Photon-photon physics in heavy ion collisions

Prof. Brian Cole, Columbia University October 26, 2023

WILHELM UND ELSE HERAEUS-STIFTUNG







Outline

Introduction

- Nuclei as sources of quasi-real photons
- Control measurements: exclusive dilepton
- ATLAS and STAR e⁺e⁻
- Light-by-light scattering
- Measurements, Limits on ALP production
- • τ ⁺ τ ⁻ and τ g-2 measurement
- ATLAS & CMS results
- Photon k_T distributions
- CMS: μ + μ acoplanarity vs # forward neutrons
- ATLAS: $\gamma + \gamma \rightarrow \mu \mu$ in hadronic A+A collisions
- γ +A \rightarrow jets advertisement
- Summary

Introduction

- Weizsacker & Williams + Jackson + ... :
- Highly relativistic particles act as sources of ~ real photons

• Finger physics:

- When λ > R/γ, or equivalently E \$\$ hc γ/R,
 the photons are emitted coherently
- At LHC, Pb+Pb @ 5.02 TeV, coherence condition is $E \lesssim 80 \text{ GeV}$
- (Coherent) Photon flux $\propto Z^2$
 - $-\gamma$ + γ luminosity \propto Z⁴
- During heavy ion operation, the LHC is also a Large Photon Collider
 ⇒ √s > 100 GeV



EPA, STARlight, geometry

- Until recently, calculations of the photon flux in UPC collisions started with textbook formula
- photon flux density for given energy, k at a perpendicular distance, r_

$$\implies N(k,b) = \frac{Z^2 \alpha}{\pi^2} \frac{k}{(\hbar c)^2} \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{kr}{\gamma \hbar c}$$

 \Rightarrow correlation between r_⊥ and energy

EPA, STARlight, geometry

Until recently, calculations of the photon flux in UPC collisions started with textbook formula

– photon flux density for given energy, **k** at a perp. distance, \mathbf{r}_{\perp}

$$\implies N(k,b) = \frac{Z^2 \alpha}{\pi^2} \frac{k}{(\hbar c)^2} \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[K_1^2(x) + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} K_0^2(x) \right] \quad x \equiv \frac{1$$

 \Rightarrow correlation between r_{\perp} and energy

• geometric convolution w/ no-hadronic interaction factor – e.g. STARlight formula for $\gamma+\gamma$:

 $\hbar c$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{d^2 N_{\gamma\gamma}(k_1, k_2)}{dk_1 dk_2} = \int \int \int d^2 b_1 d^2 b_2^2 P_{\text{NOHAD}}(|\vec{b_1} - \vec{b_2}|) N(k_1, \vec{b_1}) N(k_2, \vec{b_2})$$

• But, in textbook or literature, handling of r_{\perp} < R, unsettled

 \Rightarrow For example, STARlight neglects photons w/ r_{\perp} < R

⇒SuperChic does not

γ+γ production of dileptons

Dilepton production in y+y collisions

• At leading order in QED the $\gamma+\gamma \rightarrow l^+l^-$ process is simple



- Well-established calculations
- High-statistics measurements
- Good agreement with theory**
- ⇒ Declare success



ATLAS UPC e⁺e⁻ JHEP 06 (2023) 182

STAR exclusive e⁺e⁻

STAR UPC γ+γ→e⁺e⁻ in 200 GeV Au+Au (L_{int} = 70 μb⁻¹)
 -0.4 < M_{ee} < 2.6 GeV, p_{Tee} < 0.1 GeV, |y_{ee}| < 1

Compared to STARLight and "QED" calculation

⇒STARLight slightly underpredicts data

⇒QED calculation agrees well with data



PRL 127, 052302 (2021)

- First measurement of the angular correlation between lepton pair p_T vector and lepton φ angles
- possible due to the low electron p_T values and << material



STAR exclusive e⁺e⁻

- First measurement of the angular correlation between lepton pair p_T vector and lepton φ angles
- possible due to the low electron p_T values and << material
- Compare to calculations:
- Reasonable agreement with QED and SuperChic
- ⇒QED: cos(4∆φ) modulation from linear polarization of the photons



γ+γ scattering and forward neutrons

Nuclear breakup via Coulomb Excitation 12

In Pb+Pb γ+γ, coherent photons dominate

⇒Nominally: no forward neutrons in 0 degree calorimeters



 However, long-range EM interactions can induce giant dipole resonance++
 ⇒Emission of 1 or more neutrons by one or both nuclei

