Elliptic Flow in BM@N

M.Mamaev

Todo list:

- ❏ Corrections: my recentering, my twist and rescaling, my decomposition steps
- ❏ <Nhits> vs run-id
- ❏ <chi2/NDF> vs run-id
- ❏ <DCA> vs run-id
- ❏ Run-id dependency of vtx for central events
- ❏ $\langle F^i F^j \rangle$ as a function of centrality and run-id for midcentral events and for different run-id's
- ❏ Run-id QA for only physical data
- ❏ <beta> vs p/q
- ❏ Run-id dependence for each matrix element (visualize corrections)
- ❏ TOF vs T0 width
- ❏ TOF vs RPC width
- ❏ TOF QA strip-by-strip run-by-run
- ❏ Why 2 GeV/c cut for time-shifts
- ❏ p_T-y distributions for negatively charged particles and for identified as pions


N_{hits}
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
6800
7000
7200
7400
7600
7800
8000
8200
run id


χ²/NDF
1.4
1.2
1
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0
6800
7000
7200
7400
7600
7800
8000
8200
run id


y_{cm}
0.7
0.6
0.5
0.4
0.3
0.2
0.1
0
6800
7000
7200
7400
7600
7800
8000
8200
run id


p_T (GeV/c)
0.5
0.4
0.3
0.2
0.1
0
6800
7000
7200
7400
7600
7800
8000
8200
run id


Phi
(rad)
0.35
0.3
0.25
0.2
0.15
0.1
0.05
0
6800
7000
7200
7400
7600
7800
8000
8200
run id


N_p
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
6800
7000
7200
7400
7600
7800
8000
8200
run id

Charged particles multiplicity vs run-id



Normalized multiplicity



Squared mass of protons with TOF400 and TOF700





Vertex position







TOF-400



TOF-700



TOF-400



TOF-700



New FHCal-subevents layout

$$A(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\left[1 + 2\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}(c_m \cos m\varphi + s_m \sin m\varphi)\right]$$

Acceptance function acts as a weight A(φ) u_n and the measured vector x is:

$$x = Mu + c$$

$$u = [x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2]^T$$

$$c = [c_1, s_1, c_2, s_2]^T$$

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 1+c_2 & s_2 & c_1+c_3 & s_1+s_3 \\ s_2 & 1-c_2 & s_3-s_1 & c_1-c_3 \\ c_1+c_3 & s_3-s_1 & 1+c_4 & s_4 \\ s_1+s_3 & c_1-c_3 & s_4 & 1-c_4 \end{bmatrix}$$



$$u = M^{-1}(x - c)$$

Acceptance Fourier-moments for protons







Acceptance Fourier-moments for protons (corrected)







Acceptance Fourier-moments for protons (corrected & zoomed)







Acceptance Fourier-moments for FHCal









Acceptance Fourier-moments for FHCal



Result with only recentering applied









Result with only recentering applied: y-dep vs STAR







Result with only recentering applied: pT-dep vs STAR







Result with decomposition applied



Result with full decomposition: y-dep vs STAR







Result with full decomposition: pT-dep vs STAR







Additional check: comparison with v_1-preliminary









Proton N-sigma distributions

TOF-400



TOF-700



Proton p_T-y acceptance







Further notations

In the case of azimuthal isotropy of detector acceptance and no magnetic field:

$$\langle x_2 \rangle = 0 \quad \langle Y_1 \rangle = 0$$

$$v_2 = 2\frac{\langle x_2 Y_1^a Y_1^b \rangle}{\langle Y_1^a Y_1^b \rangle}$$

v_2 is the resolution-corrected cumulant of u_2 and two Q_1-vectors



$$cum(x_2, Y_1^a, Y_1^b) = \langle x_2 Y_1^a Y_1^b \rangle - \langle x_2 \rangle \langle Y_1^a Y_1^b \rangle - \langle x_2 Y_1^a \rangle \langle Y_1^b \rangle - \langle x_2 Y_1^b \rangle \langle Y_1^a \rangle + 2\langle x_2 \rangle \langle Y_1^a \rangle \langle Y_1^b \rangle$$

$$v_2 = 2\frac{cum(x_2, Y_1^a, Y_1^b)}{\langle Y_1^a Y_1^b \rangle}$$


20 cm
15 cm
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
100 cm
105 cm
2,5 cm
75 cm
155 cm

