

Magnetic screening in high-energy heavy-ion collisions

Adrian Dumitru^{a,b,c}, Hirotsugu Fujii^d and Yasushi Nara^e

^a *RIKEN BNL Research Center,
Brookhaven National Laboratory,
Upton, NY 11973, USA*

^b *Department of Natural Sciences,
Baruch College, CUNY,
17 Lexington Avenue,
New York, NY 10010, USA*

^c *The Graduate School and University Center,
The City University of New York,
365 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10016, USA*

^d *Institute of Physics,
University of Tokyo, Komaba,
Tokyo 153-8902, Japan*

^e *Akita International University,
Yuwa, Akita-city 010-1292, Japan*

Abstract

We show that classical chromomagnetic fields produced coherently in the initial stage of a heavy-ion collision exhibit screening. From the two-point field strength correlator we determine the magnetic mass for SU(2) to be $m_M \simeq 5$ times the saturation scale. Magnetic screening leads to an intuitive understanding of the area law scaling of spatial Wilson loops observed previously. The presence of screening effects in the initial state provides a basis for defining kinetic processes in the early stage of heavy-ion collisions, with electric and magnetic masses of the same order.

Heavy ion collisions at high energies involve non-linear dynamics of strong QCD color fields [1]. The soft field of a dense system of color charges at rapidities far from the source, resp. at light-cone momentum fractions $x \ll 1$, is determined by the classical Yang-Mills equations with a static current on the light cone [2]. It consists of gluons with a transverse momentum on the order of the density of valence charges per unit transverse area, Q_s^2 [3]. *Parametrically*, the saturation momentum scale Q_s separates the regime of non-linear color field interactions from the perturbative (linear) regime. Q_s is commonly defined from a two-point function of *electric* Wilson lines, the “dipole scattering amplitude” $\mathcal{N}(r)$, evaluated in the field of a single hadron or nucleus [4]; in covariant gauge

$$V(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{P} \exp \left(ig \int dx^- A^+(x^-, \mathbf{x}) \right) , \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{N}(r) = \langle 1 - \text{tr} V(\mathbf{0}) V^\dagger(\mathbf{x}) \rangle \simeq 1 - \exp \left(-\frac{1}{4} r^2 Q_s^2 \right) . \quad (2)$$

We refer to refs. [5] for summaries of recent predictions specifically for the p+Pb collision run at the LHC where a dense nucleus is probed by a dilute projectile.

The soft field produced in a collision of two dense nuclei is then obtained from the classical Yang-Mills equations subject to appropriate matching conditions on the light cone [6]. Right after impact longitudinal chromo-electric and magnetic fields E_z , $B_z \sim 1/g$ dominate; there is a source for B_z because the projectile and target fields do not commute [7, 8]. They fluctuate according to the random local color charge densities of the valence sources described by a quadratic effective action

$$S_{\text{eff}}[\rho^a] = \frac{\rho^a(\mathbf{x})\rho^a(\mathbf{x})}{2\mu^2} \quad , \quad \langle \rho^a(\mathbf{x}) \rho^b(\mathbf{y}) \rangle = \mu^2 \delta^{ab} \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) , \quad (3)$$

with μ^2 proportional to the thickness of a given nucleus [2]. The width of Gaussian color charge fluctuations also sets the saturation scale: $Q_s^2 \sim g^4 \mu^2$.

Before the collision the individual fields of projectile and target are 2d pure gauges,

$$\alpha_m^i = \frac{i}{g} U_m \partial^i U_m^\dagger \quad , \quad \partial^i \alpha_m^i = g \rho_m , \quad (4)$$

where $m = 1, 2$ labels projectile and target, respectively, and U_m are SU(N) fields. Eqs. (4) can be solved either analytically in an expansion in the charge density / field strength [6] or numerically on a two-dimensional lattice [9, 10]. We restrict here to a single rapidity slice and so do not consider a longitudinally extended source [11]; the parameter μ^2 in (3) is to be understood as integrated over the thickness of the source in rapidity.

The field in the forward light cone immediately after the collision, at proper time $\tau \equiv \sqrt{t^2 - z^2} \rightarrow 0$, is given by $A^i = \alpha_1^i + \alpha_2^i$ [6] in the continuum¹. This leads to [8]

$$F_{xy} = ig\epsilon^{ij} [\alpha_1^i, \alpha_2^j] \quad , \quad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = ig [A^i, B^i] \quad . \quad (5)$$

Note the presence of sources / sinks for magnetic field lines.

