

# Universality of multiplicity distribution in proton-proton and electron-positron collisions

Adam Bzdak\*

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

It is argued that the multiplicity distribution in proton-proton ( $pp$ ) collisions, which is often parameterized by the negative binomial distribution, may result from the multiplicity distribution measured in electron-positron ( $e^+e^-$ ) collisions, once the fluctuating energy carried by two leading protons in  $pp$  is taken into account.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The charged particle multiplicity distribution is one of the most basic observables in high energy collisions. Although there is an abundance of experimental results, see e.g., [1, 2], on the theory side this problem is poorly understood.

The multiplicity distribution measured in proton-proton ( $pp$ ) collisions is often parameterized by the negative binomial (NB) distribution [1–5], which is characterized by two parameters: the mean number of particles  $\langle n \rangle$ , and  $k$ , which measures the deviation from the Poisson distribution.<sup>1</sup> NB distribution works reasonably well, with certain limitations [1, 6], for a broad range of energies and in total and limited phase-space rapidity bins. For completeness we add that  $k$  is a decreasing function of energy.

Interestingly, similar experimental observations were made in electron-positron ( $e^+e^-$ ) collisions, see e.g., [2, 7]. NB works relatively well for total and limited phase-space bins in rapidity and  $k$  decreases with energy.

There are many similarities between  $pp$  and  $e^+e^-$ , as far as the soft particle production is concerned, but there are also important differences. At the same  $\sqrt{s}$ , the mean number of particles and  $k$  are significantly larger in  $e^+e^-$  than in  $pp$ .<sup>2</sup>

As pointed out in Refs. [8–10] some differences between  $pp$  and  $e^+e^-$  can be easily understood. In  $pp$  collisions a large fraction of initial energy, given by  $\sqrt{s}$ , is carried away by two leading protons and is not available for particle production. This explains larger mean multiplicity in  $e^+e^-$ , where the leading proton effect is not present. This leads to the striking relation between the total (full phase-space) mean number of charged particles in  $pp$  and  $e^+e^-$  interactions [2], see also [9, 11–18]:

$$N_{pp}(\sqrt{s}) = N_{ee}(K\sqrt{s}) + 2; \quad K = 0.35, \quad (1)$$

that is, the mean number of particles in  $pp$  at a given  $\sqrt{s}$  is given by the mean number of particles in  $e^+e^-$  at  $K\sqrt{s}$ , plus two leading protons. It turns out that the coefficient of inelasticity,  $K$ , present in Eq. (1) is approximately energy independent (see Fig. 10 in Ref. [2]) and Eq. (1) works surprisingly well from 30 to 1800 GeV. It remains to be verified at the LHC energy. More recently, certain similarities between  $e^+e^-$  and ultra-relativistic heavy-ion collisions at RHIC and the LHC were reported [18, 19]. See further discussion in section IV.

Equation (1) is suggestive of a universal mechanism of particle production (or more precisely, a universal mechanism of hadronization) in both systems, controlled mainly by the actual energy deposited into particle creation [8]. In  $e^+e^-$  all initial energy is consumed by produced particles, whereas in  $pp$  the *effective* energy available for particle production is given by

$$E_{\text{eff}}^2 = (p_1 + p_2 - q_1 - q_2)^2 \approx s(1 - x_1)(1 - x_2), \quad (2)$$

where  $p_i$  and  $q_i$  are the incoming and the leading proton momenta, respectively.  $x_i$  is a fraction of the longitudinal momentum carried by a leading proton,  $x_i = q_{i,z}/p_{i,z}$ , and  $s = (p_1 + p_2)^2$ .

We note that a universal hadronization mechanism in  $e^+e^-$  and  $pp$  collisions is strongly supported by the success of the statistical hadronization model [20–22], which provides a very good description of hadronic multiplicities with a common hadronization temperature.

In this paper we show that Eq. (1) can be naturally extended to the whole multiplicity distribution. In particular, we demonstrate that the broad multiplicity distributions measured in  $pp$  collisions naturally result from relatively narrow multiplicity distributions observed in  $e^+e^-$  interactions once the effective energy,  $E_{\text{eff}}$ , in  $pp$  is properly taken into account.

