

**This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.**

**Author(s):** PHENIX Collaboration

**Title:** Measurement of jet-medium interactions via direct photon-hadron correlations in Au+Au and d+Au collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV

**Year:** 2020

**Version:** Published version

**Copyright:** © 2020 the Authors

**Rights:** CC BY 4.0

**Rights url:** <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

**Please cite the original version:**

PHENIX Collaboration. (2020). Measurement of jet-medium interactions via direct photon-hadron correlations in Au+Au and d+Au collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV. *Physical Review C*, 102(5), Article 054910. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.102.054910>

# Measurement of jet-medium interactions via direct photon-hadron correlations in Au + Au and $d + \text{Au}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200 \text{ GeV}$

U. Acharya,<sup>23</sup> A. Adare,<sup>12</sup> S. Afanasiev,<sup>33</sup> C. Aidala,<sup>42,46,47</sup> N. N. Ajitanand,<sup>69,\*</sup> Y. Akiba,<sup>63,64,†</sup> R. Akimoto,<sup>11</sup>  
 H. Al-Bataineh,<sup>55</sup> J. Alexander,<sup>69</sup> H. Al-Ta'ani,<sup>55</sup> A. Angerami,<sup>13</sup> K. Aoki,<sup>35,38,63</sup> N. Apadula,<sup>30,70</sup> Y. Aramaki,<sup>11,63</sup>  
 H. Asano,<sup>38,63</sup> E. C. Aschenauer,<sup>7</sup> E. T. Atomssa,<sup>39,70</sup> R. Averbeck,<sup>70</sup> T. C. Awes,<sup>58</sup> B. Azmoun,<sup>7</sup> V. Babintsev,<sup>26</sup> M. Bai,<sup>6</sup>  
 G. Baksay,<sup>21</sup> L. Baksay,<sup>21</sup> B. Bannier,<sup>70</sup> K. N. Barish,<sup>8</sup> B. Bassalleck,<sup>54</sup> A. T. Basye,<sup>1</sup> S. Bathe,<sup>5,8,64</sup> V. Baublis,<sup>61</sup>  
 C. Baumann,<sup>48</sup> S. Baumgart,<sup>63</sup> A. Bazilevsky,<sup>7</sup> S. Belikov,<sup>7,\*</sup> R. Belmont,<sup>12,56,75</sup> R. Bennett,<sup>70</sup> A. Berdnikov,<sup>66</sup> Y. Berdnikov,<sup>66</sup>  
 J. H. Bhom,<sup>79</sup> L. Bichon,<sup>75</sup> A. A. Bickley,<sup>12</sup> D. Black,<sup>8</sup> B. Blankenship,<sup>75</sup> D. S. Blau,<sup>37,53</sup> J. S. Bok,<sup>54,55,79</sup> V. Borisov,<sup>66</sup>  
 K. Boyle,<sup>64,70</sup> M. L. Brooks,<sup>42</sup> J. Bryslawski,<sup>5,8</sup> H. Buesching,<sup>7</sup> V. Bumazhnov,<sup>26</sup> G. Bunce,<sup>7,64</sup> S. Butsyk,<sup>42,54</sup>  
 C. M. Camacho,<sup>42</sup> S. Campbell,<sup>13,70</sup> V. Canoa Roman,<sup>70</sup> A. Caringi,<sup>49</sup> P. Castera,<sup>70</sup> C.-H. Chen,<sup>64,70</sup> C. Y. Chi,<sup>13</sup> M. Chiu,<sup>7</sup>  
 I. J. Choi,<sup>27,79</sup> J. B. Choi,<sup>32,\*</sup> S. Choi,<sup>68</sup> R. K. Choudhury,<sup>4</sup> P. Christiansen,<sup>44</sup> T. Chujo,<sup>74</sup> P. Chung,<sup>69</sup> O. Chvala,<sup>8</sup>  
 V. Cianciolo,<sup>58</sup> Z. Citron,<sup>70,77</sup> B. A. Cole,<sup>13</sup> Z. Conesa del Valle,<sup>39</sup> M. Connors,<sup>23,70</sup> P. Constantin,<sup>42</sup> N. Cronin,<sup>49,70</sup>  
 N. Crossette,<sup>49</sup> M. Csanád,<sup>17</sup> T. Csörgő,<sup>78</sup> T. Dahms,<sup>70</sup> S. Dairaku,<sup>38,63</sup> I. Danchev,<sup>75</sup> K. Das,<sup>22</sup> A. Datta,<sup>46</sup> M. S. Daugherty,<sup>1</sup>  
 G. David,<sup>7,70</sup> M. K. Dayananda,<sup>23</sup> K. DeBlasio,<sup>54</sup> K. Dehmel,<sup>21,70</sup> A. Denisov,<sup>26</sup> A. Deshpande,<sup>64,70</sup> E. J. Desmond,<sup>7</sup>  
 K. V. Dharmawardane,<sup>55</sup> O. Dietzsch,<sup>67</sup> L. Ding,<sup>30</sup> A. Dion,<sup>30,70</sup> J. H. Do,<sup>79</sup> M. Donadelli,<sup>67</sup> L. D'Orazio,<sup>45</sup> O. Drapier,<sup>39</sup>  
 A. Drees,<sup>70</sup> K. A. Drees,<sup>6</sup> J. M. Durham,<sup>42,70</sup> A. Durum,<sup>26</sup> D. Dutta,<sup>4</sup> S. Edwards,<sup>6,22</sup> Y. V. Efremenko,<sup>58</sup> F. Ellinghaus,<sup>12</sup>  
 T. Engelmöre,<sup>13</sup> A. Enokizono,<sup>41,58,63,65</sup> H. En'yo,<sup>63,64</sup> R. Esha,<sup>70</sup> S. Esumi,<sup>74</sup> K. O. Eyser,<sup>7,8</sup> B. Fadern,<sup>49</sup> W. Fan,<sup>70</sup>  
 D. E. Fields,<sup>54</sup> M. Finger,<sup>9</sup> M. Finger, Jr.,<sup>9</sup> D. Firak,<sup>16</sup> D. Fitzgerald,<sup>47</sup> F. Fleuret,<sup>39</sup> S. L. Fokin,<sup>37</sup> Z. Fraenkel,<sup>77,\*</sup>  
 J. E. Frantz,<sup>57,70</sup> A. Franz,<sup>7</sup> A. D. Frawley,<sup>22</sup> K. Fujiwara,<sup>63</sup> Y. Fukao,<sup>63</sup> T. Fusayasu,<sup>51</sup> K. Gainey,<sup>1</sup> C. Gal,<sup>70</sup> P. Garg,<sup>3,70</sup>  
 A. Garishvili,<sup>72</sup> I. Garishvili,<sup>41,72</sup> F. Giordano,<sup>27</sup> A. Glenn,<sup>12,41</sup> H. Gong,<sup>70</sup> X. Gong,<sup>69</sup> M. Gonin,<sup>39</sup> Y. Goto,<sup>63,64</sup> R. Granier de  
 Cassagnac,<sup>39</sup> N. Grau,<sup>2,13</sup> S. V. Greene,<sup>75</sup> G. Grim,<sup>42</sup> M. Grosse Perdekamp,<sup>27,64</sup> Y. Gu,<sup>69</sup> T. Gunji,<sup>11</sup> L. Guo,<sup>42</sup>  
 H.-Å. Gustafsson,<sup>44,\*</sup> T. Hachiya,<sup>25,52,63,64</sup> J. S. Haggerty,<sup>7</sup> K. I. Hahn,<sup>19</sup> H. Hamagaki,<sup>11</sup> J. Hamblen,<sup>72</sup> R. Han,<sup>60</sup>  
 S. Y. Han,<sup>19,36</sup> J. Hanks,<sup>13,70</sup> E. P. Hartouni,<sup>41</sup> S. Hasegawa,<sup>31</sup> K. Hashimoto,<sup>63,65</sup> E. Haslum,<sup>44</sup> R. Hayano,<sup>11</sup> S. Hayashi,<sup>11</sup>  
 X. He,<sup>23</sup> M. Heffner,<sup>41</sup> T. K. Hemmick,<sup>70</sup> T. Hester,<sup>8</sup> J. C. Hill,<sup>30</sup> A. Hodges,<sup>23</sup> M. Hohmann,<sup>21</sup> R. S. Hollis,<sup>8</sup> W. Holzmann,<sup>13</sup>  
