

# Hadronic $J/\psi$ Regeneration in Pb+Pb Collisions

Joseph Dominicus Lap<sup>1</sup> and Berndt Müller<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Department of Physics, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06510, USA*

<sup>2</sup> *Department of Physics, Duke University, Durham, NC 27705, USA*

We study  $D$ -meson collisions during the hadronic break-up phase as a production mechanism for charmonium in relativistic heavy ion collisions at the Large Hadron Collider. Our calculation is based on chemical reaction rates with thermal cross sections for an effective meson interaction among pseudoscalar and vector mesons. We make use of published yields for  $D$ -mesons in Pb+Pb collisions and a schematic description of the expansion of the hadron gas. We find that the expected  $J/\psi$  yield from hadronic regeneration is comparable to that predicted in the thermal equilibrium model. Our result implies that it will be difficult to distinguish regeneration during hadronization from regeneration by final-state hadronic interactions.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The surprisingly large yield of  $J/\psi$  measured in Pb+Pb collisions at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) [1, 2] has been interpreted as evidence for the regeneration of  $J/\psi$  mesons during hadronization of the quark-gluon plasma, which is oversaturated with charm [3–5]. In the energy regime of the LHC ( $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76, 5.02$  TeV) an abundant number of charm quark pairs is created during the initial collision of two <sup>208</sup>Pb nuclei. Assuming sufficiently rapid thermalization, these  $c$  and  $\bar{c}$  quarks become an integral part of the quark-gluon plasma (QGP) that is created in the collision and eventually participate in the bulk hadronization of the QGP.

Under the thermal conditions at hadronization ( $T_H \sim 155$  MeV), the initially produced number of  $c$  and  $\bar{c}$  quarks is larger than the expected thermal yield and can be characterized by a fugacity factor  $\lambda_c \approx 30$  [6]. In the statistical hadronization model for charm (SHMc) this overpopulation of charm quarks results in a strong enhancement in the number of emitted charm quark containing hadrons, with  $D$ -mesons being enhanced by a factor  $\lambda_c$  and charmonium states by a factor  $\lambda_c^2$ .

While the  $D$ -meson and  $J/\psi$  yields predicted by the SHMc agree within uncertainties with the measured yields [6, 7],  $J/\psi$  production by coalescence of  $c$  and  $\bar{c}$  quarks at the QGP phase boundary may not be the sole mechanism contributing to secondary  $J/\psi$  production. For example,  $J/\psi$  may also be formed by reactions among hadrons with open charm in the late hadronic gas phase. This mechanism has been considered by multiple authors [8–10] well before data from the LHC became available.

It is sometimes argued that after hadronization the chemical reaction rates among hadrons with open charm are too small to affect the number of produced  $J/\psi$ . However, this is not necessarily true as the overpopulation of charm quarks in the QGP also means that the produced number of mesons with open charm is much larger than what is expected in thermal equilibrium. This enhances the rates of  $J/\psi$ -producing reactions of the type  $D + \bar{D} \rightarrow J/\psi + h$ , where  $h$  is a light hadron, quadratically. Furthermore, for many hadron states  $h$ , the reactions are exothermic and thus not suppressed at low temperature.

The total level of hadronic  $J/\psi$  regeneration depends on the number of  $D$ -mesons present in the hadron gas – which can be measured – and on the magnitude of the cross sections for the hadronic charm exchange reactions, which are not known from experiment. This naturally introduces a significant uncertainty of the calculated regeneration probability, which we will explore in the following.

We will first briefly review the broken SU(4) symmetric model for  $D$ -meson– $J/\psi$  interactions and the reaction rates derived by Abreu *et al.* [11]. We next discuss the rate equation governing  $J/\psi$  regeneration and its initial conditions and describe the schematic expansion model. We then present our results for  $N_{J/\psi}(t)$  and discuss their implications.