## II. LEADING PROTONS

The problem of multiplicity distribution is naturally more complicated than the mean number of particles; see, e.g., [23]. To proceed we need to specify the leading

\* E-Mail: bzdak@fis.agh.edu.pl

<sup>1</sup> For NB  $\langle n^2 \rangle - \langle n \rangle^2 = \langle n \rangle \left[ 1 + \frac{\langle n \rangle}{k} \right]$ , which goes to Poisson if  $k \rightarrow \infty$  (at fixed  $\langle n \rangle$ ).

<sup>2</sup> For example, at  $\sqrt{s} = 200$  GeV in  $pp$  collisions  $k \approx 5$  (full phase-space) in comparison to  $k \approx 22$  in  $e^+e^-$  at  $\sqrt{s} \approx 100$  GeV, or  $k \approx 16$  when extrapolated to  $\sqrt{s} = 200$  GeV.

proton  $x$  distribution.<sup>3</sup> We choose the beta distribution

$$f(x) \propto x^\lambda (1-x)^\mu. \quad (3)$$

It is supported by rather limited experimental evidence [24, 25]; however, it seems a natural first choice. We note that our discussion is of qualitative character and certain refinements concerning Eq. (3) are certainly possible. Having (3) we obtain

$$\langle x \rangle = \frac{1 + \lambda}{2 + \lambda + \mu}, \quad (4)$$

which is the average momentum fraction taken by a leading proton.

Next we would like to clarify how  $f(x)$  is related to Eq. (1). We obtain<sup>4</sup>

$$N_{\text{pp}}(\sqrt{s}) = \int f(x_1)f(x_2)N_{\text{ee}}(E_{\text{eff}})dx_1dx_2 + 2. \quad (5)$$

Taking

$$N_{\text{ee}}(\sqrt{s}) = a + b \cdot s^\alpha, \quad (6)$$

where  $\alpha \approx 0.17$  [2] (see Section 4 for further discussion) we arrive at

$$N_{\text{pp}}(\sqrt{s}) = N_{\text{ee}}(\langle (1-x)^\alpha \rangle^{1/\alpha} \sqrt{s}) + 2. \quad (7)$$

It means that 0.35 from Eq. (1) is not related to  $\langle 1-x \rangle$ , as naively expected, but to  $\langle (1-x)^\alpha \rangle^{1/\alpha}$ . The latter can be calculated analytically leading to the following equation

$$\langle (1-x)^\alpha \rangle = \frac{\Gamma(1+\alpha+\mu)\Gamma(2+\lambda+\mu)}{\Gamma(1+\mu)\Gamma(2+\alpha+\lambda+\mu)} = 0.35^\alpha, \quad (8)$$

which constrains possible parameters of the beta distribution. Assuming  $\langle x \rangle = 0.4$  [25], see Eq. (4), we obtain  $\lambda \simeq -0.8$  and  $\mu = -0.7$ , which fully determines  $f(x)$ .

### III. CALCULATIONS AND RESULTS

The multiplicity distribution in  $pp$  collisions,  $P_{\text{pp}}(n)$ , is related to the multiplicity distribution in  $e^+e^-$  interactions,  $P_{\text{ee}}(n)$ , as

$$P_{\text{pp}}(n; \sqrt{s}) = \int f(x_1)f(x_2)P_{\text{ee}}(n-2; E_{\text{eff}})dx_1dx_2, \quad (9)$$

where  $n \geq 2$ . This equation is a straightforward generalization of Eq. (5). Instead of directly calculating the integral (9) we performed our calculations as follows.

<sup>3</sup> In other words, we assume that the energy deposited into particle production fluctuates from event to event.

<sup>4</sup> In Ref. [10] it was found that the  $x$ 's of two leading protons are uncorrelated.

