Measurement of Bottomonia in pp, pPb and PbPb collisions at 5.02 TeV Yongsun Kim, Sejong University **CMS** Collaboration **IS2019, NY**

Universe, Whanki Kim (1913-1973)





• Y(**n**) mesons provide evidence for color charge screening that sequentially

increases w.r.t. binding energy

 This presentation reviews the recent observation of upsilon state modifications in pPb and PbPb collisions at 5.02 TeV



<u>New data 2017-2018</u> PbPb : $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, L ~ 1.6 nb⁻¹, pp : $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, L ~ 300 pb⁻¹

Suppression of excited $\Upsilon(nS)$ in PbPb at 2.76 TeV

[PRL 107 (2011)

From the first PbPb run at LHC, we observed different ratio of Y(nS)/Y(1S) between pp and PbPb. Sequential melting?

The observation led us to measure the

 $\frac{\text{double ratio}}{R_{AA} \text{ of } \textbf{Y}(nS)} \\ \frac{R_{AA} \text{ of } \textbf{Y}(nS)}{R_{AA} \text{ of } \textbf{Y}(1S)}$

- Precision measurement for very few corrections beyond signal counting
- Isolates the final state effects from production mechanism
- Used 7.3 μb⁻¹



Observation of Υ(nS) suppression at 2.76 TeV
 [PRL 109 (2012) 222301]

In the following year, we got 20 times more data

- First measurement of RAA vs centrality
- Not enough statistics for Y(3S) measurement
- Used 150 $\mu b^{\mbox{--}1}$ (x20 than 2010)



Event activity of Y(nS) in pPb at 5.02 TeV

[JHEP 04 (2014) 103]

In 2013, we took pPb data at 5.02 TeV

- pPb serves as cold nuclear baseline
- Drop of double ratios observed in pPb less than PbPb but in the analogous manner
- confirmed that large suppression of excited states is primarily due to hot medium (QGP)



Lessons from Run I result

- Y(nS) is suppressed by interaction with medium, but not exactly as predicted by the classical sequential melting picture All-ornothing switch by temperature threshold
- Yet, suppression is higher for more excited states
- Suppression smoothly depends on the centrality
- Results with more statistics and in different collision energy would be useful to comprehend the thermal property of QGP, as a function of space and time



 Nuclear modification measured for all three states





- Nuclear modification measured for all three states
- Same ordering of suppression in 2.76 TeV
 - $$\begin{split} &\mathsf{R}_{AA}(\Upsilon(1S)): 0.376 \pm 0.013 \, (\text{stat}) \pm 0.035 \, (\text{syst}) \\ &\mathsf{R}_{AA}(\Upsilon(2S)): 0.117 \pm 0.022 \, (\text{stat}) \pm 0.019 \, (\text{syst}) \\ &\mathsf{R}_{AA}(\Upsilon(3S)) < 0.096 \, \text{in } 95\% \, \text{C.L.} \end{split}$$
- R_{AA} Gradually decreases for higher centrality for 1S and 2S
 - Hints for rapid turn-on at very peripheral collision (> 70%)



•

- Nuclear modification measured for all three states
- Same ordering of suppression in
 2.76 TeV
 - $$\begin{split} &\mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{A}\mathsf{A}}(\Upsilon(1\mathsf{S})): 0.376 \pm 0.013 \, (\mathsf{stat}) \pm 0.035 \, (\mathsf{syst}) \\ &\mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{A}\mathsf{A}}(\Upsilon(2\mathsf{S})): 0.117 \pm 0.022 \, (\mathsf{stat}) \pm 0.019 \, (\mathsf{syst}) \\ &\mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{A}\mathsf{A}}(\Upsilon(3\mathsf{S})) < 0.096 \, \, \mathsf{in} \, 95\% \, \mathsf{C.L.} \end{split}$$
- R_{AA} Gradually decreases for higher centrality for 1S and 2S
- Strong suppression of 3S



[Comparison with 2.76 TeV] RAA vs centrality

[PLB 790 (2019) 270] [PLB 770, 357(2017)]



• Y(1S)

- → R_{AA}(5.02) / R_{AA}(2.76) = 1.2 ± 0.15
- compatible within uncertainties



• Y(2S)

- Monotonic dependence on centrality is clearer in 5.02 TeV
- Similar suppression in both energies

[Comparison with 2.76 TeV] $R_{AA} vs p_T$



- Extended high-p_T reach by 10 GeV for 5.02 TeV
- No significant p_T dependence for Y(1S) and Y(2S) in both energy
- Compatible suppression for both energies

Comparison with models at 5.02 TeV



p_T dependence



High speed upsilon can escape QGP -> Smooth increase R_{AA} for p_T

p⊤ dependent regeneration competes with suppression

 \rightarrow Predicts broad bump near p_T =10 GeV

Yet, both models are compatible with data within statistical uncertainty.

Have to check high $p_T > 20 \text{ GeV} \longrightarrow \text{Need}$ more data

Comparison with Charmonia results



- Very similar behavior between Charmonia and Bottomonia
 - Y(1S) aligns with J/psi(1S)
 - Υ(2S) aligns with psi(2S)
 - Any geometrical indication?

Remarks and plan

- R_{AA} of Y(1S), Y(2S) and Y(3S) were measured as a function of p_T, rapidity and centrality, improving the previous results at 2.76 TeV
 - Consistent with 2.76 TeV data within uncertainty (Models predicted -16%)
 - Clearer dependence on centrality, yet we need more data for peripheral collisions to find the turn-on curve of R_{AA}
- The Y(3S) peak is not visible yet
- Compatible with both two different models
 - p_T dependence study with higher statistics may help to resolve
- New data with ~4 times more statistics was taken in 2018. It will lead us to much more interesting physics, so stay tuned!



BACKUP

Comparison with 2.76 TeV



• No dependence on rapidity