

# Are the Angular Correlations in $pA$ Collisions due to a Glasmion or Bose Condensation ?

A. Dumitru<sup>a,b</sup>, T. Lappi<sup>c,d</sup>, L. McLerran<sup>e,f,g</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Natural Sciences, Baruch College, New York, NY 10010, USA*

<sup>b</sup>*The Graduate School and University Center, The City University of New York, 365 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10016, USA*

<sup>c</sup>*Department of Physics, P.O. Box 35, 40014, University of Jyväskylä, Finland*

<sup>d</sup>*Helsinki Institute of Physics, P.O. Box 64, 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland*

<sup>e</sup>*Physics Dept, Bldg. 510A, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY-11973, USA*

<sup>f</sup>*RIKEN BNL Research Center, Bldg. 510A, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11973, USA*

<sup>g</sup>*Physics Department, China Central Normal University, Wuhan, China*

---

## Abstract

Experiments at the LHC have recently reported results on the angular asymmetry coefficients  $v_n[m]$ , for various angular moments  $n$  and orders of cumulants  $m$ , in high multiplicity  $p + Pb$  collisions. These coefficients are large, and have both even and odd moments. We discuss here some of the implications of these results for our understanding of the initial state of the collision (Color Glass Condensate) and for the evolution in the final state (Glasma and thermalized Quark Gluon Plasma). We show the Color Glass Condensate predicts large even moments,  $v_n$  with  $n$  an even integer. Odd moments are generated by final state interactions or fragmentation. For a multi-particle determination of  $v_2[m]$ , where  $m$  is the number of particles used to determine the correlation, we argue that if these coefficients approach equality for large  $m$  in high multiplicity events, this may imply the existence of either solitonic solutions or Bose condensation either for the JIMWLK action that describes the CGC, or for the Glasma that might be produced in such a collision.

---

## 1. Introduction

Recent experiments have shown that there are large angular correlations in two and four particle correlation functions for particles far separated in rapidity in heavy ion collisions [1–9],  $pp$  collisions [10],  $pA$  [11–13] and dAu [14] collisions. The theory of such flow coefficients and their applications to hydrodynamic descriptions of heavy ion collisions is well developed [15–17]. In central heavy ion collisions, these correlations are usually thought to be generated by hydrodynamic flow patterns induced by fluctuations in the transverse position of particles in the heavy ions initiating the collision [18–20]. Although this was initially thought of as fluctuations of nucleons, subsequent computations provide a good description based on fluctuations arising from gluons and quarks, as

shown in the IP-Glasma model [21]. Surely, the existence of such effects in high multiplicity  $pp$  and  $pA$  collisions forces one to have a sub-nucleonic description of the origin of such correlations. In  $pp$  [22–25] and  $pA$  [26, 27] collisions, it was initially thought that final state effects, such as are described by hydrodynamics, would not be important, and that such correlations if present would select initial state effects.

Further analysis of the  $p + Pb$  data from CERN leads to patterns in the measured  $v_n[m]$  quite similar to those seen in heavy ion collisions, and suggest that there may be a hydrodynamic interpretation of the correlation, or at least significant final state interactions [28–30]. At this time, it is not clear whether initial state of final state effect dominate specific coefficients in various kinematic domains.

In this paper, we discuss effects that might arise either from the Color Glass Condensate or from early time evolution in the Glasma phase. For the CGC, one can provide a viable description of  $v_2[2]$ , the second angular moment of the two particle correlation for both the LHC results on  $pp$  and  $p + Pb$  scattering [24–27]. We point out that this prediction also implies significant contribution to all moments with even values of  $n$ . It is however more difficult to generate odd moments of  $v_n[2]$ , and we argue that these moments might arise from final state corrections to the even moments.

