

Conformal Holography of Bulk Elliptic Flow and Heavy Quark Quenching in Relativistic Heavy Ion Collisions

Jorge Noronha¹, Miklos Gyulassy¹, and Giorgio Torrieri²

¹*Department of Physics, Columbia University, 538 West 120th Street, New York, NY 10027, USA*

²*Frankfurt Institute for Advanced Studies, Frankfurt am Main, Germany*

(Dated: November 3, 2018)

We show that the “perfect fluid” elliptic flow of the bulk hadrons and the unexpectedly strong quenching of heavy quark jet fragments in Au+Au reactions at 200 AGeV can be simultaneously accounted for within leading order AdS/CFT holography with a common large t’Hooft coupling $\lambda = g_{YM}^2 N_c \sim 30$. In contrast, weakly coupled quark-gluon plasma models have so far failed to describe the observed correlation between these soft and hard observables even for couplings extrapolated to $\alpha_s \sim 0.5$. We show that phenomenological applications of the classical trailing string AdS/CFT holographic solution are furthermore remarkably robust to higher order curvature corrections $\mathcal{O}(1/\lambda^{3/2})$ in type IIB supergravity theories, as well as to worldsheet fluctuation corrections $\mathcal{O}(1/\lambda^{1/2})$ that were not considered previously. We emphasize the importance of future measurements at RHIC and LHC of the correlation between *identified* charm and beauty quark hard ($p_T > 10 - 30$ GeV) jet quenching observables and low transverse momenta ($p_T \leq 1$ GeV) bulk elliptic flow observables to further tests the limits of applicability of conformal holography to strongly coupled quark-gluon plasma.

PACS numbers: 25.75.-q, 11.25.Tq, 13.87.-a

I. INTRODUCTION

Two of the most remarkable experimental discoveries at the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC) are the observations of a factor five quenching of (high transverse momentum or high quark mass) jets and the nearly “perfect fluid” elliptic flow of low transverse momentum hadrons [1]. These observations and bulk multiplicity production systematics have been interpreted as providing evidence for the formation of two new forms of QCD matter 1) a locally equilibrated strongly-coupled Quark-Gluon Plasma (sQGP) and 2) its non-Abelian classical Color Glass Condensate (CGC) initial nuclear field source [2, 3].

However, it has been a challenge to find a single consistent theoretical framework to explain simultaneously both soft (long wavelength) and hard (short wavelength) properties of the sQGP phenomena. Attempts to explain bulk collective flow [4–6] based on perturbative QCD parton transport approaches [7–10], require large coupling extrapolations $\alpha_s = g_{YM}^2/4\pi \rightarrow 0.6$, which on the other hand overestimate of the opacity of the sQGP to high transverse momentum jets. At moderate coupling $\alpha_s \sim 0.4$ the observed opacity for light quark jets can be well accounted for but at the expense of too high viscosity and underestimating the elliptic flow. The heavy quark jet quenching data pose an especially difficult challenge for perturbative QCD energy loss models [11].

For large values of the QCD coupling, the t’Hooft parameter $\lambda = g_{QCD}^2 N_c > 20$ (with $N_c = 3$) may already be large enough to validate string theory inspired classical AdS/CFT holographic models [12, 13] of the sQGP. In this approximation, the viscosity to entropy ratio is naturally small [14] and close to its lower unitarity bound [7, 14]. Classical strings in the AdS background further-

more provide a dual holographic model of heavy quark drag with $dE/dx \propto \sqrt{\lambda} ET^2/M_Q$ that can easily account for the high opacity of the sQGP to heavy quark jets [15]. The key question that we address in this paper is whether there exists a single value of λ that could account for both the bulk elliptic flow as well as the strong heavy quark quenching simultaneously. We test at the same time the consistency of the CGC initial field source geometry out of which the sQGP forms. Our conclusion is that conformal holography can indeed account for the observed hard/soft correlation data with the CGC initial geometry with $\lambda \sim 30$ while classical Glauber initial geometry is not consistent within present experimental errors. We emphasize the importance of testing future identified charm and bottom jet quenching data systematics and their correlation with soft bulk flow observables.

