

QCD phase transition studied by means of hadron production

Jan Rafelski and Michal Petran

Department of Physics, The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA

Abstract

This is a brief review of our work describing the hadronization process of a QGP fireball formed in relativistic heavy-ion collisions. We introduce the SHARE method of analysis of hadron multiplicities. Using this tool we describe in consistent continuous manner the yield of all hadrons produced in the available range of reaction energies and centralities. The properties of the fireball final state can be understood by considering all primary hadronic particles. The dense hadron fireball created at SPS, RHIC, and LHC shows that the final state is differentiated solely by: i) volume changes; and ii) flavor (strangeness, charm) content. Conversely, emerging particles add up to create universal hadronization pressure $P = 80 \pm 3 \text{ MeV/fm}^3$ for all considered collision systems. The relative strangeness to entropy content of a large fireball is found to be that of quark-gluon plasma degrees of freedom near the chemical QGP equilibrium. This 'Universal Hadronization' condition common to SPS, RHIC, and LHC agrees with the proposed reaction picture of a direct QGP fireball evaporation into free-streaming hadrons.

Presented in Wroclaw at the February 2014 MB32-Symposium honoring Ludwik Turko.
Appeared in: *Physics of Particles and Nuclei* **46** (5) pp 748-755 (2015)
<https://doi.org/10.1134/S1063779615050238>.

1 Statistical hadronization with resonances (SHARE)

The focus of the statistical hadronization model is on particle abundances, i.e. the integrated p_{\perp} spectra as measured in heavy-ion collision experiments. Our interest is mainly in properties of the source which are evaluated independent of the complex transverse dynamics. This is the reason to analyze the integrated p_{\perp} spectra. Particle yields allow the exploration of the source properties in the frame comoving with the particles; the collective transverse matter dynamics gets integrated out.

We describe particle yields within Fermi's statistical approach using Hagedorn's canonical reformulation we call statistical hadronization model (SHM). To wit: by assuming equal hadron production strength irrespective of produced hadron type, the particle yields depend only on the available phase space:

- Fermi Micro-canonical phase space:
has sharp energy and a sharp number of particles [1]. However, since experiments report event-averaged rapidity particle abundances, the model should describe an average event.
- Canonical phase space:
has a sharp number of particles, but an ensemble average of energy E which is adjusted by the (inverse) temperature T as a Lagrange multiplier which may be, but needs not be a kinetic process temperature.
- Grand-canonical ensemble phase space:
fixes both energy E and number of particles N on average. N is a constraint implemented by the Lagrange multiplier μ , the chemical potential, which is equivalent to the use of the fugacity $\Upsilon = e^{\mu/T}$.

We have implemented the SHM in a publicly available program to fit the SHM parameters. The program is called SHARE (= Statistical HAdronization with REsonances) and was released in its first version by Torrieri et al. [2], then augmented in its second version by fluctuations [3] and in its recently updated version charm was also included [4].

SHARE incorporates in its many thousand lines of code the mass spectrum of more than 500 hadrons according to the particle data group (PDG 2012) [5]; hadron decays in more than 2500 channels (PDG 2012); integrated hadron yields, ratios and decay cascades. Its output provides the yields of all (presently ~ 30) experimentally observed hadron species, and the physical properties of the particle source at hadronization. Bulk matter constraints such as charge per baryon (for heaviest ions $Q/B \sim 0.39$), and that the net strangeness vanishes $\langle s - \bar{s} \rangle = 0$ are implemented.

In Fig. 1 we show the schematics of the SHARE program structure. The fitting of the SHM parameters to observational data proceeds according to the following steps:




Figure 1: Schematics of the SHARE program structure.

1. Input by hypothesis: $T, V, \gamma_q, \gamma_s, \lambda_q, \lambda_s, \lambda_3$

2. Compute the yields of all primary hadrons
3. Account for decay feed-down to observed particles
4. Evaluate bulk properties and bulk constraints
5. Compare to experimental data and evaluate χ^2 including bulk constraints
6. Use χ^2 minimization strategies to tune parameters to match data and constraints – with new parameters go back to item 1.