Our most interesting observation concerns  $v_2[m]$  for various values of  $m$ . We find that generically  $v_2[m] \sim v_2[2]$ . There is no suppression due to either factors of coupling or of the number of colors  $N_c$ . There is a numerical coefficient which is of order one, which also might be negative, but will depend upon  $m$ , the number of particles used to compute the correlation. The experimental data for high multiplicity  $p + Pb$  collisions shows that  $v_2[4]$  is quite close to  $v_2[2]$ , while they are rather different for central  $AA$  collisions. If it is true that  $v_2[m] = v_2[2]$  with small corrections, this implies that there can be only small fluctuations from event to event in high multiplicity  $p + Pb$  collisions. This means that the high multiplicity  $p + Pb$  collisions are controlled by one configuration. This would imply that in either the description of the Color Glass Condensate or in that of the Glasma, there must be a single configuration, up to rotational and color zero modes, that generates the observed angular correlations. This could arise from a solitonic field configuration, magnetic vortices [31], or a Bose condensation of the gluon field. In either the case, for very large systems, a lattice structure in the transverse plane might form corresponding to solutions or domains of the condensate. Such a configuration might or might not be reflected in instabilities generated early in the collision [32]. Because the condensation is associated with a spin one field, its manifestation would imply the breaking of rotational invariance, and its evolution would generate flow-like angular correlations. This is a very radical result that if true would imply a major conceptual change in our understanding of these forms of matter.

## 2. The Implications of Measurements of $v_n[2]$

The LHC experiments have reported results for  $v_2[2]$  and  $v_3[2]$  for  $p + Pb$  collisions. The results for  $v_2[2]$  may be understood in various hydrodynamic models. When such hydrodynamic models are applied to  $pp$  and  $pA$  collisions, one can question their validity since very large corrections occur from viscous terms. Also the initial eccentricity of the matter distribution depends on uncontrolled assumptions of the distribution of matter in the transverse plane [33], much more so than for larger collision systems. Nevertheless it is fair to assume that there will be some final state interactions at the high multiplicity of particles where these angular correlations are measured. After all, in order to have a saturated Color Glass Condensate, the gluons in the initial wave function must be strongly interacting, so that for some time after the collisions, there must also be interactions. For the moment we would like however to understand the contributions from initial state effects of the CGC.

At high transverse momentum, the classical gluon field may be expanded in powers of the color sources that generate it, and the dominant contribution corresponds to one source from each of the hadrons. At lower transverse momenta [34, 35], one must include all orders in the sources from the two hadrons, and the computation may be done numerically. The multi-particle correlation functions are computed by taking powers of the field,  $A(q_1)A(-q_1) \cdots A(q_n)A(-q_n)$ , and averaging over the sources which generate the field [22, 36, 37].

To compute  $v_n$  we average each single  $q_i$  with weight  $e^{\pm i n \theta}$ . We then extract the coefficients of this expansion. For example, for  $v_n[2]$ , we can denote this as [17]

$$(v_n[2])^2 = \left\langle e^{i n (\theta_1 - \theta_2)} \right\rangle \quad (1)$$

where the angles  $\theta_i$  refer to the angles of the two particles produced in the collision perpendicular to the reaction plane. Higher order  $v_2[m]$  are defined as connected Greens functions so that the lower order disconnected pieces vanish. For example [17],

$$(v_2[4])^4 = 2 \left\langle e^{2i(\theta_1 - \theta_3)} \right\rangle \left\langle e^{2i(\theta_2 - \theta_4)} \right\rangle - \left\langle e^{2i(\theta_1 + \theta_2 - \theta_3 - \theta_4)} \right\rangle. \quad (2)$$

For the quantity  $v_2[2]^2$ , this Fourier transform generates an expression in terms of the flow velocities which is of the form of an operator times its complex conjugate and so is manifestly positive. On the other hand, for  $v_2[4]^4$ , the expression is not manifestly positive. With the sign chosen above, for a non-zero average flow field, this expression is positive. However if the flow field is small and the expression for  $v_2[4]^4$  is fluctuation dominated, any sign might result.