## II. CHEMICAL REACTION MODEL

### A. $D$ -meson– $J/\psi$ Interactions

There exist many models for interactions among hadrons containing  $c$  and  $\bar{c}$  quarks. Here we consider the class of highly-constrained models [11–14, 14, 15] that are based on an effective interaction among pseudoscalar ( $P$ ) and vector ( $V_\mu$ ) mesons with broken SU(4) flavor symmetry. The mesons are organized into multiplets in the adjoint representation of SU(4) for pseudoscalars:

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} P_+ & \pi^+ & K^+ & \bar{D}^0 \\ \pi^- & P_- & K^0 & D^- \\ K^- & \bar{K}^0 & P_3 & D_s^- \\ D^0 & D^+ & D_s^+ & -\frac{3}{\sqrt{12}}\eta_c \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} P_\pm &= \pm \frac{\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{6}} + \frac{\eta_c}{\sqrt{12}}, \\ P_3 &= -\frac{2\eta}{\sqrt{6}} + \frac{\eta_c}{\sqrt{12}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

and vector mesons:

$$V_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} V_+ & \rho^+ & K^{*+} & \bar{D}^{*0} \\ \rho^- & V_- & K^{*0} & D^{*-} \\ K^{*-} & \bar{K}^{*0} & V_3 & D_s^{*-} \\ D^{*0} & D^{*+} & D_s^{*+} & -\frac{3}{\sqrt{12}}J/\psi \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\pm} &= \pm \frac{\rho^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\omega}{\sqrt{6}} + \frac{J/\psi}{\sqrt{12}}, \\ V_3 &= -\frac{2\omega}{\sqrt{6}} + \frac{J/\psi}{\sqrt{12}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Lorentz invariance and SU(4) symmetry then dictate the form of allowed interactions and determine vertices for the interactions of type PPV, PVV, VVV, PPPV, PPVV, PVVV, and VVVV. The relevant interactions are:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{PPV} &= -ig_{PPV}\langle V^\mu [P, \partial_\mu P] \rangle \\ \mathcal{L}_{PVV} &= g_{PVV}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\langle \partial_\mu V_\nu \partial_\alpha V_\beta P \rangle \\ \mathcal{L}_{VVV} &= ig_{VVV}\langle \partial_\mu V_\nu [V^\mu, V^\nu] \rangle \\ \mathcal{L}_{PPPV} &= -ig_{PPPV}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\langle V_\mu (\partial_\nu P)(\partial_\alpha P)(\partial_\beta P) \rangle \\ \mathcal{L}_{PPVV} &= g_{PPVV}\langle PV^\mu [V_\mu, P] \rangle \\ \mathcal{L}_{PVVV} &= ig_{PVVV}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\langle V_\mu V_\nu V_\alpha \partial_\beta P \rangle \\ \mathcal{L}_{VVVV} &= g_{VVVV}\langle V^\mu V_\nu [V^\mu, V^\nu] \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The coupling constants for these interactions can be deduced from experimental data, and where such data are lacking, from SU(4) symmetry [12, 13, 15].

## B. Reaction Rates

Using these interactions one can calculate the isospin-averaged cross-section for  $J/\psi$  absorption processes:

$$\sigma_r(s) = \frac{1}{64\pi^2 s} \frac{p_f}{p_i} \int d\Omega \langle |\mathcal{M}_r(s, \theta)|^2 \rangle_{S,I}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathcal{M}_r$  denotes the invariant amplitude for reaction  $r$ ,  $\sqrt{s}$  is the center of mass energy,  $p_i$  ( $p_f$ ) are the relative momenta in the initial (final) state of the reaction, and the average is taken over isospin and spin degrees of freedom weighted by their respective degeneracies. The matrix elements are usually calculated at lowest order in the meson coupling. The cross sections for inverse reactions can be obtained using the detailed balance relation

$$\sigma_{(3+4 \rightarrow 1+2)} = \sigma_{(1+2 \rightarrow 3+4)} \frac{(2S_1 + 1)(2S_2 + 1) p_i^2}{(2S_3 + 1)(2S_4 + 1) p_f^2}. \quad (7)$$

Abreu *et al.* [11] obtained estimates for the averaged cross-sections of various  $J/\psi$  production processes. They also calculated the thermal average of the production cross-sections:

$$\langle \sigma_{ab \rightarrow cd} v_{ab} \rangle = \frac{d^3(p_a) d^3(p_b) f_a(p_a) f_b(p_b) \sigma_{ab \rightarrow cd} v_{ab}}{d^3(p_a) d^3(p_b) f_a(p_a) f_b(p_b)} \quad (8)$$

where  $v_{ab}$  is the relative velocity of the incoming particles, and  $f_i(p_i)$  is the temperature dependent Bose-Einstein distribution for particles of species  $i$ .

