Measurements of Higher-Order Flow Harmonics in Au+Au Collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV
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Flow coefficients $v_n$ for $n = 2, 3, 4$, characterizing the anisotropic collective flow in Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV, are measured relative to event planes $\Psi_n$, determined at large rapidity. We report $v_n$ as a function of transverse momentum and collision centrality, and study the correlations among the event planes of different order $n$. The $v_n$ are well described by hydrodynamic models which employ a Glauber Monte Carlo initial state geometry with fluctuations, providing additional constraining power on the interplay between initial conditions and the effects of viscosity as the system evolves. This new constraint improves precision of the extracted viscosity to entropy density ratio $\eta/s$.

PACS numbers: 25.75.Dw, 25.75.Ld

The production of particles in heavy ion collisions at the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider is anisotropic in directions transverse to the beam. For low momentum particles ($p_T \lesssim 3$ GeV/c), this anisotropy is understood to result from hydrodynamically driven flow of the Quark-Gluon Plasma (QGP) [1,5]. The strength of the flow is measured as Fourier coefficients $v_n = \langle e^{i n (\phi - \Psi_{RP})} \rangle$, $n = 2, 4, \ldots$, where $\phi$ is the azimuthal angle of an emitted particle around the $z$ axis defined by the beam, usually at midrapidity; $\Psi_{RP}$ is the azimuth of the reaction plane defined by the beam direction and the impact vector between the colliding nuclei. The brackets denote averaging over particles and events. The reaction plane is not measurable directly a priori, so the Fourier coefficients are determined with respect to the estimated participant event planes [1]. Recent measurements have primarily focused on the even-order anisotropies $v_2$ and $v_4$, evaluated with respect to an event plane $\Psi_2$, determined from the $n = 2$ correlation.

The $v_2(v_4)$ values obtained this way for a broad range of $p_T$ and centrality have been used to extract the specific viscosity $\eta/s$ (the ratio of viscosity $\eta$ to entropy density $s$) of the hot and dense nuclear matter via hydrodynamic model comparisons [2,3]. These model comparisons, which incorporate the dynamic evolution of an early-stage strongly-coupled QGP, together with a late-stage hadronic gas, give estimates which span the range $4\pi^2/3 \sim 1 - 2$. A conjectured lower bound for the specific viscosity is $4\pi^2/3 = 1$ [3]. The rather large uncertainties associated with this range of estimates (100%) are currently dominated by the uncertainty on initial state anisotropy estimates [2,3]. Specifically, the ends of the range are given by two equally successful parameter sets. The lower bound value is obtained with a standard Glauber Monte Carlo model [10,11] of the initial state which results in smaller initial anisotropy and thus needs less viscosity to reproduce the measured final state particle anisotropy. The higher value $4\pi^2/3 \sim 2$, corresponds to a larger initial anisotropy in the Color Glass Condensate (CGC) inspired Monte-Carlo-Kharzeev-Levin-Nardi (MC-KLN) model [12,13] of the initial state.

Recently, significant attention has been given to the study of the influence of initial geometry fluctuations of the initial state anisotropy, which are typically quantified by higher-order generalized “eccentricities” $\varepsilon_n$ [14,15] with the goal of understanding how such fluctuations induce anisotropic particle emission, characterized by $v_n$ (for odd and even $n$)

$$\frac{dN}{d\phi} \propto 1 + \sum_{n=1}^\infty 2v_n \cos(n[\phi - \Psi_n]),$$  

where $v_n = \langle \cos(n[\phi - \Psi_n]) \rangle$, $n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$ and the $\Psi_n$ are the generalized participant event planes at all orders for each event. These recent developments suggest that measurements of $v_n$, especially for $n = 3$, can yield important additional constraints that provide a more precise estimate of $\frac{\eta}{s}$, as well as resolve the correct eccentricity model.

Here we present results for differential measurements following Eq. 1 for Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}}=200$ GeV. We first show how the measured event planes correlate across large rapidity gaps, and then show resulting $v_n$ moments for midrapidity particles relative to those planes. We find that the measured $v_n$ moments, in conjunction with hydrodynamical model calculations [16,17], indeed provide new constraining power for both the initial state and $\eta/s$.

The results are derived from $\sim 3.0 \times 10^9$ Au+Au events obtained with the PHENIX detector [18] during the 2007 running period. Collision centrality (related to impact parameter) and number of participating nucleons ($N_{\text{part}}$) determinations were performed with pre
FIG. 1: (color online) Raw correlation strengths (see text) of the event planes for various detector combinations as a function of collision centrality. The detectors in which the event plane is measured are: (a) RXN North, (b) BBC South, (c) MPC North, and (d) MPC South.

by-event dispersion of the $\Phi_n$. Its magnitude can be estimated via the two and three sub-events method \cite{19} in which the correlation between $\Phi_n$ from different sub-events is measured. The strength of this correlation is generally quantified as $\langle \cos(n[\Phi_n^A - \Phi_n^B]) \rangle$ for sub-events $A, B$, which measures the cosine dispersion of $\Phi_n$.

