

## Theoretical Conference Summary

Jean-Paul Blaizot<sup>\*a†</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Service de Physique Théorique, CEA-Saclay,  
F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette cedex

### 1. Introduction

For those who have been in the field since its infancy, this Quark-Matter meeting has been one long waited for. And it will certainly remain as the one marking the beginning of a new era in the study of ultra-relativistic heavy ion collisions. The first results obtained at RHIC were presented, and the variety and quality of the data confirm that the potential of the machine is truly fascinating.

It is clearly too early to draw definite conclusions, or to make firm statements about how new data fit theoretical expectations. To a large extent the results which have been shown at this conference do not change qualitatively the picture that has emerged from the analysis of nucleus-nucleus collisions performed until now. However there are a few instances where natural extrapolations do not seem to work. Furthermore, intriguing new features have been revealed, indicating that we are perhaps seeing first glimpses of non trivial QCD behavior in the bulk of nucleus-nucleus collisions.

Aside from the many discussions centered around the new data and their interpretation, exciting progress in theory have been reported, and there is no doubt that some of these will inspire further work. While there remains a significant gap between what theorists can calculate from “first principles” and the modeling of nucleus-nucleus collisions, several developments indicate that it is diminishing, which is very encouraging.

The outline of the talk is the following. I start by reviewing progress reported on first principle calculations of quark-gluon plasma properties. Then I proceed to a discussion of the “standard picture” of nucleus-nucleus collisions as it has been developed in the last years, and comment on several stages of the collisions: early phase, expansion, freeze-out. In particular it will be interesting to see to which extent the new RHIC data confirm this picture; this will be also the occasion to discuss interesting theoretical developments in the calculation of the “initial” distributions of partons playing an essential role in the collisions. Then I turn to a discussion of specific observables.

In order to save space, the various talks, and the corresponding authors, will just be quoted in the main text and not referred to in the final bibliography.

---

\*Member of CNRS

†SPhT is a laboratory from Direction des Sciences de la Matière du Commissariat à l’Energie Atomique, and Unité de Recherche Associée au CNRS (URA2306)

## 2. What is the quark-gluon plasma?

Part of the difficulty in identifying the formation of a quark-gluon plasma in nuclear collisions is linked to the difficulty to calculate its detailed properties from the first principles of QCD, and to have a good physical picture of confinement or deconfinement. Progress in this direction are constant though, and the gap between what can be calculated from QCD and what can be measured, although it is still large, is diminishing.

Much of our detailed qualitative and quantitative knowledge of the thermodynamics of QCD is coming from lattice calculations. These calculations, reviewed here by Karsch, have steadily improved over the years and the accuracy of the present results is truly impressive. For the first time, we were presented accurate results for the transition temperature for the full QCD, with dynamical quarks, and the predictions following various treatments of the fermions are now close to each other [1]. The temperature depends on the number  $N_f$  of light flavors and is  $T_c = (173 \pm 8)$  MeV for  $N_f = 2$  and  $T_c = (154 \pm 8)$  MeV for  $N_f = 3$  (statistical errors only); for the physically interesting situation of one heavy flavor and two light ones  $T_c$  is close to its value for the  $N_f = 2$  case. It is also found that the dependence of the equation of state on  $N_f$  is dominated by that of the ideal gas: the pressure divided by the ideal gas pressure when plotted as a function of  $T/T_c$  appears to be an almost universal curve. Finally, the energy density of the quark-gluon plasma near  $T_c$  is estimated to be  $\epsilon \sim 700$  MeV/fm<sup>3</sup> with 40% uncertainty.

A quantitative understanding of the slow approach to the ideal gas limit that is seen in the lattice data is now emerging from continuum analytical calculations. Early suggestions [2] that the quark-gluon plasma behaves as a gas of weakly interacting quasiparticles have been put on firm theoretical grounds using weak coupling techniques and various resummations. The main effect of such resummations is a renormalization of quasiparticle properties, after which quasiparticles remain weakly interacting degrees of freedom. As reported by Iancu, this picture is supported by a first principle calculation of the entropy of the quark-gluon plasma [3]. This analytical approach, as well as that of screened perturbation theory developed in [4], is complemented by the techniques of dimensional reduction presented by Schröder [5].

