


# Relativistic Nucleus-Nucleus Collisions: from the BEVALAC to RHIC

**Reinhard Stock**

University of Frankfurt/Main, Germany

**Abstract.** I briefly describe the initial goals of relativistic nuclear collisions research, focusing on the LBL Bevatron/Bevalac facility in the 1970's. An early concept of high hadronic density fireball formation, and subsequent isentropic decay (preserving information as to the high density stage) led to an outline of physics observables that could determine the nuclear matter equation of state at several times nuclear ground state matter density. With the advent of QCD the goal of locating, and characterizing the hadron-parton deconfinement phase transformation suggested the need for higher  $\sqrt{s}$ , the research thus moving to the BNL AGS and CERN SPS, finally to RHIC at BNL. A set of physics observables is discussed where present data span the entire  $\sqrt{s}$  domain, from Bevalac and SIS at GSI, to top RHIC energy. Referring, selectively, to data concerning bulk hadron production, the overall  $\sqrt{s}$  evolution of directed and radial flow observables, and of pion pair Bose-Einstein correlation are discussed. The hadronization process is studied in the grand canonical statistical model. The resulting hadronization points in the plane  $T$  vs.  $\mu_B$  converge onto the parton-hadron phase boundary predicted by finite  $\mu_B$  lattice QCD, from top SPS to RHIC energy. At lower SPS and top AGS energy a steep strangeness maximum occurs at which the Wroblewski parameter  $\lambda_s \approx 0.6$ ; a possible connection to the QCD critical point is discussed. Finally the unique new RHIC physics is addressed: high  $p_T$  hadron suppression and jet "tomography".



**Figure 1.** The radial density profile of neutron stars reflecting the hadronic EOS and the general QCD phase diagram.

## 1. Introduction: Bevalac Physics

In the early 70's a group of about 30 physicists settled at the LBL Bevatron-Bevalac facility to start exploitation of relativistic nucleus-nucleus collisions at fixed target energies ranging up to 2 GeV per projectile nucleon. This group consisted of scientists from the LBL Nuclear Science Division (both experimental and theoretical) as well as from the Physics and Accelerator Divisions, with significant migration from Germany and Japan. With pioneering theoretical work by the Frankfurt, Livermore and Los Alamos groups [1, 2, 3] the central goal was to create "shock compression" in extended volumes of nuclear matter, promising an avenue to investigate the properties of compressed baryonic or, more generally, hadronic matter - at densities several times the nuclear matter ground state density  $\rho_0$  of 0.15 baryons per  $\text{fm}^3$  or, equivalently, at energy density  $\epsilon_0 \approx 0.14 \text{ GeV per fm}^3$ . Concurrent astrophysics theory [4, 5] had indicated that collective hadronic matter properties (such as compressibility, temperature and entropy density) at densities reaching up to about  $4 \rho_0$  were required to understand type 2 supernova dynamics as well as its remnants: neutron stars. All this information was perceived to be contained in the equation of state (EOS) of high density hadronic matter which relates pressure to hadronic number density and temperature (in short: to the hadronic energy density).

The central role of the hadronic EOS is illustrated by Fig. 1 which shows the radial density profile of a neutron star (of about 1.4 solar mass) from about 1975 astrophysics

theory vintage. Under gravitational compression the hadronic density increases toward the interior sections. Hydrostatic equilibrium demands that, at any radial shell, the gravitational inward pressure of the matter above is balanced by the incompressibility outward pressure exerted by the matter below. As the radial scale parameter is the density in this diagram one needs the nuclear matter pressure vs. density relationship, i.e. the EOS, to solve for stability. The hypothetical density diagram of Fig. 1 suggests, furthermore, that the effective degrees of freedom of hadronic matter (at  $T \approx 0$  characteristic for the neutron star) should change with increasing density, thus affecting the overall pressure to density relationship once various conceivable collective effects (superfluidity, superconductivity, meson condensates) set in. At the limit of cold hadronic matter compression in the far interior, Fig. 1 includes a further potential phase that stemmed from early QCD studies [6]: a deconfined state of quarks, the "quark-gluon" state of strongly interacting matter, obviously featuring a radical change concerning the active degrees of freedom that dominate the overall EOS. In modern terminology it is, thus, the general QCD phase diagram that underlies, as an example, neutron star structure. The former is the subject of relativistic nuclear collision research as we see it today.

### 1.1. Bevalac observables

Backward from the present formulation of research goals we see the Bevalac research period devoted to an initial clarification of physics observables that could elucidate the high density hadronic matter EOS. At the cost of greatly over-simplifying the experimental and intellectual lines of development several crucial steps can be distinguished

The first data on proton, neutron, pion and deuteron production in central Ne + heavy target collisions were understood in the "Fireball-model" [7]. As an adaption of the Hagedorn statistical hadron production model [8] to central nuclear collisions, it stated that the initial longitudinal beam energy gets trapped in the target-projectile geometrical overlap volume which is highly excited and compressed: the participant-spectator model (spectators are the heavy target nucleons not directly hit by the incident, relatively light projectile nucleus, initially  $^{12}\text{C}$ ,  $^{20}\text{Ne}$ ,  $^{36}\text{Ar}$ ) as combined with Hagedorn statistics concerning the fireball decay to asymptotically free hadrons.

