

Valence quark-stopping and gluon junction-stopping scenarios in electron-nucleus collisions at the forthcoming Electron-Ion Collider: Which one is correct?

Ting-Ting Duan^{1,*}, Fu-Hu Liu^{1,†}, Khusniddin K. Olimov^{2,3,‡}

¹*Institute of Theoretical Physics, State Key Laboratory of Quantum Optics and Quantum Optics Devices
& Collaborative Innovation Center of Extreme Optics, Shanxi University, Taiyuan 030006, China*

²*Laboratory of High Energy Physics, Physical-Technical Institute of Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences,
Chingiz Aytmatov Str. 2b, Tashkent 100084, Uzbekistan*

³*Department of Natural Sciences, National University of Science and Technology
MISIS (NUST MISIS), Almalyk Branch, Almalyk 110105, Uzbekistan*

Abstract: In the current literature, two stopping scenarios are being discussed in the context of high-energy collisions: the valence quark scenario and the gluon or baryon junction scenario. In the valence quark-stopping scenario, three valence quarks each contribute one-third of the baryon number within a baryon. Conversely, in the gluon junction-stopping scenario, the gluon junction is responsible for carrying the entire baryon number. At present, there is no consensus regarding which type of stopping scenario is correct. Based on a multi-source thermal model, our investigation indicates that experimental data analyzed in previous studies suggest that the valence quark-stopping scenario is indeed accurate. It is anticipated that this scenario can be further validated through electron-nucleus (eA) collisions at the forthcoming Electron-Ion Collider (EIC).

Keywords: valence quark-stopping scenario; gluon or baryon junction-stopping scenario; multi-source thermal model

PACS Nos.: 12.40.Ee, 13.85.Hd, 25.30.-c, 25.30.Dh

I. INTRODUCTION

High-energy collisions represent a significant area of research in modern physics, allowing for the investigation of bulk properties of multiple particles through various theoretical models and technical methods [1–5]. These bulk properties encompass a range of characteristics including, but not limited to, multiplicity distribution, invariant yield or transverse momentum distribution, rapidity and pseudorapidity distributions, as well as the dependence of anisotropic flow on transverse momentum. The models employed can be categorized into several types such as transport and hydrodynamic models, relativistic and quantum molecular dynamics models, along with thermal and statistical models. To derive numerical results regarding the evolution characteristics of collision systems and the distribution laws governing multiple particles, these related models are often implemented using Monte Carlo methods.

In the theoretical modeling analysis of high-energy collisions, certain nuclear structures—alongside nucleon structures—may play pivotal roles [6–10]. Nuclear structures include factors such as α clusterings within nuclei; non-uniform number densities of nucleons; as well as shapes and orientations associated with deformed nuclei. Nu-

* 202312602001@email.sxu.edu.cn

† Correspondence: fuhuliu@163.com; fuhuliu@sxu.edu.cn

‡ Correspondence: khkolimov@gmail.com; kh.olimov@uzsci.net

cleon structures comprise aspects like types of baryon number carriers; spin and magnetic moments associated with nucleons and their constituents; in addition to current masses and constituent masses attributed to quarks. Notably, different carriers for baryon number may lead to variations in multiplicity distributions alongside transverse momentum distributions [as well as (pseudo)rapidity distributions], due to differing penetrability levels exhibited by projectiles or stopping power experienced by targets.

There exist two potential carriers for baryon number: valence quarks and gluon (or baryon) junction [11–15], although neither has been conclusively verified thus far [17]. Within the standard framework provided by Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD), each valence quark is understood to carry one-third of the total baryon number, which form a structure of triangular configuration, known as the Δ -shaped topology [11]. Each valence quark is positioned at one tip of the triangular topology, with a Wilson line connection established between each pair of valence quarks. An alternative proposal suggests that baryon number may be carried by a non-perturbative configuration of gluon fields, referred to as the gluon or baryon junction. This structure is assumed to be gauge-invariant and located at the center of the Y-shaped topology [12–16]. In this scenario, each valence quark resides at one tip of the Y-shaped topology, and there exists a Wilson line connection between each valence quark and the gluon junction.