It has been shown recently [12] that spatial Wilson loops in the field A^i of produced soft gluons satisfy area law scaling for areas $\gtrsim 1.5/Q_s^2$. To confirm that this is due to screening of magnetic fields we consider here the two-point correlator² of the longitudinal magnetic field strength F_{xy}

$$C^{(2)}(r) = g^2 \langle \text{tr} G_{xy}(\mathbf{0}) G_{xy}(\mathbf{x}) \rangle \quad , \quad (6)$$

$$G_{xy}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv U_{\mathbf{0} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}} F_{xy}(\mathbf{x}) U_{\mathbf{0} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}}^{-1} \quad . \quad (7)$$

In the second line we perform a parallel transport of the gluon field to the origin, i.e. $U_{\mathbf{0} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}}$ denotes a product of the links along some path³ from $\mathbf{0} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}$. The ensemble average $\langle \cdot \rangle$ in eq. (6) is performed with a sum of two actions like in eq. (3); they describe valence charge fluctuations of projectile and target, respectively.

We emphasize that the propagator $C^{(2)}(r)$ is different from

$$\langle \text{tr} F_{xy}(\mathbf{0}) F_{xy}(\mathbf{x}) \rangle \quad . \quad (8)$$

The latter is not gauge invariant. In (8) the external legs interact only with the light-cone sources (the two-dimensional pure gauges) while the parallel transporters in (6,7) introduce interactions with the produced background field. Hence, the behavior of (8), for which an explicit expression is given in ref. [13], differs from that of $C^{(2)}(r)$.

The correlation function $C^{(2)}(r)$ is gauge invariant and shall be used below to define the magnetic screening scale via

$$C^{(2)}(r) \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_M} r} \exp(-m_M r) \quad . \quad (9)$$

This form corresponds to a screened propagator in $d = 2$ dimensions,

$$\int d^d p \frac{1}{p^2 + m^2} e^{-i\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \sim \frac{1}{(m r)^{(d-1)/2}} e^{-m r} \quad (m r \gtrsim 1). \quad (10)$$

¹ See ref. [9] for the corresponding expressions on the lattice.

² We denote tr the trace over fields in the fundamental representation, divided by the dimension of that representation (i.e., by the number of colors $N_c = 2$).

³ We sum over the two paths along the sides of a rectangle in the plane $z = 0$ with $\mathbf{0}$ and \mathbf{x} on diagonally opposed corners. For any particular configuration of links $G_{xy}(\mathbf{x})$ obviously is a function of the choice of path; the ensemble averaged correlator $C^{(2)}$ is independent of the path.

We should mention here that in the present setup screening masses should not be sensitive to ultraviolet cutoffs [14]. This is due to the fact that the phase space density of gluons drops like $\sim 1/k_{\perp}^4$ at high momentum [6], much more rapidly than for a classical field in thermal equilibrium ($\sim 1/|\mathbf{k}|$). Furthermore, due to the fact that the occupation number of the classical field is $\mathcal{O}(1/g^2)$, the screening mass extracted from the correlator (6) is $m^2/Q_s^2 = \mathcal{O}(g^0)$.

One may generalize eq. (6) to higher point functions such as

$$C^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = g^3 \langle \text{tr } G_{xy}(\mathbf{0}) G_{xy}(\mathbf{x}) G_{xy}(\mathbf{y}) \rangle . \quad (11)$$

However, the operator on the rhs of this equation is odd under charge conjugation \mathcal{C} of the gauge field while the action (3) is \mathcal{C} -even. Hence, for that action $C^{(3)} = 0$. Non-zero $C^{(3)}$ could be obtained for three or more colors by adding the ‘‘odderon’’ operator $\sim d^{abc} \rho^a \rho^b \rho^c$ to (3) [15]. Here we only consider SU(2) gauge fields.

The magnetic two-point correlator (6) is computed on a two-dimensional periodic lattice with N_s sites per dimension, for a given value of $\mu_L \equiv g^2 \mu a$, where a is the lattice spacing. The continuum limit is approached as $\mu_L \rightarrow 0$ which widens the correlation function $C^{(2)}$ over an increasing number of lattice sites. At the same time, to ensure that finite size effects are small we choose $\mu_L N_s \gtrsim 100$.

Fig. 1 shows the correlator of magnetic field strengths as a function of distance. The lines represent fits of the form (9). The first data point from either set was excluded from the fit as one might expect lattice discretization effects to be large; also, eq. (9) receives corrections at small mr . The fit estimates an asymptotic standard error for the mass parameter of about 10%.

The numerical data matches the 2d screened propagator rather well. We extract a surprisingly large value for the magnetic mass, $m_M \simeq (5 \pm 0.5) Q_s$, which shows that the theory linearizes only on momentum scales quite a bit beyond Q_s . In simple terms, screening arises because of the presence of effective magnetic charges mentioned above; therefore, magnetic field lines do not escape to infinity.

