Pb-Pb and p-Pb results with the ALICE Experiment at the CERN LHC

MinJung Kweon Heavy Ion Meeting 2013-06, June 28 2013

Introduction

- In heavy nuclei collisions at high energies,
 - quarks and gluons become free,
 - form a high density colour deconfined state of strongly interacting matter.
- Lattice QCD predicts a phase transition to QGP



Heavy Ion Collisions: Space Time Evolution



Heavy Ion Collisions: Space Time Evolution





ALICE - dedicated heavy-ion experiment at the LHC



- Particle identification (practically all known techniques)
- Extremely low-mass tracker ~ 10% of X_0
- Excellent vertexing capability
- Efficient low-momentum tracking down to ~ 100 MeV/c

Bulk Particle Production

Energy, Centrality, and Rapidity dependence

Charged-particle production: pseudorapidity distributions

 $\mathrm{dN}_{\mathrm{ch}}$

2000

 $1500 \cdot$

 $1000 \cdot$

ALI-DER-3725

ALI-DER-37253

p-Pb $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02 \text{ TeV}$ 25 dN_{ch}/dn_{ab} lab Б $dN_{ch'}$ HIJING: ALICE NSD ---- 2.1 no shad. [6] Sat. Models: BB2.0 no shad. [4] IP-Sat [5] BB2.0 with shad. [4] -- KLN [3] DPMJET [32] rcBK^[7] Sat -2 0 2 ab 2 0 ab VCMS

- constrains initial conditions of heavy-ion collision
- models with shadowing or saturation describe the measurement within 20%
- saturation models too steep

Charged-particle production: collision energy dependence

- LHC 2 times higher than RHIC
- Pb-Pb 2 times higher than pp
- p-Pb like INEL pp
- steeper growth in AA than in pp and p-A

Charged-particle production in Pb-Pb: comparison with models

higher yield than expected (by most)

Charged-particle production: centrality dependence

~2 times more particles than at RHIC, same centrality dependence

Charged-particle production: centrality dependence

PRL 106 (2010) 032301

- general trend reasonably reproduced by majority of the models
- individual differences larger than the difference between the two groups

Hadron Identification

Identified hadron spectra - comparison to RHIC

Identified hadron spectra - comparison to models

- harder than VISH2+1
- described by Krakow and HKM (early flow, cross-over, realistic EOS, resonances)
- less protons than predicted by hydro

 $p_{_{\rm T}}$ (GeV/c)

Mean p_T of identified hadrons

 $< p_T > ~20\%$ higher than at RHIC at the same multiplicity

Particle flow: Collective Motion of Particles

Final momentum anisotropy reflected in azimuthal distributions

$$v_{2} = \frac{\left\langle p_{y}^{2} \right\rangle - \left\langle p_{x}^{2} \right\rangle}{\left\langle p_{y}^{2} \right\rangle + \left\langle p_{x}^{2} \right\rangle}$$

At the beginning of the collision: the nuclear overlap region is an ellipsoid.

The gradient of pressure is largest in the shortest direction of the ellipsoid

The initial spatial anisotropy evolves →Momentum-space anisotropy

Fourier expansion of azimuthal distributions $\frac{dN}{d\varphi} \propto 1 + 2v_1 \cos[\varphi - \Psi_1] + 2v_2 \cos[2(\varphi - \Psi_2)] + 2v_3 \cos[3(\varphi - \Psi_3)] + \dots$ $v_1 = \langle \cos(\varphi) \rangle \quad "directed flow" \qquad v_2 = \langle \cos(2\varphi) \rangle \quad "elliptic flow"$

Isotropic (radial) flow

 ε_3

E4

Anatomy of flow harmonics (vn)

 $\frac{dN}{d\varphi} \propto 1 + 2v_1 \cos[\varphi - \Psi_1] + 2v_2 \cos[2(\varphi - \Psi_2)] + 2v_3 \cos[3(\varphi - \Psi_3)] + \dots$

