Suppression pattern of neutral pions at high transverse momentum in Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}}=200$ GeV and constraints on medium transport coefficients
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Large transverse momentum ($p_T$) hadrons originate primarily from the fragmentation of hard scattered quarks or gluons. In high energy $p+p$ collisions this is well described in the framework of perturbative QCD [3]. In ultra-relativistic heavy ion collisions such hard scatterings occur in the early phase of the reaction, and the transiting partons serve as probes of the strongly interacting medium produced in the collisions. Lattice QCD predicts a phase transition to a plasma of deconfined quarks and gluons, which induces gluon radiation from the scattered parton and depletes hadron production at high $p_T$ (“jet quenching”) [4, 5]. The measurements in Au+Au collisions at RHIC showed suppressed hadron yields in central collisions [6] as predicted [5, 6], and motivated an advanced theoretical study of radiative energy loss using different approaches [7].

All the energy loss models must incorporate space-time evolution of the medium, as it is not static, as well as the initial distribution of the partons throughout the medium. Models generally also include an input parameter for the medium density and/or the coupling. Different assumptions in the various models lead to similar descriptions of the $\pi^0$ suppression with different model-dependent parameters [8, 9]. For instance, the Parton Quenching model (PQM) is a Monte Carlo using the quenching weights from BDMPS [8] that combines the coupling strength with the color-charge density to create a single transport coefficient, often referred to as $\langle \hat{q} \rangle$ [10, 11], which gives the average squared transverse momentum transferred from the medium to the parton per mean free path.

Measurement of identified particles up to the highest possible $p_T$, establishing the magnitude, $p_T$ and centrality dependence of the suppression pattern, is crucial to constrain the theoretical models and separate contributions of initial and final state effects from the energy loss mechanism. Collision centrality is related to the average pathlength of the parton in the medium. The suppression of $\pi^0$ puts important constraints on calculations of the energy loss, as neutral pions can be identified up to very high $p_T$. Whereas it has also been shown that the di-hadron suppression at high $p_T$ may be somewhat more sensitive than single hadron suppression to the medium opacity [12], such improvement is contingent upon the theoretical and experimental, statistical and systematic uncertainties.

This Letter reports on the measurement of neutral pions up to $p_T=20$ GeV/c in Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}}=200$ GeV at RHIC, using the high statistics collected in Run-4. Based upon the data we extract the $\langle \hat{q} \rangle$ parameter of the PQM model for the most central collisions.

The analysis used $1.03 \times 10^8$ minimum bias events taken by the PHENIX experiment [13]. Collision centrality was determined from the correlation between the number of charged particles detected in the Beam-Beam Counters (BBC, $3.0<|\eta|<3.9$) and the energy measured in the Zero Degree Calorimeters (ZDC). A Glauber model Monte Carlo with a simulation of the BBC and ZDC responses was used to estimate the associated average number of participating nucleons ($\langle N_{\text{part}} \rangle$) and binary nucleon-nucleon collisions ($\langle N_{\text{coll}} \rangle$) for each centrality bin [14].

Neutral pions were measured in the $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay channel with the photons reconstructed in the Electromagnetic Calorimeter (EMCal) located in the two central arms of PHENIX ($|\eta| \leq 0.35$). The EMCal [15] consists of two subsystems: six sectors of lead-scintillator sandwich calorimeter (PbSc) and two sectors of lead-glass Čerenkov calorimeter (PbGl) at the radial distance of about 5 m. The fine segmentation of the EMCal ($\delta \phi \times \delta \eta \sim 0.01 \times 0.01$ for PbSc and $\sim 0.008 \times 0.008$ for PbGl) ensures that the two photons from a $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay are well resolved up to $p_T^\gamma \approx 12$ (PbSc) and 16 (PbGl) GeV/c. Data from the two subsystems were analyzed separately and the fully corrected results were combined.
Details of the analysis including extraction of the raw \( \pi^0 \) yield, correction for acceptance, detector response (energy resolution, dead areas), reconstruction efficiency (particle identification cuts) have been described elsewhere [16, 17]. In this analysis the higher \( p_T \) range required correction for losses in the observed (raw) \( \pi^0 \)s due to “cluster merging”.

