

Chemical freeze-out phenomenology

G. Torrieri, Physics Department, McGill University
In collaboration with: S. Jeon, J. Rafelski, J. Letessier

- Definition
- Equilibrium ($T = 170\text{MeV}, \gamma_{q,s} = 1$) vs
explosive ($T = 140\text{MeV}, \gamma_{q,s} > 1$) vs
Continuous emission+resonance modification vs
More complicated models (dynamics)
- Yields and fluctuations in SHM
- Sensitive probes with yields and fluctuations
- Analysis of existing (130 and 200 GeV RHIC data)
- Do it yourself: SHARE
<http://www.physics.arizona.edu/~torrieri/SHARE/share.html>

The statistical model:

$$N = \int \mathcal{M} \prod_i \frac{d^3 \vec{p}_i}{E_i} \delta_E \delta_Q$$

$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{constant}$ (dynamics \rightarrow phase space)

$$P_N = \frac{\Omega_N}{\sum_n \Omega_n} \quad \Omega = \int \prod_i \frac{d^3 \vec{p}_i}{E_i} \delta_E \delta_Q$$

Observables:

$$\langle N \rangle, \quad \omega = \frac{\langle N^2 \rangle - \langle N \rangle^2}{\langle N \rangle}, \quad \text{higher cumulants}$$

calculable through **partition function**

Several ways of defining $\delta_{E,Q} \rightarrow$ **Ensembles**.

Ensembles , or how to deal with conservation laws
 $\lim_{V \rightarrow \infty}^{N/V = \text{const}} \langle N \rangle$ same in \forall ensembles. not ω

Micro-canonical : EbyE conservation

$$\delta_E \delta_Q = \delta \left(\sum_i E_i - E_T \right) \delta \left(\sum_i Q_i - Q_T \right) \quad \omega_E = \omega_Q = 0$$

Canonical : Energy conserved on average
Appropriate for system in equilibrium with bath


$$\delta_E \rightarrow \delta (E_T - \langle E \rangle) \quad \omega_E \sim 1$$

Grand Canonical : Charge conserved on average

$$\delta_Q \rightarrow \delta (Q_T - \langle Q \rangle) \quad \omega_E \sim \omega_Q \sim 1$$

Appropriate for detector sampling part of a fluid

Freeze-out from ideal fluid at mid-rapidity



Boost invariance: Rapidity \Leftrightarrow configuration space

- Mid-rapidity \Leftrightarrow system
- Peripheral regions \Leftrightarrow bath

\Rightarrow Grand Canonical ensemble needs to be used!

Cleymans, Redlich, PRC 60, 054908 (1999):

$$\left[\frac{dN}{dy} \right]_{b.i.} \sim \langle N \rangle_{4\pi} \quad \left[\frac{d(\Delta N)^2}{dy} \right]_{b.i.} \sim (\Delta N)_{4\pi}^2$$

- All details of flow and freeze-out integrate out
- Up to Normalization, $\langle N \rangle, \omega$ calculable from Grand Canonical T, λ_i

Ensemble choice forced to be Grand Canonical by $\omega_Q \sim 1$ at both SPS and RHIC.

NB: Low multiplicity yields also approximately statistical, if canonical suppression used
(Becattini, Redlich, Cleymans, ...)

but

linear scaling of fluctuations w.r.t. yields (KNO scaling) very difficult to explain this way as exact conservation suppresses all fluctuations (Gorenstein, Gazdzicki, Zozulya, ...)

⇒

Explaining both yields and fluctuations with same thermodynamic parameters probably only possible in A-A collisions, if at all

Grand canonical statistical hadronization

All particles described in terms of T and $\lambda_{q,s,I3}$.

Detailed balance: $\lambda_{\bar{q}} = \lambda_q^{-1}$ Integral can be done in rest-frame wrt flow using Bessel function K_2

$$N_i = V' \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\mp 1)^{n+1} \frac{\lambda_i^n}{n} m_i^2 T K_2 \left(\frac{nm_i}{T} \right)$$

$$\Delta N_i^2 = V' \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\mp 1)^{n+1} \frac{\lambda_i^n}{n} \binom{2+n-1}{n} m_i^2 T K_2 \left(\frac{nm_i}{T} \right)$$

$$V' = V(2J_i + 1) \frac{4\pi}{(2\pi)^3}$$

Chemical potentials for conserved quantities

$$\lambda_i = \lambda_u^{u-\bar{u}} \lambda_d^{u-\bar{u}} \lambda_s^{s-\bar{s}}$$

Non-equilibrium through phase space occupancies

$$\lambda_i \rightarrow \lambda_i^{\text{eq}} \gamma_u^{u+\bar{u}} \gamma_d^{u+\bar{u}} \gamma_s^{s+\bar{s}} \quad \gamma^{\text{eq}} = 1$$

Resonance feed-down

$$N_i = N_i^{direct} + \sum_j b_{j \rightarrow i} N_j$$

$$\Delta N_i^2 = \Delta N_i^2 + \sum_j [b_{j \rightarrow i} (1 - b_{j \rightarrow i}) N_j + b_{j \rightarrow i}^2 \Delta N_j^2]$$

