

Transport Coefficients of Hadronic Matter near T_c

Jacquelyn Noronha-Hostler,^{1,2,3} Jorge Noronha,² and Carsten Greiner³

¹Frankfurt Institute for Advanced Studies, Frankfurt, Germany

²Department of Physics, Columbia University, 538 West 120th Street, New York, NY 10027, USA

³Institut für Theoretische Physik, Goethe Universität, Frankfurt, Germany

We use a hadron resonance gas model which includes all the known particles and resonances with masses $m < 2$ GeV and also an exponentially rising density of Hagedorn states for $m > 2$ GeV to obtain an upper bound on the shear viscosity to entropy density ratio, η/s , of hadronic matter near T_c that is close to $1/(4\pi)$. The large trace anomaly and the small speed of sound near T_c computed within this model agree well with recent lattice calculations. We also comment on the behavior of the bulk viscosity to entropy density ratio of hadronic matter close to the phase transition.

PACS numbers: 25.75.Nq, 51.20.+d

Collective flow measurements [1] performed at RHIC indicate that the new state of matter produced in heavy ion collisions behaves almost as a perfect liquid [2]. In fact, the large elliptic flow coefficient measured at RHIC [1] supports the idea that this new state of matter is a strongly interacting quark-gluon plasma [3] characterized by a very small shear viscosity to entropy density ratio that is compatible with the lower bound $\eta/s \geq 1/(4\pi)$ [4] derived within the anti-de Sitter/conformal field theory (AdS/CFT) correspondence [5]. It was further conjectured by Kovtun, Son, and Starinets (KSS) [6] that this bound holds for all substances in nature. Possible counterexamples that would violate the bound involving nonrelativistic systems with very large number of particle species were discussed in [7, 8].

Recent lattice calculations [9] in pure glue $SU(3)$ gauge theory have shown that η/s remains close to the KSS bound at temperatures not much larger than T_c . Additionally, calculations within the BAMPS parton cascade [10], which includes inelastic gluonic $gg \leftrightarrow ggg$ reactions, showed that $\eta/s \sim 0.13$ in a pure gluon gas [11]. Moreover, it was argued in [12] that this ratio should have a minimum at (or near) the phase transition in quantum chromodynamics (QCD). This is expected because η/s increases with decreasing T in the hadronic phase [27] while it increases with T in the deconfined phase according to the perturbative calculations done in [14]. Note, however, that in general perturbative calculations are not reliable close to T_c (see, however, Ref. [15]).

Thus far, there have been several attempts to compute η/s in the confined using the known hadrons and resonances [16, 17, 18]. However, these studies have not explicitly considered that the hadronic density of states in QCD is expected to be $\sim \exp(m/T_H)$ for sufficiently large m [19, 20], where $T_H \sim 150 - 200$ MeV is the Hagedorn temperature [19] (see [21] for an update on the experimental verification of this asymptotic behavior). This hypothesis was originally devised to explain the fact that an increase in energy in pp and $p\bar{p}$ collisions does not lead to an increase in the average momentum per particle but rather to production of more particles of different

species [19]. Moreover, hadron resonance models that include such rapidly increasing density of states are known to have a “limiting” temperature, T_{max} , beyond which ordinary hadronic matter cannot exist [19].

In this letter, a hadron resonance gas model which includes all the known particles and resonances with masses $m < 2$ GeV [22] and also an exponentially increasing number of Hagedorn states (HS) [23, 24] is used to provide an upper limit on η/s for hadronic matter close to the critical temperature that is comparable to $1/4\pi$. Additionally, we show that our model provides a good description of the recent lattice results [25] for the trace anomaly and also the speed of sound, c_s , close to $T_c = 196$ MeV. We also study how the inclusion of HS affects the bulk viscosity to entropy density ratio, ζ/s , of hadronic matter near T_c .

