

Formation of antideuterons in heavy ion collisions

B.L. Ioffe, I.A. Shushpanov and K.N. Zyablyuk

Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics,

B.Chernushkinskaya 25, 117218 Moscow, Russia,

ioffe@vitep1.itep.ru, shushpan@heron.itep.ru, zyablyuk@heron.itep.ru

Abstract

The antideuteron production rate at high-energy heavy ions collisions is calculated basing on the concept of formation by antinucleons which move in the mean field of freeze-out reball constituents (mainly pions). The explicit formula is presented for the coalescence parameter B_2 in terms of deuteron binding energy and reball volume.

PACS numbers: 25.75.-q, 25.75.Dw, 12.38.Mh

1. Introduction. The production of antideuterons in heavy ion collisions was observed at SPS [1], RHIC [2] and AGS [3]. It is desirable to have theoretical understanding of this interesting phenomenon, which also may shed some light on the mechanism of heavy ion collisions [4]–[6]. The theoretical description of antinuclei production in heavy ion collisions was mainly restricted to statistical models [7, 8], where the small binding energy of antideuteron and its large size were not accounted. In the model of [9] the antideuteron production rate was found in terms of the deuteron wave function and antinucleon distributions, but the interaction of the antideuteron with the reball environment was not considered. Because of small binding energy in comparison to kinetic energies of other particles, antideuterons can survive only if they are produced at the final stage of evolution of the reball, when the reball may be considered as a hadronic gas. The dominant mechanism then is the formation of antideuteron through the reaction $p + n \rightarrow d$. It is clear, that the rate of this reaction vanishes, when the size of d increases, i.e. its binding energy B is going to zero. Therefore, one may expect an essential dependence of d production rate on B . The antideuteron production (unlike d -production) cannot proceed in the collision of peripheral (spectator) nucleons. So, this process is sensitive to the dynamics of heavy ion collisions.

The formation process $p + n \rightarrow d$ is not realized if all participating particles are on mass shell. In the reball, even at the last stage of its evolution, when d is formed, p , n and d are not on mass shell: they interact with surrounding matter. This fact strongly enhances the reaction rate being compared with the main process of d production in vacuum $p + n \rightarrow d + \pi$.

According to the dominant coalescence mechanism it is convenient to characterize d production in heavy ion collisions by the coalescence parameter:

$$B_2 = E_d \frac{d^3 N_d}{d^3 p_d} E_p \frac{d^3 N_p}{d^3 p_p} E_n \frac{d^3 N_n}{d^3 p_n} ; \quad (1)$$

where we can put $d^3N_p = d^3p_p = d^3N_n = d^3p_n$; $p_p = p_n = p_d = 2$. In what follows, we will consider only the central heavy ion collisions.

2. Theory. Consider the final stage of reball evolution (the so called freeze-out reball, when the reball may be treated as a gas of weakly interacting hadrons. Assume, that particle propagations at this stage may be described classically using kinetic equations. We use the notation $q_i(x;p)$, $i = p, n, d$, for the double density in coordinate and momentum spaces, $n_i(x) = \int d^3p q_i(x;p)$ are the densities. ($q_i(x;p)$ are Lorentz invariant.) Let us work in the c.m. system of colliding ions. The kinetic equation for $q_i(p_d; x)$ may be written in explicitly Lorentz covariant form (x -dependence at the right-hand side is omitted):

$$\frac{m_d}{E_d} \frac{\partial q_i(p_d; x)}{\partial x} u^d = \frac{\partial q_i}{\partial t} + v_d x q_i = \int d^3p_p d^3p_n q_p(p_p) q_n(p_n) \delta(p_n + p_d - p) q(p) v_{pn}^{rel} + \dots \quad (2)$$

where $u^d = (1; v_d) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - v_d^2}}$ is the d 4-velocity, the ellipsis mean similar terms for collisions of d with other constituents of the reball ($p; n$ etc.) and v_{pn}^{rel}, v_d^{rel} are the differences of p, n and d velocities $v_{pn}^{rel} = |v_p - v_n|$ etc. The terms, when d appears in the momentum interval $p_d + p_d$ due to elastic collisions are neglected. Necessary applicability condition of (2) is $\lambda = p_i^{-1} \gg d$, where d is the mean distance between reball constituents.