As the reactions are exothermic, the resultant thermally averaged  $J/\psi$  production cross sections vary little over

the relevant temperature range ( $100 \text{ MeV} \leq T \leq 155 \text{ MeV}$ ). The following values are taken from Figs. 4,5 of [11] using error bars to constrain any deviations from a constant value:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma v \rangle (D\bar{D} \rightarrow J\Psi + \pi) &= .03 \pm .01 \text{ mb} \\ \langle \sigma v \rangle (D^*\bar{D}^* \rightarrow J\Psi + \pi) &= 1 \text{ mb} \\ \langle \sigma v \rangle (D^*\bar{D} \rightarrow J\Psi + \pi) &= 3.75 \pm .25 \text{ mb} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma v \rangle (D\bar{D} \rightarrow J\Psi + \rho) &= .065 \pm .01 \text{ mb} \\ \langle \sigma v \rangle (D^*\bar{D} \rightarrow J\Psi + \rho) &= .15 \pm .05 \text{ mb} \\ \langle \sigma v \rangle (D^*\bar{D}^* \rightarrow J\Psi + \rho) &= .95 \pm .05 \text{ mb} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma v \rangle (D_s\bar{D} \rightarrow J/\psi + K) &= .25 \pm .05 \text{ mb} \\ \langle \sigma v \rangle (D_s^*\bar{D} \rightarrow J/\psi + K) &= 1.7 \text{ mb} \\ \langle \sigma v \rangle (D_s\bar{D}^* \rightarrow J/\psi + K) &= 1.5 \text{ mb} \\ \langle \sigma v \rangle (D_s^*\bar{D}^* \rightarrow J/\psi + K) &= .4 \text{ mb} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma v \rangle (D_s\bar{D} \rightarrow J\Psi + K^*) &= 0.3 \pm 0.1 \text{ mb} \\ \langle \sigma v \rangle (D_s^*\bar{D} \rightarrow J\Psi + K^*) &= .8 \text{ mb} \\ \langle \sigma v \rangle (D_s\bar{D}^* \rightarrow J\Psi + K^*) &= 1.2 \text{ mb} \\ \langle \sigma v \rangle (D_s^*\bar{D}^* \rightarrow J\Psi + K^*) &= 4 \text{ mb} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

We note that the thermal cross sections estimated by Bratkovskaya *et al.* [9] in their phenomenological model agree quite well with those obtained by Abreu *et al.* [11] in the effective SU(4) chiral model. Before moving on, it is worth mentioning that Abreu *et al.* also considered reactions involving the  $s$ -channel  $Z_c(3900)$  and  $Z_c(4025)$  resonances and found them to be small enough to safely ignore.

## III. RATE EQUATION

The time evolution of the  $J/\psi$  density  $n_{J/\psi}$  is described by the following rate equation [11]:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dN_{J/\psi}(\tau)}{d\tau} &= \sum_{p_1, p_2, h} \langle \sigma_{p_1+p_2 \rightarrow J/\psi+h} \rangle \frac{N_{p_1}(\tau) N_{p_2}(\tau)}{V(\tau)} \\ &\quad - \sum_{p_1, p_2, h} \langle \sigma_{J/\psi+h \rightarrow p_1+p_2} \rangle \frac{N_{J/\psi}(\tau) N_h(\tau)}{V(\tau)}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where  $N_{p_1}, N_{p_2}$  denote the abundances of the various species of  $D$ -mesons and  $N_h$  denotes the number of light hadrons in the initial state of the reverse reaction. Here we assumed that the hadrons are evenly distributed over the density profile of the fireball. This assumption allows us to write the rate equations for volume integrated numbers of mesons  $N_i$  instead of local particle densities  $n_i$ . The first term in (10) accounts for formation reactions; the second term accounts for absorption processes. Assuming boost invariance, an assumption that is well justified at

midrapidity in heavy ion collisions in the LHC energy range, we will use particle numbers and volume per unit rapidity,  $dN_i/dy$  and  $dV/dy$ , but denote these simply as  $N_i$  and  $V$ .