In our view, irrespective of whether baryon number is carried by valence quarks and/or gluon junction, it is expected that valence quarks will manifest in the forward and backward rapidity regions due to their strong penetrability when they act as spectators in high-energy collisions involving sea quarks and gluons as participants. This type of collision is characterized as a soft excitation process. Conversely, if valence quarks are participants in high-energy collisions while sea quarks and gluons serve as spectators, they should appear in the central rapidity region owing to their significant stopping power. Such collisions are classified as a hard scattering process. The participant-spectator framework applied here pertains to partons within nucleon-nucleon (NN) collisions—the fundamental interactions underlying nucleus-nucleus (AA) collisions. At the nucleonic level in AA collisions, this participant-spectator picture [19–21] has been extensively utilized for many years [22–27].

In this study we provide a qualitative prediction regarding particle distributions at the forthcoming Electron-Ion Collider (EIC), based on an analysis of both soft and hard components within charged particle distributions framed by a multi-source thermal model [28, 29]. Furthermore we discuss potential carriers of baryon number with optimism that future investigations at the EIC will offer further validation. Finally, we summary this work.

II. SOFT AND HARD COMPONENTS OF CHARGED PARTICLE DISTRIBUTION

The multi-source thermal model [28, 29] is one of the thermal and statistical models. In the model, multiple participant or contributor quarks and gluons can be regarded as the multiple energy sources at the level of parton. In high-energy nuclear collisions, the basic contributors in the nucleus are nucleons. Meanwhile, in the nucleon or other hadrons, the basic contributors are partons. In collisions induced by a lepton, the lepton is also a contributor which is approximately equivalent to a parton.

Each or the i -th contributor energy source contributes a quantity n_i to the multiplicity n_{ch} of charged particles. Let n_i obey an exponential distribution, one has

$$f_{n_i}(n_i) = \frac{1}{\langle n_i \rangle} \exp\left(-\frac{n_i}{\langle n_i \rangle}\right), \quad (1)$$

where $\langle n_i \rangle$ is the average of n_i , which results in the exponential distribution to be normalized to 1. A subscript n_i is used in $f_{n_i}(n_i)$ to distinguish the distribution from others discussed later.

If n_{ch} is contributed by m_j contributors, the distribution of n_{ch} is the fold of m_j exponential distributions. One has n_{ch} distribution to be an Erlang distribution, that is [28]

$$f_{n_{ch},E}(n_{ch}) = \frac{n_{ch}^{m_j-1}}{(m_j-1)!\langle n_{ij} \rangle^{m_j}} \exp\left(-\frac{n_{ch}}{\langle n_{ij} \rangle}\right). \quad (2)$$

Here $\langle n_{i1} \rangle$ is for the first process, i.e., the soft excitation process, while $\langle n_{i2} \rangle$ is for the second process, i.e., the hard scattering process. Usually, $\langle n_{i1} \rangle$ is considered the smaller one in $\langle n_{ij} \rangle$ ($j = 1$ and 2). There is no limitation for the relative size of m_1 and m_2 , though $m_1 \langle n_{i1} \rangle < m_2 \langle n_{i2} \rangle$.

As discussed in our previous work [28], there are few (m_1) contributors (sea quarks, gluons and lepton) involved in the soft excitation process, and another few (m_2) contributors (valence quarks and lepton) involved in the hard scattering process, where the lepton is included in $m_{1,2}$ if it induces the collisions. One has a superposition of two Erlang distributions to be

$$f_{n_{ch},2E}(n_{ch}) = \sum_{j=1,2} \frac{k_j n_{ch}^{m_j-1}}{(m_j-1)! \langle n_{ij} \rangle^{m_j}} \exp\left(-\frac{n_{ch}}{\langle n_{ij} \rangle}\right), \quad (3)$$

where k_1 (k_2) is the contribution fraction of the soft excitation (hard scattering) process and $\sum_{j=1,2} k_j = 1$. The contribution of the first component distributes in a narrow region around the low multiplicity, and the contribution of the second component distributes in a wide region from the low to high multiplicity.