While massive quasiparticles may be the relevant degrees of freedom at high temperature, what happens near the phase transition remains unclear. Pisarski suggested that degrees of freedom associated with the Polyakov loop could play an important role. Let us recall that the expectation value of the Polyakov loop:

$$l(\mathbf{x}) = (1/N) \text{Tr P exp} \left\{ ig \int_0^{1/T} A_0(\mathbf{x}, \tau) d\tau \right\}$$

constitutes, in the absence of dynamical quarks, an order parameter for the deconfinement transition: at low temperature the system is invariant under  $Z_3$  transformations and  $\langle l \rangle = 0$ , while  $Z_3$  symmetry is spontaneously broken in the deconfined phase, which is signalled by a non vanishing  $\langle l \rangle$  [6]. An effective potential can be constructed to control the variation of the order parameter. Pisarski argued that in the vicinity of the phase transition the variation of the pressure is dominated by that of this effective potential, and he suggested some observable consequences related to expected large event-by-event fluctuations in the average pion momentum [7]. An alternative picture of confinement,

involving a priori different degrees of freedom from those just discussed, is provided by the picture of a dual superconductor. In this picture, confinement is associated to a monopole condensate. Di Giacomo presented latest results of lattice calculations which provide evidence for this mechanism using various abelian projections.

The studies of the heavy quark free energy, most commonly referred to as the heavy quark potential, are of direct relevance for heavy ion physics since they condition our understanding of heavy quark bound states in a quark gluon plasma. The heavy quark free energy can be obtained from an analysis of the correlator of Polyakov loops:  $\langle L(\vec{x})L^\dagger(\vec{y}) \rangle \propto \exp\{-V(r, T)/T\}$  with  $r = |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|$ . The potential has been studied below and above  $T_c$  and as a function of the quark mass. Below  $T_c$ , and for infinite quark mass, the potential is confining. When dynamical quarks are included, string breaking occurs and beyond a certain distance the force between heavy quark vanishes; in other words, the potential goes to a constant at large  $r$ . Systematic studies were presented by Karsch and further discussed by Petrecky. It was reported that close to  $T_c$ , string breaking and screening occurs already for distances as small as  $r \simeq 0.3\text{fm}$ .

Some progress has been reported in two domains where it has been slow because the problems are notoriously difficult. One concerns the relation between Euclidean or imaginary time quantities that one evaluates on the lattice and the real time information that one needs to describe various physical phenomena. Hatsuda suggested the use of the method of maximal entropy to this goal [8], and he presented model examples showing how the method works. Ultimately one would like to use such methods to study how hadronic spectral densities vary with temperature, but one is still far from that goal. The other progress concerns calculations at finite baryonic chemical potential. Miyamura presented studies of the response of physical observables, such as meson masses, to small variations of the chemical potential  $\mu$  around  $\mu = 0$ . Such calculations are possible because they involve the evaluation of response functions for vanishing chemical potentials, and this can be done on the lattice.

Latest developments in the study of the phase structure of cold dense matter were reported by Rajagopal who argued that if quark matter exists in the core of neutron stars then this matter should be a color superconductor. He discussed the possible existence of a crystalline phase of such matter [9], and its possible role in neutron star glitches. The influence of specific features of the equation of state on neutron star properties were reviewed in more generality by Prakash.

### 3. NUCLEUS-NUCLEUS COLLISIONS. THE STANDARD PICTURE

The vast body of data accumulated over the last 15 years draw a picture of ultrarelativistic nucleus-nucleus collisions that may now be referred to as the “standard picture”. The main qualitative changes that are commonly expected as one moves up from SPS to RHIC energy are the following: a smaller crossing times of the two nuclei (about a tenth of a fermi at RHIC), a larger initial energy density (by about 70% at present energy), larger freeze-out volumes and longer lifetimes (these expectations however do not seem to be supported by the preliminary RHIC data), a slightly larger freeze-out temperature and a smaller baryonic chemical potential  $\mu_B$  (in central rapidity region); finally quark and gluon degrees of freedom should play an increasingly important role.

I shall now make a few remarks related to the various stages of the collision. I start from the last stages, namely the freeze-out, and finish with the initial conditions.

