

Bayesian Inference analysis of jet quenching using inclusive jet and hadron suppression measurements

R. Ehlers,^{1,2} Y. Chen,^{3,4,5} J. Mulligan,^{1,2} Y. Ji,⁶ A. Kumar,^{7,8,9} S. Mak,⁶ P. M. Jacobs,^{1,2} A. Majumder,⁹ A. Angerami,¹⁰ R. Arora,¹¹ S. A. Bass,¹² R. Datta,⁹ L. Du,^{8,1,2} H. Elfner,^{13,14,15} R. J. Fries,^{16,17} C. Gale,⁸ Y. He,^{18,19} B. V. Jacak,^{1,2} S. Jeon,⁸ F. Jonas,^{1,2} L. Kasper,⁵ M. Kordell II,^{16,17} R. Kunnawalkam-Elayavalli,⁵ J. Latessa,¹¹ Y.-J. Lee,^{3,4} R. Lemmon,²⁰ M. Luzum,²¹ A. Mankolli,⁵ C. Martin,²² H. Mehryar,¹¹ T. Mengel,²² C. Nattrass,²² J. Norman,²³ C. Parker,^{16,17} J.-F. Paquet,⁵ J. H. Putschke,⁹ H. Roch,⁹ G. Roland,^{3,4} B. Schenke,²⁴ L. Schwiebert,¹¹ A. Sengupta,^{16,17} C. Shen,^{9,25} M. Singh,⁵ C. Sirimanna,^{9,12} D. Soeder,²⁶ R. A. Soltz,^{9,10} I. Soudi,^{9,27,28} Y. Tachibana,²⁹ J. Velkovska,⁵ G. Vujanovic,⁷ X.-N. Wang,^{30,1,2} X. Wu,^{8,9} and W. Zhao^{9,1,2}

(The JETSCAPE Collaboration)

¹*Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley CA 94270.*

²*Nuclear Science Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley CA 94270.*

³*Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge MA 02139.*

⁴*Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge MA 02139.*

⁵*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Vanderbilt University, Nashville TN 37235.*

⁶*Department of Statistical Science, Duke University, Durham NC 27708.*

⁷*Department of Physics, University of Regina, Regina, SK S4S 0A2, Canada.*

⁸*Department of Physics, McGill University, Montréal QC H3A 2T8, Canada.*

⁹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Wayne State University, Detroit MI 48201.*

¹⁰*Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore CA 94550.*

¹¹*Department of Computer Science, Wayne State University, Detroit MI 48202.*

¹²*Department of Physics, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708, USA*

¹³*GSI Helmholtzzentrum für Schwerionenforschung, 64291 Darmstadt, Germany.*

¹⁴*Institute for Theoretical Physics, Goethe University, 60438 Frankfurt am Main, Germany.*

¹⁵*Frankfurt Institute for Advanced Studies, 60438 Frankfurt am Main, Germany.*

¹⁶*Cyclotron Institute, Texas A&M University, College Station TX 77843.*

¹⁷*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Texas A&M University, College Station TX 77843.*

¹⁸*Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Nuclear Science, Institute of Quantum Matter, South China Normal University, Guangzhou 510006, China.*

¹⁹*Guangdong-Hong Kong Joint Laboratory of Quantum Matter, Southern Nuclear Science Computing Center, South China Normal University, Guangzhou 510006, China.*

²⁰*Daresbury Laboratory, Daresbury, Warrington, Cheshire, WA44AD, United Kingdom.*

²¹*Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, C.P. 66318, 05315-970 São Paulo, SP, Brazil.*

²²*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Tennessee, Knoxville TN 37996.*

²³*Oliver Lodge Laboratory, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom.*

²⁴*Physics Department, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton NY 11973.*

²⁵*RIKEN BNL Research Center, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton NY 11973.*

²⁶*Department of Physics, Duke University, Durham NC 27708.*

²⁷*University of Jyväskylä, Department of Physics,*

P.O. Box 35, FI-40014 University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

²⁸*Helsinki Institute of Physics, P.O. Box 64, FI-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland.*

²⁹*Akita International University, Yuwa, Akita-city 010-1292, Japan.*

³⁰*Key Laboratory of Quark and Lepton Physics (MOE) and Institute of Particle Physics, Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079, China.*

(Dated: August 29, 2024)

The JETSCAPE Collaboration reports a new determination of the jet transport parameter \hat{q} in the Quark-Gluon Plasma (QGP) using Bayesian Inference, incorporating all available inclusive hadron and jet yield suppression data measured in heavy-ion collisions at RHIC and the LHC. This multi-observable analysis extends the previously published JETSCAPE Bayesian Inference determination of \hat{q} , which was based solely on a selection of inclusive hadron suppression data. JETSCAPE is a modular framework incorporating detailed dynamical models of QGP formation and evolution, and jet propagation and interaction in the QGP. Virtuality-dependent partonic energy loss in the QGP is modeled as a thermalized weakly-coupled plasma, with parameters determined from Bayesian calibration using soft-sector observables. This Bayesian calibration of \hat{q} utilizes Active Learning, a machine-learning approach, for efficient exploitation of computing resources. The experimental data included in this analysis span a broad range in collision energy and centrality, and in transverse momentum. In order to explore the systematic dependence of the extracted parameter posterior distributions, several different calibrations are reported, based on combined jet and hadron data; on jet or hadron data separately; and on restricted kinematic or centrality ranges of the jet and hadron

data. Tension is observed in comparison of these variations, providing new insights into the physics of jet transport in the QGP and its theoretical formulation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Strongly-interacting matter at high energy density forms a deconfined Quark-Gluon Plasma [1, 2]. Numerical calculations using Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) on a lattice predict that equilibrated matter with zero baryo-chemical potential has a cross-over transition to a QGP at temperature $T_C \approx 155$ MeV [3–7]. However, the deconfined QGP has fewer degrees of freedom than the Stefan-Boltzmann limit of a non-interacting gas of partons (quarks and gluons) up to much higher temperature than T_C , indicating that its constituents have significant interactions.

The QGP filled the early universe a few micro-seconds after the Big Bang, and it is recreated today in energetic collisions of heavy atomic nuclei at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) at CERN and the Relativistic Heavy-Ion Collider (RHIC) at Brookhaven National Laboratory [1, 2]. Experimental measurements at these facilities, and their comparison to theoretical calculations, show that the QGP flows as a fluid with very small specific shear viscosity [8–11] and is opaque to the passage of energetic color charges [12–14].

Jets in hadronic collisions arise from the hard (high momentum-transfer Q^2) interaction of partons from the projectiles. The scattered partons are initially highly virtual, coming on-shell by radiation of a gluon shower which manifests in a collimated spray of hadrons that is observable experimentally. Jet production and jet structure have been measured extensively at colliders, with high-order perturbative QCD (pQCD) calculations in excellent agreement with the data [15–26].

In nuclear collisions, hard-scattered partons are generated prior to formation of the QGP and interact with it; such interactions modify observed jet production rates and jet structure relative to those in vacuum (“jet quenching”) [12–14]. Of especial note is energy loss due to jet quenching, in which jet–QGP interactions induce energy transfer away from the hardest jet shower branch for inclusive hadron production, or outside of the jet cone for reconstructed jets. Such energy loss is often measured as R_{AA} , which is the ratio of inclusive hadron or jet production yields at the same transverse momentum (p_T) in A + A and pp collisions, scaled to account for nuclear geometric effects [13]. A value $R_{AA} \sim 1$ indicates negligible jet quenching effects, whereas $R_{AA} \ll 1$ (i.e. inclusive yield suppression) indicates significant energy loss due to jet quenching.

Jet quenching effects are likewise calculable theoretically, and comparisons of jet quenching calculations and measurements provide unique probes of the structure and dynamics of the QGP [12–14, 27]. Jet quenching calculations incorporate elastic and radiative interactions of the jet-initiating parton and its gluon shower with the QGP.

Various theoretical frameworks have been developed for calculating radiative interactions, using different approximation schemes: AMY based on a Hard Thermal Loop approach [28, 29]; BDMPS, which uses a soft radiation approximation [30–36]; GLV, which utilizes an opacity expansion [37–39]; and Higher-Twist [40, 41]. Comparison of different theoretical formulations of \hat{q} is presented in Ref. [27]. Jet quenching models may also include the QGP response to jet energy dissipated in the interaction [42, 43].

Comparison of jet quenching calculations with experimental data has been used to constrain the QGP jet transport coefficient \hat{q} [12–14], which characterizes the momentum transfer between an energetic partonic probe and the QGP. These constraints are commonly expressed in terms of the distribution of \hat{q}/T^3 , where T is the QGP temperature, in order to factor out the expected leading T dependence of \hat{q} (the density of scattering centers in a thermal medium varies approximately as T^3). Current constraints on \hat{q}/T^3 incorporate only a limited subset of available jet quenching measurements: hadron R_{AA} [44–48]; hadron R_{AA} , and di-hadron and γ -hadron correlations [49]; or selected hadron and jet R_{AA} [50]; these different analyses generate inconsistent constraints, however, due to differing modelling assumptions and approximations, and different data selection [14]. A key question is to determine whether \hat{q}/T^3 is a universal property of the QGP, whose extracted distribution is independent of how it is probed.

This paper presents a new determination of \hat{q}/T^3 using the multi-stage JETSCAPE framework [51], which incorporates a detailed 2+1 D hydrodynamic model with parameters determined by Bayesian calibration of soft observables [52], and with virtuality-dependent jet quenching calculated using the MATTER [53, 54] and LBT [55–58] models. Constraints on \hat{q}/T^3 are determined by Bayesian Inference, incorporating all inclusive hadron and inclusive jet R_{AA} measurements for central and semi-central A + A collisions at the LHC and RHIC published prior to February 2022. This Bayesian calibration is computationally expensive, however, requiring simulations spanning a large parameter space, and a machine-learning based approach, called Active Learning [59–62], is utilized for efficient exploitation of computing resources.

Consistency of \hat{q}/T^3 posterior distributions extracted solely from hadron or jet R_{AA} , from different kinematic ranges, and from different centrality intervals, is explored for the first time. This study demonstrates the discriminating power of such a multi-observable approach, and points towards yet broader future studies.

The paper is structured as follows: Sect. II presents the JETSCAPE physics; Sect. III presents details of the simulations, the experimental measurements used in the analysis, and the subsequent Bayesian Inference; Sect. IV

presents the analysis results, including differential comparisons; and Sect. V presents the summary and conclusions.