Generally, at least two contributors taking part in the collisions, both the minimum values of m_1 and m_2 are 2. In some cases, $k_1 = 1$, which means that there is no contribution of the second component. If $k_1 < 1$, one has to consider the contribution of the second component. Although the maximum value of m_1 is not limited, this value is comparable to m_2 according to our investigation [28, 29]. The maximum value of m_2 is 6, if all 6 valence quarks in the projectile and target nucleons take part in the collisions, though for which the probability is very low.

The transverse momentum (p_T) distribution of charged particles can be fitted by few functions [30, 31], though the two-component Erlang distribution in the framework of multi-source thermal model [28, 29] can also be used. The transverse momentum p_{ti} distribution, contributed by each contributor, and p_T distribution has the similar expressions with n_i and n_{ch} distributions. One has [29]

$$f_{p_{ti}}(p_{ti}) = \frac{1}{\langle p_{ti} \rangle} \exp\left(-\frac{p_{ti}}{\langle p_{ti} \rangle}\right), \quad (4)$$

$$f_{p_T,E}(p_T) = \frac{p_T^{M_j-1}}{(M_j-1)! \langle p_{tij} \rangle^{M_j}} \exp\left(-\frac{p_T}{\langle p_{tij} \rangle}\right), \quad (5)$$

and

$$f_{p_T,2E}(p_T) = \sum_{j=1,2} \frac{K_j p_T^{M_j-1}}{(M_j-1)! \langle p_{tij} \rangle^{M_j}} \exp\left(-\frac{p_T}{\langle p_{tij} \rangle}\right). \quad (6)$$

In the distributions related to p_T , M_j ($j = 1$ or 2) is the number of contributors in the j -th component (the first or second component), K_1 (K_2) is the contribution fraction of the first (second) component and $\sum_{j=1,2} K_j = 1$, $\langle p_{ti1} \rangle$ ($\langle p_{ti2} \rangle$) is the average contribution of each contributor in the first (second) process, and $\langle p_{ti1} \rangle$ is the smaller one in $\langle p_{tij} \rangle$ ($j = 1$ and 2). Although both n_{ch} and p_T distributions are in the same form, the free parameters in eq. (3) are k_1 , m_j and $\langle n_{ij} \rangle$, while the free parameters in eq. (6) are K_1 , M_j and $\langle p_{tij} \rangle$. The values of k_1 and K_1 (m_j and M_j) in eqs. (3) and (6) may be different due to different data sets.

To see variable shapes of curves from Erlang distribution and its two-component form, our previous work studied the examples with different $\langle n_{i1} \rangle$ ($\langle n_{ch} \rangle$) and m_1 in n_{ch} distribution with both the linear and logarithmic coordinates [28], as well as respective contributions of the first and second components and their superposition in p_T distribution [29]. To avoid unnecessary repetition if specific parameter values are not available, no relevant curves are provided here. From our previous work [28, 29], one can see the abundant results related to Erlang distribution. Indeed, the two-component Erlang distribution is very flexible in the fit to n_{ch} and p_T distributions.

On the rapidity (y) or pseudorapidity (η) distribution of charged particles, the soft excitation process which involved to sea quarks and gluons leads to a wide range from the backward to forward rapidity regions due to the

penetrability of the spectator valence quarks. Correspondingly, the hard scattering process which involved to valence quarks leads to a higher probability in the central rapidity region due to the stopping power of the participant valence quarks. In high-energy collisions at the current accelerators or colliders, baryons have higher probability appearing in the backward and forward regions due to the contribution of leading nucleon effect.

Generally, experimental data measured by international collaborations are a mixture of the soft excitation and hard scattering processes. From the backward rapidity region to the central one, then to the forward one, charged particles distribute in a wider range. In the rest frame of the emission source, particles are assumed to be emitted isotropically. According to the 1+1-dimensional hydrodynamic model firstly proposed by Landau [32], the rapidity distribution of charged particles produced in the emission source with rapidity y_x obeys a Gaussian form [33], given by

$$f_{y,G}(y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_x} \exp\left[-\frac{(y-y_x)^2}{2\sigma_x^2}\right], \quad (7)$$

where σ_x is the distribution width or standard deviation.