II. STRONGLY-COUPLED $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SUPERSYMMETRIC YANG-MILLS AND HOLOGRAPHY

The planar limit of strongly-coupled $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Supersymmetric Yang-Mills (SYM) theory provides a powerful phenomenological model of the sQGP at zero baryonic chemical potential in the temperature range where the trace anomaly is small. Soft collective flow phenomena are controlled by the system’s entropy density, $s(T)$, and shear viscosity, $\eta(T)$. In this conformal $c_s^2 = d \ln T / d \ln s = 1/3$ theory, the bulk viscosity vanishes and the dimensionless ratio η/s is independent of temperature. While conformal invariance is broken in real world QCD, the conformal symmetry of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM played an important role in the conjectured classical supergravity dual description [12] of this CFT on a $\text{AdS}_5 \times S_5$ curved spacetime. In

the N_c , $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ limits, the compactification of a 10d type IIB string theory on a 5d sphere of radius L leads to a 5d Einstein action with a negative cosmological constant

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{1}{16\pi G_5} \int d^5x \sqrt{-G} \left(\mathcal{R} + \frac{12}{L^2} + \dots \right), \quad (1)$$

The effective 5d gravitational coupling is taken as $G_5 \sim 1/N_c^2 \ll 1$, and the AdS_5 metric $G_{\mu\nu}$ is found to be a stationary solution with curvature $\mathcal{R} = -12/L^2$. The t'Hooft coupling in the gauge theory is identified with L^2/α' , where $\sqrt{\alpha'} = \ell_s$ is the fundamental 10d string length. The α' expansion in the gravity dual description is mapped into a series in $1/\sqrt{\lambda}$ in the gauge theory [13]. The extra \dots terms in Eq. (1) correspond to the corrections to the leading order supergravity action that appear when L^2/α' and/or N_c are large but finite [13]. The leading “stringy” corrections to type IIB string theory were found to come from terms $\sim \alpha'^3 \mathcal{R}^4$ to the tree level effective action [13] and they induce contributions of order $1/\lambda^{3/2}$ to the quantities mentioned above [13, 16, 17].

Breaking of supersymmetry on the gauge theory side can lead in the gravity dual description to lower order quadratic or cubic curvature corrections. A class of Gauss-Bonnet generalizations of the effective 5d Einstein action was considered in [18–20]. These corrections are characterized by a second assumed small dimensionless parameter, $\lambda_{GB} \sim 1/N_c$, which is related to the central charges c and a that characterize the conformal anomaly in curved spacetime of the dual CFT as noted in Eq. (2.14) of Ref. [18]. Varying λ_{GB} provides a parametric way to explore small deformations of the original $\mathcal{N} = 4$ $SU(N_c)$ SYM theory. Interest in possible Gauss-Bonnet deformations of conformal holography arose when Kats and Petrov [20] found that for $\mathcal{N} = 2$ $Sp(N_c)$ SYM, $\lambda_{GB} = 1/8N_c$, and the KSS viscosity bound [14], $\eta/s \geq 1/4\pi$, could be violated by 17% for $N_c = 3$, in such models. Ref. [18] further showed that a large class of other effective CFTs lead to similar $\lambda_{GB} \propto 1/N_c$ effects. In Refs. [19, 21] it was found however that causality and positive energy flow limit deformations to a narrow parametric range $-7/36 < \lambda_{GB} < 9/100$. We find below that RHIC hard/soft correlation observables are in fact compatible with $\lambda_{GB} = 0$.

Conformal holography refers to the predicted temperature independence of s/s_{SB} , the entropy density of a very strongly coupled SYM compared to its ideal Stefan Boltzmann limit, and also of the viscosity to entropy density ratio. The heavy quark jet relaxation rate, $1/\tau_Q$, is controlled by $\mu_Q = \sqrt{\lambda} \pi T^2 / 2M_Q$ for a heavy quark with mass M_Q in a plasma of temperature T [15, 22]. The relaxation time is related to the heavy quark energy loss per unit length through $\tau_Q(\lambda) = -1/(d \log p/dt) = -1/(d \log E/dx)$, where $p = M_Q \gamma v$ and $v = p/E$.

Our analysis is based on the following remarkably simple algebraic expressions relating three fundamental properties of large N_c , $\mathcal{N} = 4$ conformal SYM plasmas

at large t'Hooft coupling λ :

$$\frac{s}{s_{SB}} = \frac{3}{4} \left(1 + \frac{c_3}{8\lambda^{3/2}} \right), \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{\eta}{s} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \left(1 + \frac{c_3}{\lambda^{3/2}} \right), \quad (3)$$

$$\tau_Q^{-1} = \mu_Q \left(1 + \frac{\kappa_1}{\lambda^{1/2}} + \frac{c_3}{16\lambda^{3/2}} \right) \quad (4)$$

where $c_3 = 15\zeta(3) \approx 18$, $\kappa_1 \sim -1$ is a new worldsheet fluctuation correction amplitude discussed below. The $\lambda^{-3/2}$ correction to the entropy density ratio in Eq. (2) was found in [13] while the analogous correction to η/s was obtained from [17]. The finite t'Hooft coupling correction to the heavy quark energy loss, $c_3 \lambda^{3/2}/16$, is a new result reported here (see the derivation below) and it is needed for a consistent application of the strongly-coupled $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM model to heavy ion reactions, as will be argued below.

