

Relativistic Nuclear Collisions and the QCD Phase Boundary

P. Braun-Munzinger^a

^aGSI and Darmstadt University of Technology, Planckstr. 1,
64291 Darmstadt, Germany

In nucleus-nucleus collisions at ultra-relativistic energies matter is formed with initial energy density significantly exceeding the critical energy density for the transition from hadronic to partonic matter. We will review the experimental evidence for this new form of matter - the Quark-Gluon Plasma - from recent experiments at the SPS and RHIC with emphasis on collective behavior, thermalization, and its opacity for fast partons. We will further show that one can determine from the data a fundamental QCD parameter, the critical temperature for the QCD phase transition.

1. Introduction and historical remarks

About 40 years ago Hagedorn [1] realized that the then growing evidence for an exponentially increasing mass spectrum of hadronic resonance states would lead to divergencies in the energy density (and other thermodynamic quantities) at the (Hagedorn) temperature $T_H \approx m_\pi$. A few years later, after the discovery of asymptotic freedom in QCD [2,3] it was realized by Collins and Perry [4] and independently by Cabibbo and Parisi [5] that a hadronic system at sufficiently high density or temperature should convert into a new state of matter, commonly called quark-gluon plasma (QGP), at a critical temperature T_c . In fact, the first phase diagram of nuclear/hadronic matter appears in [5]. Although T_c and T_H were not immediately related at the time ¹, it is now clear that both developments provided the starting point for this growing field of research. About 8 years later Baym [7] drew up the phase diagram with many of the features discussed presently ².

The physics of the transition from hadronic matter to QGP is now much better understood, at least for vanishing net baryon density: solving QCD on a discrete lattice has led to the results summarized in Fig. 1. Near a critical temperature of $T_c = 175 \pm 15$ MeV the energy density (and other thermodynamic quantities) exhibit a strong increase, signalling the transition to a deconfined state consisting of quarks and gluons. The critical energy density $\epsilon(T_c)$ is 700 ± 200 MeV/fm³, about 5 times the energy density in a large nucleus; whether the transition is a true phase transition in the thermodynamic sense or rather a rapid cross-over is currently much discussed ³ but for most of the experimental observables discussed below not relevant.

¹See [6] for an interesting discussion on this subject.

²For a discussion of the events leading to the construction of the RHIC accelerator see [7].

³A cross-over seems more likely, see, e.g., [9].




Figure 1. Temperature dependence of energy density in lattice calculations with 2 light and 1 heavier quark flavor [8]

2. Hadron production and the QCD phase boundary

A vigorous experimental program has been mounted over the past 20 years, first at the BNL-AGS and CERN SPS accelerators and since the year 2000 at RHIC, to collide atomic nuclei at ultra-relativistic energies with the aim to produce the QGP and to study its properties. An impressive database has been assembled in the center of mass energy range $4 < \sqrt{s_{nn}} < 200$ GeV. The current review is not meant to be comprehensive, but rather focusses on collective behavior of the matter produced, on its opacity to fast quarks, and on our current knowledge of the phase boundary between QGP and hadronic matter. Much more information on the experimental database as well as on various theoretical descriptions can be found in the proceedings of recent Quark Matter conferences [10,11].

In Fig. 2 we show the current information on the energy dependence of charged particle and transverse energy production near midrapidity in central PbPb (AuAu) collisions. Overall there is good agreement between experiments. A noteworthy result of these studies is the apparent power-law increase in both quantities, close to what Landau [13] predicted in 1952 in his hydrodynamic approach. Extrapolation of this trend towards higher energies would lead to a charged particle multiplicity of about 2000 at midrapidity in PbPb collisions at LHC energy.

Contrasting these smooth energy dependences are recent observations by the CERN NA49 collaboration of a rather narrow structure in the K^+/π^+ ratio near $\sqrt{s_{nn}} = 8$ GeV [14]. These results look rather striking, but would need to be confirmed by another experiment before further-reaching conclusions can be drawn.

