New Results on Intermediate Mass Dileptons from NA50

NA50 collaboration

L. Ramello – Univ. Piemonte Orientale, Alessandria and INFN, Torino, Italy

Quarkonium Production in Relativistic Nuclear Collisions

BNL, September 28 - October 2, 1998

BNL'98

The NA50 Collaboration

M.C. Abreu[6], B. Alessandro[11], C. Alexa[3], R. Arnaldi[11], J. Astruc[8], M. Atayan[13], C. Baglin[1], A. Baldit[2], M. Bedjidian[12], F. Bellaiche[12], S. Beolè[11], V. Boldea[3], P. Bordalo[6], A. Bussière[1], V. Capony[1], L. Casagrande[6], J. Castor[2], T. Chambon[2], B. Chaurand[9], I. Chevrot[2], B. Cheynis[12], E. Chiavassa[11], C. Cicalò[4], M.P. Comets[8], S. Constantinescu[3], J. Cruz[6], A. DeFalco[4], N. DeMarco[11], G. Dellacasa[11], A. Devaux[2], S. Dita[3], O. Drapier[12], B. Espagnon[2], J. Fargeix[2], S.N. Filippov[7], F. Fleuret[9], P. Force[2], M. Gallio[11], Y.K. Gavrilov[7], C. Gerschel[8], P. Giubellino[11], M.B. Golubeva[7], M. Gonin[9], A.A. Grigorian[13], J.Y. Grossiord[12], F.F. Guber[7], A. Guichard[12], H. Gulkanyan[13], R. Hakobyan[13], R. Haroutunian[12], M. Idzik[11], D. Jouan[8], T.L. Karavitcheva[7], L. Kluberg[9], A.B. Kurepin[7], Y. Le Bornec[8], C. Lourenço[5], M. Mac Cormick[8], P. Macciotta[4], A. Marzari-Chiesa[11], M. Masera[11], A. Masoni[4] , S. Mehrabyan[13], S. Mourgues[2], A. Musso[11], F. Ohlsson-Malek[12], P. Petiau[9], A. Piccotti[11], J.R. Pizzi[12], W.L. Prado da Silva[11], G. Puddu[4], C. Quintans[6], C. Racca[10], L. Ramello[11], S. Ramos[6], P. Rato-Mendes[11], L. Riccati[11], A. Romana[9], S. Sartori[11], P. Saturnini[2], E. Scomparin[5], S. Serci[4], R. Shahoyan[6], S. Silva[6], C. Soave[11], P. Sonderegger[5], X. Tarrago[8], P. Temnikov[4], N.S. Topilskaya[7], G.L. Usai[4], C. Vale[6], E. Vercellin[11], N. Willis[8]

[1] LAPP, CNRS-IN2P3, Annecy-le-Vieux, France.
[2] LPC, Univ. Blaise Pascal and CNRS-IN2P3, Aubière, France.
[3] IFA, Bucharest, Romania.
[4] Università di Cagliari/INFN, Cagliari, Italy.
[5] CERN, Geneva, Switzerland.
[6] LIP, Lisbon, Portugal.
[7] INR, Moscow, Russia.
[8] IPN, Univ. de Paris-Sud and CNRS-IN2P3, Orsay, France.
[9] LPNHE, Ecole Polytechnique and CNRS-IN2P3, Palaiseau, France.
[10] IReS, Univ. Louis Pasteur and CNRS-IN2P3, Strasbourg, France.
[11] Università di Torino/INFN, Torino, Italy.
[12] IPN, Univ. Claude Bernard and CNRS-IN2P3, Villeurbanne, France.
[13] YerPhI, Yerevan, Armenia.

BNL'98

NA38/NA50: p–A, S–U, Pb–Pb

Between the ϕ and the $J/\psi \rightarrow$ *Intermediate Mass Region* (IMR)



Physics topics:

- Thermal dileptons;
- Enhancement of known sources.

Goal of this analysis

Describe the IMR spectrum from p–A to central Pb–Pb collisions in terms of (possibly enhanced) known sources, i.e.:

- Dimuons from π and K decays (comb. background);
- Drell-Yan pairs: $q\overline{q} \rightarrow \gamma^* \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$;
- Charmed meson (and baryons) decays, as $D \rightarrow \mu X$.

$\rightarrow$ do not include any thermal dimuon contribution

Preliminary studies:

- C.Lourenco et al.(NA38) N.Phys.A566(1994)77c
- E.Scomparin et al.(NA50) N.Phys.A610(1996)331c

Description of known sources

• Dimuons from π and K decays
(combinatorial background):

Mass shape:
→ from measured like-sign dimuon sample with the help (if needed) of mixed-event techniques;

Absolute normalization:
→ through the usual formula $N^{bck} = 2R\sqrt{N^{++}N^{--}}$

(R parametrizes charge correlation effects, some input from MC is needed)

• DY, semi-leptonic decay of charmed mesons pairs ($D\overline{D}$):

Mass shape:
→ PYTHIA + detector resolution effects;

Absolute normalization:
→ through a fit to the experimental (background subtracted) mass distributions; then, compare the results with N-N extrapolations using well established A–dependences.