### 3.1. Freeze-out and hadronization

The data indicate that matter at freeze-out can be described by equilibrium distributions: particle ratios are well fitted with two parameters, a temperature  $T$  and a baryon chemical potential  $\mu_B$ . As Rischke reminded us, this simple feature of chemical freeze-out is supported by many analyses, covering a wide range of data, from SIS to CERN. Redlich pointed out that the variation of the freeze-out parameters with the beam energy is such that the energy per particle remains approximately constant,  $E/N \approx 1\text{GeV}$  [10]. This picture seems to work equally well at RHIC. An interesting question addressed by Rischke and Brown in their talks is how the in-medium modifications of hadron properties (mass, width) change the freeze-out parameters.

Some understanding on how the apparent equilibrium state is reached is provided by detailed microscopic calculations which show that there may be enough final state interactions to drive indeed the system towards equilibrium (see the talks by Bass and Bravina). Calculations combining hydrodynamics with quantum molecular dynamics exhibit clearly the collective flow of matter at the thermal freeze-out; these calculations show that particles with small cross sections (such as the  $\Omega$ ) are not much affected by this collective flow, and have accordingly a lower apparent temperature (in agreement with what is seen in the data). Whereas such evidence for collective flow persists at RHIC (there are indications that the radial velocity is larger at RHIC than at the SPS, see for instance the summary by Nu Xu), the data on HBT radii presented at the meeting lead to a puzzling situation: radii are not as big as expected, and more surprisingly, the ratio  $R_{out}/R_{side}$  seems to be smaller than 1, contradicting the common interpretation of  $\sqrt{R_{out}^2 - R_{side}^2}$  as the lifetime of the emitting source (this issue is further discussed in the summary by Panitkin).

In spite of the success of some detailed microscopic calculations, the fact that particle ratios can be described by equilibrium distributions remains rather puzzling. Since similar analysis apply equally well to particle production in  $e^+ - e^-$  collisions [11] the apparent equilibrium observed at chemical freeze-out may have nothing to do with final state interactions. It could point to some universality of the statistical properties of hadronization. But even if it is not fully understood, the picture is so successful that it has been extended to the production of rare particles, such as the  $J/\Psi$  [12] to which I come back at the end.

### 3.2. Models and degrees of freedom

As emphasized by Bass, there is no single space-time model describing the entire collision process. This is because different degrees of freedom enter different stages of the reactions, each stage requiring therefore a specific treatment. An exception is hydrodynamics where changes of microscopic degrees of freedom are not treated explicitly but only collectively through changes in the equation of state. Models which use hadronic degrees of freedom, such as those based on molecular dynamics, are designed for the late stages of the collisions. They can be combined with hydrodynamics to get a better description of the freeze-out (see the talks by Bass, Bravina, Teaney). The models for the initial stages focus on partonic degrees of freedom (see the talks by Eskola, Wang). Finally, aside from models which aim at providing a complete space-time picture of the collisions, there are

models, such as those based on Gribov-Regge phenomenology like the dual parton model, which set up calculations in momentum space (see the talk by Werner).

K. Eskola showed that, when suitably extrapolated to the present RHIC energies, most models tend to overpredict the multiplicities. There are large theoretical uncertainties in each of the models, which means that they can be adjusted. But further measurements will provide more stringent constraints. This is the case for instance of the measurement of the transverse energy  $dE_T/d\eta$ , as emphasized by Eskola and Dumitru. It is not the place here to go into a detailed comparison between models, but I find it interesting to observe that some discrepancies between predictions could be traced back by Eskola to differences in the structure functions used as inputs. That such a detailed microscopic information could now matter for predicting the value of a global quantity such as the multiplicity density is revealing of a profound change in the field.

It has been expected that at RHIC energies, the effect of hard or semi-hard interactions should become important, with a substantial fraction of particle production involving minijets at an early stage of the reactions. Much progress has been made in using perturbative QCD to estimate such minijet production (see e.g. [13]) and model predictions have been reviewed by Eskola and Wang. While the role of minijets in the bulk of the reaction dynamics is still unclear, it has been argued that the data provide evidence for hard scattering. One argument which was presented relies on the following formula for the total multiplicity:

$$\frac{dN}{d\eta} = a \cdot N_{part} + b \cdot N_{coll},$$

where  $N_{part}$  is the number of participants and  $N_{coll}$  the number of binary collisions. There is evidence at RHIC for a sizeable value of  $b$  (see for instance the talk by Milov). One is used to associate the term proportional to  $N_{part}$  to soft physics, as suggested by the “wounded nucleon” model [14]: once a nucleon has collided it becomes ineffective in producing particles in a subsequent collision, so that the multiplicity is just proportional to the number of participants. However, it should be emphasized that while a term proportional to  $N_{coll}$  emerges naturally from hard scatterings, there is also a soft contribution proportional to  $N_{coll}$ , whose magnitude increases with energy [15]. Therefore more detailed studies are needed to properly quantify the importance of hard scattering in global observables. I shall end this discussion by noting an interesting attempt to relate the growth of the multiplicity from peripheral to central collisions to that of the saturation scale characterizing the parton distributions [16].