Turning to more detailed information on hadron production we note that hadron yields observed in central nuclear collisions at AGS, SPS, and RHIC energies are found to be described with high precision within a hadro-chemical equilibrium approach [15,16, 17,18,19,20,21,22,23], governed by a chemical freeze-out temperature T_{ch} , baryo-chemical potential μ and the fireball volume V_{ch} . A recent review can be found in [24]. Importantly, the data at SPS and RHIC energy comprise multi-strange hadrons including the Ω and




Figure 2. Energy dependence of charged particle and transverse energy production at midrapidity in central nucleus-nucleus collisions [12]

$\bar{\Omega}$. Their yields agree very well with the chemical equilibrium calculation and are strongly enhanced as compared to observations in pp collisions. We show as an example the results for RHIC energy in Fig. 3.

The chemical parameters T_{ch} and μ determined from fits to data at all available energies are plotted in the phase diagram of hadronic matter shown in Fig. 4. The phase transition lines in this figure are taken from recent analyses within the framework of lattice QCD [25,26] and include the most recent estimate for the tri-critical point. Also included in this figure is a line of constant energy density, computed within the framework of the hadronic gas model of [17]. Interestingly, this line of constant energy density is, at $\mu > 500$ MeV, much closer to the chemical freeze-out points than to the phase lines from lattice QCD. This raises the question whether a critical energy density significantly exceeding 1 GeV/fm³ as one would extract at critical points such as $T_c = 160$ MeV at $\mu_c = 700$ MeV makes sense (see Fig. 4).

An important observation about the phase diagram is that, for top SPS energy and above, the chemical parameters determined from the measured hadron yields coincide within the uncertainties of about ± 10 MeV with the phase boundary as determined from lattice QCD calculations. A natural question arises: is this coincidence accidental and, if not, what enforces equilibration at the phase boundary? Considerations about collisional rates and timescales of the hadronic fireball expansion [27] imply that at SPS and RHIC the equilibrium cannot be established in the hadronic medium and that is the phase transition which drives the particles densities and ensures chemical equilibrium.

In [27] it is further shown that many body collisions near T_c provide a mechanism for the equilibration. Because of the rapid density change near a phase transition such multi-particle collisions provide a natural explanation for the observation of chemical




Figure 3. Fit of particle ratios for Au-Au collisions at RHIC. The measurements are the symbols, the thermal model values are the lines [20,24]

equilibration at RHIC energies and lead to $T_{ch}=T_c$ to within an accuracy of a few MeV. Any scenario with T_{ch} substantially smaller than T_c would require that either multi-particle interactions dominate even much below T_c or that the two-particle cross sections are larger than in the vacuum by a high factor. Both of the latter hypothesis seem unlikely in view of the rapid density decrease. The critical temperature determined from RHIC for $T_{ch} \approx T_c$ coincides well with lattice estimates [8] for $\mu = 0$, as discussed above. The same arguments as discussed here for RHIC energy also hold for SPS energies: it is likely that also there the phase transition drives the particle densities and insures chemical equilibration.

It was alternatively proposed [28,30,29] that the observed hadron abundances arise from a direct production of strange (and non-strange) particles by hadronization. How this happens microscopically is unclear. To escape the above argument that $T_{ch}=T_c$ one would have to argue that no hadronic picture for this process exists at all - this is unlikely since the abundances are determined by hadronic properties (masses) with high precision. Second, one may question if the “chemical temperature” extracted from the abundances is a universal temperature which also governs the local kinetic aspects and can be associated with the critical temperature of a phase transition in equilibrium. Indeed, in a prethermalization process, different equilibrium properties are realized at different time scales. Nevertheless, all experience shows that kinetic equilibration occurs before chemical equilibration. It seems hard to imagine that chemical equilibrium abundances are realized at a time when the kinematic distributions are not yet close to their equilibrium values.

Furthermore, the recently observed centrality dependence of multi-strange baryon production at RHIC [31] supports the picture of equilibration near T_c in the hadronic phase: the yields of hyperons reach the equilibrium value only for rather central collisions ($N_{part} > 200$), underlining the importance of density in the equilibration process.

Thermal models have also been successfully used [32] to describe hadron production in e^+e^- and hadron-hadron collisions, leading to temperature parameters close to 170 MeV. Indeed, this suggests that hadronization itself can be seen as a prethermalization process.




