

Application of the Bogolyubov's theory of weakly non-ideal Bose gas on the $A + A$, $A + B$, $B + B$ reaction-diffusion system

Zoran Konkoli

Department of Applied Physics
Chalmers University of Technology
and Göteborg University,
SE 412 96 Göteborg,
Sweden

(April 14, 2024)

Theoretical methods for dealing with diffusion-controlled reactions inevitably rely on some kind of approximation and to find the one that works on a particular problem is not always easy. In here the approximation used by Bogolyubov to study weakly non-ideal Bose gas, to be referred to as weakly non-ideal Bose gas approximation (WBG A), is applied in the analysis of the three reaction-diffusion models (i) $A + A \rightarrow \emptyset$; (ii) $A + B \rightarrow \emptyset$; and (iii) $A + A \rightarrow B + B$; $A + B \rightarrow \emptyset$; (the ABBA model). The two types of WBG A are considered, the simpler WBG A-I and more complicated WBG A-II. All models are defined on the lattice to facilitate comparison with computer experiment (simulation). It is found that the WBG A describes $A + B$ reaction well, it reproduces correct $d=4$ density decay exponent. However, it fails in the case of the $A + A$ reaction and the ABBA model. (To cure deficiency of WBG A in dealing with $A + A$ model the hybrid of WBG A and Kirkwood superposition approximation is suggested.) It is shown that the WBG A-I is identical to the dressed tree calculation suggested by Lee in J. Phys. A 27, 2633 (1994), and that the dressed tree calculation does not lead to the $d/2$ density decay exponent when applied to the $A + A$ reaction, as normally believed, but it predicts $d/4$ decay exponent. Last, the usage of the small n_0 approximation suggested by Mattis and Glasser in Rev. Mod. Phys. 70 (3), 979 (1998) is questioned if used beyond $A + B$ reaction-diffusion model.

I. INTRODUCTION

A variety of methods have been used to study diffusion-controlled reactions (see, e.g., refs. [1-8] for review) ranging from simplest pair-like or Smoluchowski approach [9] towards more sophisticated methods such as many particle density function formalism [4,5] and field theory [6-8]. In here, we focus on the field theory approach which is exact but, like in any other theory, one needs approximations to solve the problem. The particular way of making approximate calculations will be analyzed, the Bogolyubov's theory of weakly non-ideal Bose gas [10], to be referred to in the following as Weakly non-ideal Bose Gas Approximation (WBG A).

The field theory is very attractive since it offers systematic way to do calculation and there are well known procedures how to represent stochastic dynamics of reaction-diffusion systems as field theory. Such mapping can be carried out for lattice- and off-lattice models, see [6] and [9] respectively for description. Final result is that the dynamics is governed by a second quantized Hamiltonian $H(a; a^\dagger)$,

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \langle t \rangle = H(a; a^\dagger) \langle t \rangle \quad (1)$$

and system configuration at time t can be extracted from state vector $\langle t \rangle$. All observables can be expressed as a field theoretic averages over products of creation and annihilation operators a^\dagger and a .

There is no need whatsoever to resort to the use of field theory as all calculations could be done without it. The reasons for using it are mostly practical. Field theory is a powerful book-keeping device. First, approximations involved can be made more transparent and, second, due to this transparency it is relatively straightforward to borrow approximations from other problems (and related forms of field theory).

However, despite its elegance, when applied to the reaction-diffusion systems, field theory seems to work with limited success. Most often the only practical procedure of solving field theory is perturbative calculation. Diffusion is set up as the zeroth order problem and reaction is perturbation. Problem is that in the most interesting regime, when dimension of the system is low (below some critical dimension), perturbation series diverges due to infra-red divergences. Any non-field theoretic approach which aims at perturbative treatment will suffer in a similar way.

The infra-red divergences are normally controlled in the framework of the renormalization group (RG) tech-

nique. When applying RG, the initial density is relevant parameter and grows under renormalization process. Growing initial densities lead to infinities in expressions which have to be controlled. So far, such control exists only in the limited amount of cases, the $A + A$ reaction being the simplest example. Clearly, there is a need to avoid perturbative treatment (together with RG) and look for alternative ways of calculation. In here, focus is on the W BGA.

The W BGA was used to study reaction-diffusion systems previously [8,9,11,13]. In somewhat technical terms, the basic idea behind W BGA is to neglect the products containing three or higher number of annihilation operators having non-zero wave vector in the Hamiltonian. This procedure leads to closed set of equations for particle density and correlation functions. Solving these equations amounts to resummation of infinite series of diagrams. In this way W BGA appears as a non-perturbative technique which can be used to control infra-red divergences of perturbation series. In the following, we will distinguish between two types of approximations to be referred to as W BGA-I or W BGA-II which result in linear or nonlinear set of equations of motion respectively.

On the more intuitive basis, the neglect of fluctuations on the shorter length scale (large k vectors) has to do with the slowness of diffusion. For initial conditions when particle density is uniform there is no $k \neq 0$ component in average particle density and the density profile is flat. Since diffusion is a very slow process one expects that this profile is kept all the time up to a small perturbation. This picture is likely to be true when particle density is low when compared to the reaction range, which is summarized in the condition that $nr^d \ll 1$ where n and r denote the particle density and the reaction range [9]. Naturally, there are other scales in the problem (which change in time) and this kind of thinking can not be employed without encountering problems [4]. In reality, one really has to test the W BGA on the particular model to see whether it works.

To analyze properties of the W BGA method, we apply it in the analysis of three diffusion-controlled reactions (i) the $A + A$, (ii) the $A + B$ and (iii) the ABBA model. The ABBA model includes $A + A$, $A + B$ and $B + B$ reactions simultaneously which allows for competitions between $A + A$ and $A + B$ reactions (see ref. [14,15] for more details). The $A + A$ and $A + B$ models have been studied by variety of methods (see, e.g., ref. [16] for review). In here, the focus is on the W BGA studies. Apart from few initial studies of the $A + A$ and $A + B$ models the W BGA have not been widely used. These early applications of W BGA on $A + A$ and $A + B$ reaction-diffusion systems are mostly done for stationary situation (and decay from it) and are listed in refs. [11] ($A + A$) and [12,13] ($A + B$). Also, the W BGA reappears in paper [6] where it is used to study the $A + B$ reaction.