### 3.3. Initial conditions

This brings me to discuss exciting theoretical advances which may lead to a complete determination of that part of the nuclear wave functions which is relevant in collisions at high energy. As a particular outcome, one may be able to relate global observables such as the total transverse energy and the multiplicity to “initial conditions” which can be calculated from first principles. The developments that I am referring to exploit a simplicity which emerges at high energy and for large nuclei. As recalled nicely by Son at the beginning of his talk, these are conditions which bring the system into a weak coupling regime where one can reliably calculate. Of course, in actual collisions, one may not quite be in this ideal regime. But the ideal case provides nevertheless an extremely

valuable reference which is worth studying in detail.

The picture being actively discussed involves the notion of a “saturation” scale  $Q_s$  [17]. Leaving aside many subtleties, let me just mention that  $Q_s$  is the scale at which QCD non linear effects become important. It may be determined by an argument similar to that used in high temperature QCD to determine the scale ( $\sim g^2 T$ ) at which perturbation theory breaks down (see for instance [18]). At that point the two terms in covariant derivatives become of the same order of magnitude. Equivalently, we expect non linear effects to become important when  $\partial^2 \sim \alpha_s \langle A^2 \rangle$ . Since the relevant dynamics is in the transverse plane, the magnitude of the gradient is fixed by the transverse momentum  $p_T$ . As for the magnitude of the gauge field fluctuations they can be estimated from the particle number density in the transverse plane, i.e.  $\langle A^2 \rangle \sim N_g(p_T)/R^2$ , where  $N_g(p_T)$  is the total number of gluons with transverse momentum of order  $p_T$  and  $R$  is the radius of the nucleus. One then obtains the saturation scale  $Q_s$  as the value of  $p_T$  which obeys:

$$p_T^2 \propto \alpha_s \frac{N_g(p_T)}{R^2}.$$

This scale has been obtained in various other ways. For instance in [19] it was determined by looking at the apparition of non linear effects in the evolution equation for the structure functions [20].

We note from the expression above that the number of partons occupying a small disk of radius  $1/Q_s$  in the transverse plane is  $\sim 1/\alpha_s$ . Such a large occupation number also characterizes the place where unscreened longwavelength (magnetic) fluctuations cause perturbation theory to break down at high temperature. In such conditions of large number of quanta, classical field approximations may become relevant to describe the nuclear wavefunctions. Such an approach, initiated by McLerran and Venugopalan [21], has led recently to very interesting developments which have been discussed in the talks by Venugopalan and Kovchegov.

Of course our ability to calculate relies ultimately on  $Q_s$  being small. It is interesting in this respect to note that the formula above indicates that  $Q_s^2 \propto \alpha_s A^{1/3}$ , where  $A$  is the number of nucleons in the nucleus (this follows from the fact that  $(N_g(p_T) \sim A$  and  $R \sim A^{1/3})$ . Thus  $Q_s$  is large for (asymptotically) large nuclei. Furthermore, because the number of gluons increases with energy,  $Q_s$  increases with energy. However, the condition  $Q_s \gg \Lambda_{QCD}$  is only marginally realized at present, various estimates giving  $Q_s^2 \sim 2 \text{ GeV}^2$ .

Until now we have been discussing properties of the nuclear wavefunctions. It may be argued that the partons which get freed in a nucleus-nucleus collisions have typical transverse momenta of the order of  $Q_s$ , and originate from collisions of gluons which, in the initial wave functions, have also transverse momenta of order  $Q_s$  [22]. Those partons get freed in a short time, of order  $1/Q_s$  and can collide with partners with comparable rapidity. The subsequent evolution of this system of partons was discussed by Son, who identified several characteristic regimes in this evolution, controlled by well defined powers of the strong coupling constant [23]. Son also pointed out the essential role of inelastic processes in the approach of the system towards equilibrium.