Figure 4. Phase diagram of hadronic matter and chemical freeze-out points [12]. The open squares represent recent estimates of the tri-critical point (see text).

However, to account for the strangeness undersaturation in such collisions, multi-strange baryons can only be reproduced by introducing a strangeness suppression factor of about 0.5, leading to a factor of 8 suppression of Ω baryons. In the hadronic picture this is due to the "absence" of sufficient multi-particle scattering since the system is not in a high density phase due to a phase transition. We further note, as is evident from Fig. 4 that, in heavy ion collisions, the chemical temperature is **not** universal, but rather strongly varies (at least at large μ -values) with the chemical potential, implying the existence of a medium in distinction to the situation in elementary particle collisions.

3. Low mass dileptons

During the year 2000 the CERES experiment took a large data sample of low mass (< 1.4 GeV) with an apparatus improved by the addition of a radial TPC, for 158 A GeV Pb+Au collisions [33]. Approximately $3 \cdot 10^7$ central events were recorded with a mass resolution of $\delta m/m \leq 4\%$. First results are shown in Fig. 5. For the first time, structure due to the ω and ϕ resonances are visible. The data, normalized to the π^0 Dalitz decay peak of the hadronic decay cocktail, are compared to various theoretical predictions. Adding pion annihilation to the hadronic decay cocktail (dashed line) yields a reasonable description of the ω and ϕ mass region but the continuum in the mass range $0.2 < m_{e^+e^-} < 700$ MeV is significantly underestimated. Modifying the ρ propagator in the medium of the fireball according to the scaling proposal of Brown and Rho [34] (dot-dashed line) or via ρ -baryon interactions [35] (solid line) leads to much better agreement

with the data, strongly disfavoring a scenario in which the ρ meson is not modified in the hot and dense medium. We observe that, near the ω region, the data are better described in the scenario of [35] but a stronger statement has to await the final data analysis.




Figure 5. Dielectron mass spectrum from CERES [33] compared to various theoretical predictions. For details see text.

The ϕ meson production yield determined from these data is consistent with that predicted in the thermal model of [17], but disagrees at the 2 sigma level with the yield determined by the NA49 experiment in the KK channel [36]. Preliminary results from $\phi \rightarrow \text{KK}$ by CERES [33] indicate good agreement between the hadronic measurements where the coverage of the experiments overlap.

4. High p_t spectra and “jet” quenching

One of the major results from all 4 RHIC experiments is the observation, at p_t values larger than 2 GeV, of a strong suppression of charged particle production in central nucleus-nucleus (AA) collisions compared to pp collisions. Commonly this is expressed in the ratio $R_{AA} = \frac{d^2 N^{AA}/dp_t d\eta}{\langle N_{binary} \rangle d^2 N^{pp}/dp_t d\eta}$, i.e. the ratio of the spectra scaled by the number of binary collisions. In the low p_t region where participant scaling applies, $R_{AA} \approx N_{part}/\langle N_{binary} \rangle \approx 0.45$ for central PbPb collisions. In the hard scattering region, i.e. in the p_t region above a few GeV this ratio should approach 1 if a nuclear collision is merely a superposition of binary nucleon-nucleon collisions. In contradistinction to this expectation, R_{AA} for central AuAu collisions never exceeds 0.7, and quite dramatically

drops to a value near 0.2 for $p_t > 6$ GeV and levels off there⁴. This is demonstrated in Fig. 6, where the impressive consistency between the data from all 4 RHIC experiments is also apparent. No or little deviation from binary scaling is observed [38] in d Au collisions, demonstrating that the suppression is due to the medium produced in AA collisions and not an initial state effect. The most straightforward interpretation of this dramatic effect is that the parton preceding the high p_t hadron observed in the measurements scatters and loses energy in the medium produced in the AA collision. The degree of opacity of the medium can be evaluated more quantitatively: for a completely black medium one would expect only surface emission of hadrons in the relevant p_t range of 3 - 10 GeV. This implies $N_{part}^{2/3}$ scaling, leading to a lower limit of

$$R_{AA}^{min} = \frac{2^{4/3}}{N_{part}^{2/3}} \approx 0.05 \quad (1)$$

for central AuAu collisions, i.e. a factor of 4 lower than observed at RHIC. It will be interesting to find out whether this surface emission limit will be reached at LHC energies.