It is useful to write (10) in the following form:

$$\frac{dN_{J/\psi}(\tau)}{d\tau} = \frac{C_{J/\psi}}{V(\tau)} - A_{J/\psi}(\tau)N_{J/\psi}(\tau) \quad (11)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_{J/\psi} &= \sum_{p_1, p_2, h} \langle \sigma_{p_1+p_2 \rightarrow J/\psi+h} \rangle N_{p_1} N_{p_2} \\ A_{J/\psi}(\tau) &= \sum_{p_1, p_2, h} \langle \sigma_{J/\psi+h \rightarrow p_1+p_2} \rangle n_h(\tau). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Because the thermal production cross sections are nearly temperature independent and the number of  $D$ -mesons does not appreciably change during the hadronic expansion stage,  $C_{J/\psi}$  remains approximately constant during the entire hadronic fireball expansion. On the other hand,  $A_{J/\psi}(\tau)$  drops rapidly with time as the hadronic gas expands and cools, because the thermal  $J/\psi$  absorption cross sections decrease rapidly with falling temperature and the light hadron densities drops inversely with the volume of the fireball.

### A. Initial conditions

We base our investigation on the estimated yields  $dN_i/dy$  for  $D$ -mesons in 0–10% central Pb+Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV (see Table 1 in [6]). Because the system is almost net-baryon free, particle and antiparticle yields are assumed to be identical. The  $D^0$  yield listed in [6] includes  $D^{0*}$ , and the  $D_s^+$  yield includes the  $D_s^{*+}$ . In order to estimate the separate yields for these species we assume the yields are in the same proportion as the identified  $D^{+*}/D^+$  ratio ( $0.88 \pm .31$ ). We also assume that the fractional uncertainty on the subdivided results is maintained. This gives the following separate yield estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} N(D^0) &= 3.196 \pm 0.57, \\ N(D^{0*}) &= 2.82 \pm 0.5, \\ N(D^+) &= 2.67 \pm 0.47 \\ N(D^{*+}) &= 2.36 \pm 0.42 \\ N(D_s) &= 1.14 \pm 0.20, \\ N(D_s^*) &= 1.01 \pm 0.18. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

These numbers include feed-down from multiple short-lived states with  $D$ -meson quantum numbers. Estimates indicate that up to 75% of the measured yields (13) originate from the decay of such states. Since most of the higher lying  $D$ -meson states in the Particle Data Book [16] have decay widths greater than 200 MeV (the  $D_2^*(2460)$  with a width of 47 MeV is an exception), corresponding to lifetimes less than 1 fm/c, we will here assume that

these feed-down processes are complete by the time when we begin integrating the rate equation (11). If some of the higher excited states (such as the  $D_2^*(2460)$ ) remain populated, they would also contribute to  $J/\psi$  regeneration. While we do not know what the corresponding thermal cross sections are, it is a reasonable assumption that they would be comparable to the cross sections (5) for  $J/\psi$  production from the low-lying  $D$ -meson states. We will therefore ignore this complication and simply use the yields listed in (13).

Using these values for the  $D$ -meson yields immediately after hadronization of the QGP and the thermally averaged cross sections the constant prefactor  $C_{J/\psi}$  in (11) takes the value

$$C_{J/\psi} = 27.4 \pm 14.1 \text{ fm}^2. \quad (14)$$

The uncertainty range accounts for the uncertainty in the number of  $D$ -mesons formed during hadronization, which enters quadratically into  $C_{J/\psi}$ .

