

Energy and system size dependence of charged particle elliptic flow and v_2/ε scaling

Sergei A. Voloshin for the STAR Collaboration[‡]

Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

E-mail: voloshin@wayne.edu

Abstract. We report measurements of charged particle elliptic flow at mid-rapidity in Au+Au and Cu+Cu collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 62$ and 200 GeV. Using correlations between main STAR TPC and Forward TPCs ensures minimal bias due to non-flow effects. We further investigate the effect of flow fluctuations on v_2/ε scaling studying initial geometry eccentricity fluctuations in Monte-Carlo Glauber model, consistent with STAR direct measurements of elliptic flow fluctuations [1]. It is found that accounting for the effect of flow fluctuations improves v_2/ε scaling.

The large elliptic flow observed at RHIC [2], along with its mass dependence at low transverse momenta [3, 4] is indicative of early thermalization of the system created in high energy nuclear collisions and its evolution consistent with ideal hydrodynamics. The observed [5] constituent quark scaling [6, 7] of elliptic flow suggests that the system spends significant time in the deconfined state. Further insight into the physics of the elliptic flow and the processes governing the evolution of the system can be achieved by the study of the elliptic flow dependence on the system size and collision energy. In [8] the authors suggested that the elliptic flow follows a simple scaling in the initial system eccentricity and the particle density in the transverse plane, $v_2/\varepsilon \propto 1/S dN_{ch}/dy$ (where S is the area of the overlap region of two nuclei). Indeed the available data are consistent with such a scaling [6, 9]. Unfortunately, the systematic uncertainties in these results are too large to conclude on how well the scaling holds. The main difficulties are the evaluation/elimination of the so-called non-flow correlations (azimuthal correlations not related to the reaction plane orientation), effects of flow fluctuations, and uncertainties in the calculation of the initial system eccentricity.

A technique to suppress non-flow contributions employed in this analysis, is the correlation of particles separated in rapidity by large interval [10]. In particular we present the results for elliptic flow measured in the STAR main TPC ($-0.9 < \eta < 0.9$), obtained via correlations with particles in the two Forward TPCs ($2.9 < |\eta| < 3.9$). The results presented below are based on an analysis (after all event quality cuts) of 9.6 M Au+Au 200 GeV, 7 M Au+Au 62 GeV, 30 M Cu+Cu 200 GeV, and 19 M Cu+Cu 62 GeV Minimum Bias events (note the better statistics for 200 GeV Au+Au and Cu+Cu

[‡] For the full list of STAR authors and acknowledgments, see appendix ‘Collaborations’ of this volume




Figure 1. (color online) Elliptic flow in Au+Au and Cu+Cu collisions as function of centrality at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV.

collisions compared to the previously reported results in [11]). Centrality of the collision is determined in accordance with the so-called Reference Multiplicity - the multiplicity of primary tracks in $|\eta| < 0.5$ region.

Fig. 1 presents the results for elliptic flow of charged particles in the pseudorapidity window $|\eta| < 0.9$, for 200 GeV Au+Au and Cu+Cu collisions. The corresponding 62 GeV results can be found in [11]. Charged particles are selected from $0.15 < p_t < 2.0$ GeV region; the low transverse momentum cut is due to TPC acceptance. In black, noted as $v_2\{2\}$, are shown the results obtained from two particle azimuthal correlations with both particle from the main TPC region. In blue, noted as $v_2\{FTPC\}$, are the results obtained correlating particles in the main and Forward TPCs regions. The larger values of $v_2\{2\}$ compared to $v_2\{FTPC\}$ are attributed to the non-flow contribution. The relative contribution of non-flow in Cu+Cu collisions is significantly larger compared to that in Au+Au collisions due to smaller values of flow itself. Analysis (similar to that performed in [2]) of the centrality dependence of correlations between flow vectors obtained in the two Forward TPCs and also with flow vector in the Main TPC yields an estimate of the systematic relative error at maximum flow of the order of $\leq 3\%$ (AuAu 200 GeV), $\leq 5\%$ (AuAu 62 GeV), $\leq 12\%$ (CuCu 200 GeV), and $\leq 20\%$ (CuCu 62 GeV).