First we sampled  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  of two leading protons from the beta distribution,  $f(x)$ , with  $\langle x \rangle = 0.4$  and  $\lambda = -0.8$ , and calculated the effective energy<sup>5</sup>,  $E_{\text{eff}}$ , available for particle production in  $pp$ .<sup>6</sup> Our choice of  $\langle x \rangle$  and  $\lambda$  ensures that Eq. (1) is satisfied with the right coefficient 0.35. Next we sampled the number of particles from the multiplicity distribution measured in  $e^+e^-$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = E_{\text{eff}}$ . Clearly we do not know  $P_{\text{ee}}(n)$  for all energies and thus we assume NB with the mean given by Eq. (6), where  $a = -2.65$ ,  $b = 5.01$ ,  $\alpha = 0.17$ , and  $k^{-1} = c + d \ln(\sqrt{s})$ , where  $c = -0.066$  and  $d = 0.024$  [2].<sup>7</sup> On top of that we add two particles corresponding to the leading protons.

We performed our calculations at  $\sqrt{s} = 30, 200, 900, 1800, 7000, \text{ and } 14000$  GeV. The results are shown in Fig. 1, where the calculated full phase-space multiplicity distributions in  $pp$  collisions (open symbols) are compared with NB fits. We repeat that Eq. (1) is satisfied by construction so our multiplicity distributions have the correct mean values, see Tab. I. The crucial test of our

$\sqrt{s}$ [GeV]	$N_{\text{pp}}$ (model)	$N_{\text{pp}}$ (data)
30.4	11.4	$10.54 \pm 0.14$
200	21.1	$21.4 \pm 0.6$
900	34.6	$35.6 \pm 1.1$
1800	43.7	$45 \pm 1.5$
7000	69.1	–
14000	87.5	–

TABLE I. Calculated mean number of charged particles in  $pp$  collisions (full phase-space) compared with the experimental data.

$\sqrt{s}$ [GeV]	$k$ (model)	$k$ (data)
30.4	12.7	$9.2 \pm 0.9$
200	5.8	$4.8 \pm 0.4$
900	4.2	$3.7 \pm 0.3$
1800	3.8	$3.1 \pm 0.1$
7000	3.3	–
14000	3.0	–

TABLE II.  $k$  parameters, see Eq. (10), of calculated multiplicity distributions in  $pp$  collisions compared with the experimental data.

<sup>5</sup> In our calculations we use the exact formula for  $E_{\text{eff}}^2$  given by  $(\sqrt{s} - \sqrt{m^2 + (x_1 p_z)^2} - \sqrt{m^2 + (x_2 p_z)^2})^2 - p_z^2 (x_1 - x_2)^2$ , where  $p_z^2 = s/4 - m^2$  and  $m$  is a proton mass.

<sup>6</sup> We accept only these events where  $E_{\text{eff}} > 0.3$  GeV so that at least two pions can be produced.

<sup>7</sup> Negative  $k$  is rounded to the integer value. NB with a negative integer  $k$  becomes binomial distribution with the number of trials  $-k$  and the Bernoulli success probability  $-N_{\text{ee}}/k$ . We also checked that the Poisson distribution for  $k < 0$  leads to practically the same results.




FIG. 1. Calculated full phase-space multiplicity distributions in proton-proton collisions (open points) with NB distribution fits (lines). For clarity we show every eighth (second) point in the left (right) plot.

approach is the value of  $k$ , which we calculate as

$$k = \frac{\langle N \rangle^2}{\langle N^2 \rangle - \langle N \rangle^2 - \langle N \rangle}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\langle N \rangle = N_{pp}$ . In Tab. II we list the obtained values of  $k$  and compare them with available data. Taking into account the simplicity of our approach, the agreement is satisfactory.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

Several comments are in order.

(i) We do not offer any explanation of multiplicity distributions in  $e^+e^-$  collisions. Our goal was to demonstrate that the problem of multiplicity distributions in  $pp$  could be reduced to  $e^+e^-$  once the fluctuating energy carried away by two leading protons in  $pp$  collisions is taken into account. We provided new evidence in favor of the hypothesis that the number of produced particles in both systems (also possibly in heavy-ion collisions) is mostly driven by the amount of effective energy deposited into particle production, which naturally varies from event to event, and certain microscopic differences between the two systems are of lesser importance. In the literature this problem is extensively discussed in the context of the average number of particles. The fact that the similar connection holds between the widths of the full multiplicity distributions in  $pp$  and  $e^+e^-$  is new and not *a priori* expected.