### B. Expansion Models

The final missing piece in our calculation is the time evolution of the volume  $V(\tau)$  of the fireball per unit rapidity. As the thermal cross sections for  $J/\psi$  production are not known from experiment and have large theoretical uncertainties, it makes sense to adopt a schematic model for the expansion of the hadronic system instead of conducting a detailed transport simulation of its expansion. As already stated, we assume that the hadrons are uniformly distributed over a large volume at the moment of hadronization and maintain this uniformity during the expansion with a prescribed velocity profile.

Both Abreu *et al.* [11] and Andronic *et al.* [6] model the expanding hadronic system as a cylindrical fireball, but their schematic models differ in details. Here we compare the two models in order to get a sense of how sensitive the produced  $J/\psi$  yield is to those details.

Abreu *et al.* [11] estimate the fireball volume as a function of the global proper time  $\tau$  by:

$$V(\tau) = c\tau\pi R(\tau)^2, \quad (15)$$

where  $R(\tau)$  denotes the expanding transverse radius of the fireball:

$$R(\tau) = R_H + v_H(\tau - \tau_H) + \frac{a_H}{2}(\tau - \tau_H)^2. \quad (16)$$

We adapt the parameter values given in [11] for Au+Au collisions at RHIC to Pb+Pb collisions at LHC. We choose these values such that they correspond to a hadronization volume  $V(\tau_H) = 4,997 \pm 455 \text{ fm}^3$  [6].

Andronic *et al.* [6] calculate the hadronization volume at chemical freeze-out as a one-dimensional integral along the freeze-out contour in the  $\tau - r$  plane, where  $\tau$  is the local proper time and  $r$  denotes the transverse coordinate:

$$V_H = 2\pi \int_0^{R_H} dr r \tau(r) u^\tau [1 - \beta(r) \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial r}]. \quad (17)$$

where  $u^\tau = (1 - \beta^2)^{-1/2}$  is the Lorentz factor associated with transverse expansion and  $\beta(r)$  is the radial velocity. This approach enables them to study different freeze-out surfaces  $\tau(r) = R_H + \int_0^r dr' \beta(r')$  with a transverse flow profile  $\beta(r)$ . Here we adopt the scaling model  $\beta(r) = \beta_H (r/R_H)^n$  with values  $n = 0.85$  and  $\beta_H = 0.62$  as advocated in [6]. By requiring that both models have same volume at hadronization we can calculate a new hadronization radius  $R_H$  and time  $\tau_H$ . The uncertainty of the volume corresponds to the range  $10.85 \text{ fm} \leq R_H \leq 11.53 \text{ fm}$ , which is slightly smaller than the transverse radius  $R_H = 12 \text{ fm}$  used in the Abreu *et al.* model.

Based on this new hadronization radius we calculate a hadronization time of  $10.87 \text{ fm}/c \leq \tau_H \leq 14.74 \text{ fm}/c$ , and instead of using the values  $v_H = 0.6, a_H = .044$  estimated in Ref. [11] we use the values  $v_H = 0.62, a_H = 0$  from Andronic *et al.* [6].

In order to estimate the freeze-out volume  $V_F$ , we use the approximate relation

$$\frac{V_F}{V_H} = \left( \frac{T_H}{T_F} \right)^3 \quad (18)$$

valid for isentropic expansion of a gas of massless particles. The hadronization temperature and freeze-out temperature are estimated to  $H_T \approx 155 \text{ MeV}$  and  $T_F \approx 90 \text{ MeV}$ , respectively [17]. This yields  $V_F \approx 25,000 \text{ fm}^3$  and  $\tau_F = 25 \pm 1 \text{ fm}/c$ .

Normally follows the hadronic fireball evolution until the thermal freeze-out time when the elastic scattering among hadrons becomes ineffective. However, as the  $D$ -meson reactions leading to  $J/\psi$  production are exothermic and thus  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  remains constant after freeze-out, there is no justification for stopping the calculation at the freeze-out time. The production of  $J/\psi$  merely becomes less common by dilution as the volume increases. As the integral  $\int d\tau/V(\tau)$  is convergent, it makes sense to simply integrate until  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$  rather than imposing an artificial upper time limit.