Implicit in this description are assumptions about the dominant contributions to these correlation functions. Note that the quantity  $v_n[1] = \langle e^{i n \theta} \rangle$ , while non zero on an event by event basis, vanishes upon averaging over the orientation of the event plane. For a fixed and known impact parameter, one could define the correlation functions with this mean field value subtracted out

so that connected correlations would isolate fluctuation contributions. Then  $v_n$  would have been a sum over background field term plus fluctuations. Let us denote the angle of the event plane by  $\chi$ , and the average over events at fixed event plane angle to be  $v_n[1, \chi] = \langle \langle e^{in\theta} \rangle \rangle (\chi)$ . We then have

$$v_n[1] = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\chi v_n[1, \chi] = 0 . \quad (3)$$

If the mean field term dominated, then

$$(v_n[m, \chi])^m = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\chi (v_n[1, \chi])^m \quad (4)$$

and all of the moments coefficients for  $v_n[m]$  would be equal for any even  $m$ .

Note however that we would not expect to have a well defined average angular flow field for small impact parameters. This means that the contributions to the various terms for  $v_n[m]$  would arise from fluctuations. In this case, there is no simple relationship between the  $v_n[m]$ , and even the sign of the various terms in the cumulant expansion might vary. We will return to this point in the next section.

To understand the effect of fluctuations compared to an average flow field, and the effect of rotations of the reaction plane in heavy ion collisions, it is useful to consider a scalar field theory example. By analogy, let the Fourier transform  $v_2[1, \chi]$  correspond to a charged scalar field  $\phi$ . If there is spontaneous symmetry breaking of rotational invariance, then  $\phi$  will take an expectation value corresponding to a net flow. On the other hand, if one generates such a value of  $\phi$  for a finite system, and averages over many such systems,  $\langle \phi \rangle = 0$  by rotational invariance. However, quantities such as  $\langle \phi \phi^\dagger \rangle$  which are charge rotationally invariant will be non-zero, and will give a non-zero  $v_2[2]^2$ . Note that for a non zero value of  $\phi$  with our definitions above the quantity  $v_2[4]^4$  is, by analogy,  $2\langle \phi \phi^\dagger \rangle \langle \phi \phi^\dagger \rangle - \langle \phi \phi^\dagger \phi \phi^\dagger \rangle = \langle \phi \phi^\dagger \rangle^2$  for  $\lambda = 0$ . A positive value of the coupling  $\lambda$  decreases fluctuations and thus increases  $v_2[4]^4$ . The fluctuations measured with this cumulant are the non-Gaussian fluctuations associated with a four scalar interaction. These are different than the Gaussian fluctuations that contribute to  $\langle \phi \phi^\dagger \rangle$ . While in the region where there are small fluctuations and the expectation values are dominated by a mean field, there is equality of  $v_2[2]$  and  $v_2[4]$ , there is no such relation in the fluctuation dominated region. In fact, we would generically expect the Gaussian fluctuations to dominate when fluctuation processes are described by the central limit theorem. In any case, we conclude that when fluctuations dominate, it is not enough to think in terms of an average flow field.

The results of the CGC computation [22, 36, 37] is that  $v_n[2]$  is an even function of  $\theta_1 - \theta_2$  for the case of the McLerran-Venugopalan model for the JIMWLK action that generates the fluctuations in the source terms (see ref. [38] for a computation of  $v_2[2]$ , for example). There are however contributions for all even  $n$ . To see that the contribution from high order moments is large, we

need only look at one of the components which is proportional to

$$C_2^1 = A \left[ \delta^{(2)}(\vec{q}_1 + \vec{q}_2) + \delta^{(2)}(\vec{q}_1 - \vec{q}_2) \right] = \frac{1}{\pi q_1} \delta(q_1 - q_2) \sum_n e^{2ni(\theta_1 - \theta_2)} . \quad (5)$$

In this expression, all of the even moments have an equal weight. The other contributions have a more complicated dependence upon the angular difference  $\theta_1 - \theta_2$  but they all in fact have contributions from all even moments. Also for higher values of  $m$ , the correlation coefficient  $v_2[m]$  is not suppressed by factors of coupling or of  $N_c$  and thus there is no reason not to expect  $v_2[m] \sim v_2[2]$ .