Let y_T , y_C and y_P be the rapidities of emission sources located at the backward (target), central and forward (projectile) rapidity regions, respectively. The rapidity distribution measured in final state is the sum of three Gaussian distributions. That is

$$f_{y,3G}(y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{x=T,C,P} \frac{k_x}{\sigma_x} \exp\left[-\frac{(y-y_x)^2}{2\sigma_x^2}\right], \quad (8)$$

where $k_{T,C,P}$ are the contribution fractions of the emission sources with $y_{T,C,P}$, and $\sum_{x=T,C,P} k_x = 1$. The emission source with y_C is contributed by both the soft excitation and hard scattering processes, while the emission sources with $y_{T,P}$ are mainly contributed by the soft excitation process. Due to large σ_x , the contributions of three sources can be overlapped, and at least the contributions of two adjacent sources can be overlapped. As one of the most common distributions, we have applied the superposition of Gaussian distributions in our previous work [34, 35].

III. QUALITATIVE PREDICTION ON PARTICLE DISTRIBUTIONS AT THE EIC

In the above section, a unified formula, the Erlang distribution, is used to describe both the soft and hard components of multiplicity (transverse momentum) distribution of charged particles produced in high-energy collisions. The total result is the superposition of two Erlang distributions in which the smaller (larger) $\langle n_{ij} \rangle$ or $\langle p_{tij} \rangle$ correspond to the contribution of each contributor in the first (second) component. Although the two components correspond to different intensities of collisions, both the contributors are partons (and lepton in electron induced collisions at the EIC if available) which are regarded as the energy sources of particle production. This is a reflection of the similarity, commonality and universality existed in high-energy collisions [36–43].

In the case of considering eA collisions at the EIC, which is in fact electron-nucleon (eN) or electron-proton (ep) and electron-neutron (en) scattering, one expects that m_1 in eq. (3) [M_1 in eq. (6)] will be 2–3 due to the projectile e and 1–2 sea quarks or gluons from the target will be possibly involved in the collisions. As for the hard scattering process, $m_2 = 2$ and $M_2 = 2$ due to the projectile e and one of the target three valence quarks being expected taking part in the collisions. The multiplicity (transverse momentum) distribution of charged particles produced in eA collisions will follow eq. (3) [eq. (6)].

Concretely, in the case of using $m_1 = 3$, $m_2 = 2$, $M_1 = 3$, and $M_2 = 2$, one has the multiplicity and transverse momentum distributions of charged particles produced in eA collisions to be

$$f_{n_{ch},2E}(n_{ch}) = \frac{k_1 n_{ch}^2}{2\langle n_{i1} \rangle^3} \exp\left(-\frac{n_{ch}}{\langle n_{i1} \rangle}\right) + \frac{k_2 n_{ch}}{\langle n_{i2} \rangle^2} \exp\left(-\frac{n_{ch}}{\langle n_{i2} \rangle}\right) \quad (9)$$

and

$$f_{p_T,2E}(p_T) = \frac{K_1 p_T^2}{2 \langle p_{ti1} \rangle^3} \exp\left(-\frac{p_T}{\langle p_{ti1} \rangle}\right) + \frac{K_2 p_T}{\langle p_{ti2} \rangle^2} \exp\left(-\frac{p_T}{\langle p_{ti2} \rangle}\right) \quad (10)$$

respectively. Our previous work demonstrates that the soft component accounts for 60–70% of the yield at TeV energy [29]. It is anticipated that the contribution fraction of the soft component will be even higher at the EIC due to lower energy. Because the specific value of $\langle n_{ij} \rangle$ or $\langle p_{tij} \rangle$ is not yet clear, we could not provide a specific curve here. However, one may refer to our previous work to understand the trend of the curve [28, 29].

The rapidity distribution of charged particles produced in eA collisions can also be described by eq. (8). However, an asymmetric distribution will be observed, in which a small yield appears in the forward rapidity region due to the projectile only including one participant e , and a great yield occurs in the backward rapidity region due to the target containing more participant partons. This results in $k_P < k_T$ in eq. (8). At the same time, the peak position will be shifted to the backward rapidity region. In other words, charged particles from the soft excitation process are mainly distributed in the backward and central rapidity regions, and those from the hard scattering process are mainly distributed in the central rapidity region. Considering the larger average p_T ($\langle p_T \rangle$) of charged particles in the hard scattering process, central rapidity region corresponds to larger $\langle p_T \rangle$ than other rapidity regions, which results in higher temperature of emission source in central rapidity region.

