B

05 JAN. 1982

GSI 81-45₉

GSI

GSI - 81 - 45
PREPRINT

CERN LIBRARIES, GENEVA

CM-P00069155

EVENT BY EVENT EMISSION-PATTERN ANALYSIS OF THE
INTRA-NUCLEAR CASCADE

J. CUGNON, J. KNOLL, C. RIEDEL AND Y. YARIV

DEZEMBER 1981

Gesellschaft für Schwerionenforschung mbH
Planckstr. 1 · Postfach 110541 · D-6100 Darmstadt 11 · Germany

EVENT BY EVENT EMISSION-PATTERN ANALYSIS OF THE INTRA-NUCLEAR CASCADE

J. Cugnon

University of Liège, B-4000 Sart Tilman, Liège, Belgium

J. Knoll and C. Riedel

Gesellschaft für Schwerionenforschung, D-6100 Darmstadt, Germany

Y. Variv

Department of Physics, Weizmann Institut of Science, Rehovot, Israel

Abstract:

An event by event analysis of the emission pattern of participants resulting from an Intra Nuclear Cascade scenario is presented. The procedure, which uses the quadrupole tensor of the momenta of all ejectiles, shows strikingly rigid emission pattern that clearly deviate from the expectations of a collective description like hydrodynamics.

How to quantify macro-dynamical effects, as for instance collective flow effects, in terms of observables is one of the central questions in the field of energetic nuclear reactions. Inclusive measurements are seen to be too insensitive, all the structural differences of quite different models wash out, and even so called 'central' spectra [1] show only marginal indications on collective effects [2].

In this note we present some ideas that are capable to quantify the occurrence of collective effects and apply the method to what one might call a genuine non-collective (though cooperative) model: the intra nuclear cascade (INC) [3,4]. The idea is similar to those employed for the jet analysis in particle physics [5]. Clearly, interested in genuine many body effects we have to exploit many body observables. Thus, the technique requires 4 π -multiplicity particle detection. Further, we have to look for bulk properties of the emission pattern, i.e. a few of the lowest moments of the observed momenta. Therefore a kind of quadrupole analysis of all emitted momenta seems to be an appropriate tool.

Let us therefore suppose that for each event we know all the momenta $\vec{p}^i$ of a certain type of particles (say charged particles). Relative to their c.m. frame one can construct the following second rank tensor

$$Q_{ij} = \sum_{\mu=1}^m p_i^{\mu} p_j^{\mu} \gamma(p^{\mu}) \quad i, j = \{x, y, z\} \quad (1)$$

where $\gamma(p)$ is a suitable chosen scalar measure, and m is the multiplicity of the ejectiles in concern. This tensor is precisely of the desired kind (low moments) and it contains some limited information of the emission pattern of that event. Its sensitivity on collective phenomena has been demonstrated

by a two thermal source model, the two sources being separated by a collective velocity [6].

In fact Q_{ij} represents an ellipsoid and through diagonalisation one can express its content through its three major axis $\{\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, \vec{q}_3\}$ where we use the convention that

$$|q_1 - q_2| \leq |q_2 - q_3| \leq |q_1 - q_3|. \quad (2)$$

Thus, $\vec{q}_1$ and $\vec{q}_2$ are the axis with about similar lengths which makes $\vec{q}_3$ to the approximate symmetry axis of the ellipsoid.

There are certainly many ways to condense the information of $\{Q_{ij}\}$ down to two variables [5-7]. For this first survey study we chose a representation which shows the amount of deviation from sphericity into the prolate or oblate direction and the spatial direction of the 'symmetry axis' relative to the beam.

The quantity

$$\epsilon = \frac{q_3 - \frac{1}{2}(q_1 + q_2)}{q_1 + q_2 + q_3} \quad (3)$$

serves isotropic events with $\epsilon=0$, 'prolate' shapes* for positive ϵ with the extreme of pencil like events at $\epsilon = 1$ and 'oblate' shapes for $\epsilon < 0$ with flat events ($q_3 = 0$) at $\epsilon = -\frac{1}{2}$. Thus, ϵ plays the role of an eccentricity while its direction gives the direction of the preferred symmetry

$$\vec{\epsilon} = |\epsilon| \vec{q}_3. \quad (4)$$

* We use apostrophes since in general all shapes are triaxial and only through (2-3) we distinguish them to be more on the prolate or on the oblate side.

Thus, bringing all events over the eccentricity plane $\{\epsilon_{||}, \epsilon_{\perp}\}$ where $\epsilon_{||}$ denotes the direction of the beam defines a cross section in 'eccentricity space'

$$d^3\sigma/d^3\epsilon = d^3\sigma/(dp_{\perp}d\epsilon_{\perp}d\epsilon_{||}). \quad (5)$$

Some remarks are in order at this time: Even if a source emits isotropically its particles it does not imply $\vec{\epsilon}=0$. Rather, if only a limited number of particles is emitted, $\vec{\epsilon}$ fluctuates in direction (consider the extreme case of two particles only; in their c.m. frame one exactly finds $\epsilon=1$)! Approximately, the fluctuations due to the finite multiplicity m are of the order

$$\langle(\epsilon - \langle\epsilon\rangle)^2\rangle = 1/(m-1). \quad (6)$$

This implies a limited resolution, and one preferentially has to analyze high multiplicity events. This will be seen in the examples shown below. As for the choice of the measure $\gamma(p)$, we studied three cases ($p = 1; 1/p$ and $1/p^2$). The last choice is identical to the angular emission analysis suggested by Bertsch and Amsden [7]. The $1/p$ -choice has the distinct advantage (as already discussed by Kapusta and Strottman [8] in the context of thrust) to be invariant under coalescence of nucleons into composite particles. Note also that, as far as nucleons are considered, $\gamma=A$, the mass number of the ejectile, also makes eq. (1) invariant under coalescence.

