

Infrared Behaviour of The Gluon Propagator in Non-Equilibrium Situations

Fred Cooper,¹ Chung-Wen Kao,^{2,y} and Gouranga C. Nayak^{3,z}

¹Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA

²Theoretical Physics Group, Department of Physics and Astronomy,
University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK

³Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA

(dated: April 15, 2024)

Abstract

The infrared behaviour of the medium modified gluon propagator in non-equilibrium situations is studied in the covariant gauge using the Schwinger-Keldysh closed-time path formalism. It is shown that the magnetic screening mass is non-zero at the one loop level whenever the initial gluon distribution function is non isotropic with the assumption that the distribution function of the gluon is not divergent at zero transverse momentum. For isotropic gluon distribution functions, such as those describing local equilibrium, the magnetic mass at one loop level is zero which is consistent with finite temperature field theory results. Assuming that a reasonable initial gluon distribution function can be obtained from a perturbative QCD calculation of minijets, we determine these out of equilibrium values for the initial magnetic and Debye screening masses at energy densities appropriate to RHIC and LHC. We also compare the magnetic masses obtained here with those obtained using finite temperature lattice QCD methods at similar temperatures at RHIC and LHC.

PACS numbers: PACS: 12.38.-t, 12.38.Cy, 12.38.Mh, 11.10.Wx

Electronic address: fcooper@lanl.gov

^yElectronic address: kao@a35.ph.manch.ac.uk

^zElectronic address: nayak@shakti.lanl.gov

Experiments at RHIC (Au-Au collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 200 \text{ GeV}$) and LHC (Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 5.5 \text{ TeV}$) will provide an excellent opportunity to produce a quark-gluon plasma in the laboratory. There is no doubt that an energy density larger than $5 \text{ GeV}/\text{fm}^3$ [1] will be created during these collisions but it is not at all clear that the partons produced following the collision will reach equilibrium. The study of the equilibration of the quark-gluon plasma is very crucial because it determines the time evolution of all global quantities such as energy density, number density etc.. This study also plays a crucial role in determining many of the potential signatures for quark-gluon plasma detection at RHIC. The space-time evolution of the parton gas for this non-equilibrium situation can be modeled by solving semi-classical relativistic transport equations [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. Central to solving the transport equations is what goes into the scattering kernels. Perturbative vacuum expressions for gluon scattering suffer from severe infrared problems. One loop medium effects in equilibrium provide an electric (Debye) screening mass, but not a magnetic screening mass [11]. Thus one cannot use a one loop resummed finite temperature gluon propagator as an approximation to the scattering kernel because of severe infrared problems in the limit that $p_0 = 0$ and $|\mathbf{p}| \rightarrow 0$. To obtain magnetic screening in equilibrium situations requires a non-perturbative lattice QCD calculation. What we would like to point out here is that if we use the CTP formalism [12] with an arbitrary non thermal initial Gaussian density matrix then it is possible to obtain at one loop a magnetic screening mass as long as the initial gluon single particle distribution function $f(k_x; k_y; k_z; t_0)$ is not isotropic with the assumption that the gluon distribution function is not divergent at zero transverse momentum. That is we assume that at $t = t_0$ one can write a Fourier decomposition of the gluon field in terms of creation and annihilation operators. By a Bogoliubov transformation at $t = t_0$ one can always set the pair distribution functions $\langle a^\dagger(\mathbf{k}; t = t_0) a(\mathbf{q}; t = t_0) \rangle = \langle a(\mathbf{k}; t = t_0) a^\dagger(\mathbf{q}; t = t_0) \rangle = 0$. Thus the propagator will have the usual vacuum part and a term which depends on the initial expectation value of the number density

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k}}^{\mathbf{x}^2} \langle a^\dagger(\mathbf{k}; t = t_0) a(\mathbf{q}; t = t_0) \rangle = f(\mathbf{k}; t_0) (2\pi)^3 \delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}); \quad (1)$$

and we have summed over the physical transverse polarizations. For f to correspond to a physically realizable quantity the number density as well as energy density has to be finite. Thus $f(\mathbf{k}; t)$ has to go to zero as $k \rightarrow \infty$ fast enough so that one obtains finite number density and energy density. For Gaussian initial value problems, one only needs to know the

two-point function at $t = t_0$. In our following analysis, we will also need to make a quasi-adiabatic approximation so that we will assume, for the purpose of determining the initial screening masses, that the system is time-translation invariant. Thus the only difference we will assume in our Green's functions from the usual thermal ones will be the choice of an anisotropic $f(\mathbf{k}; t_0)$ which will replace the usual Bose-Einstein distribution function. This approximation has been discussed in detail by Thomas and others [14]. In our calculations, we will use a simple ansatz for $f(\mathbf{k}; t_0)$ in which the parameters will be chosen to agree with known distributions for minijet production at RHIC and LHC. Here we are not suggesting that this effect replaces the nonperturbative magnetic screening mass, but that the effect we are considering is of the same order of magnitude and already cures the infrared problems of the transport theory.

In what follows we will examine the infrared behaviour of the medium modified gluon propagator at one loop using the CTP formalism. The purpose of this paper is to study the static limit of the longitudinal and transverse self energy of the gluon (Debye and magnetic screening masses) and, in particular, to determine, at the one loop level, how the magnetic screening mass depends on the initial $f(\mathbf{k}; t_0)$. Although technically the magnetic screening mass is defined as the position of the zero of the inverse propagator (i.e. in the limit $p_0 = 0; \mathbf{p} \rightarrow 0$) $m_{sc}^2 = (m_{sc}^2)$ [13], at one loop the limit of the inverse propagator as $p_0 = 0; \mathbf{p} \rightarrow 0$ is gauge invariant (independent of ξ for general covariant gauges), and moreover this limit is the one important for controlling the infrared properties of the collision kernel in the transport theory. Thus in this paper we will use the second limiting process to define the screening masses. At arbitrary momentum the polarization is not in general gauge invariant at one loop. To have a gauge invariant approximation at one loop one can make a hard momentum loop approximation as discussed in [14, 18].