Figure 1 shows the centrality dependence of this correlation strength $\langle \cos(j[\Phi_n^A - \Phi_n^B]) \rangle$ for sub-event combinations $(A, B)$ involving different event-plane detectors with $\Delta n' \sim 5$ and $\Delta n' \sim 7$. The raw correlations are presented as measured so that the magnitudes shown should be considered specific to the PHENIX detectors involved. The systematic uncertainties (not shown) for these correlations are of similar relative size to those for $v_n\{\Psi_n\}$ discussed below. The uncertainties are correlated across centrality and $n$ such that the relative size of these event plane correlations can be compared. The magnitudes for the odd parity quantities $\langle \sin(j[\Phi_n^A - \Phi_n^B]) \rangle$, which should vanish, are found to be consistent with zero for all centrality, $j$, and $\Phi$ combinations. Figure 1 panels (a) and (b) show the two sub-events correlations for $m = n$; (c) and (d) show the two-sub-events correlations for $m \neq n$. The negative correlation indicated in (a) is due to the well known antisymmetric pseudorapidity dependence of sidewards flow $v_1$, as well as momentum conservation \cite{2}. Positive sub-event correlations are indicated in (a) and (b) for $\Psi_{2,3,4}$, with sizable magnitudes for $\Psi_{2,3}$ and much smaller values for $\Psi_4$.

The sub-event correlations $\langle \cos(j[\Phi_n^A - \Phi_n^B]) \rangle$ for $m \neq n$ are also of interest. Fig. 1(c) confirms the expected correlation between $\Psi_1$ and $\Psi_2$ (due to sidewards flow), as well as that between $\Psi_2$ and $\Psi_3$. The order $j = 6$ is chosen to account for the $n$-multiplet of directions $(2\pi/n)$ of $\Psi_2$ and $\Psi_3$. The absence of this correlation suggests that the fluctuations for $\Psi_3$ about $\Psi_2$ are substantial. This is well reproduced by Glauber modeling \cite{24, 25} and therefore support an initial state fluctuation origin of $\Psi_3$ and $v_3$. A small correlation between $\Psi_3$ and $\Psi_1$ is indicated in Fig. 1(d). While such a correlation seems to be at odds with the absence of a $\Psi_2 - \Psi_3$ correlation [cf. Fig. 1(d)], we note that $\Psi_1 - \Psi_3$ correlations need not contribute to a residual contribution to $\Psi_2 - \Psi_3$ correlations through $\Psi_1$. That is, $\Psi_1$ could correlate with $\Psi_3$ and $\Psi_2$ in exclusive event classes. Comparisons using the PHENIX Zero Degree Calorimeter, which measures the $n = 1$ spectator neutron event plane \cite{23} at $|y| > 6.5$ indicate that this correlation has significant $\eta'$-antisymmetry. We defer further investigation of these correlation subtleties to future work.

Fig. 2 shows results for the midrapidity $v_n\{\Psi_n\}$ for tracks in the central arms as a function of $p_T$ for different centralities. They are from the RXN-defined event plane analysis, because this detector has the best resolution. The systematic uncertainties for these measure-
ments were estimated by detailed comparisons of the results obtained with the RXN, BBC, and MPC event plane detectors and subevent selections. They are $\sim 3\%$, $\sim 8\%$ and $\sim 20\%$ for $v_2\{\Psi_2\}$, $v_3\{\Psi_3\}$, and $v_4\{\Psi_4\}$, respectively, for midcentral collisions and increase by a few percent for more central and peripheral collisions. Through further comparison of the results obtained with the RXN, BBC, and MPC event plane detectors, pseudorapidity dependent nonflow contributions that may influence the magnitude of $v_n\{\Psi_n\}$, such as jet correlations, were shown [19] to be much less than all other uncertainties for $v_2\{\Psi_2\}$ and $v_4\{\Psi_4\}$.

The $v_n\{\Psi_n\}$ values shown in Fig. 2 increase with $p_T$ for most of the measured range, and decrease for more central collisions. $v_2\{\Psi_2\}$ and $v_4\{\Psi_4\}$ increase as expected from central to semiPeripheral collisions, which reflects the increase of $\varepsilon_n$ in peripheral collisions. $v_3\{\Psi_3\}$ appears to be much less centrality dependent, with values comparable to $v_2\{\Psi_2\}$ in the most central events. This behavior is consistent with Glauber calculations of the average fluctuations of the generalized "triangular" eccentricity $\varepsilon_3$ [24-25]. The Fig. 2 panels (c), (d), (g), and (h) show comparisons of $v_2\{\Psi_2\}$ and $v_3\{\Psi_3\}$ to results from hydrodynamic calculations. The $p_T$ and centrality trends for both $v_2\{\Psi_2\}$ and $v_3\{\Psi_3\}$ are in good agreement with the hydrodynamic models shown, especially at $p_T$ below $\approx 1$ GeV/c.

