

Dissociation of 1p quarkonium states in a hot QCD medium

Vineet Agotiya¹, Vinod Chandra², B. K. Patra¹

¹ Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, Roorkee-247 667, India

²Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Kanpur-208 016, India

We extend the analysis of a very recent work (Phys. Rev. C **80**, 025210 (2009)) to study the dissociation phenomenon of 1p states of the charmonium and bottomonium spectra (χ_c and χ_b) in a hot QCD medium. This study employed a medium modified heavy quark potential which is obtained by incorporating both perturbative and non-perturbative medium effects encoded in the dielectric function to the full Cornell potential. The medium modified potential has a quite different form (a long range Coulomb tail in addition to the usual Yukawa term) compared to the usual picture of Debye screening. We further study the flavor dependence of their binding energies and dissociation temperatures by employing the perturbative, non-perturbative, and the lattice parametrized form of the Debye masses. These results are consistent with the predictions of the current theoretical works.

KEYWORDS: Quarkonium, Debye mass, Quark-Gluon plasma, Heavy quark potential, Binding energy, Dissociation temperature

PACS numbers: 25.75.-q; 24.85.+p; 12.38.Mh

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the amazing discoveries of experimental measurements at RHIC is the surprising amount of both radial [1] and elliptic flow [2] exhibited by the outgoing hadrons. Theoretical calculations cannot generate sufficient flow to explain the observations unless partonic cross sections are artificially enhanced by more than an order of magnitude over perturbative QCD predictions[3]. Thus the matter created in these collisions is strongly interacting, unlike the type of weakly interacting quark-gluon plasma expected to occur at very high temperatures on the basis of asymptotic freedom [4]. The behavior of the heavy quarkonium states in hot strongly interacting matter was proposed as test of its confinement status, since a sufficiently hot deconfined medium will dissolve any binding between the quark-antiquark pair [5]. Another possibility of dissociation of certain quarkonium states (sub-threshold states at $T = 0$) is the decay into open charm (beauty) mesons due to in-medium modification of quarkonia and heavy-light meson masses [6].

Many attempts have been made to understand the dissociation phenomenon of $Q\bar{Q}$ states in the deconfined medium, using either lattice calculations of quarkonium spectral functions [7, 8, 9, 10, 11] or non-relativistic calculations based upon some effective potential [12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17]. These two approaches show poor matching between their predictions because of the uncertainties coming from a variety of sources. None of the approaches give a complete framework to study the properties of quarkonia states at finite temperature. However, some degree of qualitative agreement had been achieved for the S-wave correlators. The finding was somehow ambiguous for the P-wave correlators and the temperature dependence of the potential model was even qualitatively

different from the lattice one. Refinement in the computations of the spectral functions have recently been done by incorporating the zero modes both in the S- and P-channels [18, 19]. It was shown that, these contributions cure most of the previously observed discrepancies with lattice calculations. This supports the use of potential models at finite temperature as an important tool to complement lattice studies.

The production of J/ψ and Υ mesons in hadronic reactions occurs in part through production of higher excited $c\bar{c}$ (or $b\bar{b}$) states and their decay into quarkonia ground state. Since the lifetime of different sub-threshold quarkonium states is much larger than the typical lifetime of the medium which may be produced in nucleus-nucleus collisions; their decay occurs almost completely outside the produced medium. This means that the produced medium can be probed not only by the ground state quarkonium but also by different excited quarkonium states. Since, different quarkonium states have different sizes (binding energies), one expects that higher excited states will dissolve at smaller temperature as compared to the smaller and more tightly bound ground states. These facts may lead to a sequential suppression pattern in J/ψ and Υ yield in nucleus-nucleus collision as the function of the energy density. So, if one wants to interpret the J/ψ suppression pattern observed in nuclear collisions at CERN SPS and RHIC, as a signature of the formation of the QGP, one requires a right understanding of the dissociation of χ_c and χ_b in the QGP medium. This is due to the fact that a significant fraction ($\sim 30\%$) of the J/ψ yield observed in the collisions is produced by χ_c decays [20, 21, 22]. The J/ψ yield could show a significant suppression even if the energy density of the system is not enough to melt directly produced J/ψ but it is sufficient to melt the higher resonance states because they are loosely bound compared to the ground state J/ψ . This motivates the special attention to the excited states χ_c and χ_b .

