# Inclusive onium measurements in p+p collisions at RHIC

 $\bullet \bullet \bullet$ 

Jakub Češka (CTU)

Quarkonia as Tools 2024 Centre Paul Langevin, Aussois, France 7. - 13. 1. 2024

## Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC)

- Located in Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL), NY, USA
- World's only polarised hadron collider



## **RHIC collider**

$\sqrt{s_{\rm NN}}$	Species	Number Events/	Year
(GeV)		Sampled Luminosity	
200	Au+Au	$20{ m B}~/~40~{ m nb^{-1}}$	2023 + 2025
200	$p{+}p$	$235 \text{ pb}^{-1}$	2024
200	$p{+}\mathrm{Au}$	$1.3 {\rm ~pb^{-1}}$	2024





## Experiments at RHIC









### Finished data-taking in 2016

## **Production models**

- Color Singlet Model
  - pair produced directly in same state as quarkonium, associated with a gluon
- Color Octet Model
  - pair produced in any state
  - long distance matrix elements (LDMEs) bound state probability

### • (Improved) Color Evaporation Model

• quantum numbers neglected, fixed production probability

### • Color Dipole Model

- projectile radiates gluon in target rest frame
- $\circ$  gluon fluctuates into Q $\overline{ ext{Q}}$  dipole
- dipole interacts with target producing quarkonium via CS channel





#### [Phys.Rev.D 100 (2019) 5, 052009]

(a)



PHENIX J/ $\Psi$  data (left) follow the Ap<sub>T</sub>/[1+(p<sub>T</sub>/b)<sup>2</sup>]<sup>n</sup> lineshape and agree with NLO NRQCD predictions.

STAR measured J/ $\Psi$  p<sub>T</sub> spectrum up to 20 GeV/c (right), with both **NRQCD+FONLL and ICEM+FONLL** predictions overestimating the data at lower transverse momenta. NLO NRQCD+FONLL also underestimates at high p<sub>r</sub>.

## Y p<sub>T</sub> spectra



[J. Phys.: Conf. Ser., 1667(1), 012022]

The CGC+NRQCD model overestimates the STAR data at low and high p<sub>T</sub>. The CEM model predictions are consistent with the measurements.

## J/ $\Psi$ rapidity spectra

#### [Phys.Rev.D 85 (2012) 092004]



The **PHENIX data is best described by the scaled CTEQ6M model**, with GRV98 not reproducing the data trend.

## Y rapidity spectra

[Phys.Rev.C 91 (2015) 2, 024913]



[L. Kosarzewski, QM22]

10

The STAR Y->e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> data is best described by the CEM model, whereas the other models do not describe the data well.

## J/ $\Psi$ mean <p<sub>T</sub><sup>2</sup>>

[Phys.Rev.C 93 (2016) 6, 064904]



Broadening of the spectra due to **Cronin effect.** 

PHENIX and STAR measurements of mean  $J/\Psi$  mean  $p_{T}$  are **consistent with world's data**.

## **Onium-hadron correlations**

## **Onium-hadron azimuthal correlations**

- GBW model predicts a double-peak structure for central Drell-Yan dileptons and associated forward pions
- This should hold true for quarkonia in colour dipole approach
- PYTHIA8 does not reproduce the double-peak structure



 $C(\Delta\phi)$ 

[E. Basso et al., PoS, EPS-HEP2015, 191 (2016)]



13

### $J/\Psi$ -hadron azimuthal correlations

[Phys.Rev.C 80 (2009) 041902]



STAR measurements show **two peaks**, which consists of a single away-side peak contribution of prompt J/ $\Psi$  and a double peak from B to J/ $\Psi$  decays with the near-side peak having larger magnitude.

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\sigma}{\mathrm{d}\cos\vartheta\mathrm{d}\varphi} \propto 1 + \lambda_{\vartheta}\cos^2\vartheta + \lambda_{\vartheta\varphi}\sin2\vartheta\cos\varphi + \lambda_{\varphi}\sin^2\vartheta\cos2\varphi + \dots$$

## **Polarisation**

### Helicity (HX) - quarkonium momentum direction Collins-Soper (CS) - beam angle bisection Gottfried-Jackson (GJ) - beam direction







## $J/\Psi$ polarisation

[Phys.Rev.D 102 (2020) 7, 072008]



PHENIX measurements of  $\lambda_{\theta\phi}$  are consistent with 0 in C-S and G-J frames, whereas it is positive in HX at low  $P_{T}$ .

The data for  $\lambda_{\phi}$  are consistent with 0 in all frames. The C-S data does not match NRQCD prediction, but the HX data agree within errors.

## $J/\Psi$ polarisation

[Phys.Rev.D 102 (2020) 7, 072008]



PHENIX data for  $\lambda_{\mu}$  are **consistent with 0 in all frames** in both  $p_{T}$  and rapidity dependent measurements.

In p<sub>T</sub> dependent measurements **he C-S data match NRQCD prediction** within errors, but the **HX data do not agree with the predictions**.

## $J/\Psi$ polarisation

The STAR results for J/ $\Psi$  in two decay channels show differences in  $\lambda_{\theta}$  and  $\lambda_{\phi}$  between HX and CS frames.

Data consistent with no polarisation except for  $\lambda_{\theta}$  for |y| < 0.5 dimuon data at high  $p_{T}$ 

CGC+NRQCD offers best description, other models not ruled out due to large uncertainties



## Multiplicity dependence

### $J/\Psi$ multiplicity dependence

[Phys.Lett.B 786 (2018) 87-93]



The STAR data for mid-rapidity J/ $\Psi$  show a stronger than linear increase consistent with world data. The data is **described well via PYTHIA8 and EPOS3.2**, whereas the percolation model underestimates the data at large multiplicities.