⇒Explore with ATLAS γ + γ → μ + μ -



Event topology as seen in the two ZDCs





Event topology as seen in the two ZDCs





14

– 0n0n - no neutrons in either ZDC

Event topology as seen in the two ZDCs





15

− 0nXn
⇒ 0 neutrons in one
⇒ ≥ 1 in the other

Event topology as seen in the two ZDCs





-XnXn $\Rightarrow \ge 1$ neutrons in both

Dimuon acopolanarity distributions

 $lpha = 1 - rac{\Delta \phi}{\pi}$

-for different topologies

⇒Large-acoplanarity tails change shape for different neutron topologies





γ+γ→μ⁺μ⁻, nuclear breakup

Dimuon acopolanarity distributions

 $lpha = 1 - rac{\Delta \phi}{\pi}$

18

- -for different topologies
- ⇒Large-acoplanarity tails change shape for different neutron topologies

Dominant effect:

Dissociative emission of photons *a la* pp
⇒Described by LPair



γ+γ→μ⁺μ⁻, nuclear breakup

Dimuon acopolanarity distributions

– for different topologies

⇒Large-acoplanarity tails change shape for different neutron topologies

More generally

 Forward neutron rejection (i.e. 0n0n requirement) reduces γγ backgrounds
 ⇒γ+A, diffractive, dissociative γ



Light-by-light scattering

Light-by-light

21

(Background)

- Light-by-light scattering of (≈) real photons was discovered @ LHC
- -by both ATLAS and CMS
- –now being used to search from BSM physics
- \Rightarrow e.g. axion-like particles (ALP)

Diagrams for three processes:



Light-by-light

- Light-by-light scattering of (~) real photons was discovered @ LHC
- -by both ATLAS and CMS
- –now being used to search from BSM physics
- \Rightarrow e.g. axion-like particles (ALP)

Diagrams for three processes:



SM L-by-L

L-by-L ALP

CEP g+g→γγ nuclear breakup likely

ATLAS Light-by-Light Observation

- Using 2018 data, Pb+Pb @ 5.02 TeV (1.7 nb⁻¹)
- Exclusive yy events (no tracks):
- -E_{Tγ} > 2.5 GeV, |η|_γ < 2.37 (excl 1.37-1.52)
- $-m_{\gamma\gamma} > 5 \text{ GeV}$
- $-p_{T_{YY}} < 1(2) \text{ GeV, } A_{\varphi} < 0.01$

Phys. Rev. Lett. 123 (2019) 052001



Run: 366994 Event: 453765663 2018-11-26 18:32:03 CEST





ATLAS Light-by-Light Observation

exclusive e⁺e⁻ used to validate EM energy scale, trigger & reco. efficiencies



Phys. Rev. Lett. 123 (2019) 0520

24

ATLAS Light-by-Light Observation

• CEP bkgd from MC, normalized w/ data, A_{ϕ} > 0.01



•97 events observed, background: 27 ± 5 $\Rightarrow \sigma_{fid} = 120 \text{ nb} \pm 17 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 13 \text{ (syst.)} \pm 4 \text{ (lumi.)}$ • Ratio to theory(ies): \Rightarrow (combining) 1.5 ± 0.3

PRL 123 (2019) 052001

25

CMS Light-by-Light measurement

• Using 2015 data set (0.39 nb⁻¹) • Exclusive $\gamma\gamma$ events $-E_{T\gamma} > 2 \text{ GeV}, |\eta|_{\gamma} < 2.4$ $-p_{T\gamma\gamma} < 1 \text{ GeV}, A_{\phi} < 0.01$ • Estimate CEP background using $A_{\phi} > 0.02$



26

Phys. Lett. B 797 (2019) 134826

CMS Light-by-Light measurement

• Using 2015 data set (0.39 nb⁻¹)

Exclusive yy events

- $-E_{T_{Y}} > 2 \text{ GeV}, |\eta|_{Y} < 2.4$
- $-p_{T\gamma\gamma}$ < 1 GeV, A_{φ} < 0.01

- Result: 14 L-by-L candidates
- -9 ± 0.1 expected
- -3.0 ± 1.1 CEP bkgd
- -1.0 ± 0.3 e⁺e⁻ bkgd



Phys. Lett. B 797 (2019) 134826

 $\Rightarrow \sigma_{fid} = 120 \pm 46$ (stat) ± 28 (syst) ± 12 (theo) nb

⇒Theoretical: $\sigma_{fid}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = 116 \pm 12$ nb.