In the studies of the bulk properties of the QCD plasma phase [23, 24, 25, 26], deviations from perturbative calculations were found at temperatures much larger than

the deconfinement temperature. This calls for quantitative non-perturbative calculations. The phase transition in full QCD appears as a crossover rather than a ‘true’ phase transition with related singularities in thermodynamic observables (in the high-temperature and low density regime) [27]. Therefore, it is not reasonable to assume that the string-tension vanishes abruptly at or above T_c and one should study its effect on the behavior of quarkonia even above the deconfinement temperature. This issue, usually overlooked in the literature, was certainly worth to investigate. This is exactly what we have done in our recent work [28, 29] where we have obtained the medium-modified form of the heavy quark potential by correcting the full Cornell potential (linear plus Coulomb), not only its Coulomb part alone as usually done in the literature, with a dielectric function encoding the effects of the deconfined medium. We found that this approach led to a long-range Coulomb potential with an (reduced) effective charge[28] in addition to the usual Debye-screened form employed in most of the literature. With this effective potential, we investigated the effects of perturbative and non-perturbative contributions to the Debye mass on the dissociation of quarkonium states. We subsequently used this study to determine the binding energies and the dissociation temperatures of the ground and the first excited states of charmonium and bottomonium spectra.

However, our starting potential (Cornell) at $T = 0$ has no terms to account the spin-dependence forces in QCD [30], so the medium-modified potential [28] also has no spin-dependent terms. As a consequence, Schrödinger equation with the above medium-modified potential gives the same energy eigenvalues for the first excited states ψ' and χ_c making them degenerate. This is certainly not desirable since their masses are not the same (in fact, mass of ψ' is slightly higher than χ_c whereas the latter state is more tightly bound than the former). Therefore the determination of the binding energies of 1p states, *viz.*, χ_c , χ_b and their dissociation temperatures like the ground and first excited states is not directly possible as had been done in our earlier work by employing the medium modified potential [28]. The principal quantum number (n) of ψ' and χ_c are same but their spin quantum number and as well as their total angular momentum are not the same. So, their quantum states should be denoted by all four quantum numbers ($nlsj$) and the difference in their binding energies (or in their total masses) should be originated from a spin-dependent correction terms.

We have done this job in a two fold way. First, we have determined the binding energy for ψ' by employing the medium-modified potential [28] into the Schrödinger equation. Then we obtain the binding energy for χ_c by adding the correction terms to the binding energy of ψ' . In our analysis, correction terms will be obtained by adopting a variational treatment of the relativistic two-fermion bound-states in quantum electrodynamics (QED) [32, 33] taking into account the spin-dependent terms for the corresponding quantum numbers of ψ' and

χ_c states. In this endeavor, coupled integral equations for a relativistic two-fermion system are derived variationally within the Hamiltonian formalism of QED using an improved ansatz that is sensitive to all terms in the Hamiltonian [32].

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec.II, we review the work on the medium modified Cornell potential and dissociation of 1s and 2s states of charmonium and bottomonium spectra. In Sec.III, we discuss how to determine the binding energies of χ_c and χ_b . In Sec.IV, we study the melting of χ_c and χ_b in the QGP medium and determine their dissociation temperatures. Finally, we conclude in Sec.V.

II. IN-MEDIUM MODIFICATIONS TO HEAVY-QUARK POTENTIAL

The interaction potential between a heavy quark and antiquark gets modified in the presence of a medium and it plays a vital role in understanding the fate of quark-antiquark bound states in the QGP medium. This issue has well been studied and several excellent reviews exist [34, 35] which dwell both on the phenomenology as well as on the lattice QCD. In these studies, they assumed the melting of the string motivated by the fact that there is a phase transition from a hadronic matter to a QGP phase. As a consequence they modified the Coulomb part of the potential only so they used a much simpler form (screened Coulomb) of the medium modified potential in the deconfined phase. But recent lattice results indicates that there is no genuine phase transition at vanishing baryon density, it is rather a cross-over, so there is no reason to assume the melting of string at the deconfinement temperature. We have addressed this issue in our recent work [28] where we developed an effective potential once one corrects the full Cornell potential with a dielectric function embodying medium effects. We recall the basic details which are relevant for the present demonstration.

