Jet-Like Correlations with Direct-Photon and Neutral-Pion Triggers at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV

L. Adamczyk
AGH University of Science and Technology, Poland

James K. Adkins
University of Kentucky, kevin.adkins@uky.edu

G. Agakishiev
Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Russia

M. M. Aggarwal
Panjab University, India

Z. Ahammed
Variable Energy Cyclotron Centre, India

See next page for additional authors

Click here to let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://uknowledge.uky.edu/physastron_facpub

Part of the Astrophysics and Astronomy Commons, and the Physics Commons

Repository Citation
Adamczyk, L.; Adkins, James K.; Agakishiev, G.; Aggarwal, M. M.; Ahammed, Z.; Alekseev, I.; Anderson, D. M.; Aparin, A.; Arkhipkin, D.; Aschenauer, E. C.; Fatemi, Renee H.; and Ramachandran, Suvarna, "Jet-Like Correlations with Direct-Photon and Neutral-Pion Triggers at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV" (2016). Physics and Astronomy Faculty Publications. 394.
https://uknowledge.uky.edu/physastron_facpub/394

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Physics and Astronomy at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in Physics and Astronomy Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu.
Authors
L. Adamczyk, James K. Adkins, G. Agakishiev, M. M. Aggarwal, Z. Ahammed, I. Alekseev, D. M. Anderson, A. Aparin, D. Arkhipkin, E. C. Aschenauer, Renee H. Fatemi, and Suvarna Ramachandran

Jet-Like Correlations with Direct-Photon and Neutral-Pion Triggers at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV

Notes/Citation Information
Published in Physics Letter B, v. 760, p. 689-696.

© 2016 The Author(s).

This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Due to the large number of authors involved, only the first 10 and the ones affiliated with the University of Kentucky are listed in the author section above. The authors of this article are collectively known as STAR Collaboration. To see a full list of authors, please download this article or visit: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2016.07.046

Digital Object Identifier (DOI)
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physletb.2016.07.046

This article is available at UKnowledge: https://uknowledge.uky.edu/physastron_facpub/394
Jet-like correlations with direct-photon and neutral-pion triggers at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV

STAR Collaboration

L. Adamczyk, J.K. Adkins, G. Agakishiev, M.M. Aggarwal, Z. Ahammed, I. Alekseev, D.M. Anderson, A. Apresyan, D. Arkhipkin, E.C. Aschenauer, M.U. Ashraf, A. Attri, G.S. Averichev, X. Bai, V. Bairathi, R. Bellwied, A. Bhasin, A.K. Bhati, P. Bhattacharaj, J. Bielcik, J. Bielcikova, L.C. Bland, I.G. Bordyuzhin, J. Bouchet, J.D. Brandenburg, A.V. Brandin, I. Bunzarov, J. Butterworth, H. Caines, M. Calderón de la Barca Sánchez, J.M. Campbell, D. Cebra, I. Chakaberia, P. Chaloupka, Z. Changa, A. Chatterjee, S. Chattopadhyay, X. Chen, J.H. Chen, L. Cheng, M. Cherney, W. Christie, G. Cont Knox, H.J. Crawford, S. Dasm, L.C. De Silva, R.R. Dede, T.G. Dedovich, J. Deng, A.A. Derevchikov, B. di Ruzza, L. Didenko, C. Dilks, X. Dong, J.L. Drachenberg, J.D. Draper, C.M. Du, L.E. Dunkelberger, J.C. Dunlop, J. Engel, R. Engel, J. Engel, G. Eppley, R. Eshaf, O. Evdokimov, O. Eyser, R. Fatemi, S. Fazio, P. Federico, J. Fedorini, Z. Feng, P. Filip, Y. Fisyak, C.E. Flores, L. Fuleka, C.A. Gagliardi, D. Garand, F. Geurts, A. Gibson, M. Girardeau, L. Greiner, D. Grosnick, D.S. Gunaratne, Y. Guo, L. He, S. Heppelman, A. Hirschi, G.W. Hoffmann, S. Horvat, T. Huang, B. Huang, X. Huang, H.Z. Huang, P. Huck, T.J. Humanci, G. Igo, W.W. Jacobs, H. Jang, A. Jentsch, J. Jia, K. Jiang, E.G. Judd, S. Kabana, D. Kalinkov, K. Kang, K. Kauder, H.W. Ke, D. Keane, A. Kechechyan, Z.H. Khan, D.P. Kikola, A. Kisel, L. Kochenda, D.D. Koetke, L.K. Kosarzewski, A.F. Kraishan, P. Kravtsov, K. Krueger, L. Kumor, M.A.C. Lamont, J.M. Landgra, K.D. Landry, J. Laurec, A. Lebedev, R. Lednicky, J.H. Lee, X. Li, Y. Li, W. Li, X. Li, T. Lin, M.A. Lisa, F. Liu, Y. Liu, T. Ljubicic, W.J. Llope, M. Lomnitz, R.S. Longacre, X. Luo, S. Luo, G.L. Ma, L. Ma, Y.G. Ma, R. Ma, N. Magdy, R. Majka, A. Manion, S. Margetis, C. Markert, H.S. Matis, D. McDonal, S. McKinzie, K. Meehan, J.C. Mei, Z.W. Miller, N.G. Minaev, S. Mioduszewski, D. Mishra, B. Mohanty, M.M. Mondal, D.A. Morozov, M.K. Mustafa, B.K. Nand, Md. Nasim, T.K. Nayak, G. Nigmatkulov, T. Niida, L.V. Nogach, S.Y. Noh, J. Noval, S.B. Nrushev, G. Odyniec, A. Ogawa, K. Oh, V.A. Okoroko, D. Ovitt Jr., B.S. Page, R. Pak, C. Pan, Y. Pandit, H. Panebratsevs, B. Pawlik, H. Pei, C. Perkins, P. Pile, J. Pluta, K. Poniatowska, J. Porter, M. Posik, A.M. Poskanzer, N.K. Pruthi, M. Przybycien, J. Putschke, H. Qiu, A. Quintero.

