## Monte carlo simulation of collective flow analysis for $S\pi RIT$ -TPC

M. Kurata-Nishimura,<sup>\*1</sup> J. Barney,<sup>\*2,\*1</sup> G. Cerizza,<sup>\*2,\*1</sup> J. Estee,<sup>\*2,\*1</sup> B. Hong,<sup>\*3</sup> T. Isobe,<sup>\*1</sup> G. Jhang,<sup>\*2,\*1</sup> M. Kaneko,<sup>\*4,\*1</sup> H. S. Lee,<sup>\*7</sup> J. W. Lee,<sup>\*3,\*1</sup> J. Łukasik,<sup>\*5</sup> W. G. Lynch,<sup>\*2</sup> A. B. McIntosh,<sup>\*8</sup>

T. Murakami,<sup>\*4,\*1</sup> P. Pawłowski,<sup>\*5,\*1</sup> H. Sakurai,<sup>\*1</sup> C. Santamaria,<sup>\*2,\*1</sup> R. Shane,<sup>\*2</sup>

D. Suzuki,<br/>\*1 M. B. Tsang,\*2 and S. J. Yennello\*8 for  ${\rm S}\pi {\rm RIT}$  <br/>Collaboration

The SAMURAI Pion-Reconstruction and Ion-Tracker-Time-Projection Chamber  $(S\pi RIT-TPC)^{1}$ project aims to constrain the nuclear equation of state (EoS) at supra-saturation density using heavy ion collisions.

In heavy ion collision, the corrective flow, which is one of sensitive probes to the nuclear EoS, characterized by asymmetric azimuthal emission amplitude, v1 and v2 with respect to a reaction plane orientation,  $\Psi$ ,

$$\frac{2\pi}{N}\frac{dN}{d(\phi-\Psi)} = 1 + 2v_1\cos(\phi-\Psi) + 2v_2\cos(2(\phi-\Psi)).$$
(1)

The  $\Psi$  is determined from an azimuthal angle distribution of charged particles event by event. In  $S\pi RIT$ -TPC experiment, the  $\Psi$  is calculated summing up unit vectors of transverse momentum for Z = 1 and 2 particles.<sup>2)</sup> The detector bias on the  $\Psi$  caused by its rectangular shape and a limited acceptance was corrected using shifting and flattening methods.<sup>3)</sup> The coefficients, v1 and v2, were obtained after correcting with a reaction plane resolution<sup>4)</sup> which depends on the laboratory azimuthal angle.

A Monte Carlo simulation was performed to validate our analysis method. Configurations of the generated events were chosen to reproduce distributions of real data as listed in Table 1. Two acceptance setting for the  $S\pi RIT$ -TPC and  $4\pi$  (full) coverage were compared

Table 1. Configurations in the Mote Carlo simulation. The center of mass rapidity normalized with the beam rapidity was defined as  $y_{nrm} \equiv y_{cm}/y_{beam}$ . The transverse momentum  $u_t (= \beta_t \gamma_t)$  was utilized.

Particle	proton
Multiplicity	40
$dN/dy_{nrm}$	$\exp(-0.5 * (y_{nrm}/0.78)^2)$
$dN/du_t$	$\exp(-0.1u_t)$
v1	$0.52y_{nrm} - 0.18y_{nrm}^3$ , const. in $u_t$
v2	$-0.08 + 0.1y_{nrm}^2 - 0.02y_{nrm}^4$ , const. in $u_t$
Acceptance	(A) $S\pi RIT-TPC/(B)$ Full

\*1 **RIKEN** Nishina Center

- \*2 NSCL and Dept. of Phys. & Ast., Michigan State University
- \*3 Department of Physics, Korea University
- \*4 Department of Physics, Kyoto University
- \*5IFJ PAN, Kraków
- \*6 Faculty of Physics, Astronomy and Applied Computer Science, Jagiellonian University, Kraków
- \*7 Rare Isotope Science Project, Institute for Basic Science
- \*8Cyclotron Institute, Texas A&M University



Fig. 1. The v2 simulated with (A)  $S\pi RIT$ -TPC and (B) Full acceptance. A green line shows the initial function.

by analyzing through the same code developed for real data.

In Fig. 1, v2 as a function of the center of mass rapidity were shown for (A)S $\pi$ RIT-TPC and (B)full acceptance. The rapidity was normalized by the beam rapidity,  $y_{nrm} (\equiv y_{cm}/y_{beam})$ . As a result, both of them almost reproduce the initial function (green line). It indicates that the correction for the detector bias was done properly. However, the absolute v2 are  $\sim 6\%$ smaller at  $y_{nrm} = 0$ , whereas v1 reproduces the initial value. This discrepancy should be taken into account as a systematic error.

This work is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under Grant Nos. DE-SC0004835, DE-SC0014530, DE-NA0002923, US National Science Foundation Grant No. PHY-1565546, the Japanese MEXT KAKENHI (Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Areas) grant No. 24105004, and the Polish National Science Center (NCN), under contract Nos. UMO- 2013/09/B/ST2/04064 and UMO-2013/10/M/ST2/00624.

## References

- 1) R. Shane et al., Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A 784, 513 (2015).
- 2)M. Kurata-Nishimura et al., RIKEN Accel. Prog. Rep. **62**, 37 (2019).
- 3) J. Barrette et al., Phys. Rev. C 56, 3254 (1997).
- 4) A. M. Poskanzer, S. A. Voloshin, Phys. Rev. C 58, 1671 (1998).