## 4. SPECIFIC SIGNALS

I come now to the discussion of specific signals, that is, of observables which are believed to carry information about the state of matter produced at various stages of the collisions, and reveal some of its characteristic properties. It is by combining information coming from all these different signals that one can reconstruct the history of a collision and possibly get evidence for the production of a quark-gluon plasma. Most of these signals have been well studied at lower energy. But, as we shall see, the first RHIC results already provide new perspectives on some of these “old subjects”; furthermore new signals, such as jet quenching, are emerging.

### 4.1. Fluctuations

The many particles produced in high energy collisions allow for event-by-event analyses, and the theory to exploit this information is developing. There are many sources of “interesting” fluctuations that have been discussed, in particular those occurring near a phase transition (see the talk by Gavin), or close to a critical point, or those due to the formation of a “disoriented chiral condensate”. Much studied recently are the fluctuations in conserved quantities [24], related to correlators of conserved currents (see the talks by Koch, Asakawa, Stephanov; see also the related talk by Pratt on “balance functions”). Relevant conserved quantities are the electric charge, the baryon number or strangeness. The motivation for focusing on such fluctuations is that some of the “primordial” fluctuations in conserved quantities may survive hadronization, and may therefore reveal interesting properties of matter produced in the early stages of nuclear collisions.

### 4.2. Elliptic flow

The azimuthal anisotropy of the distributions of produced particles is now commonly characterized by the Fourier coefficient

$$v_2 = \langle \cos 2\varphi \rangle,$$

where  $\varphi$  is the azimuthal angle measured with respect to the collision plane. A positive  $v_2$  indicates that the particles are emitted preferentially in the collision plane, as was predicted almost 10 years ago [25]. The effect is now beautifully verified and is among the results much discussed at this conference. The fact that the flow decreases linearly with increasing centrality constitutes perhaps the first instance where hydrodynamics is seen to work quantitatively.

The main reason why the distributions are not isotropic, is that elastic collisions change the directions of the particles. If these collisions are sufficiently frequent, pressure builds up and a collective flow occurs preferentially along the direction of the largest pressure gradient. Thus the elliptic flow carries information about the pressure and hence on the equation of state. Detailed calculations show however that the dependence on the equation of state is rather weak (see e.g. the talk by Teaney). It has been argued that it is necessary for the pressure to build up at early times to have a maximal effect [26]. What is meant by “early” time however is not immediately obvious. One should keep in mind that the flow takes time to develop, a time typically of the order of the size of the system. Furthermore, it is easy to see that as one decreases the time at which the hydrodynamical

motion starts, the pressure increases but that does not lead necessarily to an increase of the flow; indeed the inertia in the hydrodynamical equation increases proportionally to the pressure:  $w d\mathbf{v}/dt = -\nabla P$  with  $w = \epsilon + P$ . In fact detailed calculations show that no visible variation of  $v_2$  follows when the initial time is changed from 1 to 2 fm/c [25].

Hydrodynamics appears to explain nicely the variation of  $v_2$  with  $p_T$  at small  $p_T$  ( $p_T < 1$  GeV), as well as the mass dependence of the effect [27]. It is interesting to observe that this effect of the mass results from an interplay between radial flow and elliptic flow, so that the existence of elliptic flow may be taken as evidence for a strong radial flow, as emphasized by Huovinen. Of course at sufficiently large  $p_T$  the effect should disappear, because the elastic cross-section drop and the high  $p_T$  particles stop to behave hydrodynamically. However the apparent saturation seen in the data around  $p_T \sim 2$  GeV remains to be understood.

A distinct mechanism for azimuthal anisotropy was proposed by X.-N. Wang [28]. High  $p_T$  particles lose energy when traversing a quark gluon plasma because of induced radiation. Since the energy loss increases with the length of traversed material, one expects this effect to soften the  $p_T$  distribution in the direction perpendicular to the collision plane. This mechanism probes therefore directly the anisotropy of the spatial distribution. In this picture,  $v_2$  is sensitive to jet quenching, and X.-N. Wang presented indeed calculations from which he argued that the amount of quenching needed to explain the observed magnitude of  $v_2$  at large  $p_T$  is comparable to that needed to explain the  $\pi_0$  spectra (see below the discussion of jet quenching).