- v₂ dominates for non-central collisions
 - "Elliptic Flow"
- Higher harmonics: vn studies
 - Fluctuations, transport
- $v_3 \sim v_2$ for central collisions
 - Fluctuations
- Transverse Momentum Regions
 - Low p_T (≈ 3 GeV/c): collective hydrodynamic expansion
 - Intermediate p_T (≈ 8 GeV/c): soft-hard interplay, recombination
 - High p_T: jet suppression vs path length

hydrodynamic behavior continues at LHC energies

Elliptic flow of identified hadrons

Additional constraints on collective evolution

 v_2 for π, p, K[±], K⁰_s, Λ, ϕ (not shown for Ξ, Ω) ϕ at low p_T (<3 GeV/c) follows mass hierarchy – at higher p_T joins mesons

Elliptic flow of identified hadrons

– at higher p_T joins mesons

NCQ scaling: violation ~ 10% at low p_T

 v_n measurements up to 20 GeV/*c* – where dominated by jet quenching Non-flow effects suppressed by rapidity gap or using higher cumulants Non-zero value of v_2 at high p_T both for $\Delta \eta > 2$ and 4-particle cumulant

 v_3 and v_4 diminish above 10 GeV/c – indication of disappearance of fluctuations at high p_T

- v₃ is not related to reaction plane
- v₃ only weakly depends on centrality

Higher harmonics of flow

the azimuthal correlations at high p_T fully described by the flow coefficients

Probing QCD Matter

Nuclear modification factor

parton energy loss in color medium manifesting as

suppression of high-p⊤ particles in Pb-Pb

Nuclear modification factor

Nuclear modification factor

no suppression of photons, W, Z⁰ in Pb-Pb

Mass dependent energy loss

But kinematic ranges (w.r.t. to parent quarks) are not exactly the same

from N_{part} > 100 suppression independent of centrality

• in central collisions, less suppression than at RHIC

Hot photons

Exponential fit for $p_T < 2.2$ GeV/c inverse slope $T = 304\pm51$ MeV for 0–40% Pb–Pb at $\sqrt{s} = 2.76$ TeV

PHENIX: $T = 221 \pm 19 \pm 19$ MeV for 0–20% Au–Au at $\sqrt{s} = 200$ GeV

photon temperature higher than T_C

Jet Bulk Interaction

Two particle correlations

CMS. EP JC 72 (2012) 2012

Correlations originating from jets and other sources

Two-particle correlations are a powerful tool to explore the mechanism of particle production in collisions of hadrons and nuclei at high energy. Such studies involve measuring the distributions of relative angles ϕ and η between pairs of particles.

Two p

In PbPb, long-range correlations can be explained by flow harmonics (v_n) In high-multiplicity p-Pb, a ridge develops

Extraction of double ridge structure in p-Pb

Extract double ridge structure by subtracting the jet-like correlations

It has been verified that the 60-100% class is similar to pp

The near-side ridge is accompanied by an almost identical ridge structure on the away-side

Properties of this double ridge

arXiv:1212.2001

Fourier analysis of the ridge $\rightarrow v_2$ and v_3 like flow: increase with p_T unlike flow: increase with centrality

Intermediate p_T in the bulk and in the jet

Intermediate p_T in the bulk and in the jet

Intermediate p_T in the bulk and in the jet

Pb-Pb, $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, 0-10% central _π+<u>p</u>)/(μ+μ Bulk Ratio (-0.52 < $\Delta \phi$ < 0.52, ±0.6 < $\Delta \eta$ < ±1.5) 1.4 **Peak - Bulk Ratio (-0.52** < $\Delta \phi$ < 0.52, -0.4 < $\Delta \eta$ < 0.4) 1.2 PRELIMINAR Pythia (Peak - Bulk Ratio) $5.0 < p_{T,tria} < 10.0 \text{ GeV/c}$ 0.8 0.6 0.4 0.2 0 1.5 2 2.5 3 3.5 4.5 $\rm p_{\rm T,assoc}~(GeV/c)$

Near-side peak (after bulk subtraction): p/π ratio compatible with that of pp (PYTHIA) Bulk region: p/π ratio strongly enhanced – compatible with overall baryon enhancement The "baryon anomaly" is a bulk effect!

Jet particle ratios not modified in medium? Could this still be surface bias?