The main assumption behind hadron resonance models is that the thermodynamic properties of an interacting gas of hadrons can be described by a free gas with the same hadrons and their respective resonances. For instance, it is known [26] that the pressure of a gas of interacting pions calculated within the virial expansion nearly coincides with that of a free gas of pions and ρ mesons. In this case there is an exact cancellation between the attractive and repulsive S-wave channels but the same is not true for an interacting gas of pions, kaons, and nucleons [27]. Thus, in general one also has to include the repulsive interactions between the hadrons when computing thermodynamic functions [27, 28, 29]. Here we assume that attractive interactions can be described by the inclusion of resonances which for large masses follow a Hagedorn spectrum. The system’s mass spectrum is assumed [23, 24] to be a sum over discrete and continuous states $\rho(m) = \rho_{HG}(m) + \rho_{HS}(m)$, where $\rho_{HG}(m) = \sum_i^{M_0} g_i \delta(m - m_i) \theta(M_0 - m)$ involves a sum over all the known hadrons and resonances [22] with their respective degeneracy factors up to $M_0 < 2$ GeV [30] and for larger masses

$$\rho_{HS}(m) = A \frac{e^{m/T_H}}{(m^2 + m_0^2)^{\frac{5}{4}}}, \quad (1)$$




FIG. 1: Comparison between the trace anomaly $\theta(T)/T^4 = (\epsilon - 3P)/T^4$ computed using a hadron resonance gas model that includes Hagedorn states with $2 < m < 20$ GeV [23] (solid red line) and a hadronic gas model where only the known hadrons with $m < 2$ GeV are included (black dashed line) [30]. The blue band between the curves is used to emphasize the effects of HS. Repulsive interactions between the hadrons are included via an excluded volume approach [29] with $B^{1/4} = 0.34$ GeV. Lattice data points for the $p4$ action with $N_\tau = 6$ [25] are also shown.

where we take $m_0 = 0.5$ GeV, $A = 0.5$ GeV $^{3/2}$ [23], and $T_H = T_c$. Effects from repulsive interactions are included using the excluded-volume approach derived in [29] where the volume excluded by a hadron equals its energy divided by $4B$, where B plays the role of an effective MIT bag constant. The thermodynamic quantities can be obtained using

$$P(T) = \frac{P_{pt}(T^*)}{1 - \frac{P_{pt}(T^*)}{4B}}, \quad T = \frac{T^*}{1 - \frac{P_{pt}(T^*)}{4B}} \quad (2)$$

and the standard thermodynamic identities at zero baryon chemical potential [29]. Note that the temperature T and the pressure $P(T)$ of the system (after volume corrections) are defined in terms of the quantities computed in the point particle (subscript pt) approximation (i.e., no volume corrections). When $P_{pt}(T_c)/4B < 1$ there is still a limiting temperature that is larger than T_c . We take $B^{1/4} = 0.34$ GeV in our calculations, which implies that $T_{max} > T_c$. We restrict our discussion to $T \leq T_c$ because at higher temperatures a description involving quarks and gluons should be more adequate.

Our results for the trace anomaly are shown in Fig. 1 where the mass of the heavier Hagedorn state was set to be $M_{max} = 20$ GeV. Note that the inclusion of HS correctly captures the trend displayed by the lattice data in the transition region whereas the hadron gas curve does not. This remains true if other values of B are used. We checked that our results did not change appreciably in this temperature range when M_{max} is increased to 80 GeV. This happens because the divergences normally associated with the limiting temperature only occur in this case at $T_{max} \sim 210$ MeV. Were $T_H < T_c$, the dependence of the thermodynamic quantities with M_{max} would be much more pronounced. In general, a very




FIG. 2: c_s^2 for the model including HS with $2 < m < 20$ GeV (solid red line) and for the hadron gas model of Ref. [30] which does not include HS (dashed black curve). The lattice results for the $p4$ action with $N_\tau = 6$ [25] are depicted in the dotted curve. The dotted-dashed blue curve was computed using HS with $2 < m < 80$ GeV.