### 4.3. Strangeness suppression (?)

We have evidence that strangeness is to a large degree “equilibrated” in nuclear collisions. Because the time scales for equilibration are a priori much smaller in a quark-gluon plasma than in a hadron gas, this is sometimes taken as evidence for quark-gluon plasma formation. However, it was shown by Greiner, following arguments presented by Rapp to explain antibaryon yields, that multi-mesonic reactions could produce antihyperons on very short time scales. Another mechanism for strangeness equilibration (at lower energy), involving the in-medium modifications of hadron properties, was proposed by G.E Brown [29].

Redlich emphasized that some form of strangeness enhancement already appears in p-A collisions, and argued that the connection of strangeness enhancement to the formation of a quark-gluon plasma remains unclear. Statistical models which describe so well the freeze-out transition involve constraints on the volume over which matter can be equilibrated. This, added to the need to implement conservation laws exactly in small systems, leads to a change of perspective: what is usually regarded as strangeness enhancement in nucleus-nucleus collisions should perhaps better be viewed as strangeness suppression in proton-proton collisions. Redlich showed that this picture accounts well for the data on multistrange hadrons obtained by WA97 [30]. However, it does not seem to be compatible with the abrupt onset of strangeness enhancement reported by the NA57 collaboration (see the talk by Carrer).

### 4.4. Dileptons and photons

Our present understanding of the various experiments on dilepton and photon production has been reviewed by Gale. The enhancement of low mass dileptons seems to be



well accounted for by detailed calculations of the spectral function of the  $\rho$  meson in a dense medium. The main question of whether the effect can be interpreted as a manifestation of chiral symmetry restoration remains opened, and will perhaps be answered by the expected new precision data.

The rate of direct photon production has been calculated in QCD at 2-loop order, and Gelis discussed the difficulties of such calculations. When these rates are combined with an hydrodynamical model for the evolution of the system, a good fit to the WA98 data is obtained for parameters compatible with quark-gluon plasma formation (see the talk by Srivastava). However, as discussed by Gale, this interpretation is not unique.

There has been also discussion of the intermediate mass dileptons, where recent calculations suggest that thermal contributions may compete with open charm [31]. Clearly a direct measurement of open charm would help clarifying the issue.

#### 4.5. $J/\Psi$ enhancement (?)

The study of  $J/\Psi$  production in nucleus-nucleus collisions is one of the highlights of the CERN/SPS program, and beautiful data on various aspects of this phenomenon have been collected over the years by the NA50 collaboration. Unfortunately, as we were reminded by J. Qiu, our theoretical understanding of  $J/\Psi$  production in hadronic collisions is still limited, even in kinematical conditions where QCD calculations could be carried out reliably. The difficult part concerns the evolution from the small  $c\bar{c}$  pair, whose production can be calculated perturbatively, to the fully developed  $J/\Psi$  meson. Qiu provided a picture for the transition from the pre- $J/\Psi$  partonic state to the physical  $J/\Psi$  in which the multiple scattering of the  $c\bar{c}$  pair with the nuclear medium may increase its invariant mass above the  $D\bar{D}$  threshold, leading eventually to  $J/\Psi$  suppression. This provides a mechanism for nuclear absorption which seems also capable to account for some of the anomalous suppression, but fails to reproduce the data at large transverse energies.

In fact, what happens at large transverse energy is likely to be related to the transverse energy fluctuations [32]. As reported by Dinh, the data can be explained by a simple model in which the  $J/\Psi$ 's are suppressed whenever they would be produced in a region where the local energy density exceeds some critical value. One outcome of this model is that it is not correct to associate the two structures in the pattern of  $J/\Psi$  suppression to the successive melting of the charmonium resonances, first the  $\chi$  and then the  $J/\Psi$ . Note that transverse energy fluctuations would also lead to increased comover absorption; however the effect is much weaker in this case, as shown by Capella. To account for the data, one needs to assume that all the  $J/\Psi$ 's are destroyed at large  $E_T$ . The analysis presented by Dinh relies on the assumption that what suppresses the  $J/\Psi$  is a local phenomenon, related to the local energy density. Confirmation of this picture could come from measurements at various beam energies, allowing to vary the local energy density without changing the collision geometry. Unfortunately, such a study was not possible at CERN.