Figure 6. Transverse momentum dependence of the ratio R_{AA} of charged particle yields in central AA and pp collisions. For details see text.

Recent measurements by the BRAHMS collaboration [39] for dAu collisions show that R_{dAu} decreases to values significantly smaller than 1 with increasing hadron rapidity. This has been interpreted [37] as evidence for non-linear effects expected within the framework

⁴For a recent review and original references see M. Gyulassy and L. McLerran [37].

of the color-glass condensate (CGC). However, recent analysis [40] shows that even in the Brahm's experiment only rather moderate parton momentum fractions $x > 0.01$ contribute significantly to the cross section. Further work needs to be done to substantiate the CGC interpretation.

It is important to realize that the overall suppression visible in Fig. 6 for charged hadrons depends in detail significantly on the type of hadron under consideration. In particular, all mesons seem to follow a similar suppression pattern while the baryon/meson ratio increases strongly with transverse momentum, reaching a value close to 1 for the p/π^+ ratio, e.g., near $p_t = 3$ GeV [41,42]. This behavior is quite inconsistent with the standard fragmentation picture of a hadronizing parton, from which much smaller p/π^+ ratios are expected. Based on these and other data on elliptic flow of mesons and baryons in the transverse momentum region $2 < p_t < 5$ GeV an alternative picture was developed recently [43,44,45,46] in which hadron production occurs by recombination rather than fragmentation of partons. In fact, if the parton density is high enough, there is, for an exponentially decreasing parton p_t spectrum, a critical parton transverse momentum below which “naive”⁵ recombination will win over fragmentation. First calculations within this framework indicate that the enhanced baryon emission as well as the hadron species dependence of the elliptic flow pattern can be quite well accounted for. How to reconcile this picture which is based on an expanding parton phase with the observed jet-like correlations in the data seems not straightforward (see, e.g., the discussion in [47]).




Figure 7. Azimuthal correlations in pp and peripheral Au-Au collisions (right panel) and in central Au-Au collisions (left panel), where the dijet pattern is absent.

⁵Naive recombination implies that 2 partons at \vec{p}_1 and \vec{p}_2 will recombine to form a hadron at \vec{p}_{12} . Note, however, that this process violates entropy conservation.

Further evidence for jets and their interaction with the dense medium formed in the collision comes from measurements of azimuthal angular correlations. Results by the STAR collaboration [48,49] of such correlation measurements in pp and AuAu collisions are shown in Fig. 7. In these measurements a leading hadron with $p_t > 4$ GeV defines the “near side” direction. The azimuthal correlation of all charged particles with $p_t > 2$ GeV is depicted in this figure for pp and peripheral AuAu collisions where a typical jet-like structure is observed with pronounced peaks centered at $\Delta\phi = 0$ and π . Note, however, the striking absence of the away-side ($\Delta\phi = \pi$) peak in central AuAu collisions, implying that the medium formed in such collisions either widens this peak dramatically or shifts the momenta of particles in the away-side direction below the 2 GeV threshold. Evidence for such a widening was observed by the CERES collaboration in PbAu collisions at SPS energy [50], indicating that the onset of this jet-quenching phenomenon takes place already at much lower energy. The data presented in Fig. 7 clearly suggest that two-body parton-parton collisions and the modification of parton momenta by the medium are at the heart of the observed phenomena.

Such energy loss of partons or “quenching” of the resulting jets was predicted as due to induced gluon radiative energy loss in the dense medium [51]⁶. The theory of parton energy loss in a dense gluonic medium was since significantly improved [53,54] to take fully account of the coherent part of the gluon radiative spectrum which is induced by multiple collisions in the medium. This leads to an energy loss larger by approximately an order of magnitude compared to that induced by elastic scattering.

Based on these developments first theoretical interpretations of the observed quenching effect have appeared. As an example we present in Fig. 8 a recent comparison to RHIC data and predictions for LHC energy. The comparison of these calculations to the RHIC data shows that the experimental observations are consistent with an initial effective gluon rapidity density $\frac{dN_g}{dy} \approx 1000$ at a mean transverse momentum of $p_t \approx 1$ GeV.