ALP searches

• ALP searches:

Look for narrow resonances in m_{YY} distribution
 ⇒Both ATLAS and CMS data consistent with background-only hypothesis



ATLAS and CMS limits on ALP in $\gamma\gamma$

• LHC measurements in UPC light-by-light: – CMS and ATLAS constraints on $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow ALP$



 ⇒LHC light-by-light data provide improved constraints on ALP production in mass range 5-100 GeV
 –Note: no combination (yet) of ATLAS and CMS data

τ⁺τ⁻ and τ g-2

UPC collisions and τ⁺τ⁻ production

Studying tau properties in ultra-peripheral collisions is an old idea



CERN-TH. 6205/91

The Possibility of Using a Large Heavy-Ion Collider for Measuring the Electromagnetic Properties of the Tau Lepton *

> F. del Aguila CERN, Geneva and Departamento de Física Teórica y del Cosmos, Universidad de Granada, E-18071 Granada, Spain F. Cornet Department of Physics, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1574 and Departamento de Física Teórica y del Cosmos, Universidad de Granada, E-18071 Granada, Spain J.I. Illana Departamento de Física Teórica y del Cosmos, Universidad de Granada, E-18071 Granada, Spain

Abstract

We study the potential of a large heavy-ion collider for the measurement of the electromagnetic properties of the tau lepton. Measuring the anomalous magnetic and the electric dipole moments of the tau at $q^2 \sim 0$ with a precision of $\sim 4 \times 10^{-5}$ and $\sim 4 \times 10^{-3}$, respectively, at the LHC and/or SSC should be no problem. Whereas the precision at RHIC should be a few per cent, comparable to present limits and to the expected precision at LEP.

tau g-2 and UPC τ⁺ τ⁻ production

Beresford and Liu:

- tau g-2 measurements could be made using UPC γ+γ → τ⁺τ⁻
- mass increases sensitivity to BSM physics
- ⇒the kinematics of the taus & decay products are sensitive to BSM physics





• ATLAS used three signal CRs to select events with 2 τ decays

ATLAS used three signal channels/regions to select events with 2 τ decays

– Muon + 1 track





ATLAS used three signal channels/regions to select events with 2 τ decays

– Muon + 3 tracks



Pb γ μ γ τ ν_{μ} ν_{τ} π^{\pm} π^{\pm} ν_{τ} Pb Pb Pb

ATLAS used three signal channels/regions to select events with 2 τ decays

– Muon + electron

Pb

Pb

μ**+e**



ν_e Pb

Ph

 τ

 γ

 μ

 ν_{μ}

 ν_{τ}

- Simultaneous analysis of 3 signal channels
- 3 control regions to constrain backgrounds
- ⇒Expected backgrounds < 15% in all three channels
- LL Fit to at assuming $\gamma \tau \tau$ coupling $F_1(q^2)\gamma^{\mu} + F_2(q^2)\frac{i}{2m_{\tau}}\sigma^{\mu\nu}q_{\nu}$
- Similar parameterization to LEP analyses

⇒ a_{τ} = (g_{τ} - 2)/2 = -0.041, a_{τ} SM = 0.0012



- LL Fit to a_{τ} assuming $\gamma \tau \tau$ coupling $F_1(q^2)\gamma^{\mu} + F_2(q^2) \frac{i}{2m_{\tau}} \sigma^{\mu\nu} q_{\nu}$
- "Standard" evaluation of 68% and 95% CLs
- But interference between SM and BSM processes make the 95% CLs "unusual"
- \Rightarrow Allow non-zero positive and negative a_{τ}



⇒Use of muon p_T distributions makes result less sensitive to uncertainties in photon flux

- CMS measurement focused on the μ +3 track channel
 - ⇒ Directly constrain one of the tau decays
- Less luminosity (0.4 nb⁻¹), but lower p_T threshold on muon:
- $-p_{T\mu}$ > 3.5 GeV for $|\eta_{\mu}|$ < 1.2,
- $p_{T\mu}$ > 2.5 GeV for 1.2 < $|\eta_{\mu}|$ < 2.4
- \Rightarrow Similar statistical precision on σ_{fid} as the ATLAS measurement
- \Rightarrow But by fitting σ_{fit} , sensitive to photon flux





- CMS measurement focused on the μ +3 track channel
 - ⇒ Directly constrain one of the tau decays
- Less luminosity (0.4 nb⁻¹), but lower p_T threshold on muon:
- $-p_{T\mu}$ > 3.5 GeV for $|\eta_{\mu}|$ < 1.2,
- $p_{T\mu}$ > 2.5 GeV for 1.2 < $|\eta_{\mu}|$ < 2.4
- \Rightarrow Similar statistical precision on σ_{fid} as the ATLAS measurement
- \Rightarrow But by fitting σ_{fit} , sensitive to photon flux