What will happen at RHIC? The various models, when extrapolated to high energies, lead to a severe suppression, making even the observation of  $J/\Psi$ 's problematic. But these extrapolations miss a potentially important feature. There is indeed the interesting possibility that  $J/\Psi$  production could be enhanced at RHIC, rather than suppressed! The main idea leading to this expectation is that, at the high energy of RHIC, several

$c\bar{c}$  pairs may be present in the same system. These pairs have a finite probability to recombine leading to a  $J/\Psi$  yield growing as the square of the number of  $c\bar{c}$  pairs produced, and various calculations suggest that this may overcome the expected severe suppression [33,34]. Clearly it will be very interesting to see the first data on  $J/\Psi$  production at RHIC!

#### 4.6. Jet quenching

The last specific signal that I wish to discuss is a new one in the list. It concerns indeed an effect which was not observed at the SPS and which is related to the energy loss of fast partons moving through a quark gluon plasma. The calculation of this effect has been done by various teams [35–39], using various formalisms, leading to successive improvements in the estimate, in particular of its energy dependence (see the talks by Levai, Wang and Wiedemann).

The energy loss of a fast moving quark or gluon in a quark-gluon plasma is mostly due to induced gluon radiation and it affects the momentum distributions of the produced hadrons: when the jets hadronize they have less energy than they would if they had been produced in free space. As a result, the hadron momentum distribution is softer. Much excitement during the meeting was generated in particular by the first reports on the  $\pi_0$  spectra by PHENIX, because these spectra are distorted in a way which could be compatible with partonic energy loss. As Levai showed in his contribution, while perturbative QCD combined with a simple Glauber picture accounts perfectly for the yields in peripheral collisions, it fails by a factor 10 for the most central ones. Jet quenching was proposed as a possible explanation and indeed a fit to the data can be achieved with a moderate value of the energy loss,  $dE/dx \approx 0.25\text{Gev}/\text{fm}$ .

Is this a hint for the presence of a quark-gluon plasma? Data with higher transverse momentum particles will certainly bring further crucial information. One should note here that the extrapolation from peripheral to central collisions involve assumptions about the dependence of centrality on the number of binary collisions which are perhaps not fully under control. It should also be emphasized that this is an indirect observation since we do not see the jets and, as was the case for the phenomenon of  $J/\Psi$  suppression, one will perhaps find hadronic mechanisms to explain the data. It remains that we have here a new and exciting phenomenon which, when fully understood, will provide a new tool for exploring the properties of the produced matter. It will complement nicely the use of other penetrating probes such as the  $J/\Psi$  meson.

### 5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

At the end of such a meeting, one cannot help feeling grateful to all the people who have contributed to make RHIC available for the study of dense and hot matter. What has been a dream for many years starts to be realized, perhaps beyond expectations, and the new perspectives that RHIC opens in the field are quite exciting.

Although many of the data presented during the week may just seem to confirm the overall picture that has emerged from previous studies at lower energies, a few observations may force us already to review certain aspects of our standard picture of high energy nuclear collisions. There is evidence that, as expected, quark and gluon degrees of freedom play a more visible role at RHIC than at the SPS, and indeed QCD is being more directly

involved in the interpretation of the data. Besides, a few new non trivial effects have been reported, and new probes have become available. At the same time several exciting theoretical developments suggest that the gap is closing between fundamental studies of QCD and more phenomenological ones on the physics of heavy ions. In summary, both the data which have been presented and the progress in theory that have been reported will certainly be the source of inspiration for a lot of work in the months to come. This is the sign of a very successful meeting!

**Acknowledgments.** I wish to thank Jean-Yves Ollitrault for numerous discussions and for his critical reading of the manuscript.