rapid increase in the number of particle species (specifically heavier species) around T_c is expected to strongly reduce the speed of sound $c_s^2 = dP/d\epsilon$ at the phase transition. While $c_s^2 \rightarrow 0$ at the transition would certainly lead to very interesting consequences for the evolution of the RHIC plasma [31], recent lattice simulations have found that $c_s^2 \simeq 0.09$ near T_c [25]. It is shown in Fig. 2 that $c_s^2(T \sim T_c) \sim 0.09$ in the model with HS while for the model without them $c_s^2 \sim 0.25$ near the transition. Note that when $M_{max} = 80$ GeV (dashed blue curve) c_s^2 is only a bit smaller than 0.09 near the phase transition. Other quantities such as the total entropy density near T_c are found to agree with lattice results within the uncertainties present in those calculations [32].

The total shear viscosity of our multi-component system computed within kinetic theory [33] is $\eta_{tot} \sim \alpha \sum_i n_i \langle p_i \rangle \lambda_i$, where n_i is the number density, $\langle p_i \rangle$ is the average momentum, and λ_i is the mean free path for discrete states and HS ($\alpha \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$). Moreover, $\lambda_i = \left(\sum_j n_j \sigma_{ij} \right)^{-1}$, with σ_{ij} being the scattering cross section. Due to their very large mass, the particle density of a HS is much smaller than that of discrete states. Thus, one can neglect the small contribution to the mean free path from terms involving the interaction between the standard hadrons and the HS. In this case, $\eta_{tot} = \eta_{HG} + \eta_{HS}$ where η_{HG} is the shear viscosity computed using only the interactions between the standard hadrons while $\eta_{HS} = \frac{1}{3} \sum_i n_i \langle p \rangle_i \lambda_i$ includes only the contribution from HS, which move non-relativistically since $m_{HS}/T \gg 1$. Note that the approximation for η_{tot} used here provides an upper bound for this quantity since the inclusion of the interactions between HS and the standard hadrons would only decrease η_{tot} . Using the results above, one sees that

$$\left(\frac{\eta}{s} \right)_{tot} \leq \frac{s_{HG}}{s_{HG} + s_{HS}} \left[\left(\frac{\eta}{s} \right)_{HG} + \frac{\eta_{HS}}{s_{HG}} \right]. \quad (3)$$

While the entropy dependent prefactor in Eq. (3) can be

easily determined using our model, the detailed calculation of η_{HG} and η_{HS} requires the knowledge about the mean free paths of the different particles and resonances in the thermal medium. In the non-relativistic approximation, we can set $\langle p_i \rangle = m_i \langle v_i \rangle = \sqrt{8m_i T/\pi}$ in Eq. (3). Note that HS with very large m_i 's are more likely to quickly decay. We assume that $\lambda_i = \tau_i \langle v_i \rangle$ where $\tau_i \equiv 1/\Gamma_i = 1/(0.151 m_i - 0.0583)$ GeV $^{-1}$ is the inverse of the decay width of the i^{th} HS obtained from a linear fit to the decay widths of the known resonances in the particle data book [23, 24, 34]. Our choice for λ_i gives the largest mean free path associated with a given state because it neglects any possible collisions that could occur before it decays on its own. The inclusion of collisions here would only shorten λ_i , which would further decrease η_{tot} . Further studies of the relationship between HS and η could be done, for instance, using the cross sections discussed in [35]. Substituting the results above in we find that $\eta_{HS} = 8T \sum_i n_i \tau_i / 3\pi$. The remaining ratio $(\eta/s)_{HG}$ has been computed in Refs. [16, 17, 18] using different models and approximations. Since our main goal is to understand the effects of HS on $(\eta/s)_{tot}$, here we will simply use the values for $(\eta/s)_{HG}$ obtained in some of these calculations to illustrate the importance of HS. We chose to obtain $(\eta/s)_{HG}$ for a gas of pions and nucleons from Fig. 5 in [16] and for a hadron resonance gas with (constant) excluded volume corrections from [17]. Note that the results for η/s obtained from the calculation that included many particles and resonances [17] are already much smaller than those found in [16] where only pions and nucleons are considered. A linear extrapolation of the results in [16, 17] was used to obtain their η/s values at high temperatures. One can see in Fig. 3 that $(\eta/s)_{tot}$ drops significantly around T_c because of HS. This result is especially interesting because η/s in the hadronic phase is thought to be too large (according to viscous hydrodynamics calculations) to be compatible with elliptic flow data. One can see that the contributions from HS should lower η/s to near the KSS bound. Thus, the drop in η/s due to HS could explain the low shear viscosity near T_c already in the hadronic phase. We used $M_{max} = 20$ GeV in the calculations shown in Fig. 3 but the results do not change significantly if M_{max} is increased by a factor of 4.