 K. Homma,<sup>25</sup> B. Hong,<sup>36</sup> T. Horaguchi,<sup>25,74</sup> Y. Hori,<sup>11</sup> D. Hornback,<sup>72</sup> J. Huang,<sup>7</sup> S. Huang,<sup>75</sup> T. Ichihara,<sup>63,64</sup> R. Ichimiya,<sup>63</sup>  
 J. Ide,<sup>49</sup> H. Iinuma,<sup>35</sup> Y. Ikeda,<sup>63,74</sup> K. Imai,<sup>31,38,63</sup> Y. Imazu,<sup>63</sup> J. Imrek,<sup>16</sup> M. Inaba,<sup>74</sup> A. Iordanova,<sup>8</sup> D. Isenhowe,<sup>1</sup>  
 M. Ishihara,<sup>63</sup> A. Isinhue,<sup>49</sup> T. Isobe,<sup>11,63</sup> M. Issah,<sup>75</sup> A. Isupov,<sup>33</sup> D. Ivanishchev,<sup>61</sup> Y. Iwanaga,<sup>25</sup> B. V. Jacak,<sup>70</sup> M. Javani,<sup>23</sup>  
 Z. Ji,<sup>70</sup> J. Jia,<sup>7,69</sup> X. Jiang,<sup>42</sup> J. Jin,<sup>13</sup> B. M. Johnson,<sup>7,23</sup> T. Jones,<sup>1</sup> K. S. Joo,<sup>50</sup> D. Jouan,<sup>59</sup> D. S. Jumper,<sup>1,27</sup> F. Kajihara,<sup>11</sup>  
 S. Kametani,<sup>63</sup> N. Kamihara,<sup>64</sup> J. Kamin,<sup>70</sup> S. Kaneti,<sup>70</sup> B. H. Kang,<sup>24</sup> J. H. Kang,<sup>79</sup> J. S. Kang,<sup>24</sup> J. Kapustinsky,<sup>42</sup>  
 K. Karatsu,<sup>38,63</sup> M. Kasai,<sup>63,65</sup> D. Kallow,<sup>46,64</sup> M. Kawashima,<sup>63,65</sup> A. V. Kazantsev,<sup>37</sup> T. Kempel,<sup>30</sup> J. A. Key,<sup>54</sup>  
 V. Khachatryan,<sup>70</sup> P. K. Khandai,<sup>3</sup> A. Khanzadeev,<sup>61</sup> A. Khatiwada,<sup>42</sup> K. M. Kijima,<sup>25</sup> J. Kikuchi,<sup>76</sup> A. Kim,<sup>19</sup> B. I. Kim,<sup>36</sup>  
 C. Kim,<sup>36</sup> D. H. Kim,<sup>50</sup> D. J. Kim,<sup>34</sup> E. Kim,<sup>68</sup> E.-J. Kim,<sup>32</sup> H. J. Kim,<sup>79</sup> K.-B. Kim,<sup>32</sup> S. H. Kim,<sup>79</sup> Y.-J. Kim,<sup>27</sup> Y. K. Kim,<sup>24</sup>  
 D. Kincses,<sup>17</sup> E. Kinney,<sup>12</sup> K. Kiriluk,<sup>12</sup> Á. Kiss,<sup>17</sup> E. Kistenev,<sup>7</sup> J. Klatsky,<sup>22</sup> D. Kleinjan,<sup>8</sup> P. Kline,<sup>70</sup> L. Kochenda,<sup>61</sup>  
 Y. Komatsu,<sup>11,35</sup> B. Komkov,<sup>61</sup> M. Konno,<sup>74</sup> J. Koster,<sup>27,64</sup> D. Kotchetkov,<sup>54,57</sup> D. Kotov,<sup>61,66</sup> A. Kozlov,<sup>77</sup> A. Král,<sup>14</sup>  
 A. Kravitz,<sup>13</sup> F. Krizek,<sup>34</sup> G. J. Kunde,<sup>42</sup> B. Kurgis,<sup>17</sup> K. Kurita,<sup>63,65</sup> M. Kurosawa,<sup>63,64</sup> Y. Kwon,<sup>79</sup> G. S. Kyle,<sup>55</sup> R. Lacey,<sup>69</sup>  
 Y. S. Lai,<sup>13</sup> J. G. Lajoie,<sup>30</sup> D. Larionova,<sup>66</sup> M. Larionova,<sup>66</sup> A. Lebedev,<sup>30</sup> B. Lee,<sup>24</sup> D. M. Lee,<sup>42</sup> J. Lee,<sup>19,71</sup> K. Lee,<sup>68</sup>  
 K. B. Lee,<sup>36,42</sup> K. S. Lee,<sup>36</sup> S. H. Lee,<sup>30,42,70</sup> S. R. Lee,<sup>32</sup> M. J. Leitch,<sup>42</sup> M. A. L. Leite,<sup>67</sup> M. Leitgab,<sup>27</sup> E. Leitner,<sup>75</sup>  
 B. Lenzi,<sup>67</sup> B. Lewis,<sup>70</sup> N. A. Lewis,<sup>47</sup> X. Li,<sup>10</sup> X. Li,<sup>42</sup> P. Lichtenwalner,<sup>49</sup> P. Liebing,<sup>64</sup> S. H. Lim,<sup>12,62,79</sup>  
 L. A. Linden Levy,<sup>12,41</sup> T. Liška,<sup>14</sup> A. Litvinenko,<sup>33</sup> H. Liu,<sup>42,55</sup> M. X. Liu,<sup>42</sup> S. Lökös,<sup>17</sup> B. Love,<sup>75</sup> R. Luechtenborg,<sup>48</sup>  
 D. Lynch,<sup>7</sup> C. F. Maguire,<sup>75</sup> T. Majoros,<sup>16</sup> Y. I. Makdisi,<sup>6</sup> M. Makek,<sup>77,80</sup> A. Malakhov,<sup>33</sup> M. D. Malik,<sup>54</sup> A. Manion,<sup>70</sup>  
 V. I. Manko,<sup>37</sup> E. Mannel,<sup>7,13</sup> Y. Mao,<sup>60,63</sup> H. Masui,<sup>74</sup> S. Masumoto,<sup>11,35</sup> F. Matathias,<sup>13</sup> M. McCumber,<sup>12,42,70</sup>  
 P. L. McGaughey,<sup>42</sup> D. McGlinchey,<sup>12,22,42</sup> C. McKinney,<sup>27</sup> N. Means,<sup>70</sup> A. Meles,<sup>55</sup> M. Mendoza,<sup>8</sup> B. Meredith,<sup>27</sup>  
 W. J. Metzger,<sup>18</sup> Y. Miake,<sup>74</sup> T. Mibe,<sup>35</sup> J. Midori,<sup>25</sup> A. C. Mignerey,<sup>45</sup> P. Mikeš,<sup>9,29</sup> K. Miki,<sup>63,74</sup> A. Milov,<sup>7,77</sup> D. K. Mishra,<sup>4</sup>  
 M. Mishra,<sup>3</sup> J. T. Mitchell,<sup>7</sup> Iu. Mitrakov,<sup>66</sup> Y. Miyachi,<sup>63,73</sup> S. Miyasaka,<sup>63,73</sup> A. K. Mohanty,<sup>4</sup> S. Mohapatra,<sup>69</sup> H. J. Moon,<sup>50</sup>  
 T. Moon,<sup>36</sup> Y. Morino,<sup>11</sup> A. Morreale,<sup>8</sup> D. P. Morrison,<sup>7</sup> S. I. Morrow,<sup>75</sup> M. Moskowitcz,<sup>49</sup> S. Motschwiller,<sup>49</sup>  
 T. V. Moukhanova,<sup>37</sup> B. Mulilo,<sup>36,63</sup> T. Murakami,<sup>38,63</sup> J. Murata,<sup>63,65</sup> A. Mwai,<sup>69</sup> T. Nagae,<sup>38</sup> S. Nagamiya,<sup>35,63</sup> J. L. Nagle,<sup>12</sup>  
 M. Naglis,<sup>77</sup> M. I. Nagy,<sup>17,78</sup> I. Nakagawa,<sup>63,64</sup> Y. Nakamiya,<sup>25</sup> K. R. Nakamura,<sup>38,63</sup> T. Nakamura,<sup>35,63</sup> K. Nakano,<sup>63,73</sup>  
 S. Nam,<sup>19</sup> C. Nattrass,<sup>72</sup> A. Nederlof,<sup>49</sup> S. Nelson,<sup>20</sup> P. K. Netrakanti,<sup>4</sup> J. Newby,<sup>41</sup> M. Nguyen,<sup>70</sup> M. Nihashi,<sup>25,63</sup> T. Niida,<sup>74</sup>  
 R. Nouicer,<sup>7,64</sup> N. Novitzky,<sup>34,70,74</sup> A. Nukariya,<sup>11</sup> A. S. Nyanin,<sup>37</sup> C. Oakley,<sup>23</sup> H. Obayashi,<sup>25</sup> E. O'Brien,<sup>7</sup> S. X. Oda,<sup>11</sup>

\*Deceased.