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: nihar@rcf.rhic.bnl.gov (N.R. Sahoo).
S. Ramachandran, R.L. Ray, R. Reed, H.G. Ritter, J.B. Roberts, O.V. Rogachevskiy, J.L. Romero, L. Ruan, J. Rusnak, O. Rusnakova, N.R. Sahoo, P.K. Sahu, I. Sakrejda, S. Salur, J. Sandweiss, A. Sarkar, J. Schambach, R.P. Scharenberg, A.M. Schmah, W.B. Schmidtke, N. Schmitz, J. Seger, P. Seyboth, N. Shah, E. Shahaliev, P.V. Shanmugananthan, M. Shao, A. Sharma, B. Sharma, M.K. Sharma, W.Q. Shen, Z. Shi, S.S. Shi, Q.Y. Shou, E.P. Sichtermann, R. Sikora, M. Simko, S. Singha, M.J. Skoby, D. Smirnov, N. Smirnov, W. Solyst, L. Song, P. Sorensen, H.M. Spinka, B. Srivastava, T.D.S. Stanislaus, M. Stepanov, R. Stock, M. Strikhanov, B. Stringfellow, M. Sumbera, B. Summa, Y. Sun, Z. Sun, X.M. Sun, B. Surrow, D.N. Svirida, Z. Tang, A.H. Tang, T. Tarnowsky, A. Tawfik, J. Thäder, J.H. Thomas, A.R. Timmins, D. Tlusty, T. Todoroki, M. Tokarev, S. Trentalange, R.E. Tribble, P. Tribedy, S.K. Tripathy, O.D. Tsai, T. Ullrich, D.G. Underwood, I. Upsal, G. Van Buren, G. van Nieuwenhuizen, M. Vandenbroucke, R. Varma, A.N. Vasiliev, R. Vertesi, F. Videbæk, S. Vokal, S.A. Voloshin, A. Vossen, H. Wang, F. Wang, Y. Wang, J.S. Wang, G. Wang, Y. Wang, J.C. Webb, G. Webb, L. Wen, G.D. Westfall, H. Wieman, S.W. Wissink, R. Witt, Y. Wu, Z.G. Xiao, W. Xie, G. Xie, K. Xin, N. Xu, Q.H. Xu, Z. Xu, J. Xu, H. Xu, Y.F. Xu, S. Yang, Y. Yang, C. Yang, Y. Yang, Y. Yang, Q. Yang, A. Yeh, Z. Ye, L. Yi, K. Yip, I.-K. Yoo, M. Yu, H. Zbroszczyk, W. Zha, Z. Zhang, J.B. Zhang, S. Zhang, S. Zhang, X.P. Zhang, Y. Zhang, J. Zhang, J. Zhao, C. Zhong, L. Zhou, X. Zhu, Y. Zoulkarneeva, M. Zyzak