It turns out the physics is not sensitive to the details of the expansion models. For example, we have used the different values for  $n$  and  $\beta$  given by [6] and [18] but found that the behaviour is insensitive to both variables within the error bars. The integral of over the inverse volume factor that influences the  $J/\psi$  yield is similarly insensitive:

#### IV. RESULTS

For a first exploration of the importance of hadronic regeneration of the  $J/\psi$ , we make the extreme assumption that no  $J/\psi$  is produced at hadronization and focus on the production channel, i. e. the first term in (10). As




FIG. 1: Comparison of volume evolution post hadronization for Bjorken freeze-out surface




FIG. 2: Comparison of the factor  $\int d\tau/V(\tau)$  for the three volume evolution models.

we just indicated, we have set  $N_{J/\psi}(\tau_H) = 0$  as our focus is on the efficiency of production of  $J/\psi$  by hadronic reactions. We next derive an estimate for the constant prefactor  $C$ . Obviously, if one started with a large yield of  $J/\psi$  at  $\tau_H$  or if the number of produced  $J/\psi$  were found to be large, the absorption processes would need to be taken into account. The time dependence of  $N(J/\psi)$  for the two different evolution models is shown in Fig.3. The number of  $J/\psi$  converges to an asymptotic value in both cases, but it takes until  $\tau \sim 50 \text{ fm}/c$  until the final yield gets frozen. Even though  $D$ -meson collisions becoming increasingly rare as the hadron gas expands, stopping the calculation at the thermal freeze-out time would underestimate the total yield.

Figure 3 shows that the  $J/\psi$  yield from  $D$ -meson reactions is  $.028 < N_{J/\psi} < .088$ . This is a significant fraction of the estimated equilibrium  $J/\psi$  yield of  $N_{\text{exp}}(J/\psi) = 0.108 + 0.041 - 0.035$  [6].

We note that the uncertainty band only includes the uncertainty from the initial  $D$ -meson yields, which enter quadratically, but does not include a full account of the uncertainty of the production cross sections, which are not directly constrained by experimental data




FIG. 3: Time dependence of hadronic  $J/\psi$  production by  $D$ -mesons shown by the red curve with shaded uncertainty bands. The dashed red curve shows the effect of absorption by inverse reactions. We note that  $D$ -meson interactions occurring after the estimated kinetic freeze-out time, indicated by the vertical dashed line, contribute significantly to the total  $J/\psi$  yield. The horizontal blue line indicates the chemical equilibrium yield.

## V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Our calculation shows is that we cannot safely ignore the contribution from hadronic charmonium production processes to the  $J/\psi$  yield in heavy-ion collisions at LHC energies. As such, calculations of thermal production of

$J/\psi$  ought to take regeneration by  $D$ -meson collisions into account.

We expect our results to give a lower bound on the true yield from hadronic regeneration of  $J/\psi$  as certain production channels have been neglected, such as  $D_s + \bar{D}_s \rightarrow J/\psi + \phi$ . A non-uniform distribution of  $c$  ( $\bar{c}$ ) quarks with greater concentration toward the center of the collision, as is expected from the transverse distribution of binary nucleon-nucleon collisions, also tends to increase the overall yield. Finally, it is unknown what fraction of  $D\bar{D}$  collisions result in the formation of excited charmonium states, especially the  $\chi_1$ , which then produce additional  $J/\psi$  via feed-down. There is no reason to expect that the primary ratio  $N(\chi_1)/N(J/\psi)$  in  $D$ -meson mediated reactions is given by the ratio obtained in the SHMc.

Since these additional sources of uncertainty tend to enhance the  $J/\psi$  yield we surmise that our result is likely an underestimate. We therefore conclude that  $D$ -meson collisions contribute substantially to the measured  $J/\psi$  yield in Pb+Pb collisions at the LHC and must be taken into account in transport models of the final hadronic phase of the heavy-ion reaction.

*Acknowledgement:* We thank A. Andronic, E. Bratkovskaya, P. Braun-Munzinger, and J. Stachel for valuable comments on a draft of this manuscript. This work was supported by grant DE-FG02-05ER41367 from the Office of Science of the U.S. Department of Energy. B.M. acknowledges hospitality and financial support during a sabbatical stay at Yale University.