The critical question: Does this finally observed hadron gas contain any information relevant to the primordial high energy density fireball; or is any such information lost due to hadronic rescattering plus entropy increase, supposed to occur during the fireball expansion period? Two crucial ideas emerged:

Firstly, Bertsch and Cugnon [9] showed that the hadronic expansion stage is essentially *isentropic* and, thus, in principle information preserving. In particular, an isentropic expansion mode lends itself to a hydrodynamical description [3, 10], which was widely employed later on. And it generates the directly observable radial flow signal (well studied from Bevalac to RHIC) that was proposed by Rasmussen et al. [11]. In isentropic

expansion the configuration space volume increases but the momentum space volume has to shrink commensurably, giving rise to dimensional reduction by developing a radially ordered "blast wave" momentum pattern that reflects the entire expansion history, onward from its initial phase.

Secondly, Mekjian [12] recalled the phenomenology of explosive nucleosynthesis occurring in the first minute of the cosmological "big bang" fireball expansion. The light nuclear species formed in a high temperature environment of initial protons, neutrons and photons stabilizes in a rate equilibrium between strong interaction binding to deuterium, helium etc., and dissociation by high energy photons. Upon expansion and cooling this light cluster population *freezes out* at a critical temperature, travelling onward unaltered by softer collisions as the universe expanded. Analogously, Mekjian predicted that the final population of hadrons becomes stationary *early* in nuclear fireball decay, thus capturing a high energy density stage that freezes-out initially, surviving isentropic rescattering. This early work led to the present method of grand canonical statistical analysis of hadron compositions, revealing the energy density "at birth" of the hadronic phase [13, 14].

Finally, the above indications of isentropic decay were systematically employed in the hydrodynamical model [3, 10] leading to the prediction of collective "bounce-off" flow of nuclear matter: the primordial geometrical distribution of high density matter and, thus, the pressure distribution gives rise to a *directed* expansion in semi-peripheral nucleus-nucleus collisions which are asymmetric in azimuth. This effect was observed with striking clarity by the GSI-LBL Plastic Ball detector [15] which made it possible — by its completely exclusive,  $4\pi$  observation of all emitted hadrons — to pin down the event-by-event direction of the impact vector, then to re-order the emitted hadron transverse momenta with respect to the impact plane. Whereupon the direction of preferred emission (flow) becomes visible.

### 1.2. The Bevalac legacy

What emerged was an overall scheme of large acceptance study that captures a significant fraction of the total hadron production output thus allowing for an event-by-event analysis, coupled to a fixation of the eventwise orientation of the impact vector thus leading to analysis relative to the reaction plane. TPC tracking in large acceptance was improved stepwise, from the LBL EOS TPC in the HISS spectrometer (that later went on to the AGS experiment E895), to the CERN SPS experiments NA49 and NA45, onward to STAR at RHIC and to ALICE at the CERN LHC which is under construction. From Bevalac to LHC the TPC granularity has increased by a factor of about 60, and so has the track multiplicity per central collision event. The size of our experimental collaborations has grown by roughly the same factor, such that a general scaling law arises, not of produced hadrons per participant baryon (which increases, from Bevalac to LHC, by about 60) but of participating scientists per produced hadron (which stays about constant). Pleading for forgivingness in view of such loose observations, I assume

that the LHC ALICE Experiment, with about 800 participating scientists, will be well-prepared to cope with a midrapidity charged particle density of  $dN/dy \leq 4000$ .


I conclude that the Bevalac physics era (1972 - 1984) has endowed our expanding research field with a wealth of physics observables, initially designed for pinning down the equation of state of dense hadronic matter. As research expanded toward elucidating the general QCD phase diagram, and moved onward to higher  $\sqrt{s}$  at the AGS, SPS, and RHIC facilities, two principal lines of investigation, as inherited from early Bevalac research, have remained until today: one tries, firstly, to outline observables that freeze-out at early times thus capturing various relevant high density stages of the dynamical evolution. Secondly, one investigates signals that build up over extended periods of the dynamical evolution. At Bevalac times observables of the first kind were seen in electron-positron pair spectroscopy (by the DLS spectrometer collaboration [16]) which refers to the interpenetration phase, in hadron production ratios that stabilize at the end of the high density phase [12, 13, 14], and by means of two pion HBT interferometry which captures the system at the late times when pions emerge from their last collision. From among the integral signals one studied radial and directed flow plus a first view of what became known later on as elliptical flow [17]. Theory confronted all these observables within the hydrodynamical model [3, 10, 18], and by means of first microscopic transport models such as VUU [19], which included a time dependent mean field. The effort to pin down the nuclear EOS which had, at first, indicated a rather stiff version [20] turned into a certain crisis when it was realized [21] that most of the apparent stiffness stems from high momentum hardening of the effective nucleon-nucleon forces which predominates in high T fireball dynamics but is absent in neutron stars and supernovae. This topic found its conclusion in subsequent studies conducted at the GSI SIS facility: a semi-soft EOS emerged [22].

## 2. Hadronic observables vs. $\sqrt{s}$ : from Bevalac to RHIC

I turn to a brief discussion of a few selected physics observables for which comprehensive data are now available, spanning the entire center of mass energy range from the Bevalac to RHIC, i.e.  $2.6 \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 200$  GeV. By implication these are mostly observables referring to bulk hadron production, and I thus refrain from discussion of the equally important physics offered by "penetrating probes", i.e. dilepton and direct photon spectroscopy.