a AGH University of Science and Technology, Krakow 30-059, Poland
b Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL 60439, United States
c Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11973, United States
d University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, United States
e University of California, Davis, CA 95616, United States
f University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095, United States
g California Normal University, Wuhan, Hubei 430079, China
h University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL 60607, United States
i Creighton University, Omaha, NE 68178, United States
j Czech Technical University in Prague, FNSPE, Prague 115 19, Czech Republic
k Nuclear Physics Institute AS CR, 250 68 Prague, Czech Republic
l Frankfurt Institute for Advanced Studies FIAS, Frankfurt 60438, Germany
m Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar 751005, India
n Indian Institute of Technology, Mumbai 400076, India
o Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47408, United States
p Alikhanov Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow 117218, Russia
q Indian University, Jammu, Jammu 180001, India
r Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna 141 980, Russia
s Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242, United States
t University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506-0655, United States
u Korea Institute of Science and Technology Information, Daejeon 305-701, Republic of Korea
v Lamar University, Beaumont, TX 77710, United States
w Institute of Modern Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Lanzhou, Gansu 730000, China
x Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, United States
y Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA 18015, United States
z Max-Planck-Institut für Physik, Munich 80805, Germany
aa Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, United States
ab National Research Nuclear University MEPhI, Moscow 115409, Russia
ac National Institute of Science Education and Research, Bhubaneswar 751005, India
ad Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210, United States
ae Institute of Nuclear Physics PAN, Krakow 31-342, Poland
af Panjab University, Chandigarh 160014, India
ag Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, United States
ah Institute of High Energy Physics, Protvino 142281, Russia
ai Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, United States
aj Pusan National University, Pusan 46241, Republic of Korea
ak Rice University, Houston, TX 77251, United States
al University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China
am Shandong University, Jinan, Shandong 250100, China
an Shanghai Institute of Applied Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shanghai 201800, China
ao State University of New York, Stony Brook, NY 11794, United States
ap Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122, United States
aq Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, United States
ar University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712, United States
as University of Houston, Houston, TX 77204, United States
at Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China
Azimuthal correlations of charged hadrons with direct-photon ($\gamma_{\text{dir}}$) and neutral-pion ($\pi^0$) trigger particles are analyzed in central Au+Au and minimum-bias $p+p$ collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 200$ GeV in the STAR experiment. The charged-hadron per-trigger yields at mid-rapidity from central Au+Au collisions are compared with $p+p$ collisions to quantify the suppression in Au+Au collisions. The suppression of the away-side associated-particle yields per $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ trigger is independent of the transverse momentum of the trigger particle ($p_{T}^{\gamma_{\text{dir}}}$), whereas the suppression is smaller at low transverse momentum of the associated charged hadrons ($p_{T}^{\text{assoc}}$). Within uncertainty, similar levels of suppression are observed for $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ and $\pi^0$ triggers as a function of $z_\gamma (\equiv p_{T}^{\gamma_{\text{dir}}}/p_{T}^{\text{assoc}})$. The results are compared with energy-loss-inspired theoretical model predictions. Our studies support previous conclusions that the lost energy reappears predominantly at low transverse momentum, regardless of the trigger energy.
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side mainly comes from gluon jets [21]. This is in contrast to the away-side of a $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ trigger, which mainly comes from quark jets, since at leading order a photon does not couple with a gluon. Thus it is expected that, on average, the away-side parton associated with a $\pi^0$ suffers more energy loss than that of a $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ due to the additional color factor from gluons. By comparing the suppression of away-side associated hadrons for $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ triggers to that for $\pi^0$ triggers, one can gain information about both the path-length and the color-factor dependence of parton energy loss.

This manuscript is organized as follows. The detector setup of the STAR experiment is discussed in Sec. 2. The transverse shower-shape analysis used to discriminate between $\pi^0$ and $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$, and the procedures to extract the charged-hadron spectra, associated with $\pi^0$ and $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ triggers, are discussed in Sec. 3. The per-trigger charged-hadron yields are presented as a function of $p_T$, in Sec. 4. The dependences of the suppression of these yields in central Au+Au collisions relative to those in minimum-bias $p+p$ collisions on both the trigger energy and the associated transverse momentum are discussed, with comparisons to theoretical model predictions. Finally, in Sec. 5, our observations are summarized.

2. Experimental setup

The data were taken by the Solenoidal Tracker at RHIC (STAR) experiment in 2011 and 2009 for Au+Au and $p+p$ collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV, respectively. Using the Barrel Electromagnetic Calorimeter (BEMC) [22] to select events containing a high-$p_T$ $\gamma$ or $\pi^0$, the STAR experiment collected an integrated luminosity of 2.8 nb$^{-1}$ of Au+Au collisions and 23 pb$^{-1}$ of $p+p$ collisions. STAR provides $2\pi$ azimuthal coverage and wide pseudo-rapidity ($|\eta|$) coverage. The Time Projection Chamber (TPC) is the main charged-particle tracking detector [23], providing track information for the charged hadrons with $|\eta| < 1.0$. The centrality selection is determined from the charged-particle multiplicity in the TPC within $|\eta| < 0.5$. The BEMC is a sampling calorimeter, and each calorimeter module consists of a lead-scintillator structure and an embedded wire chamber, the Barrel Shower Maximum Detector (BSMD). The BSMD is situated approximately five radiation lengths from the front face of the BEMC. BEMC towers (each covering 0.05 units in $\eta$ and $\phi$) provide a measurement of the energy of electromagnetic clusters, whereas the BSMD, due to its high granularity (0.007 units in $\eta$ and $\phi$), provides high spatial resolution for the center of a cluster and the transverse development of the shower. Electromagnetic clusters are constructed from the response of one or two towers, depending on the location of the centroid as determined by the BSMD. The transverse extent of the shower is used to distinguish between $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ showers and decay photons from $\pi^0$. Details of the $\pi^0/\gamma$ discrimination are discussed in the next section.

