AMD and JAM description

Akira Ono

Department of Physics, Tohoku University

Transport 2017: International Workshop on Transport Simulations for Heavy Ion Collisions under Controlled Conditions FRIB-MSU, East Lansing, Michigan, USA, March 27 - 31, 2017

- JAM description
- AMD description

JAM Description

JAM: Jet AA Microscopic transport model

Y. Nara, N. Otuka, A. Ohnishi, K. Niita, S. Chiba, PRC61 (2000) 024901.

- Applied to high-energy collisions (1 ~ 158A GeV)
- Hadron-Hadron reactions are based on experimental data and the detailed balance.
- No mean field (default).
- Some improvements were introduced for the study of low-energy collisions (~ 300 MeV/u) by Ikeno, Ono, Nara, Ohnishi, PRC93 (2016) 044612.



Collision judgment in JAM

- There is no time step. ($\Delta t = 10$ or 20 fm/c for output)
- Each pair is checked for the minimum distance condition in each c.m. frame.
- A collision occurs at an equal time in the c.m. frame. Therefore $t_1 \neq t_2$.
- The order of collisions is determined by $\frac{1}{2}(t_1 + t_2)$.
- At every collision, the collisions in future are recalculated, of course.



Collision judgment in JAM

- There is no time step. ($\Delta t = 10$ or 20 fm/c for output)
- Each pair is checked for the minimum distance condition in each c.m. frame.
- A collision occurs at an equal time in the c.m. frame. Therefore $t_1 \neq t_2$.
- The order of collisions is determined by $\frac{1}{2}(t_1 + t_2)$.
- At every collision, the collisions in future are recalculated, of course.



Each particle carries a variable k5(i).

• When a collision/reaction/decay occurred, the final particles are given a common collision ID.

 $k5(i) = 43576, \quad k5(j) = 43576$

• Particles carrying the same k5 do not collide. if (k5(i).eq.k5(j)) cycle

Example:

- After N + N → N + Δ, this N and this Δ should not collide until one of them collide with some other particle.
- After $\Delta \rightarrow N + \pi$, this π should not be absorbed by this *N* until one of them collide with some other particle.

Distance is redefined as suggested by the homework.

```
dr = r(i) - r(j)dr = modulo(dr + L/2, L) - L/2
```

We did not moved the coordinates r(i) into the box.

```
r(i) = modulo(r(i), L)
```

We only did

```
write(*,*) modulo(r(i), L)
```

This is actually a good test to check whether all the distances are redefined, though we passed the test at the first try.

Pauli blocking (Homework 1)

Pauli blocking based on the blocking factor

$$f_i = \frac{1}{2} \times 2^3 \sum_{j \in \tau_i (j \neq i)} e^{-(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)^2 / 4L - L(\mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j)^2 / \hbar^2}$$

 τ_i = proton or neutron for particle *i*

Homework 1 was very useful to check this Pauli blocking factor.



Akira Ono (Department of Physics, Tohoku University)

$NN \rightarrow N\Delta$ (Option Da)

 $N + N \rightarrow N + \Delta(m)$

• *m*: mass of Δ ($m_N + m_\pi < m < \sqrt{s} - m_N$)

• $p_N(s)$ and $p_{\Delta}(m, s)$: initial and final momenta in the center-of-mass system

$$\frac{d\sigma[NN \to N\Delta(m)]}{dm} = \frac{C_I}{p_N s} \frac{|\mathcal{M}|^2}{16\pi} F(m) p_\Delta(m)$$
$$|\mathcal{M}|^2 = A \frac{s\Gamma_\Delta^2}{(s - m_\Delta^2)^2 + s\Gamma_\Delta^2}, \qquad F(m) = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{mm_\Delta\Gamma(m)}{(m^2 - m_\Delta^2)^2 + m_\Delta^2\Gamma(m)^2}$$
$$\Gamma(m) = \Gamma_\Delta \frac{m_\Delta}{m} \left(\frac{p_\pi(m)}{p_\pi(m_\Delta)}\right)^3 \frac{1.2}{1 + 0.2(p_\pi(m)/p_\pi(m_\Delta))^2}$$
$$m_\Delta = 1.232 \text{ GeV}, \quad \Gamma_\Delta = 0.118 \text{ GeV}, \quad \frac{A}{16\pi} = 64400 \text{ mb GeV}^2 \times R$$
$$C_I = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4} & \text{for } nn \to n\Delta^0, np \to p\Delta^0, np \to n\Delta^+, pp \to p\Delta^+ \\ \frac{3}{4} & \text{for } nn \to p\Delta^-, pp \to n\Delta^{++} \end{cases}$$

