Predictions for p +Pb Collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5$ TeV: Expectations vs. Data

R. Vogt (for the JET Collaboration)¹

Physics Division, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA 94551, USA

Physics Department, University of California, Davis, CA 95616, USA

Abstract

Recently a compilation of predictions for charged hadron, identified light hadron, quarkonium, photon, jet and gauge boson production in p +Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5$ TeV was made available [1]. Here the predictions are compared to the data so far available.

Keywords: cold nuclear matter effects, charged particle production, J/ψ

---

1. Introduction

Members and friends of the JET Collaboration calculated predictions for the $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV p +Pb run at the LHC in the winter of 2013. Predictions were collected for charged hadrons; identified particles; photons; jets; quarkonium; and gauge bosons. The observables included individual distributions, ratios such as R_{pPb} , and correlation functions. The predictions were compiled in Ref. [1]. This proceedings presents the confrontation of some of the predictions with data available by Quark Matter. We focus on charged hadrons and quarkonium here.

The charged particle multiplicities, p_T distributions and nuclear modification factors, R_{pPb} , in p +Pb collisions can be calculated in several different approaches. These are briefly outlined here. All involve some parameters tuned at a specific energy to predict results for other energies. For details and model references see Ref. [1].

Event generators determine multiplicities from their models of soft particle production followed by fragmentation and hadronization. Hard particle production is typically based on a pp generator such as PYTHIA. Examples include HIJING, HIJINGBB and AMPT.

Perturbative QCD approaches involving collinear factorization at leading and next-to-leading order typically require a minimum p_T to calculate the p_T distributions and modification factors. These calculations differ in the cold nuclear matter effects employed and the parameters used. Nuclear shadowing is generally included, as is isospin. Broadening of the p_T distributions in cold matter and medium-induced energy loss are also often included.

The color glass condensate (CGC) approach provides a saturation-based description of the initial state that can predict the total multiplicity. In this approach, gluon production can be described by k_T -factorization which assumes an ordering in intrinsic transverse momentum. The unintegrated gluon density associated with k_T factorization is related to the color dipole forward scattering amplitude which satisfies the JIMWLK evolution equations. In the large N_c limit, the JIMWLK equations simplify to the Balitsky-Kovchegov (BK) equation, a closed-form result for

---

¹ A list of members of the JET Collaboration and acknowledgments can be found at the end of this issue.

the rapidity evolution of the dipole amplitude. The running coupling corrections to the leading log BK equation, rcBK, have been phenomenologically successful in describing the rapidity/energy evolution of the dipole. The initial condition still needs to be modeled with parameters constrained by data. The impact parameter dependent dipole saturation models (IP-Sat and b-CGC) are a refinement of the dipole saturation model that reproduces the correct limit when the dipole radius $r_T \rightarrow 0$. The IP-Sat model includes power corrections to the collinear DGLAP evolution and should be valid where logs in Q^2 dominate logs of x .

2. Charged Hadrons

In our compilation [1], it was shown that the charged particle pseudorapidity distributions, $dN_{\text{ch}}/d\eta$, exhibited a considerably steeper slope than the data, particularly for η in the direction of the lead nucleus. Further communication with Albacete and Dumitru [2] showed that $dN_{\text{ch}}/d\eta$ depends strongly on the $y \rightarrow \eta$ transformation. The rcBK calculation depends on this Jacobian, not uniquely defined in the CGC framework. It is necessary to assume a fixed minijet mass, related to the pre-hadronization/fragmentation stage. Thus, in Ref. [1], they assumed the same transformation for pp and $p+\text{Pb}$ collisions. If, instead, the hadron momentum is modified by $\Delta P(\eta) = 0.04\eta[(N_{\text{part}}^{\text{proj}} + N_{\text{part}}^{\text{targ}})2 - 1]$, the results are essentially identical in the proton direction but differ considerably in the direction of the lead beam [2]. The difference, bringing the calculation into better agreement with the data shows the sensitivity of this result to the mean mass and p_T of the unidentified final-state hadrons.