Using this result one may estimate the initial energy density at time $\tau = 1/p_t$ to be $\epsilon_i = \frac{p_t^2}{\pi R^2} * \frac{dN_g}{dy} \approx 33$ GeV/fm³. Clearly this estimate exceeds by 2 orders of magnitude the energy density inside a heavy nucleus and is more than a factor 30 above the critical energy density for the transition from hadronic matter to the QGP. The jet quenching data thus lend strong support to the interpretation that a quasi-equilibrated partonic state is formed at early times in central ultra-relativistic nuclear collisions.

5. Summary and outlook

In this brief survey we have presented strong evidence for the formation of partonic matter near equilibrium from data on hadron production at low and intermediate transverse momenta in ultra-relativistic nuclear collisions. In particular, the observation that the data on hadron production ratios are in very good agreement with chemical equilibrium predictions has been used to provide a first determination of the critical temperature of the QCD phase transition. The striking data on jet quenching demonstrate the opacity of the new state of matter, and provide a glimpse into the very hot early phase of the par-

⁶Energy loss by elastic parton rescattering in the dense medium as originally proposed by Bjorken [52] is now understood to be of order 1 GeV/fm, i.e. comparable to the string tension or the energy loss in cold nuclear matter, much too small to explain jet quenching.




Figure 8. Comparison of energy loss calculations based on the GLV formalism [55,56] with RHIC data and predictions for LHC energy.

tonic fireball. First and tantalizing data on heavy quark and quarkonia production have already been obtained at RHIC and high precision data in this area are eagerly awaited. Also the SPS program on heavy quarks will be revived with new results from the NA60 experiment, which will furthermore provide high resolution, high statistics pA and InIn data on low-mass dilepton production. With LHC coming on-line in 2007 quark matter studies will continue on much hotter and longer-lived fireballs formed at $\sqrt{s_{nn}} = 5.5$ TeV. For a survey of the planned physics program see, e.g., [57,58]. Matter at the highest baryon density will be studied with precision experiments at the planned FAIR facility at GSI. For a survey of the planned physics program see, e.g., [59].

6. Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Dr. D. Miskowiec for a critical reading of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. R. Hagedorn, Nuovo Cimento Suppl. **3** (1965) 147
2. D.J. Gross, F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30** (1973) 1343.
3. H.D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30** (1973) 1346.
4. J.C. Collins and M.J. Perry, Phys. Rev. Lett. **34** (1975) 1353.
5. N. Cabibbo and G. Parisi, Phys. Lett. **B59** (1975) 67.
6. R. Hagedorn, CERN-TH-3918/84.
7. G. Baym, Nucl. Phys. **A698** (2002) xxxii.
8. F. Karsch, E. Laermann, A. Peikert, Nucl. Phys. **A605** (2001) 579.