Usually, in finite-temperature QFT, medium modification enters in the Fourier transform of heavy quark potential as

$$\tilde{V}(k) = \frac{V(k)}{\epsilon(k)} \quad , \quad (1)$$

where $\epsilon(k)$ is the dielectric permittivity given in terms of the static limit of the longitudinal part of gluon self-energy[36]:

$$\epsilon(k) = \left(1 + \frac{\Pi_L(0, k, T)}{k^2} \right) \equiv \left(1 + \frac{m_D^2}{k^2} \right). \quad (2)$$

The quantity $V(k)$ in Eq.(1) is the Fourier transform (FT) of the Cornell potential. The evaluation of the FT of the Cornell potential is not so straightforward and can be done by assuming r - as distribution ($r \rightarrow r \exp(-\gamma r)$).

After the evaluation of FT we let γ tends to zero. Now the FT of the full Cornell potential can be written as

$$\mathbf{V}(k) = -\sqrt{(2/\pi)} \frac{\alpha}{k^2} - \frac{4\sigma}{\sqrt{2\pi}k^4}. \quad (3)$$

Substituting Eqs.(2) and (3) into (1) and then evaluating its inverse FT one obtains the r-dependence of the medium modified potential [29]:

$$\mathbf{V}(r, T) = \left(\frac{2\sigma}{m_D^2} - \alpha \right) \frac{\exp(-m_D r)}{r} - \frac{2\sigma}{m_D^2 r} + \frac{2\sigma}{m_D} - \alpha m_D \quad (4)$$

This potential has a long range Coulombic tail in addition to the standard Yukawa term. The constant terms are introduced to yield the correct limit of $V(r, T)$ as $T \rightarrow 0$ (it should reduce to the Cornell form). Such terms could arise naturally from the basic computations of real time static potential in hot QCD[37] and from the real and imaginary time correlators in a thermal QCD medium[38].

It is worth to note that the potential in a hot QCD medium is not the same as the lattice parametrized heavy quark free-energy in the deconfined phase which is basically a screened Coulomb [39, 40] because one-dimensional Fourier transform of the Cornell potential in the medium yields the similar form as used in the lattice QCD to study the quarkonium properties which assumes the one-dimensional color flux tube structure [41]. However, at finite temperature that may not be the case since the flux tube structure may expand in more dimensions[39]. Therefore, it is better to consider the three-dimensional form of the medium modified Cornell potential which have been done exactly in the present work. We have compared our in-medium potential with the color-singlet free-energy[42] extracted from the lattice data and found that it agrees with the lattice results except from the non-perturbative result of the Debye masses.

However, if we neglect the finite range terms *viz.* Yukawa term in the limit $r \gg 1/m_D$ and for large values of temperatures the product αm_D will be much greater than $2\sigma/m_D$, then it leads to an analytically solvable Coulomb potential:

$$V(r, T) \sim -\frac{2\sigma}{m_D^2 r} - \alpha m_D \quad (5)$$

We employed this medium-modified effective potential to study the binding energies and the dissociation temperatures for the ground and first excited states of $c\bar{c}$ and $b\bar{b}$ spectroscopy. However, to see the effects of the finite-range terms, we solve the Schrödinger equation numerically with the full effective potential(4) and found that the dissociation temperatures was changed by $\sim 10\%$ [28]. Therefore the approximated form (5) have a dominant role in deciding the fate of these states in

the hot QCD medium. Let us now proceed to the determination of the binding energies and the dissociation temperatures for χ_c and χ_b states in Sec(s).III and IV, respectively.

III. BINDING ENERGY OF χ_c AND χ_b

The in-medium potential (5) resembles to the hydrogen atom problem. The solution of the Schrödinger equation gives the eigenvalues for the ground states and the first excited states in charmonium (J/ψ , ψ' etc.) and bottomonium (Υ , Υ' etc.) spectra :

$$E_n = -\frac{E_I}{n^2} \quad ; \quad E_I = \frac{m_Q \sigma^2}{m_D^4}, \quad (6)$$

where m_Q is the mass of the heavy quark and E_I is the energy of the $Q\bar{Q}$ state in its first Bohr orbit. The allowed energy states for $Q\bar{Q}$ are $E_n = -E_I, -\frac{E_I}{4}, \dots$. These energies are known as the ionization potentials/binding energies for the n th bound state. They become temperature-dependent through the Debye masses and decrease with the increase in temperature.

