

Mapping the QCD phase diagram with statistics friendly distributions

Adam Bzdak^{1,*} and Volker Koch^{2,†}

¹AGH University of Science and Technology,

Faculty of Physics and Applied Computer Science, 30-059 Kraków, Poland

²Nuclear Science Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA, 94720, USA

We demonstrate that certain (proton) multiplicity distributions, possibly present close to the QCD first order phase transition (or the QCD critical point), can be successfully measured in terms of the factorial cumulants of surprisingly high orders with relatively small number of events.

Recently the study of fluctuations of conserved charges in relativistic heavy ion collisions has received increased interest since they represent one way to access the phase structure of QCD [1–15]. Special attention has been paid to the cumulants of the net-baryon number distribution as they are particularly sensitive to the details of the transition from hadron gas to quark gluon plasma in the cross-over region [4, 11] as well as near a potential critical point [3]. Experimentally, one is usually restricted to the measurement of cumulants of the net-proton distribution [16, 17] since neutrons are difficult to measure. However, as show in [18, 19] given fast isospin-exchange processes due to the abundance of pions the connection to the net-baryon number cumulants can be made.

Naturally to characterize a possible phase structure it is advantageous to know cumulants of as high an order as possible. However, with increasing order, the cumulants involve ever higher moments of the multiplicity distribution, which in turn requires better and better statistics. However, and this is the purpose of this note, there are certain multiplicity distributions which are “statistics friendly”, such as the one recently found in [20] being consistent with the preliminary STAR measurement at $\sqrt{s} = 7.7$ GeV. Specifically, in this paper we study various (proton) multiplicity distributions in order to evaluate the statistical errors of higher order factorial cumulants. In our studies we choose a rather small number of events, approximately 150000 (144393 to be more precise [21]), which is the statistics underlying the STAR measurement for the most central Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7.7$ GeV at RHIC [16, 22]. Furthermore, we will only consider multiplicity distributions of one species of particles, which are protons in our case.

To evaluate the statistical errors numerically, we sample the number of protons, N , $n_{\text{events}} = 144393$ times from a given multiplicity distribution $P(N)$. We then calculate the cumulants, K_n and factorial cumulants C_n for $n = 2, \dots, 9$.¹ Next we repeat this sampling n_{run} times, where n_{run} is sufficiently large so that the results presented below do not depend on n_{run} . This procedure then gives us n_{run} “measurements” or samples of K_n and C_n , $\{K_n^{(1)}, \dots, K_n^{(n_{\text{run}})}\}$ and $\{C_n^{(1)}, \dots, C_n^{(n_{\text{run}})}\}$.

From these samples we calculate the variance, for example, in the case of the factorial cumulants C_n we have

$$\text{Var}(C_n) = \frac{1}{n_{\text{run}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{run}}} (C_n^{(i)})^2 - \left(\frac{1}{n_{\text{run}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{run}}} C_n^{(i)} \right)^2. \quad (1)$$

The expected *absolute* error, ΔC_n , is then given by $\Delta C_n = \sqrt{\text{Var}(C_n)}$, whereas the *relative* error is $\Delta C_n/C_n$, where C_n denotes the true value directly calculated from the multiplicity distribution $P(N)$.

* bzdak@fis.agh.edu.pl

† vkoch@lbl.gov

¹ As a reminder the cumulants and factorial cumulants are obtained from the multiplicity distribution $P(N)$ as $K_n = \frac{d^n}{dt^n} \ln [\sum_N P(N) e^{Nt}] \Big|_{t=0}$, $C_n = \frac{d^n}{dz^n} \ln [\sum_N P(N) z^N] \Big|_{z=1}$.