The purpose of this work is twofold. First, we study $A + A$ and $A + B$ reactions with uncorrelated initial conditions with particles Poisson-distributed [17] at initial time $t = 0$. In previous work which employed W BGA method in refs. [11,13] it was assumed that particles are initially correlated, with a initial condition being prepared in a somewhat special way [18]. Second, once the workings of the W BGA approximation is illuminated, we apply the W BGA method to analyze the more complicated ABBA model. This model was studied previously with field theoretic RG technique using ϵ -expansion and numerical simulation [14,15]. The ABBA model describes a mixture of the $A + A$ and $A + B$ reactions which occur at the same time. The $A + A$ ($A + B$) component bias kinetics towards $d=2$ ($d=4$) decay exponent and it is not a priori clear which exponent will prevail. The analysis in [14,15] shows that both A and B particles decay with $d=2$ decay exponent and different amplitudes.

The $A + A$ model has been studied by variety of methods and lot is known about its behavior. The study most relevant for this work is given in ref. [19]. For uncorrelated initial conditions particle density n decays asymptotically as $n \sim A(Dt)^{d-2}$ for $d < 2$ while there is logarithmic correction at $d = 2$ as $n \sim \ln(Dt)/(8Dt)$, where d denotes dimension of system, t is time and D denotes diffusion constant. Amplitude A is universal number independent on the details of the model. Also, the exact solution of the model is possible at $d = 1$ where $n \sim 1/(8Dt)$ [20].

The $d=2$ decay exponent of the $A + A$ reaction is robust in a sense that even simplest pair like approach (e.g. Smoluchowski) predicts this exponent. Thus, it is natural to test W BGA on the $A + A$ model. It will be shown that, somewhat surprisingly, W BGA fails to describe $A + A$ reaction: W BGA-I predicts $d=4$ decay exponent while W BGA-II gives mean field exponent.

Taking slightly more complicated reaction scheme, such as the $A + B$, leads to very hard problem where calculation methods start to differ in their predictions. The nature of the asymptotics of $A + B$ reaction when initial number of A and B particles is equal has been hotly debated for decades. For example, Smoluchowski approach predicts $d=2$ decay exponent [4,5,9]. Field theoretic RG method predicts correct $d=4$ decay for $3 < d < 4$ [21], while for other dimensions nothing can be said in the RG framework. Strangely enough, seemingly the most sophisticated coupled-cluster technique argues for mean field exponent [22]. The true decay is governed by $d=4$ exponent as shown by work of Bramson and Lebowitz which provided strict mathematical proof [23]. It will be shown that when particles are initially uncorrelated, i.e. Poisson-distributed, both the W BGA-I and W BGA-II predict $d=4$ decay exponent. Strangely enough, W BGA fails on simpler $A + A$ reaction while it describes properly more complicated $A + B$ reaction.

The paper is organized as follows. In section II the

model to be studied is specified in detail, and mapping to the field theory is described. The outcome of this section is Hamiltonian which describes the most general two species reaction-diffusion model. In section III equations of motion for density and correlation functions are derived using WBG method. In section IV the WBG approach is used to describe A+A model, with application of WBG-I discussed in section IV A, and application of WBG-II in section IV B. Also in section IV A equivalence of dressed tree calculation with WBG-I is shown. Section IV C discusses modification of Kirkwood superposition approximation in the spirit of WBG. In section V A+B model is studied by using WBG-I and WBG-II methods. Finally, the analysis of the most complicated of three models studied here, the ABBA model, is presented in section VI. Workings of WBG-I are analyzed in section VI A and of WBG-II in section VI B. The step by step merger of WBG and Kirkwood superposition approximation is discussed in VI C. The summary and outline of future work is given in section VII.

II. THE MODEL AND THE MAPPING TO THE FIELD THEORY

The mapping to the field theory will be carried out for the most general two-species reaction-diffusion model. The A+A, A+B and the ABBA model will be obtained as special cases. It will be assumed that particles can not be created, neither by external source, nor by birth process. In the most general version of the two species reaction-diffusion model each of the A or B particles jumps onto the one of the neighboring lattice sites with rate (or diffusion constant) D_A or D_B , irrespectively of occupation number of the site where particle jumps to. Apart from diffusing particles annihilate in pairs. Particle sitting at lattice site x and particle sitting at the site y are assumed to annihilate with rate γ_{xy} . This is schematically denoted as



where $\cdot = A, B$ and $x, y = 1, 2, 3, \dots, V$. It is assumed that there are L lattice sites in one direction, and for dimensions total number of sites equals $V = L^d$. Labels x and y denote lattice sites.

The stochastic dynamics of the most general two-species model is governed by the master equation of the system. The master equation describes transitions between different configurations c . The configuration of the system is specified by the occupancy of lattice sites at certain time t ;

$$c = (n_1; m_1; \dots; n_x; m_x; \dots; n_y; m_y; \dots; n_V; m_V) \quad (3)$$

n_x and m_x count number of A and B particles respectively at x -th lattice site; $n_x, m_x = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and

$x = 1, 2, \dots, V$. The quantity of interest is $P(c; t)$, which denotes probability that at given time t system is in the configuration c .

Diffusion and reaction contribute independently to change of $P(c; t)$;

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} P(c; t) = P_D(c; t) + P_R(c; t) \quad (4)$$