II. PHYSICS MODEL

A. Factorization

Analytic QCD calculations of high Q^2 processes are based on factorization, i.e. division into sub-processes at different momentum scales, each of which is characterized by a probability distribution that does not depend on other sub-processes and whose interface is characterized by a few parameters. Factorization is applicable for inclusive jet production in pp collisions at high energy, whose factorized cross section is written [63–66]:

$$\frac{d^3\sigma}{dyd^2p_T} = \int dx_a dx_b G(x_a, \mu^2) G(x_b, \mu^2) \frac{d\hat{\sigma}}{d\hat{t}} \frac{J(z, \mu^2)}{\pi z} \quad (1)$$

where $G(x, \mu^2)$ is the parton distribution function (PDF) for a parton carrying a fraction x of the forward light-cone momentum of the proton; $\hat{\sigma}$ is the partonic cross section as a function of Mandelstam variable \hat{t} ; $J(z, \mu^2)$ is the jet function which specifies the multiplicity of jets carrying a momentum fraction z of the forward momentum; and $\mu \gg \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ is the scale at which G and J are evaluated. The inclusive hadron production cross section is obtained by replacing $J(z, \mu^2)$ by the Fragmentation Function $D(z, \mu^2)$, with the hadron carrying the momentum fraction z . Evaluation of these cross sections can also be carried out using Monte Carlo event generators which produce multi-particle states that model the events recorded by collider experiments.

Model calculations in this analysis are carried out using the JETSCAPE framework [51], in which distinct simulation modules calculate each independent element of the factorized process and are combined sequentially for the simulation of complete pp or A + A collisions. The initial state radiation and hard scattering are simulated using PYTHIA (8.235 default tune) [67] with Final State Radiation (FSR) turned off. Final state radiation in pp collisions is calculated using the MATTER generator [53, 54]. A separate instance of the PYTHIA generator is used for hadronization of hard processes. See Ref. [68] for calculational details, comparison with pp data, and the full parameters of the JETSCAPE PP19 tune parameters used in this analysis.

B. Simulation of A + A collisions

The calculation of jet interactions in the QGP generated in A + A collisions requires simulation of the creation and evolution of bulk matter which is calculated first, followed by simulation of hard parton showers which propagate in the evolving bulk medium. For the bulk

simulation, the initial nucleon and energy distributions are calculated using the TRENTO model [69]. The system initially evolves by free streaming [70] for a period τ_R , followed by a viscous fluid dynamic stage corresponding to the expansion and cooling of the hot QGP that is simulated by Israel-Stewart transient hydrodynamics, as implemented in the VISHNU code [71, 72]. When an element of the QGP cools below a switching temperature T_{SW} , it is hadronized using the Cooper-Frye approach [73]. Subsequent multiple scattering of hadrons is simulated using the URQMD model [74, 75]. The bulk matter was simulated with parameters corresponding to the maximum a posteriori determined in Ref. [52], which produces similar bulk properties to those obtained in a previous JETSCAPE Bayesian analysis [9, 10]. The existing profiles are utilized for expediency. These parameters include those of the TRENTO model of initial conditions; the time of transition from free streaming to hydrodynamics; parameters specifying the temperature dependence of the shear and bulk viscosities; and parameters of bulk hadronization. See Ref. [76] for details.

For A + A collisions, the geometric distribution of hard-scattering processes within the QGP is determined by sampling the distribution of nucleon-nucleon collisions generated by TRENTO. Initial-state radiation prior to the hard scattering and the hard scattering itself are modeled using the PYTHIA generator, as described above for pp collisions. Final-state radiation, both in-vacuum and in-medium, is simulated by other Monte Carlo models, as described below. The off-shellness or virtuality of a parton generated in a hard interaction is typically of the order of (though smaller than) its energy. In vacuum, a hard parton decays in a cascade of progressively lower-energy and lower-virtuality partons. This process continues until the virtuality of the partons reaches a scale at which interactions are non-perturbative. While the partonic cascade at large scales ($\mu \gg \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$) can be described using perturbation theory, the soft stage of the shower must be treated non-perturbatively, typically by a hadronization model. In this paper, hard sector hadronization will be carried out as in Ref. [76], and none of the parameters of hadronization will be included in the Bayesian analysis.

C. Specification of \hat{q}

The presence of a hot, dense medium modifies this cascade-like decay of a hard virtual parton, corresponding to jet quenching. In this case, partons in the developing cascade scatter from constituents in the medium, leading to the emission of more partons, with consequent re-distribution of the energy of the shower to wider angles than in vacuum. This process is characterized by the transport coefficient \hat{q} , which is the mean square transverse momentum exchanged between a parton and the medium per unit length traversed,




FIG. 1. Left: Single scattering of a hard parton with a gluon in the Quark-Gluon Plasma. In this diagram the hard parton is a quark and the medium parton is a gluon, but calculations also include hard gluons and quarks in the QGP. Right: The same process described in HTL effective theory, which is used to calculate \hat{q} .

$$\hat{q} = \frac{\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle_L}{L} \xrightarrow{\text{Scatterings}} \frac{1}{L} \left\langle \left(\sum_j^{N_{\text{scat}}} \vec{k}_{\perp,j} \right)^2 \right\rangle \xrightarrow{\lambda_{\text{corr}} < \lambda_{\text{mfp}}} \frac{1}{L} \sum_j^{N_{\text{scat}}} \langle k_{\perp,j}^2 \rangle. \quad (2)$$

In this equation, the second expression applies if the transverse momentum exchange can be decomposed into separate scatterings with constituents in the medium, where N_{scat} is the number of scatterings in a length L . The notation $\langle \dots \rangle$ indicates averaging over an ensemble of events used in a jet quenching measurement or a Monte Carlo simulation, or the sum over theoretical configurations in a semi-analytical or lattice calculation. Different choices of L yield different averages over the medium. For a static medium the choice of L is largely irrelevant, since \hat{q} is the same everywhere. For a dynamically evolving medium, a large value of L will average over a range of temperatures, while a very short value of L will approach a local quantity but requires many events (configurations) to produce sufficient statistics. The third expression applies if the in-medium correlation length λ_{corr} is less than the scattering mean free path λ_{mfp} , such that successive scatterings do not interfere significantly. This is typically assumed in jet quenching calculations, reducing the contribution to \hat{q} from N_{scat} multiple scatterings to the simple sum of N_{scat} single scatterings.

In a field-theoretic calculation of a parton scattering off a gluon field in a locally thermalized medium with temperature T , the single-scattering limit of \hat{q} corresponds to the Fourier transform of the correlation of gluon field strength tensors,

$$\hat{q} = \frac{16\pi\alpha_s\sqrt{2}C_R}{(N_C^2 - 1)} \int \frac{dy^- d^2y_{\perp}}{(2\pi)^3} d^2k_{\perp} e^{-i\frac{\vec{k}_{\perp}^2}{2q^+}y^- + i\vec{k}_{\perp} \cdot \vec{y}_{\perp}} \times \sum_n \langle n | \frac{e^{-E_n/T}}{Z} \text{Tr}[F^{+j}(0)F_j^+(y^-, y_{\perp})] | n \rangle, \quad (3)$$

where C_R is the representation-specific Casimir factor (for a quark, $C_R = C_F = (N_C^2 - 1)/(2N_C)$), and α_s is

the strong coupling constant at the scattering vertex of the hard quark and gluon field. States of the ensemble are represented by $|n\rangle$, and $F^{\mu\nu} = t^a F^{a\mu\nu}$ is the bare gauge field-strength tensor (with $j = 1, 2$ denoting transverse directions). The use of gauge links on the two field strength tensors, as in Ref. [77], will render the above expression gauge invariant. If the states $|n\rangle$ are replaced with a plasma of quarks and gluons and weak coupling is assumed to be applicable, at least for the purposes of jet modification, then the expectation in Eq. (3) can be calculated analytically.

Figure 1 shows the single scattering process in the QGP experienced by a hard parton, which modifies its evolving shower. The left diagram shows a hard quark scattering from a gluon in the QGP. The right diagram shows this process as implemented in Hard Thermal Loop (HTL) effective theory [78, 79], which assumes that the QGP is a thermalized, weakly-coupled QCD plasma. The gray circle is the HTL self-energy. In this approach, \hat{q} is expressed to Leading Order (LO) in the coupling as

$$\frac{\hat{q}^{\text{HTL}}}{T^3} = C_a \frac{50.48}{\pi} \alpha_s^{\text{run}} \alpha_s^{\text{fix}} \log \left[\frac{2ET}{6\pi T^2 \alpha_s^{\text{fix}}} \right]. \quad (4)$$

Next-to-leading-order (NLO) corrections to Eq. 4 have been calculated [80], with the perturbative series found to have poor convergence properties. This issue is discussed further in Sect. IV.

The scaling of \hat{q} by $1/T^3$ in Eq. 4 factors out its leading T dependence, as discussed above, and \hat{q}/T^3 is the expression extracted in the Bayesian Inference analysis. The functional dependence of \hat{q}/T^3 on E/T is specified, while the specific contributions of T to the numerator and denominator of the logarithmic argument are also shown separately to clarify their origin. The temperature T varies spatially and temporally within the evolving QGP, and in simulations its local value is determined from the pre-calibrated simulation of the bulk medium.

Eq. 4 incorporates two different values of the strong coupling α_s , denoted as α_s^{run} and α_s^{fix} . This is a consequence of letting all couplings run from the thermal and Debye scales $T, m_D \simeq gT \lesssim 1$ GeV, up to the hard scale $\bar{\mu} \approx \sqrt{2ET}$, where E is the energy of the jet parton. The value of α_s^{fix} is taken as the coupling at the soft thermal Debye scale, and is referred to below simply as α_s . The coupling at the hard scale ($\bar{\mu} \simeq \sqrt{2ET}$), α_s^{run} is defined as

$$\alpha_s^{\text{run}}(\mu^2) = \frac{12\pi}{[11N_c - 2N_f]} \frac{1}{\log \left(\frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2} \right)}, \quad (5)$$

where Λ is chosen such that $\alpha_s^{\text{run}}(\mu^2 \leq 1\text{GeV}^2) = \alpha_s^{\text{fix}}$.

Multiple scattering of a hard parton in a medium raises its virtuality. For parton lifetime τ , the total increase in virtuality is estimated to be [30]:

$$\mu_{\text{med}}^2 \simeq \hat{q}\tau. \quad (6)$$

For parton virtuality much larger than μ_{med} , emissions are mostly vacuum-like, with minor modification from rare scatterings in the medium (denoted the “high-virtuality” stage). As the virtuality of cascading partons approaches μ_{med} , they enter the stage of multiple scatterings per emission with a significant increase in the magnitude of energy loss (denoted the “low-virtuality” stage). In this analysis, simulations at high virtuality stage are carried out using the MATTER generator [53, 54], while simulations at low virtuality stage are carried out using the LBT generator [81].

Equation (4) specifies \hat{q} for both the MATTER model (high virtuality) and LBT model (low virtuality). The diagrams in Fig. 1 are used to calculate both \hat{q} and the distribution of recoil partons. The outgoing gluon (cut gluon line in the left diagram) is a recoil parton which is tracked by the simulation and is included in the calculation of fragmentation into jet hadrons.

In the high-virtuality stage, the small transverse size of the highly virtual radiating antenna causes typical scatterings to not resolve the antenna, which is referred to as the “coherence effect” in jet quenching [82, 83]. This effectively reduces the interaction between the medium and the hard partons. However, in the implementation of this effect there is usually no interaction in the high virtuality phase, in which case the evolving shower undergoes a sudden shift from no interaction to full interaction as it transitions from the high to low-virtuality stage [84].

