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Abstract

The elliptic, $v_2$, triangular, $v_3$, and quadrangular, $v_4$, azimuthal anisotropic flow coefficients are measured for unidentified charged particles, pions and (anti-)protons in Pb-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV with the ALICE detector at the Large Hadron Collider. Results obtained with the event plane and four-particle cumulant methods are reported for the pseudo-rapidity range $|\eta| < 0.8$ at different collision centralities and as a function of transverse momentum, $p_T$, out to $p_T = 20$ GeV/c. The observed non-zero elliptic and triangular flow depends only weakly on transverse momentum for $p_T > 8$ GeV/c. The small $p_T$ dependence of the difference between elliptic flow results obtained from the event plane and four-particle cumulant methods suggests a common origin of flow fluctuations up to $p_T = 8$ GeV/c. The magnitude of the (anti-)proton elliptic and triangular flow is larger than that of pions out to at least $p_T = 8$ GeV/c indicating that the particle type dependence persists out to high $p_T$.

*See Appendix A for the list of collaboration members
The goal of ultra-relativistic nucleus-nucleus collisions is to study nuclear matter under extreme conditions. For non-central collisions, in the plane perpendicular to the beam direction, the geometrical overlap region, where the highly Lorentz contracted nuclei intersect and where the initial interactions occur, is azimuthally anisotropic. This initial spatial asymmetry is converted via interactions into an anisotropy in momentum space, a phenomenon referred to as transverse anisotropic flow (for a review see [1]). Anisotropic flow has become a key observable for the characterization of the properties and the evolution of the system created in a nucleus-nucleus collision.

Identified particle anisotropic flow provides valuable information on the particle production mechanism in different transverse momentum, $p_T$, regions [1]. For $p_T < 2 - 3 \text{ GeV}/c$, the flow pattern of different particle species is qualitatively described by hydrodynamic model calculations [2]. At intermediate $p_T$, $3 < p_T < 6 \text{ GeV}/c$, the observed flow of the baryons is larger than that of the mesons [3, 4]. For $p_T \gtrsim 8 \text{ GeV}/c$, the fragmentation of high-energy partons, resulting from initial hard scatterings, is expected to play the dominant role. While traversing the hot and dense matter these partons experience collisional and radiative energy loss [5, 6], which are strongly dependent on the thickness of the created medium [7]. In the azimuthally asymmetric system, the energy loss depends on the azimuthal emission angle of the parton, which leads to an azimuthal anisotropy in particle production at high $p_T$ [8, 9].

The magnitude of the anisotropic flow is characterized by the coefficients in the Fourier expansion of the azimuthal distribution of particles with respect to the collision symmetry plane [10, 11]:

$$ v_n(p_T, \eta) = \langle \cos[n(\phi - \Psi_n)] \rangle, $$

where $p_T$, $\eta$, and $\phi$ are the particle’s transverse momentum, pseudo-rapidity, and the azimuthal angle, respectively, and $\Psi_n$ is the $n$-th harmonic symmetry plane angle. For a smooth matter distribution in the colliding nuclei, the symmetry planes of all harmonics coincide with the reaction plane defined by the beam direction and the impact parameter, the vector connecting the centers of the two colliding nuclei at closest approach. In this case, for particles produced at midrapidity, all odd Fourier coefficients are zero by symmetry. Due to event-by-event fluctuations of the positions of the participating nucleons inside the nuclei, the shape of the initial energy density of the heavy-ion collision in general is not symmetric with respect to the reaction plane, and the $\Psi_n$ may deviate from the reaction plane. This gives rise to non-zero odd harmonic coefficients [12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18], and contributes to the difference in flow coefficients calculated from two- or multi-particle azimuthal correlations, and also to the difference in $v_n$ measured with respect to different harmonic symmetry planes.

Large elliptic flow, $v_2$, and significant triangular flow, $v_3$, were observed at the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC) [19, 20, 21] and at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28]. In this paper we present the measurement of unidentified charged particle anisotropic flow out to $p_T = 20 \text{ GeV}/c$, and for protons and charged pions out to $p_T = 16 \text{ GeV}/c$. We also present unidentified charged particle quadrangular flow, $v_4$, measured with respect to the second ($\Psi_2$) and fourth ($\Psi_4$) harmonic symmetry planes.