In particular, for the baryons produced in eA collisions, one has $k_P \approx 0$ due to very few yield in the forward rapidity region, eq. (8) is then changed to

$$f_{y,2G}(y) \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{x=T,C} \frac{k_x}{\sigma_x} \exp\left[-\frac{(y-y_x)^2}{2\sigma_x^2}\right]. \quad (11)$$

As it is, baryons from the soft excitation process are mainly distributed in the backward and central rapidity regions, but rarely in the forward rapidity region. Conversely, baryons from the hard scattering process are mainly distributed in the central rapidity region. Considering the larger $\langle p_T \rangle$ of baryons in the hard scattering process, the central rapidity region corresponds to larger $\langle p_T \rangle$ than the backward rapidity region, which also results in higher temperature of emission source in the central rapidity region.

IV. DISCUSSION ON WHAT CARRIES THE BARYON NUMBER

The gluon junction consists of low-momentum gluons that interact with the soft parton field and typically stops in the central rapidity region [17, 18], provided there is no penetrability between the projectile and target during the soft excitation process. However, due to strong penetrability in high-energy collisions, the gluon junction—and subsequently the baryon—may stop in either the backward or forward rapidity regions. Valence quarks carry a significant fraction of baryon momentum, experience shorter interaction times, and are expected to end up in the backward or forward rapidity region [17, 18] if there is no stopping effect during the hard scattering process. Nevertheless, valence quarks generally conclude their trajectories in the central rapidity region owing to substantial stopping power present in high-energy collisions involving these quarks.

As discussed previously, during collisions between a projectile electron e and a target nucleon N within a nucleus A , baryons are distributed across both the backward and central rapidity regions. Notably, very few baryons appear in the forward rapidity region, where there are no leading nucleons originating from the projectile itself. In addition to baryons, other particles can also be produced as a result of eA collisions. Following particle production events, any remaining nucleons may form an excited nucleus that can fragment into various nuclear fragments. In this work, we will not delve further into discussions regarding other particles or nuclear fragments since they do not influence our assessment concerning what carries baryon numbers.

The first component in eq. (9) and eq. (10) describes the eN scattering involving sea quarks, gluons and lepton. This interaction leads to a low-temperature source of baryons due to non-violent collisions occurring during the soft

excitation process [29]. Consequently, the baryons produced in the valence quark-stopping scenario are distributed within the backward and central rapidity regions as a result of the penetrability of (spectator) valence quarks at high energies. If the gluon junction-stopping scenario is valid, the gluon junction will lose energy due to strong stopping power. As a consequence, baryons would only be expected to distribute within the central rapidity region; however, this does not accurately reflect reality. Only under conditions where the valence quark-stopping scenario holds true can we observe baryon distributions in the backward and central rapidity regions owing to the significant penetrability of high-energy valence quarks.

The second component in eq. (9) and eq. (10) pertains to eN scattering that involves valence quarks and lepton. This results in a high-temperature source of baryons arising from violent collisions during the hard scattering process [29]. In this case, baryons are predominantly distributed within the central rapidity region due to the stopping power exerted by (participant) valence quarks in the valence quark-stopping scenario. Should we assume that the spectator gluon junction-stopping scenario is accurate, it would imply that such a junction could penetrate through the collision system leading to baryon distribution in the backward and central rapidity regions; yet, this does not represent an accurate depiction of events. It is only when considering scenarios based on valence quark stopping that one might expect observations indicating that baryons are concentrated within the central rapidity region as a result of robust stopping power from target valence quarks.

Based on the discussions presented above, we emphasize that the multi-source thermal model effectively describes both the soft excitation and hard scattering processes [28, 29], elucidating the characteristics of two-component distributions concerning particle multiplicities, transverse momenta and rapidities. Notably, particles produced via the soft excitation process are found in a wide range from the backward to forward rapidity regions, whereas those generated through the hard scattering process are concentrated in the central rapidity region. Particles resulting from the soft excitation process in eA collisions—located in a wide rapidity range—are associated with a lower temperature of emission source. In contrast, particles produced through the hard scattering process occupy the central rapidity region and correspond to a higher temperature. In general, particles appearing in the central rapidity region correspond to two emission sources: one low temperature and one high temperature; while particles appearing in other rapidity regions correspond to a low-temperature source. This framework establishes a connection between different particle production mechanisms and their respective rapidity distribution regions.