In contrast, this analysis utilizes an implementation of coherence in which interaction with the medium increases with decreasing virtuality of the hard parton [76, 85, 86]. This goes beyond the typical reduction of the medium-induced emission kernel at high virtuality. The medium-induced portion of the gluon emission kernel is suppressed by the square of the hard scale. This can be seen in the gluon emission rate from at most one rescattering, expressed for gluons carrying a lightcone momentum q^+y , and transverse momentum $\mu\sqrt{y(1-y)}$ from a quark with lightcone momentum q^+ (using the higher-twist formalism) as,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dN_g}{dyd\mu^2} &= \frac{\alpha_s(\mu^2)}{2\pi\mu^2} P(y) \left[1 + \int d\xi^+ \frac{\hat{q}(\mu^2)}{\mu^2 y(1-y)} \right. \\ &\times \left. \left\{ 2 - 2 \cos \left(\frac{\mu^2}{2q^+} \xi^+ \right) \right\} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The length integral ξ^+ is carried out from the origin of a parton to its formation length $\tau = 2q^+/\mu^2$, at which point it will decay by radiating a gluon. The term with value unity in the square brackets represents the vacuum like contribution. The factor $P(y)$ is the unregulated vacuum splitting function.

At large virtuality μ^2 the second term in square brackets is negligible, with its contribution growing as μ^2 approaches $\hat{q}\tau$. At $\mu^2 \simeq \hat{q}\tau$ the second term is as large as the first term, at which point the parton is transitioned to the lower virtuality stage of the calculation that only includes medium-induced contributions to parton splitting. In the simulations presented below this transition

occurs at the scale Q_0 , which is a parameter of the model: partons with virtuality $\mu > Q_0$ are treated as high virtuality, while partons with $\mu \leq Q_0$ are treated as low virtuality.

In addition to its $1/\mu^2$ dependence, \hat{q} is also reduced by coherence effects at higher virtuality. In Ref. [85], the weakening of the interaction between the jet and the medium with increasing virtuality is derived using the effective parton distribution function (PDF) of an incoming parton from the QGP (Fig. 1). The weakening of the interaction with the medium is parametrized in this study as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{q}(\mu^2) &= f(\mu^2) \hat{q}^{\text{HTL}} \\ f(\mu^2) &= N \frac{e^{c_3 \left(1 - \frac{\mu^2}{2ME}\right)} - 1}{1 + c_1 \log \left(\frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2} \right) + c_2 \log^2 \left(\frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2} \right)}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $N = 1/f(Q_0^2)$; in the low virtuality phase this reduces to \hat{q}^{HTL} . The value of M is taken to be the proton mass. The parameter c_3 governs the value of \hat{q} at large μ^2 , and influences its evolution as a function of μ^2 . The same factor f is also multiplied with the scattering cross section between hard and recoiling medium parton (Fig. 1), so that the recoil distribution is consistent with the effective value of \hat{q} .

D. Comparison to other \hat{q} formulations

Eq. (3) shows that, in the single-scattering limit, \hat{q} is not entirely an intrinsic property of the medium. Rather, it depends on the medium temperature through the thermal partition weight. It also depends on the parton energy q^- , and the hard-parton flavor (quark or gluon) via the Casimir factor. Operator products, such as the product of field strength tensors, must be renormalized, thereby becoming scheme and scale-dependent. Thus, in this framework, \hat{q} is a scheme-dependent quantity which depends on all relevant scales in the calculation, including the medium temperature, and the energy and virtuality of the hard parton. Its calculation and extraction from comparison with data will also depend on the dynamical modeling of the thermal medium that is employed.

A comparison of different theoretical formalisms to describe jet quenching was given in Ref. [27]. Elucidation of the differences of these formulations in practice requires comparison of their quantitative constraints on \hat{q}/T^3 , whose current status is presented in Ref. [14]. This section recalls for reference the formalism used in the previous JETSCAPE Bayesian calibration of \hat{q}/T^3 [47], to which we compare the the current analysis in Sect. IV G.

The jet quenching calculation in Ref. [47] likewise applies a multi-stage approach as a function of parton virtuality, utilizing MATTER for the high-virtuality phase and LBT for the low-virtuality phase. However, its most significant difference from the current analysis is its treatment of the virtuality dependence of \hat{q}/T^3 : rather than a

continuous decrease with increasing virtuality μ^2 (Eq. 8), \hat{q}/T^3 actually increases with increasing virtuality in the high virtuality MATTER stage.

$$\frac{\hat{q}(\mu, E, T)|_{Q_0, A, C, D}}{T^3} = 42C_R \frac{\zeta(3)}{\pi} \left(\frac{4\pi}{9}\right)^2 \left\{ \frac{A \left[\log\left(\frac{\mu}{\Lambda}\right) - \log\left(\frac{Q_0}{\Lambda}\right) \right]}{\left[\log\left(\frac{\mu}{\Lambda}\right) \right]^2} \theta(\mu - Q_0) + \frac{C \left[\log\left(\frac{E}{T}\right) - \log(D) \right]}{\left[\log\left(\frac{ET}{\Lambda^2}\right) \right]^2} \right\}. \quad (9)$$

This formulation has four parameters: Q_0 , A , C , and D . The first term in Eq. 9 is dependent only on the parton virtuality μ , but not the medium temperature T ; it is sensitive to the high-virtuality phase and is largely driven by the MATTER model simulation. The second term is dependent upon both E and T , and is largely driven by the LBT model simulation. The θ function which scales the first term makes explicit the switching between them, at virtuality Q_0 . See Ref. [47] for further discussion.

III. BAYESIAN INFERENCE

Bayesian Inference is applied to constrain the following model parameters:

- α_s (denoted α_s^{fix} in Eq. 4), the coupling at the soft scale. Prior is uniform over $0.1 \leq \alpha_s \leq 0.5$.
- Q_0 , the transition scale between the lower and higher virtuality stages of the simulation, that can be interpreted as the average value of $\hat{q}\tau$. Prior is uniform over $1 \text{ GeV} \leq Q_0 \leq 10 \text{ GeV}$.
- τ_0 , the start time of jet modification. Prior is uniform over $0 \leq \tau_0 \leq 1.5 \text{ fm}/c$.
- Parameters c_1, c_2, c_3 (Eq. 8), which control the modification of \hat{q} with increasing virtuality. Priors are uniform in the logarithm of each parameter in the ranges $-5 \leq \log(c_{1,2}) \leq \log(10)$ and $-3 \leq \log(c_3) \leq \log(100)$.

Prior distributions were determined by incorporating prior physics knowledge and approximate studies of the sensitivity of \hat{q} to changes in c_1 , c_2 and c_3 .

A multi-dimensional normal distribution is used for the likelihood term. Following the procedure in Ref. [47], a Markov Chain Monte Carlo procedure [87] is employed to explore the parameter space to determine the parameter posterior distributions. However, direct computation of all choices of parameter values with the precision required to perform Bayesian Inference is prohibitively expensive. Instead, simulations are performed at selected coordinates in parameter space (referred to as “design points”), with a Gaussian Process Emulator (GPE) trained to interpolate between design points. The GPE serves as a

We focus here specifically on the “MATTER + LBT2” parametrization [47], whose results are compared to those of the current analysis in Sect. IV:

computational fast surrogate model for calculations in parameter space.

A. Simulations

Simulations were carried out using JETSCAPE v3.5¹, employing the physics modules described in Sec. II. Each event propagates partons from a single hard scattering through a 2+1D calibrated medium [52]. We utilized 20–40 pre-computed medium profiles per 1% interval in centrality, randomly selecting a single profile for each separate hard scattering event.

At each design point, simulations were performed for all collision energies of the datasets considered (Sect. III B), taking into account the fiducial and kinematic acceptances of each measurement. Since the final-state hadrons of each event have been recorded, additional observables can be explored in future analyses. To optimize the utilization of computing resources, the number of simulated events was chosen so that the statistical precision of key calculated observables matched the magnitude of corresponding experimental uncertainties.

These simulations required $\mathcal{O}(5000-10000)$ core-hours per design point per collision energy on nodes with two AMD EPYC 7742 processors, which have 64 cores per processor. Calculations are highly parallel and have significant IO requirements for loading pre-computed hydrodynamic profiles and storing all final-state hadrons. The computations were run on three high-performance computing facilities [88–90] and stored on the Open Storage Network [91].

An active-learning sampling scheme [59] was used for strategic selection of design points for simulation. Active learning is a growing area in machine learning, which addresses the challenge of limited sample sizes by using the trained learning model to query subsequent sample points [60–62]. In this analysis an active learning procedure sequentially selects batches of design points for simulation, guided by the trained Gaussian Process Emulator discussed below.

The active learning algorithm proceeds as follows. Given a total budget of 230 design points, we first se-

¹ JETSCAPE v3.5 was slightly modified to use PYTHIA 8.235

lect an initial batch of 40 design points using a Latin hypercube design [92], which provides a uniform coverage of the parameter space. The simulated hadron and jet R_{AA} at these initial design points are then used to train an initial GPE model. With this model in hand, the trained emulator is used to select a new batch of 20–40 design points for subsequent simulation. These points are optimized via a weighted sampling approach called importance support points (ISPs; [93, 94]), which targets two properties. First, such points mimic the probability distribution $[\sigma^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})]^l / \int [\sigma^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})]^l d\boldsymbol{\theta}$, where $\sigma^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the predictive variance of the GPE at parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ over all observables. As such, new design points should target regions of the parameter space where $\sigma^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is large, i.e., where the GPE is most uncertain. Second, given this distributional constraint, ISPs target design points that are well spaced-out, thereby exploring the parameter space; such a space-filling property allows for good predictive performance for GPEs [95]. This captures the exploration-exploitation trade-off fundamental to reinforcement learning [96]; in our experiments, $l = 10$ appears to provide a good trade-off. We then iterate the steps of GPE training, ISP optimization and event simulation until the desired run size is reached. The final 30 design points are taken from a separate Latin hypercube design as a validation set.

In summary, the simulations in this analysis required $\mathcal{O}(5.5)$ million CPU core-hours. Following the completion of the simulation campaign, including observable calculation, post-processing, and quality assurance checks, we then convert the simulations into a form suitable for Bayesian inference. In order to focus on the primary features of the model space, to reduce sensitivity to statistical fluctuations, and to improve numerical efficiency, a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) is performed. The number of features to retain was determined via a sensitivity study, with selection criteria requiring good description of the feature variance of the physical observables while reducing sensitivity to random fluctuations. Each feature is modeled with a separate GPE. The uncertainties in the prediction from the GPE are added to their experimental counterparts when comparing to data.

B. Experimental datasets

This analysis incorporates a broad set of inclusive hadron and jet R_{AA} measurements at RHIC and the LHC, for Au–Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 0.2$ TeV and Pb–Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ and 5.02 TeV. Due to the large-scale computational nature of the analysis, it was necessary to impose a cutoff date on the data considered. All such measurements which were published or submitted for publication prior to Feb. 2022 are in-

cluded in the analysis, corresponding to 729 data points². In comparison, the previous Bayesian calibration of \hat{q} by JETSCAPE [47] was based only on inclusive hadron R_{AA} data from a limited set of measurements [98–100], corresponding to 66 data points.