### 2.1. Elliptic Flow

Heavy projectile collisions offer a high multiplicity of hadrons, produced per event, that enables an event-wise study of the azimuthal hadron emission pattern. By definition any azimuthal emission anisotropy vanishes when the impact parameter  $b$  approaches zero in central collisions, giving rise to approximate cylindrical symmetry and maximal radially symmetric flow. However, at finite  $b$  we encounter the vector orientation of



**Figure 2.** Presently available data for the elliptic flow coefficient  $v_2$  (near midrapidity, integrated over  $p_T$ ), for  $\sqrt{s}$  from SIS/Bevalac via AGS and SPS to RHIC.

$b$  that breaks cylinder symmetry of the hadron emission pattern. After fixing this orientation (the event plane) event-by-event, the first harmonic in the emission angle  $\Theta$  with respect to this plane essentially gives the "bounce-off" flow invented at the Bevalac whereas the weight coefficient  $v_2$  of the second harmonic quantifies the elliptic flow. At high  $\sqrt{s}$  it peaks at  $\Theta=0$  and  $180^\circ$ , and it disappears toward target/projectile rapidities as PHOBOS has shown [23]. It arises from the gradient of the asymmetric pressure distribution prevailing at the instant of maximal geometrical overlap of the colliding nuclei and is, therefore, sensitive to the EOS of the primordial collision volume [24]. Fig. 2 shows a synopsis of all presently available data for  $v_2$  (near midrapidity, integrated over  $p_T$ ), provided by A. Wetzler [25] for  $\sqrt{s}$  from SIS/Bevalac via AGS and SPS to RHIC. The initial, negative signal (from SIS/Bevalac to lower AGS) reflects the fact that "cold" target-projectile spectator matter is geometrically shadowing emission into the direction of  $\vec{b}$  so that only "side splash" [17, 18] is available to emission from the primordial interaction volume (implicitly demonstrating that elliptic flow is an early time emission process). This shadowing disappears at  $\text{Lozenz-}\gamma \geq 3$ ; where the  $v_2$  signal turns positive. A tantalizing hint at a saturation occurs toward top SPS, the rise resuming at the two RHIC energies (one of the key arguments for RHIC running at lower  $\sqrt{s}$ ). This signal increases with transverse momentum [26], plausibly so as the collective, anisotropic pressure field accelerates particles differently in-plane and out-of plane — an effect that is well reproduced by hydrodynamics with partonic EOS [27] at




**Figure 3.** The mean radial velocity  $\langle \beta_T \rangle$  as a function of  $\sqrt{s}$  from Bevalac to RHIC.

RHIC energy.

### 2.2. Radial Flow and spectral "Temperature"

A radially symmetric momentum orientation arises upon isentropic expansion of an initially dense system, be it partonic or hadronic, or both ways in turn. Hydrodynamical or hydrodynamically "inspired" models (which assume an isentropic expansion by definition) describe this effect by a radial collective velocity field that increases toward the surface, at each instant of time, the surface (and average) velocity increasing over the entire course of the expansion. Thus the flow fraction of the average kinetic energy increases while the temperature falls steeply, both observables reaching a certain characteristic value that characterizes the stage where emission products decouple from rescattering. From Bevalac to RHIC the mean value  $\langle \beta_T \rangle$  increases from about 0.35 to about 0.6 [28] as is shown in Fig. 3. After an initial steep rise a hint at saturation is again observed within the SPS energy range, which is overcome by the  $\sqrt{s} = 130$  and 200 GeV RHIC data points. Such an intermediate plateau is also indicated by the  $\sqrt{s}$  dependence of the midrapidity mean transverse momenta of various hadronic species, a completely model-independent observation [28, 29] shown in Fig. 4. Finally I wish refer to the well



**Figure 4.** Mean transverse momenta for pions, kaons and protons at midrapidity as a function of  $\sqrt{s}$  indicating an intermediate plateau in the SPS region.


known "Nu-Xu" plots [30, 31] which illustrate the effect of the radial flow velocity field on the inverse slope parameter of transverse mass spectra of various hadronic species. This "spectral temperature" turns out to be more influenced by the ordered flow velocity field than by the remaining random thermal velocity. It thus exhibits an overall increase with  $\sqrt{s}$  [32]. The temperature plot is shown in Fig 5 specifically for the  $\sqrt{s}$  systematics of charged kaons. The reason for this particular choice is that kaon transverse mass spectra are known from Bevalac/SIS to RHIC to have a nearly exponential shape, thus rendering themselves to a simple inverse slope analysis — unlike pions which feature concave  $p_T$  or  $m_T$  spectra due to pronounced resonance decay contributions, and also unlike baryons with their pronounced "shoulder arm structure" at low and intermediate  $p_T$  or  $m_T$  (which requires two parameter fits by, e.g. the modern blast wave model [33]). Obviously, both charged kaon species exhibit a pronounced structure of turning from initial rise into a plateau, then into rising again at the two RHIC energies presently available.

All these patterns (Figs. 2-5) remind one of a phase diagram featuring a parton-hadron coexistence phase of QCD matter. But there may be alternative explanations for such a  $\sqrt{s}$  dependence and, in any case, one concludes that RHIC runs at intermediate  $\sqrt{s}$  are highly desirable to confirm such indications of a plateau structure.