## REFERENCES

1. F. Karsch, E. Laermann and A. Peikert, hep-lat/0012023.
2. A. Peshier, B. Kampfer, O. P. Pavlenko and G. Soff, Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 2399.
3. J. P. Blaizot, E. Iancu and A. Rebhan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** (1999) 2906 [hep-ph/9906340]; Phys. Lett. B **470** (1999) 181 [hep-ph/9910309]; Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001) 065003 [hep-ph/0005003].
4. J. O. Andersen, E. Braaten and M. Strickland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** (1999) 2139 [hep-ph/9902327]; Phys. Rev. D **61** (2000) 014017 [hep-ph/9905337]; Phys. Rev. D **61** (2000) 074016 [hep-ph/9908323].
5. K. Kajantie, M. Laine, K. Rummukainen and Y. Schroder, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2001) 10 [hep-ph/0007109].
6. B. Svetitsky and L. G. Yaffe, Nucl. Phys. B **210** (1982) 423.
7. R. D. Pisarski, Phys. Rev. D **62** (2000) 111501 [hep-ph/0006205].
8. M. Asakawa, T. Hatsuda and Y. Nakahara, hep-lat/0011040.
9. M. Alford, J. Bowers and K. Rajagopal, Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001) 074016 [hep-ph/0008208].
10. J. Cleymans and K. Redlich, nucl-th/9903063.
11. F. Becattini, Z. Phys. C **69** (1996) 485.
12. M. Gazdzicki and M. I. Gorenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** (1999) 4009 [hep-ph/9905515].
13. K. J. Eskola and K. Tuominen, hep-ph/0010319.
14. A. Bialas, M. Bleszynski and W. Czyz, Nucl. Phys. B **111** (1976) 461.
15. A. Capella, U. Sukhatme, C.I. Tan and J. Tran Thanh Van, Phys. Rept. **236** (1994) 225.
16. D. Kharzeev and M. Nardi, nucl-th/0012025.
17. A. H. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. B **558** (1999) 285 [hep-ph/9904404].
18. J. Blaizot and E. Iancu, hep-ph/0101103.
19. J. P. Blaizot and A. H. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. B **289** (1987) 847.
20. A. H. Mueller and J. Qiu, Nucl. Phys. B **268** (1986) 427.
21. L. McLerran and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 2233; Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 3352; Phys. Rev. **D50** (1994) 2225.
22. A.H. Mueller, "Toward Equilibration in the Early Stages After a High Energy Heavy Ion Collision", hep-ph/9906322.
23. R. Baier, A. H. Mueller, D. Schiff and D. T. Son, Phys. Lett. B **502** (2001) 51 [hep-

- ph/0009237].
24. M. Asakawa, U. Heinz, B. Müller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85** (2000) 2072; S. Jeon and V. Koch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85** (2000) 2076.
  25. J.-Y. Ollitrault, Phys. Rev. D **46** (1992) 229; Nucl. Phys. A **638** (1998) 195C [nucl-ex/9802005].
  26. P. F. Kolb, P. Huovinen, U. Heinz and H. Heiselberg, Phys. Lett. B **500** (2001) 232 [hep-ph/0012137].
  27. P. Huovinen, P. F. Kolb, U. Heinz, P. V. Ruuskanen and S. A. Voloshin, Phys. Lett. B **503** (2001) 58 [hep-ph/0101136].
  28. X. Wang, Phys. Rev. C **63** (2001) 054902 [nucl-th/0009019]; M. Gyulassy, I. Vitev and X. N. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2001) 2537 [nucl-th/0012092].
  29. G.E. Brown, M. Rho and C. Song, nucl-th/0010008.
  30. S. Hamieh, K. Redlich and A. Tounsi, Phys. Lett. B **486** (2000) 61 [hep-ph/0006024].
  31. R. Rapp and E. Shuryak, Phys. Lett. B **473** (2000) 13 [hep-ph/9909348].
  32. J. Blaizot, M. Dinh and J. Ollitrault, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85** (2000) 4012 [nucl-th/0007020].
  33. R. L. Thews, M. Schroedter and J. Rafelski, Phys. Rev. C **63** (2001) 054905 [hep-ph/0007323].
  34. P. Braun-Munzinger and J. Stachel, Phys. Lett. B **490** (2000) 196 [nucl-th/0007059].
  35. X. Wang and M. Gyulassy, Phys. Rev. D **44** (1991) 3501.
  36. B. G. Zakharov, JETP Lett. **63** (1996) 952 [hep-ph/9607440].
  37. R. Baier, Y. L. Dokshitzer, A. H. Mueller, S. Peigne and D. Schiff, Nucl. Phys. B **483** (1997) 291 [hep-ph/9607355].
  38. U. A. Wiedemann, Nucl. Phys. B **582** (2000) 409 [hep-ph/0003021].
  39. M. Gyulassy, P. Levai and I. Vitev, Nucl. Phys. B **571** (2000) 197 [hep-ph/9907461].