Are di-leptons sensitive messengers from the hot and dense stage?





Marcus Bleicher Institut für Theoretische Physik Goethe Universität Frankfurt Germany



Outline



- Introduction
- Baryon densities: methods, results
- Densities at rho decay
- Model features
- Di-leptons
- Summary



Tools: Transport approaches



UrQMD, IQMD, HSD, RQMD,...

- out-of-equilibrium transport model, (rel. Boltzmann equation)
- Particles interact via :
 - measured and calculated cross sections
 - string excitation and fragmentation
 - formation and decay of resonances
 - Potentials and in-medium properties
- Provides full space-time dynamics of heavy-ion collisions



Motivation





E. Bratkovskaya, M.B. et al., Phys.Rev.C69:054907,2004



Do we understand the interesting stages of the reaction?





String matter dominates the early stages (t ~ overlap time)

'string matter' = QGP?

However, overall dynamics does not seems to be sensitive to the underlying degrees of freedom

I. Arsene et al, nucl-th/0609042







Phase trajectories



Arsene et al, nucl-th/0609042



Why resonances are interesting?



- There is a (long living) hadronic rescattering stage at FAIR and SPS energies
- Lifetime and properties of the hadronic stage are defined and probed by resonance production/absorption/re-feeding/decay
- Use different resonances to explore this stage:
 e.g. mesons: K^{*}(892), ρ, f₀, φ baryons: Δ(1232), Λ(1520), Σ(1385)
- Are resonances dissolved/broadened/shifted in matter?



The rho has additional potential: Hadronic vs leptonic channel





time



Decay time distribution of ρ mesons





Resonance formation needs time (most ρ from baryon resonances) \rightarrow even short lived resonances are dominantly from later stages





Expected multiplicities



C+C@2AGeV

Pb+Pb@30AGeV

Pion reconstruction is free from $\rho \rightarrow e+e-$ model

S. Vogel, M. Bleicher, Phys.Rev.C74:014902,2006









Gerry Brown



Ralf Rapp



Jochen Wambach



Dileptons – spectral function



$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{d}N_{ll}}{\mathrm{d}^4 x \mathrm{d}^4 q} &= -\frac{\alpha^2}{3\pi^3} \frac{L(M^2)}{M^2} \operatorname{Im} \Pi^{\mu}_{\mathrm{em},\mu}(M,q;\mu_B,T) \\ &\times f^B(q_0;T) \;, \end{aligned}$$

$$\Pi^{\mu\nu}_{\rm em}(q) = \mathrm{i} \int \mathrm{d}^4 x \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}q_\sigma x^\sigma} \Theta(x^0) \left\langle [\mathbf{J}^{\mu}_{\rm em}(x), \mathbf{J}^{\nu}_{\rm em}(0)] \right\rangle$$

$$L(M) = \left(1 + \frac{2m_l^2}{M^2}\right)\sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_l^2}{M^2}}$$

van Hees, Rapp, 2008





Spectral function



1.2

1.4

1.2

DMD





Evolution of the medium

• Fix S/A ~ 27

$$V_{\rm FB}(t) = \pi \left(r_{\perp,0} + \frac{1}{2} a_{\perp} t^2 \right)^2 \left(z_0 + v_{z,0} t + \frac{1}{2} a_z t^2 \right)_z$$

$$S = s(t) \cdot V(t)$$

Use hadron gas EoS to obtain T(t) and mu_B(t) from s(t)

van Hees, Rapp, 2008



What do we want to see? →in-medium spectral functions



- Mass shift of the ρ meson
 roughly from 770 MeV → 600 MeV
- Modified width of the ρ meson roughly from 150 MeV → 300 MeV
- Possibly modifications of ϕ and ω
- Do we know the densities to the required precision?



Problems



- How are energy density and baryon density defined? (N/V doesn't work!)
 What frame? Landau? Eckardt?
 - Lorentz contraction? Nucleus? Nucleon?
- Is the system thermalized?
 Viscous contributions in hydro?
- What are the degrees of freedom?



