



# Self-similar description of heavy-ion and p+p collisions

GÁBOR KASZA DAY OF FEMTOSCOPY, GYÖNGYÖS 31ST OF OCTOBER, 2019

> NKIFH No. FK-123842 & FK-123959 EFOP 3.6.1-16-2016-00001

## Various application of hydrodynamics

- **Fluid dynamics: flow of liquid and gases**
- **Examples:** 
	- o *Calculating forces and moments in aircrafts*
	- o *Weather forecast*
	- o *Describing nebulae*
	- o *Inner structure of stars (magnetohydrodynamics)*
	- o *Modelling fission weapon detonation*
	- o *Describing the Quark Gluon Plazma (QGP)*
- Different systems in many aspects: however, hydro works well in all cases
- Why is hydrodynamics so effective?



## Scaling behaviour

I Ideal gas: isothermal process  $\rightarrow$  constant value of *T* constrains the possible states

*p* and *V* are arbitrary, but their product is not:

 $pV = Nk_BT =$ konstans

In this case *the system scales with the temperature:*



## Scaling behaviour

- I Ideal gas: isothermal process  $\rightarrow$  constant value of *T* constrains the possible states
- *p* and *V* are arbitrary, but their product is not:

 $pV = Nk_BT =$ konstans

- In this case *the system scales with the temperature:*
- **For adiabatic expansions:**

$$
\frac{pV}{T}=Nk_B=konstans
$$

- Applicable to any *N*, *the system scales with the particle number*
- It is also a general feature of hydro:

"*Hydrodynamics has no internal scale*"

## Scaling behaviour

- I Ideal gas: isothermal process  $\rightarrow$  constant value of *T* constrains the possible states
- *p* and *V* are arbitrary, but their product is not:

 $pV = Nk_BT =$ konstans

- In this case *the system scales with the temperature:*
- **For adiabatic expansions:**

$$
\frac{pV}{T} = Nk_B = \text{konstans}
$$

- Applicable to any *N*, *the system scales with the particle number*
- It is also a general feature of hydro:

"*Hydrodynamics has no internal scale*"



#### *Analogy in heavy-ion physics? This is the topic of this presentation!*

# Scaling behaviour

- I Ideal gas: isothermal process  $\rightarrow$  constant value of *T* constrains the possible states
- *p* and *V* are arbitrary, but their product is not:

 $pV = Nk_BT =$ konstans

- In this case *the system scales with the temperature:*
- **For adiabatic expansions:**

$$
\frac{pV}{T} = Nk_B = \text{konstans}
$$

- Applicable to any *N*, *the system scales with the particle number*
- It is also a general feature of hydro:

"*Hydrodynamics has no internal scale*"



Csörgő-Kasza-Csanád-Jiang solution

- $(\tau,\eta_x)=\left(\sqrt{t^2-r_z^2},\ \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{ln}\left[\frac{t+r_z}{t-r_z}\right]\right),\ \ u^\mu=\left(\cosh\left(\Omega\right),\sinh\left(\Omega\right)\right)$ Rindler coordinates, velocity field:
- 1+1 dimensional, parametric, almost self-similar solution:

[arXiv:1805.01427,](https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.01427) [arXiv:1806.06794](https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.06794) Csörgő T., Kasza G., Csanád M., Jiang Z.:

$$
\eta_x(H) = \Omega(H) - H,
$$
\n
$$
\Omega(H) = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{\lambda - 1}\sqrt{\kappa - \lambda}}\arctan\left(\sqrt{\frac{\kappa - \lambda}{\lambda - 1}}\tanh(H)\right)
$$
\n
$$
\mathbf{E} \downarrow \mathbf{E} \uparrow \mathbf{E}
$$
\n(Hwa-Bjorken:  $\lambda = 1$ )\n
$$
\sigma(\tau, H) = \sigma_0 \left(\frac{\tau_0}{\tau}\right)^{\lambda} \mathcal{V}_{\sigma}(s) \left[1 + \frac{\kappa - 1}{\lambda - 1} \sinh^2(H)\right]^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}},
$$
\n
$$
\frac{\text{accelerating solution}}{\sum_{k=1,4}^{\infty} \sigma_k^2 = 0.1}
$$
\n
$$
T(\tau, H) = T_0 \left(\frac{\tau_0}{\tau}\right)^{\frac{\lambda}{\kappa}} T(s) \left[1 + \frac{\kappa - 1}{\lambda - 1} \sinh^2(H)\right]^{-\frac{\lambda}{2\kappa}},
$$
\n
$$
\mathbf{E} \downarrow \mathbf{E} \downarrow \mathbf{E}
$$
\n
$$
\mathbf{E} \downarrow
$$

