Bottom-up thermalization from holography?

Stefan Stricker

TU Vienna

HoloGrav 2013, Helsinki

D. Steineder, SS, A. Vuorinen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 101601 (2013) R. Baier, SS, O. Taanila, A. Vuorinen, Phys. Rev. D 86, 081901(R) (2012) R. Baier, SS, O. Taanila, A. Vuorinen, JHEP 1207 (2012) 094

Motivation

quark gluon plasma

- produced in heavy collisions at RHIC and LHC
- behaves as a strongly coupled liquid
- thermalization process not well understood

goals

- gain insight into the thermalization process
- modification of production rates of photons/dileptons
- which modes thermalize first: top-down or bottom-up ?
- dependence on coupling strength

strategy

• SYM where strong and weak coupling regimes are accessible

Thermalization scenarios

bottom up scenario

- at weak coupling
- scattering processes
 - in the early stages many soft gluons are emitted which then thermalize the system (*Baier et al* (2001))
- driven by instabilities
 - instabilities isotropize the momentum distributions more rapidly than scattering processes (*Kurkela, Moore (2011)*)

top down scenario

- at strong coupling
- UV modes thermalize first
- in AdS calculations, follows naturally from causality

Photon emission in heavy ion collisions



photons are emitted at all stages of the collision

- initial hard scattering processes: quark anti-quark annihilation:
 - on-shell photon or virtual photon \rightarrow dilepton pair
- strongly coupled out of equilibrium phase: no quasiparticle picture
- additional (uninteresting) emissions from charged hadron decays

Probing the plasma

probing the plasma

- once produced photons/dileptons stream through the plasma almost unaltered
- provide observational window in the thermalization process of the plasma

quantity of interest

- spectral density : $\chi^{\mu}_{\mu} = -2 \operatorname{Im}(\Pi^{\operatorname{ret}})^{\mu}_{\mu}(k_0)$
- number of photons emitted with given momentum

fluctuation dissipation theorem

$$\eta^{\mu\nu}\Pi^{<}_{\mu\nu}(\omega) = -2n_B(\omega)\operatorname{Im}(\Pi^{ret})^{\mu}_{\mu}(\omega) = n_B(\omega)\chi(\omega)$$

production rate

$$k^0 \frac{d\Gamma_{\gamma}}{d^3 k} = \frac{\alpha}{4\pi^2} \eta^{\mu\nu} \Pi^{<}_{\mu\nu} (\omega = k^0)$$

Photon emission in equilibrium SYM plasma



perturbative result

 increasing the coupling: slope at k=0 decreases, hydro peak broadens and moves right

strong coupling result

• decreasing coupling from $\lambda = \infty$: peak sharpens and moves left

Out of equilibrium

- equilibrium picture in SYM fairly complete
- how does photon/dilepton production get modified out of equilibrium
- can one access thermalization at finite coupling ?

The falling shell setup



outside and inside spacetime

• metric:
$$ds^{2} = \frac{(\pi TL)^{2}}{u} \left(f(u)dt^{2} + dx^{2} + dy^{2} + dz^{2} \right) + \frac{L^{2}}{4u^{2}f(u)}du^{2} \qquad u = \frac{r_{h}^{2}}{r^{2}}$$
$$f(u) = \begin{cases} f_{+}(u) = 1 - u^{2}, & \text{for } u > 1\\ f_{-}(u) = 1, & \text{for } u < 1 \end{cases},$$

outside solution

$$E_+ = c_+ E_{in} + c_- E_{out}$$

matching condition

Israel junction condition

• extrinsic curvatures match across the shell

$$[K_{ij}] - [K]g_{ij} = 0, \qquad [K_{ij}] = K_{ij}^+ - K_{ij}^-$$

• can be also adapted for other fields

Fourier transformation

• discontinuity in the time coordinate

$$\frac{dt_{-}}{dt_{+}} = \sqrt{\frac{f_{+}}{f_{-}}} \equiv \sqrt{f_{m}} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \int dt_{+}e^{i\omega_{+}t_{+}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{f_{m}}}\int dt_{-}e^{\frac{i\omega_{+}t_{-}}{\sqrt{f_{m}}}},$$

• identification: $\omega_{-} = \omega_{+} / \sqrt{f_{m}}$

matching condition:

quasistatic approximation:

• energy scale of interest >> characteristic time scale of shell's motion

equation of motion

equation of motion for transverse electric field

$$E'' + \frac{f'}{f}E' + \frac{\hat{\omega}^2 - \hat{q}^2 f}{uf^2}E = 0, \qquad E_z \equiv F_{tz}$$
$$\hat{\omega} \equiv w/(2\pi T), \quad \hat{q} \equiv q/(2\pi T) \qquad T = \frac{r_h}{\pi}$$

• this equation is solved numerically by the ansatz:

$$E_{\text{in}}_{\text{out}}(u,\hat{\omega},\hat{q}) = (1-u)^{\mp \frac{i\hat{\omega}}{2}} y_{\text{in}}_{\text{out}}(u)$$

retarded correlator

$$\Pi(\omega, \mathbf{q}) = -\frac{N_c^2 T^2}{8} \lim_{u \to 0} \frac{E'(u, Q)}{E(u, Q)} = -\frac{N_c^2 T^2}{8} \Pi_{therm} \frac{1 + \frac{c_-}{c_+} \frac{E'_{out}}{E'_{in}}}{1 + \frac{c_-}{c_+} \frac{E_{out}}{E_{in}}}$$

• reproduce thermal case: $\lim_{r_s \to r_h} \frac{c_-}{c_+} \to 0$

• behaviour of c_{-}/c_{+} crucial for out of equilibrium dynamics

Photon & dilepton spectral density



photon spectral density for $r_s/r_h = 1.1, 1.01, 1.001$

dilepton spectral density for $r_s/r_h = 1.01$ and q=0,1,2

- out of equilibrium effect: oscillations around thermal value
- as the shell approaches the horizon equilibrium is reached

Thermalization at infinite coupling: photons



- thermalization: increase in frequency and decrease in amplitude
- top down thermalization: highly energetic modes are closer to equ. value

$$\chi(\hat{\omega}) \approx \hat{\omega}^{\frac{2}{3}} \left(1 + \frac{f_1(u_s)}{\hat{\omega}} \right), \qquad R \approx \frac{1}{\hat{\omega}}$$

Thermalization depending on the virtuality



- thermalization depends on the virtuality
- photons are last to thermalize
- same conclusion was reached in other models of thermalization (Arnold et al; Chesler and Teaney)

Photon production rate



photon production rate for $r_s/r_h=1.1, 1.01, 1.001$

- enhancement of production rate
- hydro peak broadens and moves right

Photon production rate



photon production rate for $r_s/r_h=1.1, 1.01, 1.001$

- enhancement of production rate
- hydro peak broadens and moves right
- combining the two allows to study thermalization at finite coupling !

Finite coupling corrections

action: $S_{IIB} = S_{IIB}^{0} + S_{IIB}^{\alpha'},$ $S_{IIB}^{0} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-g} \left(R_{10} - \frac{1}{2} (\partial \phi)^{2} - \frac{1}{4.5!} (F_{5})^{2} \right)$ $S_{IIB}^{\alpha'} = \frac{L^{6}}{2\kappa_{10}^{2}} \int d^{10}x \sqrt{-g} \left(\gamma e^{\frac{-3}{2}\phi} (C + \mathcal{T})^{4} \right), \qquad \gamma \equiv \frac{1}{8} \zeta(3) \lambda^{-\frac{3}{2}}$ $\mathcal{T}_{abcdef} = i \nabla_{a} F_{bcdef}^{+} + \frac{1}{16} \left(F_{abcmn}^{+} F_{def}^{+ mn} - 3F_{abfmn}^{+} F_{dec}^{+ mn} \right),$ Paulos (2008)

• solving Einsteins equations

$$\begin{split} ds^2 &= \frac{r_h^2}{u} \left(-f(u) \, K^2(u) \, dt^2 + d\vec{x}^2 \right) + \frac{1}{4u^2 f(u)} \, P^2(u) \, du^2 + L^2(u) \, d\Omega_5^2 \\ &\quad K(u) = e^{\gamma \, [a(u) + 4b(u)]} \,, \ P(u) = e^{\gamma \, b(u)} \,, \ L(u) = e^{\gamma \, c(u)} \,, \\ &\quad a(u) = - \frac{1625}{8} \, u^2 - 175 \, u^4 + \frac{10005}{16} \, u^6 \,, \\ &\quad b(u) = \frac{325}{8} \, u^2 + \frac{1075}{32} \, u^4 - \frac{4835}{32} \, u^6 \,, \\ &\quad c(u) = \frac{15}{32} \, (1 + u^2) \, u^4 \,, \end{split}$$