The data sample recorded by ALICE during the 2010 heavy-ion run at the LHC is used for this analysis. Detailed descriptions of the ALICE detector can be found in [29, 30, 31]. The Time Projection Chamber (TPC) was used to reconstruct charged particle tracks and measure their momenta with full azimuthal coverage in the pseudo-rapidity range $|\eta| < 0.8$, and for particle identification via the specific ionization energy loss, $dE/dx$, in the transverse momentum region $p_T > 3 \text{ GeV}/c$. Two scintillator arrays (VZERO) which cover the pseudo-rapidity ranges $-3.7 < \eta < -1.7$ and $2.8 < \eta < 5.1$ were used for triggering, and the determination of centrality [32] and symmetry planes. The trigger conditions and the event selection criteria are identical to those described in [22, 23, 32]. Approximately $10^7$ minimum-bias Pb-Pb events with a reconstructed primary vertex within $\pm 10 \text{ cm}$ from the nominal interaction point in the
beam direction are used for this analysis. Charged particles reconstructed in the TPC in |η| < 0.8 and 0.2 < p_T < 20 GeV/c were selected. The charged track quality cuts described in [22] were applied to minimize contamination from secondary charged particles and fake tracks. The charged particle track reconstruction efficiency and contamination were estimated from HIJING Monte Carlo simulations [33] combined with a GEANT3 [34] detector model, and found to be independent of the collision centrality. The reconstruction efficiency increases from 70% to 80% for particles with 0.2 < p_T < 1 GeV/c and remains constant at 80 ± 5% for p_T > 1 GeV/c. The estimated contamination by secondary charged particles from weak decays and photon conversions is less than 6% at p_T = 0.2 GeV/c and falls below 1% for p_T > 1 GeV/c.

The selection of pions and protons at p_T > 3 GeV/c is based on the measurement of the dE/dx in the TPC, following the procedure described in [35]. Enriched pion (proton) samples are obtained by selecting tracks from the upper (lower) part of the expected pion (proton) dE/dx distribution. For example, protons were typically selected, depending on their momentum, in the range from 0 to −3σ or from −1.5σ to −4.5σ around their nominal value in dE/dx, where σ is the energy loss resolution. Note that dE/dx of pions is larger than that of protons in the p_T range used for this study. The track selection criteria have been adjusted to keep the contamination by other particle species below 1% for pions and below 15% for protons. The pion and proton v_2 and v_3 are not corrected for this contamination. The systematic uncertainties in v_2 and v_3 related to the purity of the pion and proton samples are 2% for p_T < 8 GeV/c and 10% for p_T ≥ 8 GeV/c.

The flow coefficients v_n are measured using the event plane method (v_n{EP} [11]) and the four-particle cumulant technique (v_n{4} [36]), which have different sensitivity to flow fluctuations and correlations unrelated to the azimuthal asymmetry in the initial geometry (“non-flow”). The non-flow contribution to v_n{4} is estimated to be negligible from analytic calculations and Monte Carlo simulations [37, 38, 39]. The contribution from flow fluctuations was shown to be negative for v_n{4} and positive for v_n{EP} [11].

The orientation of the symmetry planes Ψ_n is reconstructed from the azimuthal distribution of hits measured by the VZERO scintillators. The large gap in pseudo-rapidity between the charged particles in
the TPC and those in the VZERO detectors greatly suppresses non-flow contributions to the measured \( v_n \{ EP \} \). Assuming that there is no anisotropic flow in pp collisions, the non-flow contributions can be estimated by comparing the azimuthal correlations measured in heavy-ion collisions to those in pp. It was observed that the two-particle azimuthal correlations in pp and the most peripheral Au-Au collisions at \( \sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 0.2 \text{ TeV} \) are very similar \[40\], which suggests that non-flow dominates correlations in the centrality range 80-90%. The systematic uncertainty from the remaining non-flow, \( \delta_{\text{cent}}^{n} \), in the measured \( v_n \{ EP \} \) coefficients was estimated based on the equation:

\[
\delta_{\text{cent}}^{n} = v_{n}^{80-90\%} \sqrt{\frac{M_{80-90\%}}{M_{\text{cent}}}},
\]