†PHENIX Spokesperson: akiba@rcf.rhic.bnl.gov

C. A. Ogilvie,<sup>30</sup> M. Oka,<sup>74</sup> K. Okada,<sup>64</sup> Y. Onuki,<sup>63</sup> J. D. Osborn,<sup>47,58</sup> A. Oskarsson,<sup>44</sup> M. Ouchida,<sup>25,63</sup> K. Ozawa,<sup>11,35,74</sup> R. Pak,<sup>7</sup> V. Pantuev,<sup>28,70</sup> V. Papavassiliou,<sup>55</sup> B. H. Park,<sup>24</sup> I. H. Park,<sup>19,71</sup> J. Park,<sup>32,68</sup> S. Park,<sup>68,70</sup> S. K. Park,<sup>36</sup> W. J. Park,<sup>36</sup> S. F. Pate,<sup>55</sup> L. Patel,<sup>23</sup> M. Patel,<sup>30</sup> H. Pei,<sup>30</sup> J.-C. Peng,<sup>27</sup> W. Peng,<sup>75</sup> H. Pereira,<sup>15</sup> D. V. Perepelitsa,<sup>12,13</sup> V. Peresedov,<sup>33</sup> D. Yu. Peressoukko,<sup>37</sup> C. E. PerezLara,<sup>70</sup> R. Petti,<sup>7,70</sup> C. Pinkenburg,<sup>7</sup> R. P. Pisani,<sup>7</sup> M. Potekhin,<sup>7</sup> M. Proissl,<sup>70</sup> A. Pun,<sup>55,57</sup> M. L. Purschke,<sup>7</sup> A. K. Purwar,<sup>42</sup> H. Qu,<sup>1,23</sup> P. V. Radzevich,<sup>66</sup> J. Rak,<sup>34</sup> A. Rakotozafindrabe,<sup>39</sup> N. Ramasubramanian,<sup>70</sup> I. Ravinovich,<sup>77</sup> K. F. Read,<sup>58,72</sup> S. Rembeczki,<sup>21</sup> K. Reygers,<sup>48</sup> D. Reynolds,<sup>69</sup> V. Riabov,<sup>53,61</sup> Y. Riabov,<sup>61,66</sup> E. Richardson,<sup>45</sup> D. Richford,<sup>5</sup> T. Rinn,<sup>27,30</sup> N. Riveli,<sup>57</sup> D. Roach,<sup>75</sup> G. Roche,<sup>43,\*</sup> S. D. Rolnick,<sup>8</sup> M. Rosati,<sup>30</sup> C. A. Rosen,<sup>12</sup> S. S. E. Rosendahl,<sup>44</sup> P. Rosnet,<sup>43</sup> P. Rukoyatkin,<sup>33</sup> J. Runcey,<sup>30</sup> P. Ružička,<sup>29</sup> M. S. Ryu,<sup>24</sup> B. Sahlmueller,<sup>48,70</sup> N. Saito,<sup>35</sup> T. Sakaguchi,<sup>7</sup> K. Sakashita,<sup>63,73</sup> H. Sako,<sup>31</sup> V. Samsonov,<sup>53,61</sup> M. Sano,<sup>74</sup> S. Sano,<sup>11,76</sup> M. Sarsour,<sup>23</sup> S. Sato,<sup>31,35</sup> T. Sato,<sup>74</sup> S. Sawada,<sup>35</sup> K. Sedgwick,<sup>8</sup> J. Seele,<sup>12</sup> R. Seidl,<sup>27,63,64</sup> A. Yu. Semenov,<sup>30</sup> A. Sen,<sup>23,30</sup> R. Seto,<sup>8</sup> P. Sett,<sup>4</sup> D. Sharma,<sup>70,77</sup> I. Shein,<sup>26</sup> T.-A. Shibata,<sup>63,73</sup> K. Shigaki,<sup>25</sup> M. Shimomura,<sup>30,52,74</sup> K. Shoji,<sup>38,63</sup> P. Shukla,<sup>4</sup> A. Sickles,<sup>7,27</sup> C. L. Silva,<sup>30,42,67</sup> D. Silvermyr,<sup>44,58</sup> C. Silvestre,<sup>15</sup> K. S. Sim,<sup>36</sup> B. K. Singh,<sup>3</sup> C. P. Singh,<sup>3</sup> V. Singh,<sup>3</sup> M. Skolnik,<sup>49</sup> M. Slunečka,<sup>9</sup> K. L. Smith,<sup>22</sup> S. Solano,<sup>49</sup> R. A. Soltz,<sup>41</sup> W. E. Sondheim,<sup>42</sup> S. P. Sorensen,<sup>72</sup> I. V. Sourikova,<sup>7</sup> N. A. Sparks,<sup>1</sup> P. W. Stankus,<sup>58</sup> P. Steinberg,<sup>7</sup> E. Stenlund,<sup>44</sup> M. Stepanov,<sup>46,55,\*</sup> A. Ster,<sup>78</sup> S. P. Stoll,<sup>7</sup> T. Sugitate,<sup>25</sup> A. Sukhanov,<sup>7</sup> J. Sun,<sup>70</sup> X. Sun,<sup>23</sup> Z. Sun,<sup>16</sup> J. Sziklai,<sup>78</sup> E. M. Takagui,<sup>67</sup> A. Takahara,<sup>11</sup> A. Taketani,<sup>63,64</sup> R. Tanabe,<sup>74</sup> Y. Tanaka,<sup>51</sup> S. Taneja,<sup>70</sup> K. Tanida,<sup>31,38,63,64,68</sup> M. J. Tannenbaum,<sup>7</sup> S. Tarafdar,<sup>3,75</sup> A. Taranenko,<sup>53,69</sup> P. Tarján,<sup>16</sup> E. Tennant,<sup>55</sup> H. Themann,<sup>70</sup> D. Thomas,<sup>1</sup> T. L. Thomas,<sup>54</sup> T. Todoroki,<sup>63,64,74</sup> M. Togawa,<sup>38,63,64</sup> A. Toia,<sup>70</sup> L. Tomášek,<sup>29</sup> M. Tomášek,<sup>14,29</sup> H. Torii,<sup>25</sup> R. S. Towell,<sup>1</sup> I. Tserruya,<sup>77</sup> Y. Tsuchimoto,<sup>11,25</sup> T. Tsuji,<sup>11</sup> Y. Ueda,<sup>25</sup> B. Ujvari,<sup>16</sup> C. Vale,<sup>7,30</sup> H. Valle,<sup>75</sup> H. W. van Hecke,<sup>42</sup> M. Vargyas,<sup>17,78</sup> E. Vazquez-Zambrano,<sup>13</sup> A. Veicht,<sup>13,27</sup> J. Velkovska,<sup>75</sup> R. Vértesi,<sup>16,78</sup> A. A. Vinogradov,<sup>37</sup> M. Virius,<sup>14</sup> B. Voas,<sup>30</sup> A. Vossen,<sup>27</sup> V. Vrba,<sup>14,29</sup> E. Vznuzdaev,<sup>61</sup> X. R. Wang,<sup>55,64</sup> D. Watanabe,<sup>25</sup> K. Watanabe,<sup>63,65,74</sup> Y. Watanabe,<sup>63,64</sup> Y. S. Watanabe,<sup>11</sup> F. Wei,<sup>30,55</sup> R. Wei,<sup>69</sup> J. Wessels,<sup>48</sup> S. Whitaker,<sup>30</sup> S. N. White,<sup>7</sup> D. Winter,<sup>13</sup> S. Wolin,<sup>27</sup> C. P. Wong,<sup>23,42</sup> J. P. Wood,<sup>1</sup> C. L. Woody,<sup>7</sup> R. M. Wright,<sup>1</sup> Y. Wu,<sup>8</sup> M. Wysocki,<sup>12,58</sup> B. Xia,<sup>57</sup> W. Xie,<sup>64</sup> Q. Xu,<sup>75</sup> Y. L. Yamaguchi,<sup>11,63,70</sup> K. Yamaura,<sup>25</sup> R. Yang,<sup>27</sup> A. Yanovich,<sup>26</sup> J. Ying,<sup>23</sup> S. Yokkaichi,<sup>63,64</sup> I. Yoon,<sup>68</sup> Z. You,<sup>42,60</sup> G. R. Young,<sup>58</sup> I. Younus,<sup>40,54</sup> I. E. Yushmanov,<sup>37</sup> W. A. Zajc,<sup>13</sup> A. Zelenski,<sup>6</sup> Y. Zhai,<sup>30</sup> C. Zhang,<sup>58</sup> S. Zharko,<sup>66</sup> S. Zhou,<sup>10</sup> L. Zolin,<sup>33</sup> and L. Zou<sup>8</sup>

(PHENIX Collaboration)

<sup>1</sup>Abilene Christian University, Abilene, Texas 79699, USA

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physics, Augustana University, Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57197, USA

<sup>3</sup>Department of Physics, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi 221 005, India

<sup>4</sup>Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Bombay 400 085, India

<sup>5</sup>Baruch College, City University of New York, New York, New York 10010, USA

<sup>6</sup>Collider-Accelerator Department, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973-5000, USA

<sup>7</sup>Physics Department, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11972-5000, USA

<sup>8</sup>University of California–Riverside, Riverside, California 92521, USA

<sup>9</sup>Charles University, Ovocný trh 5, Praha 1, 116 36, Prague, Czech Republic

<sup>10</sup>Science and Technology on Nuclear Data Laboratory, China Institute of Atomic Energy, Beijing 102413, People's Republic of China

<sup>11</sup>Center for Nuclear Study, Graduate School of Science, University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