Tables I and II show the datasets used in the analysis, for inclusive hadron R_{AA} and inclusive jet R_{AA} respectively. To account for the range of model applicability, the analyzed centrality and kinematic ranges specified in the tables do not always correspond to the full range of the published data. This analysis only uses measurements in the centrality range 0 – 50%, and inclusive hadron R_{AA} is used only in the range $p_T > 9$ GeV/ c . These limitations will be relaxed in future analyses.

The analysis utilizes the statistical and systematic uncertainties specified in the experimental publications. While the uncertainty covariance matrix is required for Bayesian Inference, it is typically not provided in the experimental publications. The uncertainty covariance matrix is therefore estimated where possible based on publicly available information, with separate treatment of statistical uncertainty and source-by-source systematic uncertainties. If insufficient information is available for this estimate from the publication for any given source, an uncertainty correlation length is employed, as described in Ref. [47]. The covariance for these sources in this case can be written as

$$\Sigma_{k,i,j} = \sigma_{k,i}\sigma_{k,j} \exp \left[- \left| \frac{p_{k,i} - p_{k,j}}{\ell_k} \right|^2 \right], \quad (10)$$

where $p_{k,i}$ is the i^{th} p_T value of experimental measurement k and ℓ_k is the covariance length, with a nominal value of 0.2. The $p_{k,i}$ transverse momentum values are linearly rescaled so that all values from the given measurement lie within $[0, 1]$. The systematic uncertainties of different data sets are assumed to be independent, with the exception of uncertainties in the luminosity and nuclear thickness calculations for inclusive jet and leading hadron measurements by a single experiment at a given collision energy. However, these uncertainties are negligible compared to others, and for this reason they are not treated differently. The covariance matrices constructed from different sources are then added together to form the total covariance matrix.

IV. RESULTS

Initial comparison of calculations utilizing a virtuality-dependent formulation of \hat{q} (Sect. II C) with a limited

² The most recent ATLAS hadron R_{AA} measurement [97] was published after the cutoff date and is not considered in the analysis.

Inclusive hadron R_{AA}					
Collab./ref.	System; $\sqrt{s_{NN}}$ [TeV]	Species	Accept.	centr. %	p_T range [GeV/c]
STAR [101]	Au–Au; 0.2	charged	$ \eta < 0.5$	[0,40]	[9,12]
ALICE [102]	Pb–Pb; 2.76, 5.02	charged	$ \eta < 0.8$	[0,50]	[9,50]
ATLAS [99]	Pb–Pb; 2.76	charged	$ \eta < 2$	[0,40]	[9,150]
CMS [103]	Pb–Pb; 2.76	charged	$ \eta < 1.0$	[0,50]	[9,100]
CMS [100]	Pb–Pb; 5.02	charged	$ \eta < 1.0$	[0,50]	[9,400]
PHENIX [104]	Au–Au; 0.2	π^0	$ \eta < 0.35$	[0,50]	[9,20]
ALICE [105, 106]	Pb–Pb; 2.76	π^0	$ \eta < 0.7$	[0,50]	[9,20]
ALICE [107, 108]	Pb–Pb; 2.76	π^\pm	$ \eta < 0.8$	[0,40]	[9,20]
ALICE [109]	Pb–Pb; 5.02	π^\pm	$ \eta < 0.8$	[0,50]	[9,20]

TABLE I. Datasets used in the analysis: inclusive hadron R_{AA} .

Inclusive jet R_{AA}						
Collab./ref.	System; $\sqrt{s_{NN}}$ [TeV]	type	R	Accept.	centr. %	p_T range [GeV/c]
STAR [110]	Au–Au; 0.2	charged	[0.2,0.4]	$ \eta < 1 - R$	[0,10]	[15,30]
ALICE [111]	Pb–Pb; 2.76	full	0.2	$ \eta < 0.5$	[0,30]	[30,100]
ALICE [22]	Pb–Pb; 5.02	full	0.2,0.4	$ \eta < 0.5$	[0,10]	[40,140]
ATLAS [112]	Pb–Pb; 2.76	full	0.4	$ \eta < 2.1$	[0,50]	[32,500]
ATLAS [113]	Pb–Pb; 5.02	full	0.4	$ \eta < 2.8$	[0,50]	[50,1000]
CMS [114]	Pb–Pb; 2.76	full	[0.2,0.4]	$ \eta < 2.0$	[0,50]	[70,300]
CMS [115]	Pb–Pb; 5.02	full	[0.2,1.0]	$ \eta < 2.0$	[0,50]	[200,1000]


TABLE II. Datasets used in the analysis: inclusive jet R_{AA} .

FIG. 2. Parameter posterior distributions (diagonal) and parameter–parameter correlations (off-diagonal), determined by the combined analysis of inclusive hadron and jet R_{AA} data (blue), or inclusive hadron R_{AA} only (red). Parameters c_1 and c_2 are not constrained significantly by the calibration and their distributions are not shown here; Fig. 10 shows the full set of parameter posterior distributions and correlations.

subset of data, and without comprehensive parameter

assessment based on Bayesian Inference, is provided in Ref. [76]. In this section, the multi-observable nature and kinematic range of the data are utilized to explore systematic sensitivity of posterior distributions to choice of observable and phase-space coverage. If \hat{q} is a universal property of the QGP and the employed theoretical framework is accurate, then the posterior distributions should be consistent for variations in choice of observable and phase space coverage. An observation of tension in posterior distributions with such variations could arise from limitations in the theoretical formulation of \hat{q} , including its dependence on E and T , and limitations in the QGP model that is used in the bulk simulations. Tension may also indicate that interpretation of \hat{q} as an intensive property of the medium is not strictly correct.

Posterior distributions of \hat{q} are presented in terms of \hat{q}/T^3 . Differential studies of posterior distributions are presented for several choices of observable, phase space coverage, and event centrality. In order to compare calibrations, the posterior distribution of \hat{q}/T^3 is shown for a reference quark energy $E_{\text{ref}} = 100$ GeV, either as a function of T or at a reference temperature $T_{\text{ref}} = 200$ MeV.

A. Posterior distributions

The model parameters which are calibrated by Bayesian Inference are presented in Sect. III. The baseline calibration, denoted “Combined,” utilizes the full set of inclusive hadron and jet R_{AA} data in Tabs. I and II.




FIG. 3. Selected measurements of hadron and jet R_{AA} at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 0.2, 2.76,$ and 5.02 TeV at various centralities, compared to posterior predictive distributions for the combined calibration (left set of panels; blue posterior distributions) and the calibration based solely on hadrons with $p_T > 30$ GeV/c (right set of panels; orange posterior distributions). The same data are shown in both sets of panels (purple).

Fig. 2, blue distributions, shows parameter posterior distributions and parameter pair correlations from the Combined calibration. Fig. 3, left set of panels, shows selected hadron and jet R_{AA} measurements compared to posterior predictive distributions from the Combined calibration. Sect. B presents the full set of jet and hadron R_{AA} , together with posterior predictive distributions from the Combined calibration.

These figures also show results from two of the alternative calibrations, chosen to illustrate specific points in the following discussion. Fig. 2, red distributions, show the parameter posterior distributions and parameter pair correlations with a calibration based solely on inclusive hadron R_{AA} data but without further selection. Fig. 3,

right set of panels, compares the same data as in the left panels, in this case with a calibration based solely on hadron R_{AA} data in the range $p_T > 30$ GeV/c.

When comparing the posterior distributions in the left and right sets of panels in Fig. 3 it is important to note that low- p_T hadron R_{AA} measurements have the highest relative precision of all the measurements considered, and therefore provide strong constraints on the Combined-data posterior. This precision difference is also reflected in the broader Credible Interval (CI, 90%) for the high- p_T hadron calibration.

B. Combined analysis of inclusive hadron and jet R_{AA}

The parameter posterior distributions from the combined analysis (Fig. 2, blue) exhibit the following features:

- The coupling parameter α_s is constrained to the range 0.3-0.5, with an approximately symmetric distribution that peaks near 0.4.
- The model switching parameter Q_0 lies predominately in the range 1-2 GeV, with a tail extending to 4-6 GeV. A similar posterior distribution for Q_0 was observed in the previous JETSCAPE Bayesian calibration of \hat{q} based solely on inclusive hadron R_{AA} [47].
- A mild constraint on the posterior of τ_0 is observed, with preferred values below 1 fm/c.
- Anti-correlation of α_s and Q_0 is observed, which is characteristic of the multi-stage approach of this model: a larger value of Q_0 corresponds to an increase in the time spent in the LBT stage of the jet evolution, in which more gluon radiation is emitted than in the MATTER stage for the same value of coupling strength. A lower value of α_s is therefore needed to describe the data correctly.
- A preference for larger c_3 values is observed. A peak is not observed within the range of priors of the calibration, indicating that a preferred value of c_3 may lie at large values. However, addressing this point will require a new calibration with a larger range of prior for c_3 , and is beyond the scope of the present work.
- The values of c_1 and c_2 are not constrained significantly, and for clarity are not shown in Fig. 2 (see Fig. 10 for the full set of parameter posterior distributions and correlations). Future study will explore this lack of constraint on c_1 and c_2 , which can arise from data sensitivity, theoretical limitations, or other causes.

Figure 4 shows the Combined-analysis posterior distribution of \hat{q}/T^3 for a quark at $E_{\text{ref}} = 100$ GeV as a function of T . The \hat{q}/T^3 distribution is shown for $\mu^2 = Q_0^2$, whose distribution is determined by the Bayesian analysis, and Eq. 8 reduces to Eq. 4. The value of \hat{q}/T^3 increases with decreasing T . This T -dependence is driven by both the measured data and the underlying physical model (Sect. II C).

In the following sections we explore the differential dependence of \hat{q}/T^3 on the observable and kinematic range used in the calibration.




FIG. 4. Posterior distribution of \hat{q}/T^3 (Eq. 8) as a function of T , for a quark with energy $E_{\text{ref}} = 100$ GeV and $\mu^2 = Q_0^2$, derived from the parameter posterior distribution of the Combined analysis. Lines show median values and bands show 90% credible intervals.

C. Comparison of inclusive hadron and inclusive jet calibrations

In order to explore the dependence of the posterior distributions on input data, Fig. 5 shows posterior distributions of \hat{q}/T^3 for a quark with energy $E_{\text{ref}} = 100$ GeV, calibrated separately on hadron or jet R_{AA} . The left panel shows the posterior distribution CI (90%) as a function of T . While the hadron-only and jet-only posterior distributions are consistent and have similar shape within the CIs, the jet-only distribution brackets lower \hat{q}/T^3 values.

Figure 5, right panel, shows the posterior distributions of \hat{q}/T^3 for a quark with energy E_{ref} at temperature $T_{\text{ref}} = 200$ MeV. The Combined posterior distribution is also shown. The most probable values for jet-only and hadron-only are markedly different, although the distributions overlap in a significant range, with an overlap fraction of 35.3%. The Combined distribution lies between the two more-differential distributions, though with greater overlap with the hadron-only distribution.