Muon selection	$p_{\rm T} > 3.5 { m GeV}$ for $ \eta < 1.2$ $p_{\rm T} > 2.5 { m GeV}$ for $1.2 < \eta < 2.4$
Pion selection	$p_{ m T} > 0.5 { m GeV}$ for the leading $p_{ m T} > 0.3 { m GeV}$ for the (sub-)subleading $ \eta < 2.5$
$ au_{3 prong}$ selection	$p_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{vis}} > 2 \mathrm{GeV}$ and $0.2 < m_{\tau}^{\mathrm{vis}} < 1.5 \mathrm{GeV}$

Clean γγ→ τ⁺τ⁻ signal with low bkgd (@ small m_{ττ}) -3 CR regions at higher track multiplicity, and/or higher E_{HF}^{lead} used to constrain background



• From fit to μ -3T $\Delta \phi$ distribution $\Rightarrow N_{sig} = 77 \pm 12$ \Rightarrow SM ratio: r = 0.99 (+0.16) (-0.14) $\Rightarrow A_T = 0.001$ (+0.055) (-0.089) 68% CL



γ+γ production of dileptons: A closer look

B-depedence of photon k_T

 The photon k_T distribution has only recently been a subject of significant focus & effort.
 Typically related to nuclear Form factor

 \Rightarrow e.g. in STARlight:

$$\frac{dN(k, p_T)}{dp_T} = \frac{2F^2(Q^2 = p_T^2)p_T^3}{(2\pi)^2((k/\gamma)^2 + p_T^2)^2}$$

But this formula (not unique to STARlight) loses correlation between the photon k_T and r⊥
 ⇒required by physics (see arXiv 2207.05595.pdf)

 r_⊥ and/or b-dependence of photon k_T distribution the subject of much recent work by multiple groups

- Recent calculation by Zha, Brandenburg, Tang, Xu
- Using formalism from Hencken, Trautmann, Baur
- Start from EM potential of the two nuclei

$$A_{1}^{\mu}(k_{1},b) = -2\pi(Z_{1}e)e^{ik_{1}^{\tau}b_{\tau}}\delta(k_{1}^{\nu}u_{1\nu})\frac{F_{1}(-k_{1}^{\rho}k_{1\rho})}{k_{1}^{\sigma}k_{1\sigma}}u_{1}^{\mu},$$
$$A_{2}^{\mu}(k_{2},0) = -2\pi(Z_{2}e)e^{ik_{2}^{\tau}b_{\tau}}\delta(k_{2}^{\nu}u_{2\nu})\frac{F_{2}(-k_{2}^{\rho}k_{2\rho})}{k_{2}^{\sigma}k_{2\sigma}}u_{2}^{\mu}$$

Zha et al, Phys. Lett. B 800 (2020) 135089

44

- Recent calculation by Zha, Brandenburg, Tang, Xu
- Using formalism from Hencken, Trautmann, Baur
- Start from EM potential of the two nuclei
- Then, using S-matrix analysis (not QED) obtain "gEPA"

$$A_{1}^{\mu}(k_{1},b) = -2\pi(Z_{1}e)e^{ik_{1}^{\tau}b_{\tau}}\delta(k_{1}^{\nu}u_{1\nu})\frac{F_{1}(-k_{1}^{\rho}k_{1\rho})}{k_{1}^{\sigma}k_{1\sigma}}u_{1}^{\mu},$$
$$A_{2}^{\mu}(k_{2},0) = -2\pi(Z_{2}e)e^{ik_{2}^{\tau}b_{\tau}}\delta(k_{2}^{\nu}u_{2\nu})\frac{F_{2}(-k_{2}^{\rho}k_{2\rho})}{k_{2}^{\sigma}k_{2\sigma}}u_{2}^{\mu}$$

45

$$\begin{split} \sigma &= 16 \frac{Z^4 e^4}{(4\pi)^2} \int d^2 b \int \frac{dw_1}{w_1} \frac{dw_2}{w_2} \frac{d^2 k_{1\perp}}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d^2 k_{2\perp}}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d^2 q_{\perp}}{(2\pi)^2} \\ &\times \frac{F(-k_1^2)}{k_1^2} \frac{F(-k_2^2)}{k_2^2} \frac{F^*(-k_1'^2)}{k_1'^2} \frac{F^*(-k_2'^2)}{k_2'^2} e^{-i\vec{b}\cdot\vec{q}_{\perp}} \\ &\times \left[(\vec{k}_{1\perp} \cdot \vec{k}_{2\perp}) (\vec{k}_{1\perp}' \cdot \vec{k}_{2\perp}') \sigma_s(w_1, w_2) \right. \\ &+ (\vec{k}_{1\perp} \times \vec{k}_{2\perp}) (\vec{k}_{1\perp}' \times \vec{k}_{2\perp}') \sigma_{ps}(w_1, w_2) \right] \end{split}$$