In particular we are interested in nonisotropic nonthermal forms for $f(\mathbf{k}; t_0)$ consistent with known minijet production results. Let us consider an expanding system of partons in 1+1 dimensions. For this purpose we introduce the flow velocity of the medium

$$u = (\cosh \eta; 0; 0; \sinh \eta); \quad (2)$$

where $\eta = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{t+z}{t-z}$ is the space-time rapidity and $u \cdot u = 1$. We define the four symmetric tensors [15, 16, 17]:

$$T_{\mu\nu}(p) = g \frac{(u \cdot p)(u \cdot p) + u_\mu u_\nu - p_\mu p_\nu}{(u \cdot p)^2 - p^2};$$

$$\begin{aligned}
L(p) &= \frac{p^2}{(u \cdot p)^2} u^\mu \frac{(u \cdot p) p^\nu}{p^2} u^\rho \frac{(u \cdot p) p^\sigma}{p^2} ; \\
C(p) &= \frac{1}{2[(u \cdot p)^2 - p^2]} u^\mu \frac{(u \cdot p) p^\nu}{p^2} p^\rho + u^\mu \frac{(u \cdot p) p^\nu}{p^2} p^\rho ; \\
D(p) &= \frac{p \cdot p}{p^2} ;
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Here T is transverse with respect to the flow-velocity but L and D are mixtures of space-like and time-like components. These tensors satisfy the following transversality properties with respect to p :

$$p^\mu T_{\mu\nu}(p) = p^\mu L_{\mu\nu}(p) = 0; \quad p^\mu p^\nu C_{\mu\nu}(p) = 0; \tag{4}$$

In terms of this tensor basis the gluon propagator in the covariant gauge is given by:

$$G_{\mu\nu}(p) = iT_{\mu\nu}(p)G^T(p) - iL_{\mu\nu}(p)G^L(p) - iD_{\mu\nu}(p)G^D(p); \tag{5}$$

where G^T, G^L, G^D correspond to T, L and D components respectively of the full gluon propagator at the one loop level. The last part $G^D(p)$ is identical to the vacuum part [15] and hence we do not consider it any more. There are separate Dyson-Schwinger equations for the different components of the CTP matrix Green's functions that do not couple with each other. These equations can be written in the form

$$G_{ij}^{T;l}(p) = G_{ij}^{T;l}(p) + \sum_{lk} G_{il}^{T;l}(p) \Gamma_{lk}^{T;l}(p) G_{kj}^{T;l}(p); \tag{6}$$

Here $i; j; k; l = +; -$ are the CTP contour labels, and suppression of Lorentz and color indices in the above equation is understood.

In the Keldysh rotated representation of the CTP formalism, in terms of retarded, advanced and symmetric Green's functions we have instead

$$G_{R;A}^{T;l}(p) = G_{R;A}^{T;l}(p) + G_{R;A}^{T;l}(p) \Gamma_{R;A}^{T;l}(p) G_{R;A}^{T;l}(p); \tag{7}$$

The straightforward solution of the above equation is given by:

$$G_{R;A}^{T;l}(p) = \frac{G_{R;A}^{T;l}(p)}{1 - G_{R;A}^{T;l}(p) \Gamma_{R;A}^{T;l}(p)} = \frac{1}{p^2 - \Gamma_{R;A}^{T;l}(p) \text{sgn}(p_0)}; \tag{8}$$

where the selfenergy contains the medium effects. Similar but more complicated equations are obtained for the resummed symmetric Green's functions

$$\begin{aligned}
G_S^{T;l}(p) &= [1 + 2f(p)] \text{sgn}(p_0) [G_R^{T;l}(p) - G_A^{T;l}(p)] \\
&+ \Gamma_S^{T;l}(p) (1 + 2f(p)) \text{sgn}(p_0) [\Gamma_R^{T;l}(p) - \Gamma_A^{T;l}(p)] - G_R^{T;l}(p) - G_A^{T;l}(p);
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

For the purposes of obtaining the correct kernel for the Boltzmann equation, we need the medium improved Feynman propagator for the gluon at one loop level which is just one component $f+g$ of the matrix Green's function of the CTP formalism.

$G_F(p) = \tilde{G}(p)_{++}^{hi}$, can be written as:

$$\tilde{G}(p)_{++}^{hi} = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{G}_S(p) + \tilde{G}_A(p) + \tilde{G}_R(p) \quad ; \quad (10)$$

where where $G_A; G_R; G_S$ stands for advanced, retarded and symmetric green's function respectively. In the above equation the '+' sign refers to the upper branch in the closed-time path. Using the relations of the various self energies one finds [14, 18]:

$$\tilde{G}_{++}(p) = \frac{p^2 \text{Re}_R(p) + \frac{1}{2} \text{Im}_S(p)}{(p^2 - \text{Re}_R(p))^2 + (\text{Im}_R(p))^2} \quad ; \quad (11)$$

where $\text{Re}_R(p)$ and $\text{Im}_R(p)$ are the real and imaginary part of the retarded self energy. These self-energies have both longitudinal and transverse parts which, in the static limit ($p_0 = 0; |\mathbf{p}| \neq 0$), give Debye and magnetic screening masses of the gluon respectively. In the above equation $\tilde{G}_S(p)$ is the the symmetric part of the self energy.

To obtain the infrared behaviour of this propagator we need to find the static limit of the gluon selfenergy for an anisotropic $f(\mathbf{k};t)$ corresponding to the initial distribution function expected from the parton model. In a frozen ghost formalism [17, 19], the gluon selfenergy is obtained from the gluon loop and tadpole loop as shown in Fig. 1. The ghost does not contribute to the medium effect in this formalism because the initial density of states are chosen to be that of the physical gluons. All the effects of the ghost are present in the vacuum.

The general expressions for the real and imaginary part of the gluon self energy in non-equilibrium in covariant gauge for an expanding gluonic medium have been derived in a previous paper [18]. Here we examine the static limit of these self-energies which play crucial roles to obtain a finite collision integral to study equilibration of the quark-gluon plasma at RHIC and LHC. The general expressions for the real part of the longitudinal and transverse self energy of the gluon loop are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}_{G_{LR}}^L(p) = & \frac{g^2}{2} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{1}{2\mathbf{q}^2} [f(\mathbf{q})G(\mathbf{q};p)]_{q^0=\mathbf{q}^2} + [f(\mathbf{q})G(\mathbf{q};p)]_{q^0=-\mathbf{q}^2} \right] \\ & + \frac{1}{2\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q}} [f(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{q})G(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{q};p)]_{p^0=q^0=\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q}} + [f(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q})G(\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q};p)]_{p^0=q^0=-\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q}} \quad] \quad (12) \end{aligned}$$