ALI-PREL-15474

Jet peak shape deformation

Can longitudinal flow deform the conical jet shape? (Armesto et al, PRL 93, 242301 (2004))

Jet peak shape deformation

Can longitudinal flow deform the conical jet shape? (Armesto et al, PRL 93, 242301 (2004))

Significant increase of $\,\sigma_{\!\Delta\!\eta}$ towards central events

Evolution of near-side-peak σ_{η} and σ_{φ} with centrality Influence of flowing medium?

Summary

New insight into the reaction dynamics from LHC

- Mach cone and ridge challenged
- proton puzzle: lower yield, lower v_2 than expected
- nuclear suppression decreasing at very high pt (R_{AA} increasing)
- J/Psi production via statistical regeneration
- ridges in high-multiplicity pp and p-Pb collisions

~2 x higher than at RHIC

- particle production
- homogeneity volume

~10-30% higher than at RHIC

- transverse flow
- mean transverse momentum
- integrated elliptic flow
- mass-splitting of v₂

Like at RHIC

- centrality dependence of particle production
- centrality dependence of v₂
- \bullet transverse momentum dependence of v_2

Thank you for your attention!

Backup

• The goal of ultra-relativistic nucleus–nucleus collisions is to study nuclear matter under extreme conditions. For non-central collisions, in the plane perpendicular to the beam direction, the geometrical overlap region, where the highly Lorentz contracted nuclei intersect and where the initial interactions occur, is azimuthally anisotropic. This initial spatial asymmetry is converted via interactions into an anisotropy in momentum space, a phenomenon referred to as transverse anisotropic flow (for a review see [1]). Anisotropic flow has become a key observable for the characterization of the properties and the evolution of the system created in a nucleus–nucleus collision.

The models shown in Figs. 13, 14, and 15 give for central collisions a fair description of the data. In the region $p_T \odot 3 \text{ GeV}/c$ (Kraków [46]), $p_T \bigcirc 1.5 \text{ GeV}/c$ (HKM[47]) and $p_T \bigcirc 3 \text{ GeV}/c$ (EPOS [48], with the exception of protons which are underestimated by about 30% at low $p_{\rm T}$), the models describe the experimental data within ~20%, supporting a hydrodynamic interpreta- tion of the $p_{\rm T}$ spectra in central collisions at the LHC. VISH2+1[49] is a viscous hydrodynamic model that reproduces fairly well the pion and kaon distributions up to $p_T \sim$ 2 GeV/c, but it misses the protons, both in shape and absolute abundance in all centrality bins. In this version of the model the yields are thermal, with a chemical temperature $T_{ch} = 165$ MeV, extrapolated from lower energies. The difference between VISH2+1 and the data are possibly due to the lack of an explicit description of the hadronic phase in the model. This idea is supported by the comparison with HKM [47, 50]. HKM is a model similar to VISH2+1, in which after the hy-drodynamic phase particles are injected into a hadronic cascade model (UrQMD), which further transports them until final decoupling. The hadronic phase builds up additional radial flow and affects particle ratios due to the hadronic interactions. As can be seen, this model yields a better description of the data. The protons at low $p_{\rm T}$, and hence their total number, are rather well reproduced, even if the slope is significantly smaller than in the data. Antibaryon-baryon anni- hilation is an important ingredient for the description of particle yields in this model [47, 50]. The Kraków [51, 52] model, on the other hand, uses an ansatz to describe deviation from equi-librium due to viscous corrections at freeze-out, which seems successful in reproducing the data. A general feature of these models is that, going to more peripheral events, the theoretical curves deviate from the data at high $p_{\rm T}$ (Figs. 14 and 15). This is similar to what is observed in the comparison to the blast-wave fits, and shows the limits of the hydrodynamical models. As speculated in [46], this could indicate the onset of a non-thermal (hard) component, which in more peripheral collisions is not dominated by the flow-boosted thermal component. This picture is further substantiated by the change in the local slopes as seen in Fig. 6.