The left-hand side of Fig. 1 contrasts the centrality dependence of $dN_{\text{ch}}/d\eta$ calculated with the default AMPT model [3] (smooth curves) and the b-CGC approach [4] (points with uncertainties). The calculations are in the same centrality bins as the ATLAS measurement [5]: 0-1%, 1-5%, 5-10%, 10-20%, 20-30%, 30-40%, 40-60%, and 60-90%. There is no b-CGC result available for the 0-1% centrality bin.

In AMPT, the centrality in $p+\text{Pb}$ collisions is defined according to the ATLAS centrality criteria, total E_T within $3.1 < \eta_{\text{lab}} < 4.9$. The 40 – 60% centrality bin gives a distribution that is very close to the min bias result, in particular on the proton side. The most central bin is the most asymmetric distribution, as well as the largest in magnitude. On the other hand, the distribution for the 80 – 100% centrality bin is symmetric around $\eta_{\text{cm}} = 0$.

Figure 1. (Left) Charged particle pseudorapidity distributions in the lab frame of $p+\text{Pb}$ collisions at various centralities for AMPT [3] and the b-CGC saturation model [4]. The calculations are in the same centrality bins as the ATLAS data [5]. (Center) Charged particle p_T distributions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV. The solid and dashed cyan curves outline the rcBK band [6]. The magenta curves, calculated with HIJINGBB2.0 are presented without (dot-dashed) and with (dotted) shadowing. The AMPT results are given by the dot-dash-dash-dashed (default) and dot-dot-dot-dashed (SM) blue curves. The data are from the ALICE Collaboration [7]. (Right) The charged hadron p_T distribution in $p+\text{Pb}$ collisions with different HIJING2.1 options is also compared to the ALICE data. All the calculations were presented in Ref. [1].

In the b-CGC approach [4], employing k_T factorization, the impact parameter dependence of the saturation model is crucial for defining the collision centrality. The asymmetry is largest in more central collisions while, for peripheral collisions such as the 60 – 80% bin, the system becomes more similar to that of pp collisions. In the Jacobian of the $y \rightarrow \eta$ transformation, a fixed minijet mass equal to the current-quark mass is assumed for all centralities, rapidities and energies. Since the minijet mass is related to pre-hadronization/hadronization stage and cannot be obtained from

saturation physics, it was fixed by fitting lower energy minimum-bias data. The main uncertainties here are again due to modeling the minijet mass in the Jacobian transformation. Note that the impact-parameter dependence of the b-CGC model was only constrained by diffractive data on proton targets at HERA. Thus this calculation is limited to $|\eta_{\text{cm}}| \leq 3$.

The results of the two calculations are most similar in the more peripheral bins. The AMPT multiplicities tend to be slightly higher, especially in the proton (backward rapidity) direction. The b-CGC results have a somewhat more linear dependence on η due to assuming the same Jacobian $y \rightarrow \eta$ transformation (and minijet mass) for all centralities. The preliminary ATLAS centrality-dependent multiplicity [5] is somewhat higher than AMPT in the direction of the lead beam (forward rapidity), especially in the most central (0–1%) bin.

The midrapidity, $|\eta| < 0.8$, charged hadron p_T distributions are shown in the center of Fig. 1 for rcBK [6], HIJINGBB2.0, and AMPT. The HIJINGBB2.0 distributions are similar to the rcBK results, albeit somewhat higher for $p_T > 10$ GeV/c. The AMPT distributions, on the other hand, drop faster at low p_T than the other results but then become harder at high p_T . The AMPT results are essentially independent of whether string melting is included or not while the HIJINGBB2.0 results without shadowing lie above those with shadowing. The right-hand side of Fig. 1 shows several options for cold matter effects in HIJING2.1 relative to $p + p$ collisions. The $p + p$ result is unscaled while the $p + \text{Pb}$ curves with decoherent hard scatterings (DHC) without shadowing, DHC with shadowing, and shadowing only are separated from each other, starting from the $p + p$ result, by a factor of 100.