We found that the sampling of m is not done accurately. (Phase III result will be updated.)

$$R = \int_{m_N + m_\pi}^{\sqrt{s} - m_N} F_3(m') p_\Delta(m') dm' \bigg/ \int_{m_N + m_\pi}^{\sqrt{s} - m_N} F(m') p_\Delta(m') dm' \quad \text{with} \quad F_3(m) = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{m^2 \Gamma(m)}{(m^2 - m_\Delta^2)^2 + m^2 \Gamma(m)^2}$$

Akira Ono (Department of Physics, Tohoku University)

Detailed balance, with the spin-isospin factor $g = 2(1 + \delta_{NN})$

$$\sigma[N\Delta(m) \to NN] = \frac{1}{g} p_N^2 \times \text{detbal} \times \int_{m_N + m_\pi}^{\sqrt{s} - m_N} \frac{d\sigma[NN \to N\Delta(m')]}{dm'} dm'$$
$$\text{detbal} = \frac{1}{p_\Delta(m) \int_{m_N + m_\pi}^{\sqrt{s} - m_N} p_\Delta(m')F(m')dm'}$$
$$F(m) = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{mm_\Delta\Gamma(m)}{(m^2 - m_\Delta^2)^2 + m_\Delta^2\Gamma(m)^2}$$

The integrals of $p_{\Delta}(m')F(m')$ cancel so that we have

$$\sigma[N\Delta(m) \to NN] = \frac{C_I}{g} \frac{1}{p_\Delta(m)s} \frac{|\mathcal{M}|^2}{16\pi} p_N$$

 $\Delta \leftrightarrow N\pi$ (Option Pa)

Г

 $\Delta(\sqrt{s}) \to N + \pi$

$$\begin{split} (\sqrt{s}) &= \Gamma_{\Delta} \frac{m_{\Delta}}{\sqrt{s}} \left(\frac{p_{\pi}(\sqrt{s})}{p_{\pi}(m_{\Delta})} \right)^3 \frac{1.2}{1 + 0.2(p_{\pi}(\sqrt{s})/p_{\pi}(m_{\Delta}))^2}, \\ m_{\Delta} &= 1.232 \text{ GeV}, \quad \Gamma_{\Delta} = 0.118 \text{ GeV} \\ \Gamma[\Delta^-(\sqrt{s}) \to n + \pi^-] = \Gamma(\sqrt{s}) \\ \Gamma[\Delta^0(\sqrt{s}) \to p + \pi^-] = \frac{1}{3}\Gamma(\sqrt{s}) \\ \Gamma[\Delta^0(\sqrt{s}) \to n + \pi^0] &= \frac{2}{3}\Gamma(\sqrt{s}) \\ \Gamma[\Delta^+(\sqrt{s}) \to n + \pi^+] = \frac{1}{3}\Gamma(\sqrt{s}) \\ \Gamma[\Delta^+(\sqrt{s}) \to p + \pi^+] = \Gamma(\sqrt{s}) \end{split}$$

 $N + \pi \rightarrow \Delta$

$$\sigma[N\pi \to \Delta(\sqrt{s})] = \frac{\pi}{p_{\pi}(\sqrt{s})^2} \times \frac{4}{2 \times 1} \times \frac{\Gamma(\sqrt{s})^2}{(\sqrt{s} - m_{\Delta})^2 + \frac{1}{4}\Gamma(\sqrt{s})^2} \times \text{B.R.}$$

There is no free parameter once the choice of $\Gamma(\sqrt{s})$ is made.