- Recent calculation by Zha, Brandenburg, Tang, Xu
- Using formalism from Hencken, Trautmann, Baur
- Start from EM potential of the two nuclei
- -then, using S-matrix analysis (not QED) obtain "gEPA"
- -has explicit Fourier term involving the A+A impact parameter, b

$$A_{1}^{\mu}(k_{1},b) = -2\pi(Z_{1}e)e^{ik_{1}^{\tau}b_{\tau}}\delta(k_{1}^{\nu}u_{1\nu})\frac{F_{1}(-k_{1}^{\rho}k_{1\rho})}{k_{1}^{\sigma}k_{1\sigma}}u_{1}^{\mu}$$
$$A_{2}^{\mu}(k_{2},0) = -2\pi(Z_{2}e)e^{ik_{2}^{\tau}b_{\tau}}\delta(k_{2}^{\nu}u_{2\nu})\frac{F_{2}(-k_{2}^{\rho}k_{2\rho})}{k_{2}^{\sigma}k_{2\sigma}}u_{2}^{\mu}$$

46

$$\begin{split} \sigma &= 16 \frac{Z^4 e^4}{(4\pi)^2} \int d^2 b \int \frac{dw_1}{w_1} \frac{dw_2}{w_2} \frac{d^2 k_{1\perp}}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d^2 k_{2\perp}}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{d^2 q_{\perp}}{(2\pi)^2} \\ &\times \frac{F(-k_1^2)}{k_1^2} \frac{F(-k_2^2)}{k_2^2} \frac{F^*(-k_1'^2)}{k_1'^2} \frac{F^*(-k_2'^2)}{k_2'^2} e^{-i\vec{b}\cdot\vec{q}_{\perp}} \\ &\times \left[(\vec{k}_{1\perp} \cdot \vec{k}_{2\perp}) (\vec{k}_{1\perp}' \cdot \vec{k}_{2\perp}') \sigma_s(w_1, w_2) \right] \\ &+ (\vec{k}_{1\perp} \times \vec{k}_{2\perp}) (\vec{k}_{1\perp}' \times \vec{k}_{2\perp}') \sigma_{ps}(w_1, w_2) \right] \end{split}$$

- Recent calculation by Zha, Brandenburg, Tang, Xu
- Using formalism from Hencken, Trautmann, Baur

Start from EM potential of the two nuclei

-Alternatively, perform the actual QED computation:

$$A_{1}^{\mu}(k_{1},b) = -2\pi(Z_{1}e)e^{ik_{1}^{\tau}b_{\tau}}\delta(k_{1}^{\nu}u_{1\nu})\frac{F_{1}(-k_{1}^{\rho}k_{1\rho})}{k_{1}^{\sigma}k_{1\sigma}}u_{1}^{\mu}$$
$$A_{2}^{\mu}(k_{2},0) = -2\pi(Z_{2}e)e^{ik_{2}^{\tau}b_{\tau}}\delta(k_{2}^{\nu}u_{2\nu})\frac{F_{2}(-k_{2}^{\rho}k_{2\rho})}{k_{2}^{\sigma}k_{2\sigma}}u_{2}^{\mu}$$

$$\sigma = \int d^2 b \frac{d^6 P(\vec{b})}{d^3 p_+ d^3 p_-} = \int d^2 q \frac{d^6 P(\vec{q})}{d^3 p_+ d^3 p_-} \int d^2 b e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{b}},$$

$$\begin{split} &\frac{d^6 P(\vec{q})}{d^3 p_+ d^3 p_-} = (Z\alpha)^4 \frac{4}{\beta^2} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^6 2\epsilon_+ 2\epsilon_-} \int d^2 q_1 \\ &F(N_0) F(N_1) F(N_3) F(N_4) [N_0 N_1 N_3 N_4]^{-1} \\ &\times \operatorname{Tr} \{ (\not\!\!p_- + m) [N_{2D}^{-1} \not\!\!\psi_1 (\not\!\!p_- - \not\!\!q_1 + m) \not\!\!\psi_2 + \\ &N_{2X}^{-1} \not\!\!\psi_2 (\not\!\!q_1 - \not\!\!p_+ + m) \not\!\!\psi_1] (\not\!\!p_+ - m) [N_{5D}^{-1} \not\!\!\psi_2 \\ &(\not\!\!p_- - \not\!\!q_1 - \not\!\!q + m) \not\!\!\psi_1 + N_{5X}^{-1} \not\!\!\psi_1 (\not\!\!q_1 + \not\!\!q - \not\!\!p_+ \\ &+ m) \not\!\!\psi_2] \}, \end{split}$$