FIG . 1: One Loop G graphs for the G luon Self-Energy

and

$$\text{Re } \Gamma_{G \text{ LR}}^T(p) = \frac{g^2}{2} abN_c \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{1}{2\mathfrak{H}} [[F(q)H(q;p)]_{q^0=\mathfrak{H}} + [F(-q)H(q;p)]_{q^0=-\mathfrak{H}}] \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{2\mathfrak{P} \mathfrak{Q}} [[F(p-q)H(p-q;p)]_{p^0=q^0=\mathfrak{P} \mathfrak{Q}} + [F(p+q)H(p-q;p)]_{p^0=q^0=-\mathfrak{P} \mathfrak{Q}}] \right] \quad (13)$$

where

$$G(q;p) = \frac{1}{(p^0 - q^0)^2 \mathfrak{H} (\mathfrak{P} \mathfrak{Q})^2} \left[\frac{8p^2}{(u-p)^2 p^2} \left[(u-q) \frac{(u-p)(q-p)}{p^2} \right] \right. \\ \left. \frac{h}{(p+q)^2} \frac{i}{2(q-p)(p-u)} \frac{(q-p)(p-u)}{(q-u)(p-u)p^2} \frac{(q-p)(p-u)}{(q-u)p^2(p-u)p^2} \frac{(p-u)}{(p-u)p^2} \right] \\ + (1) \frac{4p^2 + 8 \frac{(q-p)(u-p)}{(u-q)} \frac{4(q-p)}{(u-q)}}{(q-u)(p^2 - (p-u))} \quad (14)$$

and

$$H(q;p) = \frac{1}{(p^0 - q^0)^2 \mathfrak{H} (\mathfrak{P} \mathfrak{Q})^2} \left[\frac{(u-q)(q-p)(u-p)}{(u-p)^2 p^2} \frac{4(q-p)}{(u-p)^2 p^2} \frac{4p^2(q-u)}{(u-p)^2 p^2} \right] \\ \frac{h}{(p+q)^2} \frac{i}{1} \frac{(q-p)(u-p)}{(u-q)((u-p)p^2)} + \frac{(q-p)}{2(u-q)((u-p)p^2)} + \frac{p^2}{2((u-p)p^2)} \\ + \frac{(1) (p^4 - (q-p)^2 + 2(q-u)(p-u)(q-p) + (q^2 p^2) - 2(p-u))}{2(q-u)((q-p)p^2 - (p-u))} \quad (15)$$

The general expression for the tadpole loop contribution is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{L}_{\text{TaR}}^{\text{L}}(\mathbf{p}) &= g^2_{\text{ab}N_c} \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{f(\mathbf{q})}{2\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J}} \\ &\int \int \frac{(u-p)(q-p)}{p^2(u-q)} + \frac{p^2}{(u-p)^2 p^2} \left(1 - \frac{(u-p)(q-p)}{p^2(u-q)}\right) \Big|_{\mathfrak{J}_0=\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J}} \\ &+ \frac{f(\mathbf{q})}{2\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J}} \int \int \frac{(u-p)(q-p)}{p^2(u-q)} + \frac{p^2}{(u-p)^2 p^2} \left(1 - \frac{(u-p)(q-p)}{p^2(u-q)}\right) \Big|_{\mathfrak{J}_0=\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J}} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{T}_{\text{TaR}}^{\text{T}}(\mathbf{p}) &= g^2_{\text{ab}N_c} \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{f(\mathbf{q})}{2\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J}} \left[1 + \frac{(u-p)(q-p)}{(u-q)((u-p)^2 p^2)} \right. \\ &\left. \frac{(q-p)^2}{2(u-q)((u-p)^2 p^2)} - \frac{p^2}{2((u-p)^2 p^2)} \right] \Big|_{\mathfrak{J}_0=\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J}} \\ &+ \frac{f(\mathbf{q})}{2\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J}} \left[1 + \frac{(u-p)(q-p)}{(u-q)((u-p)^2 p^2)} - \frac{(q-p)^2}{2(u-q)((u-p)^2 p^2)} - \frac{p^2}{2((u-p)^2 p^2)} \right] \Big|_{\mathfrak{J}_0=\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J}} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

To simplify these equations in the infrared limit we expand $f(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{p})$ as: $f(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{p}) = f(\mathbf{q}) - \mathbf{p} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{q}} f(\mathbf{q})$ and neglect the higher order gradients. Similarly we expand $\mathfrak{J}(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{q})$ as: $\mathfrak{J}(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{q}) = \mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J} \left(1 - \frac{\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{q}}{\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J}}\right)$. In the static limit (first taking $p_0 = 0$ then using $\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J} \neq 0$), and in the rest frame ($u_0 = 1; \mathbf{u} = 0$) we obtain from Eq. (12):

$$\text{Re } \text{L}_{\text{GLR}}^{\text{L}}(\mathbf{p}_0 = 0; \mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J} \neq 0) = 2g^2_{\text{ab}N_c} \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \left(\frac{\mathbf{p} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{q}} f(\mathbf{q})}{\mathfrak{J} \cdot \mathbf{q}} \right) + \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{f(\mathbf{q})}{\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J}} \quad (18)$$

and from Eq. (16):

$$\text{L}_{\text{TaR}}^{\text{L}}(\mathbf{p}_0 = 0) = 2g^2_{\text{ab}N_c} \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{f(\mathbf{q})}{\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J}} \quad (19)$$

Adding both the above equations we get the expression for the Debye screening mass:

$$\begin{aligned} m_D^2 &= \text{Re } \text{L}_{\text{GLR}}^{\text{L}}(\mathbf{p}_0 = 0; \mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J} \neq 0) + \text{Re } \text{L}_{\text{TaR}}^{\text{L}}(\mathbf{p}_0 = 0; \mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J} \neq 0) \\ &= 6g^2 \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \left(\frac{\mathbf{p} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{q}} f(\mathbf{q})}{\mathfrak{J} \cdot \mathbf{q}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

which is the real part of the longitudinal self energy. $N_c = 3$ is used. This equation was obtained by various authors [20]. Similarly in the static limit and in the rest frame we get from Eq. (13):

$$\text{Re } \text{T}_{\text{GLR}}^{\text{T}}(\mathbf{p}_0 = 0; \mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J} \neq 0) = g^2_{\text{ab}N_c} \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{f(\mathbf{q})}{\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{J}} - \frac{3}{2} \frac{(q-p)^2}{2} + \frac{\mathbf{p} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{q}} f(\mathbf{q})}{\mathfrak{J} \cdot \mathbf{q}} \right] \left[1 - \frac{(q-p)^2}{2} \right] \quad (21)$$

and from Eq. (17):

$$\text{Re } \Pi_{\text{TaR}}^T(p_0 = 0) = g^2 N_c \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{f(q)}{q} \left[\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2} (q \cdot p) \right]; \quad (22)$$