The large value of the trace anomaly near T_c observed on the lattice has been used as an indication that ζ/s of QCD may be large at the phase transition [36, 37]. This is very different than at high temperatures where ζ/s is predicted to be small [38]. This may have some interesting phenomenological consequences such as the formation of clusters at freeze-out [39]. Using the QCD sum rules derived in [40], one can extract the (zero-momentum) Euclidean correlator of the trace of the energy-momentum




FIG. 3: η/s is shown for a gas of pions and nucleons [16] (upper dashed black line) and for a hadron resonance gas with (constant) excluded volume corrections [17] (lower dashed black line). An upper bound on the effects of HS on η/s is shown in solid red lines. The blue band between the curves is used to emphasize the effects of HS. The solid black line at the bottom is the AdS/CFT lower bound $\eta/s = 1/4\pi$ [6].




FIG. 4: Estimates for $\zeta/s \equiv G^E(0)/(9\omega_0 s)$ ($\omega_0 = 1$ GeV) for a model that includes HS with $2 < m < 20$ GeV (solid red line) and $2 < m < 80$ GeV (dotted-dashed blue line) and a hadron gas model with $m < 2$ GeV (black dashed line).

tensor, θ_μ^μ , as follows

$$\begin{aligned} G^E(0, \mathbf{0}) &= \int d^4x \langle \theta_\mu^\mu(\tau, \mathbf{x}) \theta_\mu^\mu(0, \mathbf{0}) \rangle \\ &= (T\partial_T - 4)(\epsilon - 3p) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The authors of Ref. [37] have argued that ζ can be obtained via G^E using $\pi\rho(\omega, \mathbf{0})/9\omega = \zeta\omega_0^2/(\omega^2 + \omega_0^2)$ as an ansatz for the small frequency limit of the $\langle \theta\theta \rangle$ spectral density at zero spatial momentum, $\rho(\omega, \mathbf{0})$. The parameter $\omega_0(T)$ defines the energy scale at which perturbation theory is applicable. The validity of this ansatz has been recently studied in Refs. [41]. Here we assume that this ansatz can at least capture the qualitative behavior of ζ around T_c and we use it to estimate how HS change the ζ/s close to T_c . The results for $\zeta/s \equiv G^E(0)/(9\omega_0 s)$ are shown in Fig. 4 where $\omega_0 = 1$ GeV. Note that while ζ/s decreases near T_c for the hadron gas model with $m < 2$ GeV, when HS are included ζ/s increases close to T_c and this enhancement does not vary much with M_{max} .

In conclusion, a hadron resonance gas model including all the known particles and resonances with masses $m < 2$ GeV and also an exponentially rising level density

of Hagedorn states for $m > 2$ GeV was used to obtain an upper bound on η/s for hadronic matter near T_c that is comparable to the KSS bound $1/(4\pi)$. This indicates that the small η/s necessary to explain the large elliptic flow observed at RHIC could be already reached in the hadronic phase. The large trace anomaly and the small speed of sound near T_c MeV computed within this model agree well with recent lattice calculations [25]. An estimate for the bulk viscosity of QCD using the proposal written by [37] generally indicates that HS increase ζ/s close to T_c .