3. Quarkonium

The J/ψ and Υ results from ALICE [8, 9] and LHCb [10, 11] are in similar rapidity windows, $2.5 < y_{\text{cm}} < 4$ for ALICE and $2.5 < y_{\text{cm}} < 5$ for LHCb in symmetric (pp and AA) collisions. Although the muon spectrometers for both experiments are only on one side of the collision point, results were obtained forward and backward of midrapidity by switching the beam direction and running both $p + \text{Pb}$ and $\text{Pb} + p$ collisions. Due to the rapidity shift in asymmetric collisions, the acceptances of the two detectors in the collision center of mass was shifted to $2.03 < y_{\text{cm}} < 3.53$ at forward rapidity and $-4.46 < y_{\text{cm}} < -2.96$ at backward rapidity for ALICE and $1.5 < y_{\text{cm}} < 4$ at forward rapidity and $-5 < y_{\text{cm}} < -2.5$ at backward rapidity for LHCb. The regions of overlap between the forward and backward rapidity regions are $2.96 < |y_{\text{cm}}| < 3.53$ for ALICE and $2.5 < |y_{\text{cm}}| < 4$ for LHCb.

The results were presented first as $R_{p\text{Pb}}(y)$, left-hand panel of Fig. 2, with an extrapolated pp normalization since there is no pp measurement at $\sqrt{s} = 5$ TeV. The pp normalization is based on an interpolation between the pp measurements at $\sqrt{s} = 2.76$ and 7 TeV, along with a model-based systematic uncertainty [8]. Note that ALICE presented both a single bin value of $R_{p\text{Pb}}$ in the forward and backward regions as well as divided into six rapidity bins. In both rapidity regions, the ALICE points seem to be above the LHCb results. However, the data are compatible within the statistical uncertainties.

In addition, to eliminate the dependence on the uncertain pp normalization, a forward-backward production ratio, $R_{F/B}(y, \sqrt{s_{NN}}) = R_{p\text{Pb}}(+|y|, \sqrt{s_{NN}})/R_{p\text{Pb}}(-|y|, \sqrt{s_{NN}})$, was extracted where $R_{F/B}$ is defined with the proton beam moving toward positive y in the numerator and negative y in the denominator. Thus cold matter effects dominant at small x are in the numerator while the denominator probes larger x . The pp contributions to $R_{p\text{Pb}}$ cancel in the ratio because pp collisions are symmetric around midrapidity. In both cases, the rapidity shift is taken into account to compare with calculations assuming no rapidity shift. The forward-backward ratio is shown as a function of rapidity and p_T in the center and right-hand panels of Fig. 2. The two measurements are in very good agreement within the region of overlap here, suggesting that the pp normalization is responsible for the difference seen in $R_{p\text{Pb}}(y)$.

In addition to the J/ψ calculations in the color evaporation model (CEM) at next-to-leading order in Ref. [1], several other calculations are also shown.

The NLO EPS09 band is obtained by calculating the deviations from the central value for the 15 parameter variations on either side of the central set and adding them in quadrature (dashed histograms on the left-hand side of Fig. 2). The calculation was done the charm production parameters obtained in Ref. [12]. The EPS09 NLO band is narrower and exhibits less shadowing than the corresponding EPS09 LO CEM result.

The EPS09 LO CEM result is similar to that obtained in a LO color singlet model calculation [13] employing EPS09 LO. The band shown is the result of taking the EPS09 LO sets that give the minimum and maximum amount of gluon shadowing. The differences are not substantially due to the production model but to the mass and scale parameters employed.

