2001) 267–352.
- [70] Z.-w. Lin and C. M. Ko, “Partonic effects on the elliptic flow at RHIC,” *Phys. Rev.* **C65** (2002) 034904, arXiv:nucl-th/0108039 [nucl-th].

- [71] Z.-W. Lin, “Evolution of transverse flow and effective temperatures in the parton phase from a multi-phase transport model,” *Phys. Rev.* **C90** no. 1, (2014) 014904, arXiv:1403.6321 [nucl-th].
- [72] **ALICE** Collaboration, J. Adam *et al.*, “Higher harmonic flow coefficients of identified hadrons in Pb-Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV,” *JHEP* **09** (2016) 164, arXiv:1606.06057 [nucl-ex].
- [73] K. J. Eskola, H. Niemi, and R. Paatelainen, “Pinning down QCD-matter shear viscosity in ultrarelativistic heavy-ion collisions via EbyE fluctuations using pQCD + saturation + hydrodynamics,” 2016. arXiv:1509.02767 [hep-ph].  
<http://inspirehep.net/record/1392658/files/arXiv:1509.02767.pdf>.

**A The ALICE Collaboration**