





### Lucia Anna Tarasovičová Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster **NBI** heavy-ion seminar 23.06.2022





## **Di-hadron correlations of identified particles** at high p<sub>T</sub> in pp collisions at the LHC













Differences between electrical and strong field

### Jets

- Gluon self-interaction  $\Rightarrow$  tube-like field lines by increasing energy
- Creation of new  $q\overline{q}$  pairs







### ATLAS event display with marked jets [1]

### Jets





- Gluon self-interaction  $\Rightarrow$  tube-like field lines by increasing energy
- Creation of new  $q\overline{q}$  pairs
- In detectors showers of hadrons in one direction
- Can be used to study the properties of the original parton















ratio of relative production

Ratio of relative produc Vº in gluon to quark jets [3]

## Quark/gluonjets



ons	

OPAL	
OPAL data LETSET 7.4	
HERWIG 5.9	
* +•+	
•*	
1.2 $1.4$	
ction of	
4a [a]	

- Gluon jets in contrast to quark jets:
  - Higher multiplicity
  - Wider
  - Higher production of  $\Lambda$  baryons, equal production of K<sup>0</sup><sub>S</sub> mesons

How does the jet-peak yield depend on the trigger particle selection?









## Strangeness enhancement



- Enhanced relative strangeness production in high multiplicity small collision systems
- Steeper increase for more strange hadrons also in small collision systems

What is the contribution to the enhancement in small systems from hard and soft processes?







## Different model descriptions

low mult pp



- Problems by modelling of strangeness in small systems
- Big differences between models in hadron production:
  - PYTHIA mainly hadronisation
  - EPOS core / corona
  - PYTHIA Shoving strings become additional kicks in the overlap regions

comparison with different models bring more light to





## Di-hadron correlations

### • Trigger particle - high p<sub>T</sub>

- The original jet parton included
- Associated particle lower p<sub>T</sub>











## **Di-hadron correlations**

### • Trigger particle - high p<sub>T</sub>

- The original jet parton included
- Associated particle lower p<sub>T</sub>
- Difference  $\Delta \varphi = \varphi_{trigg} \varphi_{assoc}$  $\Delta \eta = \eta_{trigg} - \eta_{assoc}$
- Correlation function:







### L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU





## **Di-hadron correlations**

- Trigger particle high p<sub>T</sub>
  - The original jet parton included
- Associated particle lower p<sub>T</sub>
- Difference  $\Delta \varphi = \varphi_{trigg} \varphi_{assoc}$  $\Delta \eta = \eta_{trigg} - \eta_{assoc}$



- Correlation function:  $d^2 N_{pair}^{corr}$  1  $d^2 N_{pair}^{raw}$  1 1 - C $\frac{\mathrm{d}\Delta\varphi\mathrm{d}\Delta\eta}{\mathrm{d}\Delta\eta} = \frac{1}{N_{trigg}^{corr}} \frac{\mathrm{d}\Delta\varphi\mathrm{d}\Delta\eta}{\mathrm{d}\Delta\varphi\mathrm{d}\Delta\eta} \varepsilon_{trigg} \varepsilon_{assoc} \varepsilon_{pair}(\Delta\varphi\Delta\eta)$
- $\Delta \phi$  projection
- $\Delta \varphi_2 \, \mathrm{d}N$ • Yield calculation:  $Y_J^{\Delta \varphi} =$  $J_{\Delta \varphi_1} d\Delta \varphi$

In this analysis: Vo-h ,hh and h-Vo correlations





L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU





 $\Delta \varphi$ 





## **ALICE detector**

ITS - tracking, pile-up rejection, PV reconstruction,  $|\eta| < 0.9$ 

TPC - tracking, PID,  $|\eta| < 0.9$ 

TOF - pile-up rejection, PID,  $|\eta| < 0.9$ 

V0 - multiplicity estimation in forward and backward directions V0A 2.8 <  $\eta$  < 5.1 VOC  $-3.7 < \eta < -1.7$ 











- pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV
- Minimum bias trigger (kINT7)
- Primary vertex position within 10 cm from IP
- Pile-up rejection with help of PhysicsSelectionTask and fAliEventCuts->SetupRun2pp(); fAliEventCuts->AcceptEvent(fEvent);
- Multiplicity estimation with MultSelection->GetMultiplicityPercentile("VOM")

### **Event selection**







- $|\eta| < 0.8$
- FilterBit 256 and special tune
- Pairs with invariant mass of a hadron rejected