With increasing \( \pi^0 \) momentum, the minimum opening angle of the two decay photons decreases, and eventually they will be reconstructed as a single cluster. Such “merging” reaches 50% of the total raw yield at \( p_T=14 \, \text{GeV}/c \) in the PbSc and at \( p_T=18 \, \text{GeV}/c \) in the PbGl due to their different granularity and Molière radius. Merged clusters were rejected by various shower profile cuts, and the loss was determined by simulated single \( \pi^0 \)s embedded into real events and analyzed with the same cuts. The loss increases slowly with centrality. The systematic uncertainties were estimated by comparing \( \pi^0 \) yields in the PbSc extracted in different windows of asymmetry \( |E_{y_1} - E_{y_2}|/(E_{y_1} + E_{y_2}) \) and also by comparing yields in the PbSc and PbGl.

We considered two sources of \( \pi^0 \)s not originating from the collision vertex: those produced in nuclear interactions of hadrons with detector material (instrumental background) and feed-down products from weak decay of higher mass hadrons (physics background). Based upon simulations both the instrumental background and feed-down background were found to be negligible (\(<1\%\) above \( p_T>2.0 \, \text{GeV}/c \)) except for the contribution from \( K_S^0 \) decay (\( \approx3\% \) of \( \pi^0 \) yield for \( p_T>1 \, \text{GeV}/c \)), which has been subtracted from the data. Finally the yields were corrected to the center of the \( p_T \) bins using the local slope.

The main sources of systematic uncertainties are yield extraction, efficiency corrections, and energy scale, none of which exhibit a significant centrality dependence. The PbSc and PbGl detectors have quite different systematics with all but one of them (off-vertex \( \pi^0 \)) uncorrelated.

### TABLE I: Summary of the systematic uncertainties on the \( \pi^0 \) yield extracted independently with the PbSc (PbGl) electromagnetic calorimeters. All but one, off-vertex \( \pi^0 \), are uncorrelated between PbSc and PbGl, and centrality dependence is negligible. The last row is the total systematic uncertainty on the combined spectra. Detailed description of how the errors are correlated as a function of \( p_T \) can be found in [17].

| \( p_T \) (\( \text{GeV}/c \)) | 2 | 6 | 10 | 16 |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| uncertainty source PbSc (PbGl) | | | | |
| yield extraction (%) | 3.0 (4.1) | 3.0 (4.1) | 3.0 (4.1) | 3.0 (4.1) |
| PID efficiency (%) | 3.5 (3.9) | 3.5 (3.9) | 3.5 (3.9) | 3.5 (3.9) |
| Energy scale (%) | 6.7 (9.0) | 8.0 (9.2) | 8.0 (8.2) | 8.0 (12.3) |
| Acceptance (%) | 1.5 (4.1) | 1.5 (4.1) | 1.5 (4.1) | 1.5 (4.1) |
| \( \pi^0 \) merging (%) | – (–) | – (–) | 4.4 (–) | 28 (4.8) |
| Conversion (%) | 3.0 (2.5) | 3.0 (2.5) | 3.0 (2.5) | 3.0 (2.5) |
| off-vertex \( \pi^0 \) (%) | 1.5 (1.5) | 1.5 (1.5) | 1.5 (1.5) | 1.5 (1.5) |
| Total (%) | 8.7 (12) | 9.8 (11) | 11 (11) | 30 (15) |

For PbSc and PbGl combined: Total (%) 7.0 7.5 7.6 14

\( K^0_S \) decay (\( \approx3\% \) of \( \pi^0 \) yield for \( p_T>1 \, \text{GeV}/c \)), which has been subtracted from the data. Finally the yields were corrected to the center of the \( p_T \) bins using the local slope.

The main sources of systematic uncertainties are yield extraction, efficiency corrections, and energy scale, none of which exhibit a significant centrality dependence. The PbSc and PbGl detectors have quite different systematics with all but one of them (off-vertex \( \pi^0 \)) uncorrelated.
The final systematic uncertainties (one standard deviation) on the spectra are shown in Table I. Reduced in the weighted average of the two independent PbSc and PbGl measurements. The last two points correspond to overlapping centrality bins, 0-10% and 0-5%. The dashed lines show the fit to a function. See text.