The calculations by Arleo *et al.* are based on energy loss in cold nuclear matter, without and with the central EPS09 set. They fit an energy loss parameter, q_0 , to the $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 38.8$ GeV E866 data and employ the same parameter for other energies. They find $q_0 = 0.075$ GeV²/fm for the J/ψ without shadowing. The rapidity distributions modified by the energy loss probability, $P(\epsilon)$, used to fit q_0 are defined as $(1/A)(d\sigma_{pA}(y)/dy) = \int_0^{\min(E, E_p - E)} d\epsilon P(\epsilon)(E/(E + \epsilon))(d\sigma_{pp}(y + \delta y(\epsilon))/dy)$ where E is the energy of the quarkonium state in the rest frame of the nucleus. No specific quarkonium production model is assumed and instead a parameterization of the pp cross section, $d\sigma_{pp}/dp_T^2 dx \propto [(1-x)^n/x][p_0^2/(p_0^2 + p_T^2)]^m$, is adopted. The parameters n and m are fit to pp data. See Refs. [14, 15] for more details.

Finally, CGC calculations from Ref. [16] are also shown. The uncertainty comes from varying the saturation scale in the nucleus between 4 and 6 times that for the proton, $Q_{sat}^2 \sim (4-6)Q_{sat,p}^2$, as well as varying the quark mass. The saturation scale is the biggest source of uncertainty.

Energy loss alone agrees relatively well with the J/ψ data but underpredicts the ALICE Υ data. The CGC calculations overpredict the J/ψ suppression at $y > 0$ but is closer to the ALICE Υ measurement. The EPS09 LO result is broad enough to encompass all the data while the smaller shadowing effect in EPS09 NLO underpredicts both results. With a consistent extraction of the gluon density at LO and NLO, the EPS09 LO and NLO CEM results should agree.

Figure 2. (Left) The R_{pPb} ratio for J/ψ (left) and Υ (right) as a function of y . The red histogram shows the EPS09 NLO uncertainties [1] while the cyan curves show the EPS09 LO uncertainty as outlined by the minimum and maximum shadowing sets [13]. The magenta curves include energy loss only [14, 15]. Finally, the blue curves at forward rapidity are the result of a CGC calculation [16]. The ALICE [8, 9] and LHCb [10, 11] data are also shown.

I thank J. Albacete, F. Arleo, A. Dumitru, H. Fujii, F. Jing, J.-P. Lansberg, Z. Lin, A. Rezaeian, C. Roland, E. Scomparin, P. Steinberg, J. Velkovska, and X.-N. Wang for comments and contributions. This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344 and supported in part by the JET collaboration.

References

- [1] J. L. Albacete *et al.*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **22** (2013) 1330007.
- [2] J. Albacete and A. Dumitru, private communication.
- [3] Z.-W. Lin, C. M. Ko, B.-A. Li, B. Zhang and S. Pal, Phys. Rev. C **72** (2005) 064901.
- [4] A. H. Rezaeian, Phys. Lett. B **718** (2013) 1058.
- [5] R. Debbe *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), these proceedings.
- [6] J. L. Albacete, A. Dumitru, H. Fujii and Y. Nara, Nucl. Phys. A **897** (2013) 1 [arXiv:1209.2001 [hep-ph]].
- [7] B. Abelev *et al.* (ALICE Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **110** (2013) 082302.
- [8] B. Abelev *et al.* (ALICE Collaboration), JHEP **1402** (2014) 073.
- [9] J. Castillo Castellanos (ALICE Collaboration), these proceedings.
- [10] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), JHEP **1402** (2014) 072.
- [11] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), arXiv:1405.5152.
- [12] R. E. Nelson, R. Vogt and A. D. Frawley, Phys. Rev. C **87** (2013) 014908.
- [13] E. G. Ferreira, F. Fleuret, J. P. Lansberg and A. Rakotzafindrabe, Phys. Rev. C **88** (2013) 047901.
- [14] F. Arleo and S. Peigné, JHEP **1303** (2013) 122.
- [15] F. Arleo, R. Kolevatov, S. Peigné and M. Rustamova, JHEP **1305** (2013) 155.
- [16] H. Fujii and K. Watanabe, Nucl. Phys. A **915** (2013) 1.