### 2.3. Identical Pion Bose-Einstein Correlation

I turn to pion Bose-Einstein correlations in order to introduce a certain sense of caution concerning the high expectations invited by the above discussion of collective flow signals. From the theoretical models [38] developed in the 1990's utilizing a wide spectrum of hydrodynamical approximations concerning the space-time-momentum evolution of the expanding system one expects a multitude of characteristic features






**Figure 5.** The inverse slope parameter (the "spectral temperature") for charged kaons as a function of  $\sqrt{s}$ .

which are mostly absent in the data. Fig. 6 shows a compilation [39] of the  $\sqrt{s}$  dependence of HBT parameters derived for positive and negative pion pair production observed at low pair momenta in central collisions of heavy nuclei. The 3 characteristic "geometrical" parameters of the Pratt-Bertsch model [38],  $R_{out}$ ,  $R_{side}$  and  $R_{long}$  are, essentially, constant and equal to each other, of order 6 fm with exception of the Bevalac point which, however, refers to  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  as a projectile. This deviation from intuitively expected features (such as radii growing with the square or cube roots of  $dN/dy$ ,  $R_{out}$  significantly exceeding  $R_{side}$  etc.) may stem from a radically wrong picture, employed in all hydro-typ models, concerning the pionic decoupling stage or, more precisely, the hypersphere in space-time for pionic freeze-out. This stage may differ from naive pictures concerning pion freeze-out (see H. Appelshäuser talk at this conference [40]), or stem more radically, from an onset of "instantaneous" hadronic freeze-out toward higher  $\sqrt{s}$  [41] that is not yet well captured by dynamical models.

### 3. Statistical Hadron Production

Bulk hadron production systematics in central nucleus-nucleus collisions at relativistic energy is, overall, well reproduced by a statistical Hagedorn hadronic freeze-out model. A grand canonical version of this model captures the various hadronic species multiplicities, per collision event, from pions to  $\Omega$  hyperons, in terms of a few universal parameters that describe the dynamical stage in which the emerging hadronic matter decays to a quasi-classical gas of free resonances and hadrons [13, 14, 38, 39]. The grand canonical parameters are temperature  $T$ , volume  $V$  and chemical potential  $\mu$ . They capture a snapshot of the fireball expansion within the narrow time interval surrounding



**Figure 6.** Compilation of HBT parameters [35] derived for positive and negative pion pair production as a function of the  $\sqrt{s}$ .

hadronic chemical freeze-out, which thus appears to populate the hadron/resonance mass and quantum number spectrum, predominantly, by phase space weight [8, 14, 40] thus creating an apparent thermal equilibrium state prevailing in the produced hadron-resonance-population. This chemical equilibrium instantaneously decouples from fireball expansion surviving further (near isentropic) processes. It can thus be retrieved from the finally observed hadronic multiplicities, by state of the art grand canonical model analysis. This analysis succeeds from AGS, via SPS, to RHIC energy.

Statistical model analysis is also applicable to elementary collisions,  $p + p$ ,  $p + \bar{p}$ , and  $e^+e^-$  annihilation as was shown by Hagedorn [8] and, more recently, by Becattini and Collaborators [41, 42]. The canonical version of ensemble analysis is applicable

here. Mutatis mutandis the same hadrochemical equilibrium feature is being attested, emphasizing the statement that the apparent equilibrium does not arise from an inelastic rescattering cascade toward thermodynamical equilibrium - there is essentially none in elementary processes - but should stem directly from the QCD hadronization process occurring under phase space dominance [14, 40].


The crucial difference between elementary and central nucleus-nucleus collisions resides, in statistical model view, in a transition from canonical to grand canonical order in the ensuing decoupled hadronic state. This transition was studied by Cleymans, Tounsi, Redlich et al. [43]. Its main feature is strangeness enhancement. Comparing the strange to non-strange hadron multiplicities in elementary, and in central nucleus-nucleus collisions at similar energy, one observes an increase of the singly strange hyperons and mesons, relative to pions, of about 2-4, and corresponding higher relative enhancements of multiply strange hyperons [44, 45, 46], ranging up to order-of-magnitude enhancement. In the terminology of Hagedorn statistical models, strangeness is suppressed in the small system, canonical case, of elementary collisions (due to the dictate of local strangeness conservation in a small "fireball" volume), whereas it approaches flavour equipartition in large fireballs due to the occurrence of quantum number conservation, on average only, over a large volume — as reflected by the **global** chemical potential featured by the grand canonical ensemble: "strangeness enhancement" occurs as the fading-away of canonical constraints.

From statistical model analysis we obtain a more general view of strangeness relative to non-strangeness production than is provided by considering individual strange to non-strange production ratios, like  $K/\pi$ ,  $\Omega/\pi$  etc., from  $p + p$  to central A+A. The model quantifies strange to non-strange hadron/resonance production by means of Wroblewski quark counting at hadronic freeze-out [47]. It determines the so-called Wroblewski-ratio,


$$\lambda_s = \frac{2(\langle s \rangle + \langle \bar{s} \rangle)}{\langle u \rangle + \langle \bar{u} \rangle + \langle d \rangle + \langle \bar{d} \rangle} \quad (1)$$

which quantifies the overall strangeness to non-strangeness ratio at hadronic freeze-out. Strangeness enhancement (i.e. removal of strangeness suppression in elementary collisions) is quantified, by such an analysis, to proceed from  $\lambda_s \approx 0.25$  in elementary collisions, to  $\lambda_s \approx 0.45$  in central nucleus-nucleus collisions [13, 38, 39].