<sup>12</sup>University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, USA

<sup>13</sup>Columbia University, New York, New York 10027 and Nevis Laboratories, Irvington, New York 10533, USA

<sup>14</sup>Czech Technical University, Zikova 4, 166 36 Prague 6, Czech Republic

<sup>15</sup>Dapnia, CEA Saclay, F-91191, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

<sup>16</sup>Debrecen University, H-4010 Debrecen, Egyetem tér 1, Hungary

<sup>17</sup>ELTE, Eötvös Loránd University, H-1117 Budapest, Pázmány P.s. 1/A, Hungary

<sup>18</sup>Eszterházy Károly University, Károly Róbert Campus, H-3200 Gyöngyös, Mátrai út 36, Hungary

<sup>19</sup>Ewha Womans University, Seoul 120-750, Korea

<sup>20</sup>Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, Florida 32307, USA

<sup>21</sup>Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, Florida 32901, USA

<sup>22</sup>Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306, USA

<sup>23</sup>Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia 30303, USA

<sup>24</sup>Hanyang University, Seoul 133-792, Korea

<sup>25</sup>Hiroshima University, Kagamiyama, Higashi-Hiroshima 739-8526, Japan

<sup>26</sup>IHEP Protvino, State Research Center of Russian Federation, Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino 142281, Russia

<sup>27</sup>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois 61801, USA

<sup>28</sup>Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Prospekt 60–Letiya Oktyabrya 7a, Moscow 117312, Russia

<sup>29</sup>Institute of Physics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Na Slovance 2, 182 21 Prague 8, Czech Republic

<sup>30</sup>Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011, USA

<sup>31</sup>Advanced Science Research Center, Japan Atomic Energy Agency, 2-4 Shirakata Shirane, Tokai-mura, Naka-gun, Ibaraki-ken 319-1195, Japan

<sup>32</sup>Jeonbuk National University, Jeonju, 54896, Korea

- <sup>33</sup>Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, Moscow Region, Russia
- <sup>34</sup>Helsinki Institute of Physics and University of Jyväskylä, P.O. Box 35, FI-40014 Jyväskylä, Finland
- <sup>35</sup>KEK, High Energy Accelerator Research Organization, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-0801, Japan
- <sup>36</sup>Korea University, Seoul 02841, Korea
- <sup>37</sup>National Research Center “Kurchatov Institute”, Moscow 123098, Russia
- <sup>38</sup>Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan
- <sup>39</sup>Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, CNRS-IN2P3, Route de Saclay, F-91128 Palaiseau, France
- <sup>40</sup>Physics Department, Lahore University of Management Sciences, Lahore 54792, Pakistan
- <sup>41</sup>Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California 94550, USA
- <sup>42</sup>Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA
- <sup>43</sup>LPC, Université Blaise Pascal, CNRS-IN2P3, Clermont-Fd, 63177 Aubiere Cedex, France
- <sup>44</sup>Department of Physics, Lund University, Box 118, SE-221 00 Lund, Sweden
- <sup>45</sup>University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA
- <sup>46</sup>Department of Physics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003-9337, USA
- <sup>47</sup>Department of Physics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1040, USA
- <sup>48</sup>Institut für Kernphysik, University of Münster, D-48149 Münster, Germany
- <sup>49</sup>Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pennsylvania 18104-5586, USA
- <sup>50</sup>Myongji University, Yongin, Kyonggido 449-728, Korea
- <sup>51</sup>Nagasaki Institute of Applied Science, Nagasaki-shi, Nagasaki 851-0193, Japan
- <sup>52</sup>Nara Women’s University, Kita-uoya Nishi-machi, Nara 630-8506, Japan
- <sup>53</sup>National Research Nuclear University, MEPhI, Moscow Engineering Physics Institute, Moscow 115409, Russia
- <sup>54</sup>University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131, USA
- <sup>55</sup>New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003, USA
- <sup>56</sup>Physics and Astronomy Department, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, North Carolina 27412, USA
- <sup>57</sup>Department of Physics and Astronomy, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio 45701, USA
- <sup>58</sup>Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831, USA
- <sup>59</sup>IPN-Orsay, Université Paris-Sud, CNRS/IN2P3, Université Paris-Saclay, BP1, F-91406, Orsay, France
- <sup>60</sup>Peking University, Beijing 100871, People’s Republic of China
- <sup>61</sup>PNPI, Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina, Leningrad Region 188300, Russia
- <sup>62</sup>Pusan National University, Pusan 46241, Korea
- <sup>63</sup>RIKEN Nishina Center for Accelerator-Based Science, Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan
- <sup>64</sup>RIKEN BNL Research Center, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973-5000, USA
- <sup>65</sup>Physics Department, Rikkyo University, 3-34-1 Nishi-Ikebukuro, Toshima, Tokyo 171-8501, Japan
- <sup>66</sup>Saint Petersburg State Polytechnic University, St. Petersburg, 195251 Russia
- <sup>67</sup>Universidade de São Paulo, Instituto de Física, Caixa Postal 66318, São Paulo CEP05315-970, Brazil
- <sup>68</sup>Department of Physics and Astronomy, Seoul National University, Seoul 151-742, Korea
- <sup>69</sup>Chemistry Department, Stony Brook University, SUNY, Stony Brook, New York 11794-3400, USA
- <sup>70</sup>Department of Physics and Astronomy, Stony Brook University, SUNY, Stony Brook, New York 11794-3800, USA
- <sup>71</sup>Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon 440-746, Korea
- <sup>72</sup>University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA
- <sup>73</sup>Department of Physics, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Oh-okayama, Meguro, Tokyo 152-8551, Japan
- <sup>74</sup>Tomonaga Center for the History of the Universe, University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305, Japan
- <sup>75</sup>Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee 37235, USA
- <sup>76</sup>Waseda University, Advanced Research Institute for Science and Engineering, 17 Kikui-cho, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 162-0044, Japan
- <sup>77</sup>Weizmann Institute, Rehovot 76100, Israel
- <sup>78</sup>Institute for Particle and Nuclear Physics, Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Wigner RCP, RMKI), H-1525 Budapest 114, P.O. Box 49, Budapest, Hungary
- <sup>79</sup>Yonsei University, IPAP, Seoul 120-749, Korea
- <sup>80</sup>Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, University of Zagreb, Bijenička c. 32, HR-10002 Zagreb, Croatia



(Received 2 June 2020; accepted 26 October 2020; published 19 November 2020)

We present direct photon-hadron correlations in 200 GeV/A Au + Au,  $d + Au$ , and  $p + p$  collisions, for direct photon  $p_T$  from 5–12 GeV/c, collected by the PHENIX Collaboration in the years from 2006 to 2011. We observe no significant modification of jet fragmentation in  $d + Au$  collisions, indicating that cold nuclear matter effects are small or absent. Hadrons carrying a large fraction of the quark’s momentum are suppressed in Au + Au compared to  $p + p$  and  $d + Au$ . As the momentum fraction decreases, the yield of hadrons in Au + Au increases to an excess over the yield in  $p + p$  collisions. The excess is at large angles and at low hadron  $p_T$  and



is most pronounced for hadrons associated with lower momentum direct photons. Comparison to theoretical calculations suggests that the hadron excess arises from medium response to energy deposited by jets.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.102.054910](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.102.054910)

## I. INTRODUCTION

Collisions of heavy nuclei at the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC) produce matter that is sufficiently hot and dense to form a plasma of quarks and gluons [1]. Bound hadronic states cannot exist in a quark gluon plasma, as the temperatures far exceed the transition temperature calculated by lattice quantum chromodynamics (QCD) [2]. Experimental measurements and theoretical analyses have shown that this plasma exhibits remarkable properties, including opacity to traversing quarks and gluons [3,4]. However, the exact mechanism for energy loss by these partons in quark-gluon plasma and the transport of the deposited energy within the plasma is not yet understood.

Experimental probes to address these questions include high momentum hadrons, reconstructed jets, and correlations among particles arising from hard partonic scatterings [1] occurring in the initial stages of the collision. Direct photons are produced dominantly via the QCD analog of Compton scattering,  $q + g \rightarrow q + \gamma$ , at leading order, and do not interact via the strong force as they traverse the plasma. In the limit of negligible initial partonic transverse momentum, the final state quark and photon are emitted back-to-back in azimuth with the photon balancing the transverse momentum of the jet arising from the quark. Consequently, measuring the correlation of high momentum direct photons with opposing hadrons allows investigation of quark-gluon plasma effects upon transiting quarks and their fragmentation into hadrons.

Correlations of direct photons with hadrons and jets have been measured by the PHENIX [5,6] and STAR [7] Collaborations at RHIC, and by the CMS and ATLAS Collaborations at the Large Hadron Collider [8–14]. Using the photon energy to tag the initial energy of the quark showed that quarks lose a substantial amount of energy while traversing the plasma [6,15]. The photon tag also allows construction of the quark fragmentation function  $D(z)$ , where  $z = p^{\text{hadron}}/p^{\text{parton}}$ . Here,  $z$  represents the fraction of the quark's original longitudinal momentum carried by the hadrons. In photon-hadron ( $\gamma$ -h) correlations,  $z$  can be approximated by  $z_T = p_T^{\text{hadron}}/p_T^\gamma$ . Comparison of  $\gamma$ -h correlations in heavy ion collisions to those in  $p + p$  collisions quantifies the plasma's impact on parton fragmentation.  $\gamma$ -h correlations in  $p + A$  or  $d + A$  collisions will reflect any cold nuclear matter modification of jet fragmentation. The CMS Collaboration also studied jets correlated to neutral  $Z$  bosons [16].