Adding both the above equations we get the expression for the magnetic screening mass:

$$\begin{aligned} m_g^2 &= \text{Re } \Pi_{\text{GLR}}^T(p_0 = 0; p \cdot j = 0) + \text{Re } \Pi_{\text{TaR}}^T(p_0 = 0; p \cdot j = 0) \\ &= 3g^2 \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{f(q)}{q} \left[1 + (q \cdot p) \right] + \frac{p \cdot r_q f(q)}{p \cdot q} \left[1 - (q \cdot p) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

which is the real part of the transverse self energy. For the imaginary part of the gluon self energy at one loop we get: $\text{Im } \Pi_{\text{GLR}}^T = 0$, in the static limit. Note that the above formula uses the medium part of the self energy containing a gluon loop and a tadpole loop which appears in the resummed gluon propagator (Eq. (11)). The expression for the Debye screening mass, we obtained (see Eq. (20)), is the same as that obtained by various authors [20]. The expression we obtain here for the magnetic mass for a non-equilibrium gluon distribution function is new (see Eq. (23)). There is no approximation present in the derivation of Eqs. (20) and (23). The static limit results are gauge invariant.

For an isotropic gluon distribution function $f(q)$ we get from the eq. (20)

$$m_D^2 = \frac{6g^2}{2} \int dq q f(q) \quad (24)$$

where $q = |q|$ and from eq. (23)

$$m_g^2 = 0; \quad (25)$$

Furthermore for the special isotropic case when the system is described by an equilibrium Bose-Einstein distribution function for the gluon Eqs. (20) and (23) give:

$$m_D^2 = g^2 T^2; \quad \text{and} \quad m_g^2 = 0 \quad (26)$$

respectively. These results (Eq. (26)) are identical to those obtained by using finite temperature field theory in QCD assuming that the system is in thermal equilibrium [11, 16, 35]. It is interesting to note that the magnetic mass is not only zero at one loop level in equilibrium (Eq. (26)) but it is also zero for any isotropic non-equilibrium gluon distribution function (see Eq. (25)). Only when the distribution function is non-isotropic one gets a non-zero contribution to the magnetic screening mass with the assumption that the distribution function of the gluon is not divergent at zero transverse momentum (see below). This result is

not particular to QCD but also will be true for QED when the distribution function is non-isotropic. This is explicitly calculated in [22] for the QED case where we have shown that we exactly get the same formula for the magnetic screening mass in QED as we obtained in this paper for QCD (gluon loop) except that $N_c g^2 / e^2$.

Before considering the situation at RHIC and LHC let us consider an example where there is momentum anisotropy in the transverse and longitudinal momentum distribution. For this purpose we work in the cylindrical coordinate system: $(q_\perp; q_z)$. From Eq. (20) we get:

$$m_D^2 = \frac{6g^2}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^2 q_\perp \int dq_z \int \frac{d\hat{p}}{4\pi} \left(\frac{\hat{p} \cdot q_\perp f(q)}{\hat{p} \cdot q} \right): \quad (27)$$

From this equation we realize that when $f(q)$ is isotropic, the dependence on \hat{p} drops out and we obtain eq. (24). For anisotropic f the mass depends on the direction of \hat{p} . In what follows we will assume \hat{p} is along the transverse direction and give values only for this direction. Similar results can be obtained for the longitudinal choice. Assuming \hat{p} is along the transverse direction we find

$$m_{Dt}^2 = \frac{6g^2}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^2 q_\perp \int dq_z \int \frac{d\hat{p}}{4\pi} \frac{q_\perp \cdot \hat{p}}{q_\perp^2 + q_z^2} \frac{\partial f(q_\perp; q_z)}{\partial q_\perp}: \quad (28)$$

Integrating by parts in q_\perp we get:

$$m_{Dt}^2 = \frac{3g^2}{4\pi^3} \left[\int d^2 q_\perp \int dq_z \frac{dq_z}{4\pi} f(q_\perp; q_z) + \int d^2 q_\perp \int dq_z \left[\frac{q_z}{4\pi} f(q_\perp; q_z) \right]_{q_z=0} \right]: \quad (29)$$

For an equilibrium distribution function of the form $f_{eq} = \frac{p}{e} \frac{1}{q_x^2 + q_y^2 + q_z^2 = T} = \frac{p}{e} \frac{1}{q_\perp^2 + q_z^2 = T}$ we get from the above equation:

$$m_{Dt}^2 = \frac{g^2 T^2}{2} + \frac{g^2 T^2}{2} = g^2 T^2 \quad (30)$$

which is the correct result obtained by using finite temperature QCD.

Similarly, changing to $q_\perp; q_z$ coordinate system we get from Eq. (23)

$$m_g^2 = \frac{3g^2}{8\pi^3} \int d^2 q_\perp \int dq_z \int \frac{d\hat{p}}{4\pi} \left[\frac{f(q)}{4\pi} \left[1 + \frac{(q \cdot \hat{p})}{4\pi} \right] + \frac{\hat{p} \cdot q_\perp f(q)}{4\pi \hat{p} \cdot q} \left[1 - \frac{(q \cdot \hat{p})}{4\pi} \right] \right]: \quad (31)$$

When \hat{p} points in the transverse direction and we again perform partial integration over q_\perp to obtain:

$$m_{gt}^2 = \frac{3g^2}{8\pi^3} \int d^2 q_\perp \int dq_z \cos^2 \int \frac{dq_z}{4\pi} \frac{f(q_\perp; q_z)}{4\pi} \int d^2 q_\perp \int dq_z \left[\frac{q_z}{4\pi} f(q_\perp; q_z) \right]_{q_z=0}: \quad (32)$$

For an equilibrium distribution function of the form : $f_{eq} = \frac{p}{e^{q_x^2 + q_y^2 + q_z^2 = T}} = \frac{p}{e^{q_t^2 + q_z^2 = T}}$
the above equation gives:

$$m_{gt}^2 = \frac{3g^2}{(2)^3} [(4) \frac{2T^2}{6} - (4) \frac{2T^2}{6}] = 0; \quad (33)$$

which is consistent with finite temperature QCD results.