The EPOS (2.17v3) model [48] aims at describing all p_T domains with the same dynamical picture. In this model, the initial hard scattering creates "flux tubes" which either escape the medium and hadronize as jets, or contribute to the bulk matter, described in terms of hydrodynamics. After hadronization, particles are transported with a hadronic cascade model (UrQMD). EPOS shows a good agreement with the data for central and semi-central collisions. A calcu- lation done with the same model, but disabling the late hadronic phase, yields a significantly worse description [48], indicating the important role of the late hadronic interactions in this model. An EPOS calculation for peripheral collisions was not available at the time of writing, but it will be important to see how well the peripheral data can be described in this model, since it should include all relevant physics processes. Several other models implementing similar ideas (hydrodynamics model coupled to a hadronic cascade code, possibly with a description of fluctuations in the initial condition) are available in the literature [53, 54] but not discussed in this paper. The simultaneous description of additional variables, such as the v_n azimuthal flow coefficients within the same model, will help in different hydrodynamical model scenarios.

Figure 16 shows the $p/\pi = (p + p^{-})/(\pi^{+} + \pi^{-})$ and $K/\pi = (K^{+} + K^{-})/(\pi^{+} + \pi^{-})$ ratios as a function of p_T . Both ratios are seen to increase as a function of centrality at intermediate p_T with a corresponding depletion at low p_T (the p_T integrated ratios show little dependence on centrality, Fig. 9). The p/π ratio, in particular, shows a more pronounced increase, reaching a value of about 0.9 at $p_T = 3 \text{ GeV}/c$. This is reminiscent of the 46 increase in the baryon-to- meson ratio observed at RHIC in the intermediate p_T region [19, 55], which is suggestive of the recombination picture

Viceonly

after 6 fm/c

S Jeon et al, QM 2012, B. Schenke, et al. PRL106, 042301 (2011)

Elliptic flow

< PRL 105 (2010) 252302 Ē (a) **★** v₂{2} 40-50% 0.3 v₂{4} 40-50% 0.25 v,{4} (STAR) 0.2 0.15 0.1 0.05 ۷₂{4} (b) 10-20% 0.25 20-30% 30-40% 10-20% (STAR) 0.2 20-30% (STAR) 30-40% (STAR 0.15 ***** 0.1 0.05 5 p_t (GeV/*c*) Ō 2 3 4 1

- same p_T dependence as at RHIC (and below, down to 40 GeV!)
- inclusive v₂ at LHC higher only because <p_T> higher

Two-particle correlations are a powerful tool to explore the mechanism of particle production in collisions of hadrons and nu- clei at high energy. Such studies involve measuring the distribu- tions of relative angles $\bigcirc \phi$ and $\bigcirc \eta$ between pairs of particles: a "trigger" particle in a certain transverse momentum $p_{T,trig}$ interval and an "associated" particle in a $p_{T,assoc}$ interval, where $\bigcirc \phi$ and $\bigcirc \eta$ are the differences in azimuthal angle ϕ and pseudorapidity η between the two particles.

In proton–proton (pp) collisions, the correlation at $(\bigcirc \varphi \approx 0, \bigcirc \eta \approx 0)$ for $p_{T,trig} > 2 \text{ GeV}/c$ is dominated by the "near-side" jet peak, where trigger and associated particles originate from a frag- menting parton, and at $\bigcirc \varphi \approx \pi$ by the recoil or "away-side" jet [1]. The away-side structure is elongated along $\bigcirc \eta$ due to the longitu- dinal momentum distribution of partons in the colliding protons. In nucleus– nucleus collisions, the jet-related correlations are mod- ified and additional structures emerge, which persist over a long range in $\bigcirc \eta$ on the near side and on the away side [2–14]. The shape of these distributions when decomposed into a Fourier se- ries defined by v_n coefficients [15] is found to be dominated by contributions from terms with n = 2 and n = 3 [6,7,9–14]. The v_n coefficients are sensitive to the geometry of the initial state of the colliding nuclei [16,17] and can be related to the transport

• properties of the strongly-interacting de-confined matter via hy- drodynamic models [18–20].

