

# Production Mechanism for Quark Gluon Plasma in Heavy Ion Collisions

Ambar Jain and V. Ravishankar

Department of Physics, IIT Kanpur, Kanpur-208 016, INDIA

PACS: 12.38.Mh, 25.75.-q, 24.85.+p

A general scheme is proposed here to describe the production of semi hard and soft quarks and gluons that form the bulk of the plasma in ultra relativistic heavy ion collisions. We show how to obtain the production rates in the extended phase space - including the colour part - as a function of time in a consistent manner, and without having to make ad-hoc assumptions. All the required features - the back reaction on QCD vacuum, the non-Markovian nature of the production, and the quasi particle nature of the partons are naturally incorporated. We illustrate the results with a realistic albeit toy model and also show how physically tenable source terms may be obtained.

There is a general consensus that the Quark Gluon Plasma (QGP) phase of the Hadronic matter has already been produced in ultra relativistic heavy ion collisions (URHIC) at CERN. Future measurements at RHIC [1] and LHC [2] are expected to provide more information on QGP. Be it as may, it is still premature to claim that we have a full grasp of the space-time history of QGP. Indeed, a considerable effort has gone in addressing the issue of evolution of QGP; starting with the pioneering work of Bjorken [4] which was itself based on a highly prescient work of Landau [5], a number of results have been reported [6–8]. All these approaches are based on the idea that the bulk of the plasma forms a classical gas, and evolves via an appropriate transport equation. Robust that this approach is [9,10], it has to be admitted that our understanding of the production process is not satisfactory. Recall that the transport equations (set up by incorporating The Yang-Mills (YM) dynamics) require source terms that need to be specified in the extended phase space (including the compact part corresponding to the colour degree) as a function of time; their derivation consequently requires care: the basic uncertainty principle should not be violated, and the multiple overlapping time scales that pervade the phenomenon should not be ignored. They should correctly reflect the dynamical nature of the vacuum [11], the non-Markovian nature of the production rates [12], and the quasi-particle nature of the excitations [13]. It is needless to say that a source term lacking in one or more of the above of the requirements would predict incorrect and unreliable features for the plasma.

Lattice computations [14] suggest that even at twice the transition temperature  $T_C$ , the quarks and gluons do not behave as ideal gases. We thus need effective field approaches based on non-perturbative QCD. The transport equation approach mentioned above provides a means of introducing collective degrees of freedom appropriate for

describing the non-perturbative dynamics, via the notion of a background chromoelectric field (CEF) which acts as a source for the production of the bulk of QGP. The acceleration of the partons in this field takes into account the long range interactions amongst them. The short range part of the interaction can then be suitably modelled by an appropriate collision term. That these aspects cannot be captured by the pQCD description [19] has been emphasized recently [3]. We thus pay attention to the source terms obtained from the CEF degrees of freedom.

The pioneering work in Ref. [11,12,15] introduces the non-Markovian nature into the production process, by employing the Schwinger mechanism [17] for particle production. This mechanism is valid only for static electric field configurations. Production of particles from a space time dependent field would be described perturbatively by the Schwinger Dyson expansion [18]; it is well known from transport studies [6,7,16] that the CEF in URHIC is necessarily and *strongly* space-time dependent by virtue of energy momentum conservations. See [16] for a graphic comparison of the relative contributions of the Born and the Schwinger terms. A remedy would be to correctly invoke an appropriate perturbative mechanism [16] (over the nonperturbative vacuum with CEF), but unfortunately this study ignores the non-Markovian aspect and also makes unjustified assumptions in order to extract the time dependence of the source term. Both the above attempts completely ignore the essential dynamical nature of the colour charge, which is central to the non-abelian plasma that we are interested in. There has been some attempt [7] to enlarge the phase space to include the colour part; this attempt again involves the Schwinger mechanism apart from a lack of rigour in the derivation of the colour dependence. Finally, none of the above (and other) approaches acknowledges the quasi particle nature of the excitations. In short, the source terms obtained so far have utmost limited utility, and a simple framework containing all the required features is still lacking.