Apart from the ground and the first excited states, there are other important states (1p) in the charmonium and bottomonium spectra *viz* χ_c and χ_b which contribute significantly in the suppression of ground state quarkonia (J/ψ and Υ) in RHIC experiments through their decays into J/ψ 's and Υ 's. Although both ψ' and χ_c are the first excited states of the charmonium spectra but they are not degenerate. In fact, ψ' is more massive than χ_c but χ_c is more tightly bound than ψ' . So the entire binding energy of χ_c will not come from the above calculation, the additional contribution will come from the spin-dependent quantum corrections.

Some authors have studied the relativistic two-particle Coulomb problem, based on approximations to the Bether-Salpter equations. Others have started with effective Lagrangians based on perturbative expansions of the relativistic Lagrangians. However, we choose the variational methods [31, 32, 33] where coupled integral equations for a relativistic two-fermion system are derived variationally within the Hamiltonian formalism of quantum electrodynamics, using an improved ansatz that is sensitive to all terms in the Hamiltonian. The equations are solved approximately to determine the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions, at arbitrary coupling, for various states of the two-particle system. In the variational treatment of the relativistic two-fermion bound-state system in QED, the total energy in a quantum state ($nlsj$) consists of Bohr like terms, relativistic correction in the kinetic energy and most importantly the spin-dependent terms which take into account the non-degeneracy between the sub-states. The total energy up to fourth order in α is written for a hydrogen-like potential [32]

$$E_{nlsj} = 2m_Q - \frac{1}{2}\mu \frac{\alpha^2}{n^2} + \Delta K_{nl} + \Delta V_{nlsj} \quad , \quad (7)$$

where

$$\Delta K_{nl} = -\frac{\mu^4 \alpha^4}{m_Q^3} \left(\frac{2}{(2l+1)n^3} - \frac{3}{4n^4} \right) \quad (8)$$

is the α^4 correction to the kinetic energy and the correction to the spin-dependent potential energy is

$$\Delta V_{nlsj} = -b_{nlsj} \frac{\alpha^4 \mu^3}{n^3}, \quad (9)$$

where the coefficients b_{nlsj} for the different quantum states ($nlsj$) are tabulated in Ref.[32]. We have taken their values for the Coulombic case only. The fine structure constant (α) in QED will be replaced by the effective charge ($2\sigma/m_D^2$) in our model. Using the appropriate values of the quantum numbers and the coefficients corresponding to ψ' and χ_c states in charmonium spectra (Υ' and χ_b in bottomonium spectra), we obtain the correction term which is to be added to the binding energy of ψ' is

$$E_{c,b}^{\text{corr}} = \frac{m_{c,b} \alpha^4}{96} = \frac{m_{c,b} \sigma^4}{6m_D^8} \quad (10)$$

So the binding energy of $\chi_c(\chi_b)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} E(\chi_c, \chi_b) &= E(\psi', \Upsilon') + E_{\chi_c, \chi_b}^{\text{corr}} \\ &= \frac{m_{c,b} \sigma^2}{4m_D^4} \left(1 + \frac{2}{3} \frac{\sigma^2}{m_D^4} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where m_D is the Debye mass for which we choose a gauge invariant, non-perturbative form [43]. Recently Kajantie *et. al* [43] obtained it by computing the non-perturbative contributions of $\mathcal{O}(g^2T)$ and $\mathcal{O}(g^3T)$ from a 3-D effective field theory as

$$\begin{aligned} m_D^{\text{NP}} &= m_D^{\text{LO}} + \frac{N_c g^2 T}{4\pi} \ln \frac{m_D^{\text{LO}}}{g^2 T} \\ &+ c_{N_c} g^2 T + d_{N_c, N_f} g^3 T + \mathcal{O}(g^4 T) \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the leading order (LO) perturbative result, $m_D^{\text{LO}} = g(T)T \sqrt{\frac{N_c}{3} + \frac{N_f}{6}}$, has been known for a long time [44]. The logarithmic part of the $\mathcal{O}(g^2)$ correction can be extracted perturbatively [45], but c_{N_c} and the higher order corrections are non-perturbative. We wish to explore the effects of the different terms in the Debye mass on the binding energy of χ_c and χ_b . We have used the two-loop expression for the QCD coupling constant at finite temperature from Ref.[46] and the renormalization scale from Ref.[47].

