

# ANALYTICAL SOLUTION FOR MULTIVARIATE STATISTICS IN RANDOM MULTIPLICATIVE CASCADES<sup>a</sup>

H.C. Eggers\*, M. Greiner<sup>†</sup> and P. Lipa<sup>‡</sup>

\**Department of Physics, University of Stellenbosch, 7600 Stellenbosch, South Africa*

<sup>†</sup>*Max-Planck-Institut für Physik komplexer Systeme, Nöthnitzerstr. 38, D-01187  
Dresden, Germany*

<sup>‡</sup>*Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Nikolsdorfergasse 18, A-1050 Vienna, Austria*

It has long been a puzzle how to solve random multiplicative cascade structures analytically. We present an analytical solution found recently in the form of a simple pedagogical example of the general case.

This contribution is intended to serve as an introduction-by-example for prospective students and the casual observer. For more details and greater rigour, the interested reader should consult the published papers.<sup>1,2</sup>

What are multiplicative random cascade models (MRCM's), and why are they relevant? Turbulence in fluids must necessarily obey the Navier-Stokes equation, while the QCD lagrangian in principle describes all high-energy interactions and final states. Nevertheless, many experimental results cannot be reproduced from the underlying theories, even though they are known. We hence look to **models** to reproduce essential features of physical data and hence point the way. This approach has a long and fruitful history.<sup>3</sup>

**Multiplicative** variables do not obey classical central limit theorems but rather exhibit large fluctuations even in the limit of large numbers. Large fluctuations, unexplainable in terms of additive variables, are seen in the energy dissipation  $\epsilon$  in fully developed turbulence and in the number and density of pions in the final states of high-energy hadronic collisions.

The models contain **random variables** because distributions of relevant quantities differ greatly from event to event in high energy physics and correspondingly in different spatial “snapshots” or pieces of time series of  $\epsilon$ .

Hierarchical structures or **cascades** are used because they can easily be made scale invariant and are hence well placed to mimick the scale invariance seen in the Richardson cascades, the original Kolmogorov theory, as well as some deviations from it. In high-energy  $e^+e^-$ , lepton-hadron and hadron-hadron collisions, particle production can be described at least in part as cascades of partons and hadrons.

---

<sup>a</sup>Talk presented at CF'98, 8th International Workshop on Correlations and Fluctuations, Mátraháza, Hungary, June 14–21 1998.

A typical simple MRCM goes as follows. Start with an initial interval of unit length, on which a total “energy dissipation”  $\epsilon$  is measured<sup>b</sup>. Divide the interval into two equal pieces of length  $\frac{1}{2}$  and split  $\epsilon$  randomly into a “left” piece  $\epsilon_0$  and a “right” piece  $\epsilon_1$ . These are calculated from the “parent”  $\epsilon$  by

$$\epsilon_0 = q_0\epsilon, \quad \epsilon_1 = q_1\epsilon, \quad (1)$$

where the multiplicative random variables  $q_0$  and  $q_1$  are found by rolling the dice, the probability of obtaining a particular value for  $q_0$  and  $q_1$  being determined by the model’s “splitting function”  $p(q_0, q_1)$ . For example, the so-called  $p$ -model has the splitting function

$$p(q_0, q_1) = \frac{1}{2} [\delta(q_0 - (1 + \beta)) + \delta(q_0 - (1 - \beta))] \delta(q_0 + q_1 - 2), \quad (2)$$

where  $\beta$  is an adjustable parameter determining how strong the fluctuations will be. In other words,  $q_0$  has an equal chance of being  $1 + \beta$  or  $1 - \beta$ , with  $q_1$  automatically taking the other option.<sup>c</sup> In the next step, the left “0” length interval is again split into “left” and “right” subintervals, and the energy densities are given by

$$\epsilon_{00} = q_{00}\epsilon_0 = q_{00}q_0\epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon_{01} = q_{01}\epsilon_0 = q_{01}q_0\epsilon, \quad (3)$$

where the  $q$ ’s are again determined by throwing dice weighted by  $p(q_{00}, q_{01})$ . The same kind of thing happens in the “1” interval also, so that we have four subintervals with four energy densities  $\epsilon_{00}$ ,  $\epsilon_{01}$ ,  $\epsilon_{10}$  and  $\epsilon_{11}$ . This can be continued for as long as we like: after  $J$  such cascade steps we end up with  $2^J$  intervals with one  $\epsilon$  per interval, characterised by some binary address.