### Track and V<sup>0</sup> selection











### V<sup>0</sup> invariant mass

### — Signal fit — Background fit Signal region $\mu \pm 3\sigma$

### Side-bands region



 $\Lambda + \Lambda$ 







### Corrections

$$N_{trigg}^{corr} = \frac{1 - C_{trigg}}{\varepsilon_{trigg}} N_{trigg}^{raw}$$









### Corrections







 $C = \frac{N_{secondaries}^{survived}}{N_{particles}^{survived}}$ 



L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU

### Corrections

 $\underline{C_{trigg}} N_{trigg}^{raw}$  $N_{trigg}^{corr} =$  $\varepsilon_{trigg}$ 







### Corrections

$$N_{trigg}^{corr} = \frac{1 - C_{trigg}}{\varepsilon_{trigg}} N_{trigg}^{raw}$$

$$^{g} < 4 \text{ GeV/c}$$
  
 $c < p_{T}^{assoc} < p_{T}^{trigg}$   
 $a = 1$   
 $a = 1$   
 $a = 1$   
 $a = 1$   
 $a = 0.5$   
 $b = 0$   
 $b = 1$   
 $b =$ 

 $\varepsilon_{pair} = \frac{1}{\alpha} M(\Delta \eta \Delta \varphi)$ 





### **1** T **4** T 50000 Correction for the contribution of misidentified V<sup>0</sup> 20000 10000 1.08 1.15 1.09 1.1 1.11 1.12 1.13 1.14 $\mathsf{m}_{_{\pi\Lambda}}$

1.08	1.09	1.1	1.11	1.12	1.13	1.14





L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU

÷	
1.15	

 $\mathsf{m}_{_{\pi\Lambda}}$ 







L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU





### Feed-down correction

$$\Lambda = \Lambda_{prim} + \Lambda_{sec} \quad \text{Corrected}$$

$$\Lambda_{sec}(p_{\mathrm{T},i}) = F_{ij} \int_{p_{\mathrm{T},j}} \frac{\mathrm{d}N}{\mathrm{d}p_{\mathrm{T}}} (\Xi) \mathrm{d}p_{\mathrm{T}} \quad (\Xi) \int_{\mathfrak{G}}^{20} 18$$

$$F_{ij} = \frac{N_{rec}(\Lambda)_{from \Xi in bin j}}{N_{gen}(\Xi)^{in bin j}} \quad (IA)$$

1

### Feeddown matrix $\Lambda + \overline{\Lambda}$



L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU





## Feed-down correction

$$\Lambda = \Lambda_{prim} + \Lambda_{sec} \quad \text{Corrected}$$

$$\Lambda_{sec}(p_{\mathrm{T},i}) = F_{ij} \int_{p_{\mathrm{T},j}} \frac{\mathrm{d}N}{\mathrm{d}p_{\mathrm{T}}}(\Xi) \mathrm{d}p_{\mathrm{T}}$$

$$F_{ij} = \frac{N_{rec}(\Lambda)_{from \ \Xi \ in \ bin \ j}}{N_{gen}(\Xi)^{in \ bin \ j}}$$

$$N_{trigg}^{final}(p_{\mathrm{T},i}) = C_{purity}^{\Lambda}(p_{\mathrm{T},i}) * (N_{\Lambda}^{measured}(p_{\mathrm{T},i}) - \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\Lambda}}(p_{\mathrm{T},i}) * F_{ij} *$$



 $\frac{1}{\varepsilon_{\Lambda}}(p_{\mathrm{T},i}) * F_{ij} * C_{purity}^{\Xi}(p_{\mathrm{T},j}) * N_{\Xi}^{measured}(p_{\mathrm{T},j}))$ 

 $(p_{\mathrm{T},i}) * F_{ij} * (N_{\Xi-h}^{measured}(p_{\mathrm{T},j}) - N_{\Xi-h}^{side-band}(p_{\mathrm{T},j})) - \frac{N_{\Lambda-h}^{side-band}(p_{\mathrm{T},i})}{N_{\Lambda-h}^{side-band}(p_{\mathrm{T},i})}$ 







## MC closure Test





L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU





## MC closure Test





2.5

### Residual non-closure yielding to additional systematical uncertainty:







### Hausseminar, 04.02.2022

L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU

# Results





Increasing  $p_{\rm T}^{\rm assoc}$ 





## 2D correlation function





Increasing  $p_{\rm T}^{\rm assoc}$ 

### Increase of the peak size with increasing $p_{T}^{trigg}$ more available energy



![](_page_26_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

- Increase of the peak size with increasing  $p_{T}^{trigg}$  more available energy
- Decrease of the peak size with increasing  $p_{\rm T}^{\rm assoc}$

![](_page_27_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_1.jpeg)

## 2D correlation function

![](_page_28_Figure_4.jpeg)

• Increase of the peak size with increasing  $p_{T}^{trigg}$  - more available energy

• Decrease of the peak size with increasing  $p_{\rm T}^{\rm assoc}$ 

# • Collimated peaks for high $p_{\rm T}$ - hard fragmentation

![](_page_28_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_1.jpeg)