An alternative way to calculate the expected error is by means of the delta theorem or delta method (see, e.g., [7, 23, 24] for details). In the case at hand, where we want to calculate the errors for (factorial) cumulants, application of the delta method is straightforward. Let us discuss this in more detail for the case of the factorial cumulant. The random variables are the moments about zero, $\mu_k = \langle N^k \rangle$. Therefore, we express the factorial cumulant, C_n , in terms of the moments, $C_n = F(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$. Then according to the delta method the variance of C_n for a sample with n_{events} events is given by

$$\text{Var}(C_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial F}{\partial \mu_i} \frac{\partial F}{\partial \mu_j} \text{Cov}(\mu_i, \mu_j), \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Cov}(\mu_i, \mu_j) = \frac{1}{n_{\text{events}}} (\mu_{i+j} - \mu_i \mu_j). \quad (3)$$

The *absolute* error is then again given by $\Delta C_n = \sqrt{\text{Var}(C_n)}$. For example we obtain for the variance of C_2 (after re-expressing the moments μ_i in terms of factorial cumulants)

$$\text{Var}(C_2) = \frac{1}{n_{\text{events}}} \left[2(C_1 + C_2)^2 + 2C_2 + 4C_3 + C_4 \right]. \quad (4)$$

We find that the so obtained errors are in perfect agreement with those determined via the aforementioned numerical sampling method.

After having presented the methods for error determination let us now turn to the results. The essential point of the present paper is the observation that a small deviation from Poisson or binomial distributions can result in rather peculiar distributions, which we will call, the statistics friendly distributions (SFD). From these distributions one may obtain factorial cumulants of high orders with a rather limited number of events. One example is a simple two-component distribution discussed recently in Ref. [20]

$$P(N) = (1 - \alpha)P_{(a)}(N) + \alpha P_{(b)}(N), \quad (5)$$

where both $P_{(a)}$ and $P_{(b)}$ are the proton multiplicity distributions characterized by small or even vanishing factorial cumulants. This distribution not only serves as a nice example for a statistics friendly distribution, as we shall show, it also has physics relevance, in particular in the context of searching for structures in the QCD phase diagram. As argued recently in Ref. [20] such a distribution would be consistent with a system with finite number of particles being close to a first order phase transition. The analysis in Ref. [20] found that $P(N)$ given by Eq. (5) with $\alpha \approx 0.0033$, $P_{(a)}(N)$ given by binomial ($B = 350$, $p \approx 0.1144$) and $P_{(b)}(N)$ given by Poisson ($\langle N_{(b)} \rangle = 25.3525$) is able to reproduce the preliminary results by the STAR collaboration for the proton cumulants at $\sqrt{s} = 7.7$ GeV [22]. In addition it was found that the above distribution predicts factorial cumulants to roughly scale like $C_{n+1}/C_n \sim -15$ i.e., they alter in sign from order to order while increasing in absolute value by more than an order of magnitude from order to order.² In other words, the small admixture of a Poisson distribution changes the factorial cumulants dramatically, from being close to zero to almost exponentially increasing in magnitude. The same dramatic difference can also be seen in the expected error for a finite sampling. This is shown in Fig. 1, where in the panel (a) we show the histogram of $C_n^{(i)}/C_n$ from our numerical sampling (based on $n_{\text{events}} = 144393$ events) for the binomial distribution only, i.e., $P_{(a)}(N)$.³ For completeness we note that the analytical values of C_n for binomial are given by $C_n = (-1)^{n+1}(n-1)!Bp^n$. The

² The actual ratios slightly decrease with increasing n : $C_4/C_3 = -17$, $C_5/C_4 = -15.56$, $C_6/C_5 = -15.46$, $C_7/C_6 = -15.04$, $C_8/C_7 = -13.85$, $C_9/C_8 = -10.66$, and for C_{10} the patten breaks and $C_{10}/C_9 = 0.72$.

³ We found that the absolute error of the binomial distribution is close the Poisson distribution, which can be easily calculated using Eq. (2) and is given by $\sqrt{n! \langle N \rangle^{n/2} / \sqrt{n_{\text{events}}}}$.




FIG. 1. Histogram (normalized to unity) of factorial cumulant, $C_n^{(i)}$, fluctuating from experiment to experiment, divided by a known (evaluated analytically) value, C_n , based on 144393 events sampled from (a) the binomial distribution ($B = 350$, $p = 0.114$, $\langle N \rangle = pB \approx 40$) and (b) a distribution given by Eq. (5) (see text for details). The statistical errors are given by the widths of the corresponding histograms. In the left panel, the histograms order by the height at the maximum are (from largest to smallest) C_2 , C_3 , and C_4 . In the right panel the order (from largest to smallest) are: C_2 , C_4 , C_5 , C_3 , C_6 , C_7 , and C_8 .

distribution get very wide already for C_3 . In contrast, in the panel (b) of Fig. 1 we show equivalent histograms for the two-component distribution, Eq. (5). Again, the small admixture of a Poisson distribution changes the situation dramatically. Indeed in this case the distributions are so narrow that a measurement of even the 8-th order factorial cumulants may be feasible with as little as 150k events.