III. HEAVY QUARK JETS IN $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM AT LARGE (BUT FINITE) T'HOOFT COUPLING

The hard observable we consider here is heavy quark energy loss. An object of mass M_Q in the fundamental representation of $SU(N_c)$ added to SYM is described holographically using a $D7$ brane [23] that ends at a radial direction $u_m \sim M_Q$ away from the black brane horizon $u_h \sim T$. A heavy quark moving with constant velocity v is then described in terms of a curved string in the radial direction which has the upper end attached to the bottom of a $D7$ brane while the lower end remains attached to the black brane [15, 22]. When $N_c \rightarrow \infty$ and $\lambda \gg 1$ (but finite) the string dynamics is embedded in a black brane curved background spacetime of the type

$$ds^2 = G_{00}(u) dt^2 + G_{xx}(u) d\vec{x}^2 + G_{uu}(u) du^2 \quad (5)$$

where

$$G_{00}(u) = -\frac{u^2}{L^2} \left(1 - \frac{u_h^4}{u^4} \right) (1 + O(\alpha'^3)) \quad (6)$$

$$G_{uu}(u) = \frac{L^2}{u^2} \left(1 - \frac{u_h^4}{u^4} \right)^{-1} (1 + O(\alpha'^3)) \quad (7)$$

and $G_{xx} = u^2/L^2 (1 + O(\alpha'^3))$ (the finite α' corrections to the metric we use can be explicitly found in [13]).

The classical Nambu-Goto string action (with dilaton omitted) is

$$\mathcal{A}_{NG} = -\frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'} \int d^2\sigma \sqrt{-g} \quad (8)$$

where

$$g = \det g_{ab} = G_{\mu\nu} \partial_a X^\mu \partial_b X^\nu \quad (9)$$

is the induced worldsheet metric, $\sigma^a = (\tau, \sigma)$ are the internal worldsheet coordinates, $G_{\mu\nu}(X)$ is the background

metric, and $X^\mu = X^\mu(\tau, \sigma)$ is the embedding of the string in spacetime. By restricting the analysis to the classical string the energy loss always becomes proportional to $\sqrt{\lambda}$ at leading order because of the string tension $1/(2\pi\alpha')$ in the NG action.

The trailing string ansatz (where $\tau = t$, $\sigma = u$ and $X^\mu(t, u) = (t, x_0 + vt + \xi(u), 0, 0, u)$) is assumed to describe the asymptotic behavior of a string whose endpoint (“the heavy quark”) moves with velocity v in the x direction and located at a fixed AdS radial coordinate near the boundary $u_m \gg u_h$ [15, 22]. The black brane horizon coordinate $u_h \propto T\alpha'$ is determined by $G_{00}(u_h) = 0$. Using the ansatz above and the string’s classical equations of motion, it can be shown [15] that the drag force $dp/dt = -Cv/(2\pi\alpha')$, where C is a constant determined by the negativity condition that

$$g(u) = G_{uu} (G_{00} + v^2 G_{xx}) \left(1 + \frac{C^2 v^2}{G_{00} G_{xx}} \right)^{-1} < 0 \quad (10)$$

for $u_h \leq u \leq u_m$. However, both the numerator and denominator in Eq. (10) change their sign simultaneously at a certain u^* [15] given by the root of the equation $G_{00}(u^*) + v^2 G_{xx}(u^*) = 0$. This fixes $C = G_{xx}(u^*)$ and $dp/dt = -v G_{xx}(u^*)/(2\pi\alpha')$. Neglecting higher-order derivative corrections in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM one finds $u^* = u_h \sqrt{\gamma}$, where $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1-v^2}$. The condition that $u^* \leq u_m$ leads to a maximum “speed limit” for the heavy quark jet to be consistent with this trailing string ansatz given by $\gamma_{\max} \leq u_m^2/u_h^2$ [24].