We thank G. Torrieri, K. Redlich, S. Bass, and A. Dumitru for interesting discussions. J.N. acknowledges support from US-DOE Nuclear Science Grant No. DE-FG02-93ER40764. This work was supported by the Helmholtz International Center for FAIR within the LOEWE program launched by the State of Hesse.

-
- [1] J. Adams *et al.* [STAR Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. A **757**, 102 (2005); B. B. Back *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. A **757**, 28 (2005); I. Arsene *et al.* [BRAHMS Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. A **757**, 1 (2005); K. Adcox *et al.* [PHENIX Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. A **757**, 184 (2005).
- [2] U. W. Heinz and P. F. Kolb, Nucl. Phys. A **702**, 269 (2002); D. Teaney, J. Lauret and E. V. Shuryak, arXiv:nucl-th/0110037; D. Teaney, Phys. Rev. C **68**, 034913 (2003); A. Adare *et al.* [PHENIX Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 172301 (2007); T. Hirano and M. Gyulassy, Nucl. Phys. A **769**, 71 (2006); M. Asakawa, S. A. Bass and B. Muller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 252301 (2006); P. Romatschke and U. Romatschke, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 172301 (2007); Z. Xu, C. Greiner and H. Stoecker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 082302 (2008); H. Song and U. W. Heinz, Phys. Lett. B **658**, 279 (2008).
- [3] M. Gyulassy and L. McLerran, Nucl. Phys. A **750**, 30 (2005); E. V. Shuryak, Nucl. Phys. A **750**, 64 (2005).
- [4] G. Policastro, D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 081601 (2001).
- [5] J. M. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 231 (1998) [Int. J. Theor. Phys. **38**, 1113 (1999)].
- [6] P. K. Kovtun, D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 111601 (2005).
- [7] T. D. Cohen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 021602 (2007); D. T. Son, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 029101 (2008); T. D. Cohen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 029102 (2008); A. Dobado, F. J. Llanes-Estrada and J. M. T. Rincon, AIP Conf. Proc. **1031**, 221 (2008).
- [8] A. Dobado and F. J. Llanes-Estrada, Eur. Phys. J. C **51**, 913 (2007).
- [9] H. B. Meyer, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 101701(R) (2007).
- [10] Z. Xu and C. Greiner, Phys. Rev. C **71**, 064901 (2005); **76**, 024911 (2007).
- [11] Z. Xu and C. Greiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 172301 (2008).
- [12] L. P. Csernai, J. I. Kapusta and L. D. McLerran, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 152303 (2006).
- [27] S. Gavin, Nucl. Phys. A **435**, 826 (1985); M. Prakash, M. Prakash, R. Venugopalan, and G. Welke, Phys. Rep. **227**, 321 (1993).
- [14] P. Arnold, G. D. Moore and L. G. Yaffe, JHEP **0305**, 051 (2003).
- [15] Y. Hidaka and R. D. Pisarski, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 071501(R) (2008); Nucl. Phys. A **820**, 91 C (2009).
- [16] K. Itakura, O. Morimatsu and H. Otomo, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 014014 (2008).
- [17] M. I. Gorenstein, M. Hauer and O. N. Moroz, Phys. Rev. C **77**, 024911 (2008).
- [18] A. Muronga, Phys. Rev. C **69**, 044901 (2004); D. Fernandez-Fraile and A. G. Nicola, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **16**, 3010 (2007); J. W. Chen, Y. H. Li, Y. F. Liu and E. Nakano, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 114011 (2007); J. W. Chen and E. Nakano, Phys. Lett. B **647**, 371 (2007); A. Dobado, F. J. Llanes-Estrada and J. M. Torres-Rincon, arXiv:0803.3275 [hep-ph]; N. Demir and S. A. Bass, arXiv:0812.2422 [nucl-th].