The influence of diffusion is described by

$$P_D(c; t) = \sum_{x \in \langle x \rangle} \sum_{e(x)} D_A [(n_x + 1)P(e_{n_x+1}; t) - n_x P(c; t)] + \sum_{x \in \langle x \rangle} D_B [(m_x + 1)P(e_{m_x+1}; t) - m_x P(c; t)] \quad (5)$$

where notation $P(e_{:::}; t)$ indicates that content of the sites specified by $:::$ has been modified in c . The $\sum_{e(x)}$ denotes sum over all first-neighbor sites of the site x . The change of $P(c; t)$ driven by reactions is given by

$$P_R(c; t) = \sum_x \sum_{xx} \frac{A_A (n_x + 2)(n_x + 1)}{2} P(e_{n_x+2}; t) + \sum_x \sum_{xx} \frac{B_B (m_x + 2)(m_x + 1)}{2} P(e_{m_x+2}; t) + \sum_x \sum_{xx} \frac{A_B (n_x + 1)(m_x + 1)}{1} P(e_{n_x+1, m_x+1}; t) + \sum_x \sum_{xy} \frac{A_A (n_x + 1)(n_y + 1)}{1} P(e_{n_x+1, n_y+1}; t) + \sum_{x > y} \sum_{xy} \frac{B_B (m_x + 1)(m_y + 1)}{1} P(e_{m_x+1, m_y+1}; t) + \sum_{x > y} \sum_{xy} \frac{A_B (n_x + 1)(m_y + 1)}{1} P(e_{n_x+1, m_y+1}; t) + \sum_{x \neq y} \sum_{xx} \frac{A_A n_x (n_x - 1)}{2} + \sum_{x > y} \sum_{xx} \frac{B_B m_x (m_x - 1)}{2} + \sum_x \sum_{xx} \frac{A_B n_x m_x}{1} + \sum_{x > y} \sum_{xy} \frac{A_A n_x n_y}{1} + \sum_{x > y} \sum_{xy} \frac{B_B m_x m_y}{1} + \sum_{x \neq y} \sum_{xy} \frac{A_B n_x m_y}{1} P(c; t) \quad (6)$$

The form of the master equation describing reactions can not be made more compact since distinction has to be made between reaction on the same and different lattice sites. For example, the term describing A+A reaction at the same lattice site has the pre-factor $n_x(n_x - 1)$ while for two different sites another form $n_x n_y$ has to be used.

The master equation (4) is the first order differential equation and one has to specify initial condition in the form $P(c; 0)$ for all c . In the following it will be assumed that $P(c; 0)$ is Poisson distribution with averages denoted

by $n_{0,A}$ and $n_{0,B}$ for A and B particles respectively. This means that $P(c;0)$ factorises,

$$P(c;0) = \prod_{x=0;1;2;\dots;V} P(n_x; n_{0,A}) P(m_x; n_{0,B}) \quad (7)$$

where $p(n;n)$ denotes Poisson distribution function

$$p(n;n) = e^{-n} n^n / n!; \quad n = 0;1;2;\dots \quad (8)$$

Eq. (4) can be translated into a Schrodinger-type equation (1) by defining state vector,

$$|t\rangle = \prod_{n_1, m_1, \dots, n_V, m_V} P(n_1; m_1; \dots; n_V; m_V; t) \prod_{i=1}^V (a_i^\dagger)^{n_1} (b_i^\dagger)^{m_1} \dots (a_V^\dagger)^{n_V} (b_V^\dagger)^{m_V} |0\rangle \quad (9)$$

where a_x^\dagger , a_x , b_x^\dagger , and b_x are creation and annihilation operators for A and B particles respectively;

$$\begin{aligned} [a_x; a_y^\dagger] &= \delta_{xy}; \quad [b_x; b_y^\dagger] = \delta_{xy}; \\ [a_x; b_y^\dagger] &= [a_x^\dagger; b_y] = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

and $[I; II] = I II - II I$ denotes commutator. One can see that Eq. (4) is equivalent to the Eq. (1) provided dynamics is governed by the second-quantized Hamiltonian $H = H_D + H_R$. Term H_D describes diffusion

$$H_D = \sum_{x,y} \sum_{A,B} [D_A a_x^\dagger (a_x - a_y) + D_B b_x^\dagger (b_x - b_y)] \quad (11)$$

and H_R reactions

$$\begin{aligned} H_R &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,y} \sum_{A,A} (a_x^\dagger a_y^\dagger - 1) a_x a_y + \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,y} \sum_{B,B} (b_x^\dagger b_y^\dagger - 1) b_x b_y + \\ &+ \sum_{x,y} \sum_{A,B} (a_x^\dagger b_y^\dagger - 1) a_x b_y \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Please note that expression for H_R has the more compact form than the expression for related part of the master equation (6) as all sums in (12) over x and y are unrestricted (a first sign of convenient book-keeping). Also the fact that reactions $A+A$, $B+B$ and $A+B$ happen independently from each other in unifies the form of H_R ; contributions describing $A+A$ (first line of Eq. 12), $B+B$ (second line) and $A+B$ (third line) enter additively.

Once H has been specified $|t\rangle$ can be found from (1),

$$|t\rangle = e^{-Ht} |0\rangle \quad (13)$$

In general, form of $|0\rangle$ depends on the initial particle distribution and for Poisson-distributed particles equals

$$|0\rangle = \exp \left(\sum_x n_{0,A} (a_x^\dagger - 1) + \sum_x n_{0,B} (b_x^\dagger - 1) \right) |0\rangle \quad (14)$$

Since $|t\rangle$ is available (at least in principle) one can calculate various observables with following recipe

$$\langle O(n_x(t)) \rangle = \langle 0 | \prod_x (a_x^\dagger a_x) |t\rangle \quad (15)$$

where $O(n_x)$ denotes any function which depends on particle numbers in arbitrary way. The generalization of Eq. (15) for more complicated form for $O(n_x; m_y; \dots)$ is trivial. Vector $|0\rangle$ is given by

$$|0\rangle = \exp \left(\sum_x (a_x + b_x) \right) |0\rangle \quad (16)$$

being left eigenvector of a_x^\dagger and b_x^\dagger with eigenvalue 1. To see that Eq. (15) indeed evaluates observables correctly one can expand function O in Taylor series in n_x and check that for every term in Taylor series Eq. (15) works.