At RHIC, the fragmentation function is substantially modified in central Au + Au collisions [6,17]. High  $z$  fragments are suppressed, as expected from energy loss. Low  $z$  fragments are enhanced at large angles with respect to the jet core, i.e., with respect to the original quark direction. CMS and ATLAS have measured jet fragmentation functions using reconstructed jets to tag the parton energy. These studies, conducted with jet energies of  $\approx 100$  GeV, show enhancement

of low  $p_T$  (i.e., low  $z$ ) jet fragments in central Pb + Pb collisions [18,19]. In addition, CMS has shown that the energy lost by the quark is approximately balanced by hadrons with approximately 2 GeV  $p_T$  [20] in the intrajet region. This is in qualitative agreement with the RHIC result, even though the initial quark energy differs by an order of magnitude.

There has been considerable theoretical effort to describe jet-medium interactions. Several mechanisms for parton energy loss were compared by the JET Collaboration [21]. The medium response to deposited energy is now under study by several groups [22–25]. The deposited energy may be totally equilibrated in the plasma, but alternatively the deposited energy may kick up a wake in the expanding plasma [22,26]. Different descriptions of plasma-modified gluon splitting result in different fragmentation functions, and can be tested by comparing the predictions to direct photon-hadron ( $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ -h) correlations.

The previously published analysis of  $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ -h correlations showed an enhancement in soft particle production at large angles. However, due to limited statistics, it was not possible to investigate how the fragmentation function depends on the parton energy or the medium scale. In this paper, we explore this question by looking at the direct photon  $p_T$  dependence of the fragmentation function modification. We investigate whether enhancement over the fragmentation function in  $p + p$  collisions depends on the fragment  $z_T$  or on the fragment  $p_T$ . That is, does it depend on the jet structure or does it reflect the distribution of particles in the medium? We also present first results on  $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ -h correlations in  $d + \text{Au}$  collisions to investigate possible cold-nuclear-matter effects on the fragmentation function. Fragmentation function modification is quantified here by the nuclear modification factor,  $I_{AA}$ , which is a ratio of the fragmentation function in Au + Au collisions to that in  $p + p$  collisions.

## II. DATASET AND ANALYSIS

In 2011, PHENIX collected data from Au + Au collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV. After event selection and quality cuts,  $4.4 \times 10^9$  minimum-bias (MB) events were analyzed. These are combined with the previously reported  $3.9 \times 10^9$  MB Au + Au events from 2007 and  $2.9 \times 10^9$  from 2010 [6]. The high momentum photon triggered  $d + \text{Au}$  data set at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV was collected in 2008, and  $3 \times 10^9$  events are analyzed. The  $p + p$  comparison data are from 2005 and 2006 [15].

The measurements in this paper use the PHENIX central spectrometers [27]. Two-particle correlations are constructed by pairing photons or  $\pi^0$ 's measured in the electromagnetic calorimeter (EMCal) [28] with charged hadrons reconstructed in the drift chambers and pad chambers [29]. The acceptance in pseudorapidity is  $|\eta| < 0.35$ , while each spectrometer arm covers  $90^\circ$  in azimuth. Beam-beam counters [30], located at




FIG. 1. Side view of the PHENIX central arm spectrometers in 2011.

1.44 m from the center of the interaction region, cover the pseudorapidity range from 3.0 to 3.9 and full azimuthal angle. They are used to determine the collision centralities and vertex positions. Figure 1 shows the detector configuration in 2011.

Photons and  $\pi^0$ 's are measured in the EMCal. There are four sectors of lead-scintillator (PbSc) sampling calorimeters in the west arm, while the east arm has two sectors of lead-scintillator and two lead-glass (PbGl) Čerenkov calorimeters. The PbSc and PbGl calorimeters have energy resolutions of  $\sigma_E/\sqrt{E} = 8.1\%/\sqrt{E} \oplus 2.1\%$  and  $5.9\%/\sqrt{E} \oplus 0.8\%$ , respectively. Photons are selected via an electromagnetic shower shape cut [31] on energy clusters. The high granularity of the EMCal,  $\delta\eta \times \delta\phi = 0.011 \times 0.011$  for PbSc and  $0.008 \times 0.008$  for PbGl, allows for  $\pi^0$  reconstruction via the  $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  channel (invariant mass = 120–160 MeV/ $c^2$ ) up to  $p_T = 15$  GeV, beyond which shower merging becomes significant. A charged track veto is applied to remove possible hadron or electron contamination in the photon sample, reducing auto-correlations in the measurement. The EMCal system is also used to trigger on  $d + \text{Au}$  events with high  $p_T$  photons.

Two-particle correlations are constructed as a function of  $\Delta\phi$ , the azimuthal angle between photon or  $\pi^0$  triggers and associated hadron partners. Pairs arise from jet correlations superimposed on a combinatorial background from the underlying event. In  $p + p$  and  $d + \text{Au}$  collisions where the event multiplicity is low, we treat this background as flat in  $\Delta\phi$  and subtract it, normalizing the level via the zero-yield-at-minimum (ZYAM) procedure [32]. In Au + Au collisions, the background has an azimuthal asymmetry quantified in the flow parameters  $v_n$ , which are used to modulate the subtracted background, as described in Eq. (1). Only  $v_2$  is included in the subtraction, while higher-order effects are included as an additional systematic uncertainty on the final results.

We report jet pairs as conditional (or per-trigger) yields of hadrons. Detector acceptance corrections are determined using mixed events with similar centrality and collision vertex. For Au + Au collisions, the background level  $b_0$  is estimated using an absolute normalization [32], determined from the

uncorrelated single-photon and single-hadron production rates. The final invariant yield of associated hadrons is obtained by dividing the background-subtracted correlated hadron yields by the number of triggers  $N_t$  and correcting for the associated charged hadron efficiency  $\epsilon^a$ , determined by a GEANT detector simulation:

$$\frac{1}{N_t} \frac{dN^{\text{pair}}}{d\Delta\phi} = \frac{1}{N_t \epsilon^a} \int d\Delta\phi \left\{ \frac{dN_{\text{real}}^{\text{pair}}/d\Delta\phi}{dN_{\text{mix}}^{\text{pair}}/d\Delta\phi} - b_0 [1 + 2\langle v_2^t v_2^a \rangle \cos(2\Delta\phi)] \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where  $v_2^t$  and  $v_2^a$  are the elliptic flow magnitudes independently measured for the trigger and associated particles, respectively [6]. These modulate the angular distribution of the background. Lastly,  $N^{\text{pair}}$  denotes the number of trigger-associate pairs. The subscript “real” refers to a trigger-associate particle pair that came from the same event, and the subscript “mix” refers to trigger-associate pairs that come from different events and are used to correct for correlations due to detector effects.

In both Au + Au and  $d + \text{Au}$  analyses, photons with transverse momentum of 5 to 15 GeV/ $c$  are selected as triggers. To extract yields of hadrons associated with direct photons, the background from decay photon correlations with hadrons must be subtracted. In Au + Au collisions, where the multiplicity is high, this is achieved via a statistical subtraction procedure. If  $N_{\text{inc}}$ ,  $N_{\text{dec}}$ , and  $N_{\text{dir}}$  are the inclusive, decay, and direct photon yields, respectively, then  $N_{\text{dir}} = N_{\text{inc}} - N_{\text{dec}}$ . It follows that the conditional yield of hadrons  $Y$  for different photon trigger samples is

$$Y_{\text{dir}} = \frac{R_\gamma Y_{\text{inc}} - Y_{\text{dec}}}{R_\gamma - 1}, \quad (2)$$

where  $R_\gamma \equiv N_{\text{inc}}/N_{\text{dec}}$  and is measured independently [33].