Baryon density



- Define baryon density at point r in the Eckardt frame (vanishing baryon flow)
 →I.e. ρ_B(r)= j⁰_B(r) in the frame with j^µ=(ρ_B,0)
- Lorentz contraction for the nucleons along the beam axis is taken into account

$$\rho_B(\vec{r}) \sim \sum_i \gamma_{i,z} \exp\left(\frac{(z-z_i)^2}{2\sigma^2/\gamma_{i,z}^2}\right) \exp\left(\frac{(r_T - r_{i,T})^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$



Further problem: thermalization



- Sound definition of the baryon current/density is possible
 - However, free streaming effects are not excluded (the defined baryon density is not necessarily thermal)

→consider only particles that have a velocity around to the thermal velocity (similar to threefluid approach, Brachmann et al) not practical for transport...



Local baryon densities (Averaged over the positions of all hadrons)

 Are we able to observe unambiguous signals from the most compressed region of the system?



Central Au+Au/Pb+Pb collisions



Baryon densities in momentum space at the point of the rho decay



Central Au+Au/Pb+Pb reactions



Gain and loss rates of rho mesons

- Maximal densities reached at t=10,4,2 fm
- rho production at HADES energies driven by baryon resonance decays
- at higher energies: major early stage production, but still sizeable tail from decays in the late stage







Absorption vs decay





- How are the dileptons calculated?
- Shining vs decay
- Strong absorption in the early stages



Density distributions

- Distribution baryon density at the point of rho decay or absorption
- Significantly higher reach in density if absorbed rhos are included.
 (However, here the integrated rho life times are shorter)







Density vs rho mass

- Absorption has the highest reach in density →shining method necessary?
- Moderate mass dependence
- Final feeding from decays around 1-2 ground state density







• Dalitz decay of the pseudoscalar mesons π^0 , η and η' ($m_B = 0$):

$$\frac{dN_{A\to\gamma e^+e^-}}{dM} = \frac{4\alpha}{3\pi M} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_e^2}{M^2}} \left(1 + \frac{2m_e^2}{M^2}\right) \left(1 - \frac{M^2}{m_A^2}\right)^3 \times |F_{AB}(M^2)|^2 \frac{\Gamma_{A\to 2\gamma}}{\Gamma_{tot}} \langle N_A \rangle.$$

$$\frac{dN_{A\to Be^+e^-}}{dM} = \frac{2\alpha}{3\pi M} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_e^2}{M^2}} \left(1 + \frac{2m_e^2}{M^2}\right) |F_{AB}(M^2)|^2 \frac{\Gamma_{A\to 2\gamma}}{\Gamma_{tot}} \langle N_A \rangle \\ \times \left(\left(1 + \frac{M^2}{m_A^2 - m_B^2}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{2m_A M}{m_A^2 - m_B^2}\right)^2 \right)^{3/2}.$$
 (3)

$$\Gamma_{V \to e^+e^-}(M) = \frac{\Gamma_{V \to e^+e^-}(m_V)}{m_V} \frac{m_V^4}{M^3} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_e^2}{M^2}} \left(1 + 2\frac{m_e^2}{M^2}\right)$$

- L. G. Landsberg, Phys. Rept. 128, 301 (1985)
- P. Koch, Z. Phys. C 57, 283 (1993)

G. Wolf, G. Batko, W. Cassing, U. Mosel, K. Niita and M. Schaefer, Nucl. Phys. A 517, 615 (1990) C. M. Ko, G. O. Li, G. E. Brown and H. Sorge, Nucl. Phys. A 610, 342C

C. M. Ko, G. Q. Li, G. E. Brown and H. Sorge, Nucl. Phys. A 610, 342C (1996)





Shining method



Continuous emission of dileptons

$$\frac{dN_{e^+e^-}}{dM} = \frac{\Delta N_{e^+e^-}}{\Delta M} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\Delta M}} \int_{t_i^j}^{t_f^j} \frac{dt}{\gamma} \frac{\Gamma_{e^+e^-}(M)}{\Delta M}$$

 vs. branching ratio at decay point Gamma(rho→e+e-)/Gamma_tot









Difference between shining and other approaches

Thin lines: 'no absorption'

Blue lines: only final decays

Green lines: 'shining'



Are the dynamical models good enough?