Before proceeding to compute the initial magnetic screening mass at RHIC and LHC situations we will adopt a non-isotropic test distribution function to compute the magnetic screening mass from the formula given by eq. (32). We choose a non-isotropic test distribution function of the form :

$$f = \frac{p}{e^{q_x^2 + hq_z^2 = T}} \quad (34)$$

where h is a parameter for non-isotropy. For $h = 1$ we get the usual Bose-Einstein distribution function. Using the above non-isotropic distribution function we plot the magnetic screening mass from the eq. (32) in Fig. 2. It can be seen from Fig. 2 that for $h = 1$ (corresponding to Bose-Einstein distribution function) we get $m_{gt} = 0$ and for $h \neq 1$ (corresponding to non-isotropic distribution function) we get a non-zero magnetic screening mass.

Now we consider the realistic situation at RHIC and LHC. For the situation at RHIC and LHC where the parton distribution function at $t = t_0$, $f(q; t_0)$, describes an out of equilibrium situation we can compute the value of these screening masses assuming the distribution function can be described by the parton model result for minijets. We note that to compute the second term in rhs of eqs. (29) and (32) we need to know the form of $[f(q_x; q_z)]_{q_x=0}$ and its behaviour at RHIC and LHC. In this paper we are considering the minijet distribution function which are computed by using pQCD applicable above $q_x = 1(2)$ GeV at RHIC (LHC) which are obtained by saturation arguments as studied by several authors [24]. We mention here that pQCD is not applicable for small q_x , for example below 1(2) GeV at RHIC (LHC). If one calculates the pQCD minijet production the q_x distribution behaves as: $1/q_x$ where 4 for high q_x and 2 for low q_x . If one applies pQCD at small q_x the distribution function $f(q_x; q_z)$ is singular at $q_x = 0$. However, for very low q_x pQCD formulas are not applicable and hence it is not obvious that distribution will be singular at $q_x = 0$ at RHIC and LHC. For $q_x = 0$ the only computation available at the moment is from the McLerran-Venugopalan model [37] where it is shown that at $q_x = 0$ the gluon distribution behaves as a constant with respect to q_x and does not behave as $1/q_x$. In this cases we may




FIG . 2: The transverse component of the magnetic screening mass as obtained from eq. (32) by using a non-isotropic distribution function of the form : $f = \frac{1}{e^{q_x^2 + h q_z^2} - 1}$ as a function of the non-isotropy parameter h . Note that for $h = 1$ the distribution function becomes Bose-Einstein and hence the magnetic screening mass is found to be zero from eq. (32).

assume that the gluon distribution does not diverge at $q_x=0$ in the realistic situation at RHIC and LHC. In such situations where $f(q_x=0; y;)$ is not singular ($q_x = q_T \sinh y$ for gluon minijets) one can neglect the boundary term :

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\frac{q_x}{q_x^2 + q_z^2} f(q_x; q_z;) \right]_{q_x=0}^{q_x=1} &= \left[q_x f(q_x; q_z;) \right]_{q_x=0} = \\ q_x \sinh y f(q_x; y;) \Big|_{q_x=0} &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

since for massless minijets

$$q_{\perp} = q_{\perp} \sinh y = 0 \quad \text{when} \quad q_{\perp} = 0 \quad \text{for finite } y: \quad (36)$$

Here y is the momentum rapidity of the minijet parton. This boundary condition is not true in general, and in particular not true for a thermal distribution since a thermal distribution function: $f_{\text{eq}} = \frac{1}{e^{q_{\perp} \cosh y} - 1}$ is divergent at $q_{\perp} = 0$. However if the gluon distribution at $q_{\perp} = 0$ behaves as a constant at RHIC and LHC initial situations [37] then our vanishing boundary condition should be valid at RHIC and LHC. In any case a non-perturbative analysis of gluon distribution at $q_{\perp} = 0$ is beyond the scope of this paper. If the gluon distribution behaviour at $q_{\perp} = 0$ is found to be divergent in any non-perturbative calculation unlike the case in [37] then the values reported in this paper might change. We have computed the Debye and magnetic screening masses in this paper above $q_{\perp} = 1(2)$ GeV at RHIC (LHC) which is similar to the calculations done by several authors for the Debye screening mass [38] where they have adopted similar cut-off values for the minijet momentum in their calculations.

With the above arguments and with the vanishing boundary conditions (eqs. (35) and (36)) we get from eq. (29), after changing to the rapidity variables: $\frac{dq_{\perp}}{q_{\perp}} = dy$:

$$m_{D,t}^2 = \frac{3}{2} \int_0^Z \int_0^Z \int_0^Z dq_{\perp} q_{\perp}^2 dy f(q_{\perp}; y); \quad (37)$$

where $f(q_{\perp}; y)$ is the non-isotropic gluon distribution function. For a cylindrically symmetric system we get:

$$m_{D,t}^2 = \frac{6}{s} \int_0^Z \int_0^Z dq_{\perp} q_{\perp}^2 dy f(q_{\perp}; y); \quad (38)$$

This is exactly the same equation used by several authors [2, 21] in the context of minijet plasma equilibration in heavy-ion collisions at RHIC and LHC. Similarly using the same vanishing boundary condition (eqs. (35) and (36)) we get for the magnetic screening mass from eq. (32):

$$m_{g,t}^2 = \frac{3}{s} \int_0^Z \int_0^Z dq_{\perp} q_{\perp}^2 dy f(q_{\perp}; y); \quad (39)$$

for cylindrically symmetric distribution function $f(q_{\perp}; y)$. It can be noted that in eqs. (38) and (39) one should not use equilibrium distribution function or any other distribution function which does not obey the vanishing boundary condition as stated in eqs. (35) and (36).