Following ref. [6], since $\langle 0 | a_x^\dagger |0\rangle = 0$, it is useful to transform Eq. (15) slightly in order to obtain form where $|0\rangle$ changes into the vacuum state $|0\rangle$. This makes calculation somewhat easier since one can use property of the vacuum that $\langle 0 | a_x^\dagger |0\rangle = 0$. To do the transformation following identity proves useful,

$$\langle 0 | \prod_x (a_x^\dagger; a_x) |0\rangle = \langle 0 | \prod_x (a_x^\dagger + 1; a_x) |0\rangle \quad (17)$$

and by using (17) Eq. (15) can be written in the form

$$\langle O(n_x(t)) \rangle = \langle 0 | \prod_x ((a_x^\dagger + 1) a_x) e^{-Ht} |0\rangle \quad (18)$$

where bar over H and $|0\rangle$ indicates that substitution

$$a_x^\dagger \rightarrow a_x^\dagger + 1; \quad b_x^\dagger \rightarrow b_x^\dagger + 1; \quad x = 0;1;2;\dots;V \quad (19)$$

have been made. The $|0\rangle$ is given by

$$|0\rangle = \exp \left(\sum_x n_{0,A} a_x^\dagger + \sum_x n_{0,B} b_x^\dagger \right) |0\rangle \quad (20)$$

and $H = H_D + H_R$. After the shift H_D does not change the form, i.e. $H_D = H_D$, while H_R changes into

$$\begin{aligned} H_R &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,y} \sum_{A,A} (a_x^\dagger + a_y^\dagger + a_x^\dagger a_y^\dagger) a_x a_y + \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,y} \sum_{B,B} (b_x^\dagger + b_y^\dagger + b_x^\dagger b_y^\dagger) b_x b_y + \\ &+ \sum_{x,y} \sum_{A,B} (a_x^\dagger + b_y^\dagger + a_x^\dagger b_y^\dagger) a_x b_y \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

In the following we compactify notation and use

$$hf(a_x; a_y^y; \dots) i = h0 f(a_x; a_y^y; \dots) e^{H t} j_0 i \quad (22)$$

where f denotes any function of operators a_x, a_y^y, b_x and b_y^y for any x and y . Also notation

$$(t) = e^{H t} \quad (23)$$

will be useful.

To avoid effects of boundaries periodic boundary conditions are assumed and one can introduce Fourier transforms for operators,

$$a_x = \frac{1}{V} \sum_k e^{ikx} a_k; a_x^y = \frac{1}{V} \sum_k e^{-ikx} a_k^y \quad (24)$$

$$b_x = \frac{1}{V} \sum_k e^{ikx} b_k; b_x^y = \frac{1}{V} \sum_k e^{-ikx} b_k^y \quad (25)$$

and reaction rates

$$x = \frac{1}{V} \sum_k e^{ikx}; k = \sum_x x e^{-ikx} \quad (26)$$

with $x, k = A, B$. For convenience, Fourier transforms are defined slightly differently for operators and reaction rates (just to reduce explicit occurrence of V in expressions later on). Also, it is useful to express Hamiltonian H in terms of creation and annihilation operators in k -space. Starting from (11) and (21), and using (24)-(26) gives

$$H_D = D_A \sum_k k^2 a_k^y a_k + D_B \sum_k k^2 b_k^y b_k + O(k^4) \quad (27)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H_R = & \frac{1}{V} \sum_{q,k} \sum_{q',k'} A_A a_q^y a_k a_{q+k} \\ & + \frac{1}{2V} \sum_{q,k;l} \sum_{q',k'} A_A a_q^y a_{l-k}^y a_k a_{q+l-k} \\ & + \frac{1}{V} \sum_{q,k} \sum_{q',k'} B_B b_q^y b_k b_{q+k} \\ & + \frac{1}{2V} \sum_{q,k;l} \sum_{q',k'} B_B b_q^y b_{l-k}^y b_k b_{q+l-k} \\ & + \frac{1}{V} \sum_{q,k} \sum_{q',k'} A_B (a_q^y a_k b_{q+k} + b_q^y b_k a_{q+k}) \\ & + \frac{1}{V} \sum_{q,k;l} \sum_{q',k'} A_B a_q^y b_{l-k}^y a_k b_{q+l-k} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Please note that Eq. (27) is an approximation which is valid for small k . The form in Eq. (28) is exact. Once the explicit form of H is known one can proceed with calculation of particle density, as shown in the next section.

III. EQUATIONS OF MOTION FOR DENSITY AND THE CORRELATION FUNCTIONS

Equation (18) summarizes how observables are calculated within the field theory formalism. We continue with the specific case of local particle densities $n_A(x;t)$ and $n_B(x;t)$, which can be calculated with $O = a_x^y a_x$ and $O = b_x^y b_x$ respectively; using (18) one gets $n_A(x;t) = h a_x i$ and $n_B(x;t) = h b_x i$, or more explicitly

$$n_A(x;t) = h0 a_x j_0 i = h0 a_x e^{H t} j_0 i \quad (29)$$

$$n_B(x;t) = h0 b_x j_0 i = h0 b_x e^{H t} j_0 i \quad (30)$$

If initial conditions are translationally invariant, which is the case for Poisson-distributed particles, local particles densities are position independent, i.e. $n_A(x;t) = n_A(t)$ and $n_B(x;t) = n_B(t)$. Also at $t = 0$ $n(0) = n_0$, with $n_0 = A/B$. It is convenient to re-express $n_{AP}(t)$ and $n_B(t)$ as $n_A(t) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_x n_A(x;t)$ and $n_B(t) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_x n_B(x;t)$. Using field theory $n_A(t)$ and $n_B(t)$ can be calculated from

$$n_A(t) = \frac{1}{V} h \sum_x a_x i = \frac{1}{V} h a_0 i \quad (31)$$

$$n_B(t) = \frac{1}{V} h \sum_x b_x i = \frac{1}{V} h b_0 i \quad (32)$$

where the sum over x divided by V was recognized as $k = 0$ component of a_k and b_k .