- Check space-time evolution
 HBT correlations
- Check particle production

 →Pion production (ππ→ρ !)
 →Baryon resonances (ρ from decays !)
 →Final state ρ from ππ correlations





E. L. Bratkovskaya, M.B., et al, Phys. Rev. C 69, 054907 (2004)

Excitation functions



- Good agreement between different transport models (HSD/UrQMD)
- 4 pi and midrapidity abundancies are described on a 10-20% level (systematic error)
- Energy dependence: OK
- Hadron-string models work well



Detailed view at low energies





- Comparison to KAOS data
- Reasonable agreement
- D. Schumacher, s. Vogel, M.B, Acta Phys.Hung.A27:451-458,2006



HBT-Energy dependence



- Data shows no dramatic features
- Expansion and decoupling dynamics ok
- Fireball life time ok















D. Schumacher, s. Vogel, M.B, Acta Phys.Hung.A27:451-458,2006





Trivial rho broadening

 Coupling to baryon resonances broadens the rho meson mass distribution even without 'explicit' medium contribution



Schumacher, Vogel, Bleicher, Acta Phys.Hung.A27:451-458,2006





IQMD, CC@2AGeV (instant di-leptons: no baryonand ρ resonance propagation) RQMD, CC@2AGeV (effective ρ, no ρ and π propagation)

Marcus Bleicher, NICA School 2010



HADES energies: IQMD/RQMD

Marcus Bleicher, NICA School 2010





Di-lepton summary

- Model differences due to different di-lepton 'after burner'!
- Clear hint of non-equilibrium contributions



Discussion: SIS













Overestimation at 2 GeV









Where do the rhos come from?



Resonance	$\operatorname{Br}(N\rho)$	Resonance	$\operatorname{Br}(N\rho)$
$N^{*}(1520)$.15	$\Delta^*(1620)$.05
$N^{*}(1650)$.06	$\Delta^*(1700)$.25
$N^{*}(1680)$.10	$\Delta^*(1900)$.25
$N^{*}(1700)$.20	$\Delta^*(1905)$.80
$N^{*}(1710)$.05	$\Delta^*(1910)$.10
$N^{*}(1720)$.73	$\Delta^*(1930)$.22
$N^{*}(1900)$.15	$\Delta^*(1950)$.08
$N^{*}(1990)$.43		
$N^{*}(2080)$.12		
$N^{*}(2190)$.24		
$N^{*}(2220)$.22		
$N^{*}(2250)$.25		





Re-adjustment of the branching ratios



Reduce rho production in pp bei factor 2





Standard vs. modified



MP



Standard vs modified



modified pp!



High energies





Rho meson spectral function





From Rapp, Wambach



Comparison to CERES @ 160 AGeV



- Well known dip around 500 MeV
- Dip is from
 low momentum
 di-lepton pairs

D. Schumacher, M.B.







Broad spectral function allows for a nice description of the data







Results NA60







Summary



- Theory has to get space-time structure and particle densities right (di-leptons are integrated over fireball lifetime and sensitive to baryon res. and pp collisions)
- Fundamentals, e.g. definition of densities (frames, methods, thermal fraction) have to be fixed
- Bremsstrahlung might be important for 1-2 AGeV reactions, however double counting needs to be avoided
- The underlying transport models are mostly consistent with each other, however di-lepton after burners are not
 Real r vs. effective r vs. instant leptons
 - Standard' model for hadron to di-lepton conversion needed