3. Analysis details

Events having a transverse energy in a BEMC cluster $E_T > 8$ GeV, with $|\eta| < 0.9$, are selected for this analysis. In order to distinguish a $\pi^0$, which at high $p_T$ predominately decays to two photons with a small opening angle, from a single-photon cluster, a transverse shower-shape analysis is performed. In this method, the overall BEMC cluster energy ($E_{\text{cluster}}$), the individual BSMO strip energies ($e_j$), and the distances of the strips ($r_j$) from the center of the cluster are used to construct the “Transverse Shower Profile” (TSP). The TSP is defined as, TSP = $E_{\text{cluster}}/\sum_j e_j r_j^{1.5}$ [12,24]. The $\pi^0_{\text{rich}}$ (nearly pure sample of $\pi^0$) and $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ (enhanced fraction of $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$) samples are selected by requiring TSP $< 0.08$ and 0.2 $< \text{TSP} < 0.6$, respectively, in both $p+p$ and Au+Au collisions. The $\pi^0_{\text{rich}}$ sample is estimated to be $\sim 95\%$ pure $\pi^0$, determined from studies of simulated $\pi^0$ and $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ embedded into real data. The $\Delta\phi$ azimuthal correlations are constructed with charged-hadron tracks within 1.2 GeV/c $< p_T^{\text{assoc}} < p_T^{\text{trig}}$ and $|\eta| < 1.0$. Both trigger samples are selected with $12 < p_T^{\text{trig}} < 20$ GeV/c (or $8 < p_T^{\text{trig}} < 20$ GeV/c for the study of $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$, $p_T^{\text{trig}}$ dependence) and $|\eta| < 0.9$. There is an additional requirement that no track with momentum greater than 3 GeV/c is pointing to the trigger tower. This track-rejection cut prevents significant contamination of the measured BEMC energy of the trigger particle. The $p_T$ threshold of the track-rejection cut was varied between 1 and 4 GeV/c, as a part of the systematic studies, and the variations showed no significant difference in the away-side charged-hadron yields.

The correlation functions represent the number of associated charged hadrons ($N_{\text{assoc}}$) per trigger particle, $(1/N_{\text{trig}})\langle N_{\text{assoc}}/d\Delta\phi \rangle$, as a function of $\Delta\phi$, where $N_{\text{trig}}$ is the number of trigger particles. The yield is integrated over $\Delta\eta = 2$, with no correction applied for the particle-pair acceptance in $\Delta\eta$. In Fig. 1, a sample...
of the azimuthal correlation functions for $\gamma_{\text{rich}}$ and $\pi^{0}_{\text{rich}}$-triggered associated charged hadrons, for different $p_{T,\text{assoc}}^{\text{rich}}$ ranges, is shown for the 12% most central Au+Au and minimum-bias $p+p$ collisions. In the lower $p_{T,\text{assoc}}^{\text{rich}}$ bins, the uncorrelated background (shown in Fig. 1 as dashed curves) is higher than that in higher $p_{T,\text{assoc}}^{\text{rich}}$ bins, especially in Au+Au collisions, whereas in $p+p$ collisions, this uncorrelated background is small in all $p_{T,\text{assoc}}^{\text{rich}}$ bins. 

On the near-side ($\Delta \phi \sim 0$) the $\pi^{0}_{\text{rich}}$-triggered correlated yields are larger than those for $\gamma_{\text{rich}}$ triggers, as expected. The non-zero near-side $\gamma_{\text{rich}}$-triggered yields are due to the background in the $\gamma_{\text{rich}}$ trigger sample and are used to determine the amount of background, as further discussed below. In the higher $p_{T,\text{assoc}}^{\text{rich}}$ range, it is also observed that the away-side ($\Delta \phi \sim \pi$) $\gamma_{\text{rich}}$-triggered yields are still smaller than those of the $\pi^{0}_{\text{rich}}$ triggers, which can be understood since the $\pi^{0}$ triggers originate from the fragmentation of partons generally having a higher energy than the corresponding direct-photon triggers.

The background subtraction and the pair-acceptance correction (in $\Delta \phi$) have been performed using a mixed-event technique (see e.g. [16]) for each $z_{T}$ bin. Event mixing is performed among events having similar vertex position and centrality class. In Au+Au collisions, the background (i.e. what is not correlated with the jet) may still contain azimuthal correlations due to flow. The distributions of background pairs for different $z_{T}$ bins are therefore modulated with the second Fourier (elliptic flow) coefficient ($v_{2}$) of the particle azimuthal distribution measured with respect to the event plane. It is given by $B[1+2(v_{2}^{\text{rich}})(v_{2}^{\text{assoc}})\cos(2\Delta \phi)]$, where $B$ represents the level of background pairs and is determined assuming applicability of the “Zero-Yield at 1 radian” (ZYA1) method, a variation on the “Zero-Yield at Minimum” (ZYAM) method [25].