Using the metric derived in [13] to $\mathcal{O}(\alpha'^3)$ and the classical NG action, one can compute the effects of quartic corrections on the classical drag force and determine u^* perturbatively to $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3/2})$ as $u^* = u_h \sqrt{\gamma} \left[1 + \frac{15}{32} \frac{\zeta(3)}{\lambda^{3/2}} v^2 \left(5 + \frac{5}{\gamma^2} - \frac{3}{\gamma^4} \right) \right]$ and the drag force

$$\frac{dp}{dt} = -\sqrt{\lambda} T^2 \frac{\pi}{2} v \gamma \left[1 + \frac{15}{16} \frac{\zeta(3)}{\lambda^{3/2}} \left(1 - \frac{197}{24\gamma^4} + \frac{67}{24\gamma^6} \right) \right]. \quad (11)$$

The analytical result for the classical heavy quark drag force at large (but finite) t’Hooft coupling in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM computed above is one of the main results of this paper. The heavy quark mass at $T = 0$ is $M_Q = u_m/(2\pi\alpha')$ and, to leading order in $1/\lambda$, $u_m^2/u_h^2 \simeq \frac{4M_Q^2}{\lambda T^2}$. Thus, the corrected u^* displayed above defines a new speed limit $\gamma_m \simeq \frac{4M_Q^2}{\lambda T^2} \left[1 - \frac{5}{16} \left(\frac{4\pi\eta}{s} - 1 \right) \right]$, after neglecting terms of $\mathcal{O}(1/\gamma, 1/N_c)$. Note that γ_m and dp/dt decrease with increasing η/s .

The drag force experienced by a heavy quark in the strongly-coupled $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM plasma can also receive finite λ corrections from quantum fluctuations of the string worldsheet, as it will be discussed below.

A. Finite t’Hooft coupling corrections to heavy quark energy loss

While the large amount of supersymmetries in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM excludes the corrections to η/s due to \mathcal{R}^2 and \mathcal{R}^3 -like terms in its 10d gravity dual action [13], this is not the case for observables such as the string drag or the effective heavy quark potential [25–27]. There are no known reasons to exclude terms in the α' expansion of the 2d world sheet theory. Physically, these corrections correspond to fluctuations of the string worldsheet around its minimum area. For instance, the α' corrections just from the worldsheet string loops defined on top of a supergravity background (where the gravity dual’s action contain only quadratic terms in the spacetime derivatives) would contribute to the energy loss E of a heavy quark in the medium as follows

$$\frac{d \ln E}{d \hat{x}} = -\frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{2} \frac{T}{M_Q} v \left(1 + \frac{\kappa_1(v)}{\sqrt{\lambda}} + \frac{\kappa_2(v)}{\lambda} + \frac{\kappa_3(v)}{\lambda^{3/2}} + \frac{\kappa_4(v)}{\lambda^2} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-5/2}) \right) \quad (12)$$

where $\hat{x} \equiv (\pi T)x$ is a dimensionless quantity, $E \equiv M_Q \gamma$, and κ_i with $i = 1, \dots, 4$ denote the contribution from i -th string loop corrections. The first term outside the parenthesis is the standard result obtained before in the $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ limit [15, 22]. For physical quark masses the classical string description is only applicable when $\frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{2} \frac{T}{M_Q} < 1$, which indicates that λ cannot indeed be taken to be infinitely large. In a critical string theory such as type IIB, the loop coefficients are expected to be finite and, in general, v dependent. The 1-loop coefficient of the correction to the heavy quark potential in the vacuum (which gives a term analogous to the $\kappa_1/\sqrt{\lambda}$ above) was recently found numerically to be ~ -1.33 [27].

As shown in Eq. (11), the α'^3 correction to the background studied in [13] affects the energy loss. This contribution can be taken into account independently of the worldsheet fluctuations at least to lowest order. The ultrarelativistic limit of Eq. (11) is

$$\frac{d \ln E}{d \hat{x}} = -\frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{2} \frac{T}{M_Q} \left[1 + \frac{15}{16} \frac{\zeta(3)}{\lambda^{3/2}} \right]. \quad (13)$$

This is the new term that was included in Eq. (4). Note that with this type of correction suggests that the magnitude of the energy loss becomes larger than the value obtained at infinite coupling as λ decreases (or η/s increases), which is certainly counterintuitive and most likely unphysical. This poses no harm if after the string loop corrections in Eq. (12) are included the correct physical behavior (i.e., smaller coupling means smaller energy loss) is recovered. This implies that worldsheet fluctuations must be taken into account in the study of finite λ corrections to the energy loss in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM.

