# Search for the chiral magnetic effect in U+U & Isobar collisions

Prithwish Tribedy

(for the STAR Collaboration)



#### CME workshop, RHIC & AGS Annual Users' Meeting, June 7-10, 2016

Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY, USA





## Outline

- Results for U+U & Au+Au collisions from STAR
- What else can we try with the existing data
- Outlook for collisions of Isobars @ RHIC

Flow is the dominant source of background for signals of CME

How can U+U collisions be used to disentangle the two effects ?

What else can we try : Isobars



## What have we learned from the U+U collisions at RHIC ?

• Limitations of two-component model in MC-Glauber :

Modifications : Quark-Glauber (nucl-th/0302071, 1509.06727), TRENTO (1412.4708), Shadowed Glauber (1510.01311)

Evidence of color coherence & CGC like initial state :

CGC —> Weak dependence of multiplicity on shape (Schenke, PT, Venugopalan 1403.2232)

• Dominance of fluctuations, small control in triggering shape : 35% variation in dN/d $\eta$  -> 12% variation in v<sub>2</sub> in (<1% ZDC)



U+U data contradicts strong binarycolumn ision dependence of multiplicity -20 10<sup>-1</sup> ZDC Centrality Cut 1

Next Step: Can we use U+U collisions to learn about CME?

### Qualitative picture



direction is strongly correlated in Au+Au—> Not true for U+U

Can U+U collisions disentangle flow & signals of CME?

 $\Psi_{SP}$ 

. Ψ<sub>SP</sub>

#### Observables for CME

• General (3-particle) correlator :

$$C_{m,n,m+n} = \langle \cos((m\phi_1 + n\phi_2 - (m+n)\phi_3)) \rangle$$

• Lowest order (3-particle) charge sensitive correlator :

$$C_{112} = \left\langle \cos((\phi_1^{\pm} + \phi_2^{\mp} - 2\phi_3)) \right\rangle$$

• The CME correlator :

$$\gamma^{a,b} \sim \frac{\langle \cos(\phi_1^a + \phi_2^b - 2\phi_3) \rangle}{v_2\{2\}} \sim \langle \cos(\phi^a + \phi^b - 2\Psi_{RP}) \rangle$$

(3P-cumulant method)

(event-plane method)

$$v_2\{2\}^2 = \langle \cos(2(\phi_1 - \phi_2)) \rangle$$

#### Details of the data set

- U+U 193 GeV : Year 2012 (Min-bias/ultra-central)
- Au+Au 200 GeV : Year 2004, 2007 (Min-bias), 2011 (ultra-central)
- Centrality selection :
  - TPC uncorrected multiplicity  $|\eta| < 0.5$
  - ZDC East & West ADC
- Common QA cuts :

 $-|V_r| < 2$ ,  $|V_z| < 20$ ,  $|V_z - vpdV_z| < 2$  cm

• Acceptance cuts:  $|\eta| < 1$ , 0.2 GeV/c< $|p_T|$ 

TPC acceptance (used in this analysis)



#### Measurement of $v_2$ {2} & $\gamma^{ab}$ in Au+Au collisions



Au+Au results —> baseline for measurements in U+U

## Measurement of v<sub>2</sub>{2} in U+U collisions



Δη

## Differential measurement of the C112 correlator



$$C_{112} = \langle \cos(2(\phi_1^a + \phi_2^b - 2\phi_3)) \rangle$$
$$\Delta \eta = \Delta \eta_{1,2}$$

Need to remove two major artifacts :

- Track merging
  - apply  $\Delta \eta > 0.025$
  - Short-range correlations
    - do : (OS SS)

#### Results using Cumulant and Event-plane methods

$$\gamma^{a,b} \sim \frac{\langle \cos(\phi_1^a + \phi_2^b - 2\phi_3) \rangle}{v_2\{2\}}$$



Centrality bins finer than 0-10% is needed to probe the shape of Uranium

 $\sim \langle \cos(\phi^a + \phi^b - 2\Psi_{RP}) \rangle$ 

#### Centrality Selection in 0-10% events



Binning on multiplicity

Binning on spectators

#### Estimation of v<sub>2</sub>{2} (varying multiplicity & spectators)

#### After removing track merging and HBT peak



Refmult bins

ZDC bins

Stronger variation of v<sub>2</sub> with multiplicity compared to spectators

## $\gamma^{ab}$ -V2 correlations (varying multiplicity & spectators)



Observations in 0-10%:

- Strong correlation : nearly linear dependence between γ<sup>ab</sup> & v<sub>2</sub>
- γ<sup>ab</sup>~0 for v<sub>2</sub>≠0

 $\gamma^{ab}$ -V2 correlations (varying multiplicity & spectators)



• Observation-I : linear dependence  $(\Delta \gamma - v_2)$ 

• Observation-II :  $\Delta \gamma = (\gamma^{OS} - \gamma^{SS}) \sim 0$  for non-zero v<sub>2</sub>

#### Can model calculations provide some insights ?

Proxy for  $\gamma^{ab}$  &  $v_2 \longrightarrow MC$ -Glauber model simulation



Linear dependence  $(\Delta \gamma - v_2)$  + offset  $\rightarrow$  also seen in model (B- $\varepsilon_2$ )

