

## Measurement of high $p_T$ direct photon and $\pi^0$ s in small collision systems at PHENIX

Daniel Firak (for the PHENIX collaboration) - Stony Brook University

- **Outline:** Motivation:  $R_{AB}(p_T)$ 
  - Selection bias, Energy conservation in small systems
    - Glauber Model in Small systems
  - Direct Photons, Bjorken-x
  - Nuclear modification factor in d+Au (PHENIX: arXiv:2303.12899)







#### Nuclear modification factor in Au+Au



$$R_{AB}(p_T) = \frac{Yield_{AB}}{\langle N_{coll} \rangle \cdot Yield_{pp}}$$

• For neutral pions (hadrons),  $R_{AB}^{\pi^0}$  shows suppression in large systems

• For photons,  $R_{AB}^{\gamma}$  is consistent with 1



#### Nuclear modification factor in small systems



• Suppression for the central events could be explained with QGP formation. Enhancement cannot be explained (easily) from physical arguments.

# Is the Glauber Model good both in small



$$\frac{dN_{ch}}{d\eta} \Rightarrow N_{coll} \xrightarrow[Model/Theory]{} N_{par} \xrightarrow[Theory]{} b$$

Multiplicity window = centrality class

Measurable

$$N_{coll}^{GL} \propto \left(\frac{dN_{ch}}{d\eta}\right)^a$$
 : Not directly measurable!

Obtained through Glauber model



#### There IS bias in small systems!

Centrality is determined by event activity in the BBC, on the Au going direction (PHENIX)







#### There IS bias in small systems!

Centrality is determined by event activity in the BBC, on the Au going direction (PHENIX)



"Correlations between hard probes and bulk dynamics in small systems" Sangyong Jeon – in ~30 minutes!



Daniel Firak



#### Direct photons to the rescue!



Unlike color charged matter, direct photons are unaffected by QGP.
 γ<sup>dir</sup> can be used as a less biased direct measure of N<sub>Coll</sub>



#### Direct measurement of the N<sub>coll</sub>

$$R_{AB}^{\gamma^{dir}}(p_T) = \frac{Y_{AB}^{\gamma^{dir}}(p_T)}{N_{coll} \cdot Y_{pp}^{\gamma^{dir}}(p_T)} \approx 1$$

 The ratio of direct photon yield be used as a measure of  $N_{coll}$ :

 $N_{Coll}^{EXP} = \frac{Y_{AB}^{\gamma^{dir}}(p_T)}{Y_{nn}^{\gamma^{dir}}(p_T)}$ 

$$R_{AB}^{\gamma dir}(p_{T}) = \frac{Y_{AB}^{\gamma dir}(p_{T})}{N_{coll} \cdot Y_{pp}^{\gamma dir}(p_{T})} \approx 1$$
The ratio of direct photon yields can  
be used as a measure of  $N_{coll}$ :  
$$N_{Coll}^{EXP} = \frac{Y_{AB}^{\gamma dir}(p_{T})}{Y_{pp}^{\gamma dir}(p_{T})} \Rightarrow \frac{(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^{0})^{pp}}{(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^{0})^{AB}} \Rightarrow \frac{(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^{0})^{pp}}{(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^{0})^{AB}} \Rightarrow \frac{(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^{0})^{pp}}{(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^{0})^{AB}}$$



### The Bjorken-x bias





• To first order, the same kinematic bias would affect both p + p and d + Au

$$R_{dAu,exp}^{\pi^{0}}(p_{T}) = \frac{\left(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^{0}\right)^{pp}}{(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^{0})^{dAu}}$$



### The Bjorken-x bias

- High  $p_T \gamma^{dir}$  and  $\pi^0$  (7.5 <  $p_T$  < 18 GeV/c)
  - $\gamma^{dir}$  consistent with 2003 min bias data (PHENIX: PRC87(2013)54907)
  - $\pi^0$  consistent with 2008 data (PHENIX:PRC(2022)64902)

• 
$$N_{Coll}^{EXP}(p_T) = \frac{Y_{dAu}^{\gamma^{dir}}(p_T)}{Y_{pp}^{\gamma^{dir}}(p_T)}$$

• 
$$R_{dAu,EXP}^{\pi^{0}}(p_{T}) = \frac{(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^{0})^{pp}}{(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^{0})^{dAu}}$$

- No obvious  $p_T$  dependence.
  - pp and  $dAu\left(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^0\right)$  behave similarly





#### **Comparison with Glauber** N<sub>coll</sub>



 $N_{Coll}^{EXP} = \frac{Y_{AB}^{\gamma^{dir}}(p_T)}{Y_{pp}^{\gamma^{dir}}(p_T)}$ 

- Good agreement between  $N_{Coll}^{EXP}$  and  $N_{Coll}^{GL}$  is seen in central collisions
- 15% deviation is seen in peripheral collisions







$$R_{AB,exp}^{\pi^{0}}(p_{T}) = \frac{Y_{AB}^{\pi^{0}}(p_{T})}{N_{Coll}^{EXP} \cdot Y_{pp}^{\pi^{0}}(p_{T})} \Rightarrow \frac{(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^{0})^{pp}}{(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^{0})^{AB}}$$