**dN/dy** is obtained from the CKCJ solution (in self-similar approximation):

$$
\frac{dN}{dy} \approx \frac{dN}{dy}\bigg|_{y=0} \cosh^{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha(\kappa,\lambda)-1}\left(\frac{y}{\alpha(1,\lambda)}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{m}{T_{\rm eff}}\bigg[\cosh^{\alpha(\kappa,\lambda)}\left(\frac{y}{\alpha(1,\lambda)}\right)-1\bigg]\right)
$$

#### Physical parameters:

*λ*: acceleration parameter *κ*: inverse square of *c<sup>s</sup> Teff*: effective temperature *m*: particle mass

• If 
$$
|y| \ll 2 + (\lambda - 1)^{-1}
$$
, Gaussian rapidity-density:  
\n
$$
\frac{dN}{dy} \approx \frac{\langle N \rangle}{(2\pi\Delta^2 y)^{1/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{y^2}{2\Delta^2 y}\right) \longrightarrow \frac{1}{\Delta^2 y} = (\lambda - 1)^2 \left[1 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\kappa}\right) \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{m}{T_{\text{eff}}}\right)\right]
$$

Depends on the combination of the physical parameters through the width (*Δy*)

- *λ, m, Teff and κ can be arbitrary, but their combination is not: Δy is determined by fits*
- Physical differences are only apparent in the width of the distribution

[arXiv:1805.01427](https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.01427) Csörgő, Kasza, Csanád, Jiang solution:

[arXiv:1806.06794](https://arxiv.org/abs/1806.06794) [arXiv:1811.09990](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.09990) and several applications:

The pseudorapity distribution is the product of *dN/dy* and the Jakobian:

$$
\frac{dN}{d\eta_p} \approx \frac{\langle N \rangle}{\left(2\pi\Delta^2 y\right)^{1/2}} \frac{\cosh(\eta_p)}{\left(D^2 + \cosh^2(\eta_p)\right)^{1/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{y^2}{2\Delta^2 y}\right)\Big|_{y=y(\eta_p)}
$$

The rapidity density is depressed at midrapidity by  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\frac{1}{n}}$  $\overline{1+D^2}$ 



"*D*epression" or "*D*epth" parameter

 $m$ 

 $\overline{\bar{p}_T}$ 

 $D=$ 

[arXiv:1811.09990](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.09990) [arXiv:1910.03428](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.03428) K. G. , Csörgő T.:



- Main question: Does this scaling behaviour appear in the data?
- We fitted the pseudorapidity density data with the CKCJ solution ...



Gábor Kasza, Day of Femtoscopy, 31/10/2019 7

[arXiv:1910.03428](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.03428)

[arXiv:1811.09990](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.09990)

K. G. , Csörgő T.:

- Main question: Does this scaling behaviour appear in the data?
- We fitted the pseudorapidity density data with the CKCJ solution ...



K. G. , Csörgő T.:

[arXiv:1811.09990](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.09990)

- Main question: Does this scaling behaviour appear in the data?
- We fitted the pseudorapidity density data with the CKCJ solution ...



[arXiv:1910.03428](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.03428) [arXiv:1811.09990](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.09990) K. G. , Csörgő T.:

- Main question: Does this scaling behaviour appear in the data?
- We fitted the pseudorapidity density data with the CKCJ solution ...



K. G. , Csörgő T.:

[arXiv:1811.09990](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.09990)

- Main question: Does this scaling behaviour appear in the data?
- We fitted the pseudorapidity density data with the CKCJ solution ...