Figure 2 elucidates the origin of this difference. The high- p_T hadron-only parameter posterior distributions in that figure (red) are qualitatively similar to the Combined case but are systematically narrower, preferring larger α_s , smaller Q_0 , and smaller τ_0 . The values of c_1 and c_2 remain unconstrained, while a larger value of c_3 is preferred. This bias towards stronger quenching generates larger values of \hat{q}/T^3 , as shown in Fig. 5.

Comparison of the hadron-only calibration in Fig. 5 to




FIG. 5. Left: Posterior distributions (90% CI) of \hat{q}/T^3 for a quark with energy E_{ref} as a function of T , calibrated using hadron-only or jet-only R_{AA} data. Right: slice of hadron-only or jet-only calibrations in left panel at $T_{\text{ref}}=200$ MeV, compared to that for the Combined calibration. All distributions are normalized to unit integral.

the previous JETSCAPE hadron-only calibration [47] is discussed in Sect. IV G.

D. Hadron kinematic selection

Figure 6 shows the dependence of the \hat{q}/T^3 posterior distributions on hadron p_T range used in the calibration. The figure shows the jet-only and hadron-only distributions in Fig. 5, together with hadron-only calibrations for hadrons with $p_T > 10$, 20, or 30 GeV/c. These p_T -selected hadron-only distributions interpolate between the p_T -integrated hadron-only and jet-only calibrations, with hadron $p_T > 10$ GeV/c most consistent with the hadron-only calibration, and hadron $p_T > 30$ GeV/c most compatible with the jet-only calibration.

Inclusive hadron distributions are dominated by leading jet fragments, due to the combined effect of the falling inclusive jet spectrum with rising p_T and the falling jet fragmentation function with rising momentum fraction z . A PYTHIA 8 calculation for pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$ TeV shows that the mean momentum fraction carried by the leading hadron in a jet is $\langle z \rangle \approx 0.5$ over a broad range in $p_{T,\text{jet}}$. The jet measurements in this analysis which have highest relative systematic precision cover the range $p_{T,\text{jet}} \gtrsim 50$ GeV/c, corresponding to hadrons with $p_T \gtrsim 25$ GeV/c (for this illustration we neglect jet quenching effects on leading-hadron $\langle z \rangle$). The approximate agreement of posterior distributions of the hadron-only calibration with $p_T > 30$ GeV/c and the jet-only




FIG. 6. Posterior distribution of \hat{q}/T^3 for a quark with energy E_{ref} at temperature T_{ref} , calibrated using different input datasets. Distributions for jet-only (blue) and hadron-only (orange) are the same as in Fig. 5. Distributions are also shown for hadron-only calibrations with hadrons having $p_T > 10$ (red), $p_T > 20$ (purple), and $p_T > 30$ (grey) GeV/c. All distributions are normalized to unit integral.

calibration, which probe jet quenching in a similar range of partonic kinematics, supports a picture in which \hat{q}/T^3 is indeed independent of the way it is probed and may be a universal property of the QGP. However, their inconsistency with posterior distributions from lower- p_T probes indicates that the current model description of the partonic energy dependence of jet quenching may not be complete.

E. High- p_T hadrons and jets




FIG. 7. Posterior distribution of \hat{q}/T^3 for a quark with $E = 100$ GeV at $T = 200$ MeV, calibrated using input data excluding $p_T > 100$ GeV/c. The distribution (grey) is compared to the Combined (purple), jet-only (blue) and hadron-only (orange) calibrations as shown in Fig. 5. Distributions are normalized to unit integral.

There is tension between different measurements of inclusive jet R_{AA} at the highest p_T range used in this analysis (Tab. II). To assess the effect of such high- p_T measurements on the posterior distributions of \hat{q}/T^3 , we carry out additional calibrations in which they are selectively excluded.

Figure 7 shows the posterior distribution of a calibration excluding jet and hadron R_{AA} for $p_T > 100$ GeV/c (grey), compared to the Combined, jet-only and hadron-only calibration posterior distributions shown in Fig. 5, right panel. The p_T -restricted distribution is qualitatively similar to the hadron-only calibration, with a small shift towards larger \hat{q}/T^3 . Although the high-precision low- p_T hadron data dominate the calibration, this comparison shows that the relatively lower precision high- p_T hadron and jet data nevertheless have significant influ-

ence, shifting \hat{q} to lower values.

F. Collision-centrality dependence

Model calculations show that the space-time temperature distribution of the QGP fireball generated in nuclear collisions depends on collision centrality: the fireball generated in central collisions is initially hotter and lives longer than that in semi-central collisions. This difference in temperature profile will result in quantitatively different jet quenching effects, which may be reflected in the extracted distribution of \hat{q}/T^3 .

Figure 8 explores this dependence, showing \hat{q}/T^3 posterior distributions calibrated separately with data from central (0-10%) and semi-central (20-50%) A + A collisions. The central collision posterior distribution for combined data has its largest weight at relatively low values of \hat{q} , with a long tail extending to larger values. The semi-central collision posterior distribution for combined data is symmetric and largely overlaps with the distribution from the Combined calibration that incorporates data in the full range of centralities, though with slightly higher mean.

Fig. 8 shows that the \hat{q}/T^3 posterior distributions, when calibrated separately on jet-only or hadron-only R_{AA} data, are each qualitatively similar for central and semi-central collisions. Ref. [49] likewise reports \hat{q}/T^3 posterior distributions that are consistent for calibrations using inclusive hadron R_{AA} for different centralities, separately for RHIC and LHC data. The difference in the central and semi-central Combined calibrations seen in Fig. 8 therefore arises predominantly from different relative weights of jet and hadron data. While Fig. 3 presents only a limited subset of the data used in this analysis, the selection is broadly representative, showing, for instance, differences in measurement kinematic reach and precision in central and semi-central collisions. These differences must contribute to the close correspondence in Fig. 8, left panel, of Combined calibration including both centralities and the semi-central calibration.

The approximate centrality-independence of the \hat{q}/T^3 posterior distribution calibrated using jet-only or hadron-only R_{AA} data is itself notable, in light of the differences expected in the the space-time temperature distribution of the QGP fireball for different centralities. This invariance indicates that the difference observed between the jet-only and hadron-only posterior distributions arises predominantly from the different kinematic ranges probed by jets and hadrons, rather than differences in the temperature of the QGP being probed.

Rephrasing this observation in the context of the question posed at the beginning of this section, it shows that the \hat{q}/T^3 posterior distribution is indeed not consistent under variation in choice of observable and phase space coverage. Its systematic dependence indicates that this inconsistency arises primarily from sensitivity to the kinematic (p_T) coverage of the probe, and not the model-




FIG. 8. Posterior distributions of \hat{q}/T^3 for a quark with energy E_{ref} at temperature T_{ref} , calibrated using data with different collision centrality ranges and measurement types. Distributions are normalized to unit integral. Left: Calibrated separately for central (0-10%, red) and semi-central (20-50%, grey) A + A collisions. Also shown is the Combined calibration incorporating all centralities (Fig. 5). Middle: For central collisions, additionally restricted to jet-only (blue) or hadron-only (orange) R_{AA} . The posterior distribution for central collisions in the left panel (red) is shown for comparison. Right: For semi-central collisions, additionally restricted to jet-only (blue) or hadron-only (orange) R_{AA} . The posterior distribution for semi-central collisions in the left panel (grey) is shown for comparison.

ing of QGP dynamics. This in turn focuses attention on the HTL formulation of \hat{q}/T^3 in Eq. 4 which, as noted in Sect. II, is a leading-order approximation, but whose series expansion has been found to have poor convergence properties [80]. Further exploration of this issue, for instance by incorporating higher-order corrections to Eq. 4, is however beyond the scope of this study and will be the focus of future work.

G. Comparison to previous \hat{q} calibrations

As noted in Sect. I, different determinations of \hat{q}/T^3 , which are based on different theoretical formulations and different choices of inclusive hadron and jet data, may generate constraints that are not directly comparable [14]. Their comparison therefore requires additional analysis. In this section, we focus on comparison of the current results to the previous calibrations of \hat{q}/T^3 by the JETSCAPE [47] and JET [116] collaborations.

Equation (8) is the functional form of \hat{q} in the current analysis, which includes coherence effects that reduce the effective value of \hat{q} for $\mu \geq Q_0$. The distribution of \hat{q}/T^3 shown in Fig. 4 from the current Combined analysis is reported for $\mu^2 = Q_0^2$, the medium-induced switching scale, whose distribution in magnitude corresponds to the posterior distribution of the Bayesian analysis; a typical value is $Q_0^2 \sim (1 \text{ GeV})^2$. Fig. 9 shows the \hat{q}/T^3 distribution compared to the posterior distribution from the previous JETSCAPE Bayesian calibration [47], and to values determined by the JET Collaboration [116], both of which are based solely on a limited selection of inclusive hadron R_{AA} data.

The models employed by JET do not incorporate multi-stage energy-loss, scale dependence, or coherence




FIG. 9. Posterior distribution of \hat{q}/T^3 as a function of T for the current Combined analysis with $\mu^2 = Q_0^2 \sim (1 \text{ GeV})^2$ from Fig. 4, showing median and 90% CI limits (purple line and shaded band). Also shown are the results from JET [116] (black data points) and JETSCAPE [47] (MATTER+LBT2 model of \hat{q} , Eq. (9), grey line and shaded band), which are based solely on inclusive hadron R_{AA} data. The result of the current analysis (Eq. (8)) is shown for $\mu^2 = (2.7 \text{ GeV})^2$ (blue line and shaded band), which is the MAP value for the MATTER+LBT2 model in Ref. [47]. See text for details.

effects. Nevertheless, consistency is observed between JET and the current analysis, taking into account their respective uncertainties.

In the formulation utilized by the previous JETSCAPE calibration (Eq. (9)), the value of \hat{q}/T^3 increases with increasing μ for $\mu \geq Q_0$, in contrast to the reduction in \hat{q}/T^3 with increasing μ for the current analysis (Eq. (8)). Consequently, the Maximum A Posterior (MAP) and 90% CI intervals of Q_0 are different in the two calibrations. The MAP value of Q_0^2 for the current analysis is lower than of the previous calibration ($\sim (2.7 \text{ GeV})^2$) [47]. Fig. 9 shows the posterior distribution for the previous JETSCAPE calibration for a value of μ^2 slightly smaller than the MAP value of $(2.7 \text{ GeV})^2$.

In order to compare the two calibrations quantitatively, Fig. 9 also shows the posterior distribution of \hat{q}/T^3 from the current analysis at $\mu^2 = (2.7 \text{ GeV})^2$, using Eq. (8). The 90% CI interval is wider in this case (blue band) than for $\mu^2 = Q_0^2$ for this analysis (purple band), due to the broad distributions of the calibration parameters c_1 , c_2 , and c_3 , which do not contribute at $\mu^2 = Q_0^2$. The figure shows that the two calibrations generate consistent posterior distributions, within their respective uncertainties.