Using the fit to $C^{(2)}(r)$ (incl. proper normalization) in the relation [16]

$$\sigma_M = \frac{1}{2} \int d^2 r C^{(2)}(r) \quad (12)$$

reproduces the spatial string tension $\sigma_M \simeq 0.12 Q_s^2$ obtained in ref. [12] to about 15%. Eq. (12) arises in a cluster expansion of the Wilson loop [16]. The crucial point is that (12)




FIG. 1. Two point magnetic field strength correlator $C^{(2)}(r)$. We define $Q_s^2 = (C_F/2\pi) g^4 \mu^2$. Symbols show numerical results for $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills on 2048^2 (1024^2) lattices at $\mu_L \equiv g^2 \mu a = 0.1$ ($\mu_L = 0.15$). The lines represent fits (excl. the first data point) of the form $C^{(2)}(r) \sim \exp(-m r)/\sqrt{m r}$. The extracted magnetic mass is $m_M/Q_s \approx 5 \pm 0.5$.

is *independent* of the area over which one integrates as long as magnetic fields are screened over significantly shorter scales. A generalization to higher-order cumulants of field strength correlators [16] would then explain the area law scaling of spatial Wilson loops observed previously [12]. Furthermore, it would be very interesting to determine the time evolution of $C^{(2)}$ from $\tau = 0$ to $\tau \sim 1/Q_s$. Because of the rather large value of the mass it is a difficult task to ensure that on the lattice the fields propagate with (nearly) the continuum-limit frequency.

In summary, we have shown that the chromomagnetic field produced coherently in a high-energy collision of dense color charges exhibits screening. Magnetic field lines do not escape to infinity but are captured by effective sources of non-Abelian magnetic flux. We obtain a rather large magnetic mass of about 5 times the saturation scale Q_s (for $N_c = 2$ colors). Thus, in a heavy-ion collision “naive” (unscreened) perturbation theory applies only well

beyond Q_s . The rather short screening length provides an intuitive interpretation for the onset of area law scaling of the spatial Wilson loop already for radii $R \sim 0.8/Q_s$ [12]. Finally, the presence of screening effects in the initial state should be relevant for understanding kinetic processes (among hard on-shell particles) occurring right after a heavy-ion collision.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A.D. gratefully acknowledges support by the DOE Office of Nuclear Physics through Grant No. DE-FG02-09ER41620; and from The City University of New York through the PSC-CUNY Research Award Program, grants 65041-00 43 and 66514-00 44.

-
- [1] A. H. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. B **558**, 285 (1999).
 - [2] L. D. McLerran and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 2233 (1994), Phys. Rev. D **49**, 3352 (1994); Y. V. Kovchegov, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 5463 (1996).
 - [3] J. Jalilian-Marian, A. Kovner, L. D. McLerran and H. Weigert, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 5414 (1997).
 - [4] Y. V. Kovchegov and A. H. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. B **529**, 451 (1998).
 - [5] J. L. Albacete *et al.*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E Vol. **22**, 1330007 (2013) [arXiv:1301.3395 [hep-ph]]; J. L. Albacete, A. Dumitru and C. Marquet, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **28**, 1340010 (2013) [arXiv:1302.6433 [hep-ph]].
 - [6] A. Kovner, L. D. McLerran and H. Weigert, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 6231 (1995); Phys. Rev. D **52**, 3809 (1995).
 - [7] R. J. Fries, J. I. Kapusta and Y. Li, nucl-th/0604054.
 - [8] T. Lappi and L. McLerran, Nucl. Phys. A **772**, 200 (2006).
 - [9] A. Krasnitz and R. Venugopalan, Nucl. Phys. B **557**, 237 (1999).
 - [10] A. Krasnitz, Y. Nara and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 192302 (2001); T. Lappi, Phys. Rev. C **67**, 054903 (2003); Eur. Phys. J. C **55**, 285 (2008).
 - [11] K. Fukushima, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 074005 (2008).
 - [12] A. Dumitru, Y. Nara and E. Petreska, arXiv:1302.2064 [hep-ph].
 - [13] H. Fujii, K. Fukushima and Y. Hidaka, Phys. Rev. C **79**, 024909 (2009).

- [14] D. Bödeker, L. D. McLerran and A. V. Smilga, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 4675 (1995).
- [15] S. Jeon and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 105012 (2004); Phys. Rev. D **71**, 125003 (2005); A. Dumitru, J. Jalilian-Marian and E. Petreska, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 014018 (2011)
- [16] H. G. Dosch and Yu. A. Simonov, Phys. Lett. B **205**, 339 (1988); Yu. A. Simonov, Phys. Usp. **39**, 313 (1996) [Usp. Fiz. Nauk **166**, 337 (1996)] [hep-ph/9709344]; A. Di Giacomo, H. G. Dosch, V. I. Shevchenko and Yu. A. Simonov, Phys. Rept. **372**, 319 (2002);