New FHCal-subevents layout

$$A(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\left[1 + 2\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}(c_m \cos m\varphi + s_m \sin m\varphi)\right]$$

Acceptance function acts as a weight A(φ) u_n and the measured vector x is:

$$x = Mu + c$$

$$u = [x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2]^T$$

$$c = [c_1, s_1, c_2, s_2]^T$$

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 1+c_2 & s_2 & c_1+c_3 & s_1+s_3 \\ s_2 & 1-c_2 & s_3-s_1 & c_1-c_3 \\ c_1+c_3 & s_3-s_1 & 1+c_4 & s_4 \\ s_1+s_3 & c_1-c_3 & s_4 & 1-c_4 \end{bmatrix}$$



$$u = M^{-1}(x - c)$$

Correlation of recentered Q_1-vectors from FHCal







Plain protons with recentered F1 and F2







Plain protons with recentered F1 and F3







Plain protons with recentered F2 and F3







Plain proton v_2 wrt different symmetry planes







Plain protons with plain F2 and F3







Plain Q1-vectors

Correlation of plain Q_1-vectors from FHCal







Plain protons with plain F1 and F2







Plain protons with plain F1 and F3







Plain protons with plain F2 and F3







Plain proton v_2 wrt different symmetry planes







Plain protons with plain F2 and F3







plain u_2-vector with rec.-corr. F1 and F2







plain u_2-vector with rec.-corr. F1 and F3







plain u_2-vector with rec.-corr. F2 and F3







v_2 as a function of y_{cm}, p_T and centrality







Proton v_2 vs deuteron v_2







Comparison with STAR-FXT: y-dependence







Comparison with STAR-FXT: y-dependence








Xe+CsI 3.8A GeV Plain
0-10%; 0.4<p_T<2 (GeV/c)
c_n
s_n
v_2
y_cm


Xe+CsI 3.8A GeV Plain
0-10%; 0.0<y_cm<0.6
1
2
3
4
v_2
p_T (GeV/c)


Xe+CsI 3.8A GeV Plain
0<p_T<2 (GeV/c); 0.0<y_cm<0.6
v_2
centrality (%)


Xe+CsI 3.8 A GeV
F1×F2
F1
F1×F2
centrality (%)


Xe+CsI 3.8 A GeV
F1×F3
⟨x1⟩
⟨y1⟩
⟨x2⟩
⟨y2⟩
F2
F1×F3
centrality (%)


Xe+CsI 3.8 A GeV
F2×F3
F3
F2×F3
centrality (%)


Xe+CsI 3.8A GeV Plain
0-10%; -0.1<y_cm<0.5
v2
p_T (GeV/c)


Xe+CsI 3.8A GeV Plain
10-40%; -0.1<y_cm<0.5
BM@N Xe+CsI √s_NN=3.26 GeV
STAR Au+Au √s_NN=3.2 GeV
STAR Au+Au √s_NN=3.5 GeV
v2
p_T (GeV/c)


Xe+CsI 3.8A GeV Plain
40-60%; -0.1<y_cm<0.5
v2
p_T (GeV/c)


Au+Au, JAM MF MD2
protons, 0.4 < p_T < 2.0 GeV/c, |y_cm| < 0.1
0-10%
20-30%
50-60%
V2
√s_NN, GeV


Au+Au, JAM MF MD2
protons, 0.4 < p_T < 2.0 GeV/c, |y_cm| < 0.4
0-10%
20-30%
50-60%
V2
√s_NN, GeV

Decomposition correction

Average of FHCal $Q_{1,2}$-vector components







Average of proton $u_{1,2}$-vector components







The core idea of correction

In the case of ideal detector acceptance, distribution is described as:

$$\rho(\varphi - \Psi) = \frac{1}{2\pi}(1 + 2\sum_{n} v_n \cos n(\varphi - \Psi))$$

In the case of azimuthal acceptance non-uniformity this transforms into:

$$P(\varphi - \Psi) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\left(1 + 2\sum_{m}(c_m \cos m\varphi + s_m \sin m\varphi)\right) \times \left(1 + 2\sum_{n} v_n \cos n(\varphi - \Psi)\right)$$

Q_n-vector components in the case of ideal detector acceptance:

$$X_n^\rho \equiv \langle x_n \rangle_\rho(\Psi) = \int d\varphi \frac{1}{2\pi}(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} v_n \cos n(\varphi - \Psi)) \cos n\varphi = V_n \cos n\Psi$$

$$Y_n^\rho \equiv \langle y_n \rangle_\rho(\Psi) = \int d\varphi \frac{1}{2\pi}(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} v_n \cos n(\varphi - \Psi)) \sin n\varphi = V_n \sin n\Psi$$