From a recent energy scan conducted at the SPS by NA49, studying hadron multiplicities from  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  to 17 GeV, a steep maximum was observed [48] in the  $K^+/\pi$  and  $\Lambda/\pi$  ratios in central Pb+Pb collisions, as shown in Figs. 7 and 8. As the  $K^+$  and  $\Lambda$  channels carry most of the total  $\langle s \rangle + \langle \bar{s} \rangle$  content, this experimental result indicates a kind of "singularity" in the strange to non-strange production ratio, from AGS to RHIC energy. This effect is absent in  $p + p$  collisions. Becattini et al. [39] analyzed the  $\sqrt{s}$  dependence of the Wroblewski-parameter  $\lambda_s$  in the grand canonical statistical hadronization model. Their result is shown in Fig. 6 which gives  $\lambda_s$  as a function of the chemical potential  $\mu_B$ . From top AGS energy (at  $\mu_B \approx 550$  MeV) to RHIC energy ( $\mu_B \leq 50$  MeV) one perceives an average  $\lambda_s$  of about  $0.45 \pm 0.08$  whereas



**Figure 7.** Energy dependence of the  $\langle K^+ \rangle / \langle \pi^+ \rangle$  ratio for central Pb+Pb (Au+Au) collisions (upper points) and p+p interactions (lower points).



**Figure 8.** Energy dependence of the  $\langle \Lambda \rangle / \langle \pi \rangle$  ( $\langle \pi \rangle = 1.5(\langle \pi^- \rangle + \langle \pi^+ \rangle)$ ) ratio for central Pb+Pb (Au+Au) collisions (upper points) and p+p interactions (lower points).



**Figure 9.** Dependence of the  $\lambda_s$  parameter on baryochemical potential extracted from the fits to hadron multiplicities in central Pb+Pb (Au+Au) collisions at AGS, SPS and RHIC energies. The lines show the dependence expected for different values of the  $\gamma_s$  parameter [ref. 39]

a steep excursion is seen, to  $\lambda_s = 0.6 \pm 0.1$ , at  $\mu_B = 440$  MeV. This point corresponds to the steep maxima observed in Figs.7 and 8, to occur at SPS fixed target energy of 30 GeV/A in central Pb+Pb collisions, corresponding to  $\sqrt{s} = 7.3$  GeV. The observed  $\lambda_s$  maximum should, therefore, present a hint that hadronization at  $\sqrt{s} \approx 7$  GeV should occur under influences, absent at energies above and below. Moreover, NA49 has shown recently [49] that the event-by-event fluctuation of the ratio  $(K^+ + K^-)/(\pi^+ + \pi^-)$  measured in central Pb+Pb collisions increases steeply toward  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  GeV whereas it was formerly found [50] to amount to be below 4%, at top SPS energy,  $\sqrt{s} = 17.3$  GeV.

We thus propose that the dynamical trajectory of central Pb+Pb collisions comes close to the critical point of QCD, at or near  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  GeV. This point has been expected to occur on the line in the  $T, \mu_B$  plane which describes the boundary between the hadronic and partonic QCD phases [51]. Along that line the phase transition is expected to be a crossover at  $\mu_B < \mu_B^c$ , become second order at  $\mu_B = \mu_B^c$ , and first order for  $\mu_B > \mu_B^c$ . At  $\mu_B = \mu_B^c$  and  $TT_c$  we thus expect phenomena analogous to critical opalescence. Recent QCD lattice calculations succeeded in an extrapolation to finite chemical potential [52, 53], thus making a first prediction for the phase boundary line and, in particular, the critical point - albeit with considerable uncertainty as was discussed by Redlich at this conference [54]. This uncertainty stems, firstly, from the uncertainty in the extrapolation to finite  $\mu_B$  but, secondly, from the unphysical (high) strange quark mass employed in these lattice calculations which, at present, place the

critical point somewhere in the interval  $500 \text{ MeV} < \mu_B^c \leq 700 \text{ MeV}$ . Redlich argued that it should move to considerably lower  $\mu_b$  once the s-mass can be chosen closer to the physical quark mass. This expectation was substantiated by recent lattice calculations which show that the critical point might move downward in  $\mu_B$  once more realistic quark masses are employed [55]. From Fig. 9 we see that the strangeness maximum at  $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ GeV}$  corresponds to  $\mu_B \approx 440 \text{ MeV}$  and thus quite close to the expected  $\mu_B^c$  position. The energy density at the phase boundary is estimated by lattice QCD to be rather low [56] ( $\epsilon \leq 1 \text{ GeV/fm}^3$ ).

Central collisions of heavy nuclei at moderately relativistic energy exhibit a general cycle of initial compression and heating which is followed by a maximum energy density stage which then turns into expansion and cooling [20]. The quantities characterizing the overall system dynamics, such as volume and energy-entropy density etc. change very rapidly except during the high density stage which acts analogous to a classical turning point. If it coincides closely with the QCD critical endpoint one could expect to observe substantial critical phenomena. Now it is well known that the maximum energy density in central collisions of mass 200 nuclei amounts (Bjorken estimate) to above  $2 \text{ GeV/fm}^3$  at top SPS [57], and to about  $5 \text{ GeV/fm}^3$  at RHIC energies [58], thus overshooting, by far, the critical QCD energy density. The system thus crosses the phase coexistence line, upon re-expansion, whilst already undergoing rapid expansion. Furthermore, the chemical potential is certainly well below  $300 \text{ MeV}$  at the time of hadronization. The evolution will thus miss the critical point at top SPS, and RHIC energies; and at much lower AGS energies the dynamics falls into the  $\mu_B \geq 500 \text{ MeV}$  domain but the energy might not suffice to reach the phase boundary. In summary we may indeed expect that the dynamical evolution reaches its energy density plateau phase near the expected critical point (i.e. at energy density slightly below  $1 \text{ GeV/fm}^3$ , and at  $\mu_B$  between  $300$  and  $500 \text{ MeV}$ ) somewhere in the domain of maximum AGS and minimum SPS energy.