The equations of motion for $n_A(t)$ and $n_B(t)$ can be derived as follows. $n_A(t)$ and $n_B(t)$ are proportional to $h a_0 i$ and $h b_0 i$ respectively, and it is sufficient to derive equations for them. Taking time derivative of $h a_0 i$ and $h b_0 i$ gives,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} h a_0 i = h [a_0; H] i \quad (33)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} h b_0 i = h [b_0; H] i \quad (34)$$

The commutator emerges when time derivative acts on $\exp(-H t)$ [24]. Evaluating the commutator with H given in (27) and (28), and taking into account (31) and (32) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial n_A}{\partial t} = & \frac{A_A}{0} n_A n_A + \frac{A_B}{0} n_A n_B + \frac{1}{V} \sum_{k \neq 0} (\frac{A_A}{k} \frac{A_A}{k} + \frac{A_B}{k} \frac{A_B}{k})^5 \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial n_B}{\partial t} = & \frac{B_B}{0} n_B n_B + \frac{A_B}{0} n_A n_B + \frac{1}{V} \sum_{k \neq 0} (\frac{B_B}{k} \frac{B_B}{k} + \frac{A_B}{k} \frac{A_B}{k})^5 \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where

$$\begin{matrix} A A \\ k \end{matrix} h_k a_{k i} \quad (37)$$

$$\begin{matrix} B B \\ k \end{matrix} h_k b_{k i} \quad (38)$$

$$\begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix} h_k b_{k i} \quad (39)$$

To derive (35) and (36) the sum over k is split into $k = 0$ and $k \neq 0$ parts and assumption is made that $k = 0$ components are non-fluctuating, i.e. $h_0 a_0 i = h_0 i h_0 i$ and likewise for $h_0 b_0 i$ and $h_0 b_0 i$ (thermodynamic limit).

The equations (35) and (36) involve correlation functions $\begin{matrix} A A \\ k \end{matrix}$ with $\begin{matrix} ; \\ k \end{matrix} = A; B$ which we proceed to calculate. The time evolution of correlators is governed by $[D; H]$ with $O = a_k a_k; a_k b_k; b_k b_k$. Evaluating commutators gives equations of motion,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{matrix} A A \\ k \end{matrix} &= 2D_A k^2 \begin{matrix} A A \\ k \end{matrix} - \begin{matrix} A A \\ k \end{matrix} n_A^2 + \\ &+ \frac{1}{V} \sum_{q \neq k} \begin{matrix} A A \\ q \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} A A \\ k+q \end{matrix} + 2 \left(\begin{matrix} A A \\ 0 \end{matrix} + \begin{matrix} A A \\ k \end{matrix} \right) n_A \begin{matrix} A A \\ k \end{matrix} + \\ &+ \begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix} n_A \left(\begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix} + \begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix} \right) + 2 \begin{matrix} A B \\ 0 \end{matrix} n_B \begin{matrix} A A \\ k \end{matrix} \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{matrix} B B \\ k \end{matrix} &= 2D_B k^2 \begin{matrix} B B \\ k \end{matrix} - \begin{matrix} B B \\ k \end{matrix} n_B^2 + \\ &+ \frac{1}{V} \sum_{q \neq k} \begin{matrix} B B \\ q \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} B B \\ k+q \end{matrix} + 2 \left(\begin{matrix} B B \\ 0 \end{matrix} + \begin{matrix} B B \\ k \end{matrix} \right) n_B \begin{matrix} B B \\ k \end{matrix} + \\ &+ \begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix} n_B \left(\begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix} + \begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix} \right) + 2 \begin{matrix} A B \\ 0 \end{matrix} n_A \begin{matrix} B B \\ k \end{matrix} \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix} &= (D_A + D_B) k^2 \begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix} - \begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix} n_A n_B + \\ &+ \frac{1}{V} \sum_{q \neq k} \begin{matrix} A B \\ q \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} A B \\ k+q \end{matrix} - 5 \left(\begin{matrix} A A \\ 0 \end{matrix} + \begin{matrix} A A \\ k \end{matrix} \right) n_A + \\ &+ \left(\begin{matrix} B B \\ 0 \end{matrix} + \begin{matrix} B B \\ k \end{matrix} \right) n_B + \begin{matrix} A B \\ 0 \end{matrix} (n_A + n_B) \begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix} \\ &+ \begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix} (n_A \begin{matrix} B B \\ k \end{matrix} + n_B \begin{matrix} A A \\ k \end{matrix}) \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Eqs. (40), (41) and (42) are approximate since correlators of type $h_k a_q a_l i$ with $k \neq 0, q \neq 0$, and $l \neq 0$ are assumed to be small. This is exactly the content of the W BGA.

Few comments about the inversion symmetry (in k -space) of $\begin{matrix} ; \\ k \end{matrix} = A; B$ are in order. By construction, $\begin{matrix} (t) \\ k \end{matrix} = \begin{matrix} (t) \\ k \end{matrix}$ for $\begin{matrix} ; \\ k \end{matrix} = A; B$ since these functions represent correlations for same operator types. It is not obvious whether this property holds for $\begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix}$ which describes correlations for different operators type. Using Eq. (42) to derive equation of motion for $\begin{matrix} (t) \\ k \end{matrix}$ provided $\begin{matrix} (0) \\ k \end{matrix} = 0$. The initial conditions for $\begin{matrix} ; \\ k \end{matrix}$ with $\begin{matrix} ; \\ k \end{matrix} = A; B$ are given by

$$\begin{matrix} (0) \\ k \end{matrix} = \begin{matrix} ; \\ 0 \end{matrix} V n_0; n_0; \quad ; \quad ; = A; B \quad (43)$$

where δ_{xy} denotes Kronecker delta-function,

$$\delta_{xy} = \begin{cases} 1 & x = y \\ 0 & x \neq y \end{cases} \quad (44)$$

Also, notation

$$\delta_{xy} = 1 \quad \delta_{xy} \quad (45)$$

will be used. Thus $\begin{matrix} (0) \\ k \end{matrix}$ is indeed zero. It follows that $\begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix}(t) = \begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix}(t)$ for every $t \geq 0$. In the following whenever $\begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix} + \begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix}$ appears in the equations of motion, we will use assumption of inversion symmetry and shorten expression to $2 \begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix}$. Naturally, if this inversion symmetry is broken at $t = 0$ one has to keep full form $\begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix} + \begin{matrix} A B \\ k \end{matrix}$ in the equations of motion, but such case is not considered here.