SHARE iterates these steps till CERN provided programs for parameter optimization terminates. Several initial input parameters sets can be tried to assure that the same best, stable parameter fit is found. If such a solution was not achieved, it is advisable to evolve a better initial input parameter set from fits that worked nearby either in energy or centrality. In order to account for the quark flavor chemistry we introduce the following quantities which go back to the initial model of QGP hadronization of 30 years ago [6], for illustration see also Fig. 2:




Figure 2: Illustration of the difference in action of quantities required in the SHM for describing chemical conditions: the flavor conservation factor λ and the flavor yield factor γ .

- Flavor conservation factor $\lambda_q = e^{\mu/T}$:
it controls the difference between quarks and antiquarks of the same flavor $q - \bar{q}$, and describes “relative” chemical equilibrium
- Flavor yield factor γ_q :
it measures the phase space occupancy, the absolute abundance of flavor q , controls the the number of quark-antiquark pairs $q + \bar{q}$, and describes “absolute” chemical equilibrium
- Overall fugacity $\Upsilon = \gamma\lambda$:
it is a product of the contributions from the constituent quark flavors contained in hadron i . Example: $\Lambda(uds)$ is described with $(q = u, d)$: $\Upsilon_{\Lambda(uds)} = \gamma_q^2 \gamma_s \lambda_q^2 \lambda_s$ and for the antilambda holds $\Upsilon_{\bar{\Lambda}(\bar{u}\bar{d}\bar{s})} = \gamma_q^2 \gamma_s \lambda_q^{-2} \lambda_s^{-1}$
- As noted above strangeness, (and charm) has similar fugacity factors as light quarks $q = u, d$ with flavor indicated by lower index.

The questions and topic we address in the following are:

1. Does the SHM describe particle production at LHC, see Fig. 3?
2. How does the QGP fireball hadronize?
3. What is same and what different comparing to RHIC
4. Universality across all collision energies: SPS, RHIC, LHC




Figure 3: Comparison of LHC-ALICE Collaboration results with the SHM: for both central (left panel) and peripheral (right panel) Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV.

2 SHM description of LHC results

We test the SHM by applying it to the LHC data of the ALICE Collaboration obtained in the Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV where the hadron yields span 5 orders of magnitude from central to peripheral collisions. The fit works perfectly, see Fig. 3, in the entire range of centralities.

The salient element that makes the SHM work producing continuous and consistent results for the entropy content of the fireball is the allowance for chemical nonequilibrium of light quarks $\gamma_q \simeq 1.6$, an approach motivated by the fast hadronization hypothesis. The preference for this nonequilibrium value is seen for all centralities in Fig. 4 showing the profile of χ^2 as a function of γ_q .




Figure 4: The dependence of the χ^2 for the fit on the flavor yield factor justifies the choice of $\gamma_q = 1.6$ for best fit, see Ref. [7].

In Fig. 5 we see the centrality dependence of some of the particle yield ratios which play an important role in recognizing the chemical properties of the hadron source. Only with chemical nonequilibrium of light quarks, $\gamma_q = 1.6$, we can describe all LHC data. No other approach works; the so-called “afterburners” which can fix one particle yield, ruin the centrality systematics of other particles.




Figure 5: Comparison of selected ratios in the ALICE experiment (full symbols) to the nonequilibrium SHM (open symbols) for the Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV, see Ref. [7].

3 SHM description of RHIC-62

Seen the success of our approach at LHC, we turn now to the question, does the SHM approach also describe particle production at RHIC? Clearly this question is a very large one and we focus here on one of the collision energies that we were able to look at comprehensively. This is the case of Au-Au results obtained at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 62$ GeV. As the energy is lower, one expects that more peripheral collisions are less likely to reach a thermally equilibrated QGP stage. Thus another question arises: For how small a system is the hadronization at RHIC of same universal character we see it at LHC?




Figure 6: The SHM analysis with SHARE (blue lines) of hadron yields from Au-Au collisions at RHIC for $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 62$ GeV (red symbols with error bars) results in a fit of freeze-out parameters $T = 140$ MeV and $\mu_B = 62.8$ MeV.

We performed the analysis with SHARE for Au-Au collisions at RHIC $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 62$ GeV and have compared the results for the fireball properties with the LHC fits. The results are shown in Fig. 6, where an excellent fit ($\chi^2 = 0.38$) of STAR data [8, 9] is obtained with the model parameters: $T = 140$ MeV, $dV/dy = 850$ fm³, $\gamma_q = 1.6$, $\gamma_s = 2.2$, $\lambda_q = 1.16$, $\lambda_s = 1.05$ corresponding to $\mu_B = 62.8$ MeV [10].