The effects of each terms in the Debye mass (12) cannot always be explored separately due to the following reason: In the weak coupling regime, the soft scale ($\simeq gT$) at the leading-order related to the screening of electrostatic fields is well separated from the ultra-soft scale ($\simeq g^2T$) related to the screening of magnetostatic fields. In such regime, it appears meaningful to see the contribution of each terms in the Debye mass separately. But

when the coupling becomes large enough (which is indeed the case), the two scales are no longer well separated. So while looking for the next-to-leading corrections to the leading-order result from the ultra-soft scale, it is not a wise idea to stop at the logarithmic term, since it becomes crucial the number multiplying the factor $1/g$ to establish the correction to the LO result. In fact the Debye mass in the NLO term is always smaller than the LO term because of the negative (logarithmic) contribution ($\log(1/g)$) to the leading-order term, while the full correction (all g^2T terms) to the Debye mass results positive. So, we consider only three forms of the Debye masses, *viz.* leading-order result (m_D^{LO}), non-perturbative form (m_D^{NP}), and lattice parametrized form ($m_D^L = 1.4m_D^{\text{LO}}$) to study the dissociation phenomena.

Thus we have finally computed the binding energies for χ_c and χ_b and plotted them in Figs. 1 and 2, respectively where different curves denote the choice of the Debye masses used to calculate the binding energy from Eq.(11). We consider three cases for our analysis: pure gluonic, 2-flavor and 3-flavor QCD. There is a common observation in all figures that the binding energies show strong decrease with increase in temperature. In particular, binding energies obtained from m_D^{LO} and m_D^L give realistic variation with the temperature. The temperature dependence of the binding energies show a quantitative agreement with the results based on the spectral function technique calculated in a potential model for the non-relativistic Green's function [48]. On the other hand, when we employ non-perturbative form of the Debye mass (m^{NP}) the binding energies become unrealistically small compared to its zero temperature value and also compared to the binding energies employing m_D^{LO} and m_D^L . This anomaly can be understood by the fact that the value of m_D^{NP} is significantly larger than both m_D^{LO} and m_D^L so that the binding energies become substantially smaller. This observation indicates that the present form of the non-perturbative corrections to the Debye mass may not be the complete one, the situation may change once the $\mathcal{O}(g^4T)$ non-perturbative contributions to Debye mass are incorporated and then evaluate the binding energy. Thus, the study of temperature dependence of binding energy is poised to provide a wealth of information about the nature of dissociation of quarkonium states in a thermal medium which will be reflected in their dissociation temperatures discussed in the next section.

In addition, we take advantage of all the available lattice data, obtained not only in quenched QCD ($N_f = 0$), but also including two and, more recently, three light flavors. We are then in a position to study also the flavor dependence of the dissociation process, a perspective not yet achieved by the parallel studies of the spectral functions, which are only available in quenched QCD.




FIG. 1: Dependence of χ_c binding energy (in GeV) on temperature T/T_c .

IV. DISSOCIATION TEMPERATURES

It has been customary to consider a state dissociated when its binding energy becomes zero. In principle, a state is dissociated when no peak structure is seen, but the widths shown in spectral functions from current potential model calculations are not physical. Broadening of states as the temperature increases is not included in any of these models. In [48] authors have argued that no need to reach zero binding energy ($E_{bin} = 0$) to dissociate, but when $E_{bin} \leq T$ a state is weakly bound and thermal fluctuations can destroy it. However, others have set a more conservative condition for dissociation [49]: $2E_{bin}(T) < \Gamma(T)$, where $\Gamma(T)$ is the thermal width of state. However, we now calculate the upper bound of the dissociation temperature by the condition for dissociation: $|E_{\chi_{c,b}}| \approx T$,

$$E(\chi_{c,b}) = \frac{m_{c,b}\sigma^2}{4m_D^4} \left(1 + \frac{2}{3} \frac{\sigma^2}{m_D^4} \right) = T_D, \quad (13)$$