The correspondence between these models and data is established by pretending that the **measured**  $\epsilon$ ’s in an experimental data set result directly from such a cascade (of course this is a big simplification), and then to **compare correlations** between  $\epsilon$ ’s from different bins to those given by the model. In this way, one can see whether such models reproduce the correlation data.

The problem is that so far it has been impossible to find systematically analytic expressions for correlations in these models; only a few special cases were solved. Here, we show in a very simple example how, if you do everything in the **logarithms** of the  $\epsilon$ ’s, then you can get analytical answers easily.

Assume that we have a cascade of just two steps,  $J = 2$ , so that we have four intervals. The tree for our little example cascade is shown in Figure 1.

---

<sup>b</sup> The variable  $\epsilon$  can correspond to different physical quantities for different systems; for our purposes it is important only that the  $\epsilon$ ’s must be positive scalars.

<sup>c</sup> The delta function  $\delta(q_0 + q_1 - 2)$  ensures that  $q_0$  and  $q_1$  add up to 2 because  $\epsilon_0$  and  $\epsilon_1$  are **energy densities** so that the left and right **energies**  $E_0 = \epsilon_0 \cdot (\frac{1}{2})$  and  $E_1 = \epsilon_1 \cdot (\frac{1}{2})$  add up to  $E = \epsilon/1$ . Hence we call this model “energy-conserving”.




Figure 1: Branches, splitting functions  $p$ , multipliers  $q$  and (logs of) final energy densities  $\ln \epsilon$  for a two-step multiplicative cascade.

The generating function for these four bins,

$$Z_T(\lambda_{00}, \lambda_{01}, \lambda_{10}, \lambda_{11}) = \left\langle e^{(\lambda_{00} \ln \epsilon_{00} + \lambda_{01} \ln \epsilon_{01} + \lambda_{10} \ln \epsilon_{10} + \lambda_{11} \ln \epsilon_{11})} \right\rangle, \quad (4)$$

contains all possible information on the model, because any correlation can be found from it (in the form of moments and cumulants) by taking derivatives of  $Z_T$ . For example, the “moment between bin 00 and 10” is given by

$$\langle \ln \epsilon_{00} \ln \epsilon_{10} \rangle = \rho_{00,10} = \frac{\partial^2 Z_T}{\partial \lambda_{00} \partial \lambda_{10}} \Big|_{\lambda_{00}=\lambda_{01}=\lambda_{10}=\lambda_{11}=0}, \quad (5)$$

and the corresponding cumulant is found from  $\langle \ln \epsilon_{00} \ln \epsilon_{10} \rangle - \langle \ln \epsilon_{00} \rangle \langle \ln \epsilon_{10} \rangle = C_{00,10} = (\partial^2 \ln Z_T / \partial \lambda_{00} \partial \lambda_{10})|_0$ . Higher orders are calculated in the same way. Hence, if we know  $Z_T$  analytically, all correlations are known analytically too.

We now show that  $Z_T$  factorizes by first writing out the average  $\langle \rangle$  in Eq. (4) in terms of the joint distribution function  $p(\ln \epsilon_{00}, \ln \epsilon_{01}, \ln \epsilon_{10}, \ln \epsilon_{11})$ ,

$$Z_T = \int d \ln \epsilon_{00} d \ln \epsilon_{01} d \ln \epsilon_{10} d \ln \epsilon_{11} p(\ln \epsilon_{00}, \ln \epsilon_{01}, \ln \epsilon_{10}, \ln \epsilon_{11}) \times e^{(\lambda_{00} \ln \epsilon_{00} + \lambda_{01} \ln \epsilon_{01} + \lambda_{10} \ln \epsilon_{10} + \lambda_{11} \ln \epsilon_{11})}. \quad (6)$$

Since  $\epsilon_{kl} = q_{kl} q_k \epsilon$ , the logs are additive,  $\ln \epsilon_{kl} = \ln q_{kl} + \ln q_k$  for all  $k, l$ . (As the initial energy density is a constant, we can set it to 1 so that  $\ln \epsilon = 0$ .) We can hence write  $p(\ln \epsilon_{00}, \ln \epsilon_{01}, \ln \epsilon_{10}, \ln \epsilon_{11})$  in terms of the splitting functions by fixing the  $\epsilon_{kl}$ 's to the appropriate  $q$ 's:

$$p(\ln \epsilon_{00}, \dots, \ln \epsilon_{11}) = \int dq_0 dq_1 dq_{00} dq_{01} dq_{10} dq_{11} p(q_0, q_1) p(q_{00}, q_{01}) p(q_{10}, q_{11}) \times \delta[\ln \epsilon_{00} - \ln q_{00} - \ln q_0] \delta[\ln \epsilon_{01} - \ln q_{01} - \ln q_0] \times \delta[\ln \epsilon_{10} - \ln q_{10} - \ln q_1] \delta[\ln \epsilon_{11} - \ln q_{11} - \ln q_1]. \quad (7)$$