In this paper, we outline a general scheme for deriving such a source term, based on simple but general considerations. (i) The non-perturbative aspects of the mechanism are modelled after the colour flux tube model [20] which is known to provide a natural setting for discussing quark confinement [21]. (ii) The rate is extracted not from an S-matrix computation, but by studying the time dependent evolution of the state in the Fock space. As a natural byproduct, the quasi particle and the non-Markovian nature emerge automatically.

We now describe the flux tube model in brief. Soon

after the two nuclei collide, and start receding from each other, colour strings are formed between them. These strings merge to form the so called colour rope, a picturesque way of stating that a CEF is produced between the nuclei. The consequent production process tantamounts to the instability of the QCD vacuum in the presence of a classical CEF which is, in general, space time dependent. Of course, the dependence itself is to be obtained self consistently from a transport equation [6,7]; here we merely content ourselves by indicating how to infer the source term given an explicit history of CEF. We study both the  $q\bar{q}$  and the gluon productions in the presence of a classical YM field below. We discuss The gluon case mainly since its production process is quintessentially non-abelian with no counterpart in QED.

**Formalism:** Consider the gluon case first. The gauge potentials  $A_\mu^a$  are expanded as a sum of the classical values  $C_\mu^a$  and their fluctuations  $\phi_\mu^a$ :  $\langle A_\mu^a \rangle = C_\mu^a$ . Expanding the YM Lagrangian, the terms that are responsible for the gluon production are identified to be

$$L_{2g} = -\frac{g}{2} f^{abc} [(\partial_\mu C_\nu^a - \partial_\nu C_\mu^a) \phi^{\mu b} \phi^{\nu c} + (\partial_\mu \phi_\nu^a - \partial_\nu \phi_\mu^a)(C^{\mu b} \phi^{\nu c} + \phi^{\mu b} C^{\nu c})] + \mathcal{O}(g^2) \quad (1)$$

where we have kept terms quadratic in the fluctuations. The production rate is to be determined from the above Lagrangian, by a suitable choice of the background field  $C_\mu^a$ .

Unlike in the Maxwell case, the YM configuration is not completely specified by the field tensor [24]. It is well known [25] that the consequent vacuum polarization also differs for each of the above (physically distinct) configurations. It is thus pertinent to examine which are the configurations that would make the vacuum unstable against particle production. We have checked that *a la* the results for constant CEF [25] only the ‘abelian configuration’ of the CEF leads to the quark and gluon productions - atleast in the leading order. Keeping in mind the model and invoking (local) gauge covariance of CEF, we take the form of the gauge potential to be  $C_\mu^a = \delta_{\mu,0} \sum_i C_i(t, \vec{r}) \delta_{a,i}$  where the summation is restricted to the diagonal generators of the gauge group. For all such configurations, the magnetic field vanishes. Denote as usual the initial vacuum state, at  $t = 0$ , by  $|0\rangle$ . Let  $|\Psi\rangle(t) \equiv U(t,0)|0\rangle$  be the state at any later time  $t$ :  $U(t,0)$  is the evolution operator determined by the standard Schwinger-Dyson expansion that is obtained from Eqn.1. Adapting the analysis in [18], the amplitude for the gluon production as a function of time is obtained by projecting  $|\Psi\rangle(t)$  to the two gluon state  $|gg\rangle \equiv |\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2; s_1, s_2; c_1, c_2\rangle$  labelled by momentum, spin and colour quantum numbers respectively. In the leading order which we consider for simplicity [26], the amplitude is given by

$$\langle gg|T(t)|0\rangle = \frac{ig}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{(E_2 - E_1)}{2\sqrt{E_1 E_2}} \bar{e}^{s_1}(\vec{p}_1) \cdot \bar{e}^{s_2}(\vec{p}_2) f^{ac_1 c_2}$$