where the string tension (σ) is 0.184 GeV^2 and critical temperatures (T_c) are taken as 270 MeV , 203 MeV and 197 MeV for pure gluonic, 2-flavor and 3-flavor QCD medium, respectively[50]. However, the choice of the mean thermal energy (T) is not rigid because even at low temperatures $T < T_D$ (say) the Bose/Fermi distributions of partons will have a high energy tail with partons of mechanical energy $> |E_{\chi_{c,b}}|$. The dissociation temperatures for χ_c and χ_b are listed in Table I with the Debye mass in the leading-order. It is found that χ_c 's are dissociated at $1.1T_c$, $1.31T_c$, and $1.26T_c$ for the pure, 2-flavor, and 3-flavor QCD, respectively whereas χ_b 's are dissociated comparatively much higher temperature which seems justifiable. This is perhaps the first observation in the literature on the flavor (system) dependence of the dissociation temperature. This dependence is essential while

TABLE I: Upper(lower) bound on the dissociation temperature(T_D) for χ_c and χ_b (in unit of T_c) using the leading-order term in Debye mass, m_D^{LO} .

State	Pure QCD	$N_f = 2$	$N_f = 3$
χ_c	1.10 (0.89)	1.31 (1.06)	1.26 (1.02)
χ_b	1.38 (1.10)	1.64 (1.31)	1.57 (1.26)

TABLE II: Same as Table I but with the lattice parametrized form of the Debye mass m_D^L .

State	Pure QCD	$N_f = 2$	$N_f = 3$
χ_c	0.77 (0.59)	0.93 (0.73)	0.90 (0.71)
χ_b	0.98 (0.77)	1.17 (0.93)	1.14 (0.90)

calculating the screening energy density (energy density at the dissociation temperature) in various descriptions of QGP ($N_f = 0, 2, 3$) for the study of J/ψ survival in an expanding QGP. On the other hand, employing lattice parametrized form, m_D^L we obtain the values (Table II) much smaller than the leading-order results where χ_c is dissociated below T_c and χ_b is dissociated just above T_c . At last, when we use non-perturbative form of the Debye mass, the dissociation temperatures come out to be unrealistically small. Summarizing the results, we conclude that as we move from perturbative to non-perturbative domain, the binding energies are becoming smaller and smaller. As a result the dissociation temperatures obtained are also becoming smaller. This is due to the hierarchy in the Debye masses: $m_D^{LO} < m_D^L \ll m_D^{NP}$. In fact, m_D^L is 1.4 times greater than m_D^{LO} while m_D^{NP} is much greater than both m_D^{LO} and m_D^L .

However, if we treat the partons in high temperature to be relativistic, we could replace the mean thermal energy by $3T$ (instead of T) to obtain the lower bound for the dissociation temperatures. It is found that all entries in




FIG. 2: Dependence of χ_b binding energy (in GeV) on T/T_c .

TABLE III: Upper bound of the dissociation temperatures with $T_c = 192$ MeV and the lattice parametrized form of the Debye mass [48].

State	χ_c	χ_b
T_D	$\leq 0.9T_c$	$1.2T_c$

Table I and II have been decreased by 30% approximately giving the lower bound of the dissociation temperatures (inside the first bracket). To compare our results quantitatively with the recent results [48] based on the spectral function technique calculated in a potential model with a similar description of the system (for 3-flavor QCD with $T_c=192$ MeV), we tabulated the upper limit on the dissociation temperatures with the same form of Debye mass used in Ref.[48] in Table III giving a good agreement with their results.

Finally, it is learnt that inclusion of non-perturbative corrections to the Debye mass (m_D^{NP}) leads to unusually smaller value of the dissociation temperatures for both χ_c and χ_b . This does not immediately imply that the non-perturbative effects should be ignored. It is rather interesting to investigate the disagreement between the non-perturbative result obtained with a dimensional-reduction strategy and the Debye mass arising from the Polyakov-loop correlators. Only future investigation may throw more light on this issue.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we have studied the dissociation of $1p$ states in the charmonium and bottomonium spectra (χ_c and χ_b) in the hot QCD medium. We have employed the medium modified form of the heavy quark-potential in which the medium modification causes the dynam-

ical screening of color charge which, in turn, leads to the temperature dependent binding energy of ψ' and Υ' . We have then studied the temperature dependence of the binding energy of the χ_c and χ_b states in the pure gauge and realistic QCD medium by incorporating the fourth-order corrections (in the screened charge $\alpha_{\text{eff}} = 2\sigma/m_D^2$) coming from the spin dependent terms to the binding energies of ψ' and Υ' states, respectively. For this purpose, we have adopted a formulation [32], in which a variational treatment of the relativistic two-fermion bound-state system in QED [32] has been developed to compute the spin-dependent corrections.

