

# $\frac{\text{PURDUE}}{\text{UNIVERSITY}}$

### Study charm hadronization via $\Lambda_c^+$ and $D_s^+$ production in pp and PbPb collisions with the CMS experiment





Milan Stojanovic Purdue University on behalf of the CMS collaboration



Hard Probes 2020, Austin TX, USA





- Heavy quarks produced at earliest stages of the collision
  - follow the whole evolution of the system
- Convenient for perturbative calculations
- Studying energy loss mechanism
  - different than light quarks
- Hadronization process
  - >  $\Lambda_c^+(udc)$  essential for charm quark coalescence (baryon meson ratio)
  - $\triangleright$  **D**<sup>+</sup><sub>s</sub>(cs) suitable for studying strangeness enhancement and coalescence





JHEP 04 (2018)108



◆ ALICE and LHCb results different for Λ<sup>+</sup><sub>c</sub> / D<sup>0</sup> in pp collisions
 ▶ Different rapidity range?





JHEP 04 (2018)108



★ ALICE and LHCb results different for  $\Lambda_c^+ / D^0$  in pp collisions
→ Different rapidity range?



PLB 793 (2019) 212





JHEP 04 (2018)108





### Reconstruction



- Data from 2015 Run:
  - PbPb: 300M Minimum Bias events
  - pp: 2B Minimum Bias events
- ★ Λ<sup>+</sup><sub>c</sub> reconstruction
  ★ Λ<sup>+</sup><sub>c</sub> → P<sup>+</sup>K<sup>-</sup>π<sup>+</sup>
  ★ BR ~ 6.23%
- ★  $D_s^+$  reconstruction
  ★  $D_s^+ \rightarrow \varphi \pi^+ \rightarrow K^+ K^- \pi^+$ ★ BR ~ 2.3%





### Reconstruction



- Data from 2015 Run:
  - PbPb: 300M Minimum Bias events
  - pp: 2B Minimum Bias events
- ★ Λ<sup>+</sup><sub>c</sub> reconstruction
  ★ Λ<sup>+</sup><sub>c</sub> → P<sup>+</sup>K<sup>-</sup>π<sup>+</sup>
  ★ BR ~ 6.23%
- ★ D<sub>s</sub><sup>+</sup> reconstruction
  ★ D<sub>s</sub><sup>+</sup> → φπ<sup>+</sup> → K<sup>+</sup>K<sup>-</sup>π<sup>+</sup>
  ★ BR ~ 2.3%
- ✤ No particle identification → All possible combinations of three charged tracks in an event are taken into account





### Reconstruction



- Data from 2015 Run:
  - PbPb: 300M Minimum Bias events
  - pp: 2B Minimum Bias events
- ★ Λ<sup>+</sup><sub>c</sub> reconstruction
  ★ Λ<sup>+</sup><sub>c</sub> → P<sup>+</sup>K<sup>-</sup>π<sup>+</sup>
  ★ BR ~ 6.23%
- ★  $D_s^+$  reconstruction ★  $D_s^+ \to \varphi \pi^+ \to K^+ K^- \pi^+$ ★ BR ~ 2.3%
- ✤ No particle identification → All possible combinations of three charged tracks in an event are taken into account
- ♦  $\Lambda_c^+$  measured inclusively, i.e. prompt+nonpropmpt
- Only prompt  $D_s^+$  is measured





### Signal Extraction $\Lambda_c$



Hard Probes 2020

 $\Lambda_{c}^{+} + \Lambda_{c}^{-}$ 



### Signal Extraction $D_s^+$





Combinatorial background: 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> order Chebyshev polynomial function

Signal: Double Gaussian

CMS-PAS-HIN-18-017



### Signal Extraction $D_s^+$





Hard Probes 2020



### **Results:** p<sub>T</sub> spectra



#### PLB 803 (2020) 135328



- PYTHIA 8 systematically below data
- PYTHIA 8 + CR consistent with pp data
- GM-VFNS Systematically below data for p<sub>T</sub> < 10 GeV/c</li>



### **Results:** p<sub>T</sub> spectra







- PYTHIA 8 systematically below data
- PYTHIA 8 + CR consistent with pp data
- GM-VFNS Systematically below data for p<sub>T</sub> < 10 GeV/c</li>