Widths

Decay $M \rightarrow m_1, m_2, \dots$ width Γ_i , total width Γ_T
relative angular momentum l , threshold mass M_{th}

$$N(M, \lambda) \rightarrow \frac{\int_{M_{Th}}^{\infty} \rho(m) N(m, T, \lambda) dm}{\int_{M_{Th}}^{\infty} \rho(m) dm}$$



Where

$$\rho(m) = \frac{\Gamma_T \Gamma(m)}{(M - m)^2 + \Gamma^2(m)/4}$$

$$\Gamma(m) = \Gamma_i \left[1 - \left(\frac{M_{Th}}{m} \right) \right]^{l/2}$$

Model I: Equilibrium statistical mechanics


(Braun-Muntziger, Magestro, Florkowski, Broniowski, Redlich, ...)



$\frac{dT}{d\sqrt{s}} > 0$ $\frac{d\mu_B}{d\sqrt{s}} < 0$ $\frac{E}{V} \sim 1 \text{ GeV}$

Resonances not well described (Rescattering?)

Alternatively... Supercooling+oversaturation (chemical Non-equilibrium)




inaccessible by kinetic evolution
(if put "in a box", this system would heat)
but accessible in a **fast** phase transition
from a **high entropy** phase $\gamma_q > 1, \gamma_s/\gamma_q > 1$.


J. Rafelski, J Letessier, PRL 85:4695-4698,2000:
Explosive hadronization from supercooled QGP

$$P_{vacuum} = P_{QGP} \quad S_{HG} = S_{QGP} \quad V \sim \frac{2}{3} V_{equilibrium}$$


$$T = 140 \text{ MeV}, \quad \gamma_q \sim 0.9 e^{m_\pi/2T} \sim 1.6$$



$\gamma_q > 1, T \rightarrow \sim 140 \text{ MeV} @ \text{critical } \sqrt{s}, N_{part}$




“Horn” explained by this critical point




Smoking gun 4 deconfinement?? Perhaps...

Equilibrium and non-equilibrium models have a different number of parameters.

Comparison standard: **Statistical significance**



- **Statistical significance**, the probability of getting χ^2 with n DoF given that “your model is true”, is a quantitative measure of your fit’s goodness
- With few DoF, “nice” looking graphs can have a very small statistical significance.
- It is said that you can fit an elephant with enough parameters. Maybe so, but if you are honest, you won’t get a good statistical significance.




Maximum for SPS and RHIC is at $\gamma_q > 1$, but equilibrium not ruled out!

Need further data capable of determining γ_q .

Resonances and fluctuations

Diagnostics with Yields and fluctuations



T increase \Rightarrow π Fluctuations decrease because of enhanced resonance production

over-saturation ($\gamma_q > 1$) \Rightarrow π Fluctuations increase because of BE corrections

$\gamma_q > 1$, unlike resonances (detectable, rescattered, in-medium modified, ...) affects **fluctuation terms** rather than **correlations**

Suitable:

Yields Independent of $\gamma_s, \lambda_s, \text{volume}$

- Λ/K^- , better
 - Λ corrected for $\Xi, \Omega \rightarrow \Lambda$
 - K^- corrected for $\phi \rightarrow K^- K^+$
- Ξ/ϕ


Fluctuations $v(Q), \sigma_{\pi^+/\pi^-}$

$$v(Q) = \frac{\langle Q^2 \rangle - \langle Q \rangle^2}{N_{ch}}$$


$$\sigma_{N_1/N_2} = \frac{\omega_{N_1}}{\langle N_1 \rangle} + \frac{\omega_{N_2}}{\langle N_2 \rangle} - 2 \frac{\langle N_1 N_2 \rangle - \langle N_1 \rangle \langle N_2 \rangle}{\langle N_1 \rangle \langle N_2 \rangle}$$

σ_{π^+/π^-} can also be used to probe ρ, f_0 mass modification due to $\pi^+ - \pi^-$ correlations
undetected or rescattered resonances also contribute to fluctuations!!!


$v(Q)$ vs Λ/K^-



$v(Q)$ vs Ξ^-/ϕ




σ_{π^+/π^-} vs Λ/K^-




- σ_{π^+/π^-} probes T independently of (non)equilibrium
- Allowed region narrow \rightarrow mass modification probe

σ_{π^+/π^-} vs Ξ^-/ϕ




130 GeV within band! Good agreement with non-equilibrium freeze-out T
No evidence of ρ, σ modification


And for consistency... Ξ/ϕ vs Λ/K^-



And for consistency... σ_{π^+/π^-} vs $v(Q)$



These diagrams are made with static fluctuations susceptible to detector response effects




use dynamical fluctuations $\sigma_{dyn} = \sigma - \sigma_{stat}$ Where $\sigma_{stat} \sim \frac{1}{\langle N_1 \rangle} + \frac{1}{\langle N_2 \rangle}$ obtained by mixed event technique

σ_{dyn} robust against detector acceptance but needs more parameters (“volume”) to be described \Rightarrow no diagrams. Can use it in fit, including one/more yields at same centrality as σ_{dyn} .