This finding is quantified in Fig. 2, where we show the *relative errors* $\Delta C_n/C_n$ for various distributions again based on $n_{\text{events}} = 144393$ event. The relative error for both the binomial and the negative binomial (NBD)⁴ with $\langle N \rangle = 40$ and $k = 80$, increase essentially exponentially with increasing order of the factorial cumulant. Obviously all of these distributions are statistics hungry, and the measurement of higher order factorial cumulants with good accuracy require very large statistics. For the two component model, labeled “Binomial + Poisson”, on the other hand the relative errors remain very small even for C_9 . The actual values for the relative errors are (0.036, 0.16, 0.13, 0.14, 0.18, 0.26, 0.42, 0.91) for $(\Delta C_2/C_2, \dots, \Delta C_9/C_9)$.

We also show as “Binomial + Poisson + effi” the result one would obtain, if one takes a finite detection efficiency of $\epsilon = 0.65$ into account, that is $\langle N_{(b)} \rangle = 25.3525 \times \epsilon$, $p = 0.1144 \times \epsilon$ so that $\langle N \rangle = 40 \times \epsilon$. Again, the relative error for the factorial cumulants remain small but larger than in the case without efficiency. Here we have (0.056, 0.29, 0.27, 0.31, 0.41, 0.61, 1.06, 2.55) for $(\Delta C_2/C_2, \dots, \Delta C_9/C_9)$. It also means that using the efficiency uncorrected STAR data one could try to measure the factorial cumulants up to the seventh order where $\Delta C_7/C_7 = 1 \pm 0.61$.

The above results may be understood qualitatively in the following way. In general we have two types of multiplicity distributions, $P(N)$. One where the higher order factorial cumulants are driven by the tails (Poisson, binomial, NBD etc.) and the other one where the higher order factorial cumulants are driven by some structure away from the tails. This is exactly the case of our superposition model.⁵ To be a bit more precise the factorial cumulants of Eq. (5), assuming $\alpha \ll 1$ are given by

$$C_n \approx C_n^{(a)} + (-1)^n \alpha \bar{N}^n, \quad (6)$$

⁴ For NBD $C_n = (n-1)! \langle N \rangle^n / k^{n-1}$, where k measures the deviation from a Poisson distribution, e.g., $\langle N^2 \rangle - \langle N \rangle^2 = \langle N \rangle (1 + \langle N \rangle / k)$.

⁵ Another example of statistics friendly distribution is a uniform distribution. For example, taking $P(N) = \text{const}$ for $N \in [0, 80]$ we obtain (0.0026, 0.0309, 0.0071, 0.0447, 0.0114, 0.0477, 0.0157, 0.0487) for $(\Delta C_2/C_2, \dots, \Delta C_9/C_9)$.




FIG. 2. The relative error, $\Delta C_n/C_n$, of factorial cumulant for various proton multiplicity distributions based on 144393 events, as present in the most central $Au + Au$ collisions at RHIC. The presented here binomial and negative binomial distributions are statistically very demanding, whereas the distribution given by Eq. (5) (Binomial+Poisson) with $\langle N \rangle = 40$, allows to successfully measure higher order factorial cumulants with a relatively small number of events. This feature is also present for the efficiency uncorrected distribution (Binomial+Poisson+effi) where $\langle N \rangle = 40 \times 0.65$.

where $C_n^{(a)}$ is a factorial cumulant characterizing $P_{(a)}(N)$ and $\bar{N} = \langle N_{(a)} \rangle - \langle N_{(b)} \rangle$. For $C_n^{(a)}$ being a Poisson or binomial the values of C_n are completely dominated by a term $\alpha \bar{N}^n$, which results in very large factorial cumulants. The error, ΔC_n , on the other hand, is of the same magnitude as that of the first term, $\Delta C_n^{(a)}$ (in practice $\Delta C_n^{(a)}/\Delta C_n$ ranges from ~ 0.95 for $n = 2$ to ~ 0.2 for $n = 9$). Thus we have a situation, where the error of the factorial cumulant is of the same magnitude as that of a binomial distribution, but the factorial cumulant is orders of magnitude larger. Consequently, and not surprisingly, the *relative* error is much smaller for the two-component distribution than for the binomial distribution.