One might object that the angular contribution above needs to be smeared out due to particle fragmentation effects, as well as scattering in the final state. This is true, but if one smears the contributions associated with the delta function by a width  $\Delta\theta$  it is easy to see that the moments  $v_n[2]$  are not strongly affected until  $n \sim 1/\Delta\theta$ . If one is studying the correlation for high momentum particles, then we would expect  $\delta\theta \sim Q_s/p$  so this smearing would be small. For  $p \leq Q_s$ , the smearing is of course large, but still one expects effects of order 1.

How might one generate odd moments? The most obvious candidate are particle scattering effects for a finite size media. Surely if the inverse saturation momentum is much smaller than the size of the proton, which is equivalent to  $Q_s \gg \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ , then because particles are strongly interacting with one another in the saturated CGC, they will also surely interact with one another in the final state. This means that if we measure a particle in a two particle correlation at relatively high momentum it will be biased to come from a region which is close to the surface of the collision. If however, it goes in the backwards direction, it would be suppressed since it would have the possibility to undergo more interactions that deflect its momentum. This effect will result in coefficients of  $v_n[2]$  for all odd moments which may be interpreted as arising from flow, even though their origin is somewhat different. The size of the contribution for odd moments relative to even moments would be expected to increase as the associated multiplicity and thus the opacity increases, whereas the effect on the even moments appears even in the zero opacity limit.

It might also be possible that there are effects not included in the lowest order expression for the McLerran-Venugopalan model for the JIMWLK action. These corrections might either come from higher order terms in the source [39–41] or they might arise from allowing the sources to exist in a transverse plane which is not translationally invariant [42]. The latter case may be checked in the IP Glasma model; see [34] for a calculation that does not include fluctuating nucleon coordinates.

In any of the above cases, it is clear that the even moments have non-zero source contributions from the initial state. The odd moments will have contributions either from final state interactions or higher order terms which are presumably small for the JIMWLK action. Seeing large coefficients for even moments and small for odd might be interpreted as an indication of the importance of initial state effects.

In the next section, we will consider a different possible source for the gluon correlations. We should emphasize at this point that we are discussing a possible

hypothesis to explain the correlation, and that at this time it is not clear which if any of the scenarios we discuss are correct.

### 3. What Can We Learn from $v_n[m]$ ?

The conventional assumption about the origin of  $v_2[m]$  is that it arises from a mean field term<sup>1</sup> at a fixed reaction plane angle, that must be averaged over. Fluctuations in  $v_2[m]$  at a fixed impact parameter and fixed reaction plane angle are assumed to be small when one extracts a value of  $v_2$  from such a measurement. However, as we proceed to smaller and smaller impact parameter, the contribution to  $v_2$  from the mean field should decrease and fluctuations should become larger. This can be seen in the data. In Fig. 1, the quantity

$$\Delta = \sqrt{\frac{v_2[2]^2 - v_2[4]^2}{v_2[2]^2 + v_2[4]^2}} \quad (6)$$

is plotted as a function of pseudorapidity and of transverse momentum. This




Figure 1: Flow fluctuations in the ALICE experiment[7].

allows us to extract the ratio

$$r = v_2[4]^2 / v_2[2]^2 . \quad (7)$$

For peripheral collisions, we find that  $r \sim .8$  and that the flow coefficients extracted from the higher order contributions are not strongly affected by fluctuations. However for central collisions,  $r \sim .2$ , and it would appear, as expected, that fluctuation effects are very important<sup>2</sup>. To see this effect in the context

<sup>1</sup>That is, from an underlying single-particle distribution with a specific, fixed angular emission pattern across events.

<sup>2</sup>This is in agreement with the observation by PHOBOS [43] that  $v_2$  in central heavy-ion collisions scales with the so-called “participant eccentricity” which corresponds to the effective elliptic source deformation due to fluctuations.

of a hydrodynamical simulation, consider the computation of  $\Delta$  from ref. [44], shown in Fig. 2. Note that the four particle cumulant turns negative for very central collisions.