Figure 2 presents the results for p_t dependence of elliptic flow in Au+Au and Cu+Cu collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV. Two sets of results are shown: $v_2\{2\}$ - two particle correlation results with both particles in the main TPC region, and $v_2\{FTPC\}$. Cu+Cu plot additionally shows $v_2\{AA - pp\}$ which is $v_2\{2\}$ with subtracted non-flow contribution as measured in pp -collisions. Differential flow results indicate that non-flow contribution increases with transverse momentum, and at $p_t > 6$ GeV non-flow effects can become significant. $v_2(p_t)$ calculated at different collision centralities (not




Figure 2. (color online) $v_2(p_t)$ in midcentral Au+Au and Cu+Cu collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}}=200$ GeV.

presented in the proceedings) indicate relatively larger non-flow effects at high transverse momentum in more central collisions.

Adequate treatment of flow fluctuations is essential for understanding the flow dependence on centrality of the collision and the size of colliding nuclei. Under the assumption that elliptic flow closely follows initial eccentricity of the system, $\varepsilon = \langle y^2 - x^2 \rangle / \langle y^2 + x^2 \rangle$, one can estimate flow fluctuations by calculation of eccentricity fluctuations [12, 13], e.g. in Glauber Monte-Carlo model. It was argued [14, 15] that the so-called “participant” eccentricity should be used in this calculations. The corresponding results for the four systems studied in this analysis have been presented in [15], and are used in the current analysis. The direct measurement of flow fluctuations presented in this conference [1] are consistent with the assumption that flow fluctuations are dominant by fluctuation in the initial eccentricity.

Fig. 3 shows how new results on the integrated elliptic flow fit to the v_2/ε scaling. This plot is made under assumption that flow fluctuations in the main TPC region, $|\eta| < 0.5$, are fully correlated with flow fluctuations in the Forward TPC regions $2.9 < |\eta| < 3.9$, which justifies rescaling with $\sqrt{\langle \varepsilon_{part}^2 \rangle}$. (More details on how flow results obtained in different ways should scale with eccentricity can be found in [15].) The results obtained with the use of the first order reaction plane from STAR ZDC-SMD [16] are rescaled with $\langle \varepsilon_{part} \rangle$, as they are not a subject to flow fluctuations. For the references to other data presented in Fig. 3 see [9].

Note that for the v_2/ε scaling plot the results from Figures 1 and 2 have been rescaled/extrapolated to a full transverse momentum coverage using blast wave fits to spectra; rapidity density has been obtained from pseudorapidity density using scaling factors based on HIJING and RQMD calculations. The presented (ideal) hydrodynamic predictions are based on calculations [17]. The curves shown are obtained from hydro




Figure 3. (color online) v_2/ε scaling plot

results made for fixed impact parameter ($b = 7$ fm) and different particle densities (collision energies). Note that hydro results do not scale perfectly in this plot and in general exhibit somewhat flatter centrality dependence at each collision energy.

Fig. 3 shows that, despite that 62 GeV Au+Au results are somewhat higher than the rest, in general the scaling [8] holds well. Also remarkable is the agreement between $v_2\{FTPC\}$ and $v_2\{ZDC - SMD\}$ rescaled with appropriate (but different) values of eccentricity. Obviously the LHC and/or RHIC U+U data will be very valuable to understand what happens at even higher particle density.

[1] P. Sorensen [STAR Collaboration], this proceedings, arXiv:nucl-ex/0612021
 [2] Ackermann K H *et al* [STAR Collaboration] 2001 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** 402.
 [3] Adler C *et al* [STAR Collaboration] 2001 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** 182301
 [4] Huovinen P *et al* 2001 *Phys. Lett.* **B503** 58
 [5] J. Adams *et al.* [STAR Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 052302 (2004).
 [6] Voloshin S A 2003 *Nucl. Phys.* **A715** 379
 [7] Molnar D and Voloshin S A 2003 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91** 092301
 [8] Voloshin S A and Poskanzer A M 2000 *Phys. Lett.* **B474** 27
 [9] Alt C *et al* [NA49 Collaboration], 2003 *Phys. Rev.* **C68** 034903
 [10] Poskanzer A M and Voloshin S A 1998 *Phys. Rev.* **C58** 1671
 [11] Voloshin S A [STAR Collaboration], 2006 AIP Conf. Proc. **870** 691
 [12] Adler C *et al* [STAR Collaboration], 2002 *Phys. Rev.* **C66** 034904
 [13] Miller M and Snellings R arXiv:nucl-ex/0312008
 [14] Manly S *et al* [PHOBOS Collaboration], 2006 *Nucl. Phys.* **A774** 523
 [15] Voloshin S A arXiv:nucl-th/0606022
 [16] Wang G *et al* [STAR Collaboration], 2006 *Nucl. Phys.* **A774** 515
 [17] Kolb P, Sollfrank J and Heinz U 2000 *Phys. Rev.* **C62** 054909