Recently, measurements in pp collisions at a centre-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV [21] and in proton–lead (p–Pb) collisions at a nucleon–nucleon centre-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV [22] have revealed long-range ($2 < |\bigcirc \eta| < 4$) near-side ($\bigcirc \varphi \approx 0$) cor- relations in events with significantly higher-than-average particle multiplicity. Various mechanisms have been proposed to explain the origin of these ridge-like correlations in high-multiplicity pp and p–Pb events. These mechanisms include colour connections forming along the longitudinal direction [23–26], jet-medium [27] and multi-parton induced [28,29] interactions, and collective ef- fects arising in the high-density system possibly formed in these collisions [30–35].

V₂ Fluctuations

 $\propto \sigma_{\nu_2}/\langle \nu_2 \rangle$ for small flow

5–30% centrality, relative flow fluctuations independent of momentum up to $p_T \sim 8$ GeV/c

Common origin for flow fluctuations (fluctuations of the initial collision geometry)?

ALICE, PLB 719 18 (2013)

See also: ATLAS-CONF-2012-118

Summary

- Soft Particle Production, Flow and Correlations Observables: essential information on system
- Hydrodynamics describes the evolution of the system
- Initial conditions and Fluctuations play crucial role: progress in understanding of initial conditions
- Late hadronic phase (potentially) affects the observables
- Many new results from the LHC experiments: accessing precision measurement of properties of deconfined matter

QCD: Running coupling constant (a_s)

⇒ QCD predict the creation of a deconfined state of the matter called : Quark Gluon Plasma (QGP)

QCD Prediction: Estimation of the T of the Phase Transition

: Energy density related to the degree of freedom of the system

Hadron gas : degree of freedom of pions QGP : degree of freedom of quarks (3 colors for each flavour) + gluons (8 colors)

Temperature ~ **170** MeV (~ **10**¹² K)

Lattice QCD: rigorous way of doing calculations in non-perturbative regime of QCD discretization on a space-time lattice

QGP is a New State of Matter

Lattice QCD simulation

Atomic property: we see in everyday world

Subatomic property

Theory for History of the Universe: Big Bang Theory

 10^{-32} to $10^{-10} s,$ temperature decrease from 10^{27} to $10^{15^\circ} C > T_C$

Universe could be composed of a <<soup>> of quark and anti-quark = QGP

What are the property of the universe very early on? How are they evolved into the matters in the current universe? Answering to the origin of the matter composing the current universe...

The QCD Phase Diagram

: Sturdy how collective phenomena and macroscopic properties of strongly interacting GeV matter emerge from fundamental interactions $\sqrt{s_{MV}} \approx 4.5 \ GeV$

LHC: √s_{NN} = 5.5 TeV, RHIC: √s_{NN} = 200 GeV, SPS: √s_{NN} = 17 GeV, AGS: √s_{NN} = 4.5 GeV, GSI: √s_{NN} = 2 Ge^V/₆

What we observe: varies depending on the created matter property and interactions between the matter and parton

Models of high- p_T parton energy loss

Two different "categories" of models of parton energy loss, depending on the basic underlying process:

Theories and models of radiative energy loss

- LPM-effect based approaches: BDMPS-Z & AMY
- Opacity expansion: GLV; (AS)W
- Medium-enhanced higher-twist effects
- Medium-modified MLLA

Theories and models of collisional energy loss

- Regards as negligible!
- BUT => it is sizable?

Example of Energy Loss Model

Energy loss by multiple soft scattering

: Models based on the Landau-Pomeranchuk-Migdal effect

Longitudinal expansion reduces $\Delta E \sim L^2$ to $\Delta E \sim L$

he created matter

Color charge dependence of energy loss

$$\omega \frac{dI}{d\omega} \propto \alpha_s C_R f(\omega),$$

$$C_R = 3(4/3) \text{ for } g(q)$$

 $\begin{array}{l} \Delta E(\mathcal{E}_{medium};C_{m},L) \\ \text{ets constitute are very pure samples} \\ \text{pliatiojet} \Delta E_{g} > \Delta E_{c\approx q} > \Delta E_{b} \end{array}$

FIG. 7: As in Fig. 6 but for light u, d quarks and gluons. The yellor band or find or find or find this case with effective g, u path lengths $L_g = 3.5$ and $L_u = 5.0$ fm based **Need to measure heavy if yark energy loss FIG. 8:** The consistency of the extended jet quark ing theory is tested by comparing its prediction **Need to measure heavy if yark energy loss FIG. 8:** The consistency of the extended jet quark ing theory is tested by comparing its prediction **PHENIX** [1].