Inserting this into Eq. (6), we see that the four delta functions kill the  $d \ln \epsilon_{kl}$  integrals, so that we are left with

$$Z_T = \int dq_0 dq_1 p(q_0, q_1) \int dq_{00} dq_{01} p(q_{00}, q_{01}) \int dq_{10} dq_{11} p(q_{10}, q_{11}) \\ \times e^{[\lambda_{00}(\ln q_{00} + \ln q_0) + \lambda_{01}(\ln q_{01} + \ln q_0) + \lambda_{10}(\ln q_{10} + \ln q_1) + \lambda_{11}(\ln q_{11} + \ln q_1)]}, \quad (8)$$

which can be written in a factorised form:

$$Z_T(\lambda_{00}, \lambda_{01}, \lambda_{10}, \lambda_{11}) = \int dq_0 dq_1 p(q_0, q_1) e^{[(\lambda_{00} + \lambda_{01}) \ln q_0 + (\lambda_{10} + \lambda_{11}) \ln q_1]} \\ \times \int dq_{00} dq_{01} p(q_{00}, q_{01}) e^{[\lambda_{00} \ln q_{00} + \lambda_{01} \ln q_{01}]} \\ \times \int dq_{10} dq_{11} p(q_{10}, q_{11}) e^{[\lambda_{10} \ln q_{10} + \lambda_{11} \ln q_{11}]}, \quad (9)$$

in other words,

$$Z_T(\lambda_{00}, \lambda_{01}, \lambda_{10}, \lambda_{11}) = Z(\lambda_0, \lambda_1) Z(\lambda_{00}, \lambda_{01}) Z(\lambda_{10}, \lambda_{11}), \quad (10)$$

where we have defined  $\lambda_0 = \lambda_{00} + \lambda_{01}$  and  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_{10} + \lambda_{11}$ . Each of the three generating functions on the right is the Laplace transform of the corresponding splitting function; for example

$$Z(\lambda_{00}, \lambda_{01}) = \int dq_{00} dq_{01} p(q_{00}, q_{01}) e^{[\lambda_{00} \ln q_{00} + \lambda_{01} \ln q_{01}]}. \quad (11)$$

The importance of Eq. (10) is that it makes explicit the statistical independence of the different branchings. This we knew, of course, because each branching had its own independent splitting function  $p$ , but we could not previously make this independence explicit in the generating functions.

The independence becomes even more marked when writing (10) in terms of the *cumulant branching generating functions*  $Q \equiv \ln Z$ : the total cumulant generating function becomes a simple sum of cumulant branching generating functions (CBGF),

$$\ln Z_T(\lambda_{00}, \lambda_{01}, \lambda_{10}, \lambda_{11}) = Q(\lambda_0, \lambda_1) + Q(\lambda_{00}, \lambda_{01}) + Q(\lambda_{10}, \lambda_{11}). \quad (12)$$

The above derivation can be generalised to any number of cascade steps: for  $J$  cascade steps leading to  $2^J$  bins and  $\lambda$ 's, the overall cumulant generating function is the sum of CBGF's, one for each branching:

$$\ln Z_T = \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_{j-1}=0}^1 Q(\lambda_{k_1 k_2 \dots k_{j-1} 0}, \lambda_{k_1 k_2 \dots k_{j-1} 1}), \quad (13)$$

where the indices  $k_1 k_2 \dots k_J$  are just the binary addresses of the different bins as before. Also, just as above we had  $\lambda_0 = \lambda_{00} + \lambda_{01}$  and  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_{10} + \lambda_{11}$ , there is a “tree of parameters”

$$\lambda_{k_1 \dots k_j} = \sum_{l_{j+1}, \dots, l_J=0}^1 \lambda_{k_1 \dots k_j l_{j+1} \dots l_J}. \quad (14)$$

The tree structures of (13) and (14) are shown in Figures 2 and 3. The hierarchy of  $Q$ 's shows how each one governs the behaviour of the local branching and how the  $Q$ 's sum to  $\ln Z_T$ . Each  $\lambda$  shown in Figure 3 is the sum of all the  $\lambda$ 's in the tree below it.