The $(v_{2}^{\text{rich}})(v_{2}^{\text{assoc}})$ is the average value of the second-order flow coefficient [26] of the trigger (associated) particle at the mean $p_{T,\text{assoc}}^{\text{rich}}$ ($p_{T,\text{assoc}}^{\text{rich}}$) in each $z_{T}$ bin. The flow term in the background subtraction only has a significant effect for Au+Au collisions at low $z_{T}$, and the higher order flow components are ignored as their magnitudes are small in the most central Au+Au collisions. In $p+p$ collisions, B is determined assuming a flat (uncorrelated) background.

The trigger-associated charged-hadron yields are determined from the azimuthal correlation functions, per trigger particle ($\pi^{0}_{\text{rich}}$ and $\gamma_{\text{rich}}$ samples), per $\Delta \phi$, both on the near side ($\Delta \phi \sim 0$) and the away side ($\Delta \phi \sim \pi$). In this analysis, the near-side and away-side yields are extracted by integrating the correlation functions, for given $z_{T}$ bins, over $|\Delta \phi| \leq 1.4$ and $|\Delta \phi - \pi| \leq 1.4$, respectively. The raw near-side and away-side associated charged-hadron yields are corrected for the associated-particle efficiencies determined by embedding simulated charged hadrons into real events. The average tracking efficiencies for charged hadrons (with $p_{T,\text{assoc}}^{\text{rich}} > 1.2$ GeV/c) are determined via detector simulations to be around 70% and 90% for central Au+Au and minimum-bias $p+p$ collisions, respectively. The $\pi^{0}$-triggered yields are calculated from the $\pi^{0}_{\text{rich}}$-triggered correlation functions, with no further correction for the contamination in the trigger sample, because of the high purity in the $\pi^{0}_{\text{rich}}$ sample.

Away-side charged-hadron yields for $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ triggers are determined by assuming zero near-side yield for $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ triggers, and using the following expression

$$Y_{\gamma_{\text{dir}}+h} = \frac{Y_{\text{away}}}{Y_{\gamma_{\text{rich}}+h}} = \frac{Y_{\text{away}}}{Y_{\gamma_{\text{rich}}+h}}. \frac{1}{1 - R}.$$

Here $Y_{\text{away}}$ ($Y_{\gamma_{\text{rich}}+h}$) represents the away-side yield of $\gamma_{\text{rich}}$ ($\pi^{0}_{\text{rich}}+h$), and $R$ is given by

$$R = \frac{Y_{\text{near}}}{Y_{\gamma_{\text{rich}}+h}} = \frac{1}{1 - R}.$$

the ratio of the near-side yield in the $\gamma_{\text{rich}}$-triggered correlation function to the near-side yield in the $\pi^{0}_{\text{rich}}$-triggered correlation function. This means

$$1 - R = \frac{N^{\gamma_{\text{dir}}}}{N^{\gamma_{\text{rich}}}}.$$

where $N^{\gamma_{\text{dir}}}$ ($N^{\gamma_{\text{rich}}}$) is the number of $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ ($\gamma_{\text{rich}}$) triggers. The values of $1 - R$, representing the fractions of signal in the $\gamma_{\text{rich}}$ trigger sample, are found to be 40% and 70% for $p+p$ and the central Au+Au collisions, respectively. Using this technique, almost all sources of background (including photons from asymmetric hadron decays and fragmentation photons) can be removed, assuming that their correlations are similar to those for $\pi^{0}$ triggers. This assumption was tested using PYTHIA simulations, with decay photons as the trigger particles, and it was found to be valid to within at least 15% (the statistical precision of the PYTHIA study).

Systematic uncertainties include the effects of track-quality selection criteria, neutral-cluster selection criteria, $\pi^{0}/\gamma$ discrimination (TSP) cuts for the $\pi^{0}_{\text{rich}}$ and $\gamma_{\text{rich}}$ samples, the size of the ZYA1 normalization region, the $v_{2}$ uncertainty range, and the yield-integration windows. All of these sources of uncertainty are evaluated for each data point individually. For groups of sources that are not independent, such as different yield-extraction conditions, the maximum deviation among the different conditions is taken as the contribution to the systematic error. The systematic uncertainties from sources that are considered to be independent are added in quadrature. The $\pi^{0}/\gamma$ discrimination uncertainty dominates in most $z_{T}$ bins, varying between 10 and 25%. The track-quality selection criteria typically contributes a 5–10% uncertainty. In the lowest $z_{T}$ bin in Au+Au collisions for $\pi^{0}$ triggers, the yield extraction uncertainty dominates with as much as 50% uncertainty in the near-side yield. The variation of the $p_{T}$ threshold for the track-rejection cut for the neutral-tower trigger selection typically has a negligible effect.