Returning to the lattice results [53, 54, 55] at finite  $\mu_B$ , we see a steep maximum of the quark number susceptibility

$$\chi_{u,d} \equiv T^2 \left( \frac{d^2}{d(\mu/T)^2} \frac{p}{T^4} \right) \quad (2)$$

occurring at  $T = T_c = 150 \text{ MeV}$  and  $\mu_B = 3\mu_Q = 3T450 \text{ MeV}$ . We reproduce the Bielefeld-Swansea results in Fig. 10 which also shows the calculations for  $\mu_B = 225 \text{ MeV}$  and  $\mu_B = 0$  (essentially corresponding to top SPS and RHIC energies, respectively). The latter exhibit no susceptibility peak but a smooth transition from  $T < T_c$  to  $T > T_c$ . As  $\chi_{u,d}$  can also be written as

$$\chi_q = T^2 \left( \frac{\delta}{\delta(\mu_u/T)} + \frac{\delta}{\delta(\mu_d/T)} \right) \frac{n_u + n_d}{T^3} \quad (3)$$

we see that the peak in the susceptibility implies a maximum fluctuation of the quark number densities  $n_u$  and  $n_d$ . We interpret this result as an indication of critical fluctuation occurring in the vicinity of the critical endpoint implicitly present in this



**Figure 10.** The quark number susceptibility calculated within lattice QCD as function of temperature (relative to transition temperature) for different values of quark chemical potential.

calculation. Directly at  $\mu_c$  the susceptibility would diverge. The critical point in this calculation must thus be near  $\mu_B = 450$  MeV and  $T = 150$  MeV. This, in turn, is very close to the parameters of the grand canonical model at the strangeness maximum,  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  GeV (Fig. 9).

As to the relation between the susceptibility maximum of lattice QCD and the strangeness maximum observed by NA49 (at which the Wroblewski parameter  $\lambda_s$  exhibits an anomaly), Gavai and Gupta [59] have suggested the relationship

$$\lambda_s = \frac{2\chi_s}{\chi_u + \chi_d} \quad (4)$$

which appears to offer a direct link. In fact they obtain  $\lambda_s = 0.48$  from a lattice calculation at zero  $\mu_b$ : closely coinciding with the value observed at top SPS and RHIC energy (Fig. 9). Unfortunately, though, their result refers to  $\mu_b = 0$ , and the Bielefeld-Swansea calculations at finite  $\mu_b$  [53, 55] are in two-flavour QCD only. A prediction for  $\chi_s$  at  $\mu_B \approx 450$  MeV, or, more generally, a full three-flavour lattice treatment of the vicinity of the critical point is required to finally assess the above argument that tries to establish a link between the Wroblewski maximum and the parton density fluctuations at the critical point.

#### 4. New RHIC Physics: In-Medium Parton Attenuation and Jets

It has been the point of the previous two chapters to present observables for which we have comprehensive data from Bevalac/SIS to RHIC. With the exception of HBT "radii" all these  $\sqrt{s}$  dependences exhibit an interesting structure, of an initial steep rise up to the lower SPS energies that is followed by indications of a plateau extending over the SPS domain  $7 \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 17$  GeV, then by a further steep rise occurring at RHIC energies  $\sqrt{s} = 130$  and  $200$  GeV. This overall pattern has not yet been theoretically understood. Qualitatively one might argue that the plateau structure signals phase coexistence setting in over the SPS energy range, whereas partonic, primordial dynamics becomes dominant at top RHIC energies.

Before turning to this physics I wish to note, however, that the two characteristic temperatures that describe the bulk hadronic dynamical trajectory do indeed reach saturation from top SPS to RHIC energy. The hadronization temperature (inferred from the grand canonical statistical hadronization model) saturates at about  $165 \pm 10$  MeV, in close agreement with lattice QCD estimates of the parton-hadron phase coexistence domain [13, 14, 39]. Furthermore, the second characteristic "freeze-out" temperature, that describes the final bulk hadronic decoupling from strong interaction, appears to saturate at  $100 \pm 10$  MeV. For lack of space I can not discuss here the possible excursions from this universal picture of hadronic phase expansion, as implied by hyperon data. Within such reservation the *thermal* history of bulk hadron expansion may well turn out to be universal from SPS to RHIC, while its hydrodynamical parameters (radial and elliptic flow, as well as mean  $p_T$  of  $m_T$ ) reflect the increasing influence of the pre-hadronic phase, setting the stage for the ensuing hadronic expansion phase.