To quantify the comparison of spectra in heavy ion and p+p collisions, the nuclear modification factor \( R_{AA} \) is defined as:

\[
R_{AA} = \frac{1/N_{\text{coll}} dN/dydp_T}{\langle T_{\text{AB}} \rangle d\sigma_{pp}/dydp_T}
\]

is used where \( \sigma_{pp} \) is the production cross section of the particle in p+p collisions, and \( \langle T_{\text{AB}} \rangle \) is the nuclear thickness function averaged over a range of impact parameters for the given centrality, calculated within a Glauber model [14]. Figure 2 shows \( R_{AA} \) for \( \pi^0 \) at different centralities, the 0-5% bin is shown on Figure 3. The reference p+p yield was obtained from the 2005 (Run-5) RHIC p+p measurement [15].

\( R_{AA} \) reaches ~0.2 in 0-10% centrality at \( p_T > 5 \text{ GeV/c} \) with very little (if any) \( p_T \) dependence. While its magnitude changes, the suppression pattern itself is remarkably similar at all centralities suggesting that the bulk \( R_{AA} \) (integrated over the azimuthal angle) is sensitive only to the \( N_{\text{part}} \) but not to the specific geometry. Consequently, study of the \( p_T \)-integrated \( R_{AA} \) vs. centrality is instructive.

Figure 4 shows the integrated nuclear modification factor \( R_{AA} \) as a function of collision centrality expressed in terms of \( N_{\text{part}} \). The error bars/bands are the same as in Fig. 2. The last two points correspond to overlapping centrality bins, 0-10% and 0-5%. The dashed lines show the fit to a function. See text.

Therefore, when combining their results, the total error is reduced in the weighted average of the two independent measurements. The final systematic uncertainties (one standard deviation) on the spectra are shown in Table I. One at three centralities. The spectra are quite similar at all centralities: when fitting \( p_T > 5 \text{ GeV/c} \) with a power law function (\( \propto p_T^{\gamma} \)), the exponents vary from \( n = -8.00 \pm 0.12 \) in 0-5% to \( n = -8.06 \pm 0.08 \) in the 80-92% (most peripheral) bin. Note that \( n = -8.22 \pm 0.09 \) in p+p collisions. The errors are combined statistical errors and systematic uncertainties.

To quantify the comparison of spectra in heavy ion and p+p collisions, the nuclear modification factor \( R_{AA} \) is defined as:

\[
R_{AA} = \frac{1/N_{\text{coll}} dN/dydp_T}{\langle T_{\text{AB}} \rangle d\sigma_{pp}/dydp_T}
\]
tems (such as U+U planned at RHIC) should exhibit even more suppression.

The common power-law behavior ($\propto p_T^2$) in p+p and Au+Au allows the suppression to be re-interpreted as a fractional energy loss $S_{loss} = 1 - R^{1/(n-2)}_{AA}$ where $n$ is the power-law exponent, and we found that $S_{loss} \propto N_{part}$ \cite{16}. Fitting the integrated $R_{AA}$ as a function $R_{AA} = (1 - S_{loss} N_{part})^{-1/n}$ gives $a = 0.58 \pm 0.07$ for $N_{part}$\textgreater 20 for $p_T$\textgreater 5 GeV/$c$, and $a = 0.56 \pm 0.10$ for $p_T$\textgreater 10 GeV/$c$. The GLV \cite{6} and PQM \cite{11} models predict that $a \approx 2/3$, which is consistent with the data. The fitted values of $S_0$ are $(8.3\pm3.3)\times10^{-3}$ and $(9.2\pm4.9)\times10^{-3}$ for $p_T$\textgreater 5 GeV/$c$ and $p_T$\textgreater 10 GeV/$c$, respectively. The fits are shown as dashed lines in Fig. 4.

Note that in this interpretation a constant $S_{loss}$ (independent of $p_T$) implies that the energy loss increases with $p_T$.

