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1. Introduction: Upsilon Suppression in PbPb @ LHC

Y suppression as a sensitive probe for the QGP

- No significant effect of regeneration
- $m_b \approx 3m_c \Rightarrow$ cleaner theoretical treatment
- More stable than $J/\psi$

- $E_B(Y_{1S}) \approx 1.10$ GeV
- $E_B(J/\psi) \approx 0.64$ GeV

**Y(nS) states are suppressed in PbPb @ LHC:**

A clear QGP indicator

1. Y(1S) ground state is suppressed in PbPb:
   \[ R_{AA}(Y(1S)) = 0.56 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.07 \text{ in min. bias} \]

2. Y(2S, 3S) states are > 4 times stronger suppressed in PbPb than Y(1S)
   \[ R_{AA}(Y(2S)) = 0.12 \pm 0.04 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 0.02 \text{ (syst.)} \]
   \[ R_{AA}(Y(3S)) = 0.03 \pm 0.04 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 0.01 \text{ (syst.)} \]

CMS Collab., PRL 109, 222301 (2012)

[Plot from CMS database]

\[ R_{AA} = \frac{N_{PbPb}(Q\bar{Q})}{N_{coll}N_{pp}(Q\bar{Q})} \]
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2. The model: Screening, Gluodissociation and Collisional broadening of the Y(nS) states

- Debye screening of all states involved: Static suppression

- The imaginary part of the potential (effect of collisions) contributes to the broadening of the Y(nS) states: damping

- Gluon-induced dissociation: dynamic suppression, in particular of the Y(1S) ground state due to the large thermal gluon density

- Reduced feed-down from the excited Y/χ_b states to Y(1S) substantially modifies the populations: indirect suppression

F. Vaccaro, F. Nendzig and GW, Europhys.Lett. 102, 42001 (2013); J. Hoelck and GW, unpublished
2.1 Screening and damping treated in a nonrelativistic potential model

\[ V_{nl}(r, T) = -\frac{\sigma}{m_D(T)} e^{-m_D(T)r} - C_F \alpha_{nl}(T) \left( \frac{e^{-m_D(T)r}}{r} + iT\phi(m_D(T)r) \right) \]

\[ \phi(x) = \int_0^\infty \frac{dz \, 2z}{(1 + z^2)^2} \left( 1 - \frac{\sin xz}{xz} \right), \quad m_D(T) = T \sqrt{4\pi\alpha_s(2\pi T) \frac{2N_c + N_f}{6}} \]

Screened potential: \( m_D = \) Debye mass,
\( \alpha_{nl}(T) \) the strong coupling constant;
\( C_F = \frac{(N_c^2 - 1)}{(2N_c)} \)
\( \sigma \approx 0.192 \) the string tension (Jacobs et al.; Karsch et al.)

Imaginary part: Collisional damping (Laine et al. 2007, Beraudo et al. 2008, Brambilla et al. 2008) for \( 2\pi T >> <1/r> \); different form for \( 2\pi T << <1/r> \).

From the literature
Radial wave function of Y(1S) at temperatures $T$

Solutions of the Schrödinger equation with complex potential $V(r, T, \alpha_s)$ for the radial wave functions $g_{nl}(r, T)$, 

$$[H(r, T, \alpha_s) - E + i\Gamma/2]g(r) = 0$$

From: J. Hoelck and GW, unpublished
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Radial wave functions of $Y(nS)$, $\chi_b(nP)$ states

Calculate the damping widths $\Gamma_{\text{damp}}(T)$ for all six states

$Y(nS)$, $\chi_b(nP)$, $n = 1, 2, 3$
2.2 Cross section for gluodissociation

Born amplitude for the interaction of gluon clusters according to Bhanot & Peskin in dipole approximation / Operator product expansion, extended to include the screened coulombic + string eigenfunctions as outlined in Brezinski and Wolschin, PLB 70, 534 (2012)

\[ \sigma_{diss}^{nS}(E) = \frac{2\pi^2\alpha_s E}{9} \int_0^\infty dk \delta \left( \frac{k^2}{m_b} + \epsilon_n - E \right) |w^{nS}(k)|^2 \]

\[ w^{nS}(k) = \int_0^\infty dr \, r \, g^{s_{n0}}(r) g^{a_{k1}}(r) \]

for the Gluodissociation cross section of the Y(nS) states, and correspondingly for the \( \chi_b(nP) \) states.
Figure 3. Gluodissociation cross section $\sigma_{\text{diss}}$ (left scale) of the $\Upsilon(1S)$ and $\Upsilon(2S)$ and the thermal gluon distribution (right scale) plotted for temperature $T = 170$ (solid curves) and 250 MeV (dotted curves) as functions of the gluon energy $E_g$.