with

$$\begin{split} N_0 &= -q_1^2, N_1 = -[q_1 - (p_+ + p_-)]^2, \\ N_3 &= -(q_1 + q)^2, N_4 = -[q + (q_1 - p_+ - p_-)]^2, \\ N_{2D} &= -(q_1 - p_-)^2 + m^2, \\ N_{2X} &= -(q_1 - p_+)^2 + m^2, \\ N_{5D} &= -(q_1 + q - p_-)^2 + m^2, \\ N_{5X} &= -(q_1 + q - p_+)^2 + m^2, \end{split}$$

- Recent calculation by Zha, Brandenburg, Tang, Xu
- Using formalism from Hencken, Trautmann, Baur
- Start from EM potential of the two nuclei
- -Alternatively, perform the actual QED computation:
- -Which also has the explicit Fourier term involving the impact parameter, b

$$A_1^{\mu}(k_1, b) = -2\pi (Z_1 e) e^{ik_1^{\tau} b_{\tau}} \delta(k_1^{\nu} u_{1\nu}) \frac{F_1(-k_1^{\rho} k_{1\rho})}{k_1^{\sigma} k_{1\sigma}} u_1^{\mu}$$
$$A_2^{\mu}(k_2, 0) = -2\pi (Z_2 e) e^{ik_2^{\tau} b_{\tau}} \delta(k_2^{\nu} u_{2\nu}) \frac{F_2(-k_2^{\rho} k_{2\rho})}{k_2^{\sigma} k_{2\sigma}} u_2^{\mu}$$

$$\begin{split} &= \int d^2 b \frac{d^6 P(\vec{b})}{d^3 p_+ d^3 p_-} = \int d^2 q \frac{d^6 P(\vec{q})}{d^3 p_+ d^3 p_-} \int d^2 l e^{i \vec{q} \cdot \vec{b}}, \\ &\frac{d^6 P(\vec{q})}{d^3 p_+ d^3 p_-} = (Z \alpha)^4 \frac{4}{\beta^2} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^6 2\epsilon_+ 2\epsilon_-} \int d^2 q_1 \\ &F(N_0) F(N_1) F(N_3) F(N_4) [N_0 N_1 N_3 N_4]^{-1} \\ &\times \mathrm{Tr} \{ (\not\!p_- + m) [N_{2D}^{-1} \not\!\psi_1 (\not\!p_- - \not\!q_1 + m) \not\!\psi_2 + \\ &N_{2X}^{-1} \not\!\psi_2 (\not\!q_1 - \not\!p_+ + m) \not\!\psi_1](\not\!p_+ - m) [N_{5D}^{-1} \not\!\psi_2 \\ &(\not\!p_- - \not\!q_1 - \not\!q + m) \not\!\psi_1 + N_{5X}^{-1} \not\!\psi_1 (\not\!q_1 + \not\!q - \not\!p_+ \\ &+ m) \not\!\psi_2] \}, \end{split}$$

with

 σ

$$\begin{split} N_0 &= -q_1^2, N_1 = -[q_1 - (p_+ + p_-)]^2, \\ N_3 &= -(q_1 + q)^2, N_4 = -[q + (q_1 - p_+ - p_-)]^2, \\ N_{2D} &= -(q_1 - p_-)^2 + m^2, \\ N_{2X} &= -(q_1 - p_+)^2 + m^2, \\ N_{5D} &= -(q_1 + q - p_-)^2 + m^2, \\ N_{5X} &= -(q_1 + q - p_+)^2 + m^2, \end{split}$$

- Recent calculation by Zha, Brandenburg, Tang, Xu
- Using formalism from Hencken, Trautmann, Baur