The last terms in Eqs. (40)–(42), which are product of density and correlator, and appear to be third order in density $O(n^3)$, lead to non-linear equations of motion. These terms come from averages of the type $h_k a_q a_l i$ where one of k, q, l momenta is zero while remaining two are not. One example would be $h_0 a_k a_l i$ which is approximately equal to $h_0 i h_k a_l i$. (Same discussion would apply irrespectively which operator one uses in average, a_k or b_k .) Being third order in density, it is tempting to neglect these $O(n^3)$ terms, since one expects that leading contribution should come from terms which are second order in density $O(n^2)$, e.g. first and second terms on the right hand side of Eq. (40) and likewise for Eqs. (41) and (42). To test the effect of neglecting or keeping $O(n^3)$ terms two approximations will be studied W BGA-I or W BGA-II with $O(n^3)$ terms taken away or kept in the calculation. W BGA-I approximation results in a linear set of equations which makes the analytical analysis possible. Also, as formulated above, the W BGA-II and W BGA appear to be equivalent. In the following, the term W BGA will imply both W BGA-I and W BGA-II.

The equations of motion for the three models we wish to study, the A + A, A + B and ABBA are easily extracted from the most general form given in (35)–(36) and (40)–(42). To obtain equations of motion for the ABBA model one simply sets $D_A = D_B = D$ and

$$\begin{matrix} A A \\ xy \end{matrix} = \begin{matrix} B B \\ xy \end{matrix} = \delta_{xy}; \quad \begin{matrix} A B \\ xy \end{matrix} = \delta_{xy} \quad (46)$$

An obvious distinction is being made between Kronecker delta-function δ_{xy} and the symbol δ_{xy} which denotes the reaction rate. Thus particles have to meet at the same lattice site in order to react. Further, to obtain the A + A model one simply sets $\delta_{xy} = 0$ (this decouples A + A and B + B reactions, i.e. particles A and B move and react independently of each other). To get A + B model one takes $\delta_{xy} = 0$ which rules out the A + A reaction. In the following section we continue with analysis of the A + A model within W BGA framework.

IV. W BGA APPLIED TO THE A + A REACTION

Using (46) with $\epsilon = 0$ in (35)–(36) and (40)–(42) gives equation of motion for the density

$$\frac{\partial n}{\partial t} = [n^2 + \epsilon] \quad (47)$$

and the correlator

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} k = 2D k^2 k [n^2 + \epsilon] - 4 n k \quad (48)$$

Letter A has been dropped on n_A and $\frac{A}{k}$ to simplify notation, and likewise $n_{0,A}$ is shortened to n_0 . $\epsilon(t)$ is implicitly defined by correlators,

$$\epsilon(t) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{k \in 0} X_k(t) \quad (49)$$

Thus equations above are meant to describe the model where only one type of species, A, jumps on the lattice and particles have a chance to react only when at the same lattice site. The equations above will be solved in the following two subsections using W BGA-I and W BGA-II approaches.

A. The W BGA-I approximation

In the W BGA-I approximation, when term proportional to n_k is dropped, Eq. (48) can be studied analytically. Uncorrelated (Poisson-like) initial condition is described by $k = k_0 V n_0^2$ and solution of (48), with $k \in 0$, reads

$$k(t) = \int_0^t dt e^{-2D k^2 (t-t^0)} [n(t^0)^2 + \epsilon(t^0)] \quad (50)$$

Please note that the $\epsilon_0(t)$ is determined from $\epsilon_0(t) = V n(t)^2$ (thermodynamic limit) and not from (50). Summation of Eq. (50) over $k \in 0$ and division by V gives

$$\epsilon(t) = \int_0^t dt G(t-t^0) [n(t^0)^2 + \epsilon(t^0)] \quad (51)$$

where

$$G(t-t^0) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{k \in 0} e^{-2k^2 D (t-t^0)} \quad (52)$$

was introduced. As shown in the appendix A, for large lattice size when $V \rightarrow \infty$, expression above can be approximated as

$$G(t-t^0) = [\delta D (t-t^0)]^{d=2} \quad (53)$$

where $\delta = \frac{1}{8D}$.

Equations (47), (51) and (53) completely specify $n(t)$. It is not possible to solve them analytically, however, large time behavior of $n(t)$ can be extracted. To do this we introduce $\epsilon' = n^2 + \epsilon$ and rewrite Eqs. (47) and (51) as

$$\frac{\partial n}{\partial t} = \epsilon' \quad (54)$$

$$\epsilon'(t) = n(t)^2 + \int_0^t dt G(t-t^0) \epsilon'(t^0) \quad (55)$$

which completely specify $n(t)$.

By using Laplace transform it is possible to transform equations (54) and (55) into a single equation. Laplace transform is defined as

$$X(s) = \int_0^\infty dt e^{-st} X(t) \quad (56)$$

For $X = n$; same symbol will be used for Laplace transform as for the original function. The only exception to the rule are two cases. For $X(t) = n(t)^2$, $X(s) = n_2(s)$, while for $X(t) = G(t)$, $X(s) = g(s)$.

Taking Laplace transform of Eq. (55) one gets $\epsilon'(s) = n_2(s) - g(s)\epsilon'(s)$, and combining it with $\epsilon'(s) = sn(s)$ from (54) gives

$$n_2(s) = g(s) + \frac{1}{s} [n_0 - sn(s)] \quad (57)$$

The $g(s)$ is the Laplace transform of $G(t)$,

$$g(s) = (8D)^{-d=2} e^{-sD^{d=2-1}} (1 - d=2; s) \quad (58)$$

$(-; x)$ denotes incomplete Gamma function;

$$(-; x) = \int_x^\infty du u^{-1} e^{-u} \quad (59)$$

The analytic continuation of $(-; x)$ is possible. For non-integer d and $\epsilon = 0$, $(-; z)$ is multiple-valued function of z with a branch point at $z = 0$, and has no poles. Dividing by $g(s) + 1 =$ Eq. (57) results in

$$sn(s) - n_0 = e(s) n_2(s) \quad (60)$$

where $e(s)$ denotes Laplace transform of the effective reaction rate,

$$e(s) = \frac{1}{1 + g(s)} \quad (61)$$

Finally, taking inverse Laplace transform of (60) gives

$$\frac{\partial n}{\partial t} = \int_0^{\infty} dt^0 e^{-(t-t^0)} n(t^0)^2 \quad (62)$$

Equations (54)–(55) and Eq. (62) are fully equivalent. Both equations have been dealt with before, however, in a very different context. Eq. (62) was obtained in ref. [19] through a diagrammatic technique and referred to as the dressed-tree calculation. Thus in here we have shown that WBG A-I is equivalent to the dressed tree calculation. Eqs. (54)–(55) have been also obtained in the study of the entirely different A + B model in ref. [6].