(ii) In this paper we focused on the total phase-space multiplicity distributions. It is plausible that the total number of particles is determined (mostly) by the amount of available energy. This is not obvious (expected) for limited phase-space bins since the distribution of parti-

cles in transverse momentum or rapidity may be modified by some nontrivial dynamics. This problem is much more difficult to tackle and any considerations would be strongly model dependent. For example, interesting collective effects were recently discovered in  $pp$  collisions, see, e.g., [27], and their origin is still under debate [28]. A possible parton rescattering (cascade, hydrodynamics) or other sources of correlations are not expected to significantly change the total number of produced particles.

(iii) The starting point of our analysis is the experimental observation summarized in Eq. (1). The coefficient of inelasticity,  $K = 0.35$ , was found [2] to be practically energy independent from  $\sqrt{s} = 30$  to  $\sqrt{s} = 1800$  GeV in contrast to certain dynamical models [2]; see, e.g., Refs. [13, 15, 29]. The value of  $K = 0.35$  is often interpreted as a manifestation of the three-quark structure of the nucleon; see, e.g., Refs. [14, 16–18]. In a typical (minimum-bias)  $pp$  collision roughly one constituent quark per nucleon interacts and this corresponds to an average inelasticity of  $K \approx 1/3$ . In heavy-ion collisions a nucleon usually undergoes more collisions and thus more quarks per nucleon are involved in particle production, leading to a higher value of  $K$  [19]. In fact, the average number of particles produced in heavy-ion collisions is quite well described in a wounded quark or quark-diquark model; see, e.g., Refs. [30–33]. In this paper we argue that an event-by-event fluctuation of  $K$  can naturally connect the multiplicity distributions measured in  $e^+e^-$  and  $pp$  collisions and it would be interesting to investigate the full multiplicity distributions in proton-nucleus ( $pA$ ) and nucleus-nucleus ( $AA$ ) collisions [18, 34].

(iv) The main uncertainty of our approach is the leading proton  $x$  distribution given in Eq. (3). This form is partly supported by existing data, but at rather limited energies and ranges of  $x$ . Thus it should be treated as an educated guess, which hopefully is not far from reality.

In addition, we assumed that  $f(x)$  is energy independent, which is not proven experimentally. A mild energy dependence is indicated by theoretical studies of [15]. The agreement between the model and the data presented in Tab. II suggests that the assumed leading proton  $x$  distribution might be an acceptable first approximation.

(v) To calculate the multiplicity distribution in  $pp$  collisions one needs, as an input, the multiplicity distribution in  $e^+e^-$  at all energies, see Eq. (9). In this paper we assumed that  $e^+e^-$  follows a NB distribution (with the mean given by Eq. (6) and  $k^{-1}$  discussed in Section III), which should be a reasonable approximation for our semi-quantitative study. As seen in Fig. 1, the obtained multiplicity distributions in  $pp$  collisions are close to NB with certain deviations. For example, the NB fits overestimate calculated multiplicity distributions for higher values of  $N$ . Interestingly, similar trends are seen in experimental data; see, e.g., Fig. 6 in Ref. [2] or Figs. 3–5 in Ref. [26]. Also it is known that for higher energies NB seems to fail for both  $e^+e^-$  and  $pp$  collisions [2, 7]. This is not in contradiction to our study. In fact, if the multiplicity distribution is revealing a new structure at a given energy in  $e^+e^-$ , we expect the same phenomena to appear in  $pp$  collisions but at different (higher) energies. In this paper we focus on the width of the multiplicity distribution, being the first step after the mean number of particles, and thus detailed questions regarding an exact shape of the multiplicity distributions are not fully addressed in this paper.

(vi) We extrapolated  $N_{ee}(\sqrt{s})$  into higher energies using the 3NLO QCD result [2, 35], which is almost identical to the NLO QCD fit (see, e.g., Fig. 10 in Ref. [2]) and Eq. (6). For  $k^{-1}$  we assumed it is a linear function of  $\ln(\sqrt{s})$  up to the LHC energies.