The decay photon background is estimated using measured  $\pi^0$ -hadron ( $\pi^0$ -h) correlations and a Monte Carlo pair-by-pair mapping procedure. The simulation calculates the probability distribution for decay photon-hadron ( $\gamma_{\text{dec}}$ -h) pairs in a certain photon  $p_T$  range as a function of the parent  $\pi^0$   $p_T$ .  $\gamma_{\text{dec}}$ -h correlations are constructed via a weighted sum over all individual  $\pi^0$ -hadron pairs, where the weighting factor reflects the kinematic probability for a  $\pi^0$  at a given  $p_T$  to decay into a photon in the selected  $p_T$  range. The  $\gamma_{\text{dec}}$ -h per-trigger yield can be described by the following equation:

$$Y_{\text{dec}} = \frac{\int \rho(p_T \pi^0 \rightarrow p_{T\gamma}) \epsilon^{-1}(p_{T\pi^0}) N_{\pi^0-h} dp_{T\pi^0}}{\int \rho(p_T \pi^0 \rightarrow p_{T\gamma}) \epsilon^{-1}(p_{T\pi^0}) N_{\pi^0} dp_{T\pi^0}}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\rho$  gives the probability that a  $\pi^0$  decays to a photon with  $p_{T\gamma}$ , and  $\epsilon$  is the  $\pi^0$  reconstruction efficiency, which can be determined by scaling the raw  $\pi^0$  spectra to a power law fit to published data [34].  $N_{\pi^0-h}$  and  $N_{\pi^0}$  are the number of  $\pi^0$ -h pairs and number of  $\pi^0$ 's, respectively. When reconstructing the  $\pi^0$ , a strict cut on the asymmetry of the energy of the two photons is applied to reduce the combinatorial background from low energy photons. The probability weighting function, determined from Monte Carlo simulation, takes into account

the actual EMCal response, including energy and position resolution and detector acceptance.

With the  $\pi^0$  to decay photon  $p_T$  map,  $\rho$ , the inclusive photon sample can be separated into a meson decay component and a direct component. Of the meson decay component, 20% of the decay yield is from non- $\pi^0$  decays as calculated from previous PHENIX results [35]. To construct  $\gamma_{\text{dec-h}}$  yields with trigger photon  $p_T$  of 5–15 GeV/ $c$ , hadron correlations with  $\pi^0$  of  $4 \leq p_T \leq 17$  GeV/ $c$  are utilized. The slightly wider  $p_T$  range is chosen to account for decay kinematics, as well as  $p_T$  smearing from the EMCal energy and position resolution. An additional cutoff correction accounts for the small  $\gamma_{\text{dec-h}}$  yield in the trigger  $p_T$  range 5–15 GeV/ $c$  from  $\pi^0$  with  $p_T \geq 17$  GeV/ $c$ . The merging of decay photons from high  $p_T$   $\pi^0$  is not accounted for in the Monte Carlo mapping simulation. Instead, the efficiency to detect photons from a high momentum parent meson is calculated via GEANT simulation of the full detector response. This loss is included in the probability function as an additional correction. The opening angle of photon pairs that merge is small, thus they are removed from the measured inclusive photon sample by the shower shape cut.

In  $d + \text{Au}$  collisions, where the underlying event background is much smaller, it is possible to improve the signal to background for direct photons. This is done event by event using a photon isolation cut and by removing all photons identified (tagged) as resulting from a  $\pi^0$  decay [15]. First, all photons with  $p_T \geq 0.5$  GeV/ $c$  are paired. Those pairs with invariant mass between 120–160 MeV/ $c^2$  are tagged as decay photons and removed from the inclusive sample. Next, an isolation criterion is applied to the remaining photons to further reduce the background of decay photons, as well as contamination from fragmentation photons. The isolation cut requires that the energy in a cone around the trigger photon be less than 10% of the photon energy in  $p + p$  collisions. In the  $d + \text{Au}$  analysis, the cut is modified slightly to include the effect of the modest underlying event. The underlying event is evaluated separately for each  $d + \text{Au}$  centrality class, resulting in an isolation criterion:

$$\sum_{\Delta R < R_{\text{max}}} E < (E_\gamma * 0.1 + \langle E_{bg} \rangle), \quad (4)$$

where  $E$  is the measured energy in the isolation cone,  $E_\gamma$  is the photon energy,  $\Delta R = \sqrt{\Delta\phi^2 + \Delta\eta^2}$  is the distance between the trigger photon and other particles in the event and  $\langle E_{bg} \rangle$  is the average energy inside the cone in the underlying event. The cone size ( $R_{\text{max}}$ ) used in this analysis is 0.4.

To account for the  $d + \text{Au}$  underlying event, the ZYAM procedure [32] is applied to the angular correlation functions for each centrality class. As an isolation cut distorts the near-side yield, the minimum point is determined within the restricted  $\Delta\phi$  range of 0.9–1.6 rad. The zero-point yield is determined by integrating in a 0.03 rad range around the minimum point. The hadron conditional yield reported here is corrected for the PHENIX hadron acceptance. The ZYAM subtracted inclusive and decay yields for each centrality are combined using a weighted sum based on the number of each type of trigger to obtain the MB yields.




FIG. 2. Per-trigger yield of hadrons associated with direct photons in Au + Au collisions (closed [black] circles) for direct photon  $p_T$  5–9 GeV/ $c$ , compared with  $p + p$  baseline (open [blue] squares), in various  $\xi$  bins.

Some decay photons are missed by the  $\pi^0$  tagging procedure and slip through the isolation cut to be counted as direct photons. Such falsely isolated  $\gamma_{\text{dec-h}}$  correlations are corrected via a statistical subtraction, similar to Eq. (2). If we define  $N_{\text{inc-tag}}^{\text{iso}}$  as the yield of isolated photons after removing those isolated photon tagged as decay photons,  $N_{\text{dec}}^{\text{miss,iso}}$  as those decay photons that are isolated but not tagged as decay photons, and  $N_{\text{dir}}^{\text{iso}}$  as isolated direct photons, then  $N_{\text{dir}}^{\text{iso}} = N_{\text{inc-tag}}^{\text{iso}} - N_{\text{dec}}^{\text{miss,iso}}$ . It follows that the condition of yield of hadrons for direct, isolated photons is

$$Y_{\text{dir}}^{\text{iso}} = \frac{R_\gamma^{\text{eff}} Y_{\text{inc-tag}}^{\text{iso}} - Y_{\text{dec}}^{\text{miss,iso}}}{R_\gamma^{\text{eff}} - 1}, \quad (5)$$

where

$$R_\gamma^{\text{eff}} = \frac{N_{\text{inc}}^{\text{iso}}}{N_{\text{dec}}^{\text{iso}}} = \frac{R_\gamma}{(1 - \epsilon_{\text{dec}}^{\text{tag}})(1 - \epsilon_{\text{dec}}^{\text{iso}})} \frac{N_{\text{inc-tag}}^{\text{iso}}}{N_{\text{inc}}}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\epsilon_{\text{dec}}^{\text{iso}}$  is the isolation cut efficiency and  $\epsilon_{\text{dec}}^{\text{tag}}$  is the tagging efficiency. More detail on the subtraction procedures and cuts can be found in Refs. [5,15].

In the Au + Au analysis, there are four main sources of systematic uncertainties. The systematic uncertainty coming from the statistical subtraction method is due to the statistical and systematic uncertainties on the value of  $R_\gamma$ . There are also uncertainties when extracting the jet




FIG. 3. Per-trigger yield of hadrons associated with direct photons in  $d + \text{Au}$  collisions (closed [black] circles) for direct photon  $p_T$  7–9 GeV/ $c$ , compared with  $p + p$  baseline (open [blue] squares), in various  $\xi$  bins.

functions due to uncertainties on the value of the elliptic flow modulation magnitude,  $v_2$ . This analysis uses published values and uncertainties from PHENIX [6]. The absolute normalization method to determine the underlying event background level and the determination of the decay photon  $p_T$  mapping are also significant contributors to the overall systematic uncertainties. The uncertainties, along with their  $p_T$  and centrality dependence, are propagated into the final jet functions and per-trigger hadron yields. The systematic uncertainty on the hadron efficiency determination comes in as a global scale uncertainty on the correlated hadron yields.

In MB  $d + \text{Au}$  collisions,  $v_2$  is small. However, the systematic uncertainties on  $\gamma$ -h correlations include those arising from the ZYAM procedure used to determine the combinatorial background. There is also an uncertainty arising from the  $\pi^0$  tagging and isolation cuts, which is included in the quoted systematic uncertainty.

### III. RESULTS

In this paper, we aim to quantify the modification of the jet fragmentation function  $D(z)$  in  $\text{Au} + \text{Au}$  and  $d + \text{Au}$  collisions, compared to the  $p + p$  baseline. The jet fragmentation function describes the probability of an outgoing parton yielding a hadron with momentum fraction  $z = p^{\text{hadron}}/p^{\text{parton}}$ . Assuming that the initial state  $k_T$  of partons in a nucleon has a negligible effect, then  $z_T = p_T^{\text{hadron}}/p_T^{\gamma}$  can be used to approximate  $z$ . To focus on the low  $z_T$  region, where modification is anticipated, we use the variable  $\xi = \ln(1/z_T)$ .

Figure 2 shows azimuthal angular distributions of hadrons associated with direct photons of  $5 < p_T < 9$  GeV/ $c$ , in the 0–40% most central  $\text{Au} + \text{Au}$  collisions, separated into bins of  $\xi$ . These distributions are a combination of the 2007, 2010, and 2011 data sets. The  $\text{Au} + \text{Au}$  results are shown as closed [black] circles, with shaded boxes representing systematic uncertainties on the measurement. The  $p + p$   $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ -h results are shown in open [blue] squares. The  $p + p$  baseline measurement combines data collected in 2005 and 2006 [6,15]. It should be noted that the isolation cut in the  $p + p$  analysis makes the near-side yield not measurable. Consequently, the  $p + p$  points with  $\Delta\phi < 1$  are not shown in these distributions.