4. Results and discussion

In this measurement, both $\pi^{0}$ and $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ triggers are required to be within a range of $12 < p_{T,\text{trigger}}^{\gamma_{\text{dir}}} < 20$ GeV/c, or $8 < p_{T,\text{trigger}}^{\pi^{0}_{\text{rich}}} < 20$ GeV/c for the study of the $p_{T}^{\text{trigger}}$ dependence. In contrast to a $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ trigger, a $\pi^{0}$ trigger carries a fraction of the initial parton energy of the hard-scattered parton. In this case, the $z_{T}$ for a trigger+associated-particle pair is only a loose approximation of the fractional parton energy carried by the jet constituent. The integrated away-side and near-side charged-hadron yields per $\pi^{0}$ trigger, $D(z_{T})$, are plotted as a function of $z_{T}$, both for Au-Au (0–12% centrality) and $p+p$ collisions, in Fig. 2. Yields of the away-side associated charged hadrons are suppressed, in Au-Au relative to $p+p$, at all $z_{T}$ except in the low $z_{T}$ region. On the other hand, no suppression is observed on the near-side in Au-Au, relative to $p+p$ collisions, due to the surface bias imposed by triggering on a high-$p_{T}$ $\pi^{0}$.

Fig. 3 shows the away-side $D(z_{T})$ for $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ triggers, as extracted from Eq. (1), as a function of $z_{T}$ for central Au-Au and minimum-bias $p+p$ collisions. The $\pi^{0}$-triggered away-side charged-hadron yields cannot be directly compared to those of $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ triggers, as the $\pi^{0}$ trigger is a fragment of a higher energy parton. One can approximate the fraction of additional energy by integrating $z_{T}$ times a fit to the near-side $D(z_{T})$ distribution, measured in $p+p$ collisions, over all $z_{T}$ ($z_{T} = 0 \rightarrow \infty$). The value of that fraction is
Applying this ratio as a correction factor to the $z_T$ values of the away-side $D(z_T)$ for $\pi^0$ triggers in $p+p$ collisions results in the $D(z_T^{corr})$ distribution, where

$$z_T^{corr} = \frac{P_T^{assoc}}{P_T^{jet}}.$$  (7)

Since $z_T^{corr}$ represents the fractional momentum of the jet carried by the associated particles, it is (to the extent that the $P_T^{jet}$ is a good approximation of the initial $P_T$ of the recoil parton) equivalent to the $z_T$ measured when using $\gamma^{dir}$ triggers. $D(z_T^{corr})$ is directly compared to the fragmentation function measured via direct-photon triggers in Fig. 4 and shows reasonable agreement.

In order to quantify the medium modification for $\gamma^{dir}$- and $\pi^0$-triggered recoil jet production as a function of $z_T$, the ratio, defined as

$$I_{AA} = \frac{D(z_T^{corr})_{Au+Au}}{D(z_T^{corr})_{p+p}},$$  (8)

does the per-trigger conditional yields in $Au+Au$ to those in $p+p$ collisions is calculated. In the absence of medium modifications, $I_{AA}$ is expected to be equal to unity. Fig. 5 shows the away-side medium modification factor for $\pi^0$ triggers ($I_{AA}^{\pi^0}$) and $\gamma^{dir}$ triggers ($I_{AA}^{\gamma_{dir}}$), as a function of $z_T$. $I_{AA}^{\pi^0}$ and $I_{AA}^{\gamma_{dir}}$ show similar suppression within uncertainties. At low $z_T$ ($0.1 < z_T < 0.2$), both $I_{AA}^{\pi^0}$ and $I_{AA}^{\gamma_{dir}}$ show an indication of less suppression than at higher $z_T$. This observation is not significant in the $z_T$-dependence of $I_{AA}$ because the uncertainties in the lowest $z_T$ bin are large; however, $I_{AA}$ is plotted vs. $P_T^{assoc}$ (shown in a later figure), the conclusion is supported with somewhat more significance. At high $z_T$, both $I_{AA}^{\pi^0}$ and $I_{AA}^{\gamma_{dir}}$ show a factor $\sim 3-5$ suppression.

Theoretical model predictions, labeled as Qin [27] and ZOWW [15,28], using the same kinematic coverage for $\gamma^{dir}$-triggered away-side charged-hadron yields, are compared to the data. In the model by Qin et al., the energy loss mechanism is incorporated into a thermalized medium for $Au+Au$ collisions with impact parameters of 0–2.4 fm by using a full (3+1)-hydrodynamic evolution model description. Although this model also includes jet-medium photons (photons coming from the interaction of hard partons with the medium [29,30]) and fragmentation photons (photons radiating from hard partons [30]), both of these contribute to $I_{AA}^{\gamma_{dir}}$ mainly at high $z_T$ and thus do not affect our comparison at low to mid $z_T$. 