For conditions pertinent to RHIC and LHC we use the mini-jet gluon distribution function to evaluate the Debye and magnetic screening masses. At high energy the mini-jet cross section can be calculated by using perturbative QCD (pQCD). The leading order mini-jet cross section is given by:

$$\sigma_{\text{jet}} = \int_{p_t}^Z \int_{y_1}^Z \int_{y_2}^Z \frac{2 p_t x}{\hat{s}} x_1 f_{i=A}(x_1; p_t^2) x_2 f_{j=B}(x_2; p_t^2) \hat{\sigma}_{ij|kl}(\hat{s}; \hat{t}; \hat{u}): \quad (40)$$

Here x_1 and x_2 are the light-cone momentum fractions carried by the partons i and j from the projectile and the target, respectively, f are the bound-nucleon structure functions and y_1 and y_2 are the rapidities of the scattered partons. The symbols with carets refer to the parton-parton c.m. system. The $\hat{\sigma}_{ij|kl}$ are the elementary pQCD parton cross sections. As we will be considering a gluon system we include the dominant gluon production cross sections at the partonic level which are given by:

$$\hat{\sigma}_{gq|gq} = \frac{2}{\hat{s}} (\hat{s}^2 + \hat{u}^2) \left[\frac{1}{\hat{t}^2} - \frac{4}{9\hat{s}\hat{u}} \right]; \quad (41)$$

and

$$\hat{\sigma}_{gg|gg} = \frac{9}{2\hat{s}} \left[\beta \frac{\hat{u}\hat{t}}{\hat{s}^2} - \frac{\hat{u}\hat{s}}{\hat{t}^2} - \frac{\hat{s}\hat{t}}{\hat{u}^2} \right]; \quad (42)$$

Here \hat{s} is the strong coupling constant and

$$\hat{s} = x_1 x_2 s = 4p_t^2 \cosh^2 \frac{Y_1 - Y_2}{2}; \quad (43)$$

The rapidities y_1, y_2 and the momentum fractions x_1, x_2 are related by,

$$x_1 = p_t (e^{y_1} + e^{y_2}) = \frac{p_t}{\hat{s}}; \quad x_2 = p_t (e^{-y_1} + e^{-y_2}) = \frac{p_t}{\hat{s}}; \quad (44)$$

The limits of integrations are given by:

$$p_{\text{min}} \leq p_t \leq \frac{p_t}{2 \cosh y_1}; \quad \ln \left(\frac{p_t}{\hat{s}} e^{y_1} \right) \leq y_2 \leq \ln \left(\frac{p_t}{\hat{s}} e^{y_1} \right); \quad (45)$$

with

$$y_1 \leq \ln \left(\frac{p_t}{\hat{s}} e^{y_1} + \frac{q}{\hat{s} - 4p_{\text{min}}^2} \right); \quad (46)$$

In the above equations p_{min} is the minimum transverse momentum above which mini-jet production is computed by using pQCD. We multiply the above mini-jet cross sections by a K factor $K = 2$ to account for the higher order $O(\alpha_s^3)$ contributions. The minimum transverse momentum above which the mini-jets are computed via pQCD are of the order of

$p_{m\ in} = 1\ GeV$ at RHIC and $2\ GeV$ at LHC [24]. These values are energy dependent and are obtained from the saturation arguments. We take $p_{m\ in} = 1\ GeV$ at RHIC and $2\ GeV$ at LHC for our computations. The mini-jet cross section (Eq. (40)) can be related to the total number of partons (N) by

$$N^{jet} = T(0) \int_{jet} d^3p; \quad (47)$$

where $T(0) = 9A^2/8R_A^2$ is the total number of nucleon-nucleon collisions per unit area for central collisions [25]. Here $R_A = 1.1A^{1/3}$ is the nuclear radius. A rough estimate of the initial volume in which these initial partons are formed at RHIC and LHC can be given by: $V_0 = R_A^2 \tau_0$, where the partons are assumed to be spread by a length $\tau_0 = 1/p_{m\ in}$. Assuming that the partons are uniformly distributed in the coordinate space (but non-isotropic in momentum space) we can easily extract a phase-space gluon distribution function of the gluon from the total number of gluon mini-jets from Eq. (47). The initial distribution function of the gluon is then given by:

$$f(p_t; y_1) = \frac{1}{R_A^2 \tau_0} dN^{jet} = d^3p \quad (48)$$

where

$$d^3p = d^2p_t dp_z = p_t d^2p_t \cosh y_1 dy_1; \quad (49)$$

Using the above mini-jet initial gluon distribution function in Eq. (38) and Eq. (39) we get:

$$m_{D\ t}^2 = \frac{T(0)}{2R_A^2 \tau_0} 6K_s \int_s^Z \int_{p_t}^Z \int_{y_1}^Z \frac{1}{\hat{s} \cosh y_1} \sum_{ijkl} x_1 f_{i=A}(x_1; p_t^2) x_2 f_{j=A}(x_2; p_t^2) \hat{\Lambda}_{ij!kl}(s; \hat{t}; \hat{u}); \quad (50)$$

for the Debye screening mass and:

$$m_{g\ t}^2 = \frac{T(0)}{2R_A^2 \tau_0} 3K_s \int_s^Z \int_{p_t}^Z \int_{y_1}^Z \frac{1}{\hat{s} \cosh y_1} \sum_{ijkl} x_1 f_{i=A}(x_1; p_t^2) x_2 f_{j=A}(x_2; p_t^2) \hat{\Lambda}_{ij!kl}(s; \hat{t}; \hat{u}); \quad (51)$$

for the magnetic screening mass of the gluon at the one loop level. Note that in the above equation K_s occurs outside the p_t integration and hence a scale has to be defined, at which

this coupling constant has to be determined. For this purpose we take α_s as $\alpha_s(\langle p_t^2 \rangle)$ where the momentum scale $\langle p_t^2 \rangle$ is defined by:

$$\langle p_t^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{\text{jet}} \int_{p_t}^Z \frac{dp_t p_t^2}{dy_1} \int_{p_t}^Z \frac{2 p_t^X}{s} \int_{p_t}^Z \alpha_{ij \rightarrow k1}(\mathbf{s}; \hat{t}; \hat{u}); \quad (52)$$

where jet is defined by the Eq. (40).

In this paper we will be using both GRV98 [26] and CTEQ6M [27] parametrizations for the gluon and quark structure functions inside free proton with EK S98 [28] parametrizations for the nuclear modifications. In Fig. 3 we present the results of the initial gluon distribution function (see Eq. (48)) at RHIC as a function of the transverse momentum of the gluon for different values of the rapidities. The rapidity y is related to the longitudinal momentum p_z via: $p_z = p_t \sinh y$.

We present the longitudinal momentum distribution of the initial gluon minijet distribution function at RHIC in Fig. 4 for different values of p_t .