Gubser et al; Pawelczyk, Theisen (1998)

Finite coupling corrections

equation of motion

• after all the contractions are worked out the eom for a transverse electric field takes the simple form

$$\Psi''(u) - V(u)\Psi(u) = 0$$
 Hassanain, Schvellinger

• making the ansatz

$$\Psi_{\inf_{\text{out}}}(u,) = (1-u)^{\mp \frac{i\hat{\omega}}{2}} \left(\psi_{\inf_{\text{out}}}^{(0)}(u) + \gamma \psi_{\inf_{\text{out}}}^{(1)}(u) + \mathcal{O}(\gamma^2) \right),$$

 inside solution (pure AdS) stays the same (*Banks*, *Green (1998)*), but relation between frequencies gets corrected

$$\omega_{-} = \frac{\omega_{+}}{\sqrt{f_m}}, \qquad f_m \equiv f(u_s)K^2(u_s),$$

• all the corrections have to be taken into account, e.g

$$\frac{c_-}{c_+} = C_0 + \gamma C_1$$

• spectral density

$$\chi(\omega) = \frac{N_c^2 T^2}{2} \left(1 - \frac{265}{8} \gamma \right) \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{\Psi'_+}{\Psi_+} \right) \bigg|_{u=0}$$

Photon production rate at finite coupling



• behaviour very similar to thermal limit

relative deviation from thermal limit



• behaviour of relative deviation changes at large frequency

relative deviation from thermal limit



• behaviour of relative deviation changes at large frequency

- decreasing the coupling: change happens at lower frequency
- indicates a change of the thermalization pattern from top-down towards bottomup ?



$$\Pi(\omega) \approx \Pi_{therm} \frac{1 + (C_0 + \gamma C_1) \frac{E'_{out}}{E'_{in}}}{1 + (C_0 + \gamma C_1) \frac{E_{out}}{E_{in}}}$$

$$C_0 \approx \frac{1}{\omega}, \qquad C_1 \approx \omega$$

- behaviour of the fields near the horizon is crucial
- originates from the Schroedinger potential

WKB approximation

$$\chi(\hat{\omega}) \approx \hat{\omega}^{\frac{2}{3}} \left(1 + \frac{3\zeta(3)}{8\lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{f_1(u_s)}{\hat{\omega}} + \frac{f_2(u_s)\hat{\omega}}{\lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right)$$



$$\Pi(\omega) \approx \Pi_{therm} \frac{1 + (C_0 + \gamma C_1) \frac{E'_{out}}{E'_{in}}}{1 + (C_0 + \gamma C_1) \frac{E_{out}}{E_{in}}}$$

$$C_0 \approx \frac{1}{\omega}, \qquad C_1 \approx \omega$$

- behaviour of the fields near the horizon is crucial
- originates from the Schroedinger potential

WKB approximation

$$\chi(\hat{\omega}) \approx \hat{\omega}^{\frac{2}{3}} \left(1 + \frac{3\zeta(3)}{8\lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{f_1(u_s)}{\hat{\omega}} + \frac{f_2(u_s)\hat{\omega}}{\lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right)$$

- so far: only photons that get emitted from the plasma
- what about plasma constituents themselves ?

Future directions I: $\langle T_{\mu\nu}T_{\alpha\beta}\rangle$

Relative deviation of the shear channel: $\langle T_{xy}T_{xy}\rangle$



- finite coupling effects are weaker
- for large energies relative deviation becomes constant
- can be seen from the behaviour of c_{-}/c_{+}

Future directions II: QNM analysis

QNM for R current correlator at infinite coupling



• flow of the imaginary part of the first QNM:

Im
$$\omega_1 = 2\pi T \left(-1 + \frac{c}{\lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}} \right)$$

Conclusion

thermalization at infinite coupling

- enhancement of production rate
- top down thermalization
- depends on virtuality: on-shell photons are last to thermalize

thermalization at finite coupling

- enhancement of production rate
- indication of thermalization pattern changing from top down towards bottom up

open questions

- why does the causality argument not apply
- go beyond quasistatic approximation
- can one include finite coupling corrections in more involved models of holographic thermalization