Let us take a concrete example to show what these hierarchies imply. To find the second cumulant between the bins “101” and “110”, we note that  $(\partial \ln Z_T / \partial \lambda_{101})$  contains contributions from the branchings involving  $\lambda_1$ ,  $\lambda_{10}$  and  $\lambda_{101}$  because these all “contain” the relevant  $\lambda_{101}$  through the sum hierarchy of Fig. 3. These contributions are shown by the circled branching points in Fig. 4a. Similarly, the derivative  $(\partial \ln Z_T / \partial \lambda_{110})$  contains contributions as shown in Fig. 4b. Since the lowest circles in Fig. 4a and 4b respectively are completely uncorrelated (their  $Q$ 's are independent, after all), it is thus plausible that only those branching points common to both (shown in Fig. 4c) will contribute to the second derivative  $(\partial^2 \ln Z_T / \partial \lambda_{101} \partial \lambda_{110})$ ; indeed this is so. Hence the relevant cumulant can simply be read off as

$$C_{101,110} = \left. \frac{\partial^2 \ln Z_T}{\partial \lambda_{101} \partial \lambda_{110}} \right|_0 = \left. \frac{\partial^2 Q(\lambda_0, \lambda_1)}{\partial \lambda_1^2} \right|_0 + \left. \frac{\partial^2 Q(\lambda_{10}, \lambda_{11})}{\partial \lambda_{10} \partial \lambda_{11}} \right|_0. \quad (15)$$




Figure 2: Cumulant branching generating functions  $Q$ , one at each branching point. The overall generating function  $\ln Z_T$  is the sum of all  $Q$ 's.




Figure 3: Each  $\lambda$  is the sum of all  $\lambda$ 's in the tree below it.




Figure 4: Example of calculating the cumulant  $C_{101,110}$  from “same-lineage” and “splitting” cumulant pieces which lie along the common line of ancestry of the two addresses 101 and 110.

Actually, things become even simpler. Since each  $Q$  has only *two* parameters, there are two basic kinds of branching cumulants, namely “same-lineage” cumulants, involving only derivatives with respect to *one* of the two  $\lambda$ ’s, and “splitting” cumulants involving *both* the left and right  $\lambda$ . An arbitrary multivariate cumulant will then obey the principle of common ancestry:

*A cumulant between  $n$  bins is the sum of all same-lineage branching cumulants at branching points which are ancestors of ALL the relevant bins. The moment the first splitting in daughters occurs, the splitting cumulant of this branching point is added, and then the process stops. In other words, once at least one bin has “separated” into a different lineage, the last common branching point contributes and nothing after that.*

This is expressed elegantly in mathematical form with the help of the so-called ultrametric distance  $d_2$ , shown in Figure 5, which is simply a count of how many generations one must move up before a common ancestor is found.

The ultrametric distance closely mimicks family terminology, e.g. siblings have  $d_2 = 1$  and cousins  $d_2 = 2$ . For any bin addresses  $\kappa_1$ ,  $\kappa_2$  and  $\kappa_3$ , the cumulants can be expressed generically as<sup>d</sup>

$$C_{\kappa_1} = J \left. \frac{\partial \ln Z_T}{\partial \lambda_{\kappa_1}} \right|_0, \quad (16)$$

<sup>d</sup> The assumption made here is that the splitting functions are the same at all branchings. This is not necessary, of course, but the formulae would become more complicated.




Figure 5: The ultrametric distance  $d_2$  between bins.

$$C_{\kappa_1, \kappa_2} = (J - d_2) \frac{\partial^2 Q}{\lambda_L^2} \Big|_0 + (1 - \delta_{d_2, 0}) \frac{\partial^2 Q}{\partial \lambda_L \partial \lambda_R} \Big|_0. \quad (17)$$

The second term in (17) represents the splitting cumulant contribution; the  $(1 - \delta_{d_2, 0})$  makes sure that this is not counted when  $\kappa_1$  and  $\kappa_2$  are identical. The first term counts all the same-lineage branching cumulants; the prefactor  $(J - d_2)$  represents the number of common ancestors. The same can be done in third order: defining the ultrametric distance as  $d_3 = \max[d_2(\kappa_1, \kappa_2), d_2(\kappa_2, \kappa_3), d_2(\kappa_3, \kappa_1)]$ , the cumulant between any three bins is given by

$$C_{\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3} = (J - d_3) \frac{\partial^3 Q}{\lambda_L^3} \Big|_0 + (1 - \delta_{d_3, 0}) \frac{\partial^3 Q}{\partial^2 \lambda_L \partial \lambda_R} \Big|_0, \quad (18)$$

with a similar interpretation. Fourth order works similarly.

