

Significance of Isolated Non-Prompt Photons on Photon-Triggered Jet Observables

Chathuranga Sirimanna

Duke University

Workshop on Heavy Ion Physics in the EIC Era

Duke

Outline

- Introduction: JETSCAPE framework and multistage evolution
- Photon triggered jets
- Simulating jet evolution with JETSCAPE framework
- Simultaneous description of leading hadron and jet spectrum
- This study: 5.02 TeV
  - γ-jet: asymmetry, correlation, and R_{AA}
  - γ + 2 jets
  - Groomed jets substructure using photon triggered jets
- Summary



https://github.com/JETSCAPE/JETSCAPE

Manual (arXiv:1903.07706), JETSCAPE PP19 tune (arXiv:1910.05481), JETSCAPE AA23 tune (arXiv:2204.01163)

Duke

Introduction

- JETSCAPE: General, modular and extensive framework
- No single model can describe all stages of jet evolution
- Multi-stage jet evolution
  - Different stages depending on the virtuality, Q and Energy, E of the partons
- One can customize the framework by using their own modules
- ASCII, Gzip, and HepMC output formats



Pre-generated Trento Initial

Pre generated 2+1D VISHNU Hydro profiles

Pythia Hard Scattering

MATTER – Medium modified DGLAP evolution in High Virtuality

LBT – Linearized Boltzmann Transport model with HT gluon emission

JETSCAPE framework: Multistage Evolution

- Large Q, Large E: Dominated by radiation with few scatterings (DGLAP, HT)
  - MATTER *(Majumder(13), Kordell, Majumder(17), Cao, Majumder(17))*
- Small Q, Large E: Scattering driven emission, mostly by medium effects (Transport, AMY, HT)
  - LBT *(Wang, Zhu(13), Luo, et al.(15,18),Cao, et al.(16,17), He, et al.(18))*
  - MARTINI *(Schenke, Gale, Jeon(09), Park, Jeon, Gale(17, 18))*
- Small Q & E: Nearly thermal, strongly coupled (AdS/CFT)
  - AdS/CFT *(Chesler, Rajagopal(14, 15), Pablos, et al.(15, 16, 17), and others)*



Virtuality Separation Scale: Q_0

Switching between modules parton by parton depending on the virtuality and energy

Large Q: $Q > Q_0$
Small Q: $Q < Q_0$

Prompt photons as Probes of QGP

- Prompt photons - produced directly in the hard sub-processes
- Can be used to estimate the energy and the direction of jet initiating parton (before the energy loss) – Calibrated probe of the QGP
  - Limited Statistics: Challenging to measure experimentally
- Important probe to study jet energy loss (Wang, Huang, and Sarcevic, PRL 77 (1996) 231-234)
- Isolation criteria is necessary to identify the prompt photons
  - Same isolation criteria used in experimental analysis (CMS-HIN-13-006, CMS-HIN-16-002, PLB 789 (2019) 167)
- Isolated photons mainly consist of prompt photons
  - Isolated Non-prompt photons make considerable contribution





Simulating Jet Evolution

- p-p baseline: Pythia for hard scattering and MATTER for shower
- PbPb:
  - Virtuality separation scale, Q_0 = 2 GeV
  - MATTER+LBT with recoil
  - Colorless hadronization (color is randomly assigned) with Pythia Lund String model
  - Event by event hydro
- p-p and PbPb:
  - Prompt photons, photons from intermediate shower and fragmentation photons
  - Same isolation criteria used in experimental analysis





$$\Delta R = \sqrt{\Delta\eta^2 + \Delta\phi^2}$$

$$\sum_{\Delta R} E_T < E_{T,Iso}$$

$$\Delta\phi_{\gamma,jet} < \frac{7\pi}{8}$$



Simultaneous Description of Leading Hadrons and Jets

- Parameters tuned for simultaneously describe leading hadron and jet spectra
  - Blue line of each plot: $Q_{sw} = Q_0 = 2\ GeV, \alpha_s^{fix} = 0.3, \tau_0 = 0.6\ fm/c$, and $T_c = 160\ MeV$
  - AA23 tune
- Not tuned using Bayesian calibration
- Same tune can be used to accurately describe number of different observables (Different E_{CM}, centrality, etc.)
- JETSCAPE AA paper: Phys.Rev.C 107 (2023) 3, 034911, arXiv: 2204.01163
  - Further information on parameter tuning





γ-jet Asymmetry – p-p

- γ-jet Asymmetry: $X_{J\gamma} = \frac{p_T^{jet}}{p_T^{\gamma}}$
- 5.02 TeV p-p: Full Events and Prompt Photon Events
  - $p_T^{jet} > 31.6\ GeV$; $|\eta_\gamma| < 2.37$ (excluding the region $1.37 < |\eta_\gamma| < 1.52$); $R = 0.4, |\eta_{Jet}| < 2.8, |\Delta\phi| > \frac{7\pi}{8}$
  - Isolation cut (E < 3 GeV) $\Delta R = \sqrt{\Delta\eta^2 + \Delta\phi^2} = 0.3$
- p-p simulation using JETSCAPE PP19 tune
- Full events: Have better description with relatively large error bars

ATLAS [PLB 789, 167-190 (2019)]



γ-jet Asymmetry – Central PbPb

- 5.02 TeV PbPb: Full Events and Prompt Photon Events
  - $p_T^{jet} > 31.6\ GeV$; $|\eta_\gamma| < 2.37$ (excluding the region $1.37 < |\eta_\gamma| < 1.52$); $\mathrm{R} = 0.4, |\eta_{Jet}| < 2.8, |\Delta\phi| > \frac{7\pi}{8}$
  - Isolation cut (E < 8 GeV) $\Delta R = \sqrt{\Delta\eta^2 + \Delta\phi^2} = 0.3$
- Unfolded experimental results
- Full events: Have better description with relatively large error bars