Start from EM potential of the two nuclei

both gEPA and QED calculations
have b-dependent
"broadening" of the dilepton p⊤ distributions
⇒more on this later

$$A_{1}^{\mu}(k_{1},b) = -2\pi(Z_{1}e)e^{ik_{1}^{\tau}b_{\tau}}\delta(k_{1}^{\nu}u_{1\nu})\frac{F_{1}(-k_{1}^{\rho}k_{1\rho})}{k_{1}^{\sigma}k_{1\sigma}}u_{1}^{\mu}$$
$$A_{2}^{\mu}(k_{2},0) = -2\pi(Z_{2}e)e^{ik_{2}^{\tau}b_{\tau}}\delta(k_{2}^{\nu}u_{2\nu})\frac{F_{2}(-k_{2}^{\rho}k_{2\rho})}{k_{2}^{\sigma}k_{2\sigma}}u_{2}^{\mu}$$

$$\sigma = \int d^2 b \frac{d^6 P(\vec{b})}{d^3 p_+ d^3 p_-} = \int d^2 q \frac{d^6 P(\vec{q})}{d^3 p_+ d^3 p_-} \int d^2 b e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{b}},$$

$$\begin{split} &\frac{d^6 P(\vec{q})}{d^3 p_+ d^3 p_-} = (Z\alpha)^4 \frac{4}{\beta^2} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^6 2\epsilon_+ 2\epsilon_-} \int d^2 q_1 \\ &F(N_0) F(N_1) F(N_3) F(N_4) [N_0 N_1 N_3 N_4]^{-1} \\ &\times \operatorname{Tr} \{ (\not\!\!\!p_- + m) [N_{2D}^{-1} \not\!\!\!\psi_1 (\not\!\!\!p_- - \not\!\!\!q_1 + m) \not\!\!\!\psi_2 + \\ &N_{2X}^{-1} \not\!\!\!\psi_2 (\not\!\!\!q_1 - \not\!\!\!p_+ + m) \not\!\!\!\psi_1] (\not\!\!\!p_+ - m) [N_{5D}^{-1} \not\!\!\!\psi_2 \\ &(\not\!\!\!p_- - \not\!\!\!q_1 - \not\!\!\!q + m) \not\!\!\!\psi_1 + N_{5X}^{-1} \not\!\!\psi_1 (\not\!\!\!q_1 + \not\!\!\!q - \not\!\!\!p_+ \\ &+ m) \not\!\!\!\psi_2] \}, \end{split}$$

with

$$\begin{split} N_0 &= -q_1^2, N_1 = -[q_1 - (p_+ + p_-)]^2, \\ N_3 &= -(q_1 + q)^2, N_4 = -[q + (q_1 - p_+ - p_-)]^2, \\ N_{2D} &= -(q_1 - p_-)^2 + m^2, \\ N_{2X} &= -(q_1 - p_+)^2 + m^2, \\ N_{5D} &= -(q_1 + q - p_-)^2 + m^2, \\ N_{5X} &= -(q_1 + q - p_+)^2 + m^2, \end{split}$$

Zha et al, Phys. Lett. B 800 (2020) 135089

49

Photon Wigner Distribution

- An alternative calculation has been performed by Klein *et al*, and Klusek-Gawenda *et al*:
- Starting from the photon Wigner distribution
- describe the correlation between photon k_T and r_\perp
- using formalism developed for PDFs (Belitsky, Ji, Yuan)

$$xf_{\gamma}(x,k_T;b_{\perp}) = \int \frac{d^2 \Delta_{\perp}}{(2\pi)^2} e^{i\Delta_{\perp} \cdot b_{\perp}} xf_{\gamma}(x,k_T;\Delta_{\perp})$$

$$xf_{\gamma}(x, k_T; \Delta_{\perp}) = xh_{\gamma}(x, k_T; \Delta_{\perp})$$
$$= \frac{4Z^2 \alpha}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{q_{\perp} \cdot q'_{\perp}}{q^2 q'^2} F_A(q^2) F_A(q'^2)$$
$$q_{\perp} = k_T - \Delta_{\perp}/2, \ q'_{\perp} = k_T + \Delta_{\perp}/2$$
$$q^2 = q_{\perp}^2 + x^2 m_p^2$$