- 
- [1] B. Abelev *et al.* (ALICE), Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 072301 (2012), arXiv:1202.1383 [hep-ex] .
  - [2] B. B. Abelev *et al.* (ALICE), Phys. Lett. B **734**, 314 (2014), arXiv:1311.0214 [nucl-ex] .
  - [3] P. Braun-Munzinger and J. Stachel, Phys. Lett. B **490**, 196 (2000), arXiv:nucl-th/0007059 .
  - [4] R. L. Thews, M. Schroedter, and J. Rafelski, Phys. Rev. C **63**, 054905 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0007323 .
  - [5] A. Andronic, P. Braun-Munzinger, K. Redlich, and J. Stachel, Phys. Lett. B **571**, 36 (2003), arXiv:nucl-th/0303036 .
  - [6] A. Andronic, P. Braun-Munzinger, M. K. Köhler, A. Mazeliauskas, K. Redlich, J. Stachel, and V. Viskovic, JHEP **07**, 035 (2021), arXiv:2104.12754 [hep-ph] .
  - [7] A. Andronic, P. Braun-Munzinger, K. Redlich, and J. Stachel, Nature **561**, 321 (2018), arXiv:1710.09425 [nucl-th] .
  - [8] B. Zhang, C. M. Ko, B.-A. Li, Z.-W. Lin, and S. Pal, Phys. Rev. C **65**, 054909 (2002), arXiv:nucl-th/0201038 .
  - [9] E. L. Bratkovskaya, W. Cassing, and H. Stoecker, Phys. Rev. C **67**, 054905 (2003), arXiv:nucl-th/0301083 .
  - [10] O. Linnyk, E. L. Bratkovskaya, and W. Cassing, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **17**, 1367 (2008), arXiv:0808.1504 [nucl-th] .
  - [11] L. M. Abreu, K. P. Khemchandani, A. Martínez Torres, F. S. Navarra, and M. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. C **97**, 044902 (2018), arXiv:1712.06019 [hep-ph] .
  - [12] S. G. Matinyan and B. Muller, Phys. Rev. C **58**, 2994 (1998), arXiv:nucl-th/9806027 .
  - [13] K. L. Haglin, Phys. Rev. C **61**, 031902 (2000), arXiv:nucl-th/9907034 .
  - [14] Y.-S. Oh, T. Song, and S. H. Lee, Phys. Rev. C **63**, 034901 (2001), arXiv:nucl-th/0010064 .
  - [15] F. Carvalho, F. O. Duraes, F. S. Navarra, and M. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. C **72**, 024902 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0508137 .
  - [16] P. A. Zyla *et al.* (Particle Data Group), PTEP **2020**, 083C01 (2020).
  - [17] B. Abelev *et al.* (ALICE), Phys. Rev. C **88**, 044910 (2013), arXiv:1303.0737 [hep-ex] .
  - [18] A. Mazeliauskas and V. Viskovic, Phys. Rev. C **101**, 014910 (2020), arXiv:1907.11059 [hep-ph] .
  - [19] K. Aamodt *et al.* (ALICE), Phys. Lett. B **696**, 328 (2011), arXiv:1012.4035 [nucl-ex] .
  - [20] S. Acharya *et al.* (ALICE), Phys. Rev. C **101**, 044907 (2020), arXiv:1910.07678 [nucl-ex] .
  - [21] E. Schnedermann, J. Sollfrank, and U. W. Heinz, Phys. Rev. C **48**, 2462 (1993), arXiv:nucl-th/9307020 .
  - [22] J. Adam *et al.* (ALICE), JHEP **03**, 081 (2016), arXiv:1509.06888 [nucl-ex] .

- [23] S. Acharya *et al.* (ALICE), Phys. Lett. B **793**, 212 (2019), arXiv:1809.10922 [nucl-ex] .
- [24] S. Acharya *et al.* (ALICE), Phys. Rev. C **104**, 054905 (2021), arXiv:2011.06079 [nucl-ex] .
- [25] S. Acharya *et al.* (ALICE), Phys. Rev. Lett. **127**, 202301 (2021), arXiv:2011.06078 [nucl-ex] .