Having demonstrated that SHARE works very well in explaining hadron yields over the whole energy range between RHIC and LHC, we are well equipped for a discussion of similarities and differences. We are particularly interested in strangeness as a signature of the QGP.

4 Synthesis: LHC+RHIC+SPS

The topic of a unified description of hadron production from SPS to RHIC, to LHC is discussed in Refs. [12, 13, 14]. For the physical properties of the fireball at freeze-out we find the energy density $\varepsilon = 0.5$ GeV/fm³, the pressure of $P = 82$ MeV/fm³ and the entropy density of $\sigma = 3.3$ fm⁻³.

In Fig. 7 we show freeze-out bulk properties (pressure, entropy density and energy density) as a function of collision centrality at LHC and in Fig. 8 the same for most central collisions as function of energy. These results demonstrates universality of freeze-out [11], i.e., independence of collision energy and centrality.




Figure 7: Thermodynamic properties (pressure P , entropy density σ and energy density ε) at freeze-out are universal [11], nearly independent of collision energy and centrality.

In Fig. 9 we highlight the differences we found between LHC and RHIC that arise in the SHM interpretation of the particle yields. The centrality dependence of the total entropy (left panel) shows at LHC a steeper than linear behavior and an additional centrality dependent entropy production. The strangeness per entropy (right panel) shows a steeper increase at low N_{part} and a quick saturation at a steady level for $N_{part} > 100$.

In Fig. 10 we show the expected theoretical strangeness per entropy ratio [15] for both QGP and hadron phases of matter, the hadron result was obtained for equilibrated HG using SHARE program.




Figure 8: Fireball bulk properties at freeze-out across the energies from SPS to RHIC, to LHC.




Figure 9: The LHC-RHIC difference as a function of centrality: total entropy (left) and strangeness production per entropy s/S (right), from Ref. [7].

This theoretical result can be compared with the right panel in Fig. 9. We see that the experimental yields which emerged from our analysis are in the QGP domain for all LHC centralities.

In Fig. 11 it is shown [14] that the peak in the beam energy dependence of the K^+/π^+ ratio (“Marek’s horn”) is tracked well as a function of energy with the nonequilibrium SHM fit provided by SHARE.

The beam energy dependence of the SHM parameters are shown in Fig. 12, while




Figure 10: Strangeness per entropy as a function of temperature in the hadron resonance gas and in the QGP.




Figure 11: The energy dependence of the K^+/π^+ ratio (“Marek’s horn”) is tracked perfectly with SHARE. Dotted line shows that not all models are able to agree with data.

In Fig. 13 we show a comparison of freeze-out parameters for different models with the pseudo-critical temperature from Lattice QCD [16]. For consistency reasons, the observed chemical freeze-out MUST be in the hadron resonance domain, i.e. below the lattice results for the pseudo-critical temperature of the chiral/deconfinement crossover transition. Clearly the recent lattice results rule out most hadronization models. We observe that since 1998 [17] we have proposed and defended a view of hadronization that produces results fully consistent with present day lattice results.

5 Conclusions

Our exploration of phases of QCD matter relies on a precise method of hadron abundance analysis within the SHARE statistical hadronization model. Bulk properties of the QGP fireball are derived from physical properties of emitted hadronic particles. Hadronization of a relatively small and rapidly




Figure 12: Comparison of SHM parameters across the energies from SPS to RHIC, to LHC.

expanding drop of QGP considered in this work is not to be confounded with the lattice-QCD derived properties of infinite in size deconfined matter filling the early Universe.

This study does not tell how a common QCD phase - the QGP state - was created at LHC, RHIC, *and* SPS, and how it evolves to hadronization. These paths could differ. However, we observe in the final state the same physical conditions of the fireball particle source - with varying hadronization volume V or equivalently, total entropy content S and strangeness s . In most central (head-on) high energy LHC collisions we observe relatively constant ratio s/S indicating a QGP fireball near to full thermal equilibrium condition.