In ref. [7-9] the implications of a hydrodynamical evolution have been studied. However, the above discussed fluctuation has been ignored so far discussing only the ridge lines of the respective observables. Therefore it would be desirable to incorporate the finite number effects also into the hydrodynamical scheme, while for our cascade study they are included right away. Besides hydrodynamical flow effects also instabilities toward pion condensation [10]

could lead to similar preferred emission patterns for the pions.

We analyze two types of cascade described in refs. [4] and [3], respectively. While the first [4] treats the incident nuclei as a medium, the second [3] starts right away with nucleons in both nuclei, however, frozen at positions and momenta relative to the respective nuclear frames. We further make the model-dependent distinction of participants and spectators, and concentrate first on the emission pattern resulting from the participants only, including, however, also the pions produced. The examples selected emphasize the typical features of the cascade scenario.

In contour diagrams over the eccentricity-plane (ϵ_n, ϵ_t) we show the distribution of events separated into 'oblate' and 'prolate' shapes in fig. 1 and 2, for the cascade of ref. [4] at low and high bombarding energies for two different multiplicity cuts and for the cascade of ref. [3] at 800 MeV/nuc1. for two different impact parameter cuts. In fig. 2 (below) also the spectator nucleons are included. The most striking observation is that the cascade shows quite rigid emission patterns. Besides the fluctuations discussed above the pattern are almost independent on the selection ; be it central or non central high or low multiplicities, respectively. The most frequent shapes are actually pretty close to the shape of the respective inclusive cross section. The emission patterns are fairly isotropic at low bombarding energies (360 MeV/nuc1.) and with increasing bombarding energy they show more and more 'collectivity'. The latter, however, is sort of trivial in nature ; the events recognize the incident beam orientation due to the forward growing N-N cross sections. Interesting in particular is the little amount of 'oblate' shapes. Especially for central collisions of equal mass systems this finding is in strong contradiction with the expectations from a hydrodynamical

scenario [2,9] all the more so as the "symmetry" axis of the "oblate" cascade-events points perpendicular to the beam direction.

As experimentally one cannot (and may not want to) distinguish participants from spectators we also included the latter in the analysis (fig. 2b) which clearly emphasizes even more the beam direction.

The very same features are reflected in a thrust analysis [8,9]. The thrust t is defined by:

$$t = \max_{\tilde{n}} \frac{\sum_{\mu} |\vec{p}_{\mu} \cdot \tilde{n}|}{\sum_{\mu} |\vec{p}_{\mu}|}, \quad (7)$$

where $\tilde{n}$ is an arbitrary unit vector. The thrust angle θ is the angle of the optimal direction $\tilde{n}$ and the beam axis. Even in central collisions the thrust angle θ concentrates around 0° with a width at half maximum of about $\pm 10^\circ$ and no events with $\theta = 90^\circ$, fig. 3.

In summary, we presented some observables that show striking difference between the expectations from a cascade and a hydrodynamical scenario. These observables be it sphericity, thrust or eccentricity as discussed in detail here exploit the eventwise knowledge of the momenta of all particles emitted. With existing (emulsion, streamer chamber) and forthcoming 4 π -detectors (plastic ball / wall; Diogen) such an analysis will be feasible and may ultimately isolate collective effects that will bring us closer to the interesting properties of nuclear matter under extreme conditions.

References:

- 1) R. Stock et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 44 (1980) 1243
- 2) H. Stöcker, A. Maruhn, W. Greiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 44 (1980) 725
- 3) J. Cugnon, Phys. Rev. C22 (1981) 2094
- 4) Y. Yariv, Z. Fraenkel, Phys. Rev. C20 (1979) 2227;
ibid C22 (1981) 488
- 5) E. Fashi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 39 (1977) 1587;
J.D. Bjorken, S.J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. D1 (1970) 1416;
S.L. Wu, G. Zobernig, Part. Fields 2 (1979) 107
- 6) J. Knoll, Proceedings of the V. High Energy Heavy Ion Study,
Berkeley, May 1981
- 7) G. Bertsch, A.A. Amsden, Phys. Rev. C18 (1978) 1293
- 8) J. Kapusta, D. Strottman, Los Alamos preprint
- 9) H. Stöcker et al., LBL-11774, Phys. Rev. C, in press
- 10) H.J. Pirner, Phys. Rev. C22 (1980) 1962

Figure captions:

- Fig. 1: Distributions of events over the eccentricity plane ($\epsilon_{II}, \epsilon_{\perp}$) for prolate and oblate shapes, participants only. A factor of two separates the contour lines, successively. Calculations with cascade [4] for Ar on Ar at 360 and 1180 MeV/nuc1. for two multiplicity selections (m) and two choices of the weight γ .
- Fig. 2: The same as in fig. 1, however with cascade [3] at 800 MeV/nuc1., selected with respect to impact parameter b ; above: participants only; below: all nucleons.
- Fig. 3: The events of fig. 2 at $b=0$ fm (full lines) and $b=1.1$ fm (dashed lines) subjected to a thrust analysis; left: distribution of the thrust t ; right: distribution of the thrust angle θ . Note: the thrust distribution is found to lie essentially in the reaction plane, positive angles point towards the impact side.

5-8800-18-T-1-159

Fig. 1

GSI-T-81-0039-3

Fig. 2

Fig. 3