Studies [19] and [6] suggest contradictory result: ref. [19] argues that the dressed tree calculation gives $d=2$ decay exponent for particle density, while ref. [6] argues for the $d=4$ decay exponent. In ref. [19] it was incorrectly concluded that dressed-tree calculation results in the $d=2$ exponent, which basically came from balancing wrong terms in Laplace transformed version of Eq. (62). In here calculation done in ref. [19] will be repeated to show how to balance terms correctly. Also, calculation will justify approximations employed in ref. [6] more rigorously as the method of calculation employs Laplace Transform and well known Tauberian theorems which relate small s with large t behavior. In this way all the approximations are controlled.

To extract asymptotic behavior for $n(t)$ from Eq. (62) one assumes that at large times density decays as

$$n(t) \sim A (t + \tau)^{-\alpha} \quad (63)$$

A and α denote amplitude and exponent of decay to be found. τ is introduced as regulator for small t so that Laplace transform of $n(t)$ and $n^2(t)$ exist;

$$n(s) = A e^{\tau s} s^{-\alpha} (1 + O(s^{-1})) \quad (64)$$

$$n_2(s) = A^2 e^{\tau s} s^{-2\alpha} (1 + O(s^{-1})) \quad (65)$$

and please note that $n(s)^2 \neq n_2(s)$. To extract asymptotics one inserts (64)–(65) and (61) into (60) and expands in small s (to extract leading order behavior for large t) and matches the most dominant terms.

The expansion of $g(s)$ for small s is given by

$$g(s) = (8D)^{d=2} e^{\tau s} \left((1 - d/2) s^{d=2-1} + \frac{2-1-d=2}{d-2} + O(s) \right) \quad (66)$$

for $d \neq 2, 4, 6, \dots$. For $d = 2$ one has

$$g(s) = (8D)^{-1} e^{\tau s} \left[-\gamma_E \ln(s) + O(s) \right] \quad (67)$$

where γ_E is Euler constant. Please note that the behavior of $g(s)$ for small s is qualitatively different for $d < 2$ and $d > 2$ which has to do with recurrence of random walks below and above $d = 2$. For small s and $d < 2$

$g(s) \sim s^{d=2-1}$ while for $d > 2$ $g(s) = \text{const.}$ At $d = 2$ there is logarithmic dependence on s . The term $e^{\tau s}$ can be neglected if leading order behavior for small s (large t) is sought for.

At the moment we focus on the $d < 2$ case. Inserting approximate formulas above for $g(s)$ into (61) gives

$$e^{-\tau s} (s) = \frac{(8D)^{d=2}}{(1-d/2)^{d=2}} s^{d=2+1}; \quad d < 2 \quad (68)$$

Since value for τ is not known one has to separate various cases: expansion for $n(s)$ reads

$$n(s) = A \begin{cases} (1 - \alpha) s^{-\alpha+1} + O(s^{-\alpha}) & \alpha < 1 \\ \frac{1}{1-\alpha} + O(s^{-\alpha}) & \alpha > 1 \end{cases} \quad (69)$$

and likewise for $n_2(s)$

$$n_2(s) = A^2 \begin{cases} (1 - 2\alpha) s^{-2\alpha+1} + O(s^{-2\alpha}) & 2\alpha < 1 \\ \frac{1-2\alpha}{2-1} + O(s^{-2\alpha}) & 2\alpha > 1 \end{cases} \quad (70)$$

Inserting small s expansions (68)–(70) into (60) gives

$$A \left[(1 - \alpha) + O(s) \right] n_0 = A^2 \frac{(8D)^{d=2}}{(1-d/2)^{d=2}} s^{d=2} (1 - 2\alpha) + O(s^{d=2+1}) \quad (71)$$

Also, please note that there are two different forms to use for $n(s)$ and $n_2(s)$ in (69) and (70) and the ones used in (71) were for $\alpha < 1$ and $2\alpha < 1$ respectively (same choice was made in ref. [19]). Once τ is found, one has to check these conditions on τ for self consistency. There are two ways to match the terms in (71), (a) as in the ref. [19], and (b) in a way related to the work in ref. [6]. We begin with first case.

Balancing s term on the left hand side of (71) with $s^{d=2}$ on the right hand side, gives $\tau = d=2$ and

$$A_a = \frac{1}{-\sin(\alpha)} (d) (1 - d/2)^2 (8D)^{d=2} \quad (72)$$

Also from $\alpha < 1$ and $2\alpha < 1$ one has constraint that $d < 1$. However, for $d < 1$ the term $\sin(\alpha)$ is positive which makes amplitude A_a negative. Thus all physical conditions can not be met with this type of matching. In ref. [19] the condition $d < 1$ [coming from the fact that first row is used in (70)] was overlooked (if $d > 2$ is allowed amplitude A_a is perfectly acceptable).

The $\tau = d=2$ scenario can still turn out to be true. With this choice of τ and $d < 2$ condition coming from (68) the second row in (70) have to be used. Again, carrying out similar type of matching procedure would give negative amplitude. Finally, the $\tau = d=2$ avenue has to be given up.

At this stage one is left by the second (b) way of balancing, i.e. matching constant n_0 term on the left hand side of (71) with $s^{2-d=2}$ on the right hand side. (The remaining terms, e.g. such as the s on the left hand side can be balanced by considering sub-leading corrections to $n(s)$). This way of balancing immediately gives $d=4$ and

$$A_b = \frac{P}{n_0} (8D)^{d=4} \quad (73)$$

with constraints that $d < 2$ (Eq. 68 was used to get Eq. 71).

Matching the constant term n_0 on the left hand side of (71) is rather counter-intuitive since in the framework of Laplace transform constant can normally be disregarded when large t behavior is sought for. To see how this comes about it is useful to turn back to Eq. (60).