On the near side, i.e.,  $\Delta\phi < \pi/2$ , the  $\text{Au} + \text{Au}$   $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ -h yields are consistent with zero, indicating that the statistical subtraction is properly carried out and next-to-leading-order effects are negligible. On the away side, i.e.,  $\Delta\phi > \pi/2$ , an enhancement in the  $\text{Au} + \text{Au}$  data compared to  $p + p$  is observed in the higher  $\xi$  bins. As noted before, this corresponds to low  $z$ , where the observed hadrons carry a small fraction of the scattered parton's original momentum. In the low  $\xi$  bins, the  $\text{Au} + \text{Au}$  per-trigger yield is suppressed, as expected if the parton loses energy in the medium.

Figure 3 shows the  $\Delta\phi$  distributions of isolated  $\gamma_{\text{dir}}$ -h yields in  $d + \text{Au}$  and  $p + p$  collisions, for direct photon  $p_T$  7–9 GeV/ $c$ . The  $d + \text{Au}$  and  $p + p$  results are consistent in all the measured  $\xi$  bins.

Figure 4(a) shows the fragmentation functions for all three systems as a function of  $\xi$ . These are calculated by integrating the per-trigger yield of hadrons in the azimuthal angle region






FIG. 4. (a) Integrated away-side  $\gamma_{\text{dir}}-h$  per-trigger yields of Au + Au (closed [black] circles), d + Au ([purple] crosses) and p + p (open [blue] squares), as a function of  $\xi$ . The p + p and d + Au points have been shifted to the left for clear viewing, as indicated in the legend. (b)  $I_{AA}$  (closed [black] circles) and  $I_{dA}$  ([purple] crosses).

$|\Delta\phi - \pi| < \pi/2$  rad. Data points for Au + Au are plotted on the  $\xi$  axis at the middle of each  $\xi$  bin: 0.2, 0.6, 1.0, 1.4, 1.8, 2.2. The p + p and d + Au points have been shifted to the left in  $\xi$  for viewing clarity.

As noted in the Introduction,  $I_{AA} = Y_{AA}/Y_{pp}$  is a nuclear-modification factor, which quantifies the difference between the fragmentation functions in Au + Au and p + p. In the absence of any medium modifications,  $I_{AA}$  should equal 1.

Figure 4(b) shows  $I_{AA}$  for direct photons of  $5 < p_T^\gamma < 9 \text{ GeV}/c$ . In Au + Au collisions, there is a clear suppression at low  $\xi$  and enhancement at high  $\xi$ . The d + Au nuclear modification factor,  $I_{dA}$ , is also shown as closed [purple] crosses in Fig. 4(b).  $I_{dA}$  is consistent with unity across all  $\xi$  ranges, indicating that there is no significant modification of the jet fragmentation function in d + Au collisions.

The statistics from the combined Au + Au runs allow for a differential measurement as a function of direct photon  $p_T$  (i.e., as a function of the approximate jet energy). Figure 5 shows  $I_{AA}$  as a function of  $\xi$  for three direct photon  $p_T$  ranges. While the associated hadron yields are smaller than those in p + p at low  $\xi$ , the appearance of extra particles at higher  $\xi$  is observed for direct photons with  $p_T$  of 5–7 GeV/c. A qualitatively similar increase of  $I_{AA}$  with  $\xi$  is visible for the 7–9 GeV/c direct photon  $p_T$  range.

To investigate where the energy deposited in the plasma goes, we study the dependence of  $I_{AA}$  on the integration range in azimuthal opening angle. The hadron yields are also integrated in two narrower angular ranges on the away side:  $|\Delta\phi - \pi| < \pi/3$  rad and  $|\Delta\phi - \pi| < \pi/6$  rad. The resulting  $I_{AA}$  values are shown in Fig. 6 for all three direct photon  $p_T$  bins. The enhancement over p + p is largest for the 5–7 GeV/c direct photon momentum range, and for the full away-side integration range. The suppression pattern is similar for the different integration regions, suggesting that the jet core is suppressed, and the enhancement exists at large angles. The angular distributions support the observation from Fig. 2 that




FIG. 5.  $I_{AA}$  vs  $\xi$  for direct photon  $p_T^\gamma$  of 5–7 GeV/c (closed [black] circles), 7–9 GeV/c (closed [red] squares), and 9–12 GeV/c (closed [green] triangles).

particle yields are enhanced at large angles with respect to the away-side jet axis in the  $1.6 < \xi < 2.0$  bin.

Whether or not  $I_{AA}$  becomes significantly larger than unity (what we have been referring to as enhancement) there is a tendency for  $I_{AA}$  to increase with increasing  $\xi$ . To quantify this, we calculate the weighted averages of  $I_{AA}$  values above and below  $\xi = 1.2$ . The ratio for each integration range is plotted in Fig. 7, as a function of the direct photon  $p_T$ . The enhancement is largest for softer jets and for the full away-side integration range, implying that jets with lower energy are broadened more than higher energy jets.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

To determine whether  $I_{dA}$  indicates any cold nuclear matter effects, the  $\chi^2$  per degree of freedom values were calculated




FIG. 6.  $I_{AA}$  as a function of  $\xi$  for direct photon  $p_T^\gamma$  of (a) 5–7, (b) 7–9, and (c) 9–12 GeV/c. Three away-side integration ranges are chosen to calculate the per-trigger yield and the corresponding  $I_{AA}$ :  $|\Delta\phi - \pi| < \pi/2$  (closed [black] circles),  $|\Delta\phi - \pi| < \pi/3$  (closed [blue] squares), and  $|\Delta\phi - \pi| < \pi/6$  (closed [red] triangles).




FIG. 7. Ratios of  $I_{AA}$  as a function of direct photon  $p_T$  for three different away-side integration ranges.

under the assumption of no modification and are determined to be 7.4/5, 4.0/5, 10.0/5 for direct photon  $p_T$  bins 5–7, 7–9, and 9–12 GeV/c, respectively. The result indicates that  $I_{dA}$  is consistent with unity and therefore the jet fragmentation function is not significantly modified in  $d + Au$  collisions, within the current uncertainties. This suggests that any possible cold nuclear matter effect is small.

We next compare our Au + Au results to predictions from the coupled linear Boltzmann transport and hydrodynamic (CoLBT-hydro) model [26] in Fig. 8, which shows  $I_{AA}$  as a function of  $\xi$  for the three direct photon  $p_T$  bins; the  $z_T$  axis is displayed on the top. The solid lines are from the CoLBT model calculated in the same kinematic ranges as the data. The model calculation shows the same trends with  $\xi$  as the data. CoLBT has a kinetic description of the leading parton propagation, including a hydrodynamical picture for the medium evolution. In this calculation, both the propagating jet shower parton and the thermal parton are recorded, along with their further interactions with the medium. Consequently, the medium response to deposited energy is modeled. The model clearly shows that as the direct photon  $p_T$  increases, the transition where  $I_{AA}$  exceeds 1 occurs at increasing  $\xi$ . According to this calculation, the enhancement at large  $\xi$  arises from jet-induced medium excitations, and that the enhancement occurs at low  $z_T$  reflects the thermal nature of the produced soft particles.

Figure 8(b) shows a Borghini Wiedemann-modified leading logarithmic approximation (BW-MLLA) calculation (dashed [red] curve) in which it is assumed that the lost energy is redistributed, resulting in an enhanced production of soft particles [36]. The calculation for jets with energy of 7 GeV in




FIG. 8. Measured  $I_{AA}$  for direct photon  $p_T$  of (a) 5–7, (b) 7–9, and (c) 9–12 GeV/c, as a function of  $\xi$ , are compared with theoretical model calculations.

the medium is in relatively good agreement with the measured results. The model comparisons suggest that the enhancement of soft hadrons associated with the away-side jet should scale with the  $p_T$  of the hadrons. A modified fragmentation function could be expected to produce a change at fixed  $z_T$ . This is not consistent with either the data or the CoLBT model.

## V. SUMMARY

We have presented direct photon-hadron correlations in  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV Au + Au,  $d + Au$ , and  $p + p$  collisions, for photon  $p_T$  from 5–12 GeV/ $c$ . As the dominant source of correlations is QCD Compton scattering, we use the photon energy as a proxy for the opposing quark's energy to study the jet fragmentation function. Combining data sets from three years of data taking at RHIC allows study of the conditional hadron yields opposite to the direct photons as a function of  $z_T$  and the photon  $p_T$ . This is the first time such a differential study of direct photon-hadron correlations has been performed at RHIC.

We observe no significant modification of the jet fragmentation in  $d + Au$  collisions, indicating that cold nuclear matter effects are small or absent. We find that hadrons carrying a large fraction of the quark's momentum are suppressed in Au + Au compared to  $p + p$  and  $d + Au$ . This is expected from energy loss of partons in quark gluon plasma. As the momentum fraction decreases, the yield of hadrons in Au + Au increases, eventually showing an excess over the jet fragment yield in  $p + p$  collisions. The excess is seen primarily at large angles and is most pronounced for hadrons associated to lower momentum direct photons.