All of the above discussion has focused, implicitly, on low  $p_T$  physics. The radically new physics, offered by RHIC, stems from expanding our view to  $p_T$  up to about 15 GeV. With RHIC we thus turn from soft to hard QCD physics, approaching a situation in which observed high transverse momentum hadrons stem from primordial hard partonic rescattering as described by perturbative QCD. The qualitatively new feature (added to well known pQCD hadron production as it gets imbedded into a large primordial interaction volume) is the in-medium attenuation of the leading partons that are initially emitted in a hard partonic scattering. A colour charge propagating through a colour charged medium suffers induced radiative energy loss thus modifying the well known DGLAP evolution that describes leading parton hadronization in vacuum (in elementary collisions). This energy loss is a QCD analogy to the Landau-Pomeranchuk phenomena of QED that occur once an electric charge traverses an extended electrically charged medium. Due to quantum mechanical interference the net in-medium radiative energy loss becomes proportional to the square of the path-length  $L$  over which the propagating charge interacts in-medium. A complication arises as we are not dealing with a homogeneous, infinite volume in central nucleus-nucleus collisions: the simple  $L^2$  law of radiative energy loss gets modified by a transport coefficient that reflects the changing local energy density as experienced by the leading parton traversing the



primordial fireball volume while it expands [60].

A vision emerges, for an experimental program of the RHIC experiments (and for further studies at the CERN LHC) that could verify the basic  $L^2$  law of leading parton in-medium energy loss. As a first step the RHIC experiments have demonstrated a universal in-medium suppression of high  $p_T$  bulk hadron production yields, as compared to elementary collisions at similar  $\sqrt{s}$ . The next step results from analysis of the back-to-back production pattern of jets. This primordial hard parton scattering signal offers a distinct geometrical pattern which can be related to the overall geometry of an A+A collision fireball, into which it is embedded. If a jet is created in the periphery of the primordial fireball one of the emerging leading partons may escape into free space essentially unattenuated whereas its opposite side partner traverses the entire radial extent of the reaction volume, thus being maximally attenuated. This opposite side jet quenching phenomenon, as observed by the RHIC experiments, can be quantified, both, versus reaction centrality, and with respect to the location of the impact plane. Such an analysis promises to unravel the two essential parameters of jet attenuation study: the length  $L$  of the opposite side jet parton traversal through the dense medium, and the integral of the QCD transport coefficient over the entire trajectory of the emerging opposite-side jet. The first quantity is merely geometric, the second depends on a model of the radial energy density distribution of the primordial fireball, and its evolution during the time interval sampled by the opposite side leading parton while fragmenting into an eventually observed jet. Actually, a multitude of contributions to this Conference show that at RHIC jet energies, in the domain of about 10 GeV studied thus far, the opposite side jet is entirely quenched in central Au+Au collisions, whereas it gradually appears toward smaller  $L$  as encountered in semi-peripheral collisions. These, and expected further RHIC data may thus result in verification of the QCD  $L^2$  law, characteristic of a deconfined medium.

## References

- [1] W. Scheid, H. Müller and W. Greiner, Phys. Rev. Lett.32 (1974) 741.
- [2] G. Chapline, M. Johnson, E. Teller and M. Weiss, Phys. Rev. D8 (1973) 4302.
- [3] A. A. Amsden, F. H. Harlow and J. R. Nix, Phys. Rev. C15 (1977) 2059;  
J.Kapusta and D. Strottman, Phys. Rev. C23 (1981) 1282.
- [4] H. A. Bethe and M. B. Johnson, Nucl. Phys. A230 (1974) 1;  
J. M. Irvine, Progr. Part. Nucl. Physics, Vol. 6 (Pergamon Press 1981) p. 191;  
M. Nauenberg and G. Chapline, Astrophys. Journ. 179 (1973) 277;  
E. Baron et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 59 (1987) 736.
- [5] N. K. Glendenning, Phys. Rev. C37 (1988) 2733.
- [6] E. V. Shuryak, Phys. Reports 61 (1980) 71.
- [7] G. D. Westfall et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 37 (1976) 1202;  
J. Gosset et al., Phys. Rev. C16 (1977) 629.
- [8] R. Hagedorn, Nuovo Cimento 35 (1965) 395;  
CERN yellow preprint TH 3684 (1983).
- [9] G. Bertsch and J. Cugnon, Phys. Rev. C24 (1981) 2514.
- [10] H. Stöcker et al., Progr. Part. Nucl. Phys. 4 (1980) 133;  
H. Stöcker, J. A. Maruhn and W. Greiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 44 (1980) 125.