It is notable that the two Bayesian calibrations of \hat{q}/T^3 shown in Fig. 9 are consistent within uncertainties, despite their markedly different theoretical formulations and the different experimental datasets they employ. This observation raises the question of how to discriminate them based on more detailed analysis. Qualitative visual assessment shows a similar level of agreement between hadron R_{AA} data and the posterior predictive distributions in Ref. [47] and in this analysis (Fig. 3 and Sect. B), with good agreement found over significant phase space, but tension found in some regions. However, further exploration of these different \hat{q} formulations in Ref. [76] shows that inclusion of a virtuality-dependent interaction (Eq. 8) provides significantly better agreement with the limited dataset used in Ref. [47], and with the broader dataset used in this analysis. Additional Bayesian Inference tools to discriminate different models quantitatively [9, 117] will be explored in future calibrations of \hat{q} .

V. SUMMARY

The JETSCAPE collaboration reports a new, multi-observable determination of the jet transport coefficient \hat{q} , using all available inclusive hadron and jet suppression data from RHIC and the LHC. The model of the QGP bulk medium and its evolution is based on parameters determined by a previous Bayesian calibration of soft-sector observables. Virtuality-dependent jet quenching is implemented in a multi-stage model.

The combined calibration of \hat{q}/T^3 , using both inclusive hadron and jet R_{AA} data, describes the data well over a significant phase space, though with tension in some

regions. The posterior distribution of \hat{q}/T^3 increases with decreasing T , consistent with some other determinations of \hat{q} from inclusive hadron and jet data.

Additional differential studies explore the interplay of hadron and jet R_{AA} data in constraining the posterior distributions. High- p_T hadron data (roughly, $p_T > 30 \text{ GeV}/c$) provide consistent posterior constraints as the jet R_{AA} data, much of which covers the range $p_{T,\text{jet}} > 50 \text{ GeV}/c$; these observables evidently probe jet quenching in similar partonic phase space. However, the posterior distribution from calibration with lower- p_T hadron R_{AA} is not consistent, indicating that the model dependence of \hat{q}/T^3 on parton energy is not fully accurate.

The centrality dependence of the posterior distributions, and their further classification based on jet-only or hadron-only R_{AA} measurements, likewise indicates that the most significant source of tension in the comparison of the current model to data is the functional dependence on parton energy E . Improving this model description, and exploring alternative modeling approaches, is likewise the subject of future work.

The calibration in this analysis is consistent with that of the previous JETSCAPE calibration of \hat{q}/T^3 , which is based on a formulation of \hat{q} with different functional dependence on parton virtuality and using data corresponding to a subset of the hadron R_{AA} data in this analysis. The consistency is manifest when the \hat{q}/T^3 is evolved in virtuality μ to the scale $Q_0 \approx 2.7 \text{ GeV}$ of the prior analysis [using Eq. (8)].

The analysis presented represents a significant step towards the long-term goal of a comprehensive multi-observable Bayesian calibration of jet quenching data to constrain fundamental transport properties of the Quark-Gluon Plasma. However, as noted above, it has raised several important questions that require resolution with future work in order to achieve this goal. An equally important, long-standing issue in the field is the specification of meaningful theoretical and modeling uncertainties, to be used in the likelihood calculations that are at the heart of Bayesian Inference. While this issue is likewise beyond the scope of the present work, the analysis presented in this paper serves to highlight the urgent need for progress in this area as well.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation (NSF) within the framework of the JETSCAPE collaboration, under grant number OAC-2004571 (CSSI:X-SCAPE). It was also supported under PHY-1516590 and PHY-1812431 (R.J.F., M.Ko., C.P. and A.S.), by PHY-2012922 (C.Sh.); it was supported in part by the US Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics under grant numbers DE-AC02-05CH11231 (B.J., P.M.J., X.-N.W., and W.Z.), DE-AC52-07NA27344 (A.A., R.A.S.), DE-SC0013460 (A.K., A.M., C.Sh., I.S., C.Si, R.D. and X.W.), DE-SC0021969

(C.Sh. and W.Z.), DE-SC0012704 (B.S.), DE-FG02-92ER40713 (J.H.P.), DE-FG02-05ER41367 (D.S. and S.A.B.), DE-SC0024660 (R.K.E), DE-SC0024347 (J.-F.P. and M.S.). The work was also supported in part by the National Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under grant numbers 11935007, 11861131009 and 11890714 (Y.H. and X.-N.W.), by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (C.G., S.J., and G.V.), by the University of Regina President's Tri-Agency Grant Support Program (G.V.), by the Canada Research Chair program (G.V. and A.K.) reference number CRC-2022-00146, by the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) at Wayne State University (Y.T.), and by the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) under projects 2016/24029-6, 2017/05685-2 and 2018/24720-6 (M.L.). I. S. was funded as a part of the European Research Council project ERC-2018-ADG-835105 YoctoLHC , and as a part of the Center of Excellence in Quark Matter of the Academy of Finland (project 346325). C.Sh., J.-F.P. and R.K.E. acknowledge a DOE Office of Science Early Career Award.

A portion of the computations related to the bulk were carried out on the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center (NERSC), a U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science User Facility operated under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231. The bulk medium simulations were done using resources provided by the Open Science Grid (OSG) [118, 119], which is supported by the National Science Foundation award #2030508. Data storage was provided in part by the OSIRIS project supported by the National Science Foundation under grant number OAC-1541335. Jet quenching calculations were carried out at the Expanse system at the San Diego Supercomputer Center (SDSC), the Bridges-2 system, which is supported by National Science Foundation award number ACI-1928147, at the Pittsburgh Supercomputing Center (PSC), and the Stampede2 system at Texas Advanced Computing Center (TACC), The University of Texas at Austin, through allocation PHY200093 from the Extreme Science and Engineering Discovery Environment (XSEDE), which was supported by NSF grant number #1548562.

Appendix A: Full parameter posterior distributions

Figure 10 shows the same parameter posterior distributions and correlations as Fig. 2, in addition including those for parameters c_1 and c_2 .

Appendix B: Complete set of posterior predictive distributions

Figure 3 shows a representative selection of jet and R_{AA} data compared to the posterior predictive distributions. The complete set of jet and R_{AA} data used in the Combined analysis, along with the posterior predictive




FIG. 10. Same as Fig. 2 but also showing the posterior distributions and correlations for parameters c_1 and c_2 .

distributions, is shown in Fig. 11 for comparison.




FIG. 11. All measurements of hadron and jet R_{AA} at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 0.2, 2.76,$ and 5.02 TeV at various centralities (purple) considered in this analysis, compared to posterior predictive distributions for the Combined analysis (blue).

- [1] W. Busza, K. Rajagopal, and W. van der Schee, “Heavy Ion Collisions: The Big Picture, and the Big Questions”, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **68** (2018) 339–376, [arXiv:1802.04801 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [2] J. W. Harris and B. Müller, “QGP signatures revisited”, [arXiv:2308.05743 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [3] S. Borsanyi, Z. Fodor, C. Hoelbling, S. D. Katz, S. Krieg, and K. K. Szabo, “Full result for the QCD equation of state with 2+1 flavors”, *Phys. Lett. B* **730** (2014) 99–104, [arXiv:1309.5258 \[hep-lat\]](#).
- [4] T. Bhattacharya *et al.*, “QCD Phase Transition with Chiral Quarks and Physical Quark Masses”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113** no. 8, (2014) 082001, [arXiv:1402.5175 \[hep-lat\]](#).
- [5] **HotQCD** Collaboration, A. Bazavov *et al.*, “Equation of state in (2+1)-flavor QCD”, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014) 094503, [arXiv:1407.6387 \[hep-lat\]](#).
- [6] H.-T. Ding, F. Karsch, and S. Mukherjee, “Thermodynamics of strong-interaction matter from Lattice QCD”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. E* **24** no. 10, (2015) 1530007, [arXiv:1504.05274 \[hep-lat\]](#).
- [7] A. Bazavov *et al.*, “The QCD Equation of State to $\mathcal{O}(\mu_B^6)$ from Lattice QCD”, *Phys. Rev. D* **95** no. 5, (2017) 054504, [arXiv:1701.04325 \[hep-lat\]](#).
- [8] U. Heinz and R. Snellings, “Collective flow and viscosity in relativistic heavy-ion collisions”, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **63** (2013) 123–151, [arXiv:1301.2826 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [9] **JETSCAPE** Collaboration, D. Everett *et al.*, “Multisystem Bayesian constraints on the transport coefficients of QCD matter”, *Phys. Rev. C* **103** no. 5, (2021) 054904, [arXiv:2011.01430 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [10] **JETSCAPE** Collaboration, D. Everett *et al.*, “Phenomenological constraints on the transport properties of QCD matter with data-driven model averaging”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126** no. 24, (2021) 242301, [arXiv:2010.03928 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [11] G. Nijs, W. van der Schee, U. Gürsoy, and R. Snellings, “Bayesian analysis of heavy ion collisions with the heavy ion computational framework Trajectum”, *Phys. Rev. C* **103** no. 5, (2021) 054909, [arXiv:2010.15134 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [12] A. Majumder and M. Van Leeuwen, “The Theory and Phenomenology of Perturbative QCD Based Jet Quenching”, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **66** (2011) 41–92, [arXiv:1002.2206 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [13] L. Cunqueiro and A. M. Sickles, “Studying the QGP with Jets at the LHC and RHIC”, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **124** (2022) 103940, [arXiv:2110.14490 \[nucl-ex\]](#).
- [14] L. Apolinário, Y.-J. Lee, and M. Winn, “Heavy quarks and jets as probes of the QGP”, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **127** (2022) 103990, [arXiv:2203.16352 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [15] **STAR** Collaboration, B. I. Abelev *et al.*, “Longitudinal double-spin asymmetry and cross section for inclusive jet production in polarized proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 200$ GeV”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97** (2006) 252001, [arXiv:hep-ex/0608030](#).
- [16] **STAR** Collaboration, L. Adamczyk *et al.*, “Measurement of the cross section and longitudinal double-spin asymmetry for di-jet production in polarized pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 200$ GeV”, *Phys. Rev. D* **95** no. 7, (2017) 071103, [arXiv:1610.06616 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [17] **ALICE** Collaboration, B. Abelev *et al.*, “Measurement of the inclusive differential jet cross section in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 2.76$ TeV”, *Phys. Lett. B* **722** (2013) 262–272, [arXiv:1301.3475 \[nucl-ex\]](#).
- [18] **ATLAS** Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, “Measurement of the inclusive jet cross-section in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV using 4.5 fb⁻¹ of data with the ATLAS detector”, *JHEP* **02** (2015) 153, [arXiv:1410.8857 \[hep-ex\]](#). [Erratum: *JHEP* 09, 141 (2015)].
- [19] **CMS** Collaboration, V. Khachatryan *et al.*, “Measurement and QCD analysis of double-differential inclusive jet cross sections in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV and cross section ratios to 2.76 and 7 TeV”, *JHEP* **03** (2017) 156, [arXiv:1609.05331 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [20] **CMS** Collaboration, V. Khachatryan *et al.*, “Measurement of the double-differential inclusive jet cross section in proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** no. 8, (2016) 451, [arXiv:1605.04436 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [21] **ATLAS** Collaboration, M. Aaboud *et al.*, “Measurement of inclusive jet and dijet cross-sections in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *JHEP* **05** (2018) 195, [arXiv:1711.02692 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [22] **ALICE** Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Measurements of inclusive jet spectra in pp and central Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. C* **101** no. 3, (2020) 034911, [arXiv:1909.09718 \[nucl-ex\]](#).
- [23] **ATLAS** Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, “Measurement of the jet fragmentation function and transverse profile in proton-proton collisions at a center-of-mass energy of 7 TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71** (2011) 1795, [arXiv:1109.5816 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [24] **ALICE** Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Charged jet cross section and fragmentation in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. D* **99** no. 1, (2019) 012016, [arXiv:1809.03232 \[nucl-ex\]](#).
- [25] **ATLAS** Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, “Properties of jet fragmentation using charged particles measured with the ATLAS detector in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** no. 5, (2019) 052011, [arXiv:1906.09254 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [26] **ALICE** Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Jet fragmentation transverse momentum distributions in pp and p-Pb collisions at \sqrt{s} , $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV”, *JHEP* **09** (2021) 211, [arXiv:2011.05904 \[nucl-ex\]](#).
- [27] N. Armesto *et al.*, “Comparison of Jet Quenching Formalisms for a Quark-Gluon Plasma ‘Brick’”, *Phys. Rev. C* **86** (2012) 064904, [arXiv:1106.1106 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [28] P. B. Arnold, G. D. Moore, and L. G. Yaffe, “Photon emission from quark gluon plasma: Complete leading order results”, *JHEP* **12** (2001) 009, [arXiv:hep-ph/0111107](#).
- [29] P. B. Arnold, G. D. Moore, and L. G. Yaffe, “Photon and gluon emission in relativistic plasmas”, *JHEP* **06**