Given universal hadronization conditions that we have obtained we believe that when the QGP hadronizes it evaporates into free-streaming hadrons. Our analysis works without an interacting ‘phase’ of hadrons. This is so since the use of light quark in QGP abundance, thus light quark overabundance among hadrons regulates just in correct way the observed hadron yields. This favors very good data fit since requilibration reactions following hadronization diminish agreement with production yields of multi-strange baryon and antibaryon.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the contributions by Inga Kuznetsova, Jean Letessier, Vojtech Petracek, and Giorgio Torrieri to the models and results presented here. Jan Rafelski acknowledges a long term collaboration with Ludwik Turko to whom this work is dedicated, see Fig. 14.




Figure 13: Comparison of freeze-out parameters for different models with the pseudo-critical temperature from Lattice QCD [16]. Figure from Ref. [7].



Figure 14: Ludwik and Jan at the MB32 Symposium

References

- [1] E. Fermi, *High-energy nuclear events*. Prog. Theor. Phys. (1950) **5**, 570.
- [2] G. Torrieri, S. Steinke, W. Broniowski, W. Florkowski, J. Letessier and J. Rafelski, *SHARE: Statistical hadronization with resonances*. Comput. Phys. Commun. (2005) **167**, 229.
- [3] G. Torrieri, S. Jeon, J. Letessier and J. Rafelski, *SHAREv2: Fluctuations and a comprehensive treatment of decay feed-down*. Comput. Phys. Commun. (2006) **175**, 635.
- [4] M. Petran, J. Letessier, J. Rafelski and G. Torrieri, *SHARE with CHARM*. Comput. Phys. Commun. (2014) **185**, 2056.
- [5] J. Beringer *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], *Review of Particle Physics (RPP)*. Phys. Rev. D (2012) **86**, 010001.
- [6] P. Koch, B. Müller and J. Rafelski, *Strangeness in Relativistic Heavy Ion Collisions*. Phys. Rept. (1986) **142**, 167.
- [7] M. Petráň, J. Letessier, V. Petráček and J. Rafelski, *Hadron production and quark-gluon plasma hadronization in Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV*. Phys. Rev. C (2013) **88**, 034907.
- [8] B. I. Abelev *et al.* [STAR Collaboration], *Systematic Measurements of Identified Particle Spectra in pp, d⁺ Au and Au+Au Collisions from STAR*. Phys. Rev. C (2009) **79**, 034909.
- [9] B. I. Abelev *et al.* [STAR Collaboration], *Measurements of phi meson production in relativistic heavy-ion collisions at RHIC*. Phys. Rev. C (2009) **79**, 064903.
- [10] M. Petran, J. Letessier, V. Petracek and J. Rafelski, *Strangeness Production in Au-Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 62.4$ GeV*. Acta Phys. Polon. Supp. (2012) **5**, 255.
- [11] M. Petran and J. Rafelski, *Universal hadronization condition in heavy ion collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 62$ GeV and at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV*. Phys. Rev. C (2013) **88**, no. 2, 021901.
- [12] J. Rafelski and M. Petran, *Strangeness in QGP: Hadronization Pressure*. Acta Phys. Polon. Supp. (2014) **7**, 35.
- [13] J. Rafelski and J. Letessier, *Critical Hadronization Pressure*. J. Phys. G (2009) **36**, 064017.
- [14] J. Rafelski and J. Letessier, *Particle Production and Deconfinement Threshold*. PoS CONFINEMENT (2008) **8**, 111.
- [15] I. Kuznetsova and J. Rafelski, *Heavy flavor hadrons in statistical hadronization of strangeness-rich QGP*. Eur. Phys. J. C (2007) **51**, 113-133.
- [16] A. Bazavov, T. Bhattacharya, M. Cheng, C. DeTar, H. T. Ding, S. Gottlieb, R. Gupta and P. Hegde, U.M. Heller, F. Karsch, E. Laermann, L. Levkova, S. Mukherjee, P. Petreczky, C. Schmidt, R.A. Soltz, W. Soeldner, R. Sugar, D. Toussaint, W. Unger, P. Vranas, *The chiral and deconfinement aspects of the QCD transition*. Phys. Rev. D (2012) **85**, 054503.
- [17] J. Letessier and J. Rafelski, *Chemical nonequilibrium and deconfinement in 200-A/GeV sulphur induced reactions*. Phys. Rev. C (1999) **59**, 947