Figure 2: The coefficients  $v_2[2]$  and  $v_2[4]$  from a hydrodynamic computation of nucleus nucleus collisions as a function of centrality, based on the result of Ref. [44].

The CMS collaboration has extracted the quantity  $\Delta$  for high multiplicity  $p + Pb$  events, shown in Fig. 3. They compare their result to peripheral  $Pb + Pb$  collisions. The remarkable feature of this plot is that the fluctuations in “flow” are small in very high multiplicity  $p + Pb$  collisions.

How can this be? In peripheral  $Pb + Pb$  collisions one indeed expects a large mean  $v_2$  due to geometry and small relative fluctuations around this mean. This is also seen in Monte Carlo Glauber simulations of the corresponding eccentricities [45]. In contrast, in high multiplicity  $p + Pb$  collisions, surely one is looking at central events. How can there be a well defined flow if there is no well defined reaction plane? In the absence of a clearly defined reaction plane direction, one could perhaps expect the flow in  $p + Pb$  collisions to be fluctuation dominated. This is, however, not seen in the data, which indicates a larger mean field contribution. Nevertheless, the argument for a mean field would be strengthened by a measurement of  $v_2[6]$  and if it was true that  $v_2[6] = v_2[4] = v_2[2]$  to reasonable approximation, then one has to deal with the issue of a large mean field contribution.

There is a possible way out of the dilemma posed by the  $p + Pb$  data. Suppose that instead of generating the average value for the event by event  $v_2[1]$  described above by impact parameter, that in fact one is generating a classical solution of either the JIMWLK action or the Glasma equations of motion. This could correspond to either a Bose condensate or a solitonic solution. More gen-




Figure 3: The coefficients  $v_2[2]$  and  $v_2[4]$  for CMS high-multiplicity  $p + Pb$  events and for peripheral  $Pb + Pb$  collisions [11].

erally the Bose condensate solution might form a lattice of domains for large systems, and therefore the distinction between soliton and Bose condensate might become fuzzy. One does not have an analytic understudying of the fully evolved JIMWLK equation; it is a two-dimensional theory for the source  $\rho$  so it is quite conceivable that there might be a solitonic solution, or that of a Bose condensate. In the Glasma, it has been argued that there may be Bose condensation effects due to its highly coherent nature [46]. An explicit calculation of the time development of a solitonic field configuration in the Glasma can be found in [47].

Note that since Bose condensation concerns the occupation numbers in the very infrared modes, finding a gauge invariant definition for the condensate in the usual way via occupation numbers can be problematic. In numerical simulations one must revert to using Coulomb gauge-fixed occupation numbers, or alternatively study explicitly gauge invariant observables. The former method was recently employed in explicit simulations in the Abelian Higgs model, where one has seen the emergence of non-trivial solitonic solution solutions related to vortices and Q-balls [48]. An important explicitly gauge invariant observable is the spatial Wilson loop. In fact, it was recently observed that the classical field produced in a collision of two sheets of color charges exhibits area law scaling of spatial Wilson loops and  $Z(N)$  vortex structure over scales  $\gtrsim 1/Q_s$  [31].

If there is a soliton or Bose condensation, it solves the problem of the small amount of fluctuations. This is because the configuration corresponds to a sta-



tionary phase point of some effective action. Of course for a colored vector field, there will be zero modes associated with spatial rotations and color rotations, but these are treated in precise analogy to the integration over reaction plane angles described above for  $v_2[1]$ , and do not affect the argument about the smallness of fluctuations when measuring rotationally invariant and color singlet operators. Moreover, one expects non-trivial angular structure because the gluon field is spin-1, and any expectation value for the gluon field will break both color rotational and spatial rotational invariance. Even if a potential solitonic solution decays fast, as has been argued in [49], the decay products could still retain some sensitivity to the coherent nature of the initial stage, and the consequences for experimental observables could be similar.