9. S. Ejiri et al, hep-lat/0408046.
10. Proc. Quark Matter 2002, Nucl. Phys. **A715** (2003), H. Gutbrod, J. Aichelin, and K. Werner, editors.
11. Proc. Quark Matter 2004, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. **30** (2004), H. G. Ritter and X.N. Wang, editors.
12. A. Andronic and P. Braun-Munzinger, hep-ph/0402291.
13. L.D. Landau, Izv. Akad. Nauk Ser. Fiz. **5** (1950) 570.
14. M. Gazdzicki et al, NA49 collaboration, QM2004.
15. P. Braun-Munzinger, J. Stachel, J.P. Wessels and N. Xu, Phys. Lett. **B344** (1995) 43 and **B365** (1996) 1.
16. J. Cleymans, D. Elliott, H. Satz, and R.L. Thews, Z. Phys. **C74** (1997) 319.
17. P. Braun-Munzinger, I. Heppe and J. Stachel, Phys. Lett. **B465** (1999) 15.
18. J. Cleymans and K. Redlich, Phys. Rev. **C60** (1999) 054908.
19. F. Becattini, J. Cleymans, A. Keranen, E. Suhonen, and K. Redlich, Phys. Rev. **C64** (2001) 024901.
20. P. Braun-Munzinger, D. Magestro, K. Redlich, and J. Stachel, Phys. Lett. **B518** (2001) 41.
21. N. Xu and M. Kaneta, Nucl. Phys. **A698** (2002) 306c.
22. F. Becattini, J. Phys. **G28** (2002) 1553.
23. R. Rapp and E. Shuryak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2001) 2980.
24. P. Braun-Munzinger, K. Redlich, and J. Stachel, nucl-th/0304013, invited review in Quark Gluon Plasma 3, eds. R.C. Hwa and X.N. Wang, (World Scientific Publishing, 2004).
25. S. Ejiri et al., hep-lat/0312006.
26. Z. Fodor and S. Katz, JHEP **0404** (2004) 050.
27. P. Braun-Munzinger, J. Stachel, C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. **B596** (2004) 61.
28. R. Stock, Phys. Lett. **B465** (1999) 277.
29. U. Heinz, Nucl. Phys. **A638** (1998) 357.
30. U. Heinz, Nucl. Phys. **A685** (2001) 414.
31. J. Adams et al., STAR coll., Phys. Rev. Lett. **92** (2004) 182301, nucl-ex/0307024.
32. F. Becattini, Z. Physik **C69** (1996) 485, F. Becattini and U. Heinz, Z. Physik **C76** (1997) 269.
33. A. Marin et al., CERES coll., J. Phys. **G30** (2004) S709.
34. G.E. Brown and M. Rho, Phys. Rep. **363** (2002) 85.
35. R. Rapp and J. Wambach, Adv. Nucl. Phys. **25** (2000) 1, and R. Rapp, private communication.
36. D. Röhrich, J. Phys. **G27** (2001) 355.
37. M. Gyulassy, L. McLerran, nucl-th/0405013.
38. J. Adams et al., STAR coll., Phys.Rev.Lett. **91** (2003) 072304, S. Adler et al., PHENIX coll., Phys.Rev.Lett. **91** (2003) 072303; I. Arsene et al., BRAHMS coll., Phys.Rev.Lett. **91** (2003) 072305; B. Back et al., PHOBOS coll., Phys.Rev.Lett. **91** (2003) 072302.
39. I. Arsene et al., BRAHMS collaboration, nucl-ex/0403005.
40. V. Guzey, M. Strikman, W. Vogelsang, hep-ph/0407201.
41. K. Adcox et al., PHENIX coll., Phys. Rev. Lett. **88** (2002) 242301.

42. C. Adler et al., STAR coll., Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** (2002) 093201.
43. D. Molnar and S.A. Voloshin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** (2002) 092301.
44. R. J. Fries, B. Müller,, C. Nonaka, S.A. Bass, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** (2003) 202303
45. V. Greco, C. M. Ko, P. Levai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** (2003) 202302.
46. R. C. Hwa, C. B. Yang, Phys. Rev. **C67** (2003) 034902.
47. R. J. Fries, S. A. Bass, B. Müller, nucl-th/0407102.
48. C. Adler et al, STAR coll., Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** (2003) 082302.
49. D. Hartke et al, Star coll., Nucl. Phys. **A715** (2003) 272.
50. G. Agakichiev et al., CERES coll., Phys. Rev. Lett. **92** (2004) 032301.
51. M. Gyulassy, M. Plumer, Nucl. Phys. **A527** (1991) 641.
52. J. D. Bjorken, Fermilab Pub-82-059-THY (unpublished).
53. R. Baier, Yu. Dokshitzer, A. H. Muller, S. Peigne, D. Schiff, Nucl. Phys. **B484** (1997) 265.
54. for a recent review see R. Baier, D. Schiff, B. G. Zakharov, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **50** (2000) 37 for a recent review.
55. M. Gyulassy, P. Levai, I. Vitev, Nucl. Phys. **B549** (2001) 371.
56. I. Vitev, J. Phys. **G30** (2004) S791, hep-ph/0403089.
57. I. Schutz, J. Phys. **G30** (2004) S903.
58. J.P. Revol et al., ALICE physics performance report, J. Phys. **G30** (2004) 1517.
59. P. Senger, J. Phys. **G30** (2004) S1087.