If one includes both the string loop corrections and the bulk-induced new term one obtains (assuming that the $v \rightarrow 1$ limit of the loop corrections is well defined)

$$\frac{d \ln E}{d \hat{x}} = -\frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{2} \frac{T}{M_Q} \left[1 + \frac{\kappa_1(1)}{\sqrt{\lambda}} + \frac{\kappa_2(1)}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{\lambda^{3/2}} \right. \\ \left. \left(\frac{15}{16} \zeta(3) + \kappa_3(1) \right) + \frac{\kappa_4(1)}{\lambda^2} + \dots \right] \quad (14)$$

A comparison between Eqs. (2), (3), and (14) shows that the heavy quark energy loss can be in principle much more sensitive to finite λ corrections than the bulk quantities. This is also true, for instance, for heavy quark bound states described within AdS/CFT [28]. On the other hand, bulk quantities such as η/s are finite at any (large) value of the coupling.

For our applications, we consider the range $\lambda \sim 5 - 30$ and $N_c = 3$. Also, we neglect other formally higher order corrections [17] $\sim \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\lambda}/N_c^2)$ to the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM entropy density and shear viscosity and set $\kappa_2 = \kappa_3 = \kappa_4 = 0$ in this first attempt to test conformal holography of hard and soft observable correlations in high energy A+A collisions.

IV. CORRELATION BETWEEN THE HEAVY QUARK JET R_{AA} AND BULK ELLIPTIC FLOW

The dependence of soft phenomena on η/s in nearly perfect fluids can be studied using viscous relativistic hydrodynamics [29]. Once v_2 as a function of η/s is known from hydrodynamic simulations, one can use Eq. (3) to obtain its dependence on λ and estimate how much elliptic flow is generated in a strongly-coupled SYM plasma. In order to compute $v_2(p_T, \eta/s)$ for a given centrality interval \mathcal{C} , we employ a linear fit to the numerical results of [29] for both Glauber [30] and CGC initial transverse profiles [31, 32]

$$v_2(p_T, \eta/s, \mathcal{C}) = a(p_T) \epsilon_2(\mathcal{C}) (1 - a_1 \eta/s) \quad (15)$$

where $\epsilon_2(\mathcal{C}) = \langle y^2 - x^2 \rangle_{\mathcal{C}} / \langle x^2 + y^2 \rangle_{\mathcal{C}}$ is the average initial elliptic geometric eccentricity for the centrality class \mathcal{C} . We consider the 20-60% centrality class because, as shown in Fig. 23 of [5], there is good agreement at $p_T \sim 1$ GeV between STAR $v_2(4)$ and PHENIX $v_2(BBC)$ data and non-flow effects [33] are reduced. To rescale the minimum bias results of Ref. [29] to the considered 20-60% centrality class we use the factor $\epsilon_2^{Glaub}(20 - 60\%) / \epsilon_2^{Glaub}(0 - 92\%) = 0.317 / 0.281 = 1.128$ from Ref. [6]. Our fit to the rescaled numerical results of [29] gives $a_1 \approx 2.5$ and $a(p_T = 1) \epsilon_2(20 - 60\%) \approx 0.14$ (0.098) for CGC (Glauber) initial conditions. In this case, the Glauber initial conditions do not generate enough elliptic flow and only the CGC initial conditions can fully describe the elliptic flow data.

The nuclear modification factor of single non-photonic electrons, $R_{AA}^e(p_T)$, obtained from quenched heavy quark jets can be computed at strong coupling [34] by using the generalized energy loss in Eq. (14) to compute the path length dependent heavy quark fractional energy loss ϵ . In

this case $R_{AA} = \langle (1 - \epsilon)^{n_Q} \rangle$, where $n_Q(p_T)$ is the flavor dependent spectral index $n_Q + 1 = -\frac{d}{d \ln p_T} \ln \left(\frac{d\sigma_Q}{dy dp_T} \right)$ obtained from FONLL production cross sections [35]. The path length average of the nuclear modification at impact parameter b is computed using a Woods-Saxon nuclear density profile with Glauber profiles $T_A(\vec{x}_\perp)$ with $\sigma_{NN} = 42$ mb. For 0-10% centrality triggered data both Glauber and CGC geometries lead to similar numerical results for R_{AA} [31]. The distribution of initial hard jet production points at a given \vec{x}_\perp and azimuthal direction ϕ is taken to be proportional to the binary parton collision density, $T_{AA}(\vec{x}_\perp, b)$.