Need to measure the energy loss of charm and beauty quarks separately the only source of electrons. If the charm to bot

smaller width for fluctuations relative to radiative fluctuations. Even in moderately opaque media with $L/\lambda \sim 10$, tio given by FONLL calculations is accurate, the

A Large Ion Collider Experiment (ALICE)

Designed to discover and understand the New Created Matter (Quark-Gluon Plasma)

 \Rightarrow Only dedicated experiment at LHC, must be comprehensive and able to cover all relevant observables

Characteristics of Heavy Ion Collisions

Particle Production and Energy density ϵ : Produced Particles: $dN_{ch}/d\eta \sim 1600 \pm 76$ (syst) ~ 30,000 particles in total, ~ 400 times pp

$$\varepsilon(\tau) = \frac{E}{V} = \frac{1}{\tau_0 A} \frac{dN}{dy} < m_t >$$
$$\varepsilon \sim 10 GeV / fm^3$$

Energy density $\varepsilon > 3 \times RHIC$

Matter under extreme conditions: ~50 times the density of neutron star core (40 billion tons/cm³)

50 protons packed into the volume of one proton, more than enough for deconfinement!

of the cr

Identical particle interferometry to measure extend of dynamical evolving source (HBT, Bose-Einstein correlations)

- Volume ≈ 300 fm³ (≈ 2 x RHIC)
- Lifetime ≈ 10 fm/c (≈ +20%)

note: 1fm/c ~ 0.33x10⁻²³s

Volume at 'freeze-out'(hadron decoupling) Lifetime from collision to 'freeze-out'

Lives 10⁴⁰ less than current age of universe

Parton Energy Loss: via Nuclear Modification Factor

prompt

BAA

1.6

0.8

0.6

▲∩+

OD^{*+}

|v|<0.5

 $R_{AA}(p_T) = \frac{(1/N_{\text{evt}}^{AA}) d^2 N_{\text{ch}}^{AA}/d\eta dp_T}{\langle N_{\text{coll}} \rangle (1/N_{\text{evt}}^{pp}) d^2 N_{\text{ch}}^{pp}/d\eta dp_T}$

 Nuclear modification factor R_{AA}(p_T) for charged particles produced in 0-5% centrality range ⇒ Strong suppression even larger than at RHIC

 Nuclear modification factor R_{AA}(p_T) for prompt D mesons ⇒ Strong suppression

Centrality 0-20%

p, (GeV/c)

AI ICE

Centrality 40-80%

Pb-Pb, $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76 \text{ TeV}$

Rad (Vitev)

Rad + dissoc (Vitev)

CUJET1.0 (Buzzatt

12

10

WHDG rad+coll (Horowitz

AdS/CFT Drag (Horowitz)

p. (GeV/c)

via New Method First B Measurement

Measure the $c\bar{c}$ and $b\bar{b}$ production cross sections through **semileptonic decays** of open charm and open beauty hadrons:

Heavy Quark Measurement via Semi-electronic Decays

- Jet Quenching
- Quarkonium suppression (Thermometer of the plasma): Less suppressed than RHIC
- Thermal photon
- Ratio between yield of particles
- Low mass resonances
- •

Group Genius

The capacity of a group of individuals to tap into the power of collaboration in a way that produces outcomes that surprise even themselves.

- A team that successfully leverages its combined wisdom can generate genuinely new solutions that aren't traceable back to any one individual to produce fresh ideas that the group is passionate about, resulting in a dramatic performance improvement
- example: Wikipedia, GisikIn

(but obviously, there are also many 'sole' genius! :))

Epilogue: We are miners

A friend of mine told me one episode from one of our colleagues.

On one occasion, he invited his parents to the experimental area in ALICE and showed them with proud how big the experimental setups are. Then, his mother said, "You look like a miner!". He expected a kind of words expressing admiration he has in mind to the setups rather than a comment about his appearance.