Antisymmetrized Molecular Dynamics (very basic version)

AMD wave function

|₫

$$\Phi(Z)\rangle = \frac{\det}{ij} \Big[\exp \Big\{ -\nu \Big(\mathbf{r}_j - \frac{\mathbf{Z}_i}{\sqrt{\nu}} \Big)^2 \Big\} \chi_{\alpha_i}(j) \Big]$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Z}_{i} &= \sqrt{v} \mathbf{D}_{i} + \frac{i}{2\hbar\sqrt{v}} \mathbf{K}_{i} \\ & v : \text{Width parameter} = (2.5 \text{ fm})^{-2} \\ & \chi_{\alpha_{i}} : \text{Spin-isospin states} = p \uparrow, p \downarrow, n \uparrow, n \downarrow \end{aligned}$$

Equation of motion for the wave packet centroids Z

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{Z}_{i} = \{\mathbf{Z}_{i}, \mathcal{H}\}_{\mathsf{PB}} + (\mathsf{NN \ collisions})$$

$\{\mathbf{Z}_i, \mathcal{H}\}_{PB}$: Motion in the mean field	NN collisions
$\mathcal{H} = \frac{\langle \Phi(Z) H \Phi(Z) \rangle}{\langle \Phi(Z) \Phi(Z) \rangle} + (\text{c.m. correction})$ H: Effective interaction (e.g. Skyrme force)	$W_{i \to f} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \langle \Psi_f V \Psi_i \rangle ^2 \delta(E_f - E_i)$ • $ V ^2$ or σ_{NN} (in medium) • Pauli blocking
	Ono, Horiuchi et al., Prog. Theor. Phys. 87 (1992) 1185.

Wigner function for the AMD wave function

$$\begin{split} f_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{p}) &= 8 \sum_{i \in \alpha} \sum_{j \in \alpha} e^{-2\nu(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{R}_{ij})^2} e^{-(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{P}_{ij})^2/2\hbar^2 \nu} B_{ij} B_{ji}^{-1}, \qquad \alpha = p \uparrow, p \downarrow, n \uparrow, n \downarrow \\ \mathbf{R}_{ij} &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\nu}} (\mathbf{Z}_i^* + \mathbf{Z}_j), \quad \mathbf{P}_{ij} = i\hbar\sqrt{\nu} (\mathbf{Z}_i^* - \mathbf{Z}_j), \quad B_{ij} = e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{Z}_i^* - \mathbf{Z}_j)^2} \end{split}$$

Equation of motion for the wave packet centroids Z

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{Z}_{i} = \{\mathbf{Z}_{i}, \mathcal{H}\}_{\mathsf{PB}} + (\mathsf{NN \ collisions})$$

$\{\mathbf{Z}_i, \mathcal{H}\}_{PB}$: Motion in the mean field	NN collisions
$\mathcal{H} = \frac{\langle \Phi(Z) H \Phi(Z) \rangle}{\langle \Phi(Z) \Phi(Z) \rangle} + (\text{c.m. correction})$ H: Effective interaction (e.g. Skyrme force)	$W_{i \to f} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \langle \Psi_f V \Psi_i \rangle ^2 \delta(E_f - E_i)$ • $ V ^2$ or σ_{NN} (in medium) • Pauli blocking
	Ono, Horiuchi et al., Prog. Theor, Phys. 87 (1992) 1185.

Transport code comparison

PHYSICAL REVIEW C 93, 044609 (2016)

Understanding transport simulations of heavy-ion collisions at 100A and 400A MeV: Comparison of heavy-ion transport codes under controlled conditions

Jun Xu,^{1,*} Lie-Wen Chen,^{2,1} ManYee Betty Tsang,^{3,1} Hermann Wolter,^{4,4} Ying-Xun Zhang,^{5,4} Joerg Aichelin,⁶ Maria Coloma,⁷ Dan Cozma,⁸ Pawel Danielewicz,³ Zhao-Qing Feng,⁹ Amaud Le Fèvre.¹⁰ Theodoros Gaitanos,¹¹ Christoph Hartnack,⁶ Kyungil Kim,¹² Youngman Kim,¹² Che-Ming Ko,¹³ Bao-An Li,¹⁴ Qing-Feng Li,¹⁵ Zhu-Xia Li,⁵ Paolo Napolitani,¹⁶ Akira Ono,¹⁷ Massimo Papa,¹⁸ Taiseo Song,¹⁹ Jun Su²⁰ Jun-Long Tian,²¹ Ning Wang,²² Yong-Jia Wang,¹⁵ Janus Weil,¹⁹ Wen-Jie Xie,²³ Feng-Shou Zhang,²⁴ and Guo-Qiang Zhang⁴ J. Xu et al., PRC93 (2016) 044609.



Transport code comparison: Rapidity distribution



- Weaker stopping in QMD than in BUU?
- Too strong stopping in AMD
 - The proper density distribution is not used because the physical-coordinate approximation is not good.