The cross section $\sigma_{pn \rightarrow d} = \sigma_{pn \rightarrow d}$ is equal to:

$$\sigma_{pn \rightarrow d} = \frac{3}{4} \frac{g^2}{4 E_p E_n E_d} \frac{1}{v_{pn}^{rel}} (E_p + E_n - E_d); \quad (3)$$

where E_p, E_n, E_d are p, n and d total energies, $3/4$ is the spin factor and g is the coupling constant of low energy effective pnd interaction (in the d c.m. system). The value of g^2 was found by Landau [10] from the requirement of coincidence (at the deuteron pole) of the pn scattering amplitude in effective theory with the amplitude in the Bethe-Peierls theory of the low-energy pn -scattering [11]. In the limit of zero range of nuclear forces g^2 is

$$g^2 = 128 m_N \frac{p}{m_N} \frac{1}{m_N}; \quad (4)$$

where m_N is the nucleon mass, $\frac{p}{m_N} = 2.2 M eV$ is the deuteron binding energy. The account of non-zero range r_0 increases g^2 by a factor of $(1 + \frac{p}{m_N} r_0)^{-1} \approx 1.6$ [1, 12].

The mass of the particle moving in medium is shifted being compared with its vacuum value. Similarly, due to interaction with medium constituents, the width appears (or width broadening, if the particle has its proper width). This phenomenon is analogous to existence of the refraction and attenuation indices in optics. The mass shift $m(E)$ and $\Gamma(E)$ are expressed through the forward scattering amplitude $f(E)$ of the particle on medium constituent (see [13, 14] and references therein).

$$m(E) = m_0 + 2 \frac{n}{m} \text{Re} f(E) \quad (5)$$

$$\Gamma(E) = 4 \frac{n}{m} \text{Im} f(E) = \frac{np}{m} \Gamma(E); \quad (6)$$

where E , p and m are particle energy, momentum and mass, n is the density of the constituent in medium. Eqs. (5), (6) take place in the system, where constituents are at rest. In case of moving constituents the corresponding Lorentz boost must be done. (By definition m and $\mathcal{Q}$ are Lorentz invariant, for details see [15]).

Therefore, p , n and d in the reaction $p + n \rightarrow d$ can be considered as Breit-Wigner resonances with varying masses distributed according to the Breit-Wigner formula. The first term in the r.h.s. of (2) after substituting (3) is represented by

$$I = \frac{3}{16} g^2 \int \frac{d^3 p_p d^3 p_n}{E_p^0 E_n^0 E_d^0} \mathcal{Q}_p(p_p) \mathcal{Q}_n(p_n) \delta(p_p + p_n - p_d) (E_p^0 + E_n^0 - E_d^0) dm_p^0 dm_n^0 dm_d^0$$

$$\frac{p=2}{(m_p^0 - m_p)^2 + \frac{p^2}{p^2=4}} \frac{n=2}{(m_n^0 - m_n)^2 + \frac{n^2}{n^2=4}} \frac{d=2}{(m_d^0 - m_d)^2 + \frac{d^2}{d^2=4}} \quad (7)$$

where $E_p^0 = \sqrt{p_p^2 + m_p^2}$ etc. With a good accuracy $p = n = d = 2$ and $\mathcal{Q}_p(p_p) = \mathcal{Q}_n(p_n)$; $p_p = p_n = p_d = 2$. Assume, that m and $\mathcal{Q}$ is much smaller than characteristic momenta in p, n distributions. (In fact, 300 MeV { see below, m are small, $m \approx 30 \text{ MeV}$). Then we can omit 0 in E_i^0 in (7), except for δ -function and integrate over m_i^0 from -1 to $+1$. We get

$$I = \frac{3}{8 E_d} g^2 \frac{1}{m_N} \mathcal{Q}_p^2(p_p) \quad (8)$$

It can be shown, that the term in square brackets in (2) is equal to

$$(m_d = E_d) \mathcal{Q}_d = 2 (m_N = E_p) : \quad (9)$$

Let us sketch the proof. Consider the pion contribution to $\mathcal{Q}$. Let us perform the boost from the pion rest system, where (6) takes place, to the d rest system. We have n (d at rest) = n (d at rest) ($m = E$) and from kinematics $m_d E_d$ (d at rest) = $m E_d$ (d at rest). Since $\mathcal{Q}$ is the same in both systems, $p_d = v_d E_d$ (d at rest), v_d (d at rest) = v_d^{rel} (d at rest),

$$\mathcal{Q}_d = \int d^3 p \mathcal{Q}(p) v_d^{\text{rel}} \mathcal{Q}_d(d \text{ at rest}) \quad (10)$$

As follows from (2), due to Lorentz invariance, the second term in the r.h.s. of (2) has the form

$$\int d^3 p \mathcal{Q}(p) \mathcal{Q}_d v_d^{\text{rel}} = a \frac{m_d}{E_d} : \quad (11)$$

Going to the d rest system, after comparison with (10) we get $a = \mathcal{Q}_d$. The proof for other constituents is similar, but their contribution to $\mathcal{Q}$ is small ($\approx 10 - 20\%$).