Average the gluodissociation cross section over the Bose-Einstein distribution of the thermal gluons in the QGP to obtain the dissociation width at temperature $T$ for each of the six bottomia states involved:

$$
\Gamma_{\text{diss}, \, nl}(T) \equiv \frac{g_d}{2\pi^2} \int_0^\infty dE_g \frac{E_g^2 \sigma_{\text{diss}, \, nl}(E_g)}{e^{E_g/T} - 1}
$$

($g_d = 16$)

With rising temperature, the peak of the gluon distribution moves to larger gluon energies $E_g$, whereas the dissociation cross sections move to smaller $E_g$, giving rise to a maximum in the gluodissociation width for fixed coupling $\alpha_s$. (Larger cross sections at higher temperatures due to running coupling counteract.)
Damping and gluodissociation widths for six bottomia states

\[ \Gamma_{\text{tot}}(T) = \Gamma_{\text{damp}}(T) + \Gamma_{\text{diss}}(T) \]
2.3 Hydrodynamic expansion (ideal)

Temperature profile for central collisions at different times $\tau$

Use total decay widths $\Gamma_{\text{tot}}(b,x,y)$ of the bottomia states for each impact parameter $b$ and time step $t$ in the transverse $(x^1,x^2)$ plane.
Dynamical fireball evolution

Dependence of the local temperature $T$ on impact parameter $b$, time $t$, and transverse coordinates $x$, $y$ evaluated in ideal hydrodynamic calculation with transverse expansion

$$T(b, \tau_{\text{init}}, x^1, x^2) = T_0 \left( \frac{N_{\text{mix}}(b, x^1, x^2)}{N_{\text{mix}}(0, 0, 0)} \right)^{1/3}$$

$$N_{\text{mix}} = \frac{1 - f}{2} N_{\text{part}} + f N_{\text{coll}}, \quad f = 0.145$$

The number of produced $bb$-pairs is proportional to the number of binary collision, and the nuclear overlap

$$N_{bb}(b, x, y) \propto N_{\text{coll}}(b, x, y) \propto T_{AA}(b, x, y)$$

QGP suppression factor (without feed-down and CNM effects):

$$R_{AA}^{QGP} = \frac{\int d^2b \int dx dy T_{AA}(b, x, y) e^{-\int_{t_F}^{\infty} dt \Gamma_{\text{tot}}(b, t, x, y)}}{\int d^2b \int dx dy T_{AA}(b, x, y)}$$
Integrand in the transverse plane

\[ b = 0 \text{ fm} \quad b = 8 \text{ fm} \]

\[ p_T = 0 \quad p_T = 12 \text{ GeV}/c \]

\( \Upsilon(1S) \)

\( \Upsilon(2S) \)

2.4 Feed-down cascade including $\chi_{n\rho}$ states

Relative initial populations in pp computed using an inverted cascade from the final populations measured by CMS and CDF($\chi b$) 
$[N_{\text{final}}(1S) : = 1]$

\begin{align*}
N_{\text{initial}} \\
3S: 0.387 \\
2S: 0.371 \\
1S: 0.458
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
N_{\text{initial}} \\
2P: 0.976 \\
1P: 1.29
\end{align*}
3. Theoretical vs. exp. (CMS) Suppression factors

- Screening (potential model)
- Gluodissociation (OPE with string tension included)
- Collisional damping (imaginary part of potential)
- Reduced feed-down from excited states

\[ t_F: \text{Y formation time} \]
\[ t_{QGP}: \text{QGP lifetime} \]
\[ T_{\text{max}} @ t_F: 200-800 \text{ MeV} \]

\[ t_F = 0.1 \text{ fm/c} \]
\[ t_{QGP} = 4, 6, 8 \text{ fm/c} \]

Recent model upgrades

2014/15: Substantial improvements of the model

- Consider running of the coupling
- Transverse momentum of the $Y$ included
- Relativistic Doppler effect
- Improved initial conditions
- $T_c = 160$ MeV

\[ \alpha_s(Q) = \frac{\alpha(\mu)}{1 + \alpha(\mu)b_0 \ln \frac{Q}{\mu}}, \quad b_0 = \frac{11N_c - 2N_f}{6\pi} \]


$\alpha_{nl}(T)$ depends on the solution $g_{nl}(r,T)$ of the Schrödinger eq.: Iterative solution
Room for additional suppression mechanisms for the excited states: Hadronic dissociation, mostly by pions, is one possibility. Thermal pions are insufficient; direct pions may contribute, and magnetic dissociation.

2014/15: Substantial improvements of the model

$t_f = 0.4 \text{ fm}/c$: $Y$ formation time
$T_{max} = 550 \text{ MeV}$: central temp. at $b = 0$ and $t = t_f$

2.76 TeV PbPb

F. Nendzig and GW, J. Phys. G41, 095003 (2014); J. Hoelck and GW, unpublished
Enhanced suppression for smaller $T_c$: QGP-induced dissociation processes act longer. But: the effect is small.

$< 5\%$ higher suppression for $T_c = 160 \text{ MeV}$ vs $170 \text{ MeV}$

F. Hoelck and GW, unpublished
4. Prediction for Y(1S) suppression at 5.125 TeV

\[ t_F : Y \text{ formation time} \]
\[ T_{\text{max}} @ t_F : 579 \text{ MeV} \]

\[ t_F = 0.4 \text{ fm/c}; \text{ use} \]
\[ s_0 \propto dN_{ch}/d\eta \propto T_0^3 \]

with reduced feed-down

<10% higher suppression at 5.125 TeV vs 2.76 TeV

F. Hoelck and GW, unpublished
5. Conclusion Upsilon suppression

- The suppression of the $\Upsilon(1S)$ ground state in PbPb collisions at LHC energies through gluodissociation, damping, screening, and reduced feed-down has been calculated for min. bias, and as function of centrality, and is found to be in good agreement with the CMS result. Screening is not decisive for the 1S state except for central collisions.

- The enhanced suppression of the $\Upsilon(2S, 3S)$ relative to the 1S state in PbPb as compared to pp collisions at LHC energies (CMS) leaves room for additional suppression mechanisms, in particular for peripheral collisions where discrepancies to the CMS data persist. Hadronic and/or magnetic dissociation of the excited states may be relevant.

Thank you for your attention!