

# 'Charm'ing new results from STAR!

NSD Staff Meeting, January 22, 2019 Sooraj Radhakrishnan Relativistic Nuclear Collisions, LBNL







# **Relativistic Nuclear Collisions**



Ordinary nuclear matter

Quark-Gluon Plasma (QGP)

- Nuclear matter transitions to QGP phase at very high temperatures and densities
- Study properties of QGP, evolution, interactions with color charged probes, nature of phase transition, QCD phase diagram,...



 Active experimental programs at Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC) and Large Hadron Collider (LHC)



# Heavy quarks in QGP



Charm (and bottom) quarks produced predominantly in initial hard scatterings: Ideal probes to study medium interactions and QGP properties

Can study various aspects of charm quark evolution in the QGP



Sooraj Radhakrishnan

# Heavy quarks in QGP



Charm (and bottom) quarks produced predominantly in initial hard scatterings: Ideal probes to study medium interactions and QGP properties

Can study various aspects of charm quark evolution in the QGP



- Charm quark energy loss: D<sup>0</sup> R<sub>AA</sub> and R<sub>CP</sub> [arXiv:1812.10224 (2018)]
- Transport in QGP: Elliptic (v<sub>2</sub>) [*PRL.118.212301 (2017)*]
  - and directed  $(v_1)$  flow of  $D^0$
- Hadronization:

 $\Lambda_c$  production,  $D_s$  production

# Hadronization: $\Lambda_c$ production

• Hadronization implemented in PYTHIA via string fragmentation.





- In heavy-ion collisions the deconfined quarks can hadronize via coalesence
- Enhances baryon production compared to string fragmentation



# Hadronization: $\Lambda_c$ production

- Enhancement in B/M ratio at intermediate  $p_T$  if hadronization by coalesence
- Observed for light and strange flavor hadrons
- Also important to understand charm hadron (eg: D<sup>0</sup>) modification and energy loss in QGP and total charm cross-section



# The STAR Detector



- Charged particle tracks reconstructed with TPC (and HFT)
- Particle

   identification from
   ionization energy
   loss in TPC and
   time of flight from
   TOF detector

• Heavy Flavor Tracker (HFT) installed for runs in 2014-2016



# Heavy Flavor Tracker





- HFT: 2 layers of Si pixels with MAPS and 2 layers of Si strips
- Full azimuthal coverage
- Provides excellent vertex position resolution and allows reconstruction of charm hadron decays
- Designed and constructed primarily at LBNL





- $\Lambda_c$  reconstructed with the pK $\pi$  channe, Life time about 60  $\mu$ m!
- HFT improves S/B ratio for reconstructing  $\Lambda_{\!c}$  decay
- Three body decay, huge combinatorial background in HI collisions



Use Supervised Learning Methods to improve signal to background separation

- Boosted Decision Trees: Decision trees recursively split the data into subsets. At each decision node a binary classification is made untill a classification a reached
- 'Boosting' improves classification power and reduce overtraining



- Boosted Decision Trees: Decision trees recursively split the data into subsets. At each decision node a binary classification is made untill a classification a reached
- 'Boosting' improves classification power and reduce overtraining
- More than 50% signal significance improvement with **BDT**





#### **Rectangular Cuts (QM17)**



#### **BDT Cuts (QM18)**



- With statistics from 2016, signal significance of about 11 sigma
- Allows measurement of  $p_{\rm T}$  and centrality dependence of  $\Lambda_c$  production in HI collisions

# Modelling detector response

- HFT detector description with fully misaligned geometry incorporated into STAR GEANT for full event reconstruction and corrections for detector effects.
- Tuning with data and cosmic data for hit efficiency, hit resolution.
- Also tune TPC performance also to reproduce the high precision tracking





## Modelling detector response





#### Detailed matching of the topological variables of the D0 decays

Proper accounting of the uncertainties in the HFT alignment and TPC distortions sufficient to describe