Let us use the  $p$ -model as an example again. Insert Eq. (2) into the Laplace transform (11) and take the logarithm to get

$$Q(\lambda_0, \lambda_1) = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1) \ln(1 - \beta^2) + \ln \cosh \left[ \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1) \ln \left( \frac{1 + \beta}{1 - \beta} \right) \right]. \quad (19)$$

The  $\alpha$ -model, characterised by  $p(q_0, q_1) = \frac{1}{4} [\delta(q_0 - (1 + \beta)) + \delta(q_0 - (1 - \beta))] \times [\delta(q_1 - (1 + \beta)) + \delta(q_1 - (1 - \beta))]$  resembles the  $p$ -model, except that now the  $q_0$  and  $q_1$  can take on the values  $(1 + \beta)$  and  $(1 - \beta)$  independently. Its CBGF is found to be

$$Q[\lambda_0, \lambda_1] = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1) \ln(1 - \beta^2) + \ln \cosh \left[ \frac{1}{2}\lambda_0 \ln \left( \frac{1 + \beta}{1 - \beta} \right) \right] + \ln \cosh \left[ \frac{1}{2}\lambda_1 \ln \left( \frac{1 + \beta}{1 - \beta} \right) \right], \quad (20)$$

clearly resembling that of the  $p$ -model, but also clearly different. The law of common ancestry for these two models is illustrated nicely in the plot in Figure 6a of the second order cumulant  $C_{\kappa_1, \kappa_2}$  against ultrametric distance  $d_2$  between bins  $\kappa_1$  and  $\kappa_2$ , and in Figure 6b for the fourth order  $C_{\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3, \kappa_4}$  (note that some indices are set equal). Given  $J = 6$ , Eq. (17) shows that for  $d_2 = 6$  only the splitting cumulant contributes: it is negative for the  $p$ -model and zero for the  $\alpha$ -model.<sup>e</sup> Every time  $d_2$  decreases by one, a constant (the same-lineage cumulant) is added, until  $d_2 = 1$ . At  $d_2 = 0$ , the (negative) splitting cumulant does not contribute and so there is a jump in  $C_{\kappa_1, \kappa_2}$  for the  $p$ -model. Similar arguments apply in fourth order.

<sup>e</sup> This must naturally be so since  $q_0$  and  $q_1$  are independent in the  $\alpha$ -model.

We should briefly mention some of the consequences of this analytical solution. One important connection is that to multifractals, which we show in Refs. <sup>1,2</sup> to be equivalent to setting one of the two variables in  $Q(\lambda_0, \lambda_1)$  to zero. Hence we contend that our formalism can “see more” than multifractals can: indeed, the latter cannot distinguish between the  $\alpha$ - and  $p$ -models, while Figure 6 shows that we can.

In retrospect, it is obvious why the logarithm prescription works: by taking the logarithm, the previously multiplicative process becomes an additive one, which is easily handled and solved. Previously, conversion from multiplicative to additive variables could be done only by assuming scaling and then using scaling exponents,<sup>4</sup> while the change in variable from  $\epsilon$  to  $\ln \epsilon$  does not rely on scaling assumptions at all. If there is any reason to suspect that multiplicative structures are at work, it is advisable to work in logarithmic quantities.

### Acknowledgements

We mourn the loss of Peter Carruthers and dedicate this work to him. Thanks to the conference organising team for their kind hospitality and support. This work was funded in part by the Foundation for Research Development.

### References

1. M. Greiner, H.C. Eggers and P. Lipa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5333 (1998).
2. M. Greiner, J. Schmiegel, F. Eickemeyer, P. Lipa and H.C. Eggers, Phys. Rev. E **58**, 554 (1998).
3. See e.g. U. Frisch, *Turbulence*, Cambridge University Press (1995).
4. Appendix B in H.-O. Peitgen, H. Jürgens and D. Saupe, *Chaos and Fractals*, Springer (1992).




Figure 6: Cumulants as a function of the ultrametric distances.