In the case of azimuthal non-uniformity:

$$X_n^P = \int d\varphi P(\varphi - \Psi) \cos n\varphi = X_n^\rho + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}(c_m X_{n+m}^\rho + c_m X_{m-n}^\rho + s_m Y_{m+n}^\rho + s_m Y_{m-n}^\rho)$$

$$Y_n^P = \int d\varphi P(\varphi - \Psi) \sin n\varphi = Y_n^\rho + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}(c_m Y_{m+n}^\rho - c_m Y_{m-n}^\rho - s_m X_{m+n}^\rho + s_m X_{m-n}^\rho)$$

Acceptance decomposition

$$\langle x_n \rangle = \int d\varphi \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(1 + 2 \sum_m (c_m \cos m\varphi + s_m \sin m\varphi) \right) \cos n\varphi = c_n$$

$$\langle y_n \rangle = \int d\varphi \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(1 + 2 \sum_m (c_m \cos m\varphi + s_m \sin m\varphi) \right) \sin n\varphi = s_n$$

$$cov(x_n x_l) = \langle x_n x_l \rangle - c_n c_l$$

First, for vector s = [X_1, Y_1, X_2, Y_2] we bild covariation matrix M, where $M_{i,j}$ = cov(s_i, s_j). Then we apply the whitening procedure:

x = $M^{-1/2}$s
After this procedure: cov(x_i, x_i) = 1, cov(x_i, x_j)$_{i!=j}$=0
This supposed to decompose acceptance so that:

$$x = [\cos\varphi, \sin\varphi, \cos 2\varphi, \sin 2\varphi]$$

Cov(x_1, x_n/y_n) for protons before/after whitening:







Cov(y_1, x_n/y_n) for protons before/after whitening:







Cov(x_2, x_n/y_n) for protons before/after whitening:







Cov(y_2, x_n/y_n) for protons before/after whitening:







$Cov(x_1, x_n/y_n)$ for FHCal before/after whitening:







$Cov(y_1, x_n/y_n)$ for protons before/after whitening:







Cov(x_2, x_n/y_n) for protons before/after whitening:







Cov(y_2, x_n/y_n) for protons before/after whitening:







Xe+CsI at 3.8A GeV

Protons x Rec. F1 x Rec. F2







Protons x Rec. F1 x Rec. F3







Protons x Rec. F2 x Rec. F3







Corrected proton v_2







Corrected proton v_2







Xe+CsI at 3.0A GeV

Protons x Rec. F1 x Rec. F2







Protons x Rec. F1 x Rec. F3







Protons x Rec. F2 x Rec. F2







Protons x Rec. F2 x Rec. F2







Correlation with F1 and F2

Checking the corrections on u-vector, FHCal vectors are Rescaled-corrected

- After applying recentering on u-vector, correlation drops 10 times



Correlation with F2 and F3

Checking the corrections on u-vector, FHCal vectors are Rescaled-corrected

- After applying recentering on u-vector, correlation drops 10 times



Correlation with F1 and F3

Checking the corrections on u-vector, FHCal vectors are Rescaled-corrected

- After applying recentering on u-vector, correlation drops 10 times



Plain proton with single F1







Plain proton with single F2







Plain proton with single F3







Recentered proton with single F1







Recentered proton with single F2







Recentered proton with single F3







Plain double proton







Recentered double







Rescaled double proton







Correlations with recentered F-vectors

Plain proton v_2







Recentered proton v_2







Rescaled proton v_2







Correlations with rescaled F-vectors

Plain proton v_2







Recentered proton v_2







Rescaled proton v_2







Plain proton v_2







Recentered proton v_2







Rescaled proton v_2







Plain proton correlation with F1







Recentered proton correlation with F1







Rescaled proton correlation with F1







Plain proton correlation with F2







Recentered proton correlation with F2







Rescaled proton correlation with F2







Plain proton correlation with F3







Recentered proton correlation with F3







Rescaled proton correlation with F3







Calculating the effective rotation angle

α ~ 31.717474







Symmetry plane resolution in Xe+Cs(I) collisions







All the estimations for symmetry plane resolutions are in a good agreement