- The HFT matching ratio
- DCA distributions
  - D0 topological observables



• Excellent description of detector response in simulations

 $\succ$ 

# Results: Comparison to light flavor



- Large values of B/M ratio for charm hadrons, comparable to those of light and strange flavor hadrons
- Similar  $p_T$  dependence as for light flavor hadrons

## **Results: Model comaprisons**



- Significant enhacement of  $\Lambda_c/D^0$  ratio compared to p+p values from PYTHIA
- PYTHIA with Color Reconnection enhances baryon production, but still underpredicts data

$$\chi^2$$
 to PYTHIA default = 23.86; P( $\chi^2_{if true} > \chi^2_{measured}$ ) = 2.7e-5  
 $\chi^2$  to PYTHIA CR = 7.74 ; P( $\chi^2_{if true} > \chi^2_{measured}$ ) = 0.052

## **Results: Model comaprisons**

Au+Au, √s<sub>NN</sub> = 200 GeV 10-80%



- Coalesence models: phase-space recombination of partons to hadrons
- Quarks that dont hadronize by coalesence hadronized by fragmentation
- Models differ in choice of spectra for light and charm quarks, Wigner functions for hadrons

 Models with coalesence hadronization of charm quarks show similar enhancement as in data

## Results: Centrality dependence



 \c/D<sup>0</sup> ratio show increasing trend towards more central collisions, similar to that for light and strange flavor hadrons

# Heavy quarks in QGP



Charm (and bottom) quarks produced predominantly in initial hard scatterings: Ideal probes to study medium interactions and QGP properties

Can study various aspects of charm quark evolution in the QGP



- Charm quark energy loss: D<sup>0</sup> R<sub>AA</sub> and R<sub>CP</sub> [arXiv:1812.10224 (2018)]
- Transport in QGP: Elliptic (v<sub>2</sub>) [PRL.118.212301 (2017)] and directed (v<sub>1</sub>) flow of D<sup>0</sup>
- Hadronization:

 $\Lambda_{\!c}$  production,  $D_{\!s}$  production

#### Charm quarks and intial magnetic fields in HI colliisions



- Moving spectator protons induce extremely strong magnetic fields in initial stages of HI collisions
- Correlated in direction to the reaction plane

#### Charm quarks and intial magnetic fields in HI colliisions

- Charm quarks produced very early in collisions when initial B field are significant
- Also relaxation time large for charm quarks

Au

х

 Results in v<sub>1</sub> (directed flow) with opposite slopes w.r.t rapidity for D<sup>0</sup> and anti-D<sup>0</sup>

Ex



Au

# Directed flow from initial geometry

- Significant directed flow (v1) predicted for charm quarks from flow!
- Charge independent
- 'Tilted bulk' in longitudinal direction, but HF quark production profile is symmetric — first order density anisotropy
- Viscous drag on c quarks by the expanding tilted bulk generates  $D^0 v_1$
- Sensititive to initial tilt and viscous drag experienced by c quarks in medium



# Measurement of D<sup>0</sup> directed flow



- Spectator neutrons pushed out along the impact parameter
- Used to determine RP direction with Zero Degree Calorimeters
- D<sup>o</sup> reconstructed at midrapidity using HFT

```
Quark content: D^{0} (\overline{uc}), \overline{D^{0}} (\overline{uc}),
Decay channel: D^{0} \longrightarrow K^{-}\pi^{+}
\overline{D^{0}} \longrightarrow K^{+}\pi^{-}
Decay length (c\tau): 120 µm
Mass: 1864.84 +/- 0.18 MeV/c<sup>2</sup>
Branching ratio: 3.89%
```



#### Measurement of D<sup>0</sup> directed flow

- v<sub>1</sub> measured by correlating D<sup>0</sup> with the spectator plane from ZDC
- Corrected for RP resolution



#### Results: D<sup>0</sup> directed flow at mid-rapidity



- Evidence of non-zero v<sub>1</sub> for D<sup>0</sup> at mid-rapidity
- Slope at mid-rapidity much larger than that for charged kaons