where \( v_{n}^{80-90\%} \) and \( M_{80-90\%} \) are the magnitude of \( v_n \) and average multiplicity for the centrality range 80-90%, respectively, and \( M_{\text{cent}} \) is the average multiplicity in a given centrality class. The non-flow increases with \( p_T \) and from central to peripheral collisions. For example, the non-flow contributions to \( v_2 \) in 5-10% (40-50%) most central collisions are about 1% (2%) at \( p_T = 1 \text{ GeV/c} \) and reach up to 10% (12%) for \( p_T > 10 \text{ GeV/c} \). Other sources of systematic uncertainties were evaluated from the variation of the results with different cuts on the reconstructed collision vertex and the centrality estimated from the charged particle multiplicity measured in the TPC and VZERO detectors. Changes due to variations of the track selection criteria and the difference of the results obtained using only positively or negatively charged particles were considered as a part of the systematic error. The difference in the extracted coefficients using one or the other of the two VZERO detectors was found to be below 1% for \( v_2 \) and \( v_3 \), and below 5% for \( v_4 \) over the measured region of transverse momentum. The combined results from correlations with both VZERO detectors are denoted as \( v_n \{ EP, |\Delta\eta| > 2.0 \} \) in the following. The contributions from all sources were added in quadrature as an estimate of the total systematic uncertainty. The resulting systematic uncertainties in \( v_2 \) are 3% for 0.9 < \( p_T \) < 1 \text{ GeV/c} and \(+3_{-11\%}^{+5\%} \) for 9 < \( p_T \) < 10 \text{ GeV/c} in the 5-10% (40-50%) centrality class. The resulting systematic uncertainties in \( v_3 \) are 3% for 0.9 < \( p_T \) < 1 \text{ GeV/c} and increase to 6% (10%) for 7 < \( p_T \) < 9 \text{ GeV/c} for centrality 5-10% (40-50%). We assign an 8% (16%) systematic uncertainty to \( v_4 \) for 0.9 < \( p_T \) < 1 \text{ GeV/c} in the 5-10% (40-50%) centrality class, while for \( p_T > 6 \text{ GeV/c} \) the systematic uncertainty is dominated by non-flow contributions.

Fig. 2: (color online) Comparison of the ALICE results on \( v_n(p_T) \) obtained with the event plane method to the analogous measurements from ATLAS \[26\] and CMS \[27\] collaborations, as well as \( v_2 \) measurements by STAR \[44\]. Only statistical errors are shown.
Figure 1 shows unidentified charged particle \( v_2, v_3, \) and \( v_4 \) as a function of transverse momentum for different centrality classes. The difference between \( v_2 \{\text{EP}\} \) and \( v_2 \{4\} \) for \( p_T < 7 \text{ GeV/c} \) is predominantly due to flow fluctuations. The measured \( v_2 \) at \( p_T > 8 \text{ GeV/c} \) is non-zero, positive and approximately constant, while its value increases from central to mid-peripheral collisions. The observed \( v_2 \{\text{EP}\} \) at \( p_T > 10 \text{ GeV/c} \) is fairly well described by extrapolation to the LHC energy [41] of the WHDG model calculations [42] for \( v_2 \) of neutral pions including collisional and radiative energy loss of partons in a Bjorken-expanding medium [43]. The coefficient \( v_3 \) exhibits a weak centrality dependence with a magnitude significantly smaller than that of \( v_2 \), except for the most central collisions. Unlike \( v_3 \), which originates entirely from fluctuations of the initial geometry of the system, \( v_4 \) has two contributions, which are probed by correlations with the \( \Psi_2 \) and \( \Psi_4 \) symmetry planes. The measured \( v_4/\Psi_4 \{\text{EP}\} \) does not depend strongly on the collision centrality which points to a strong contribution from flow fluctuations. In contrast, \( v_4/\Psi_4 \{\text{EP}\} \) shows a strong centrality dependence which is typical for correlations with respect to the true reaction plane. The difference between the two, indicative of flow fluctuations, persists at least up to \( p_T = 8 \text{ GeV/c} \).

Figure 2 compares our results obtained with the event plane method for 30-40% centrality to the analogous measurements by ATLAS [26] and CMS [27] collaborations, and results obtained at RHIC by the STAR [44] collaboration. An excellent agreement is observed between results from all three LHC experiments. \( v_2(p_T) \) at top RHIC energy has a peak value about 10% lower than at LHC although is very similar in shape.