Finally, we note that in the case of Eq. (5), the regular cumulants are less statistics friendly. This is presented in Fig. 3. The reason for this is the same as just stated. The absolute errors for both cumulants and factorial cumulants are of the same magnitude, $\Delta K_n \sim \Delta C_n$. On the other hand, for the two-component model, the factorial cumulants are very large while the regular cumulants are only modestly larger than that of a simple binomial distribution. This is a result of the alternating signs of the factorial cumulants. For example, the sixth order cumulant, K_6 , is given in terms of the factorial cumulants as $K_6 = \langle N \rangle + 31C_2 + 90C_3 + 65C_4 + 15C_5 + C_6$ (see e.g., Ref. [20]). And for our example of "binomial+Poisson+effi", where we see a rapid increase in the relative error, we have $C_6 \approx 3080$, $15C_5 \approx -4600$ and $65C_4 \approx 1970$. As a result, $K_6 \approx 180 \ll C_6$, and consequently the relative error is much larger for K_6 as compared to C_6 .

In summary, we demonstrated that for the multiplicity distribution given by Eq. (5), which is relevant in the context of searching for structures in the QCD phase diagram, factorial cumulants of high orders can be determined with relatively small number of events. This is in contrast to various statistics hungry distributions (Poisson, binomial, NBD, etc.), for which the error increases nearly exponentially with increasing order. As shown in Ref. [20], the distribution, Eq. (5), describes the preliminary STAR data for proton cumulants (up to the fourth order) in central Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7.7$ GeV. Since this distribution is statistics friendly, it can be further tested by evaluating the higher order factorial cumulants even with the presently available STAR data set of 144393 events for the most central collisions. We also pointed out that factorial cumulants are more statistics friendly when compared to regular cumulants, which, in the case of Eq. (5), results from a delicate cancellation of large factorial cumulants. Assuming that $C_4 = 170$ (as extracted from a




FIG. 3. The relative errors of the factorial cumulants, $\Delta C_n/C_n$, and the regular cumulants, $\Delta K_n/K_n$, based on 144393 events sampled from a distribution given by Eq. (5).

preliminary STAR data) we predict:

$$\begin{aligned} C_5 &= -307 (1 \pm 0.31), & C_6 &= 3085 (1 \pm 0.41), \\ C_7 &= -30155 (1 \pm 0.61), & C_8 &= 271492 (1 \pm 1.06), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

for efficiency uncorrected data and

$$\begin{aligned} C_5 &= -2645 (1 \pm 0.14), & C_6 &= 40900 (1 \pm 0.18), \\ C_7 &= -615135 (1 \pm 0.26), & C_8 &= 8520220 (1 \pm 0.42), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

for $\langle N \rangle = 40$, corresponding to the efficiency corrected data.⁶ We note, that in the next phase of the RHIC beam energy scan the statistics is expected to increase by roughly a factor of ~ 25 [25] reducing the above errors by about a factor of 5.

In this work we have restricted ourselves to distributions of a single species, protons. It would be interesting to explore if similar statistics friendly distribution also exists for more than one species, such as net-proton distributions which involves protons as well as anti-protons.

Acknowledgments: We thank Jan Steinheimer for useful comments. A.B. is partially supported by the Faculty of Physics and Applied Computer Science AGH UST statutory tasks No. 11.11.220.01/1 within subsidy of Ministry of Science and Higher Education, and by the National Science Centre, Grant No. DEC-2014/15/B/ST2/00175. V.K. is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics, under contract number DE-AC02-05CH11231. This work also received support within the framework of the Beam Energy Scan Theory (BEST) Topical Collaboration.