- (2002) 030, [arXiv:hep-ph/0204343](#).
- [30] R. Baier, Y. L. Dokshitzer, A. H. Mueller, S. Peigne, and D. Schiff, “Radiative energy loss and p(T) broadening of high-energy partons in nuclei”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **484** (1997) 265–282, [arXiv:hep-ph/9608322](#).
- [31] R. Baier, Y. L. Dokshitzer, A. H. Mueller, and D. Schiff, “Medium induced radiative energy loss: Equivalence between the BDMPS and Zakharov formalisms”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **531** (1998) 403–425, [arXiv:hep-ph/9804212](#).
- [32] B. G. Zakharov, “Fully quantum treatment of the Landau-Pomeranchuk-Migdal effect in QED and QCD”, *JETP Lett.* **63** (1996) 952–957, [arXiv:hep-ph/9607440](#).
- [33] B. G. Zakharov, “Radiative energy loss of high-energy quarks in finite size nuclear matter and quark - gluon plasma”, *JETP Lett.* **65** (1997) 615–620, [arXiv:hep-ph/9704255](#).
- [34] U. A. Wiedemann, “Gluon radiation off hard quarks in a nuclear environment: Opacity expansion”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **588** (2000) 303–344, [arXiv:hep-ph/0005129](#).
- [35] C. A. Salgado and U. A. Wiedemann, “Calculating quenching weights”, *Phys. Rev. D* **68** (2003) 014008, [arXiv:hep-ph/0302184](#).
- [36] N. Armesto, C. A. Salgado, and U. A. Wiedemann, “Medium induced gluon radiation off massive quarks fills the dead cone”, *Phys. Rev. D* **69** (2004) 114003, [arXiv:hep-ph/0312106](#).
- [37] M. Gyulassy, P. Levai, and I. Vitev, “Jet quenching in thin quark gluon plasmas. 1. Formalism”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **571** (2000) 197–233, [arXiv:hep-ph/9907461](#).
- [38] M. Gyulassy, P. Levai, and I. Vitev, “Reaction operator approach to nonAbelian energy loss”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **594** (2001) 371–419, [arXiv:nucl-th/0006010](#).
- [39] M. Gyulassy, P. Levai, and I. Vitev, “Jet tomography of Au+Au reactions including multigluon fluctuations”, *Phys. Lett. B* **538** (2002) 282–288, [arXiv:nucl-th/0112071](#).
- [40] X.-N. Wang and X.-f. Guo, “Multiple parton scattering in nuclei: Parton energy loss”, *Nucl. Phys. A* **696** (2001) 788–832, [arXiv:hep-ph/0102230](#).
- [41] A. Majumder, “Hard collinear gluon radiation and multiple scattering in a medium”, *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 014023, [arXiv:0912.2987 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [42] S. Cao and X.-N. Wang, “Jet quenching and medium response in high-energy heavy-ion collisions: a review”, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **84** no. 2, (2021) 024301, [arXiv:2002.04028 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [43] R. Kunnawalkam Elayavalli and K. C. Zapp, “Medium response in JEWEL and its impact on jet shape observables in heavy ion collisions”, *JHEP* **07** (2017) 141, [arXiv:1707.01539 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [44] C. Andrés, N. Armesto, M. Luzum, C. A. Salgado, and P. Zurita, “Energy versus centrality dependence of the jet quenching parameter \hat{q} at RHIC and LHC: a new puzzle?”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** no. 9, (2016) 475, [arXiv:1606.04837 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [45] X. Feal, C. A. Salgado, and R. A. Vazquez, “Jet quenching test of the QCD matter created at RHIC and the LHC needs opacity-resummed medium induced radiation”, *Phys. Lett. B* **816** (2021) 136251, [arXiv:1911.01309 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [46] JET Collaboration, K. M. Burke *et al.*, “Extracting the jet transport coefficient from jet quenching in high-energy heavy-ion collisions”, *Phys. Rev. C* **90** no. 1, (2014) 014909, [arXiv:1312.5003 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [47] JETSCAPE Collaboration, S. Cao *et al.*, “Determining the jet transport coefficient \hat{q} from inclusive hadron suppression measurements using Bayesian parameter estimation”, *Phys. Rev. C* **104** no. 2, (2021) 024905, [arXiv:2102.11337 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [48] M. Xie, X.-N. Wang, and H.-Z. Zhang, “ γ -hadron spectra in p +Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. C* **103** no. 3, (2021) 034911, [arXiv:2003.02441 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [49] M. Xie, W. Ke, H. Zhang, and X.-N. Wang, “Information-field-based global Bayesian inference of the jet transport coefficient”, *Phys. Rev. C* **108** no. 1, (2023) L011901, [arXiv:2206.01340 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [50] W. Ke and X.-N. Wang, “QGP modification to single inclusive jets in a calibrated transport model”, *JHEP* **05** (2021) 041, [arXiv:2010.13680 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [51] J. H. Putschke *et al.*, “The JETSCAPE framework”, 3, 2019.
- [52] J. E. Bernhard, J. S. Moreland, and S. A. Bass, “Bayesian estimation of the specific shear and bulk viscosity of quark-gluon plasma”, *Nature Phys.* **15** no. 11, (2019) 1113–1117.
- [53] A. Majumder, “Incorporating Space-Time Within Medium-Modified Jet Event Generators”, *Phys. Rev. C* **88** (2013) 014909, [arXiv:1301.5323 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [54] S. Cao and A. Majumder, “Nuclear modification of leading hadrons and jets within a virtuality ordered parton shower”, *Phys. Rev. C* **101** no. 2, (2020) 024903, [arXiv:1712.10055 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [55] S. Cao, T. Luo, G.-Y. Qin, and X.-N. Wang, “Heavy and light flavor jet quenching at RHIC and LHC energies”, *Phys. Lett. B* **777** (2018) 255–259, [arXiv:1703.00822 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [56] W. Chen, S. Cao, T. Luo, L.-G. Pang, and X.-N. Wang, “Effects of jet-induced medium excitation in γ -hadron correlation in A+A collisions”, *Phys. Lett. B* **777** (2018) 86–90, [arXiv:1704.03648 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [57] T. Luo, S. Cao, Y. He, and X.-N. Wang, “Multiple jets and γ -jet correlation in high-energy heavy-ion collisions”, *Phys. Lett. B* **782** (2018) 707–716, [arXiv:1803.06785 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [58] JETSCAPE Collaboration, S. Cao *et al.*, “Multistage Monte-Carlo simulation of jet modification in a static medium”, *Phys. Rev. C* **96** no. 2, (2017) 024909, [arXiv:1705.00050 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [59] D. A. Cohn, Z. Ghahramani, and M. I. Jordan, “Active learning with statistical models”, *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* **4** (1996) 129–145.
- [60] S. Mak, H. S. Yushi, and Y. Xie, “Information-guided sampling for low-rank matrix completion”, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.08037* (2017).
- [61] J. Chen, S. Mak, V. R. Joseph, and C. Zhang, “Adaptive design for Gaussian process regression under censoring”, *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **16** no. 2, (2022) 744–764.
- [62] D. Song, S. Mak, and C. F. Wu, “Ace: Active learning for causal inference with expensive experiments”, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.07480* (2023).
- [63] J. C. Collins, D. E. Soper, and G. F. Sterman, “All Order Factorization for Drell-Yan Cross-sections”, *Phys. Lett. B* **134** (1984) 263.