Phys. Rev. D 102 (2020) 9, 094013

50

Photon Wigner Distribution

- An alternative calculation has been performed by Klein *et al* starting from the photon Wigner distribution
- describe the correlation between photon k_T and r_{\perp}
- using formalism developed for PDFs (Belitsky, Ji, Yuan)
- ⇒Also see Fourier term, but now for single nucleus

$$\begin{aligned} xf_{\gamma}(x,k_{T};b_{\perp}) &= \int \frac{d^{2}\Delta_{\perp}}{(2\pi)^{2}} e^{i\Delta_{\perp}\cdot b_{\perp}} xf_{\gamma}(x,k_{T};\Delta_{\perp}) \\ xf_{\gamma}(x,k_{T};\Delta_{\perp}) &= xh_{\gamma}(x,k_{T};\Delta_{\perp}) \\ &= \frac{4Z^{2}\alpha}{(2\pi)^{2}} \frac{q_{\perp}\cdot q_{\perp}'}{q^{2}q'^{2}} F_{A}(q^{2})F_{A}(q'^{2}) \\ q_{\perp} &= k_{T} - \Delta_{\perp}/2, \ q_{\perp}' &= k_{T} + \Delta_{\perp}/2 \\ q^{2} &= q_{\perp}^{2} + x^{2}m_{p}^{2} \end{aligned}$$

Phys. Rev. D 102 (2020) 9, 094013

Photon Wigner Distribution

- An alternative calculation has been performed by Klein et al starting from the photon Wigner distribution
- describe the correlation between photon k_T and r_\perp
- using formalism developed for PDFs (Belitsky, Ji, Yuan)
- ⇒Also see Fourier term, but now for single nucleus
- ⇒Non-trivial dependence of photon WF on b, k_T

$$xf_{\gamma}(x,k_T;b_{\perp}) = \int \frac{d^2 \Delta_{\perp}}{(2\pi)^2} e^{i\Delta_{\perp} \cdot b_{\perp}} xf_{\gamma}(x,k_T;\Delta_{\perp})$$

$$xf_{\gamma}(x, k_T; \Delta_{\perp}) = xh_{\gamma}(x, k_T; \Delta_{\perp})$$
$$= \frac{4Z^2 \alpha}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{q_{\perp} \cdot q'_{\perp}}{q^2 q'^2} F_A(q^2) F_A(q'^2)$$
$$q_{\perp} = k_T - \Delta_{\perp}/2, \ q'_{\perp} = k_T + \Delta_{\perp}/2$$
$$q^2 = q_{\perp}^2 + x^2 m_p^2$$



Phys. Rev. D 102 (2020) 9, 094013

Nuclear breakup, and photon k_T



b-dependence of Coulomb excitation, forward neutrons

+ b dependence of photon kT

⇒ Broadening of dilepton acoplanarity with increasing nuclear breakup (# neutrons)



Observed by CMS

Phys. Rev. Lett. 127, 122001 (2021)

γ+γ dilepton production in hadronic Pb+Pb 54

- ATLAS studied $\gamma + \gamma \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^$ in hadronic Pb+Pb collisions
- Goal: use tight Δφ correlation of muons as EM probe of the quark gluon plasma
- ⇒See a centrality-dependence of µ⁺µ⁻ acoplanarity distribution

⇒Magnetic field? Collisional?



γ+γ dilepton production in hadronic Pb+Pb 55

- ATLAS studied $\gamma + \gamma \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^$ in hadronic Pb+Pb collisions
- Goal: use tight Δφ correlation of muons as EM probe of the quark gluon plasma
- ⇒See a centrality-dependence of µ⁺µ⁻ acoplanarity distribution
- ⇒Magnetic field? Collisional?

 In fact, data are reproduced by calculations including b-dependence of the photon k_T distribution



γ+γ dilepton production in hadronic Pb+Pb 56

- ATLAS studied $\gamma + \gamma \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^$ in hadronic Pb+Pb collisions
- Goal: use tight Δφ correlation of muons as EM probe of the quark gluon plasma
- ⇒See a centrality-dependence of µ+µ-acoplanarity distribution
- ⇒Magnetic field? Collisional?

 In fact, data are reproduced by calculations including b-dependence of the photon k_T distribution



May provide new/competitive method to probe the electromagnetic structure of nuclei.

Summary, Observations

LHC (and RHIC) are high-luminosity photon colliders

- Can study γ + γ scattering with \sqrt{s} > 100 GeV
- Photon fluxes can be calculated ab initio
- But important details still under study
- \Rightarrow Especially photon k_T and correlation with r_\perp and b

• γ + γ → dilepton data provide important tests of theory

- But there are complications/interesting physics
- \Rightarrow Photon k_T and impact parameter dependence
- \Rightarrow Dissociative γ emission
- ⇒Higher-order processes (didn't discuss)
- $-\gamma+\gamma \rightarrow$ dileptons in hadronic Pb+Pb collisions a new topic

• γ + γ processes are being used for SM and BSM tests

- Light-by-light, ALP limits
- τ **g-2**

 \Rightarrow more will come: e.g. WW, bbbar, exotics, ...