To investigate further the role of flow fluctuations at different transverse momenta we study the relative difference between \( v_2 \{\text{EP}\} \) and \( v_2 \{4\} \), \( [(v_2 \{\text{EP}\})^2 - v_2 \{4\}^2]/(v_2 \{\text{EP}\}^2 + v_2 \{4\}^2)]^{1/2} \), which for small non-flow is proportional to the relative flow fluctuations \( \sigma_{v_2}/v_2 \) [1]. Figure 3 presents this quantity as a function of transverse momentum for various centrality classes. The relative flow fluctuations are minimal for mid-central collisions and become larger for peripheral and central collisions, similar to those observed at RHIC energies [1]. It is remarkable that in the 5-30% centrality range, relative flow fluctuations are within errors independent of momentum up to \( p_T \sim 8 \text{ GeV/c} \), far beyond the region where the flow magnitude is well described by hydrodynamic models (\( p_T < 2 - 3 \text{ GeV/c} \)). This indicates a
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common origin for flow fluctuations, which are usually associated with fluctuations of the initial collision geometry, at least up to the regime where hard scattering and jet energy loss are expected to dominate. The ratio develops a momentum dependence, starting to increase at \( p_T \sim 1.5 \text{ GeV/c} \), for more peripheral collisions (30-50%), and in most central collisions (0-5%), where it is most pronounced. In both cases, the relative contribution of non-flow effects is expected to be the largest.

Figure 4 shows unidentified charged particle \( v_2 \), \( v_3 \), and \( v_4 \) averaged over \( 10 < p_T < 20 \text{ GeV/c} \) as a function of centrality. \( v_2 \) increases from central to peripheral collisions. No significant difference between \( v_2 \{ \text{EP} \} \) and \( v_2 \{ 4 \} \) results is observed, which might indicate that the fluctuations of the initial collision geometry become unimportant for \( p_T > 10 \text{ GeV/c} \). The centrality dependence of \( v_3 \) differs significantly from that of \( v_2 \). \( v_4 \) measured with respect to the second and fourth harmonic symmetry planes is consistent with zero within relatively large uncertainties. All these observations indicate that for \( p_T > 10 \text{ GeV/c} \) the effect of fluctuations of the initial collision geometry might be very different compared to that at low and intermediate \( p_T \).

Figure 5 presents charged pion and proton \( v_2 \) and \( v_3 \) as a function of \( p_T \) in the 10-50% centrality range from the event plane method. The proton \( v_2 \) and \( v_3 \) are higher than that of pions out to \( p_T = 8 \text{ GeV/c} \) where the uncertainties become large. This behavior is qualitatively consistent with a picture where particle production in this intermediate \( p_T \) region includes interaction of jet fragments with bulk matter, e.g. as in model [45]. The magnitude of the measured charged pion elliptic flow for \( p_T > 8 \text{ GeV/c} \) is compatible with that for unidentified charged particles, and \( \pi^0 \) measured by PHENIX [46] in Au-Au collisions at \( \sqrt{s_{NN}} = 0.2 \text{ TeV} \), and reproduced by the WHDG model calculations for \( v_2 \) of neutral pions [43].

In summary, we have presented elliptic, triangular, and quadrangular flow coefficients measured by the ALICE collaboration in Pb-Pb collisions at \( \sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76 \text{ TeV} \) over a broad range of transverse momentum. For \( p_T > 8 \text{ GeV/c} \), we find that the unidentified charged particle \( v_2 \) and \( v_3 \) are finite, positive and only weakly dependent on transverse momentum, while \( v_4 \) is consistent with zero within rather large sta-
Fig. 5: (color online) $v_2$ (top) and $v_3$ (bottom) of charged pion and proton as a function of transverse momentum for 10-50% centrality class compared to unidentified charged particles results from the event plane method. For clarity, the markers for $v_2$ and $v_3$ at $p_T > 8$ GeV/c are slightly shifted along the horizontal axis. PHENIX $\pi^0$ $v_2$ measurements [46] are also shown. The dashed line represents the WHDG model calculations for neutral pions [43] extrapolated to the LHC collision energy for the 20-50% centrality range. Error bars (shaded boxes) represent the statistical (systematic) uncertainties.
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