

## BOSE-EINSTEIN CORRELATIONS AS CORRELATIONS OF FLUCTUATIONS

O.V.UTYUZH AND G.WILK

*The Andrzej Soltan Institute for Nuclear Studies; Hoża 69; 00-689 Warsaw,  
Poland*

*E-mail: utyuzh@fuw.edu.pl and wilk@fuw.edu.pl*

M.RYBCZYŃSKI AND Z.WŁODARCZYK

*Institute of Physics, Świętokrzyska Academy; Konopnickiej 15; 25-405 Kielce,  
Poland*

*E-mail: mryb@pu.kielce.pl and wlod@pu.kielce.pl*

The limitations of the recently proposed new method of numerical modelling of Bose-Einstein correlations (BEC) are explicitly demonstrated. It is then argued that BEC should still be considered as emerging from the correlations of fluctuations, however they have to be modelled first in any Monte Carlo event generator (MCEG) and not added *a posteriori* to the existing output of some MCEG.

Recently we have proposed new method of numerical modelling of BEC which makes use of the fact that BEC can be regarded as correlations of fluctuations<sup>1,2,3</sup>. Our aim was to provide a fast algorithm, which could be used on the even-by-event basis together with the output of other MCEG's and which would introduce a characteristic structure of the correlation function  $C_2(Q)$  between them<sup>3</sup>. The main idea was<sup>1,3</sup> to resign from the initial allocation of charges to the particles provided by a given MCEG and to perform then the new allocation in a way which would result in a desired bunching of like particles in the phase space<sup>a</sup>. As a result one gets a number of (what we have called<sup>3</sup>) *elementary emitting cells* (EEC),  $N_{cell}$ , each of them containing particles,  $n_{part}$ , of a given charge distributed according to geometrical distribution (in order to model the bosonic character of produced secondaries<sup>1,2</sup>). Those cells (and parameters connected with their formation) represent therefore the main object of interest in our approach.

---

<sup>a</sup>At the same time all positions of the initial particles in the phase-space, as well as the number of particles of given charge in an event, remain intact<sup>1,2,3</sup>.

It means then that their number and the (mean) multiplicity of secondaries they contain are the main factors dictated the shape of  $C_2(Q)$  (and therefore also the 'size' parameter  $R$  and 'chaoticity' parameter  $\lambda$  usually used to fit  $C_2(Q)$ <sup>1,3</sup>). In Fig. 1 we show that it is, in principle, possible to fit experimental data. Our reservation comes from the fact that so far only one sample of  $e^+e^-$  data were fitted by only two types of MCEG (cf. <sup>3</sup> for details) and using only direct pions. But it shows also explicitly the price to be paid for this, namely the anticorrelations between the unlike-particles showing up<sup>b</sup>.




Figure 1. Comparison with DELPHI data presented in <sup>3</sup> shown together with the results for the unlike-pairs for CAS model <sup>3</sup>.




Figure 2. Comparison with DELPHI data presented in <sup>3</sup> are shown together with the results for the unlike-pairs for JETSET model <sup>3</sup>.

Such anticorrelation feature is, however, after a bit of thinking, to be expected. The reason is that we start, in a given event, with *a priori* uncorrelated particles provided by a MCEG. Our algorithm shifts now charges in a fixed pool of particles in this event. It is constructed in such a way that the EEC of different charges essentially do not overlap in the phase space (although, in principle there is nothing preventing them to do so; but we have checked that allowing for substantial overlap in order to diminish the anticorrelation effect weakens dramatically the obtained BEC signal as well). The possible way out is the reparametrization of the original MCEG in such way as to have *positive* charge-particles correlations from the very beginning which are then washed out by the action of our algorithm. Another,

<sup>b</sup>We are deeply indebted to Prof. W.Kittel for suggesting to us this simple check before proceeding with any further, more involved, development of our algorithm.




Figure 3. (a, b) Application of our toy model with two types of weights  $P$  (defining the formation of the EEC's) to fit DELPHI data<sup>3</sup> on  $e^+e^-$  annihilation. Panels (c) and (d) show the corresponding distributions of EEC,  $P(N_{cell})$ , and distribution of the like-charge particles allocated to such cell,  $P(n_{part})$ , with mean values and dispersions as indicated (corresponding also to parameters of the best fits, respectively, poissonian and geometrical, to  $P(N_{cell})$  and  $P(n_{part})$ , which are not shown here). Notice the small values of multiplicities in EEC's,  $\langle n \rangle \sim 1.1$  only.

more physical (in our opinion) possibility, which we shall demonstrate here, is to construct MCEG satisfying the requirements of BEC from the very beginning (i.e., essentially to continue the line of reasoning proposed some time ago in<sup>4</sup>). It means that, contrary to the situation in Figs. 1 and 2, where the original outputs of MCEG were not showing any BEC and our

algorithm was not changing the main characteristics of these outputs (like, for example, multiplicity distributions), one has to change from the very beginning the inclusive distributions to accommodate the characteristic BEC effects in them, see also discussion in <sup>3</sup>). Fig. 3 shows results of our first attempts in this direction <sup>3</sup> where preliminary comparison of a kind of toy model (presented in <sup>3</sup>) with data at  $W = 91.2$  GeV has been shown for two types of the specific weight variables,  $P$  <sup>3</sup>. Particles were selected from the energy  $W$  with given proportion of  $(+/-/0)$  and allocated to EEC's in such a way that, as evident in Fig. 3, distribution of cells,  $P(N_{cell})$ , is poissonian whereas distribution of particles (of the same sign) in a cell,  $P(n_{part})$ , is geometrical. It means then that the multiplicity distribution of all particles follow the Negative Binomial (NB) form with EEC playing a role of *clans* <sup>3</sup>. It is very important to realize that in order to get the observed structure of  $C_2(Q)$  one has to allow for some uncertainties in energies of particles allocated to a given EEC (here given by a gaussian form with width  $\sigma$  as indicated in Fig. 3, they correspond to the *sizes* of EEC,  $\delta y$ , introduced in <sup>4</sup>, although they are not identical with them). As one can see the result of our "toy model" shown in Fig. 3 is quite promising and can form a basis of more detailed investigations (which we plan to pursue<sup>c</sup>).

### Acknowledgments

One of us (GW) would like to thank the Bogolyubow-Infeld Program (JINR, Dubna) for financial help in attending the XXXII ISMD conference where the above material has been presented.

### References

1. O.V.Utyuzh, G.Wilk and Z.Włodarczyk, *Phys. Lett.* **B522** (2001) 273 and *Acta Phys. Polon.* **B33** (2002) 2681.
2. For more details see: O.V.Utyuzh, *Fluctuations, correlations and non-extensivity in high-energy collisions*, PhD Thesis, available at <http://www.fuw.edu.pl/~smolan/p8phd.html>.
3. The preliminary fits to  $e^+e^-$  data using different MCEG's are presented in M.Rybczyński, O.V.Utyuzh, G.Wilk and Z.Włodarczyk, *Are BEC emerging from correlations of fluctuations?*, hep-ph/0210075.
4. T.Osada, M.Maruyama and F.Takagi, *Phys. Rev.* **D59**, 014024 (1999).

---

<sup>c</sup>In particular one should improve the approximate for a moment (although kept on the same numerical level as in <sup>4</sup>) conservation of charges and energy-momenta in a given event.