---

Fig. 2. (Color online.) The $z_T$ dependence of $\pi^0$--$h^+$ away-side (a) and near-side (b) associated charged-hadron yields per trigger for $Au+Au$ at 0–12% centrality (filled symbols) and $p+p$ (open symbols) collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV. Vertical lines represent the statistical errors, and the vertical extent of the boxes represents systematic uncertainties.

Fig. 3. (Color online.) The $z_T$ dependence of $\gamma^{dir}$-h$^+$ away-side associated charged-hadron yields per trigger for $Au+Au$ at 0–12% centrality (filled diamonds) and $p+p$ (open diamonds) collisions. Vertical lines represent statistical errors, and the vertical extent of the boxes represents systematic uncertainties.

where $P_T^{assoc}$ is equal to the $P_T^{jet}$ plus the total $P_T$ carried by the near-side associated charged hadrons. This is consistent with what is obtained when applying the same analysis on $\pi^0$-triggered charged-hadron correlations from a PYTHIA simulation. In PYTHIA, the neutral associated energy can also be accounted for, giving us an estimate of the fractional energy carried by the $\pi^0$ trigger, when accounting for all associated particles (charged and neutral),

$$P_T^{assoc}/P_T^{jet} = 0.17 \pm 0.04.$$  (4)

From that, the fraction of energy carried by the $\pi^0$ trigger, with $P_T^{jet} = 12–20$ GeV/c, is estimated to be

$$P_T^{assoc}/P_T^{jet} = 85 \pm 3%,$$  (5)

where $P_T^{assoc}$ is equal to the $P_T^{jet}$ plus the total $P_T$ carried by the near-side associated charged hadrons. This is consistent with what is obtained when applying the same analysis on $\pi^0$-triggered charged-hadron correlations from a PYTHIA simulation. In PYTHIA, the neutral associated energy can also be accounted for, giving us an estimate of the fractional energy carried by the $\pi^0$ trigger, when accounting for all associated particles (charged and neutral),

$$P_T^{assoc}/P_T^{jet} = 80 \pm 5%.$$  (6)
The calculation by ZOWW also incorporates the parameterized parton energy loss into a bulk-medium evolution [28]. It does not include fragmentation or jet-medium photons, and also describes the experimental measurement of $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ as a function of $z_T$ for the top central Au+Au collisions. The calculated $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ (also by ZOWW) shows a somewhat larger suppression than the $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ at low $z_T$. The difference at low $z_T$ between the $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ and the $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ (as calculated by ZOWW) is likely due to the color factor effect and the differences in average path lengths between $\pi^0$ triggers and $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ triggers. The calculated difference in the suppression is approximately 50% at $z_T = 0.1$. The data are not sensitive to this difference within the measured uncertainties. These models (Qin and ZOWW) do not include a redistribution of the lost energy to the lower $p_T$ jet fragments, in contrast to the YajEM model [17].

The calculation by ZOWW also incorporates the parameterized parton energy loss into a bulk-medium evolution [28]. It does not include fragmentation or jet-medium photons, and also describes the experimental measurement of $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ as a function of $z_T$ for the top central Au+Au collisions. The calculated $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ (also by ZOWW) shows a somewhat larger suppression than the $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ at low $z_T$. The difference at low $z_T$ between the $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ and the $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ (as calculated by ZOWW) is likely due to the color factor effect and the differences in average path lengths between $\pi^0$ triggers and $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ triggers. The calculated difference in the suppression is approximately 50% at $z_T = 0.1$. The data are not sensitive to this difference within the measured uncertainties. These models (Qin and ZOWW) do not include a redistribution of the lost energy to the lower $p_T$ jet fragments, in contrast to the YajEM model [17]. The YajEM model is also shown in Fig. 5, although for a somewhat lower trigger $p_T$ range of 9–12 GeV/c. It predicts $I_{AA}^{\gamma} = 1$ at $z_T = 0.2$ (corresponding to $p_T^{\text{assoc}} \sim 1.8$ GeV/c) and rising well above 1 in the $z_T$ range of 0.1–0.2 [17]. This is calculated with a small integration window of $\pi/5$ around $\Delta \phi = \pi$. Although this calculation has a different $p_T^{\text{FRG}}$ cut, such a large rise is not observed in our data. In contrast to the other calculations shown (Qin and ZOWW), the rise in $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ at low $z_T$ in YajEM is predominantly due to the redistribution of lost energy. In this picture, the in-medium shower is modified by the medium and a suppression at high $z_T$ results in an enhancement at lower $z_T$. The authors compare the “medium-modified shower” picture to an “energy loss” picture, where the energy is carried through the medium by a single parton, and the lost energy would only show up at extremely low energies and large angles. In such a picture, they argue that the rise in $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ at low $z_T$ would be more modest and $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ would remain less than 1.