One can imagine two rather different scenarios depending on how such solitonic or condensate solutions might arise. If it is from the JIMWLK action and it is an initial state property then such an ordered solution might extend over the entire transverse plane. We would expect structure on a scale of the order of the saturation momentum, which was replicated up to the scale of the size of the nucleus. In this case, the transverse system should look like some sort of two dimensional lattice. If, on the other hand, the structure arose in the Glasma, its transverse extent would be limited by causality, and it might only appear in small systems such as  $pp$  or  $pA$  collisions. While in peripheral  $AA$  collisions the relative flow fluctuations are small because the flow itself is large, this might explain why they can also be small in central  $pA$  collisions.

#### 4. Summary

We have proposed a very radical solution to the origin of the large angular “flow” correlations observed for central  $p+Pb$  collisions. Azimuthal correlations could arise from a large mean field rather than being fluctuation dominated. However, rather than assuming a well developed hydrodynamic flow field as the underlying mechanism for the fixed (across events) single-particle distribution we point out the possible existence of a dominant classical stationary phase point of the effective action. Clearly, a measurement of  $v_2[6]$  would be a strong confirmation of our hypothesis if it turned out that  $v_2[6] = v_2[4]$  with good accuracy.

In the case of condensation, we expect some domain structure on a size scale of order the saturation momentum [31]. It would be difficult to imagine color structures forming which have long range. Such domain like structures might be thought of as solitons, and the resulting lattice a solitonic lattice. For a large system like a nucleus, this lattice would be no doubt disordered on some size scale associated with causality. Such a hypothetical localized solution could be either a domain in the condensate, or perhaps even a true solitonic solution that we call the Glasmion. Clearly, such structures must be sought in numerical simulations of Glasma evolution [50–52].

## Acknowledgements

The research of LM is supported under DOE Contract No. DE-AC02-98CH10886. LM thanks J. Berges, J. Pawlowski, B. Schenke and R. Venugopalan for informative discussions issues related to the results of this paper. He especially thanks Juergen Schukraft and Raju Venugopalan for provocative statements about higher order flow coefficients and their possible implications. He was supported as a Hans Jensen Professor of Theoretical Physics in the Theoretical Physics Institute during the time this research was initiated and completed. AD thanks T. Kodama for sharing his insight on coarse graining in hydrodynamics; he gratefully acknowledges support by the DOE Office of Nuclear Physics through Grant No. DE-FG02-09ER41620 and from The City University of New York through the PSC-CUNY Research Award Program, grant 66514-0044. TL is supported by the Academy of Finland, projects 133005, 267321 and 273464.

## References

- [1] STAR, K. Ackermann *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 402 (2001), [[arXiv:nucl-ex/0009011](#) [[nucl-ex](#)]].
- [2] STAR, C. Adler *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **C66**, 034904 (2002), [[arXiv:nucl-ex/0206001](#) [[nucl-ex](#)]].
- [3] PHENIX, S. Adler *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 182301 (2003), [[arXiv:nucl-ex/0305013](#) [[nucl-ex](#)]].
- [4] ALICE, K. Aamodt *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 252302 (2010), [[arXiv:1011.3914](#) [[nucl-ex](#)]].
- [5] ALICE, K. Aamodt *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 032301 (2011), [[arXiv:1105.3865](#) [[nucl-ex](#)]].
- [6] ALICE, K. Aamodt *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B708**, 249 (2012), [[arXiv:1109.2501](#) [[nucl-ex](#)]].
- [7] ALICE, S. A. Voloshin, *Nucl. Phys.* **A904-905**, 90c (2013), [[arXiv:1211.5680](#) [[nucl-ex](#)]].
- [8] CMS, E. Appelt, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **1441**, 783 (2012), [[arXiv:1110.1026](#) [[nucl-ex](#)]].
- [9] ATLAS, G. Aad *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **C86**, 014907 (2012), [[arXiv:1203.3087](#) [[hep-ex](#)]].
- [10] CMS, V. Khachatryan *et al.*, *JHEP* **1009**, 091 (2010), [[arXiv:1009.4122](#) [[hep-ex](#)]].
- [11] CMS, S. Chatrchyan *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B724**, 213 (2013), [[arXiv:1305.0609](#) [[nucl-ex](#)]].