-
- [1] S. Jeon and V. Koch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2076 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/0003168 [hep-ph].
 - [2] M. Asakawa, U. W. Heinz, and B. Muller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2072 (2000), hep-ph/0003169.
 - [3] M. Stephanov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 032301 (2009), arXiv:0809.3450 [hep-ph].
 - [4] V. Skokov, B. Friman, and K. Redlich, Phys. Rev. **C83**, 054904 (2011), arXiv:1008.4570 [hep-ph].
 - [5] M. Stephanov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 052301 (2011), arXiv:1104.1627 [hep-ph].

⁶ We note that the errors quoted here are only due to the sample size and do not account for additional uncertainties due to the efficiency correction [24].

- [6] X.-F. Luo, B. Mohanty, H. G. Ritter, and N. Xu, Phys. Atom. Nucl. **75**, 676 (2012), arXiv:1105.5049 [nucl-ex].
- [7] X. Luo and N. Xu, Nucl. Sci. Tech. **28**, 112 (2017), arXiv:1701.02105 [nucl-ex].
- [8] C. Herold, M. Nahrgang, Y. Yan, and C. Kobdaj, Phys. Rev. **C93**, 021902 (2016), arXiv:1601.04839 [hep-ph].
- [9] D.-M. Zhou, A. Limphirat, Y.-l. Yan, C. Yun, Y.-p. Yan, X. Cai, L. P. Csernai, and B.-H. Sa, Phys. Rev. **C85**, 064916 (2012), arXiv:1205.5634 [nucl-th].
- [10] X. Wang and C. B. Yang, Phys. Rev. **C85**, 044905 (2012), arXiv:1202.4857 [nucl-th].
- [11] F. Karsch and K. Redlich, Phys. Rev. **D84**, 051504 (2011), arXiv:1107.1412 [hep-ph].
- [12] B. J. Schaefer and M. Wagner, Phys. Rev. **D85**, 034027 (2012), arXiv:1111.6871 [hep-ph].
- [13] L. Chen, X. Pan, F.-B. Xiong, L. Li, N. Li, Z. Li, G. Wang, and Y. Wu, J. Phys. **G38**, 115004 (2011).
- [14] W.-j. Fu, Y.-x. Liu, and Y.-L. Wu, Phys. Rev. **D81**, 014028 (2010), arXiv:0910.5783 [hep-ph].
- [15] M. Cheng *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D79**, 074505 (2009), arXiv:0811.1006 [hep-lat].
- [16] L. Adamczyk *et al.* (STAR), Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 032302 (2014), arXiv:1309.5681 [nucl-ex].
- [17] A. Rustamov (ALICE), *Proceedings, 26th International Conference on Ultra-relativistic Nucleus-Nucleus Collisions (Quark Matter 2017): Chicago, Illinois, USA, February 5-11, 2017*, Nucl. Phys. **A967**, 453 (2017), arXiv:1704.05329 [nucl-ex].
- [18] M. Kitazawa and M. Asakawa, Phys. Rev. **C85**, 021901 (2012), arXiv:1107.2755 [nucl-th].
- [19] M. Kitazawa and M. Asakawa, Phys. Rev. **C86**, 024904 (2012), [Erratum: Phys. Rev. **C86**, 069902 (2012)], arXiv:1205.3292 [nucl-th].
- [20] A. Bzdak, V. Koch, D. Oliinychenko, and J. Steinheimer, (2018), arXiv:1804.04463 [nucl-th].
- [21] X. Luo, private communication.
- [22] X. Luo (STAR), *Proceedings, 9th International Workshop on Critical Point and Onset of Deconfinement (CPOD 2014): Bielefeld, Germany, November 17-21, 2014*, PoS **CPOD2014**, 019 (2015), arXiv:1503.02558 [nucl-ex].
- [23] A. Davison, *Statistical Models*, Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics (Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- [24] X. Luo, Phys. Rev. **C91**, 034907 (2015), arXiv:1410.3914 [physics.data-an].
- [25] STAR Note 598, <https://drupal.star.bnl.gov/STAR/starnotes/public/sn0598>.