(vii) There are many sophisticated Monte Carlo models (PYTHIA [36], HIJING [37], EPOS [38] etc.) that are used to describe the multiplicity distributions in various colliding systems. However, we are not aware of any Monte Carlo model that would naturally explain Eq. (1), which, as discussed earlier, is usually interpreted in the

constituent quark picture. It would be very interesting to investigate this problem in detail, in particular, to see to what extent the multiplicity distribution in  $pp$  is related to the multiplicity distribution in  $e^+e^-$  interactions.

(viii) The particle production in  $pp$  and  $AA$  collisions can be successfully described in the color glass condensate (CGC) approach; see, e.g., [39–41]. In Ref. [39] it was shown that the production of gluons from glasma color flux tubes follows the negative binomial distribution. In Ref. [40] the measured  $pp$  multiplicity distributions were described within the CGC multi-particle production framework. In Ref. [41], the authors argue that the mean number of particles can be described with an input from jet production in  $e^+e^-$  annihilation. It would be interesting to see if the full multiplicity distribution in  $pp$  can be described in a similar manner.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, we argued that the full phase-space multiplicity distribution in  $pp$  collisions is directly related to the multiplicity distribution in  $e^+e^-$  interactions, once the leading proton effect in  $pp$  is properly accounted for. In  $pp$  a large fraction of initial energy, roughly 1/2 on average, is carried away by two leading protons and is not available for particle production. This component fluctuates from event to event, which results in a significantly broader multiplicity distribution in  $pp$  than in  $e^+e^-$ . We provide a new argument in favor of a common mechanism of soft particle production in both systems, which is mainly driven by the amount of energy available for particle production.

## Acknowledgments

I thank Andrzej Bialas for useful discussions. Supported by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education (MNiSW) and by the National Science Centre, Grant No. DEC-2014/15/B/ST2/00175, and in part by DEC-2013/09/B/ST2/00497.

- 
- [1] W. Kittel and E. A. De Wolf, Hackensack, USA: World Scientific (2005) 652 p.
  - [2] J. F. Grosse-Oetringhaus and K. Reygers, J. Phys. G **37**, 083001 (2010) [arXiv:0912.0023 [hep-ex]].
  - [3] R. E. Ansorge *et al.* [UA5 Collaboration], Z. Phys. C **43**, 357 (1989).
  - [4] A. Breakstone *et al.* [Ames-Bologna-CERN-Dortmund-Heidelberg-Warsaw Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **30**, 528 (1984).
  - [5] T. Alexopoulos, E. W. Anderson, N. N. Biswas, A. Bujak, D. D. Carmony, A. R. Erwin, L. J. Gutay and A. S. Hirsch *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **435**, 453 (1998).
  - [6] R. Szwed, G. Wrochna and A. K. Wroblewski, Acta Phys. Polon. B **19**, 763 (1988).
  - [7] D. Buskulic *et al.* [ALEPH Collaboration], Z. Phys. C **69**, 15 (1995).
  - [8] M. Basile, G. Cara Romeo, L. Cifarelli, A. Contin, G. D’Ali, P. Di Cesare, B. Esposito and P. Giusti *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **92**, 367 (1980).
  - [9] M. Basile, G. Cara Romeo, L. Cifarelli, A. Contin, G. D’Ali, P. Di Cesare, B. Esposito and P. Giusti *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **95**, 311 (1980).
  - [10] M. Basile, G. Bonvicini, G. Cara Romeo, L. Cifarelli, A. Contin, M. Curatolo, G. D’Ali and C. Del Papa *et al.*, Nuovo Cim. A **73**, 329 (1983).
  - [11] E. Fermi, Prog. Theor. Phys. **5**, 570 (1950).
  - [12] J. Benecke, A. Bialas and E. H. de Groot, Phys. Lett. **57B**, 447 (1975).
  - [13] K. Kadija and M. Martinis, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 2027 (1993).
  - [14] T. F. Hoang, Z. Phys. C **62**, 481 (1994).
  - [15] M. Batista and R. J. M. Covolan, Phys. Rev. D **59**,