We consider a longitudinally expanding local (participant) parton density $\rho(\vec{x}_\perp, b) = \chi \rho_{part}(\vec{x}_\perp, b) / \tau$, where $\chi \equiv (dN_\pi/dy) / N_{part}$ and ρ_{part} is the Glauber participant nucleon profile density. In our calculations we use a reduced temperature $T_{CFT} = 0.74(S/S_{SB})^{1/3} T_{QCD}$ to take into account the fewer number of degrees of freedom in a strongly-coupled QCD plasma, which is similar to the prescription given in [36]. The heavy quark modification factor is

$$R_{AA}^Q(p_T, b) = \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \int d^2 \vec{x}_\perp \frac{T_{AA}(\vec{x}_\perp, b)}{2\pi N_{bin}(b)} \\ \times \exp \left[-n_Q(p_T) \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_f} \frac{d\tau}{\tau_Q(\vec{x}_\perp + \tau \hat{e}(\phi), \phi)} \right] \quad (16)$$

where N_{bin} is the number of binary collisions and the relaxation time τ_Q is defined in terms of (14).

Here, $\tau_0 = 1$ fm/c is the assumed plasma equilibration time and τ_f is determined from $T(\vec{\ell}, \tau_f) = T_f = 140$ MeV, i.e, the time at which the local temperature falls below a freeze-out temperature taken from [29]. We assume that the non-photonic electron modification factor is $R_{AA}^e(p_T) = 0.6 R_{AA}^{bottom}(p_T^Q) + 0.4 R_{AA}^{charm}(p_T^Q)$, where $p_T^Q = p_T / 0.7$ is an estimate of fragmentation effects [11].

The $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM prediction for the soft v_2 and hard R_{AA}^e correlation, computed to lowest order in the coupling (supergravity limit), is shown in Fig. 1 (horizontal, red line) for $\lambda = 5, \dots, 30$. Only the results obtained with CGC initial conditions are shown. The eccentricity of the Glauber initial geometry models are too low to fit the data. In this case $4\pi\eta/s = 1$ and the energy loss is $\sim \sqrt{\lambda}$ [15, 22]. The agreement between this lowest order calculation and the RHIC data is rather remarkable for large $\lambda \sim 20 - 30$. While finite coupling corrections to η/s only slightly shift v_2 to the left, R_{AA}^e involves an exponential of the energy loss and, thus, one may expect this quantity to display a stronger sensitivity to $1/\lambda^n$ corrections. While most of the coefficients in the expansion (14) are unknown, a useful check of the robustness of the lowest order result can be done by repeating the calculations with the known $1/\lambda^{3/2}$ corrections to η/s in Eq. (3) and approximating Eq. (14) with the 1-loop worldsheet correction coefficient to the heavy quark potential in vacuum $\kappa_1 = -4/3$ found in [27] (with other corrections neglected). This leads to the dashed blue curve in Fig. 1. Note that because $\lambda \sim 30$ is so large even




FIG. 1. (Color online) The observed correlation between the nuclear modification, $R_{AA}^e(p_T = 5.5)$, of 0-10% centrality non-photonuclear electrons from heavy quark jets and the bulk elliptic flow moment $v_2(p_T = 1 \text{ GeV})$ of pions produced in 20-60% semi-central reactions is shown by the orange (grey) ellipse from PHENIX (STAR) measurements of Au+Au 200 AGeV data at RHIC [4, 5, 39, 40]. Curves show predictions based on conformal holography with t'Hooft coupling in the range $5 \leq \lambda \leq 30$ and assuming the initial participant geometry predicted by the KLN Color Glass Model [3, 31, 32] and with total entropy constrained by the measured total pion multiplicity $dN_\pi/dy = 1000$ in central collisions. The horizontal black line corresponds to the lowest order supergravity result with $(\kappa_1 = 0, c_3 = 0)$ in Eqs. (2-4). The green curve is for $(\kappa_1 = 0, c_3 \approx 18)$ including only \mathcal{R}^4 stringy curvature corrections to the \mathcal{R}^1 Einstein action. The dashed blue curve includes, in addition, an estimate for the leading worldsheet fluctuation correction W^1 with $\kappa_1 = -1.33$ (see text). The purple band denotes a range of these observables far from the observed data as computed in pQCD-based transport models [8, 11].

this formally much larger correction is negligible compared to the leading supergravity prediction. We have checked [41] that adding phenomenologically a “perturbative” quadratic Gauss-Bonnet curvature corrections to the Einstein action dual to $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM [18–20] including also its modification of the heavy quark energy loss from [37, 38], following the suggestion made in Ref. [18], does not lead to any significant changes in the results shown in Fig. 1 for the range $|\lambda_{GB}| < 0.09$ allowed by causality and positivity of energy flux. This indicates that possible $1/N_c$ corrections do not alter the conclusions of this paper.