We use the highest centrality (0-5%) $R_{AA}$ data as shown on Fig. 3 to constrain the PQM model parameters. The procedure is described in detail in \cite{17}. First we break up the errors of the measured points into Type A ($p_T$-uncorrelated, statistical $\oplus$ systematic, $\sigma$), Type B ($p_T$-correlated, $\sigma_b$, boxes on Fig. 2) and Type C (normalization, uniform fractional shift for all points, $\sigma_c$). Then taking the theory curves calculated for different values of the input parameter $p_T$ one would normally perform a least-squares fit to the theory by finding the values of $\epsilon_b$, $\epsilon_c$ that minimize:

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ \frac{(y_i - \epsilon_b \sigma_b + \epsilon_c y_i \sigma_c - \mu_i(p))^2}{\sigma_i^2} + \epsilon_b^2 + \epsilon_c^2 \right], \tag{1}$$

where $\epsilon_b$ and $\epsilon_c$ are the fractions of the type B and C systematic uncertainties that all points are displaced together. It is important to note that Eq. (1) follows the $\chi^2$-distribution with $n + 2$ degrees of freedom when $p$, $\epsilon_b$ and $\epsilon_c$ are fixed, because it is the sum of $n + 2$ independent Gaussian distributed random variables.

However, for the present data, the statistical and random systematic uncertainties are such that the shift in the measurement $y_i$ due to the correlated systematic uncertainties preserves the fractional type A uncertainty. Thus, we use a least squares fit of the quantity $\tilde{\chi}^2$ to estimate the best fit parameters, where $\tilde{\chi}^2$ is Eq. (1) with $\sigma_i$ replaced by $\tilde{\sigma}_i = \sigma_i(y_i - \epsilon_b \sigma_b + \epsilon_c y_i \sigma_c)/y_i$, which is the uncertainty scaled by the multiplicative shift in $y_i$ such that the fractional uncertainty is unchanged under shifts. For any fixed values of $\epsilon_b$, $\epsilon_c$, $\tilde{\chi}^2$ still follows the $\chi^2$ distribution with $n + 2$ degrees of freedom. The best fit, the minimum of $\tilde{\chi}^2$, is found by standard methods (for example using a MINUIT type minimization algorithm) and the correlated uncertainties of the best fit parameters are estimated in the Gaussian approximation by $\tilde{\chi}^2(\epsilon_b, \epsilon_c, p) = \tilde{\chi}^2_{\min} + N^2$ for $N$ standard deviation uncertainties. The right panel of Fig. 4 shows the $\tilde{\chi}^2(\epsilon_b, \epsilon_c, p)$ distribution for a wide range of values of the PQM model parameter $\langle \tilde{q} \rangle$. Our data constrain the PQM model transport coefficient $\langle \tilde{q} \rangle$ as $13.2^{+6.3}_{-5.2}$ GeV$^2$/fm at the one and two standard deviation levels. These constraints include only the experimental uncertainties and do not account for the large model dependent differences in the quenching scenario and description of the medium. Extracting fundamental model-independent properties of the medium from the present data requires resolution of ambiguities and open questions in the models themselves which also will have to account simultaneously for the $p_T$ and centrality (average pathlength) dependence. This work demonstrates the power of data for pion production in constraining the energy loss of partons. The data can be fitted with a constant in the entire $p_T$\textgreater 5 GeV/$c$ range as well: the slope of a simple linear fit is $0.0017 \pm 0.0035$ and $0.0076$ GeV/$c$ at the one and two standard deviation levels.

In summary, PHENIX has measured neutral pions in Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}}$=200 GeV at mid rapidity in the transverse momentum range of $1<p_T<20$ GeV/$c$, analyzing high statistics RHIC Run-4 run data. The shape of the spectra is similar for all centralities, as is the shape of $R_{AA}(p_T)$ at $p_T$\textgreater 5 GeV/$c$. In central collisions the yield is suppressed by a factor of $\sim 5$ at 5 GeV/$c$ compared to the binary scaled p+p reference and the suppression prevails with little or no change up to 20 GeV/$c$. Studying the integrated $R_{AA}$ vs. centrality we find that it does not saturate at this nuclear size; also the prediction $S_{loss} \propto N_{part}$ \cite{6,11} is consistent with our data and in this picture the energy loss increases with $p_T$. Using the 0-5% (most central) $R_{AA}$ we find that the transport coefficient $\langle \tilde{q} \rangle$ of the PQM model is constrained to $13.2^{+6.3}_{-5.2}$ GeV$^2$/fm at the one (two) $\sigma$ level. A simple linear fit with zero slope is also consistent with our data.
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