- 054006 (1999) [hep-ph/9811425].
- [16] P. V. Chliapnikov and V. A. Uvarov, Phys. Lett. B **251**, 192 (1990).
- [17] E. K. G. Sarkisyan and A. S. Sakharov, Eur. Phys. J. C **70**, 533 (2010) [arXiv:1004.4390 [hep-ph]].
- [18] E. K. G. Sarkisyan, A. N. Mishra, R. Sahoo and A. S. Sakharov, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 1, 011501 (2016) [arXiv:1603.09040 [hep-ph]].
- [19] B. B. Back *et al.* [PHOBOS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. C **74**, 021902 (2006).
- [20] F. Becattini, In \*Erice 1996, Universality features in multihadron production and the leading effect\* 74-104. [hep-ph/9701275].
- [21] F. Becattini, P. Castorina, J. Manninen and H. Satz, Eur. Phys. J. C **56**, 493 (2008) [arXiv:0805.0964 [hep-ph]].
- [22] F. Becattini and R. Fries, Landolt-Bornstein **23**, 208 (2010) [arXiv:0907.1031 [nucl-th]].
- [23] M. Basile *et al.*, Lett. Nuovo Cim. **41**, 293 (1984).
- [24] J. W. Chapman, J. W. Cooper, I. N. Green, A. A. Seidl, J. C. Van der Velde, C. Bromberg, D. H. Cohen and T. Ferbel *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **32**, 257 (1974).
- [25] M. Basile, G. Bonvicini, G. Cara Romeo, L. Cifarelli, A. Contin, M. Curatolo, G. d'Ali and C. Del Papa *et al.*, Lett. Nuovo Cim. **38**, 359 (1983).
- [26] P. Ghosh, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 054017 (2012) [arXiv:1202.4221 [hep-ph]].
- [27] V. Khachatryan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], JHEP **1009**, 091 (2010) [arXiv:1009.4122 [hep-ex]].
- [28] K. Dusling, W. Li and B. Schenke, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **25**, no. 01, 1630002 (2016) [arXiv:1509.07939 [nucl-ex]].
- [29] G. N. Fowler, F. S. Navarra, M. Plumer, A. Vourdas, R. M. Weiner and G. Wilk, Phys. Rev. C **40**, 1219 (1989).
- [30] A. Bialas and A. Bzdak, Phys. Lett. B **649** (2007) 263; Acta Phys. Pol. B **38** (2007) 159; Phys. Rev. C **77** (2008) 034908.
- [31] S. S. Adler *et al.* [PHENIX Collaboration], Phys. Rev. C **89**, no. 4, 044905 (2014) [arXiv:1312.6676 [nucl-ex]].
- [32] P. Bozek, W. Broniowski and M. Rybczynski, Phys. Rev. C **94**, no. 1, 014902 (2016) [arXiv:1604.07697 [nucl-th]].
- [33] R. A. Lacey, P. Liu, N. Magdy, M. Csand, B. Schweid, N. N. Ajitanand, J. Alexander and R. Pak, arXiv:1601.06001 [nucl-ex].
- [34] A. Akindinov, A. Alici, P. Antonioli, S. Arcelli, M. Basile, G. Cara Romero, M. Chumakov and L. Cifarelli *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **50**, 341 (2007) [arXiv:0709.1664 [hep-ph]].
- [35] I. M. Dremin and J. W. Gary, Phys. Rept. **349**, 301 (2001) [hep-ph/0004215].
- [36] T. Sjostrand *et al.*, Comput. Phys. Commun. **191**, 159 (2015) [arXiv:1410.3012 [hep-ph]].
- [37] X. N. Wang and M. Gyulassy, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 3501 (1991).
- [38] T. Pierog and K. Werner, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **196**, 102 (2009) [arXiv:0905.1198 [hep-ph]].
- [39] F. Gelis, T. Lappi and L. McLerran, Nucl. Phys. A **828**, 149 (2009) [arXiv:0905.3234 [hep-ph]].
- [40] P. Tribedy and R. Venugopalan, Nucl. Phys. A **850**, 136 (2011) Erratum: [Nucl. Phys. A **859**, 185 (2011)] [arXiv:1011.1895 [hep-ph]].
- [41] E. Levin and A. H. Rezaeian, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 114001 (2011) [arXiv:1102.2385 [hep-ph]].