## $J/\Psi$ multiplicity dependence

[Universe 2023, 9(7), 322]



The PHENIX measurements allow for measuring forward- and backward-rapidity  $J/\Psi$ , which are mostly **consistent with world data** with the exception of the last bin in the backwards produced  $J/\Psi$ .

The analysis also highlights a strong dependence of the rapidity window used for  $N_{ch}$  calculation.

## Y multiplicity dependence

[L. Kosarzewski, MPI@LHC 2023]



The STAR measurements of Y exhibit the same stronger-than-linear increase with high- $p_T$  data having a larger magnitude than  $p_T$ -integrated ones.

## Feed-down and ratio measurements

## $\Psi(2S)$ and J/ $\Psi$ ratio

#### [Phys.Rev.D 100 (2019) 5, 052009]





The CEM prediction underestimates the PHENIX data at intermediate  $p_{T^{-}}$ 

The ICEM model underestimates the STAR data point.

## $\Psi(2S)$ and J/ $\Psi$ ratio

[JongHo Oh, QM23]



PHENIX analysis show measurements in different  $|\Delta \eta|$  intervals. In all, **the ratio changes minimally with multiplicity**. PYTHIA8 Monash and Detroit tune describe the data well at lower multiplicities.

## $B \to J/\Psi$ fraction

#### [Phys.Rev.D 95 (2017) 9, 092002]



#### [Phys.Lett.B 722 (2013) 55-62]



STAR 200 GeV data at central rapidity and PHENIX 500 GeV data at forward/backward rapidity **consistent with FONLL+CEM calculations** within errors

## $\chi_{c} \rightarrow J/\Psi$ branching ratio



[*Phys.Rev.D* 85 (2012) 092004]

PHENIX measurements of  $\chi_c$  to J/ $\Psi$  feed-down fraction consistent with CEM predictions.

## Quarkonia and jets



**PYTHIA8** predicts a larger fraction of jet-associated  $J/\Psi$  compared to STAR data. Theoretical model calculations needed.

## $J/\Psi$ production within jets





Should provide constraints to LDMEs.

No significant *z* dependence in data observed.  $J/\Psi$  production less isolated in data compared to PYTHIA8 prediction.

## Outlook

### • STAR:

- Forward upgrade installed
  - 2.5 < y < 4 (FST and sTGC tracking, EM and h calorimetry)
  - High integrated luminosity at mid and forward rapidity
- Better precision J/ $\Psi$  and Y dependence on N<sub>ch</sub> with 2017 and 2022 datasets
  - Higher integrated luminosities sampled (up to a factor of 10 in 2017 data compared to 2011)
  - 2017 dataset analyses ongoing [J. Ceska, A. Knospe, QM23]
  - Better model discrimination
- sPHENIX:
  - Quarkonia are an essential part of the physics program
- RHIC
  - 200 GeV polarised p+p collisions planned for Run24

## Summary

- RHIC and its experiments have a rich quarkonium programme
  - Spectra
  - Onium-hadron correlations
  - Polarisation
  - Multiplicity dependent measurements
  - Feed-down and ratio measurements
  - Quarkonia and jets
  - Single-spin asymmetry, ...
- Exciting new results
- Data taking still ongoing
- Plenty of data yet to be analysed

## Thank you for your attention!

## Backup

## Multiplicity dependence

#### [Universe 2023, 9(7), 322]



The analysis also highlights a **strong dependence of the rapidity window used for N<sub>ch</sub>** calculation.

## Single-spin asymmetry

### https://inspirehep.net/literature/870935

#### Taken from erratum



FIG. 1: (color online) Transverse single-spin asymmetry in  $J/\psi$  production as a function of  $x_F$  for 2006 and 2008 data sets separately, and the combined result; the points for the combined result have been offset by 0.01 in  $x_F$  for visibility. The error bars shown are statistical and type A systematic uncertainties, added in quadrature. Type B systematic uncertainties are not included but are 0.003 or less in absolute magnitude and can be found in Table IIII Not shown is an additional uncertainties of 3.4%, 3.0%, and 2.4% for the 2006, 2008, and combined 2006 + 2008 data sets, respectively.





37

### https://inspirehep.net/literature/1467456



FIG. 3.  $A_{LL}^{J/\psi}$  as a function of  $p_T$  (top panel) and |y| (bottom panel). The black error bars show the statistical uncertainty. The red boxes show only the Type A systematic uncertainty ties. There are additionally a  $4 \times 10^{-4}$  global systematic uncertainty from the relative luminosity determination and a 6.5% global scaling systematic uncertainty from the polarization magnitude determination for all  $p_T$  or |y| bins. The blue curve with shaded band is our  $A_{LL}^{J/\psi}$  estimation using PYTHIA6 [29] simulation with NNPDF data sets under the as-

sumption of  $\hat{a}_{LL}^{gg \to J/\psi + X} = 1$ . The solid blue curve is the central value and the blue shaded band is the  $\pm 2 \sigma$  uncertainty range. See details in the text.

### https://inspirehep.net/literature/1671782



FIG. 4. (a) Backward  $[x_F < 0]$  and (b) forward  $[x_F > 0] A_N^{J/\psi}$  vs  $p_T$  for open [black] circles p+p, closed [red] circles p+Al, and closed [blue] boxes p+Au collisions. The shaded [gray] boxes show the systematic uncertainty. The data points for p+Al and p+Au collisions have been shifted in  $p_T$  for clarity.