AMD and JAM description



AMD doesn't usually use test particles.

For some purposes, the distribution function is approximated by a simple summation of Gaussians.

$$f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}) = 8 \sum_{i=1}^{A} \sum_{j=1}^{A} e^{-(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_{ij})^2 / 2\Delta x^2} e^{-(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{P}_{ij})^2 / 2\Delta p^2} B_{ij} B_{ji}^{-1}$$

$$\approx 8 \sum_{k=1}^{A} e^{-(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_k)^2 / 2\Delta x^2} e^{-(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{P}_k)^2 / 2\Delta p^2} \qquad (\mathbf{R}_k, \mathbf{P}_k): \text{ physical coordinates}$$

- This physical-coordinate approximation is used in the traditional way of two-nucleon collisions in AMD.
 Ono, Horiuchi et al., Prog. Theor. Phys. 87 (1992) 1185.
- However, this approximation is not necessarily good enough in some cases.



Wigner function for the AMD wave function

$$f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}) = 8 \sum_{i=1}^{A} \sum_{j=1}^{A} e^{-(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R}_{ij})^2 / 2\Delta x^2} e^{-(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{P}_{ij})^2 / 2\Delta p^2} B_{ij} B_{ji}^{-1}$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{v}} (\mathbf{Z}_i^* + \mathbf{Z}_j), \quad \mathbf{P}_{ij} = i\hbar \sqrt{v} (\mathbf{Z}_i^* - \mathbf{Z}_j), \quad B_{ij} = e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{Z}_i^* - \mathbf{Z}_j)^2}, \quad \Delta x^2 = \frac{1}{4v}, \quad \Delta p^2 = \hbar^2 v$$

Regarding $f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p})$ as the probability distribution function, we randomly generate test particles $(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{p}_1), (\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{p}_2), \dots$ (1 test particle per nucleon)

- Density $\rho(r)$ for ¹⁹⁷Au (for test)
- Transport code comparison (for convenience)
- AMD + JAM (for pion production, Ikeno's talk)
- To improve NN collisions



More faithful to the BUU collision term.

$$I_{\text{coll}} = \int \frac{d\mathbf{p}_2}{(2\pi\hbar)^3} \int d\Omega |\nu| \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)_{\nu} \left\{ f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}_3) f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}_4) \left[1 - f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p})\right] \left[1 - f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}_2)\right] - f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}) f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}_2) \left[1 - f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}_3)\right] \left[1 - f(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}_4)\right] \right\}$$

- **1** Generate test particles $(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{p}_1), (\mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{p}_2), \dots, (\mathbf{r}_A, \mathbf{p}_A)$
- Ollision attempt is judged by the Bertsch prescription, for each pair (*i*, *j*).

$$2|\mathbf{r}\cdot\mathbf{v}| < \mathbf{v}^2 \Delta t$$
 and $\mathbf{r}^2 - \frac{(\mathbf{r}\cdot\mathbf{v})^2}{\mathbf{v}^2} < \frac{\sigma}{\pi}$, $(\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j, \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_j)$

3 Pauli blocking/allowing by the factor

$$[1 - f(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{p}'_i)][1 - f(\mathbf{r}_j, \mathbf{p}'_j)], \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{p}'_i = \mathbf{p}_i + \mathbf{q}, \quad \mathbf{p}'_j = \mathbf{p}_j - \mathbf{q},$$



Effect in rapidity distribution



Two directions of extension of AMD



Wave-packet splitting: Give fluctuation to each wave packet centroid, based on the **single-particle motion**.

$$\frac{d}{dt}Z = \{Z, \mathcal{H}\}_{\mathsf{PB}} + (\mathsf{NN Collision})$$

+ (W.P. Splitting) + (E. Conservation)

Ono, Hudan, Chibihi, Frankland, PRC66 (2002) 014603

Ono and Horiuchi, PPNP53 (2004) 501



At each two-nucleon collision, **cluster formation** is considered for the final state.

$$N_1 + B_1 + N_2 + B_2 \rightarrow C_1 + C_2$$

$$W_{i \to f} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} |\langle \mathsf{CC} | V_{NN} | \mathsf{NBNB} \rangle|^2 \delta(\mathcal{H} - E)$$

Ono, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. 420 (2013) 012103

Ikeno, Ono et al., PRC 93 (2016) 044612

AMD and JAM description