• Minimum bias (0-100%):

- No significant  $p_T$  dependence
- Average:

$$\left\langle R_{dAu,exp}^{\pi^{0}} \right\rangle = 0.92 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.15$$

- Consistent with unity
- Consistent with 5% enhancement from CNM effects\*

\*Arleo et al.: CNM effects largely cancel in the  $\gamma^{dir}/\pi^0$  in this  $p_T$  range



- Peripheral collisions are consistent with inclusive (0-100%)
- No peripheral enhancement

PHĚENIX



- $R_{AB,exp}^{\pi^{0}}(p_{T}) = \frac{Y_{AB}^{\pi^{0}}(p_{T})}{N_{Coll}^{EXP} \cdot Y_{nn}^{\pi^{0}}(p_{T})} \Rightarrow \frac{(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^{0})^{pp}}{(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^{0})^{AB}}$ PH<sup>\*</sup>ENIX <sup>2</sup> ط 40, 20 >20% 0.6 0 - 5% 0.4  $^{/} R_{dAu,EXP}^{\pi^{0}}$ 0.75±0.03±0.13 0.2 8 14 16 GeV/c] **р**\_ PHENIX: arXiv:2303.12899
- Central collisions (0-5%) are consistent with >20% suppression
  - No enhancement
  - Clear suppression!







### Summary





## **Backup:**

Daniel Firak



### The Bjorken-x bias





- Even so, the final answer to this puzzle comes from the (upcoming) systematic study of small systems
- Final State
   <sup>3</sup>He > d > p
- p Size fluctuation
   p > d > <sup>3</sup>He



#### Energy conservation in small systems



"Correlations between hard probes and bulk dynamics in small systems" Sangyong Jeon – in ~30 minutes!



### Data analysis

#### The 2016 dataset for d+Au at 200 GeV is used

- $\pi^0$  reconstructed from  $\gamma$  clusters on the EMCal
- Triggered on high  ${\rm p}_T$  range. Analysis done for  $\gamma$  and  $\pi^0$  on  $p_T>7.5~{\rm GeV}$

#### Analysis chain:

- Reconstructed Raw  $\pi^0$  from  $\gamma$  showers  $(\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma \gamma)$
- Raw spectra is unfolded to obtain Invariant  $\pi^0$ 
  - $\frac{\eta}{\pi^0}$  ratio used to obtain invariant  $\eta$  yield
- Model  $\pi^0$  and  $\eta$  decay in PHENIX to obtain  $\gamma^{decay}$
- Subtraction of decay from inclusive raw  $\gamma$  to obtain Raw  $\gamma^{dir}$
- Unfolding Raw  $\gamma^{dir}$  to obtain Invariant  $\gamma^{dir}$

#### Systematic uncertainties

- ~12% on  $\pi^0$  and  $\gamma^{dir}$
- 6% on  $\gamma^{dir}/\pi^0$
- Uncertainties on  $\gamma^{dir}/\pi^0$  are common to all centralities





#### **Bias in Centrality determination**



 Since the event activity is measured in the forward region of the detector, a hard event (think jets) can deplete the forward activity, and would have a high pT event on the central detectors



 This can drive central events to appear as peripheral, explaining a source of "peripheral enhancement" at high pT

# $\frac{\gamma^{dir}}{\pi^0}$ : An observable of centrality bias



Centrality dependent: direct photons are not affected - centrality dependence in  $\pi^0$  is genuine physics

 Centrality Independent: affects direct
 photons - bias on centrality determination affecting π<sup>0</sup>s 

#### Event activity to centrality



 Centrality is determined by event activity in the BBC, on the Au going direction





#### Event activity to centrality



• Centrality is determined by event activity in the BBC, on the Au going direction





#### Nuclear modification factor in d+Au



- For high  $p_T \pi^0$ s in small systems, large centrality dependence is observed:
  - Suppression for central events



 Suppression for the central events could be explained with QGP formation. Enhancement cannot be trivially explained from physical arguments.



$$R_{AB,exp}^{\pi^0}(p_T) = \frac{\left(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^0\right)^{pp}}{(\gamma^{dir}/\pi^0)^{AB}}$$

 $\frac{\gamma}{\pi^0}$ : same normalization peak extraction energy scale

In pp - pp cross section

Double: Hadron contamination

Assumption:  $R_{AA}^{\gamma^{dir}} \equiv 1$ 

**Glauber Bias** 

Pp cross section

Centrality bias

Model dependent

$$R_{AB,GL}^{\pi^{0}}(p_{T}) = \frac{Y_{AB}^{\pi^{0}}}{N_{Coll}^{GL} \cdot Y_{pp}^{\pi^{0}}}$$