Suppose, that the rate of antideuteron collisions with other constituents of the reball resulting in antideuteron dissociation is much larger than the rate of reball expansion. This happens at collisions of heavy nuclei at high energies, when the size of freeze-out reball is large because of large number of produced pions per nucleon. In this case one may expect the balance: the first term in the r.h.s. of (2) is equal to the second one and

$$\mathcal{Q}_d(p_d) = \frac{I}{(m_d = E_d)} = \frac{3}{32 m_N} \frac{1}{m_N} g^2 \mathcal{Q}_p^2(p_p) \quad (12)$$




Figure 1: Fireball at the freeze-out stage. The effective volume V_{eff} is the half of the outer shell of thickness l_{ann} , from which the antiprotons reach detector

$d^3N_d = d^3p_d$ entering (1) is obtained from (12) by integration over reball volume

$$\frac{d^3N_d(p_d)}{d^3p_d} = \int d^3x q_d(p_d; x) \quad (13)$$

Using (1), (12), (13) and (4) (with r_0 correction) we find for the coalescence parameter

$$B_2^{th} = \frac{24}{E_p} \frac{\int d^3x q_p^2(p_p; x)}{[\int d^3x q_p(p_p; x)]^2} \quad (14)$$

Since the x -dependence of $q_p(p_p; x)$ is not known, we replace (14) by:

$$B_2^{th} = \frac{24}{E_p} \frac{2}{V} \frac{\overline{n_p^2}}{(n_p)^2} \quad (15)$$

where V is the reball volume, n_p and $\overline{n_p^2}$ are the mean and mean square p densities in the reball. (The coordinate dependence of $\overline{n_p^2}$ is neglected). B_2^{th} (14) is Lorentz invariant, as it should be. The freeze-out volume V may be understood as a mean value of the reball volume at a stage, where, on one side, hadrons are already formed, i.e., mean distances between them are larger than the constituent radius $R_c \approx 1 \text{ fm}$ (1.4 fm), but on the other side, hadron interactions are still essential. The antinucleon distributions $n_p(r); n_n(r)$ inside the reball are essentially nonuniform: at the pre-freeze-out and freeze-out stages antinucleons strongly annihilated in the internal part of the reball and in much less extent in its external layer of the thickness of order p(n) annihilation length l_{ann} (this effect was considered in [9]). For this reason $\overline{n_p^2} = n_p^2$ may be remarkable larger than 1. For the same reason the antinucleons and antideuterons from the backside of the reball (relative to the observer) are absorbed in the reball and cannot reach the detector (see Fig. 1). Therefore, only one half of the reball volume contributes to the number of registered p, n and d. The corresponding factor approximately equal to 2 is accounted in (15).

may be calculated in one or another freeze-out reball model. Then by comparison with the data the parameter $V^{-1}(\overline{n_p^2} = n_p^2)$ can be found, what would allow to check various models of reball evolution.

3. Comparison with the data. Consider the NA 44 experiment at SPS (CERN): Pb + Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 17 \text{ A GeV}$ [1]. Antideuterons were observed at $0.6 < p_{dt} < 1.6 \text{ GeV}$ and in the rapidity interval 1.9 to 2.1 in lab. system, which corresponds to $p_{pt} = 0.55 \text{ GeV}$, $(E_p)_{cm} = 1.5 \text{ GeV}$. The spectra and particle yields at such collisions are given in [16].

The number of active nucleons, participating in collision ("wounded" nucleons) N_N and the number of produced pions are presented in [17]: $N_N = 362$, $N_\pi = 1890$, $Q = N_\pi / N_N = 5.2$ (see also [18] for the review of the data on heavy ion collisions).

We accept the following model for the freeze-out (final) stage of reball evolution [14]. (A related model had been suggested long ago [19, 20]: it may be called Fermi-Pomeranuk model). Neglect for a moment contributions of all particles except for nucleons and pions. Assume that at freeze-out stage any participant (nucleon or pion) occupies the volume v_N or v_π , respectively. Then

$$n_N = \frac{N_N}{V} = \frac{n_N^0}{1 + Q}; \quad n_\pi = \frac{N_\pi}{V} = \frac{n_N^0 Q}{1 + Q} \quad (16)$$

where $n_N^0 = 1/v_N$, $n_\pi^0 = 1/v_\pi$. For numerical estimations we take $n_N^0 = 0.26 \text{ fm}^{-3}$, 1.5 times standard nucleus density and $n_\pi^0 = (r/r_N)^3 \cdot 0.55$, where $r = 0.66 \text{ fm}$ and $r_N = 0.81 \text{ fm}$ are pion and nucleon electric radii.