## **Results: Model comparisons**



- Magnitude of  $D^0 v_1$  sensitive to initial tilt of the source
- Can help constrain the model parameter

## **Results: Model comparisons**





- Sensitive to temperature dependence of the drag coefficient
- Together with  $D^0 R_{AA}$  and  $v_2$  can better constrain the tranport parameters

# Results: Charge dependence



- Negative slope for both D<sup>0</sup> and anti-D<sup>0</sup> v<sub>1</sub>
- No significant difference observed at current precision (within  $\sim 1\sigma$ )
- Magnitude of charge dependent signal predicted by Hydro+EM calculations are also small

## Summary & Conclusions

- Λ<sub>c</sub> production in Au+Au collisions:
  - Significant enhancement of  $\Lambda_c/D^0$  ratio compared to p+p values from PYTHIA
    - Evidence for coalesence hadronization of charm quarks
    - Large  $\Lambda_{\!c}$  production cross-section in HI collisions



# Summary & Conclusions

#### Directed flow of D<sup>0</sup>

- Evidence of non-zero directed flow for D<sup>0</sup> mesons
  - Magnitude much larger than for light flavor hadrons
  - Can constrain c quark transport coefficients and initial conditions in the longitudinal direction
- No significant charge dependence observed, within uncertainties



Future experiments (sPHENIX, ALICE ITS upgrade)

- Improve precision and push to lower  $p_T$  for  $\Lambda_c$  measurements
- Differentiate between models
- Predicted v<sub>1</sub> signal from B field measurable at statistics projected for sPHENIX

# Back Up

# Energy Loss [arXiv:1812.10224 (2018)]



- Strong suppression of D<sup>0</sup> mesons, increasing towards central collisions
- Suppression smaller than light flavor hadrons at intermediate  $p_{\mathsf{T}}$
- Most precise D<sup>0</sup> measurements in heavy-ion collisions, constrain the charm quark energy loss in the QGP



Sooraj Radhakrishnan

# Elliptic flow [PhysRevLett.118.212301 (2017)]

- Pressure driven expansion of the QGP medium
- Azimuthal anisotropies in the momentum distribution of produced particles
- · Seeded by initial geometry of the fireball
- QGP viscosity, transport properties





compare with	$2\pi TD_s$	$\chi^2/\text{NDF}$	<i>p</i> -value
SUBATECH [17]	2 - 4	15.2 / 8	0.06
TAMU c quark diff. [20]	5 - 12	10.0 / 8	0.26
TAMU no c quark diff. $[20]$	-	29.5 / 8	$2 \times 10^{-4}$
Duke [19]	7	35.7 / 8	$2 \times 10^{-5}$
LBT [21]	3 - 6	11.1 / 8	0.19
PHSD [16]	5 - 12	8.7 / 7	0.28
3D viscous hydro [45]	-	3.6 / 6	0.73

Charm quarks acquire flow from diffusion through QGP



## Results: Charm cross section

 Cross-section for D<sup>0</sup> production lower than in p+p



 Also measurements on D<sub>s</sub> and D<sup>+/-</sup> production

Charm Hadron		Cross Section dơ/dy (µb)		
AuAu 200 GeV (10-40%)	$D^0$	41 ± 1 ± 5		
	$D^+$	18 ± 1 ± 3		
	$D_s^+$	15 ± 1 ± 5		
	$\Lambda_c^+$	69 ± 11 ± 27 <b>*</b>		
	Total	143 ± 11 ± 28		
pp 200 GeV	Total	130 ± 30 ± 26		

\* derived using  $\Lambda_c^+ / D^0$  ratio in 10-80%

- Enhancement for  $\Lambda_c$  and  $D_s$  and suppression for  $D^0$
- But total charm cross-section is found to be consistent with p+p