$$\tilde{C}^{0,a}(E_1 + E_2; \vec{p}_1 + \vec{p}_2; t) \quad (2)$$

where  $T(t) \equiv U(t,0) - 1$ . Further,

$$\tilde{C}_0^a = \int_0^t dt_1 e^{-i(E_1 + E_2)t_1} \int d^3\vec{r} \exp(i(\vec{p}_1 + \vec{p}_2) \cdot \vec{r}) C^{0,a}(t_1, \vec{r})$$

is the incomplete Fourier transform of the gauge field and  $E_i$  are the energies carried by the gluons. The lower limit of integration emphasizes that the CEF gets created at  $t = 0$ . The corresponding expression for the  $q\bar{q}$  production is given by

$$\langle q\bar{q}|T(t)|0\rangle = \frac{g}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{m}{\sqrt{E_1 E_2}} \tilde{C}_0^a T_{c_1, c_2}^a u_{s_1}^\dagger(p_1) v_{-s_2}(-\vec{p}_2), \quad (3)$$

with  $|q\bar{q}\rangle \equiv |\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_2; s_1, s_2; c_1, c_2\rangle$ .  $T^a$  are the generators of the gauge group in the fundamental representation, while  $u, v$  are the usual Dirac spinors. For  $t$  finite, the gluons and the quarks that are in the final state have non-overlapping projection with the unphysical degrees of freedom. We distinguish the physical pairs by projecting the states further onto the physical subspace, by imposing the on the mass shell and the transversality restrictions as subsidiary conditions (analogous to the separation of the transverse part of the electromagnetic field from the longitudinal part in the study of radiation by charged particles).

The probability that a pair is produced *any time* during the interval  $(0, t)$  is given by  $|\langle \phi|T(t)|0\rangle|^2$ ,  $\phi$  standing for either  $gg$  or  $q\bar{q}$ . The production rate at any time  $t$  is thus given by its derivative at that instant; clearly, the rate takes both positive and negative values, from which one concludes that the particles acquire a (time dependent) finite life time. Equivalently, vacuum has a dynamical role - both as a source and a sink. Further, the rate at any time depends not merely on the field configuration at that instant - it has a highly non-Markovian character, being determined by the entire history. In short, quantum interference effects dominate the production mechanism, and this cannot be accessed by the approaches based on Schwinger mechanism and pQCD.

**A model example:** We now illustrate the main results with an example drawn from its behaviour expected in real situations [4]. Taking the gauge group to be  $SU(3)$ , let the CEF have the form  $\mathcal{E}_i^a = \delta_{i,z} \mathcal{E}_0(\delta_{a,3} + \delta_{a,8}) \exp\{|z| - t/t_0\} \theta(t) \theta(t^2 - z^2)$  with the initial field strength given by  $\mathcal{E}_0$ . This choice captures most of the features expected of a boost invariant description [4], although it is by itself not a boost invariant configuration. Notice that the field is characterised by a single time scale  $t_0$ , in the units of which all the observables will be expressed. Indeed,  $t_0$  gives the decay time of the field or equivalently, the overall ‘production time’ of the partons, while  $g$  is related to the string tension. The initial energy density  $\mathcal{U}$ ,  $t_0$  and  $g$  are not entirely independent