Check first the applicability conditions of our approach. We have: $n = n_N + n_\pi = 0.42 \text{ fm}^{-3}$ and the mean distance between the reball constituents is $d = 1/n^{1/3} = 1.3 \text{ fm}$. Evidently, the condition $d \gg r_p = 1.1 \text{ fm}$ is well satisfied. Check now the balance condition (that the probability of deuteron dissociation exceeds its escape or reball expansion rate). The former is given by $2(m_N = E_p)$. Using (10) and the pion spectrum, presented in [16], was found: 300 MeV . The estimation for the escape rate (or reball expansion) is $w = (1/4) \text{ fm}^{-1}$. We have: $2(m_N = E_p) = 2.0 \text{ fm}^{-1} > 0.25 \text{ fm}^{-1}$. So, this condition is also fulfilled. Eq.6 is legitimate, if $\text{Im} f(E) > d$ [13, 14]. Since $\text{Im} f = 1 \text{ fm}$, this condition is not well satisfied. For this reason the value of B_2^{th} , presented above, has a large (may be 50%) uncertainty. This fact, however, does not influence too much the value B_2^{th} , since $\text{Im} f$ enters (14). One may expect, that because of their larger velocities in comparison with nucleons, pions form a halo around the reball. So, their density, and, consequently, the value of B_2 , probably, are overestimated.

At the parameters used above the reball volume comes out to be: $V = 6.2 \cdot 10^3 \text{ fm}^3$ (15% correction for other particles, except for pions and nucleons were accounted). In the case of sphere its radius is equal to $R = 11.4 \text{ fm}$. If we assume, that antiprotons are mainly concentrated in the outer shell of the reball of the thickness of $l_{\text{ann}} = 3 \text{ fm}$, then $\bar{n}^2 = n^2/2$ and we get for the coalescence parameter

$$B_2^{\text{th}} = 3.5 \cdot 10^{-4} \text{ GeV}^2 \quad (17)$$

Experimentally [1], for the average value of the most central 10% events it was found: $B_2^{\text{exp}} = (4.4 \pm 1.3) \cdot 10^{-4} \text{ GeV}^2$. However, B_2^{exp} strongly depends on centrality: the results for 0–5% centrality are about 1.5 times lower. Taking in mind all uncertainties (theoretical and experimental, we believe, that the NA44 data for coalescence parameter are not in contradiction with theoretical expectation.

Turn now to the STAR experiment at RHIC: Au + Au collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 130 \text{ A GeV}$ [2]. Antideuterons were measured at $0.5 < p_t < 0.8 \text{ GeV}$ and in the rapidity interval $|y_{\text{cm}}| < 0.3$, 18% of central collisions were collected. We take $E_{p,\text{cm}} = 1.05 \text{ GeV}$. The number of "wounded" nucleons in the 18% central Au + Au collisions can be estimated as $N_N = 320$ [21]. Multiplicity of negative hadrons h (mainly, pions) was measured in [22] at pseudorapidity

$= 0$ only and it was found an increasing of $dh/dj_{=0}$ by 52% comparing with the SP S data at $\sqrt{s} = 17 \text{ GeV}$. But it is known that $dh/dj_{=0}$ increase faster with energy than the total multiplicity. We estimate $Q = N_{\pi}/N_N \approx 7/1$. (A value close to the presented above, can be found from the data compilation [23]). At $N_N = 320$ with account of 20% correction for K-mesons and hyperons the freeze-out volume is equal to $V = 7.2 \cdot 10^3 \text{ fm}^3$. The coalescence parameter is equal to

$$B_2^{\text{th}} = 4.4 \cdot 10^{-4} \text{ GeV}^2 \quad (18)$$

($\sqrt{s} = 320 \text{ MeV}$, $n^2 = (n)^2$ was put to be 2). Experimentally, STAR found $B_2^{\text{exp}} = (4.5 \pm 0.3 \pm 1.0) \cdot 10^{-4} \text{ GeV}^2$. So, the agreement with experiment is satisfactory.