In order to better utilize eA collision experiments at the EIC for testing the carriers of baryon numbers, we summarize several relationships related to baryon production. If valence quarks are indeed the carriers of baryon numbers, the baryons produced through the soft excitation processes will be distributed in both backward and central rapidity regions, which corresponds to a low-temperature source. Conversely, baryons generated by the hard scattering processes will predominantly appear in the central rapidity region, indicative of a high-temperature source. In short, the scenario involving valence quark stopping is expected to yield higher temperatures or larger $\langle p_T \rangle$ values in the central rapidity region. On the other hand, if gluon junctions serve as carriers of baryon numbers, the soft excitation processes will result in baryons being concentrated within the central rapidity region—again corresponding to a low-temperature source. Meanwhile, the hard scattering processes would lead to an increased distribution of baryons across both backward and central rapidity regions, reflecting a high-temperature source. Thus, under this gluon junction-stopping scenario, one would anticipate lower temperatures or smaller $\langle p_T \rangle$ values in the central rapidity region.

In experimental settings, it is possible to measure separately the p_T distributions of baryons within both backward and central rapidity regions. These measurements can subsequently be fitted using the two-component Erlang distribution [see eq. (6) or eq. (10)] to derive $\langle p_T \rangle$, which serves as an alternative metric for temperature comparison. More specifically, experimental data on p_T distributions across different rapidity regions can be analyzed; fitting these data allows us to ascertain how $\langle p_T \rangle$ varies with respect to rapidity. Even without fitting procedures applied directly on raw experimental datasets can yield estimates for $\langle p_T \rangle$. Should it be observed that baryons in the backward rapidity region exhibit smaller $\langle p_T \rangle$ values compared with those found in the central rapidity region, this would support our

hypothesis that valence quarks are indeed carriers of baryon numbers. On the contrary, if $\langle p_T \rangle$ of baryons in the backward rapidity region is larger than that in the central rapidity region, the gluon junction is a carrier of baryon numbers.

After excluding the contribution of leading nucleons, the dependence of baryons and mesons produced in collision systems on rapidity should be similar, as they originate from the same emission source. In other words, the relationship between baryons and common charged particles with respect to rapidity is expected to exhibit similarities. Our previous studies [44–46], along with related research [47], indicate that the temperature of the emission source or $\langle p_T \rangle$ of charged particles generally decreases with increasing $|y|$ in most cases. This observation serves as evidence that valence quarks act as carriers of baryon numbers. Based on our comprehensive analysis, we can preliminarily conclude that valence quarks are indeed carriers of baryon numbers. This conclusion arises naturally from the multi-source thermal model proposed in our earlier work [28, 29], which will be further tested at the EIC in future experiments.

In our view, during experimental investigations of eA collisions at the forthcoming EIC, determining which type of stopping scenario is correct requires only measuring $\langle p_T \rangle$ for charged particles in both backward and central rapidity regions and comparing their magnitudes. If $\langle p_T \rangle$ measured in the central rapidity region exceeds that measured in the backward region, this suggests a valence quark-stopping scenario; conversely, a smaller $\langle p_T \rangle$ observed in the central rapidity region indicates a gluon junction-stopping scenario. If both $\langle p_T \rangle$ values obtained from backward and central rapidity regions fall within uncertainty limits indicating no significant difference between them, an effective judgment cannot be made.

V. SUMMARY

In summary, utilizing the multi-source thermal model, we present an analysis of bulk properties related to multi-particle production in eA collisions at the EIC through statistical distribution laws encompassing two components. The soft excitation process involves few contributors (sea quarks, gluons and lepton), while another set of contributors (valence quarks and lepton) participate in the hard scattering process. For both multiplicity and transverse momentum distributions, results from our multi-source thermal model yield a two-component Erlang distribution; this allows us to ascertain both individual contributions from each contributor as well as their respective quantities involved in the soft excitation and hard scattering processes.