![](_page_12_Figure_8.jpeg)

- PYTHIA 8 overestimates data at low p<sub>T</sub>
- ✤ At higher p<sub>T</sub> prediction below data

![](_page_13_Picture_0.jpeg)

### **Results:** R<sub>AA</sub>

![](_page_13_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Figure_3.jpeg)

- Indication of  $\Lambda_c^+$  suppression in PbPb collision
- Suppression larger in central events

![](_page_14_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_2.jpeg)

- Indication of  $\Lambda_c^+$  suppression in PbPb collision
- Suppression larger in central events

![](_page_14_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Results: $\Lambda_c/D_0$

![](_page_15_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### PLB 803 (2020) 135328

![](_page_15_Figure_4.jpeg)

- Similarity between pp & PbPb results suggest that there is no significant coalescence of Λ<sup>+</sup><sub>c</sub> (10 < p<sub>T</sub> < 20 GeV/c)</li>
- ✤ No significant p<sub>T</sub> dependence observed

![](_page_16_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Results: $\Lambda_c/D_0$

![](_page_16_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### PLB 803 (2020) 135328

![](_page_16_Figure_4.jpeg)

- Similarity between pp & PbPb results suggest that there is no significant coalescence of Λ<sup>+</sup><sub>c</sub> (10 < p<sub>T</sub> < 20 GeV/c)</li>
- ✤ No significant p<sub>T</sub> dependence observed
- PYTHIA8 underestimates pp data
- PYTHIA8 + color reconnection good description of data
- Solid line (Catania) predicts stronger pT dependence
  - Coalescence + fragmentation
- Dashed line (TAMU) reasonable description of data for p<sub>T</sub> < 10 GeV/c</p>
  - Includes charm baryon states beyond PDG

![](_page_17_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Results: D<sub>s</sub>/D<sub>0</sub>

![](_page_17_Picture_2.jpeg)

#### CMS-PAS-HIN-18-017

![](_page_17_Figure_4.jpeg)

- Ratio similar for PbPb and pp collisions
- ✤ No significant p<sub>T</sub> dependence observed
- PYTHIA8 shape consistent with pp data
- PHSD systematically below pp&PbPb data, but gives a good description of double ratio (PbPb/pp)
  - Microscopic transport model w only collision energy loss
  - PRC 93 (2016) 034906
- TAMU consistent with pp data
  - Model includes charm baryon states beyond PDG
  - PLB 795 (2019) 117

![](_page_18_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Summary

![](_page_18_Picture_2.jpeg)

- ↔ Production of  $\Lambda_c^+$  and  $D_s^+$  measured in pp & PbPb collisions
- Suppression of  $\Lambda_c^+ \& D_s^+$  consistent with  $D^0$  results in PbPb
- ✤ No significant coalescence of  $\Lambda_c^+$  observed for 10 < p<sub>T</sub> < 20 GeV/c
- $\Lambda_c^+$  in pp described well by PYTHIA 8 + CR
- ✤ TAMU describes  $D_s^+/D^0$  ratio well in pp;  $\frac{D_s^+/D^0(PbPb)}{D_s^+/D^0(pp)}$  described well by PHSD
- Possible additional constraints to theoretical models
- New analysis ongoing with increased statistics
  - ~13 times more PbPb data
  - ~ 6 times more pp data

![](_page_18_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_13.jpeg)

Hard Probes 2020

### **Backup Slides**

![](_page_20_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_0.jpeg)

## $\Lambda_c$ uncertainty from nonprompt component

![](_page_22_Picture_2.jpeg)

- The alternative estimation based on the FONLL calculation for the B hadron cross section
- The systematic uncertainty is taken as the difference between the nominal and alternative A e values.
  - ➢ pp: 18%
  - > PbPb: 29% (also considering the effect of  $\frac{R_{AA}^{nonprompt}}{R_{AA}^{prompt}}$  correction.)
- The default PbPb  $A\epsilon$ :

• Considering 
$$\frac{R_{AA}^{nonprompt}}{R_{AA}^{prompt}} = 1.66 \pm 0.38$$

- The nonprompt fraction passing the selection criteria:
  - > pp: 28-34% (PYTHIA CUETP8M1 tune)
  - ➤ 4-7% for the alternative method.