Next we have determined the dissociation temperatures employing the Debye mass in leading-order and the lattice parametrized form. Our estimates are consistent with the finding of recent theoretical works based on potential models [48]. We have further shown that inclusion of non-perturbative contributions to the Debye mass lower the dissociation temperatures substantially which looks unfeasible to compare to the spectral analysis of lattice temporal correlator of mesonic current. This leaves an open problem of the agreement between these two kind of approaches. This could be partially due to the arbitrariness in the criteria/definition of the dissociation temperature. To examine this point we have estimated both the upper and lower bound on the dissociation temperatures by fixing the mean thermal energy T and $3T$, respectively. Thus, this study provides us a handle to decipher the extent upto which non-perturbative effects should be incorporated into the Debye mass.

In brief, we obtained the analytic forms for the binding energies and the dissociation temperatures of χ_c and χ_b . This enable us to investigate their flavor dependence and temperature dependence. We have estimated the upper bound on the dissociation temperatures of χ_c and χ_b . We found that these estimates obtained by employing the

lattice parametrized Debye mass show good agreement with the prediction in [48]. On the other hand, these

values are significantly smaller than the predictions of lattice studies [8, 11, 16, 20].

-
- [1] J. Adams, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92 (2004) 112301; PHENIX Collaboration, K. Adcox, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C 69 (2004) 024904; I. Arsene, *et al.* [BRAHMOS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. C 72 (2005) 014908.
- [2] S. S. Adler, *et al.* (PHENIX collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 91(2003) 182301; J. Adams, *et al.* (STAR Collaboration), Phys. Rev. C 71 (2005) 014904; B. B. Back, *et al.* (PHOBOS Collaboration), Phys. Rev. C 72 (2005) 051901(R).
- [3] D. Molnar and M. Gyulassy, Nucl. Phys. A 697 (2002) 495.
- [4] J. C. Collins and M. J. Perry, Phys. Rev. Lett 34 (1975) 1353; E. V. Shuryak, Yad. Fiz. 28 (1978) 796 [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 28 (1978) 408]; J. I. Kapusta, Nucl. Phys. B 148 (1979) 461.
- [5] T. Matsui and H. Satz, Phys. Lett. B 178 (1986) 416.
- [6] S. Digal, P. Petreczky, and H. Satz, Phys. Lett. B 514 (2001) 57.
- [7] M. Asakawa, T. Hatsuda, and Y. Nakahara, Nucl. Phys. A 715 (2003) 863; M. Asakawa and T. Hatsuda, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92 (2004) 012001.
- [8] S. Datta, F. Karsch, P. Petreczky, and I. Wetzorke, Phys. Rev. D 69 (2004) 094507.
- [9] T. Umeda, K. Nomura, and H. Matsufuru, Eur. Phys. J. C 39 (2005) 9; H. Iida, T. Doi, N. Ishii, H. Sughanuma, and K. Tsumura, Phys. Rev. D 74 (2006) 074502.
- [10] A. Jakovac, P. Petreczky, K. Petrov, and A. Velytsky, Phys. Rev. D 75 (2007) 014506.
- [11] G. Aarts, C. Allton, M. B. Oktay, M. Peardon, J.-I Skullerud, Phys. Rev. D 76 094513 (2007) 094513.
- [12] E. V. Shuryak and I. Zahed, Phys. Rev. D 70 (2004) 054507.
- [13] W. M. Alberico, A. Beraudo, A. De Pace, and A. Molinari, Phys. Rev. D 72 (2005) 114011.