The main uncertainty of B_2^{th} comes from the reball volume V which was calculated by (16) with the density n_N^0 1.5 times larger than standard nuclear density. However, the width also depends on the reball volume, so that $B_2^{\text{th}} \propto 1/V$, which suppresses this uncertainty twice. We expect the accuracy of our estimations (17), (18) to be about 50%.

In E864 experiment [3] at AGS the antideuterons were observed in Au + Pt collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 4.8 \text{ A GeV}$. 10% of central collisions we selected. From the data we take: $p_{\text{pt}} = 0.17 \text{ GeV}$, $\overline{E}_{\text{PCM}} = 0.99 \text{ GeV}$. The number of "wounded" nucleons and N_{π}/N_N ratio are $N_N = 350$, $Q = 1.6$ (see [18] and references herein). In the same way as before, we find: $V = 2.8 \cdot 10^3 \text{ fm}^3$, $\sqrt{s} = 220 \text{ MeV}$, $l_{\text{ann}} = 1.2 \text{ fm}$. In this case the validity conditions of our approach are at the edge of their applicability. So, the theoretical expectations for B_2 are valid only by the order of magnitude:

$$B_2^{\text{th}} \approx 1.5 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^2 \quad (19)$$

in comparison with $B_2^{\text{exp}} = (4.1 \pm 2.9 \pm 2.3) \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^2$.

4. Summary and Acknowledgements. The coalescence parameter B_2 for the antideuteron production in heavy ions collisions was calculated. It was supposed, that the d production proceeds at freeze-out reball, when the reball may be treated as a gas of weakly interacting hadrons. The d production is described as the formation process $p + n \rightarrow d$, where p, n, d are moving in the mean field of the reball constituents (mainly pions). It was shown, that in case of large N_{π}/N_N ratio one may expect a balance: the number of produced antideuterons is equal to the number of dissociated d due to collisions with pions. The balance condition determines d production rate and the value of coalescence parameter B_2 . The later is expressed in terms of deuteron binding energy, and freeze-out reball volume. The theoretical values of B_2 are in satisfactory agreement with experimental data at SP S, RHIC and AGS but more data at various nuclei and various energies of collision and d energies would be very desirable. The comparison of the data with theory would allow to check various models of reball evolution.

We are thankful to S Kiselev, Yu Kiselev, A Smiritsky and N Rabin for information about experimental data. This work was supported in part by CRDF grant RP2-2247 and INTAS grant 2000-587.

References

- [1] I.G. Bearden et al., Phys.Rev.Lett 85, 2681 (2000).
- [2] C. Adler et al., Phys.Rev.Lett. 87, 262301 (2001).
- [3] T. A. Armstrong et al., Phys.Rev.Lett.85, 2685 (2000).
- [4] S.Gavin et al., Phys.Lett. B 234, 175 (1990).
- [5] V. Koch, G. E. Brown and C. M. Ko, Phys.Lett. B 265, 29 (1990).
- [6] J.L. Nagle et al., Phys.Rev.Lett 73, 1219 (1994).
- [7] A. Z. Mekjian, Phys.Rev. C 17, 1051 (1978).
- [8] L. P. Csernai and J. I. Kapusta, Phys.Rep. 131, 223 (1986).
- [9] S. Mrowczynski, Phys.Lett. B 308, 216 (1993).
- [10] L. D. Landau, Sov.Phys. ZhETF 39, 1856 (1960).
- [11] H. A. Bethe and R. E. Peierls, Proc.Roy.Soc. A 149, 176 (1935).
- [12] H. A. Bethe, Elementary nuclear theory, N. Y., 1947.
- [13] V. L. Eletsky and B. L. Joo, Phys.Rev.Lett. 78, 1010 (1997).
- [14] V. L. Eletsky, B. L. Joo and J. I. Kapusta, Eur.Phys.J. A 3, 381 (1998).
- [15] V. L. Eletsky and B. L. Joo, Phys.Lett. B 401, 327 (1997).
- [16] S. V. Afnasiev et al., nucl-ex/0208014.
- [17] M. Gazdzicki et al., nucl-ex/0205002.
- [18] W. Cassing and E. L. Bratkovskaya, Phys.Rep. 308, 65 (1999).
- [19] E. Fermi, Prog.Theor.Phys. 5, 570 (1950).
- [20] I. Pomerenchuk, Doklady Akad.Nauk U.S.S.R. 78, 889 (1951).
- [21] C. Adler et al., Phys.Rev.Lett. 89 202301 (2002).
- [22] C. Adler et al., Phys.Rev.Lett. 87, 112303 (2001).
- [23] P. Braun-Munzinger et al., hep-ph/0105229.