To address whether the excess is a result of medium modification of the jet fragmentation function or the excess indicates the presence of “extra” particles from the medium, we compared to theoretical calculations. The calculations suggest that the observed excess arises from medium response to the deposited energy. Furthermore, the excess particles appear at low  $z_T$ , corresponding to low associate hadron  $p_T$ . This can be seen in each direct photon  $p_T$  bin.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the staff of the Collider-Accelerator and Physics Departments at Brookhaven National Laboratory and the staff of the other PHENIX participating institutions for their vital contributions. We acknowledge support from the Office of Nuclear Physics in the Office of Science of the Department of Energy, the National Science Foundation, Abilene Christian University Research Council, Research Foundation of SUNY, and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Vanderbilt University (USA); Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology and the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (Japan); Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico and Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (Brazil); Natural Science Foundation of China (People's Republic of China); Croatian Science Foundation and Ministry of Science and Education (Croatia); Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (Czech Republic); Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Commissariat à l'Énergie Atomique, and Institut National de Physique Nucléaire et de Physique des Particules (France); Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst, and Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung (Germany); J. Bolyai Research Scholarship, EFOP, the New National Excellence Program (ÚNKP), NKFIH, and OTKA (Hungary); Department of Atomic Energy and Department of Science and Technology (India); Israel Science Foundation (Israel) Basic Science Research and SRC(CENuM) Programs through NRF funded by the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Science and ICT (Korea); Physics Department, Lahore University of Management Sciences (Pakistan); Ministry of Education and Science, Russian Academy of Sciences, Federal Agency of Atomic Energy (Russia); VR and Wallenberg Foundation (Sweden); the US Civilian Research and Development Foundation for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union, the Hungarian American Enterprise Scholarship Fund, the US-Hungarian Fulbright Foundation, and the US-Israel Binational Science Foundation.

- 
- [1] K. Adcox *et al.* (PHENIX Collaboration), Formation of dense partonic matter in relativistic nucleus-nucleus collisions at RHIC: Experimental evaluation by the PHENIX collaboration, *Nucl. Phys. A* **757**, 184 (2005).
  - [2] J. H. Weber, A. Bazavov, and P. Petreczky, Equation of state in (2+1) flavor QCD at high temperatures, *PoS (Confine-ment2018)*, 166 (2019).
  - [3] K. Adcox *et al.* (PHENIX Collaboration), Suppression of Hadrons with Large Transverse Momentum in Central Au + Au Collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 130$  GeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 022301 (2002).
  - [4] C. Adler *et al.* (STAR Collaboration), Disappearance of Back-to-Back High  $p_T$  Hadron Correlations in Central Au + Au Collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 082302 (2003).
  - [5] A. Adare *et al.* (PHENIX Collaboration), Photon-hadron jet correlations in  $p + p$  and Au + Au collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV, *Phys. Rev. C* **80**, 024908 (2009).
  - [6] A. Adare *et al.* (PHENIX Collaboration), Medium Modification of jet Fragmentation in Au + Au Collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV Measured in Direct Photon-Hadron Correlations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 032301 (2013).
  - [7] L. Adamczyk *et al.* (STAR Collaboration), Jet-like correlations with direct-photon and neutral-pion triggers at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV, *Phys. Lett. B* **760**, 689 (2016).
  - [8] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), Studies of jet quenching using isolated-photon+jet correlations in PbPb and  $pp$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV, *Phys. Lett. B* **718**, 773 (2013).
  - [9] M. Aaboud *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), Comparison of Fragmentation Functions for Jets Dominated by Light Quarks and Gluons from  $pp$  and Pb + Pb Collisions in ATLAS, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 042001 (2019).
  - [10] M. Aaboud *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), Measurement of photon-jet transverse momentum correlations in 5.02 TeV

- Pb + Pb and  $pp$  collisions with ATLAS, *Phys. Lett. B* **789**, 167 (2019).
- [11] G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), Medium-induced modification of Z-tagged charged particle yields in Pb + Pb collisions at 5.02 TeV with the ATLAS detector, CERN Report No. CERN-EP-2020-148, [arXiv:2008.09811](https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.09811) (2020).
- [12] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), Jet Shapes of Isolated Photon-Tagged Jets in Pb-Pb and  $pp$  Collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 152001 (2019).
- [13] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), Observation of Medium-Induced Modifications of Jet Fragmentation in Pb-Pb Collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV Using Isolated Photon-Tagged Jets, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 242301 (2018).
- [14] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), Study of jet quenching with isolated-photon+jet correlations in PbPb and  $pp$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV, *Phys. Lett. B* **785**, 14 (2018).
- [15] A. Adare *et al.* (PHENIX Collaboration), High  $p_T$  direct photon and  $\pi^0$  triggered azimuthal jet correlations and measurement of  $k_T$  for isolated direct photons in  $p + p$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 200$  GeV, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 072001 (2010).
- [16] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), Study of Jet Quenching with Z + jet Correlations in Pb-Pb and  $pp$  Collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$  TeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 082301 (2017).
- [17] L. Adamczyk *et al.* (STAR Collaboration), Jet-Hadron Correlations in  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV  $p + p$  and Central Au + Au Collisions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 122301 (2014).
- [18] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), Measurement of Jet Fragmentation in PbPb and  $pp$  Collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV, *Phys. Rev. C* **90**, 024908 (2014).
- [19] G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), Measurement of inclusive jet charged-particle fragmentation functions in Pb + Pb collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV with the ATLAS detector, *Phys. Lett. B* **739**, 320 (2014).
- [20] V. Khachatryan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), Measurement of transverse momentum relative to dijet systems in PbPb and  $pp$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$  TeV, *J. High Energy Phys.* **01** (2016) 006.
- [21] K. M. Burke *et al.* (JET Collaboration), Extracting the jet transport coefficient from jet quenching in high-energy heavy-ion collisions, *Phys. Rev. C* **90**, 014909 (2014).
- [22] Y. He, T. Luo, X.-N. Wang, and Y. Zhu, Linear Boltzmann transport for jet propagation in the quark-gluon plasma: Elastic processes and medium recoil, *Phys. Rev. C* **91**, 054908 (2015); **97**, 019902(E) (2018).
- [23] S. Cao *et al.* (JETSCAPE Collaboration), Multistage Monte Carlo simulation of jet modification in a static medium, *Phys. Rev. C* **96**, 024909 (2017).
- [24] K. C. Zapp, F. Krauss, and U. A. Wiedemann, A perturbative framework for jet quenching, *J. High Energy Phys.* **03** (2013) 080.
- [25] R. Kunawalkam Elayavalli and K. C. Zapp, Medium response in JEWEL and its impact on jet shape observables in heavy ion collisions, *J. High Energy Phys.* **07** (2017) 141.
- [26] W. Chen, S. Cao, T. Luo, L.-G. Pang, and X.-N. Wang, Effects of jet-induced medium excitation in  $\gamma$ -hadron correlation in A + A collisions, *Phys. Lett. B* **777**, 86 (2018).
- [27] K. Adcox *et al.* (PHENIX Collaboration), PHENIX detector overview, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **499**, 469 (2003).
- [28] L. Aphecetche *et al.* (PHENIX Collaboration), PHENIX calorimeter, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **499**, 521 (2003).
- [29] K. Adcox *et al.* (PHENIX Collaboration), PHENIX central arm tracking detectors, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **499**, 489 (2003).
- [30] M. Allen *et al.* (PHENIX Collaboration), PHENIX inner detectors, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **499**, 549 (2003).
- [31] G. David, E. Kistenev, S. White, C. Woody, A. Bazilevsky, S. Belikov, V. Kochetkov, V. Onuchin, and A. Usachev, Pattern recognition in the PHENIX PbSc electromagnetic calorimeter, *IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci.* **47**, 1982 (2000).
- [32] A. Sickles, M. P. McCumber, and A. Adare, Extraction of correlated jet pair signals in relativistic heavy ion collisions, *Phys. Rev. C* **81**, 014908 (2010).
- [33] S. Afanasiev *et al.* (PHENIX Collaboration), Measurement of Direct Photons in Au + Au Collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 152302 (2012).
- [34] A. Adare *et al.* (PHENIX Collaboration), Suppression Pattern of Neutral Pions at High Transverse Momentum in Au + Au Collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV and Constraints on Medium Transport Coefficients, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 232301 (2008).
- [35] S. S. Adler *et al.* (PHENIX Collaboration), High transverse momentum  $\eta$  meson production in  $p + p$ ,  $d + \text{Au}$ , and  $\text{Au} + \text{Au}$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$  GeV, *Phys. Rev. C* **75**, 024909 (2007).
- [36] N. Borghini and U. A. Wiedemann, Distorting the hump-backed plateau of jets with dense QCD matter, [arXiv:hep-ph/0506218](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0506218).