What is expected in A–B collisions ?

- DY

Absolute yield expected : $\sigma_{AB}^{DY} = \sigma_{NN}^{DY} \cdot AB$

NA38/NA50 have MEASURED $\sigma_{AB}^{DY} = \sigma_{NN}^{DY} \cdot AB^{\alpha}$,
$\alpha = 1.002 \pm 0.011$
(see also Abreu et al., Phys. Lett. B410(1997) 337)

$\rightarrow$ DY in A–B collisions scales as expected.

- $D\overline{D}$

Absolute yield expected : $\sigma_{AB}^{D\overline{D}} = \sigma_{NN}^{D\overline{D}} \cdot AB$
Compare with extrapolation of charm production data (CERN,FNAL), taking into account the $\sqrt{s}$ dependence.

$\rightarrow$ It is then expected that $\sigma_{AB}^{D\overline{D}}/\sigma_{AB}^{DY}$ be constant vs. AB.

NA38/NA50 results on Drell-Yan (summary)

- From p–p to Pb–Pb collisions σ_{tot}^{DY} scales with the number of $N-N$ collisions;
- *DY* K–factor with respect to MRS[a] calculations is ~ 1.8 .



[a] MRS set A: A.D. Martin et al., Phys. Rev. D51 (1995) 4756

Combinatorial Background

$$\frac{dN^{bck}}{dM} = 2R\sqrt{\frac{dN^{++}}{dM}\frac{dN^{--}}{dM}}$$



R is crucial for the present study, these are the main difficulties:

R=1 only if π,K multiplicity is high and no charge correlation exists

$\longrightarrow$ p–A or peripheral A–B could yield $R > 1$

Since $N^{bck}/N^{+-} \sim 0.8(\text{pA}) \div 0.95(\text{PbPb})$

$\longrightarrow$ Estimation of charge correlation is necessary, use VENUS to get:

$$R = \frac{N^{+-}_{sim}}{2\sqrt{N^{++}_{sim}N^{--}_{sim}}}$$

For pA collisions, at high beam intensity, pileup of several interactions (on average 6 in pW) smears out charge correlation

$\longrightarrow$ R closer to 1 at high beam intensity

Estimation of the R factor (example)



$$R = \frac{N^{+-}}{2\sqrt{N^{++}_{sim} N^{--}_{sim}}} = 1.05 \pm 0.01$$

R vs. impact parameter b in AB collisions



R vs. transverse energy E_T in AB collisions



$R > 1$ for peripheral A–B collisions

E_T related to impact parameter b and number of participants N_{part} via geometrical model with realistic nuclear densities

Estimation of expected sources ($D\overline{D}$, DY)

- Generate dimuons from DY and $D\overline{D}$ (m_c=1.5 GeV/c^2, $\langle k_T^2 \rangle$ = 0.8 GeV^2) using PYTHIA;
- Track dimuons through the apparatus (for each setup);
- Reconstruct dimuons kinematical variables using the same reconstruction procedure adopted for experimental data.



- Determine acceptance in kinem. region: -0.5< $\cos\theta_{CS}$ <0.5 and 0< y_{cm} <1 (for p–A: -0.52< y_{cm} <0.48).
- Fit the A–B experimental mass spectra in the region $M > 1.5$ GeV/c^2 with a superposition of the mass shapes of the expected sources, keeping the relative normalizations of the various contributions as free parameters.

Fit of mass spectra: peripheral PbPb collisions



R fixed, fit for M>1.5 GeV/c^2

(if the fit starting point is shifted down to M=1.3 GeV/c^2 the results are stable within 2%)

Fit of mass spectra: central PbPb collisions



R fixed, fit for M>1.5 GeV/c^2

Central vs. peripheral Pb–Pb collisions

- We know that the DY exhibits no anomalous behaviour from p–p to Pb–Pb collisions (see Abreu et al., Phys. Lett. B410(1997)337);
- We would then expect: $\sigma_{D\overline{D}}/\sigma_{DY} = const.$ vs E_T;



But we see that, in central Pb–Pb collisions, an enhancement of the open charm component, with respect to DY, is necessary in order to describe the mass spectrum $\rightarrow$ **charm–like** enhancement.

Expected open charm contribution

Introducing an overall up–scale factor PYTHIA reproduces the open charm hadro-production $\sqrt{s}$-dependence and the D-meson differential distributions measured at CERN and FNAL energies (see review by Braun–Munzinger et al., Eur. Phys. J. C1(1998)123) :



Cross-sections per nucleon in the forward region ($x_f > 0$), averaged between charged and neutral channels, are shown;

PYTHIA multiplied by $K_{neutral}$=4.5 and $K_{charged}$=7

• The NA50 point (obtained from four different p-A systems, see later) is compatible with other data points

• We can use as a reference (expected charm) for A-B collisions either the PYTHIA curve as shown, or the same rescaled to the NA50 point

Charm–like enhancement vs N_{part}: Pb–Pb, S–U



Pb–Pb

- a factor ∼2 enhancement from peripheral to central collisions;
- first bin to be taken with care (residual non–target background, quality of the fit worse).