- [12] ATLAS, G. Aad *et al.*, [Phys. Lett. \*\*B725\*\*, 60 \(2013\)](#), [[arXiv:1303.2084 \[hep-ex\]](#)].
- [13] ALICE, B. Abelev *et al.*, [Phys. Lett. \*\*B719\*\*, 29 \(2013\)](#), [[arXiv:1212.2001](#)].
- [14] PHENIX, A. Adare *et al.*, [Phys. Rev. Lett. \(2013\)](#), [[arXiv:1303.1794 \[nucl-ex\]](#)].
- [15] A. M. Poskanzer and S. Voloshin, [Phys. Rev. \*\*C58\*\*, 1671 \(1998\)](#), [[arXiv:nucl-ex/9805001 \[nucl-ex\]](#)].
- [16] S. Voloshin and Y. Zhang, [Z. Phys. \*\*C70\*\*, 665 \(1996\)](#), [[arXiv:hep-ph/9407282 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [17] N. Borghini, P. M. Dinh and J.-Y. Ollitrault, [Phys. Rev. \*\*C64\*\*, 054901 \(2001\)](#), [[arXiv:nucl-th/0105040 \[nucl-th\]](#)].
- [18] R. Andrade, F. Grassi, Y. Hama, T. Kodama and J. Socolowski, O., [Phys. Rev. Lett. \*\*97\*\*, 202302 \(2006\)](#), [[arXiv:nucl-th/0608067 \[nucl-th\]](#)].
- [19] B. Alver and G. Roland, [Phys. Rev. \*\*C81\*\*, 054905 \(2010\)](#), [[arXiv:1003.0194 \[nucl-th\]](#)].
- [20] H. Niemi, G. Denicol, H. Holopainen and P. Huovinen, [Phys. Rev. \*\*C87\*\*, 054901 \(2013\)](#), [[arXiv:1212.1008 \[nucl-th\]](#)].
- [21] C. Gale, S. Jeon, B. Schenke, P. Tribedy and R. Venugopalan, [Phys. Rev. Lett. \*\*110\*\*, 012302 \(2013\)](#), [[arXiv:1209.6330 \[nucl-th\]](#)].
- [22] A. Dumitru, F. Gelis, L. McLerran and R. Venugopalan, [Nucl. Phys. \*\*A810\*\*, 91 \(2008\)](#), [[arXiv:0804.3858 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [23] K. Dusling, F. Gelis, T. Lappi and R. Venugopalan, [Nucl. Phys. \*\*A836\*\*, 159 \(2010\)](#), [[arXiv:0911.2720 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [24] A. Dumitru *et al.*, [Phys. Lett. \*\*B697\*\*, 21 \(2011\)](#), [[arXiv:1009.5295 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [25] K. Dusling and R. Venugopalan, [Phys. Rev. Lett. \*\*108\*\*, 262001 \(2012\)](#), [[arXiv:1201.2658 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [26] K. Dusling and R. Venugopalan, [Phys. Rev. \*\*D87\*\*, 054014 \(2013\)](#), [[arXiv:1211.3701 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [27] K. Dusling and R. Venugopalan, [Phys. Rev. \*\*D87\*\*, 094034 \(2013\)](#), [[arXiv:1302.7018 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [28] P. Bozek and W. Broniowski, [Phys. Lett. \*\*B718\*\*, 1557 \(2013\)](#), [[arXiv:1211.0845 \[nucl-th\]](#)].
- [29] P. Bozek and W. Broniowski, [Phys. Rev. \*\*C88\*\*, 014903 \(2013\)](#), [[arXiv:1304.3044 \[nucl-th\]](#)].