Using these gluon minijet distribution functions in eqs. (50) and (51) we get for RHIC :

$$m_{D_t} = 116 \text{ M eV} \quad \text{and} \quad m_{g_t} = 82 \text{ M eV} \quad (53)$$

and for LHC :

$$m_{D_t} = 150 \text{ M eV} \quad \text{and} \quad m_{g_t} = 105 \text{ M eV} \quad (54)$$

by using GRV98 structure functions along with EK S98. The coupling constant $\alpha_s(\langle p_t^2 \rangle)$ is found to be 0.287 at RHIC and 0.214 at LHC. If higher order contribution to the minijet production would have not been taken into account then our results of screening mass would have been $\frac{1}{K} (= 2)$ times less than the above values. The above masses may be lower bounds to the actual values as we have used a lower transverse momentum cut-off for minijets in order that pQCD to be applicable. However, the gluon distribution may be dominant at lower p_t [37] and hence the magnitude of the screening mass may increase if one can include the soft partons into the gluon distribution function. The values we reported in this paper are for gluon minijet distribution functions at RHIC and LHC with p_{min} greater than 1 and 2 GeV respectively.

Let us now look at the equilibrium situation. Note that at one loop level we get (see Eq. (26)): $m_D^2 = g^2 T^2$ and $m_g^2 = 0$ in equilibrium. Since the one loop magnetic mass is zero in




FIG. 3: Initial gluon distribution function at RHIC energies as a function of p_t

equilibrium we will compare our results with the magnetic mass which is obtained by using non-perturbative methods. The magnetic mass obtained by using non-perturbative methods in equilibrium is given by: $m_g^2 = \frac{3}{2} (0.255g^2T)^2$, see [5, 29]. Assuming a temperature of about 500 MeV at RHIC and by using the coupling constant value $g_s = 0.287$ at RHIC (see above) we get: $m_D = gT = 950$ MeV and $m_g = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} (0.255g^2T) = 563$ MeV. Assuming $T = 1000$ MeV at LHC and using the LHC coupling constant $g_s = 0.214$ we obtain $m_D = 1.639$ GeV and $m_g = 840$ MeV. In obtaining these masses, one has integrated over all momentum ranges of the equilibrium distribution functions. For example, if one uses a Bose-Einstein distribution function in Eq. (24) and then integrates from $(p_{min} \leq p \leq p_{max})$ then we obtain $m_D = 486$ MeV at RHIC for $T = 500$ MeV and $g_s = 0.287$. Similarly for LHC one obtains $m_D = 840$ MeV for




FIG . 4: Initial gluon distribution function at RH IC energies as a function of p_z

$T = 1 \text{ GeV}$ and $\alpha_s = 0.214$.

Note that these values are of the same order as that obtained by using the non-equilibrium distribution functions at RH IC and LHC. Since the gluon distribution function may be dominant at lower p_t the magnitude of the screening mass might increase if one can include the soft partons into the gluon distribution function [9, 10, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34]. The values we reported in this paper are for gluon minijet distribution functions at RH IC and LHC with p_{min} greater than 1 and 2 GeV respectively. Note that due to the asymmetry we have computed a specific component (\hat{p} in transverse direction) of the Debye (m_{D_t}) and magnetic (m_{g_t}) screening mass. If one computes the values in all directions their values may be even higher. Similar situations hold for magnetic screening masses at RH IC and

LHC. As the magnetic mass is a non-perturbative calculation at equilibrium and ours is a one loop calculation at non-equilibrium, we expect that a non-perturbative non-equilibrium calculation might give a higher magnetic screening mass. The argument is similar to the study of non-perturbative calculation for Debye screening mass at finite temperature [36].

To summarize, we have applied the closed-time path formalism to non-equilibrium situations in QCD expected at RHIC and LHC energies to study the infrared behaviour of the one loop gluon self energy. We have followed a frozen ghost formalism where the initial density of states consists of physical gluons and the ghost is only present in the vacuum level. In the infrared limit of the gluon self energy we obtain a non-vanishing magnetic screening mass of the gluon at one loop level for non-isotropic gluon distribution functions with the assumption that the distribution function of the gluon is not divergent at zero transverse momentum. At RHIC and LHC we assumed that the gluon distribution is not divergent at $q_\perp = 0$ which is supported by the computation done in [37]. With this approximation we then applied pQCD above $q_\perp = 1(2)$ GeV at RHIC (LHC) and obtain a reasonable initial non-equilibrium gluon-minijet distribution function. Using this non-isotropic gluon minijet distribution function above $q_\perp = 1(2)$ GeV at RHIC (LHC) we predicted the values of the magnetic and Debye screening masses at the initial time.

Acknowledgments

We thank Tanmoy Bhattacharya, Larry McLerran, Emil Mottola, E. V. Shuryak and Raju Venugopalan for useful discussions.

-
- [1] X . N . W ang, Phys. Rep. 280 (1997) 287; X . N . W ang and Miklos Gyulassy, Phys. Rev. D 44 (1991) 1991; K . J. Eskola and K . K ajantie, Z. Phys. C 75 (1997) 515; A . K rasnitz and R . Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84 (2000) 4309; K . G eiger, Phys. Rep. 258 (1995) 237; K . G eiger and B . M ullaer, Nucl. Phys. B 369 (1992) 600; N . H am m on, H . Stoecker, W . G reiner, Phys. Rev C 61 (2000) 014901.
- [2] G . C . N ayak, A . D um itru, L . M cLerran and W . G reiner, Nucl. Phys. A 687 (2001) 457.
- [3] R . B aier, A . H . M ueller, D . Schi and D . T . Son, Phys. Lett. B 502 (2001) 51, A . H . M ueller, Phys. Lett. B 475 (2000) 220.
- [4] K . G eiger, Phys. Rep. 280 (1995) 237; K . G eiger and J . I. K apusta, Phys. Rev. D 47, (1993) 4905.
- [5] H . H eiselberg, X N . W ang, Nucl. Phys. B 462:389-414 (1996).
- [6] S H M . W ong, Phys. Rev C 54 (1996) 2588; Phys. Rev. C 56 (1997) 1075.
- [7] M . G yulassy, Y . P ang, B . Zhang, Nucl. Phys. A 626 (1997) 999; B . Zhang, Comput. Phys. Commun. 109 (1998) 193.
- [8] A . H osoya and K . K ajantie, Nucl. Phys. B 250 (1985) 666.
- [9] R . S . B halerao, G . C . N ayak, Phys. Rev. C 61 (2000) 054907.
- [10] G . C . N ayak and V . R avishankar, Phys. Rev D 55 (1997) 6877; Phys. Rev. C 58 (1998) 356.
- [11] R . D . P isarski, Phys. Rev. D 47 (1993) 5589; E . B raaten and R . D . P isarski, Nucl. Phys. B 339 (1990) 310; T . A ltherr, Phys. Lett. B 341 (1995) 325; R . B aier, M . D irks, K . R edlich and D . Schi , Phys. Rev. D 56 (1997) 2548; and references therein.
- [12] J . Schw inger, J. M ath. Phys. 2 (1961) 407; P . M . B akshi and K . T . M ahanthappa, J. M ath. Phys. 4 (1963) 1; 4 (1963) 12; L . V . K eldysh, Zh. Eksp. Teo. Fiz. 47 (1964) 1515; [Sov. Phys. JETP 20 (1965) 1018]; G . Zhou, Z . Su, B . H ao and L . Yu, Phys. Rep. 118 (1985) 1;
- [13] A . K . R ebhan, Phys. Rev. D 48 (1993) R3967.
- [14] for exam ple see, M . H . Thom a, hep-ph/0010164, 10 th Jyvaskyla Sum m er School, Jyvaskyla, Finland, 31 Jul-18 Aug (2000); S . M rowczynski and M . H . Thom a, Phys. Rev. D 62 (2000) 036011.
- [15] N . P . Landsm an and Ch G . van W eert, Phys. Rep. 145 (1987) 141.
- [16] H . A . W eldon, Phys. Rev. D 26 (1982) 1394, and references therein.