- [14] C. Y. Wong and H. W. Crater, Phys. Rev. D 75 (2007) 034505.
- [15] D. Cabrera and R. Rapp, Phys. Rev. D 76 (2007) 114506.
- [16] W. M. Alberico, A. Beraudo, A. De Pace, and A. Molinari, Phys. Rev. D 75 (2007) 074009.
- [17] A. Mocsy and P. Petreczky, Phys. Rev. D 77 (2008) 014501.
- [18] T. Umeda, Phys. Rev. D 75 (2007) 094502.
- [19] W. M. Alberico, A. Beraudo, A. De Pace, and A. Molinari, Phys. Rev. D 77 (2008) 017502.
- [20] H. Satz, Nucl. Phys. A 783 (2007) 249.
- [21] D. Pal, B. K. Patra and D. K. Srivastava, Eur.Phys. J. C 17 (2000) 179.
- [22] B. K. Patra and D. K. Srivastava, Phys. Lett. B 505 (2001) 113.
- [23] O. Kaczmarek, F. Karsch, E. Laermann and M. Lutgemeier, Phys. Rev. D 62 (2000) 034021.
- [24] O. Kaczmarek, F. Karsch, F. Zantow and P. Petreczky, Phys. Rev. D 70 (2004) 074505.
- [25] B. Beinlich, F. Karsch, E. Laermann and A. Peikert, Eur. Phys. J. C 6 (1999) 133.
- [26] F. Karsch, E. Laermann and A. Peikert, Phys. Lett. B 478 (2000) 447.
- [27] F. Karsch, hep-lat/0601013; Journal of Physics: Conference Series 46 (2006) 121; O. Philipsen, Pos(LAT 2005) 016; Urs M. Heller, Pos(LAT 2006) 011; M. A. Stephanov, Pos(LAT 2006) 024; M. Cheng *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D 77 (2008) 014511.
- [28] V. Agotiya, V. Chandra and B. K. Patra, Phys. Rev. C 80 (2009) 025210.
- [29] V. Chandra, A. Ranjan, V. Ravishankar, Eur. Phys. J A 40 (2009) 109; arXiv:0801.1286.
- [30] E. Eichten and F. Feinberg, Phys. Rev. D 23 (1981) 2724.
- [31] G. Hardekopf and J. Sucher, Phys. Rev. A 30 (1984) 703.
- [32] J. W. Darewych and M. Horbatsch, J. Phys. B: At. Mol Opt. Phys. 22 (1989) 973; *ibid* 23 (1990) 337.
- [33] J. W. Darewych, M. Horbatsch and R. Kounik, Phys. Rev. D 39 (1989) 499.
- [34] L. Kluberg, H. Satz, arXiv:hep-ph/0901.3831.
- [35] N. Brambilla, *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. 77 (2005) 1423.
- [36] R. A Schneider, Phys. Rev. D 66 (2002) 036003.
- [37] M. Laine, O. Philipsen, M. Tassler and P. Romatschke, JHEP 03 (2007) 054.
- [38] A. Beraudo, J. P. Blaizot, C. Ratti, Nucl. Phys. A 806 (2008) 312.
- [39] H. Satz, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. 32 (2006) R25.
- [40] C. Young and E. Shuryak, arXiv:0803.2866 (nucl-th); F. Karsch, M. T. Mehr and H. Satz, Z. Phys. C 37 (1988) 617.
- [41] Vijai V. Dixit, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 5 (1990) 227.
- [42] A. Nakamura and T. Saito, arXiv:hep-lat/0404002.
- [43] K. Kajantie, M. Laine, J. Peisa, A. Rajantie, K. Rummukainen, M. E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 (1997) 3130.
- [44] E. Shuryak, Sov. Phys. JETP 47 (1978) 212; Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 74 (1978) 408; J. Kapusta, Nucl. Phys. B 148 (1979) 461; D. Gross and R. Pisarski and L. Yaffe, Rev. Mod. Phys. 53 (1981) 43.
- [45] A. Rebhan, Phys. Rev. D 48 (1993) 3967.
- [46] M. Laine, Y. Schroder, JHEP 0503 (2005) 067.
- [47] S Huang, M Lissia, Nucl.Phys. B 438 (1995) 54.
- [48] A. Mocsy and P. Petreczky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 99 (2007) 211602.
- [49] D. Kharzeev, L. D. McLerran and H. Satz, Phys. Lett. B 356 (1995) 349.
- [50] O. Kazmarek and F. Zantow, PoS (LAT2005) 177.