- [11] P. J. Siemens and J. O. Rasmussen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42 (1979) 844.
- [12] A. Z. Mekjian, Nucl. Phys. A312 (1978) 491;  
S. Das Gupta and A. Z. Mekjian, Phys. Reports 72 (1981) 131.
- [13] P. Braun-Munzinger, I. Heppe and J. Stachel, Phys. Lett. B465 (1999) 15;  
P. Braun-Munzinger, D. Magestro, K. Redlich and J. Stachel, Phys. Lett B518 (2001) 41;  
P. Braun-Munzinger, K. Redlich and J. Stachel, nucl-th/0304013;  
P. Braun-Munzinger, J. Cleymans, H. Oeschler and K. Redlich, Nucl. Phys. A697 (2002) 902.
- [14] R. Stock, Phys. Lett B456 (1999) 277;  
R. Stock, hep-ph/0312039.
- [15] H. A. Gustafsson et al., Plastic Ball Coll., Phys. Rev. Lett. 52 (1984) 1590.
- [16] R. J. Porter et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 (1997) 1229.
- [17] H.H. Gutbrod et al., Phys. Lett. B216 (1989) 267;  
H.H. Gutbrod et al., Phys. Rev. C42 (1990) 640.
- [18] G. Buchwald et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 52 (1984) 1594.
- [19] H. Kruse, B. Jacak and H. Stöcker, Phys. Rev. Lett. 54 (1985) 289.
- [20] R. Stock, Phys. Reports, 135 (1986) 259.
- [21] P. Danielewicz, R. Lacey and W. Lynch, Science 298 (2002) 1592;  
J. Aichelin, Phys. Rev. 202 (1991) 233;  
P. Danielewicz, Nucl.Phys. A673 (2000) 375.
- [22] C. Fuchs et al., Phys.Rev.Lett. 86 (2001) 1974.
- [23] S. Manly et al., PHOBOS Coll., Nucl. Phys. A715 (2003) 611.
- [24] M. Gyulassy, talk at this Conference.
- [25] A. Wetzler, private communication.
- [26] S. A. Voloshin, Nucl. Phys. A715 (2003) 379, and references therein.
- [27] U. Heinz, talk at this Conference.
- [28] Ch. Blume et al., NA49 Coll., Proc. 20th Winter Workshop on Nuclear Dynamics, Jamaica 2004.
- [29] T. Nayak, Poster session, this conference.
- [30] E. Esumi, S. Chapman, H. van Hecke and N. Xu, NA44 Coll., Phys. Rev. C55 (1997) 2163;  
H. van Hecke, H. Sorge and N. Xu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81 (1998) 5764;  
H. van Hecke, H. Sorge and N. Xu, Nucl. Phys. A661 (1999) 493.
- [31] M. Mitrovski et al., NA49 Coll., Proc. 20th Winter Workshop on Nuclear Dynamics, Jamaica 2004.
- [32] M. Gazdzicki et al., NA49 Coll., talk at this Conference.
- [33] E. Schnedermann and U. Heinz, Phys. Rev. C50 (1994) 1675.
- [34] H. Appelshäuser et al., NA49 Coll., Eur. Phys. Journal C2 (1998) 661, and references therein.
- [35] S. Kniese et al., NA49 Coll., talk at this Conference.
- [36] S. Pratt, Phys. Rev. D33 (1986) 1314.
- [37] H. Appelshäuser, talk at this Conference.
- [38] F. Becattini, M. Gazdzicki and J. Sollfrank, Nucl. Phys. A638 (1998) 403;  
J. Cleymans and K. Redlich, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81 (1998) 5284.
- [39] F. Becattini, M. Gazdzicki, A. Keraenen, J. Manninen and R. Stock, Phys. Rev. C69 (2004) 024905.
- [40] R. Hagedorn, Nucl. Phys. B24 (1979) 93;  
J. Ellis and K. Geiger, Phys. Rev. D54 (1996) 1967.
- [41] F. Becattini, Z. Phys. C69 (1996) 485.
- [42] F. Becattini and L. Ferroni, hep-ph/0307061.
- [43] J. Cleymans et al., Phys. Rev. C56 (1997) 2747;  
A. Tounsi and K. Redlich, J. of Physics G28 (2002) 2095.
- [44] S. V. Afanasiev et al., NA49 Coll., Phys. Rev. C66 (2002) 054902;  
A. Mischke et al., NA49 Coll., Nuc. Phys. A715 (2003) 453.
- [45] L. Ahle et al., E802 Coll., Phys. Rev. C60 (1999) 064901.
- [46] F. Antinori et al., NA57 Coll., Nucl. Phys. A698 (2002) 118;  
F. Antinori, talk at this Conference.

- [47] A. K. Wroblewski, Acta Phys. Pol. B16 (1985) 379.
- [48] V. Friese et al., NA49 Coll., nucl-ex/0305017;  
M. Gazdzicki, NA49 Coll., talk at this Conference.
- [49] Ch. Roland et al., NA49 Coll., talk at this Conference.
- [50] S. V. Afanasiev et al., NA49 Coll., Phys. Rev. Lett. 86 (2001) 1965.
- [51] M. G. Alford, K. Rajagopal and F. Wilczek, Phy. Lett B442 (1998) 247;  
Y. H. Atta and T. Ikeda, Phys. Rev. D67 (2003) 014028.
- [52] Z. Fodor and S. D. Katz JHEP 0203 (2002) 14.
- [53] R. V. Gavai and S. Gupta, hep-lat/0303013;  
C. R. Allton et al., hep-lat/0305007.
- [54] K. Redlich, talk at this Conference.
- [55] Z. Fodor and S. D. Katz, hep-lat/0402006;  
F. Karsch et al., Bielefeld-Swansea lattice Collaboration, hep-lat/0309116.
- [56] F. Karsch, Nucl. Phys. A698 (2002) 199.
- [57] T. Alber et al., NA49 Coll., Phys. Rev. Lett 75 (1995) 3814.
- [58] G. Roland, PHOBOS Coll., talk at this Conference.
- [59] R. V. Gavai and S. Gupta, Phys. Rev. D (2002);  
R. V. Gavai, talk at this Conference;  
R. V. Gavai and S. Gupta, hep-lat/0303013.
- [60] C. A. Salgado and U. A. Wiedemann, Phys. Rev. D68, (2003) 014008.