The light purple band near the top right corner of Fig. 1 shows the range of hard/soft correlations that far from the data predicted by pQCD based transport models [8, 11]. Our results suggest that the sQGP discovered at RHIC are remarkably well described at both large and

small wavelengths by an approximate conformal holographic model, while the observed hard/soft correlation severely challenges perturbative QCD approximations.

We conclude by demonstrating that future identified charm and beauty jet quenching data at RHIC and LHC will soon allow much more stringent and sensitive test of holographic QCD phenomenology. The predicted small




FIG. 2. (Color online) The predicted correlation between identified heavy quark jet quenching, R_{AA}^Q , and soft elliptic flow, $v_2(p_T = 1 \text{ GeV})$, based on approximate $R^1 + W^1 + R^4$ conformal holography that includes leading order worldsheet fluctuations and quartic curvature corrections via Eqs. (2-4). The upper red curve corresponds to bottom quark flavor tagged jets while the lower green curve corresponds to charm flavor tagged jets. The blue dashed curve is the nuclear modification of single electrons from b and c jets estimated from $R_{AA}^e \approx 0.6R_{AA}^b + 0.4R_{AA}^c$ with $p_T^e \approx 0.7p_T^Q$, as also shown in Fig. 1.

double ratio $R_{AA}^c/R_{AA}^b \ll 1$ is a robust signature of AdS string drag models as emphasized in [34], which differs significantly from pQCD-based transport models and can be readily tested once flavor tagged jet measurement in A+A reactions become feasible at RHIC and LHC.

An important open theoretical problem is to generalize the above analysis to non-conformal holographic models that take into account the conformal anomaly near $T_c \sim 170 \text{ MeV}$ as predicted by lattice QCD. Furthermore a more consistent and quantitative light quark/gluon jet non-conformal holographic QCD phenomenology will need to be developed to account simultaneously also for the observed nuclear modification high p_T pions from light quark and gluon jets, $R_{AA}^\pi(p_T)$. The holographic string drag model postulated for heavy quarks is inapplicable for light quark jets and may break down already for charm quark jets. This possibility underlines the need for the next generation experiments at RHIC and LHC that can measure simultaneously charm and bottom jet quenching observables as well as pion nuclear modifica-

tion factors and their correlations with the bulk elliptic flow and total entropy production.

We thank A. Dumitru, S. Gubser, W. Horowitz, A. Poszkanzer, B. Cole, R. Lacey, and W. Zajc for useful comments. J.N. and M.G. acknowledge support from US-DOE Nuclear Science Grant No. DE-FG02-93ER40764.

G.T. acknowledges the financial support received from the Helmholtz International Center for FAIR within the framework of the LOEWE program (Landesoffensive zur Entwicklung Wissenschaftlich-Ökonomischer Exzellenz) launched by the State of Hesse.