For large acceptance, can hope fitting both σ_{dyn} and $\sigma, \omega, v(Q)$

Fit exp. yields, ratios, $\omega, \sigma, \langle s \rangle = 0, \frac{Q}{B} = 0.4$ for



- Equilibrium parameters T, λ_{q,s,I_3}
- Non-equilibrium parameters γ_{q,s,I_3}
- System “volume” dV/dy



Different models have a different DoF → Use Statistical significance (P_{true}) to judge fit quality

Non-trivial correlations/data-point sensitivity can be analyzed by Profiles in statistical significance

All other parameters at their best fit value for point in abscissa




Fits at 130 GeV

fluctuations


- $\sigma_{\pi^+/\pi^-}^{dyn}, \sigma_{K^+/K^-}^{dyn}, \sigma_{\bar{p}/p}^{dyn}$: STAR
PRC 68, 044905 (2003), nucl-ex/0307007
Insensitive to Volume fluctuations but require
 $\langle V \rangle$ (6% centrality)
- $\omega_{h^+}, \omega_{h^-}, \omega_{h^+-h^-}, \omega_{h^-+h^+}$ STAR
Nucl. Phys. A 698 (2002) 611
Need $\Delta V/V$, independent of centrality.
No error bar, assume Ad Hoc 10%

Yields and Ratios

- $h^{charged}$, PHOBOS
PRL (2003) , nucl-ex/0201005 (6% centrality)
- $\pi, K, p, \Lambda, \Xi, \phi, K^*$ and antiparticles, STAR,
various (5% centrality)



- When volume fluctuation is used as a fit parameter, both yields and fluctuations fit nicely
- Volume fluctuations needed 4 ω_{h^+,h^-,h^+h^-} , not 4 σ^{dyn} and $\omega_{h^+-h^-}$ (as understood by Koch, Jeon).
- Fluctuations shift fitted γ_q, T w.r.t. ratios-only fit




T, γ_q not as well determined as it could be

- As we saw earlier, $\sigma_{\pi, K, p}^{dyn}$ are not very good constraints on γ_q
- **Volume fluctuation** essential for fitting $\omega_{h+}, \omega_{h-}, \omega_{h+\pm h-}$ (if $\Delta V = 0$, $P_{true} < 0.1$ due to disagreement with these data points), but correlates with normalization, γ_q .

Fits at 200 GeV

- $\sigma_{K/\pi}^{dyn}$: Supriya Das et al [STAR]
nucl-ex/0503023
- Ratios: O. Barannikova et al [STAR]
nucl-ex/0403014


NB: All preliminary



With fluctuations, T, γ_q determined
 ($K/\pi +$ its fluctuation is very sensitive to γ_q).

- firmly in $\gamma_q > 1, T \sim 140$ MeV,
- T, γ_q consistent with 130 GeV considering
all preliminary

but...




Some datapoints fail


σ_{K^+/π^+} vs σ_{K^-/π^-} :	too different
$\bar{\Omega}/\Omega > 1$	not thermal: Liu, Bleicher, Aichelin
$\Delta^{++}/p \sim 0.25$	way too large

If these fitted, best fit unchanged but $P_{true} < 0.1$

Data-model (dis)agreement for ratios




$\frac{\Lambda^*}{\Lambda}, \frac{K^*}{K^-}$ fail @ $\gamma_q = 1$, fit @ $\gamma_q = 1.6, T = 140$ GeV
 $\frac{\Delta^{++}}{p}$ hopeless (>2 std)




$\gamma_3 > 1$ (u/d non-equilibrium) If $\gamma_3 \neq 1$.

- Helps with Δ^{++}/p
- $\frac{\Sigma^+}{\Lambda}$, $\frac{\pi^0}{\pi^\pm}$, $\frac{\rho^0}{\pi^\pm}$, $\frac{f_0}{\pi^\pm}$, ... enhanced.

Data-model (dis)agreement for $\sigma_{K/\pi}^{dyn}$



either $\sigma_{K-/pi-}$ or $\sigma_{K+/pi+}$ explained @ $\gamma_q > 1$, but not the difference



Only way in SHM to increase difference is λ_{I3}
 necessary λ_{I3} excluded by π^-/π^+ , Q/B constraint

Some tentative **conclusions**

- Ξ/ϕ vs $v(Q)$, σ_{π^+/π^-} fits SHM well, **no** indication of ρ, σ **modification**
- Yields, ratios, resonances and fluctuations **fit reasonably well** provided $\gamma_q > 1$
- very unlikely equilibrium SHM can do it
- $\Lambda(1520)$, K^* well accounted for in non-equilibrium. Something very funny going on with Δ^{++}

Do it yourself: **SHARE**

<http://www.physics.arizona.edu/~torrieri/SHARE/share.html>