# $\Lambda_c$ cross-section

#### Lc cross section update

#### **Old results**

#### updated Lc spectra sys from data: 0.18 \* y\_value is correlated part $d^2N/(N_{ev}dp_Tdy)$ (GeV/c)<sup>-2</sup> AuAu 200 GeV, 10-80% AuAu 200 GeV, 10-80% - Data $10^{3}$ $\Lambda_c^+$ cross section (µb) $\Lambda_{c}^{+}$ cross section (µb) Fit: mean mean = $78.5 \pm 12.9 \pm 28.4$ Ko: di-quark mean = $69.1 \pm 11.4 \pm 27.0$ ----- Ko: three-quark Ko: di-quark: 99.6 Ko: three-quark Ko: di-quark: 88.5 Ko: three-quark: 68.5 Ko: three-quark: 60.7 Greco 10 Greco: 60.3 Tshingua Tshingua: 66.7 10<sup>-1</sup> 10<sup>-3</sup> 10<sup>-5</sup> data: $5.0 \pm 0.8$ (stat.) $\pm 1.4$ (sys.) (µb) data: $5.4 \pm 0.9$ (stat.) $\pm 1.3$ (sys.) (µb) 6 8 p<sub>T</sub> (GeV/c) 2 0 4 6 8 p<sub>T</sub> (GeV/c)

Greco: 67.5

4

#### **Old results:**

10<sup>2</sup>

10<sup>-2</sup>

 $10^{-4}$ 

10<sup>-6</sup>

0

🗕 Data

Fit: mean

Greco

Ko: di-quark

2

 $d^2N/(N_{ev}dp_Tdy)$  (GeV/c)<sup>-2</sup>

10-80%									_
pt	data	stat.	sys.	di-quark	three-quark	Greco	mean	diff(nSigma)	
2.5-3.5	0.021807	0.00418592	0.00533427	0.0217311	0.0202819	0.0229574	0.0216568	0.0221546	
3.5-5	0.00226732	0.000312316	0.000523047	0.00266194	0.00269616	0.00262791	0.002662	0.647882	
5-8	0.000146672	2.18035e-05	2.84159e-05	9.46113e-05	0.000100248	8.75238e-05	9.41276e-05	1.46702	
Upda	ited:							L	
pt	data	stat.	sys.	di-quark	three-quark	Greco	Tshingua mr	aan	diff(nSigma
2.5-3.5	0.0202388	0.00388898	0.00597229	0.019322	0.0179641	0.0204975	0.0212112 0.0	197487	0.0687619
3.5-5	0.00201695	0.000279065	0.000592138	0.00236684	0.00238805	0.00234633	0.00230445 0.0	00235142	0.510944
5-8	0.000119426	1.8018e-05	3.34517e-05	8.41228e-05	8.87916e-05	7.81457e-05	8.14049e-05 8.3	31163e-05	0.955641
Xiaolo	ng Chen			LIST	C/L BNI				3

# String fragmentation vs cluster hadronization



## $\Lambda_c$ production in p+p collisions



# Efficiency corrections

- Efficiency correction from data driven fast simulation (also used for D<sup>0</sup>)
  - Extensively validated with HIJING+GEANT simulations
  - Uses as inputs HFT ratio and dca resolution from data, TPC efficiency and momentum resolution from Embedding

EFS = ETPC X EHFT X EPID X EBDT

- Corrections from Embedding:
  - Secondary protons from  $\wedge are$  not matched in HFT.
  - Secondary tracks cause a broadened Dca tail in data
  - Primary vertex resolution effects not accounted for in FastSim
  - Uses  $\Lambda_{\!c}$  embedded into HIJING+ZB events to evaluate these

 $\epsilon_{\wedge c} = \epsilon_{FS} x \epsilon_{sec} x \epsilon_{vtx}$ 



# Comparison with rectangular cuts



- Error bars are much reduced.
- Cuts are from different tress with different efficiencies
- BDT values are lower than that from rectangular cuts
- BDT FastSim performance need to be validated with HIJING