- [17] P. V. Landshof and A. Rebhan, Nucl. Phys. B 383 (1992) 607 and Erratum, *ibid* 406 (1993) 517.
- [18] C-W. Kao, G. C. Nayak and W. Greiner, Phys. Rev. D 66 (2002) 034017, hep-ph/0102153.
- [19] M. D'Attanasio and M. Pietroni, Nucl. Phys. B 498 (1997) 443.
- [20] See for example: T. S. Biro, B. Müller and X. N. Wang, Phys. Lett. B 283 (1992) 171; H. Satz and D. Srivastava, Phys. Lett. B 475 (2000) 225; T. S. Biro, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E 1 (1992) 39; and references therein.
- [21] J. Bjorker and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. C 63 (2001) 024609; J. Serreau and D. Schi, JHEP 0111 (2001) 039; R. Baier, A. H. Mueller, D. Schi and D. T. Son, Phys. Lett. B 502 (2001) 51.
- [22] F. Cooper, C-W. Kao and G. C. Nayak, hep-ph/0207370.
- [23] K. J. Eskola, B. Müller, X. N. Wang, Phys. Lett. B 374 (1996) 20.
- [24] A. H. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. B 572 (2000) 227; K. J. Eskola, K. Kajantie, P. V. Ruuskanen and K. Tuominen, Nucl. Phys. B 570 (2000) 379.
- [25] K. J. Eskola, K. Kajantie and J. Lindfors, Nucl. Phys. B 323 (1989) 37.
- [26] M. G. Lueck, E. Reya and A. Vogt, Euro. Phys. J. C 5 (1998) 461.
- [27] J. Pumphlin, D. R. Stump, J. Huston, H. L. Lai, P. N. Adolsky and W. K. Tung, hep-ph/0201195.
- [28] K. J. Eskola, V. J. Kolhinen and P. V. Ruuskanen, Nucl. Phys. B 535 (1998) 351; K. J. Eskola, V. J. Kolhinen and C. A. Sagado, Euro. Phys. J. C 9 (1999) 61.
- [29] See, T. S. Biro and B. Müller, Nucl. Phys. A 561 (1993) 477, and references therein; J. Ruppert, G. C. Nayak, D. D. Dietrich, H. Stoecker and W. Greiner, Phys. Lett. B 520 (2001) 233.
- [30] Y. K. Luger, J. M. Eisenberg, B. Svetitsky, F. Cooper and E. M. Otolla, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67 (1991) 2427; F. Cooper, J. M. Eisenberg, Y. K. Luger, E. M. Otolla and B. Svetitsky, Phys. Rev. D 48 (1993) 190; J. M. Eisenberg Phys. Rev. D 36 (1987) 3114; *ibid* D 40 (1989) 456; T. S. Biro, H. B. Nielsen and J. Knoll, Nucl. Phys. B 245 (1984) 449; M. Hermann and J. Knoll, Phys. Lett. B 234 (1990) 437; D. Boyanovsky, H. J. de Vega, R. Holman, D. S. Lee and A. Singh, Phys. Rev. D 51 (1995) 4419; H. Gies Phys. Rev. D 61 (2000) 085021.
- [31] L. McLerran and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 2233, Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 3352; Yu. Kovchegov and A. H. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. B 529 (1998) 451; A. Kovner, L. McLerran and H. Weigert, Phys. Rev. D 52 (1998) 3809, Phys. Rev. D 52 (1998) 6231; Y. V. Kovchegov, E. Levin and L. McLerran, hep-ph/9912367.

- [32] D. D. Dietrich, G. C. Nayak and W. Greiner, *Phys. Rev. D* 64 (2001) 074006; hep-ph/0009178; hep-ph/0202144, *J. Phys. G* (in press); G. C. Nayak, D. D. Dietrich and W. Greiner, Rostock 2000/Trento 2001, *Exploring Quark Matter* 71-78, hep-ph/0104030.
- [33] C. D. Roberts and S. M. Schmidt, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* 45 Suppl.1:1-103, 2000; V. V. Inik, et. al, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 22 (2001) 341; J. C. R. Bloch, C. D. Roberts and S. M. Schmidt, *Phys. Rev. D* 61 (2000) 117502; J. C. R. Bloch, et. al, *Phys. Rev. D* (1999) 116011.
- [34] J-P. Blaizot and E. Iancu, *Phys. Rept.* 359 (2002) 355 ; *Nucl. Phys. B* 570 (2000) 326; *Nucl. Phys. B* 417 (1994) 608.
- [35] J-P. Blaizot, E. Iancu and R. R. Parwani, *Phys. Rev. D* 52 (1995) 2543.
- [36] K. Kajantie et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 79 (1997) 3130.
- [37] A. Krasnitz, Y. Nara and R. Venugopalan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87 (2001) 192302.
- [38] K. J. Eskola, B. Muller and X-N. Wang, *Phys. Lett. B* 374 (1996) 20 and references therein.