## 2D correlation function

- Increase of the peak s with increasing  $p_{T}^{trigg}$ more available energy
- Decrease of the peak with increasing  $p_{\rm T}^{\rm assoc}$
- Collimated peaks for  $p_{\rm T}$  - hard fragmentati
- Broader peaks for low  $p_{\rm T}^{\rm assoc}$  or  $p_{\rm T}^{\rm trigg}$  - softer fragmentation

<u>+</u>
size
_
y
size
high
ion
V

![](_page_29_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_0.jpeg)

## $\Delta \phi$ projection with model comparison

![](_page_30_Figure_2.jpeg)

Published in [5]

- No model can give a proper description
- EPOS underestimates both peaks for all trigger particles except for  $K_S^0$  at higher  $p_{\rm T}$
- Bigger difference between PYTHIA8 models (Monash and Shoving) at higher  $p_{\rm T}$

![](_page_30_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_0.jpeg)

## $\Delta \phi$ projection with model comparison

![](_page_31_Figure_2.jpeg)

- No model can give a proper description
- Monash fits the underlying event for hh good tuning on spectra, but underestimates
  - $h (\Lambda + \Lambda)$
- Shoving fits  $h (\Lambda + \overline{\Lambda})$ - improvement
- **EPOS** overestimates the peak widths

![](_page_31_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_0.jpeg)

L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU

![](_page_32_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_0.jpeg)

L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU

![](_page_33_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Figure_0.jpeg)

- caused by more available energy
- Clear multiplicity ordering in h-h, a ridge-like structure, other effects?

L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU

![](_page_34_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_0.jpeg)

- not detected by the V0 detector

![](_page_35_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Figure_2.jpeg)

L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU

![](_page_36_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Figure_2.jpeg)

L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU

![](_page_37_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Integrated yields ( $p_T^{trigg}$ and multiplicity) Underlying event

![](_page_38_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_9.jpeg)

L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU

![](_page_39_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Figure_2.jpeg)

L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU

![](_page_39_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Figure_2.jpeg)

L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU

### PYTHIA8 - the deviation from data depends weakly on multiplicity

![](_page_41_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Figure_2.jpeg)

L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU

- PYTHIA8 the deviation from data depends weakly on multiplicity
  - Monash tune better for hard processes

![](_page_41_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Figure_2.jpeg)

L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU

- PYTHIA8 the deviation from data depends weakly on multiplicity
  - Monash tune better for hard processes
  - Shoving better for intermediate  $p_{\rm T}$

![](_page_42_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Figure_2.jpeg)

- PYTHIA8 the deviation from data depends weakly on multiplicity
  - Monash tune better for hard processes
  - Shoving better for intermediate  $p_{T}$
- EPOS LHC strong dependence on multiplicity

![](_page_44_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_44_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Figure_0.jpeg)

- No dependence on the event multiplicity
- Different trends of the ratio for different trigger particles:

![](_page_45_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Figure_0.jpeg)

- No dependence on the event multiplicity
- Different trends of the ratio for different trigger particles:
  - $K_S^0$  rather flat with  $p_T^{trigg}$  and below unity

![](_page_46_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Figure_0.jpeg)

- No dependence on the event multiplicity
- Different trends of the ratio for different trigger particles:
  - $K_S^0$  rather flat with  $p_T^{trigg}$  and below unity
  - $\Lambda$  increasing with  $p_{T}^{trigg}$

![](_page_47_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Jet-like particle-yield ratios to h-h yields

![](_page_48_Figure_2.jpeg)

### Published in [5]

- Different trends of the ratio for different trigger particles:
  - $K_S^0$  rather flat with  $p_T^{\text{trigg}}$  and below unity
  - $\Lambda$  increasing with  $p_{T}^{trigg}$
- No dependence on the event multiplicity

Triggering with high- $p_{\rm T} \Lambda$  causes a bias towards gluon jets

![](_page_48_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Figure_0.jpeg)

- No clear increase with multiplicity in each region
- Biggest difference in the first bin
- High multiplicity trigger new point
- $h \pi$  should be used as proper basis

![](_page_49_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_52_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_52_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Figure_0.jpeg)

Best described by the PYTHIA8 Shoving model

![](_page_53_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_54_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_54_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_54_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_54_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Figure_2.jpeg)

• The underlying event measurement - in agreement with inclusive measurement

![](_page_55_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_56_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_56_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_56_Figure_2.jpeg)

measurement

selection)  $\Rightarrow$  usable in Pb-Pb collisions

• The underlying event measurement - in agreement with inclusive

# Consistency with jet-finder method (difference caused by kinematic

![](_page_56_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_57_Picture_0.jpeg)