- [30] K. Werner, M. Bleicher, B. Guiot, I. Karpenko and T. Pierog, [arXiv:1307.4379 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [31] A. Dumitru, Y. Nara and E. Petreska, [Phys. Rev. \*\*D88\*\*, 054016 \(2013\), \[arXiv:1302.2064 \[hep-ph\]\]](#).
- [32] S. Mrowczynski, [Phys. Lett. \*\*B314\*\*, 118 \(1993\)](#).
- [33] A. Bzdak, B. Schenke, P. Tribedy and R. Venugopalan, [Phys. Rev. \*\*C87\*\*, 064906 \(2013\), \[arXiv:1304.3403 \[nucl-th\]\]](#).
- [34] T. Lappi, S. Srednyak and R. Venugopalan, [JHEP \*\*01\*\*, 066 \(2010\), \[arXiv:0911.2068 \[hep-ph\]\]](#).
- [35] J. P. Blaizot, T. Lappi and Y. Mehtar-Tani, [Nucl. Phys. \*\*A846\*\*, 63 \(2010\), \[arXiv:1005.0955 \[hep-ph\]\]](#).
- [36] K. Dusling, D. Fernandez-Fraile and R. Venugopalan, [Nucl. Phys. \*\*A828\*\*, 161 \(2009\), \[arXiv:0902.4435 \[nucl-th\]\]](#).
- [37] F. Gelis, T. Lappi and L. McLerran, [Nucl. Phys. \*\*A828\*\*, 149 \(2009\), \[arXiv:0905.3234 \[hep-ph\]\]](#).
- [38] Y. V. Kovchegov and K. L. Tuchin, [Nucl. Phys. \*\*A708\*\*, 413 \(2002\), \[arXiv:hep-ph/0203213 \[hep-ph\]\]](#).
- [39] S. Jeon and R. Venugopalan, [Phys. Rev. \*\*D70\*\*, 105012 \(2004\), \[arXiv:hep-ph/0406169\]](#).
- [40] S. Jeon and R. Venugopalan, [Phys. Rev. \*\*D71\*\*, 125003 \(2005\), \[arXiv:hep-ph/0503219 \[hep-ph\]\]](#).
- [41] A. Dumitru, J. Jalilian-Marian and E. Petreska, [Phys. Rev. \*\*D84\*\*, 014018 \(2011\), \[arXiv:1105.4155 \[hep-ph\]\]](#).
- [42] A. Kovner and M. Lublinsky, [Phys. Rev. \*\*D83\*\*, 034017 \(2011\), \[arXiv:1012.3398 \[hep-ph\]\]](#).
- [43] PHOBOS, B. Alver *et al.*, [Phys. Rev. Lett. \*\*98\*\*, 242302 \(2007\), \[arXiv:nucl-ex/0610037 \[nucl-ex\]\]](#).
- [44] Z. Qiu and U. W. Heinz, [Phys. Rev. \*\*C84\*\*, 024911 \(2011\), \[arXiv:1104.0650 \[nucl-th\]\]](#).
- [45] R. S. Bhalerao, M. Luzum and J.-Y. Ollitrault, [Phys. Rev. \*\*C84\*\*, 034910 \(2011\), \[arXiv:1104.4740 \[nucl-th\]\]](#).
- [46] J.-P. Blaizot, F. Gelis, J.-F. Liao, L. McLerran and R. Venugopalan, [Nucl. Phys. \*\*A873\*\*, 68 \(2012\), \[arXiv:1107.5296 \[hep-ph\]\]](#).
- [47] S. Floerchinger and C. Wetterich, [arXiv:1311.5389 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [48] T. Gasenzer, L. McLerran, J. M. Pawłowski and D. Sexty, [arXiv:1307.5301 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [49] A. Kurkela and G. D. Moore, *Phys. Rev.* **D86**, 056008 (2012), [\[arXiv:1207.1663 \[hep-ph\]\]](#).
- [50] J. Berges, K. Boguslavski, S. Schlichting and R. Venugopalan, [arXiv:1303.5650 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [51] T. Epelbaum and F. Gelis, [arXiv:1307.1765 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [52] T. Epelbaum and F. Gelis, [arXiv:1307.2214 \[hep-ph\]](#).