Figure 3 compares the centrality dependence of $v_2\{\Psi_2\}$ and $v_3\{\Psi_3\}$ with several additional calculations, demonstrating both the new constraints the data provide and also the robustness of hydrodynamics to the details of different model assumptions for medium evolution. Alver et al. [10] use relativistic viscous hydrodynamics in 2+1 dimensions. Fluctuations are introduced for two different initial conditions. For Glauber initial conditions, the energy density distribution in the transverse plane is proportional to a superposition of struck nucleon and binary collision densities; in MC-KLN initial conditions the energy density profile is further controlled by the dependence of the gluon saturation momentum on the transverse position [12-13]. These two models of the initial state are paired with two different values of $4\pi/\varepsilon_2 = 1$ and 2, respectively. Both values reproduce the measured $v_2\{\Psi_2\}$ equally well and the viscosity differences reflect the different initial $\varepsilon_2$. The two models have similar $\varepsilon_2$, and thus the larger viscosity needed in the MC-KLN model corresponds to lower $v_3$ than for Glauber. Consequently, our measurement of $v_3\{\Psi_3\}$ helps to disentangle viscosity and initial conditions. The efficacy of these 2+1 hydrodynamic results for Glauber initial conditions are confirmed further calculations with different model assumptions. Petersen et al. [26] determine a Glauber initial state event-by-event, translating through pre-equilibrium with the UrQMD transport model [27-28], then evolving the medium with ideal QGP hydrodynamics ($\eta/s = 0$), and finally switching to a hadronic cascade (which has an effective viscosity) as regions become dilute. B. Schenke et al. [17] use event-by-event Glauber initial conditions, evolved with ideal 3+1 dimensional hydrodynamics, which includes the effects of viscosity in the plasma phase.

All of these models are compared with $v_2\{\Psi_2\}$, and $v_3\{\Psi_3\}$ data as a function of $N_{\text{part}}$ in two $p_T$ bins. All calculations describe $v_2\{\Psi_2\}$ well at $p_T = 0.75$ GeV/c. Deviations from hydrodynamics should be expected in peripheral collisions, where nonequilibrium effects may be large. At higher $p_T$, differences between the calculations become more apparent. All models still agree with $v_2\{\Psi_2\}$, including MC-KLN initial conditions. However, the lower panels of Fig. 3 show the constraining power of $v_3\{\Psi_3\}$ and that the calculated results from viscous hydrodynamics, with MC-KLN initial conditions and $4\pi/\varepsilon_2 = 2$, lie significantly below the data. This is more apparent in the higher $p_T$ bin, even in the most central collisions. Therefore, our comparisons suggest that the combination of MC-KLN initial conditions in concert with $4\pi/\varepsilon_2 = 2$ is disfavored by our new $v_3\{\Psi_3\}$ measurements. By contrast, the results from the hydrodynamical

![Figure 2](image-url)
calculations which employ Glauber initial condition fluctuations and $4\pi\frac{\Delta}{c} = 1$ show relatively good agreement with the $v_{2,3}(\Psi_{2,3})$ data. The exact statistical significance of these constraints should be determined through a global fit procedure, after quantitative accounting of the breakdown of hydrodynamics in peripheral collisions, as well as the systematics associated with the averaging of eccentricity fluctuations within these models are fully understood. From our data it is already clear that the higher order moments $v_n(\Psi_n)$ for $n \geq 3$ provide an important avenue for constraining different physical properties of the QGP.

In summary, we have presented participant event plane $\Psi_n$ correlations and differential measurements of $v_n(\Psi_n)$ for $n = 2, 3, 4$ for charged hadrons using the generalized event plane method. The higher order harmonic moments $v_3(\Psi_3)$ and $v_4(\Psi_4)$, as well as strong correlations between the higher order event planes across a large rapidity gap of $\Delta y > 7$, provide evidence that the initial state has transverse geometry fluctuations of the generalized eccentricities which are then propagated in the hydrodynamic evolution of the plasma afterwards. This evidence, includes (1) a lack of correlation between the measured event planes of order $n = 2$ and $3$ as predicted by Glauber modeling, assuming correlations of the event planes with the generalized eccentricity, (2) proper description of the shapes of the $p_T$ dependence in the low $p_T$ region by hydrodynamic calculations, and (3) agreement with several different initial state + hydrodynamic models across centralities for order $v_n(\Psi_n)$. The combined results for $v_{2,3}(\Psi_{2,3})$, in concert with initial hydrodynamic model calculations now suggest that the large (100%) uncertainty previously associated with the extraction of $4\pi\frac{\Delta}{c}$ can be significantly reduced. Within the models considered, $4\pi\frac{\Delta}{c} \sim 1$ is favored, which is close to the conjectured lower bound for the specific viscosity.
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FIG. 3: (color online) Comparison of $v_n(\Psi_n)$ vs. $N_{\text{part}}$ measurements and theoretical predictions (see text): “MC-KLN + $4\pi\frac{\Delta}{c} = 2$” and “Glauber + $4\pi\frac{\Delta}{c} = 1$ (1)” [16]; “Glauber + $4\pi\frac{\Delta}{c} = 1$ (2)” [17]; “UrQMD” [26]. The dashed lines (black) around the data points indicate the size of the systematic uncertainty.