ATLAS [PLB 789, 167-190 (2019)]



γ-jet Asymmetry – p-p and Central PbPb

- 5.02 TeV: Full Events and Prompt Photon Events
  - $p_T^{jet} > 30\ GeV,\ |\eta_\gamma| < 1.44,\ \mathrm{R} = 0.3, |\eta_{jet}| < 1.6, |\Delta\phi| > \frac{7\pi}{8}$
  - Isolation cut (E < 5 GeV) $\Delta R = \sqrt{\Delta\eta^2 + \Delta\phi^2} = 0.4$
- Full events: Have better description with large error bars
- Same JETSCAPE Events
- Smeared jet p_T (p-p and PbPb)

CMS [PLB 785, 14-39 (2018)]





Smearing Function



$$\sigma(p_T) = \sqrt{C^2 + \frac{S^2}{p_T} + \frac{N^2}{p_T^2}}$$



γ-jet Asymmetry – Smeared p-p

- 5.02 TeV p-p: Full Events and Prompt Photon Events
  - $p_T^{jet} > 30\ GeV,\ |\eta_\gamma| < 1.44,\ R = 0.3, |\eta_{jet}| < 1.6,\ |\Delta\phi| > \frac{7\pi}{8}$
  - Isolation cut (E < 5 GeV) $\Delta R = \sqrt{\Delta\eta^2 + \Delta\phi^2} = 0.4$
- Full events: Have better description with large error bars
- Ratio plots: Shows large deviation at large $X_{J\gamma}$
  - Wide angle photon radiation after initial hard scattering

CMS [PLB 785, 14-39 (2018)]



γ-jet Asymmetry – Peripheral PbPb

- 5.02 TeV PbPb: Full Events and Prompt Photon Events
- Deviated from experimental results
  - Similar behavior can be seen in the central events
- Full Events: Significantly better agreement
  - Larger Statistical Errors
  - Need larger number of events: More computer power
- Non-prompt photons: Important for direct photon observables



ATLAS [PLB 789, 167-190 (2019)]

γ-jet Correlation - pp

- 5.02 TeV pp: Full Events and Prompt Photon Events
- Prompt Photon Events: Deviated from experimental results
- Full Events: Significantly better agreement
  - Larger Statistical Errors
  - Overestimate the smallest bin
- $\Delta\phi > \frac{7\pi}{8}$: Similar in large p_T^γ



CMS [PLB 785, 14-39 (2018)]

γ-jet Correlation - PbPb

- 5.02 TeV PbPb: Full Events and Prompt Photon Events
- Same Behavior as pp
- Prompt Photon Events: Deviated from experimental results
- Full Events: Significantly better agreement
  - Larger Statistical Errors
  - Overestimate the smallest bin
- $\Delta\phi > \frac{7\pi}{8}$: Similar in large p_T^γ



CMS [PLB 785, 14-39 (2018)]

γ-jet– R_{AA}

- 5.02 TeV: Full Events and Prompt Photon Events
- Two centralities
- Full events captures most of the features
- Statistical Errors are significant
- More statistics or Different approach?
- Full Events: Significantly better agreement
  - Larger Statistical Errors
  - Need larger number of events: More computer power
- Non-prompt photons: Important for direct photon observables



ATLAS [PLB 846, 138154 (2023)]

γ+2 jets

- Same Isolation criteria as γ-triggered single jet analysis
- Prompt Photon Events only
- $PbPb/pp$ ratio for all three observables have good agreement
- Multiplicative factor of 1.4 separately improves Pb-Pb and p-p
- Tension with models (without multiplicative factor)
- Possible role of NLO effects

$$x_{JJ\gamma} = (\vec{p}_1 + \vec{p}_2)_T / p_{T,\gamma},$$

$$A_{JJ\gamma} = (p_{T,1} - p_{T,2}) / p_{T,\gamma},$$

$$\Delta R_{JJ} = \sqrt{\Delta\phi_{1,2}^2 + \Delta\eta_{1,2}^2}.$$



ATLAS Preliminary [ATLAS-CONF-2023-008]







Groomed Jet Substructure with γ-triggered jets



- Prompt Photon Events Only
- Soft Drop grooming ($z_{cut} = 0.2, \beta = 0$)
- Prominent modification of quark jets
- Manifestation of quark jet characteristics in γ -tagged jets

$$m_g = \sqrt{(p_1 + p_2)_\mu (p_1 + p_2)^\mu}$$

r_g-distribution



m_g-distribution



Groomed Jet Substructure with γ-triggered jets

- z_g: energy imbalance of its hardest splitting
- r_g: angular separation of its hardest splitting
- Doesn't show significant dependence on $X_{J\gamma}$
- Only a slight signal of narrowing of the splitting can be seen in r_g

$$z_g = \frac{\min(p_{T,i}, p_{T,j})}{p_{T,i} + p_{T,j}}$$





Unlocking the Power of Multistage Evolution



Summary and Future Directions

- Photon observables - an independent, parameter free verification of the multistage evolution

- Using the prompt photon events from hard scattering might not be sufficient
  - Prompt photon events are rare: Computer intensive simulation
  - Full events shows a better description of all results with relatively large error bars
  - Isolated Non-prompt photons make considerable contribution

- Further studies needed to understand γ+2 jets
- Groomed Jet substructure doesn't show significant dependence to $X_{J\gamma}$

- Full event analysis with reduced statistical uncertainty for both central and peripheral PbPb events
  - More statistics or Different approach?
- Include more physics in our simulations

Duke