Because PHENIX has reported an enhancement at low $z_T$ ($z_T < 0.4$) in $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ at large angles [11], it is interesting to compare our results over the full integration window of $|\Delta \phi - \pi| < 1.4$ radians to an $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ calculated with a smaller window of $|\Delta \phi - \pi| < 0.6$ radians in Fig. 6. Within our uncertainties, an enhancement effect is only seen in the lowest $z_T$ bin for $p_T^{\pi^0}$ triggers. However, for the PHENIX measurement, $z_T < 0.4$ corresponds to lower $p_T$ for the associated hadrons ($\lesssim 2$ GeV/c), since the $p_T$ was chosen in the range of 5–9 GeV/c. In our analysis, associated hadrons with $p_T < 2$ GeV/c are only present at $z_T < 0.2$. The apparent inconsistency between STAR and PHENIX, when investigating the recovery of the lost energy as a function of $z_T$, indicates that $p_T^{\text{assoc}}$ may be the more pertinent variable. The conclusion is that the “modified fragmentation function” (constructed from the in-medium jet-like yields as a function of $z_T$) is not universal. In particular, the lost energy is not recovered at a fixed range of $z_T$, but perhaps at a given range of $p_T^{\text{assoc}}$. The conclusion that the lost energy is recovered at larger angles only for $p_T < 2$ GeV/c, regardless of the trigger energy, is consistent with the conclusion of the STAR paper on jet-hadron correlations [18].

The earlier measurements [12] at low trigger energy ($8 < p_T^{\text{FRG}} < 16$ GeV/c) show the same level of suppression (factor 3–5) via the medium modification factor ($I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ and $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$) down to $z_T \sim 0.3$. This suggests that $I_{AA}$ does not depend on the trigger energy at mid to high $z_T$ for $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ and $\pi^0$-triggered away-side jets with trigger $p_T$ ranging from 8 to 20 GeV/c. This is further investigated in Fig. 7 with $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ triggers, since the photon trigger energy closely approximates the initial outgoing parton energy. The left panel shows $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ as a function of $p_T^{\text{FRG}}$ for $0.3 < z_T < 0.4$. The per-trigger nuclear modification factor of $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$–triggered away-side charged-hadron yields is independent of the trigger energy of the $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ within our 25% systematic uncertainty. This indicates that the away-side parton energy loss is not sensitive to the initial parton energy in this range of 8–20 GeV/c, as measured with our level of precision. The ZOWW calculation also predicts $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ as a function of $p_T^{\text{FRG}}$ to be approximately flat in this range. In the right panel, the values of $I_{AA}^{\gamma}$ are plotted as a function of $p_T^{\text{assoc}}$. It shows that the low-$p_T^{\text{assoc}}$ hadrons on the away-side are not as suppressed as
those at high $p_{T}^{\text{assoc}}$. Both model predictions shown [15,27], which do not include the redistribution of lost energy, are in agreement with the data.

5. Summary

In summary, in order to understand the medium modification of partons in the QGP, away-side charged-hadron yields for $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ and $\pi^{0}$ triggers in central (0–12%) Au+Au collisions are compared with those in minimum-bias $p+p$ collisions. Both $p_{T}^{\text{trig}}$ and $I_{AA}^{/\Delta 1\phi}$ show similar levels of suppression, with the expected differences due to the color-factor effect and the path-length dependence not manifesting themselves within experimental uncertainties. At low $z_{T}$ and low $p_{T}^{\text{assoc}}$, the data are consistent with less suppression than at higher $p_{T}^{\text{assoc}}$. The suppression shows little difference for integration windows of $\pm 0.6$ vs. $\pm 1.4$ radians around $\Delta \phi = \pi$, with an enhancement at large angles observed only for $z_{T} < 0.2$ ($p_{T}^{\text{assoc}} < 2.4 \text{ GeV}/c$) for $\pi^{0}$ triggers. There is no trigger-energy dependence observed in the suppression of $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$-triggered yields, suggesting little dependence for energy loss on the initial parton energy, in the range of $p_{T}^{\text{trig}} = 8–20 \text{ GeV}/c$. The data are consistent with model calculations [15,27,28], in which the suppression is caused by parton energy loss in a thermalized medium. These calculations do not include redistribution of energy within the shower. The very large $I_{AA}^{/\Delta 1\phi}$ at low $z_{T}$ predicted by models of in-medium shower modification (including energy redistribution) [17] is not observed for $p_{T}^{\text{trig}} > 12 \text{ GeV}/c$. This is in contrast to the PHENIX result [11], where the $p_{T}^{\text{assoc}}$ exceeds unity, for $p_{T}^{\text{trig}} \approx 5–9 \text{ GeV}/c$. However, it is not clear that the redistribution of lost energy would scale with the jet energy. In fact, our studies support previous conclusions that the lost energy reappears predominantly at low $p_{T}$ (approximately $p_{T} < 2 \text{ GeV}/c$), regardless of the trigger $p_{T}$. This leads to the important conclusion that the modified fragmentation function is not universal (i.e. it does not have the same $z_{T}$ dependence for all trigger $p_{T}$).
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