ALICE Pb+Pb at 5 TeV, 0-5% centrality 2000 1500 CL=100%  $\begin{array}{c}\n\overline{\mathbf{d}} & \overline{\mathbf{r}} \\
\overline{\mathbf{d}} & \mathbf{r} \\
\overline{\mathbf{d}} & \mathbf{r} \\
\end{array}$  $x^2$ /ndf=0.207/17  $\langle N \rangle = 21215^{+3984}_{.2444}$  $\Delta$ y=3.84 $^{+0.88}_{-0.56}$ D= $0.56^{+0.1}_{-0.11}$ 500 dN/d $\eta_{\mathsf{n}}$  - data  $\bullet$  $dN/d\eta_{n}$  - CKCJ fit Fitted range:  $\eta_{\alpha} \in$  [-2.5, 2.5]  $\Omega$  $-1$  $-0.5$  $\mathsf O$  $0.5$  $-2.5$  $-2$  $-1.5$  $\overline{1}$  $1.5$ 2 2.5  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\mathbf{p}}$ 

Gábor Kasza, Day of Femtoscopy, 31/10/2019 7



K. G. , Csörgő T.:

[arXiv:1811.09990](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.09990)

- Main question: Does this scaling behaviour appear in the data?
- We fitted the pseudorapidity density data with the CKCJ solution ...



[arXiv:1811.09990](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.09990) K. G. , Csörgő T.:

- Main question: Does this scaling behaviour appear in the data?
- We fitted the pseudorapidity density data with the CKCJ solution …



K. G. , Csörgő T.:

[arXiv:1811.09990](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.09990)

- Main question: Does this scaling behaviour appear in the data?
- We fitted the pseudorapidity density data with the CKCJ solution ...

CMS p+p at 7 TeV 5 CL=99.99%  $\begin{array}{c}\n\mathsf{d}\mathsf{N}\mathsf{d}\eta_{\mathsf{p}} \\
\mathsf{d}\mathsf{N}\n\end{array}$  $\chi^2$ /ndf=0.322/7 3  $\langle N \rangle = 125^{+86}_{.43}$  $\Delta$ y=7.69<sup>+5.62</sup>  $\overline{2}$ D= $0.51^{+0.14}_{-0.15}$  $\mathbf{1}$ dN/d $\eta_{\bf p}$  - data  $dN/d\eta_{n}$  - CKCJ fit Fitted range:  $\eta_{\text{R}} \in$  [-2.5, 2.5]  $-2.5$  $-2$  $-0.5$  $\mathbf 0$  $0.5$ 2.5  $-1.5$  $-1$  $1.5$ 2  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\mathbf{p}}$ 

[arXiv:1910.03428](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.03428)

[arXiv:1811.09990](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.09990)

K. G. , Csörgő T.:

- Main question: Does this scaling behaviour appear in the data?
- We fitted the pseudorapidity density data with the CKCJ solution ...



[arXiv:1811.09990](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.09990) K. G. , Csörgő T.:

- Main question: Does this scaling behaviour appear in the data?
- We fitted the pseudorapidity density data with the CKCJ solution ...



K. G. , Csörgő T.:

[arXiv:1811.09990](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.09990)

- Main question: Does this scaling behaviour appear in the data?
- We fitted the pseudorapidity density data with the CKCJ solution ...
- The collisions of small systems (p+p) and heavy-ions (Au+Au, Pb+Pb) are well described by us
- *Scaling behaviour is evident*: hydro works well independently on the system size …
	-

K. G. , Csörgő T.:

[arXiv:1811.09990](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.09990)

- Main question: Does this scaling behaviour appear in the data?
- We fitted the pseudorapidity density data with the CKCJ solution ...
- The collisions of small systems (p+p) and heavy-ions (Au+Au, Pb+Pb) are well described by us
- *Scaling behaviour is evident*: hydro works well independently on the system size …



*Our self-similar hydrodynamic calculations are succesful in such cases where other models fail.*

> CMS collab.: [arXiv:1902.03603](https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.03603) Werner, Liu, Pierog: [arXiv:hep-ph/0506232](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0506232) Pierog, Karpenko, et all.: [arXiv:1306.0121](https://arxiv.org/abs/1306.0121) Lokhtin, Snigirev: [arXiv:hep-ph/0506189](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0506189) Lin, Ko, et all.: [arXiv:nucl-th/0411110](https://arxiv.org/abs/nucl-th/0411110)

[arXiv:1811.09990](https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.09990) K. G. , Csörgő T.:

- p+p collisions can be described as collective systems
- Our fits indicate low  $c_s$  value (≈0.35), but it can be determined only by violating the scaling behaviour
- **Low**  $c_s$  value indicate the presence of fluid, so the presence of QGP
- p+p and A+A collisions: *self-similar* systems

- p+p collisions can be described as collective systems
- Our fits indicate low  $c_s$  value (≈0.35), but it can be determined only by violating the scaling behaviour
- **Low**  $c_s$  value indicate the presence of fluid, so the presence of QGP
- p+p and A+A collisions: *self-similar* systems

*Is the hydrodynamic description well-accepted?*

- p+p collisions can be described as collective systems
- Our fits indicate low  $c_s$  value (≈0.35), but it can be determined only by violating the scaling behaviour
- **Low**  $c_s$  value indicate the presence of fluid, so the presence of QGP
- p+p and A+A collisions: *self-similar* systems

#### *Is the hydrodynamic description well-accepted?*

• A+A collisions: become a major trend since 2005

- p+p collisions can be described as collective systems
- Our fits indicate low  $c_s$  value (≈0.35), but it can be determined only by violating the scaling behaviour
- **Low**  $c_s$  value indicate the presence of fluid, so the presence of QGP
- p+p and A+A collisions: *self-similar* systems

#### *Is the hydrodynamic description well-accepted?*

- A+A collisions: become a major trend since 2005
- p+A, d+A and He+A collisions: accepted since 2019



- p+p collisions can be described as collective systems
- Our fits indicate low  $c_s$  value (≈0.35), but it can be determined only by violating the scaling behaviour
- **Low**  $c_s$  value indicate the presence of fluid, so the presence of QGP
- p+p and A+A collisions: *self-similar* systems

#### *Is the hydrodynamic description well-accepted?*

- A+A collisions: become a major trend since 2005
- p+A, d+A and He+A collisions: accepted since 2019
- p+p collisions: not widely accepted yet

- p+p collisions can be described as collective systems
- Our fits indicate low  $c_s$  value (≈0.35), but it can be determined only by violating the scaling behaviour
- **Low**  $c_s$  value indicate the presence of fluid, so the presence of QGP
- p+p and A+A collisions: *self-similar* systems

#### *Is the hydrodynamic description well-accepted?*

- A+A collisions: become a major trend since 2005
- p+A, d+A and He+A collisions: accepted since 2019
- p+p collisions: not widely accepted yet
- However, describing H+H systems by hydro is not a recent idea



19 Dec 1997

v:hep-ex/9711009v2

analysed in the framework of the hydrodynamical model of three-dimensionally expanding cylindrically symmetric finite systems. A satisfactory description of experimental data is achieved. The data favour the pattern according to which the hadron matter undergoes predominantly longitudinal expansion and non-relativistic transverse expansion with mean transverse velocity  $\langle u_t \rangle = 0.20 \pm 0.07$ , and is characterized by a large temperature inhomogeneity in the transverse direction: the extracted freezeout temperature at the center of the tube and at the transverse rms radius are  $140 \pm 3$  MeV and  $82 \pm 7$ MeV, respectively. The width of the (longitudinal) space-time rapidity distribution of the pion source is found to be  $\Delta \eta = 1.36 \pm 0.02$ . Combining this estimate with results of the Bose-Einstein correlation analysis in the same experiment, one extracts a mean freeze-out time of the source of  $\langle \tau_f \rangle = 1.4 \pm 0.1$  $\text{fm}/c$  and its transverse geometrical rms radius,  $R_{\text{G}}(\text{rms}) = 1.2 \pm 0.2$  fm.

Niimegen preprint **HEN-405** Doc  $07$ 

#### *We hope that these results help to confirm the legitimacy of hydro in p+p collisions!*

## In conclusion…

- p+p collisions can be described as collective systems
- Our fits indicate low  $c_s$  value (≈0.35), but it can be determined only by violating the scaling behaviour
- **Low**  $c_s$  value indicate the presence of fluid, so the presence of QGP
- p+p and A+A collisions: *self-similar* systems

#### *Is the hydrodynamic description well-accepted?*

- A+A collisions: become a major trend since 2005
- p+A, d+A and He+A collisions: accepted since 2019
- p+p collisions: not widely accepted yet
- However, describing H+H systems by hydro is not a recent idea