S–U

- A factor ∼1.5 enhancement from peripheral to central collisions.

(Enhancement w.r.t. non–rescaled PYTHIA)

The p–A data

- The charm–like enhancement with respect to PYTHIA extrapolations ranges from ∼2 (peripheral S–U) to ∼6 (central Pb–Pb).
- To check these values, one can look at p–A data, where no enhancement is expected.
- NA50 has taken high–statistics pA data on four nuclear targets (Al, Cu, Ag, W), at 450 GeV/c incident energy $\longrightarrow$ perform a simultaneous fit of the IMR for the four p–A data samples:
  - Impose $\sigma_{D\overline{D}}/\sigma_{DY} = const.$ from pAl to pW, since both processes should scale with A;
  - Consider the background R-factors as:
    - free parameters;
    - fixed from the VENUS simulation;
  - Fit the data in the regions $1.3 < M < 2.0$ GeV/c^2 and $4.5 < M < 8.0$ GeV/c^2 (exclude the J/ψ region to limit the number of parameters) or in the region $1.5 < M < 8.0$ GeV/c^2: compatible results ;
  - Compare $D\overline{D}$ yield with the PYTHIA-based calculation.

Fit of the p–W mass spectrum



• If the background R–factors are fixed in the fit, a $\sim 20\%$ higher value for $\sigma_{D\overline{D}}/\sigma_{DY}$ is obtained (open triangle in the next plots).

Charm–like enhancement vs N_{part}: p–A, S–U, Pb–Pb



- The charm–like enhancement increases smoothly from p–A to S–U to Pb–Pb
- We should expect an enhancement ~ 1 in p–A

(Enhancement w.r.t. non–rescaled PYTHIA)

Is there charm–like enhancement already in p–A ?

- The data sets collected in *Braun-Munzinger et al.* exhibit rather large relative uncertainties between the cross section points.
- Taking into account all possible systematic uncertainties, namely:
  - Absolute cross sections;
  - Branching Ratios $D \to \mu + X$;
  - Dependence of phase space factors on m_c;
- It is reasonable to suppose that **no enhancement** is present in p–A and consequently take as a reference the PYTHIA cross-section **rescaled to the NA50 p–A point**

Charm–like enhancement vs N_{part}: p–A, S–U, Pb–Pb



Charm–like enhancement:

a factor 3 in central Pb–Pb with respect to p–A

(Enhancement w.r.t. rescaled PYTHIA)

Possible interpretations of IMR excess

- Additional open charm pairs produced in nucleus–nucleus collisions (but not in p-A), arising from the interactions of gluons produced in different soft-soft baryon-baryon collisions:

  $\longrightarrow$ C.Y.Wong and Z.Q.Wang, Phys.Lett. B367 (1996) 50

- Gluon anti-shadowing $\rightarrow$ preliminary estimates show that it could only account for a small fraction of the enhancement seen:

  $\longrightarrow$ K.J.Eskola et al., preprint hep-ph/9807297

- Thermal dimuons production in nucleus–nucleus collisions, if the mass shape of such a contribution happens to be similar to the open charm one:

  $\longrightarrow$ P.Huovinen et al., preprint nucl-th/9803006; A.V.Leonidov et al., Eur. Phys. J. C4 (1998) 519

- Final state rescattering which distorts the shape of differential distributions only in nucleus–nucleus collisions $\rightarrow$ check p_T, y, $\cos\theta_{CS}$ distributions of IMR dimuons:

  $\longrightarrow$ Z.Lin and X.-N.Wang, preprint nucl-th/9808033

p_T distributions of the Pb–Pb IMR events



- p_T shapes for DY, $D\overline{D}$, J/ψ from PYTHIA (gaussian k_T with $\sigma_{k_T} = 0.9$ GeV/c) + simulation of the detector;
- Absolute normalizations from the fit of the mass spectra;
- Independent evidence that the enhancement is due to a charm–like component.

y distributions of the Pb–Pb IMR events



- y shapes for DY, $D\overline{D}$, J/ψ from PYTHIA + simulation of the detector;
- Absolute normalizations from the fit of the mass spectra;
- Good description of the data, but the y shapes are similar for the various processes in the (narrow) rapidity region covered by NA50.

Conclusions

- From pA to central PbPb collisions a satisfactory description of the mass spectra in the IMR can be achieved in term of classical sources: Drell-Yan and Open Charm. Thermal dileptons have not been included in this analysis.

- The charm-like contribution requested to explain the dimuon yield in the IMR in nucleus–nucleus collisions exceeds a linear extrapolation of the measured charmed mesons production in pA collisions.

- The charm-like enhancement exhibits a steady increase from peripheral SU to central PbPb collisions. In particular, a factor 3 enhancement in the charm-like yield well describes the dimuon production in the IMR for central PbPb collisions.

- The analysis of p_T spectra of the PbPb IMR events gives an independent confirmation that these excess dimuons come from a charm-like source.