#### Can model calculations provide some insights ?

Proxy for  $\gamma^{ab}$  &  $v_2 \longrightarrow MC$ -Glauber model simulation



Linear dependence  $(\Delta \gamma \cdot v_2) + \text{offset} \rightarrow \text{also seen in model} (\vec{B} \cdot \epsilon_2)$ Central events —> direction of  $\vec{B}$  de-correlates with event-plane

#### Can model calculations provide some insights ?

Proxy for  $\gamma^{ab}$  &  $v_2 \rightarrow MC$ -Glauber model simulation



Background driven scenario :  $\Delta \gamma \rightarrow 0$  when  $v_2 \rightarrow 0$ B-field driven scenario :  $\Delta \gamma \rightarrow 0$  when  $\cos(\Psi_B - \Psi_2) \rightarrow 0$  even if  $v_2 \neq 0$ 

New challenge for 100% background driven models

#### What else can we try with the existing U+U data ?

A new tuning parameter to disentangle  $\varepsilon_2$  and B-field



Binning in IL-RI it is possible to trigger body-tip events : B to e2B field was

B-f

#### Spectator asymmetry in U+U to disentangle $\Delta \gamma \& V_2$



same  $\varepsilon_2$  & vice-versa

 $\Delta \gamma \& v_2$  with **ZDC asymmetry** 

Analysis under progress (challenges : ZDC response to neutrons)

#### Outlook for Isobar collisions at RHIC

#### Idea is to change B-field without changing background

 $_{44}Ru^{96} + _{44}Ru^{96} \xrightarrow{40} Zr^{96} + _{40}Zr^{96}$ 

Different B-field with same flow background is expected



#### Comparisons of multiplicities for centrality estimation

- Two component MC-Glauber corrected dN/dη
- Using parameters compatible to e-A scattering data



Comparison between different systems —> Zr+Zr & Ru+Ru similar

#### Comparisons of the magnetic fields

Estimation of B-field —> t=0, center of participant zone (in vacuum)



Estimation of B-field —> not affected by nuclear deformation

Vladimir Skokov : QCD Chirality workshop '2016 http://starmeetings.physics.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/vladimir\_skokov.pdf

#### Comparisons of the projected magnetic fields

CME signal depends on both |B| and direction  $\Psi_B$ 



- Signal strength ~  $|B^2|cos(2(\Psi_B-\Psi_2)) \longrightarrow$  Projected field
- About 20% difference in Ru+Ru vs Zr+Zr

#### Projection for CME correlator in Isobar collisions

Step-I —> parameterize Au+Au data in terms of B

 $Y = \qquad \Delta \gamma \times N_{\text{part}} = \qquad \alpha + \beta \left\langle B^2 \cos(2(\Psi_B - \Psi_2)) \right\rangle^{\lambda}$ 

Step-II —> make projections for Ru+Ru & Zr+Zr

Contribution from the background has to be incorporated



#### Significance of the expected signal in Isobar collisions

Ref: https://drupal.star.bnl.gov/STAR/system/files/STAR\_BUR\_Run1718\_v19.pdf



Isobar ratio gives maximum  $5\sigma$  (1.2 B) if CME is ~ 20% B-field driven

Equivalent running of RHIC : 3.5-weeks for each species (STAR proposal for BUR in Runs 18)

#### Summary / Outlook

- Charge dependent azimuthal correlations have been studied in U+U & compared to Au+Au results.
- Strong correlation between γ<sup>ab</sup> & v<sub>2</sub> observed in central events (<10%) with γ<sup>ab</sup> ~0 for v<sub>2</sub>>0 in both U+U and Au+Au collisions.
- New analyses under way to use U+U data to disentangle CME signal from backgrounds (specifically using spectator asymmetry).
- Collisions of Isobar look very promising : (3.5 x 2) weeks of running with about (1.2 x 2) B events can provide about 5σ confidence of signal/bkg.

backup

#### Significance of the expected signal in Isobar collisions

Projection for 400M events

Study done by Gang Wang



#### Spectator asymmetry in U+U collisions

Body-Tip events are experimentally triggered by asymmetry of ZDCs



Experimental challenges :

- Response of ZDC to neutrons
- Clustering of nucleons that introduces artificial de-correlation

Analysis in this direction (separating signals of flow & CME) and systematic studies are under progress

#### A few QA plots



#### Weight estimation for cumulant calculations

• Acceptance binning for weight calculation :

Sagitta = charge\*((20.\* $p_T/3.$ ) -  $\sqrt{((20.*p_T/3.)^2 - 0.75^2))}$ 

Weight = 1/(entries in 
$$\eta$$
- $\phi$ ) \* 1/ $\epsilon$   
The tracking efficiency :  
 $\epsilon = \frac{C}{(1. + \exp(-(p_T + 0.1)/0.15))}$ 



#### B-field simulations : Dominance of fluctuations



t=0, x=<x>, y=<y>, z=0, U+U collisions

1

0.6

0.2

-0.2

-0.6

-1

0



100

80

60

40

20

0

-20

-40 -60

-80

0

-100

 $|eB|^2 cos(2(\Psi_B^-\Psi_2)) (fm)^{-4}$ 



0.2

0.4

ε2

0.6

0.8

1

32

10

b [fm]

15

5