- [64] J. C. Collins, D. E. Soper, and G. F. Sterman, “Factorization for Short Distance Hadron - Hadron Scattering”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **261** (1985) 104–142.
- [65] J. C. Collins, D. E. Soper, and G. F. Sterman, “Soft Gluons and Factorization”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **308** (1988) 833–856.
- [66] J. C. Collins, D. E. Soper, and G. F. Sterman, “Factorization of Hard Processes in QCD”, *Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys.* **5** (1989) 1–91, [arXiv:hep-ph/0409313](#).
- [67] T. Sjöstrand, S. Ask, J. R. Christiansen, R. Corke, N. Desai, P. Ilten, S. Mrenna, S. Prestel, C. O. Rasmussen, and P. Z. Skands, “An introduction to PYTHIA 8.2”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **191** (2015) 159–177, [arXiv:1410.3012](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [68] **JETSCAPE** Collaboration, A. Kumar *et al.*, “JETSCAPE framework: $p + p$ results”, *Phys. Rev. C* **102** no. 5, (2020) 054906, [arXiv:1910.05481](#) [[nucl-th](#)].
- [69] J. S. Moreland, J. E. Bernhard, and S. A. Bass, “Alternative ansatz to wounded nucleon and binary collision scaling in high-energy nuclear collisions”, *Phys. Rev. C* **92** no. 1, (2015) 011901, [arXiv:1412.4708](#) [[nucl-th](#)].
- [70] J. Liu, C. Shen, and U. Heinz, “Pre-equilibrium evolution effects on heavy-ion collision observables”, *Phys. Rev. C* **91** no. 6, (2015) 064906, [arXiv:1504.02160](#) [[nucl-th](#)]. [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.C* **92**, 049904 (2015)].
- [71] H. Song and U. W. Heinz, “Causal viscous hydrodynamics in 2+1 dimensions for relativistic heavy-ion collisions”, *Phys. Rev. C* **77** (2008) 064901, [arXiv:0712.3715](#) [[nucl-th](#)].
- [72] C. Shen, Z. Qiu, H. Song, J. Bernhard, S. Bass, and U. Heinz, “The iEBE-VISHNU code package for relativistic heavy-ion collisions”, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **199** (2016) 61–85, [arXiv:1409.8164](#) [[nucl-th](#)].
- [73] F. Cooper and G. Frye, “Comment on the Single Particle Distribution in the Hydrodynamic and Statistical Thermodynamic Models of Multiparticle Production”, *Phys. Rev. D* **10** (1974) 186.
- [74] S. A. Bass *et al.*, “Microscopic models for ultrarelativistic heavy ion collisions”, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **41** (1998) 255–369, [arXiv:nucl-th/9803035](#).
- [75] M. Bleicher *et al.*, “Relativistic hadron hadron collisions in the ultrarelativistic quantum molecular dynamics model”, *J. Phys. G* **25** (1999) 1859–1896, [arXiv:hep-ph/9909407](#).
- [76] **JETSCAPE** Collaboration, A. Kumar *et al.*, “Inclusive jet and hadron suppression in a multistage approach”, *Phys. Rev. C* **107** no. 3, (2023) 034911, [arXiv:2204.01163](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [77] M. Benzke, N. Brambilla, M. A. Escobedo, and A. Vairo, “Gauge invariant definition of the jet quenching parameter”, *JHEP* **02** (2013) 129, [arXiv:1208.4253](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [78] E. Braaten and R. D. Pisarski, “Soft Amplitudes in Hot Gauge Theories: A General Analysis”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **337** (1990) 569–634.
- [79] J. Frenkel and J. C. Taylor, “High Temperature Limit of Thermal QCD”, *Nucl. Phys. B* **334** (1990) 199–216.
- [80] S. Caron-Huot, “O(g) plasma effects in jet quenching”, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 065039, [arXiv:0811.1603](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [81] Y. He, T. Luo, X.-N. Wang, and Y. Zhu, “Linear Boltzmann Transport for Jet Propagation in the Quark-Gluon Plasma: Elastic Processes and Medium Recoil”, *Phys. Rev. C* **91** (2015) 054908, [arXiv:1503.03313](#) [[nucl-th](#)]. [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.C* **97**, 019902 (2018)].
- [82] Y. Mehtar-Tani, C. A. Salgado, and K. Tywoniuk, “Jets in QCD Media: From Color Coherence to Decoherence”, *Phys. Lett. B* **707** (2012) 156–159, [arXiv:1102.4317](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [83] J. Casalderrey-Solana and E. Iancu, “Interference effects in medium-induced gluon radiation”, *JHEP* **08** (2011) 015, [arXiv:1105.1760](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [84] P. Caucal, E. Iancu, A. H. Mueller, and G. Soyez, “Vacuum-like jet fragmentation in a dense QCD medium”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120** (2018) 232001, [arXiv:1801.09703](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [85] A. Kumar, A. Majumder, and C. Shen, “Energy and scale dependence of \hat{q} and the “JET puzzle””, *Phys. Rev. C* **101** no. 3, (2020) 034908, [arXiv:1909.03178](#) [[nucl-th](#)].
- [86] S. Cao, C. Sirimanna, and A. Majumder, “The medium modification of high-virtuality partons”, [arXiv:2101.03681](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [87] D. W. Hogg and D. Foreman-Mackey, “Data analysis recipes: Using Markov Chain Monte Carlo”, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **236** no. 1, (2018) 11, [arXiv:1710.06068](#) [[astro-ph.IM](#)].
- [88] J. Towns *et al.*, “XSEDE: Accelerating scientific discovery”, *Computing in Science and Engineering* **16** no. 5, (2014) 62–74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/MCSE.2014.80>.
- [89] San Diego Supercomputer Center, “Triton Shared Computing Cluster”, 2022. <https://tritoncluster.sdsc.edu>.
- [90] S. T. Brown, P. Buitrago, E. Hanna, S. Sanielevici, R. Scibek, and N. A. Nystrom, “Bridges-2: A platform for rapidly-evolving and data intensive research”, in *Practice and Experience in Advanced Research Computing*, PEARC ’21. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3437359.3465593>.
- [91] C. R. Kirkpatrick *et al.*, “Open Storage Network Concept Paper: Open Storage Network Retrospective & the Future of Distributed Storage for eInfrastructure”, 2021. <https://library.ucsd.edu/dc/object/bb56058395>.
- [92] M. D. McKay, R. J. Beckman, and W. J. Conover, “A comparison of three methods for selecting values of input variables in the analysis of output from a computer code”, *Technometrics* **42** no. 1, (2000) 55–61.
- [93] C. Huang, V. R. Joseph, and S. Mak, “Population quasi-monte carlo”, *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **31** no. 3, (2022) 695–708.
- [94] S. Mak and V. R. Joseph, “Support points”, *The Annals of Statistics* **46** no. 6A, (2018) 2562–2592.
- [95] S. Mak and V. R. Joseph, “Minimax and minimax projection designs using clustering”, *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **27** no. 1, (2018) 166–178.
- [96] M. Kearns and S. Singh, “Near-optimal reinforcement learning in polynomial time”, *Machine Learning* **49** (2002) 209–232.

- [97] **ATLAS** Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, “Charged-hadron production in pp , p +Pb, Pb+Pb, and Xe+Xe collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5$ TeV with the ATLAS detector at the LHC”, *JHEP* **07** (2023) 074, [arXiv:2211.15257](#) [[hep-ex](#)].
- [98] **PHENIX** Collaboration, A. Adare *et al.*, “Neutral pion production with respect to centrality and reaction plane in Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}}=200$ GeV”, *Phys. Rev. C* **87** no. 3, (2013) 034911, [arXiv:1208.2254](#) [[nucl-ex](#)].
- [99] **ATLAS** Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, “Measurement of charged-particle spectra in Pb+Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV with the ATLAS detector at the LHC”, *JHEP* **09** (2015) 050, [arXiv:1504.04337](#) [[hep-ex](#)].
- [100] **CMS** Collaboration, V. Khachatryan *et al.*, “Charged-particle nuclear modification factors in PbPb and pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV”, *JHEP* **04** (2017) 039, [arXiv:1611.01664](#) [[nucl-ex](#)].
- [101] **STAR** Collaboration, J. Adams *et al.*, “Transverse momentum and collision energy dependence of high p_T hadron suppression in Au+Au collisions at ultrarelativistic energies”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91** (2003) 172302, [arXiv:nucl-ex/0305015](#).
- [102] **ALICE** Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Transverse momentum spectra and nuclear modification factors of charged particles in pp , p -Pb and Pb-Pb collisions at the LHC”, *JHEP* **11** (2018) 013, [arXiv:1802.09145](#) [[nucl-ex](#)].
- [103] **CMS** Collaboration, S. Chatrchyan *et al.*, “Study of high- p_T charged particle suppression in PbPb compared to pp collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72** (2012) 1945, [arXiv:1202.2554](#) [[nucl-ex](#)].
- [104] **PHENIX** Collaboration, A. Adare *et al.*, “Suppression pattern of neutral pions at high transverse momentum in Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV and constraints on medium transport coefficients”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101** (2008) 232301, [arXiv:0801.4020](#) [[nucl-ex](#)].
- [105] **ALICE** Collaboration, B. B. Abelev *et al.*, “Neutral pion production at midrapidity in pp and Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** no. 10, (2014) 3108, [arXiv:1405.3794](#) [[nucl-ex](#)].
- [106] **ALICE** Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Neutral pion and η meson production at mid-rapidity in Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. C* **98** no. 4, (2018) 044901, [arXiv:1803.05490](#) [[nucl-ex](#)].
- [107] **ALICE** Collaboration, B. B. Abelev *et al.*, “Production of charged pions, kaons and protons at large transverse momenta in pp and Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV”, *Phys. Lett. B* **736** (2014) 196–207, [arXiv:1401.1250](#) [[nucl-ex](#)].
- [108] **ALICE** Collaboration, J. Adam *et al.*, “Centrality dependence of the nuclear modification factor of charged pions, kaons, and protons in Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. C* **93** no. 3, (2016) 034913, [arXiv:1506.07287](#) [[nucl-ex](#)].
- [109] **ALICE** Collaboration, S. Acharya *et al.*, “Production of charged pions, kaons, and (anti-)protons in Pb-Pb and inelastic pp collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. C* **101** no. 4, (2020) 044907, [arXiv:1910.07678](#) [[nucl-ex](#)].
- [110] **STAR** Collaboration, J. Adam *et al.*, “Measurement of inclusive charged-particle jet production in Au + Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV”, *Phys. Rev. C* **102** no. 5, (2020) 054913, [arXiv:2006.00582](#) [[nucl-ex](#)].
- [111] **ALICE** Collaboration, J. Adam *et al.*, “Measurement of jet suppression in central Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV”, *Phys. Lett. B* **746** (2015) 1–14, [arXiv:1502.01689](#) [[nucl-ex](#)].
- [112] **ATLAS** Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, “Measurements of the Nuclear Modification Factor for Jets in Pb+Pb Collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV with the ATLAS Detector”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114** no. 7, (2015) 072302, [arXiv:1411.2357](#) [[hep-ex](#)].
- [113] **ATLAS** Collaboration, M. Aaboud *et al.*, “Measurement of the nuclear modification factor for inclusive jets in Pb+Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *Phys. Lett. B* **790** (2019) 108–128, [arXiv:1805.05635](#) [[nucl-ex](#)].
- [114] **CMS** Collaboration, V. Khachatryan *et al.*, “Measurement of inclusive jet cross sections in pp and PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV”, *Phys. Rev. C* **96** no. 1, (2017) 015202, [arXiv:1609.05383](#) [[nucl-ex](#)].
- [115] **CMS** Collaboration, A. M. Sirunyan *et al.*, “First measurement of large area jet transverse momentum spectra in heavy-ion collisions”, [arXiv:2102.13080](#) [[hep-ex](#)].
- [116] **JET** Collaboration, K. M. Burke *et al.*, “Extracting the jet transport coefficient from jet quenching in high-energy heavy-ion collisions”, *Phys. Rev. C* **90** no. 1, (2014) 014909, [arXiv:1312.5003](#) [[nucl-th](#)].
- [117] D. R. Phillips *et al.*, “Get on the BAND Wagon: A Bayesian Framework for Quantifying Model Uncertainties in Nuclear Dynamics”, *J. Phys. G* **48** no. 7, (2021) 072001, [arXiv:2012.07704](#) [[nucl-th](#)].
- [118] R. Pordes *et al.*, “The Open Science Grid”, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **78** (2007) 012057.
- [119] I. Sfiligoi, D. C. Bradley, B. Holzman, P. Mhashilkar, S. Padhi, and F. Wurthwrin, “The pilot way to Grid resources using glideinWMS”, *WRI World Congress* **2** (2009) 428–432.