of each other:  $g \mathcal{U} t_0^4 \sim 1$ . We shall discuss the gluonic case in detail. Consider the spin summed rate in the momentum space (see below for the colour part description). We display the two particle rates because eventually they are the ones needed to study signals involving correlations such as dilepton production. Since the rate is defined in a six dimensional space, two dimensional sections will be plotted as filled contour diagrams after scaling them with respect to appropriate powers of  $t_0$ ,  $E_0^2$  and  $g^2$ . As an example, we fix the total centre of mass energy  $\sqrt{s} = 0.6$  and the transverse momentum  $p_T = 0.1$ . The rates are then exhibited as contour plots in the plane defined by time and the longitudinal momentum  $p_{L1}$  of one of the particles. The longitudinal momentum  $p_{L2}$  of the other particle then has two solutions, one with the same sign as  $p_{L1}$ , and the other having the opposite sign. We designate the two channels by  $(+,+)$  and  $(+,-)$  respectively, and show in figs. 1-4 the rates in both the channels. Observe the following features: The rate is a highly fluctuating function of all the variables involved, changing signs rapidly, both with the momenta as well as time, as shown in Figs 1-4. The rate oscillates over a much larger range for smaller values of  $p_T$  at a given  $\sqrt{s}$ . For example, it oscillates roughly between  $(-500, 500)$  at  $\sqrt{s} = 0.6$ ,  $p_T = 0.1$  (Figs. 1, 2). In contrast, the range is restricted to  $\sim (-100, 100)$  when  $p_T$  is increased to 0.2 (Figs. 3, 4). Notice also that for a given  $\sqrt{s}$  and  $p_T$ , the fluctuations are more dominant for very small and very large values of longitudinal momenta. We have checked that the rate and its fluctuations are larger at small values of  $\sqrt{s}$ , dropping rapidly as  $\sqrt{s}$  is increased. Though not shown here, the number of oscillations are also seen to increase as we increase  $\sqrt{s}$ . It may also be seen from the figures that the  $(+,+)$  channel is relatively placid in comparison with the  $(+,-)$  channel. However, the activity at intermediate values of longitudinal momenta is more pronounced in the  $(+,-)$  channel for a given value of  $\sqrt{s}, p_T$ . In short, these figures exhibit in a vivid manner the production and the absorption of the pairs, and the correlation between them, in the momentum space. The correlations are of vital importance in getting the screening lengths as well as in studying the hadronization. Coming to the quark production, suffice it to mention that they are equally rich in features differing only in the topology of the distributions. We do not show them here.

The analysis is incomplete in that the rates are still not described in the phase space. This has been a vexed issue, with solutions attempted by imposing additional conditions rather arbitrarily [4,27,6]. We resolve this issue by projecting the amplitudes to a basis of coherent states in the extended phase space, a method that allows as accurate a classical description as possible for these quantum processes. As an illustration, consider the colour part which is unique and central to the plasma under discussion. The structure of Eqns.(2,3) guarantees that it

is independent of momentum and spatial variables. Let the gauge group be  $SU(2)$  for simplicity (it has a simple topology). Denoting the two gluon colour state in the coherent basis by  $|\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2\rangle$  [28], the colour part of the source term may be written as  $\Sigma^g(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2) \sim |\hat{n}_1 \times \hat{n}_2|^2$ . This expression has been obtained by averaging over the direction of the CEF in the group space. Contrast  $\Sigma^g$  with its counterpart for  $q\bar{q}$  production which has the structure  $\Sigma^q(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2) \sim \frac{1}{2}(1 - \hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2)$ . While the gluons are predominantly produced in directions normal to each other in the colour space, the quark pair prefers to be produced in antiparallel directions, a feature that holds for  $SU(3)$  as well, although in a more involved fashion due to its more complicated topology. Coupled with the fact that the colour charges are indeed vectors in the group space and that they are dynamical variables obeying the Wong equation [29], we conclude that the dynamics of QGP would differ significantly in the bosonic and fermionic sectors in a manner that cannot be captured by simply multiplying the Maxwell results by the number of degrees of freedom. Finally, we have performed a preliminary computation and found that the phase space dependences of quarks and gluons in position and momenta bear no resemblance to each other; Those details will be presented in a separate communication.