The scene in the above picture is the typical scenery in the experimental area located at 60 m down from the earth surface. So I think his mother made a proper observation and indeed we are all like miners who work on finding out values in the dark.

Heavy Quark Energy Loss in Medium

Dead Cone Effect

At LHC...

- In vacuum, gluon radiation is suppressed at angles smaller than the ratio of the quark mass M_Q to its energy E_Q Gluonsstrahlung $\propto \frac{1}{\left[\theta^2 + (M_Q/E_Q)^2\right]^2}$
- In medium, dead cone implies lower energy loss (Dokshitzer and Kharzeev, PLB 519 (2001) 199.)

 \Rightarrow suppression of high-energy tail of medium induced gluon radiation for heavy quarks (more pronounced for beauty)

Color charge dependence of energy loss

gluon radiation spectrum by the parton propagation in the medium:

$$\approx \frac{1}{\left[\theta^{2} + (M_{Q}/E_{Q})^{2}\right]^{2}}$$

$$\omega \frac{dI}{d\omega} \propto \alpha_{s}C_{R}f(\omega)$$
lower energy loss
zeev, PLB 519 (2001) 199.)
gy tail of
tion for heavy
r beauty)

$$R_{AA}^{\pi} < R_{AA}^{D} < R_{AA}^{B}$$

$$R_{AA}(P_{T}) = \frac{1}{\langle N_{coll} \rangle} \frac{dN_{AA}/dp_{T}}{dN_{pp}/dp_{T}}$$
r beauty)

$$R_{AA}^{\pi} < R_{AA}^{D} < R_{AA}^{B}$$

$$R_{AA}(P_{T}) = \frac{1}{\langle N_{coll} \rangle} \frac{dN_{AA}/dp_{T}}{dN_{pp}/dp_{T}}$$

$$R_{AA}(P_{T}) = \frac{1}{\langle N_{coll} \rangle} \frac{dN_{AA}/dp_{T}}{dN_{pp}/dp_{T}}$$

$$R_{AA} < R_{AA}^{D} < R_{AA}^{B}$$

$$R_{AA}(P_{T}) = \frac{1}{\langle N_{coll} \rangle} \frac{dN_{AA}/dp_{T}}{dN_{pp}/dp_{T}}$$

$$R_{AA} < R_{AA}^{D} < R_{AA}^{B}$$

$$R_{AA}(P_{T}) = \frac{1}{\langle N_{coll} \rangle} \frac{dN_{AA}/dp_{T}}{dN_{pp}/dp_{T}}$$

$$R_{AA} < R_{AA}^{D} < R_{AA}^{B}$$

$$R_{AA}(P_{T}) = \frac{1}{\langle N_{coll} \rangle} \frac{dN_{AA}/dp_{T}}{dN_{pp}/dp_{T}}$$

$$R_{AA} < R_{AA}^{D} < R_{AA}^{B}$$

$$R_{AA}(P_{T}) = \frac{1}{\langle N_{coll} \rangle} \frac{dN_{AA}/dp_{T}}{dN_{pp}/dp_{T}}$$

$$R_{AA} < R_{AA}^{D} < R_{AA}^{B}$$

$$R_{AA}(P_{T}) = \frac{1}{\langle N_{coll} \rangle} \frac{dN_{AA}/dp_{T}}{dN_{pp}/dp_{T}}$$

$$R_{AA} < R_{AA}^{B}$$

$$R_{AA}(P_{T}) = \frac{1}{\langle N_{coll} \rangle} \frac{dN_{AA}/dp_{T}}{dN_{pp}/dp_{T}}$$

$$R_{AA}(P_{T}) = \frac{1}{\langle N_{$$

domain and heavy ion reference

p_T [GeV]

R_{D/h}: Heavy-to-light ratios Armesto, Dainese, Salgado, Wiedemann, PRD 71 (2005) 054027. Pb-Pb 0-10%, $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.5 \text{ TeV}$ Color charge effect $\Delta E_q < \Delta E_g$ $m_c = 1.2 \text{ GeV}$ $m_c = 1.2 \text{ GeV}$ $m_c = 1.2 \text{ GeV}$

p_T [GeV]