-
- [1] I. Arsene *et al.* [BRAHMS Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. A **757**, 1 (2005); B. B. Back *et al.*, [PHOBOS Collaboration] Nucl. Phys. A **757**, 28 (2005); J. Adams *et al.* [STAR Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. A **757**, 102 (2005); K. Adcox *et al.* [PHENIX Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. A **757**, 184 (2005).
- [2] M. Gyulassy and L. McLerran, Nucl. Phys. A **750**, 30 (2005); E. V. Shuryak, Nucl. Phys. A **750**, 64 (2005).
- [3] L. D. McLerran and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 2233 (1994). D. Kharzeev, E. Levin and M. Nardi, Phys. Rev. C **71**, 054903 (2005).
- [4] B. I. Abelev *et al.* (STAR Collaboration), Phys. Rev. C **77**, 054901 (2008).
- [5] A. Afanasiev *et al.* [PHENIX Collaboration], arXiv:0905.1070 [nucl-ex].
- [6] K. Adcox *et al.* [PHENIX Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 212301 (2002); D. d’Enterria, private communication.
- [7] P. Danielewicz and M. Gyulassy, Phys. Rev. D **31**, 53 (1985).
- [8] D. Molnar and M. Gyulassy, Nucl. Phys. A **697**, 495 (2002) [Erratum-ibid. A **703**, 893 (2002)].
- [9] A. Majumder, B. Muller and X. N. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 192301 (2007).
- [10] O. Fochler, Z. Xu and C. Greiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 202301 (2009).
- [11] S. Wicks, W. Horowitz, M. Djordjevic and M. Gyulassy, Nucl. Phys. A **784**, 426 (2007), S. Wicks, M. Gyulassy, contributed section in J.Phys.G35:054001,2008, M. Djordjevic, Phys. Rev. C **80**, 064909 (2009), M. Gyulassy, Physics 2, 107 (2009).
- [12] J. M. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 231 (1998); E. Witten, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 253 (1998); S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov and A. M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. B **428**, 105 (1998).
- [13] S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov and A. A. Tseytlin, Nucl. Phys. B **534**, 202 (1998).
- [14] P. K. Kovtun, D. T. Son and A. O. Starinets, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 111601 (2005).
- [15] C. P. Herzog, A. Karch, P. Kovtun, C. Kozcaz and L. G. Yaffe, JHEP **0607**, 013 (2006); S. S. Gubser, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 126005 (2006).
- [16] A. Buchel, J. T. Liu and A. O. Starinets, Nucl. Phys. B **707**, 56 (2005); A. Buchel, Nucl. Phys. B **803**, 166 (2008); A. Buchel, Nucl. Phys. B **803**, 166 (2008).
- [17] R. C. Myers, M. F. Paulos and A. Sinha, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 041901 (2009); A. Buchel, R. C. Myers, M. F. Paulos and A. Sinha, Phys. Lett. B **669**, 364 (2008).
- [18] A. Buchel, R. C. Myers and A. Sinha, JHEP **0903**, 084 (2009).
- [19] M. Brigante, H. Liu, R. C. Myers, S. Shenker and S. Yaida, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 126006 (2008); M. Brigante, H. Liu, R. C. Myers, S. Shenker and S. Yaida, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 191601 (2008).
- [20] Y. Kats and P. Petrov, JHEP **0901**, 044 (2009).
- [21] D. M. Hofman and J. Maldacena, JHEP **0805**, 012 (2008).
- [22] J. Casalderrey-Solana and D. Teaney, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 085012 (2006).
- [23] A. Karch and E. Katz, JHEP **0206**, 043 (2002).
- [24] J. Casalderrey-Solana and D. Teaney, JHEP **0704**, 039 (2007); S. S. Gubser, Nucl. Phys. B **790**, 175 (2008).
- [25] S. Forste, D. Ghoshal and S. Theisen, JHEP **9908**, 013 (1999); N. Drukker, D. J. Gross and A. A. Tseytlin, JHEP **0004**, 021 (2000); S. Naik, Phys. Lett. B **464**, 73 (1999); Y. Kinar, E. Schreiber, J. Sonnenschein and N. Weiss, Nucl. Phys. B **583**, 76 (2000).
- [26] D. f. Hou, J. T. Liu and H. c. Ren, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 046007 (2009).
- [27] S. x. Chu, D. Hou and H. c. Ren, JHEP **0908**, 004 (2009).
- [28] J. Noronha and A. Dumitru, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 014007 (2009).
- [29] M. Luzum and P. Romatschke, Phys. Rev. C **78**, 034915 (2008); Erratum-ibid. **79**, 039903 (E) (2009).
- [30] P. F. Kolb, U. W. Heinz, P. Huovinen, K. J. Eskola, and K. Tuominen, Nucl. Phys. A **696**, 197 (2001).
- [31] A. Adil, H. J. Drescher, A. Dumitru, A. Hayashigaki and Y. Nara, Phys. Rev. C **74**, 044905 (2006).
- [32] A. Dumitru, E. Molnar and Y. Nara, Phys. Rev. C **76**, 024910 (2007).
- [33] A. Poszkanzer, private communication.
- [34] W. A. Horowitz and M. Gyulassy, Phys. Lett. B **666**, 320 (2008).
- [35] M. Cacciari, P. Nason, R. Vogt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 122001 (2005); M. L. Mangano, P. Nason, G. Ridolfi, Nucl. Phys. B **373**, 295 (1992).
- [36] S. S. Gubser, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 126003 (2007)
- [37] J. F. Vazquez-Poritz, arXiv:0803.2890 [hep-th].
- [38] K. B. Fadafan, JHEP **0812**, 051 (2008).
- [39] S. S. Adler *et al.* [PHENIX], Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 032301 (2006); A. Adare *et al.* [PHENIX], Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 172301 (2007).
- [40] B. I. Abelev *et al.* [STAR], Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 192301 (2007).
- [41] J. Noronha, M. Gyulassy and G. Torrieri, “Constraints on AdS/CFT Gravity Dual Models of Heavy Ion Collisions,” arXiv:0906.4099 [hep-ph] (unpublished).