In eA collisions, the soft excitation process characterized by lower temperatures exhibits a Δ -shaped topology, which results in baryons being distributed across the backward and central rapidity regions. Conversely, a Y-shaped topology leads to baryon distribution primarily within the central rapidity region. In contrast, during the hard scattering process associated with higher temperatures in eA collisions, a Δ -shaped topology causes baryons to be concentrated in the central rapidity region, while Y-shaped topology results in their distribution across both backward and central rapidity regions. Consequently, when considering contributions from both soft excitation and hard scattering processes, it is observed that Δ -shaped topology correlates with elevated temperatures in the central rapidity region, whereas Y-shaped topology corresponds to increased temperatures in the backward rapidity region.

The temperature findings derived from previous comprehensive analyses of both soft excitation and hard scattering processes align with predictions for Δ -shaped topology but are inconsistent with those for Y-shaped topology. Previous studies alongside the multi-source thermal model support the valence quark-stopping scenario; this can be further validated at future experiments conducted at the EIC. At these experiments, one may measure $\langle p_T \rangle$ of charged particles within both backward and central rapidity regions. A comparison revealing larger values of $\langle p_T \rangle$ in the central rapidity region relative to those measured in the backward region would lend support to the valence quark-stopping scenario; conversely, smaller values of $\langle p_T \rangle$ observed in the central rapidity region would favor a gluon junction-stopping scenario.

Acknowledgements

The work of Shanxi Group was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12147215 and the Fund for Shanxi “1331 Project” Key Subjects Construction. The work of K.K.O. was supported by the Agency of Innovative Development under the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Innovations of the Republic of Uzbekistan within the fundamental project No. F3-20200929146 on analysis of open data on heavy-ion collisions at RHIC and LHC.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

ORCID iDs

Fu-Hu Liu, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2261-6899>

Khusniddin K. Olimov, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1879-8458>

-
- [1] B. Schenke, C. Shen, P. Tribedy, *Nucl. Phys. A* **2021**, 1005, 121756.
 - [2] Y. C. Feng, F. Q. Wang, *J. Phys. G* **2025**, 52, 013001.
 - [3] A. Rios, A. Polls, A. Ramos, I. Vidaña, *Phys. Rev. C* **2005**, 72, 024316.
 - [4] M. Hegazy, A. Razaat, N. Magdy, W. L. Li, A. Deshpande, A. M. H. Abdelhady, A. Y. Ellithi, *J. Phys. G* **2025**, 52, 015002.
 - [5] J. F. Paquet, *J. Phys. G* **2024**, 51, 103001.
 - [6] K. J. Eskola, V. J. Kolhinen, P. V. Ruuskanen, R. L. Thews, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. E* **2003**, 12, 197–209.
 - [7] X. Zhu, N. Xu, P. Zhuang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2008**, 100, 152301.
 - [8] L. Cunqueiro, J. Dias de Deus, C. Pajares, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **2010**, 65, 423–426.
 - [9] D. E. Kharzeev, J. Liao, S. A. Voloshin, G. Wang, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **2016**, 88, 1–28.
 - [10] E. Basso, V. P. Goncalves, M. Krelina, J. Nemchik, R. Pasechnik, *Phys. Rev. D* **2016**, 93, 094027.
 - [11] J. M. Cornwall, *Phys. Rev. D* **1996**, 54, 6527–6536.
 - [12] X. Artru, *Nucl. Phys. B* **1975**, 85, 442–460.
 - [13] D. Kharzeev, *Phys. Lett. B* **1996**, 378, 238–246.
 - [14] G. C. Rossi, G. Veneziano, *Nucl. Phys. B* **1977**, 123, 507–545.
 - [15] T. T. Takahashi, H. Matsufuru, Y. Nemoto, H. Suganuma, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2001**, 86, 18–21.
 - [16] H. Suganuma, T. T. Takahashi, F. Okiharu, H. Ichie, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **2005**, 756, 123–132.
 - [17] W. D. Lv, Y. Li, Z. Y. Li, R. R. Ma, Z. B. Tang, P. Tribedy, C. Y. Tsang, Z. B. Xu, W. M. Zha, *Chin. Phys. C* **2024**, 48, 044001.
 - [18] N. Magdy, A. Deshpande, R. Lacey, W. L. Li, P. Tribedy, Z. B. Xu, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **2024**, 84, 1326.
 - [19] R. L. Glauber, in: *Lectures in Theoretical Physics* (Eds: W. E. Brittin, L. G. Dunham), Interscience, New York **1959** p. 1.
 - [20] W. Czyż, L. C. Maximon, *Ann. Phys. (New York)* **1969**, 52, 59–121.
 - [21] A. Białas, M. Błeszyński, W. Czyż, *Acta Phys. Pol. B* **1977**, 8, 389–392.
 - [22] M. V. Ricciardi, T. Enqvist, J. Pereira, J. Benlliure, M. Bernas, E. Casarejos, V. Henzl, A. Kelić, J. Taieb, K. H. Schmidt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2003**, 90, 212302.