- [19] R. Hagedorn, Nuovo Cim. Suppl. **3**, 147 (1965); R. Hagedorn and J. Ranft, Nuovo Cim. Suppl. **6**, 169 (1968); P. Blanchard, S. Fortunato and H. Satz, Eur. Phys. J. C **34**, 361 (2004).
- [20] K. Huang and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **25**, 895 (1970); C. J. Hamer and S. C. Frautschi, Phys. Rev. D **4**, 2125 (1971); W. Nahm, Nucl. Phys. B **45**, 525 (1972); A. Chodos, R. L. Jaffe, K. Johnson, and V. F. Weisskopf, Phys. Rev. D **9**, 3471 (1974); J. I. Kapusta, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 2444 (1981); Nucl. Phys. B **196**, 1 (1982); T. D. Cohen, arXiv:0901.0494 [hep-th].
- [21] W. Broniowski, W. Florkowski and L. Y. Glozman, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 117503 (2004).
- [22] C. Amsler *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **667**, 1 (2008).
- [23] J. Noronha-Hostler, C. Greiner and I. A. Shovkovy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 252301 (2008).
- [24] J. Noronha-Hostler, C. Greiner and I. A. Shovkovy, to appear.
- [25] M. Cheng *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 014511 (2008).
- [26] G. Welke, R. Venugopalan and M. Prakash, Phys. Lett. B **245**, 137 (1990).
- [27] R. Venugopalan and M. Prakash, Nucl. Phys. A **546**, 718 (1992).
- [28] R. Hagedorn and J. Rafelski, Phys. Lett. B **97**, 136 (1980).
- [29] J. I. Kapusta and K. A. Olive, Nucl. Phys. A **408**, 478 (1983).
- [30] C. Spieles, H. Stoecker and C. Greiner, Eur. Phys. J. C **2**, 351 (1998).
- [31] S. Pratt, Phys. Rev. C **49**, 2722 (1994); D. H. Rischke and M. Gyulassy, Nucl. Phys. A **608**, 479 (1996).
- [32] A. Bazavov *et al.*, arXiv:0903.4379 [hep-lat].
- [33] F. Reif, *Fundamentals of Statistical and Thermal Physics* (McGraw-Hill, Singapore, 1965).
- [34] F. Lizzi and I. Senda, Nucl. Phys. B **359**, 441 (1991); Phys. Lett. B **244**, 27 (1990).
- [35] S. Pal and P. Danielewicz, Phys. Lett. B **627**, 55 (2005).
- [36] H. B. Meyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 162001 (2008).
- [37] D. Kharzeev and K. Tuchin, JHEP **0809**, 093 (2008); F. Karsch, D. Kharzeev and K. Tuchin, Phys. Lett. B **663**, 217 (2008).
- [38] A. Hosoya and K. Kajantie, Nucl. Phys. B **250**, 666 (1985); P. Danielewicz and M. Gyulassy, Phys. Rev. D **31**, 53 (1985); S. Jeon, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 3591 (1995); P. Arnold, C. Dogan and G. D. Moore, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 085021 (2006).
- [39] G. Torrieri, B. Tomasik and I. Mishustin, Phys. Rev. C

- 77**, 034903 (2008); G. Torrieri and I. Mishustin, Phys. Rev. C **78**, 021901(R) (2008); R. J. Fries, B. Muller and A. Schafer, Phys. Rev. C **78**, 034913 (2008).
- [40] P. J. Ellis, J. I. Kapusta and H. B. Tang, Phys. Lett. B **443**, 63 (1998); I. A. Shushpanov, J. I. Kapusta and P. J. Ellis, Phys. Rev. C **59**, 2931 (1999).
- [41] S. S. Gubser, A. Nellore, S. S. Pufu and F. D. Rocha, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 131601 (2008); G. D. Moore and O. Saremi, JHEP **0809**, 015 (2008); H. B. Meyer, arXiv:0805.4567 [hep-lat]; C. Sasaki and K. Redlich, arXiv:0806.4745 [hep-ph]; K. Huebner, F. Karsch and C. Pica, arXiv:0808.1127 [hep-lat]; D. Fernandez-Fraile and A. G. Nicola, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 121601 (2009).