- 
- [1] J. L. Nagle Pramana, **37**, 355 (2001).
  - [2] see, e.g., K. Werner, H. J. Drescher, S. Ostapchenko and T. Pierog, Nucl. Phys. **A698**, 387 2002
  - [3] see, e.g., C. M. Hung and Edward V Shuryak, Phys. Rev. **C57**, 1891 (1998); Dietrich Bodekar, Nucl. Phys. **B559**,502 (1999).
  - [4] J. Bjorken, Phys. Rev D **27**, 140 (1983).
  - [5] L. D Landau, Akad. Nauk. SSSR. Ser. Fiz, **17**, 51 (1953); E. Fermi, Prog. Theo. Phys., **5** 570 (1951); I. Ya. Pomeranchuk, Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR, **78**, 889 (1951).
  - [6] B. Banerjee, R. S. Bhalerao and V. Ravishankar, Phys. Lett., **B224** 16 (1989) and references therein.
  - [7] see Gouranga C Nayak and V. Ravishankar, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 6877 (1997); Phys. Rev. **C58**, 356 (1998);
  - [8] D. F. Litim and C. Manuel, Phys. Rept. **364** 451 (2002) and references therein.
  - [9] P. Carruthers and F Zacharaiasen, Rev. Mod. Phys. **55**, 245 (1983); T. D. Lee, unpublished CU-TP-94; Dmitri Kharzeev, preprint hep-ph 0204014 (BNL-NT-02-05); P. F. Kelly, Q. Liu, C. Luchessi and C. Manuel, Phys. Rev. Lett., **72**, 3461 (1994); Melissa Lampert and Benjamin Svetitsky, Phys. Rev. **D61**, 0304011 (2000).
  - [10] There are proposals to simulate the space time evolution and determine the transport coefficients in URHIC on lattice: see, e.g., Sunao Sakai, Atsushi nakumara and Takuya Saito, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **106**, 543 (2002); W. Pöschl, Nucl. Phys. **A661**, 641 (1999); S. A. Bass, B.

- Müller and W. Pöschl, J. Phys. G **L109**, (1999). . .
- [11] J. C. R. Bloch *et al*, Phys Rev. **D60**, 116011 (1999)
  - [12] S. Schmidt *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 0940005 (1999); J. C. R. Bloch, C. D. Roberts and S. M. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. **D61**, 117502 (2000).
  - [13] Peter A Henning and E. Quack, Phys. Rev. Lett., **75**, 3811 (1995); H. Arthur Weldon, unpublished (hep-ph 9809330); I. V. Andreev, Mod. Phys. Lett.A **14**, 459 (1999)
  - [14] G. Boyd *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4169 (1995); Nucl. Phys. **B469**, 419 (1996)
  - [15] R. Alkhofer *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett., **87**, 193902 (2001); D. V. Vinnik *et. al.*, Euro. Phys. Jour. **C22**, 341 (2001)
  - [16] R. S. Bhalerao and V. Ravishankar, Phys. Lett., **409**, 38 (1997).
  - [17] J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **82**, 664 (1951).
  - [18] Claude Itzykson and J B Zuber, Quantum Field Theory, McGraw Hill (Singapore), 191 -193 (1985).
  - [19] Klaus Geiger, Phys. Rev. **D47**,133 (1993).
  - [20] T. S. Biro, H. B. Nielsen and J. Knoll, Nucl. Phys. **B245**, 449 (1984). For a recent review see, B. Svetitsky, eprint hep-ph/9907278
  - [21] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. **B190**, 455 (1981)
  - [22] see *e.g.*, Marlon O Scully, and M. Suhail Zubairi, Quantum Optics, Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, UK) 1997
  - [23] The method employed here may therefore be of applicability to atomic systems. For a similarly interesting example, see C. D. Roberts *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 153901 (2002)
  - [24] T. T. Wu and C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. **D12** 3843 (1975)
  - [25] Lowell S. Brown and William I Weisberger, Nucl. Phys. **157**, 285 (1979); erratum: *ibid.* **B172**, 54 (1980).
  - [26] The expansion parameter here is  $g\mathcal{E}_0$  where  $\mathcal{E}_0$  is the initial field strength.
  - [27] A. Casher, H. Neuberger and S. Nussinov, Phys. Rev., **D20**,179 (1979)
  - [28] A. Perelomov, Generalized Coherent States and Their Applications, Springer-Verlag (Berlin, Germany) 1986
  - [29] S.K. Wong, Nuovo. Cim. **A65**, 689 (1970).

This figure "fig1.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/nucl-th/0212001v2>

This figure "fig2.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/nucl-th/0212001v2>

This figure "fig3.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/nucl-th/0212001v2>

This figure "fig4.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/nucl-th/0212001v2>