- $^{\circ}$  V<sup>0</sup>-h, h-h and h-V<sup>0</sup> correlations analysis performed within different pT and multiplicity intervals in pp collision at 13 TeV
- Per-trigger yield extracted and compared with MC models
- A difference between jet-like particle yields triggered with  $K_S^0$  and  $\Lambda$  with respect to charged hadron was observed in pp collisions at 13 TeV
  - Explanation (through PYTHIA8): triggering with  $\Lambda$  causes a bias towards gluon jets
- $^{\circ}$  No clear multiplicity dependence of V<sup>0</sup> in or outside of jets
- The enhancement in  $\Lambda + \overline{\Lambda}/2K_{S}^{0}$  ratio visible only for the outside of jet region

### Summary

![](_page_57_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_57_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_58_Picture_0.jpeg)

Thank you for your attention!

![](_page_58_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_59_Picture_0.jpeg)

## References

[1] <u>https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/AtlasPublic/EventDisplayRun2Physics</u> [2] ACTA PHYSICA POLONICA B, No 2, Vol. 36 (2005), page 433 [3] K. Ackerstaff et al. "Production of  $K_S^0$  and  $\Lambda$  in quark and gluon jets from  $Z^0$  decay". arXiv: hep-ex/9805025 [4] ALICE Collaboration "Enhanced production of multi-strange hadrons in high-multiplicity proton-proton collisions". arXiv: 1606.07424 [n ex].

[5] ALICE Collaboration " $K_S^0$ - and (anti-) $\Lambda$ -hadron correlations in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV". arXiv: 2107.11209 [nucl-ex].

![](_page_59_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_59_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_60_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Hausseminar, 04.02.2022

![](_page_60_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_61_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Track and V<sup>0</sup> selection

•  $|\eta| < 0.8$ 

- FilterBit 256 and special tune
- Pairs with invariant mass of a hadron rejected

Selection Online or On-Th Rapidity |y| V<sup>0</sup> decay radius DCA Neg to PV DCA Pos to PV DCA V<sup>0</sup> daughter  $V^0 \cos(\theta_{PA})(K)$  $V^0 \cos(\theta_{PA})(\Lambda)$ Proper lifetime  $K_{c}^{0}$ Proper lifetime  $\Lambda$ Competing  $V^0$  rejection Competing V<sup>0</sup> rejection dE/dx (N $\sigma$ )

Table 1: Selection criteria for V<sup>0</sup> candidates

 $3 < p_{T}^{\text{trigg}} < 20 \text{ GeV/}c$ 

	Value
e-fly	only offline
	< 0.5
(cm)	>0.5
(cm)	>0.06
(cm)	>0.06
rs ( $\sigma$ )	<1
$(S_{S}^{0})$	>0.97
۱)	>0.995
$\frac{1}{2}$ (cm)	<20
(cm)	<30
$K_S^0$ (GeV/c <sup>2</sup> )	< 0.005
$\Lambda (\text{GeV/c}^2)$	< 0.01
	<3

Selection	
Pseudorapidity $ \eta $	
Number of TPC Crossed Rows	
TPC Refit Flag	k
Number of Findable Clusters	
TPC Crossed Rows / Findable Ratio	

Table 2: Selection criteria for V<sup>0</sup> daughter tracks

 $1 \text{GeV}/c < p_{\text{T}}^{\text{assoc}} < p_{\text{T}}^{\text{trigg}}$ 

![](_page_61_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_61_Picture_15.jpeg)

![](_page_62_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_62_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_63_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Systematic Uncertainties Study

![](_page_63_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_63_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_64_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_64_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Systematic Uncertainties Study

![](_page_64_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_64_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_65_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_65_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_65_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_66_Picture_0.jpeg)

## **Yield** ( $p_T^{assoc}$ )- model comparison

![](_page_66_Figure_2.jpeg)

L.A. Tarasovičová, WWU

![](_page_66_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_67_Figure_0.jpeg)

# Jet-like particle-yield ratios to h-h yields

- Different trends of the ratio for different trigger particles:
- $K_S^0$  below unity for all  $p_T^{\text{trigg}}$  intervals  $p_{\mathrm{T}}^{\mathrm{trigg}}$ and  $p_{\rm T}^{\rm assoc}$  bins
  - $\Lambda$  higher than  $K_S^0$  and above unity for low  $p_{\rm T}^{\rm assoc}$  at high  $p_{\rm T}^{\rm trigg}$

The bias towards gluon jets is more pronounced at the soft part of hard jets

![](_page_67_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_67_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_67_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_67_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_67_Figure_11.jpeg)

![](_page_67_Figure_12.jpeg)

![](_page_67_Figure_13.jpeg)

![](_page_67_Figure_14.jpeg)

![](_page_67_Figure_15.jpeg)