- [23] L. Shi, P. Danielewicz, R. Lacey, *Phys. Rev. C* **2001**, *64*, 034601.
- [24] T. Gaitanos, H. H. Wolter, C. Fuchs, *Phys. Lett. B* **2000**, *478*, 79–85.
- [25] M. L. Miller, K. Reygers, S. J. Sanders, P. Steinberg, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **2007**, *57*, 205–243.
- [26] V. Vovchenko, D. Anchishkin, L. P. Csernai, *Phys. Rev. C* **2014**, *90*, 044907.
- [27] A. D. Sood, R. K. Puri, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. E* **2006**, *15*, 899–910.
- [28] F. H. Liu, *Nucl. Phys. A* **2008**, *810*, 159–172.
- [29] F. H. Liu, Y. Q. Gao, T. Tian, B. C. Li, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **2014**, *50*, 94.
- [30] J. Cleymans, D. Worku, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **2012**, *48*, 160.
- [31] A. De Falco (for the ALICE Collaboration), *J. Phys. G* **2011**, *38*, 124083.
- [32] L. D. Landau, in: *Collected Papers of L. D. Landau* (Ed: D. Ter-Haarp), Pergamon, Oxford **1965** p. 569.
- [33] P. A. Steinberg, *Nucl. Phys. A* **2005**, *752*, 423–432.
- [34] L. N. Gao, F. H. Liu, *Adv. High Energy Phys.* **2015**, *2015*, 184713.
- [35] L. N. Gao, F. H. Liu, *Adv. High Energy Phys.* **2015**, *2015*, 641906.
- [36] E. K. G. Sarkisyan, A. S. Sakharov, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **2006**, *828*, 35–41.
- [37] E. K. G. Sarkisyan, A. S. Sakharov, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **2010**, *70*, 533–541.
- [38] E. K. G. Sarkisyan, A. N. Mishra, R. Sahoo, A. S. Sakharov, *Phys. Rev. D* **2016**, *93*, 054046.
- [39] A. N. Mishra, R. Sahoo, E. K. G. Sarkisyan, A. S. Sakharov, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **2014**, *74*, 3147.
- [40] E. K. G. Sarkisyan, A. N. Mishra, R. Sahoo, A. S. Sakharov, *Phys. Rev. D* **2016**, *94*, 011501.
- [41] E. K. Sarkisyan-Grinbaum, A. N. Mishra, R. Sahoo, A. S. Sakharov, *EPL* **2019**, *127*, 62001.
- [42] A. N. Mishra, A. Ortiz, G. Paić, *Phys. Rev. C* **2019**, *99*, 034911.
- [43] P. Castorina, A. Iorio, D. Lanteri, H. Satz, M. Spousta, *Phys. Rev. C* **2020**, *101*, 054902.
- [44] Y. H. Chen, F. H. Liu, E. K. Sarkisyan-Grinbaum, *Chin. Phys. C* **2018**, *42*, 104102.
- [45] P. P. Yang, F. H. Liu, K. K. Olimov, *Entropy* **2023**, *25*, 1571.
- [46] P. P. Yang, M. Ajaz, M. Waqas, F. H. Liu, M. K. Suleymanov, *J. Phys. G* **2022**, *49*, 055110.
- [47] M. Waqas, M. Ajaz, A. H. Ismail, A. Tawfik, M. B. Ammar, H. I. Alrebdi, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **2024**, *60*, 123.