Equation (60) comes from Eq. (57). For simplicity reasons we focus on the case $d=1$ in (57). It is clear that at the right hand side of equation (57) the $sn(s)$ term is sub-leading to n_0 . (True enough, n_0 is constant but it is multiplied by $g(s)$.) Thus $n_2(s)$ indeed has to be matched with $g(s)n_0$. This procedure results in amplitude A_b obtained previously. Also, by using form (57), one can show that amplitude A_b as given in Eq. (73) is valid even for $d > 2$. A analysis can be repeated with finite value of d with the same outcome. Before proceeding, it is important to mention that procedure outlined above does not work at $d=4$ and it has to be modified.

The main findings of this subsection are twofold. First, it has been shown that dressed tree calculation is equivalent to W BGA-I. Second, it was shown that W BGA-I (and dressed tree calculation) fail to describe $A+A$ reaction predicting $d=4$ decay exponent;

$$n(t) = \frac{P}{n_0} (8D t)^{d=4} \quad (74)$$

All findings of this subsection are summarized in Fig. 1. The numerical treatment of Eqs. (54) and (55) confirms asymptotic decay given in Eq. (74). Equations (54) and (55) were solved previously numerically in ref. [6]. In here, the features of the decay curves are somewhat different from the ones obtained in ref. [6]. For example, curves shown in this work have concave form (bend upward), while curves in Fig. 1 of ref. [6] are convex (bend downward) as if asymptotics have not yet been reached. Also, in here, there is no intersection of curves, which can be found in ref. [6]. These difference could come from the numerical treatment. Apart from using double precision, to obtain curves in Fig. 1 the method of integration was used which integrates exactly $\int_0^t dt' (t-t')^{d=2} f(t')$ provided $f(t)$ is piecewise linear in t . The more detailed description of numerical treatment is shown in the appendix B

In the next subsection it will be shown that, in the case

of $A+A$ reaction, weaknesses of W BGA-II method extend to W BGA-II level.

B. The W BGA-II approximation

When term n_k is kept in Eq. (48), equivalent of Eq. (55) reads

$$n'(t) = n(t)^2 - \int_0^t dt' I(t;t') n'(t') \quad (75)$$

while Eq. (54) stays the same. The $I(t;t')$ is given by

$$I(t;t') = G(t-t') \exp \left[-4 \int_{t'}^t dt'' n(t'') \right] \quad (76)$$

The asymptotics of Eq. (75) can not be extracted by Laplace transform, and it is more convenient to use approach of ref. [6]. For large t , Eq. (75) can be approximated by

$$n'(t) = n(t)^2 - I(t;0) I(t) \quad (77)$$

where $I(t) = \int_0^t dt' I(t;t')$. This step is valid provided two conditions are satisfied. First, the term $I(t;t')$ has to vanish as time difference $t-t'$ grows. Second, the integral $\int_0^t dt' I(t;t')$ has to be finite. Using (54) one gets $I(t) = n_0 \int_0^t n(t') dt'$ and (77) becomes

$$\frac{\partial n}{\partial t} = n^2 - I(t;0) n_0 \quad (78)$$

Equation above is solved with the assumption that asymptotically $n(t) = A/t$, which is checked self-consistently at the end. Using postulated asymptotics for t , one can see from Eq. (76) that $I(t;0) = \text{const } t^{-(d=2+4A)}$. Assuming that

$$\frac{I(t;0)}{n(t)^2} \rightarrow 0; \quad t \rightarrow \infty \quad (79)$$

one can solve (78) in form $\partial n / \partial t = -n^2$, and get $A = 1/2$. Assumption (79) is correct provided $2 < d=2+4A = d=2+4$, which is true for any d . This shows that $n(t) = 1/(2t)$ is asymptotic form for the solution of Eqs. (54) and (75). This means that the last term (n_k) in (48) only influences intermediate behavior when t is not too large. For large t , W BGA-II gives exactly the same asymptotics as the pure mean field treatment.

Thus main finding so far is that both W BGA-I and W BGA-II fail to describe $A+A$ reaction. This is somewhat surprising as even simplest pair-approach, e.g. Smoluchowski method, describes exponent of $A+A$ correctly. Clearly $A+A$ reaction can not be viewed as a weakly interacting Bose-gas. The question is what is the minimum modification of W BGA which will provide correct result for the $A+A$ model? This question will be answered in the next subsection.

To see how to improve W BGA one has to clarify what went wrong in the first place. We start from problematic equation (40) which becomes (48) when terms with $\frac{A+B}{k}$ are set to zero. To trace why W BGA fails it is useful to rewrite Eq. (40) as it looks one step before W BGA is made, and we keep only terms describing A+A reaction:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho_k = -2D k^2 \rho_k - 4 \rho_k n^2 + \frac{1}{V} \sum_{q \neq k} \rho_q \rho_k \rho_{q-k}^5 \quad (80)$$

where

$$\rho_q^{(3)} = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} (\rho_{\mathbf{k}} \rho_{\mathbf{q}} \rho_{\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k}} + \rho_{\mathbf{k}} \rho_{\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k}} \rho_{\mathbf{q}}) \quad (81)$$

is focus of present subsection. In technical terms, the usage of W BGA can be translated into approximating three point density $\rho_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_{\mathbf{y}} \rho_{\mathbf{z}}$ in a particular way. In the case of W BGA-I one simply takes

$$\rho_{\mathbf{k}_1} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_2} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_3} = \rho_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_{\mathbf{y}} \rho_{\mathbf{z}} = 0 \quad (82)$$

while in W BGA-II one assumes

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_1} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_2} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_3} &= \rho_{\mathbf{k}_1;0} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_2;0} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_3;0} a_0^3 + \\ &+ \rho_{\mathbf{k}_1;0} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_2;0} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_3;0} a_0 \rho_{\mathbf{k}_2} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_3} + \\ &+ \rho_{\mathbf{k}_1;0} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_2;0} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_3;0} a_0 \rho_{\mathbf{k}_1} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_3} + \\ &+ \rho_{\mathbf{k}_1;0} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_2;0} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_3;0} a_0 \rho_{\mathbf{k}_1} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_2} \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

where $\rho_{\mathbf{k};0} = 1/\rho_{\mathbf{k};0}$. Inserting (83) into (80) gives the terms describing A+A process in (40). It is useful to transform approximation above into the x-space to understand nature of approximation better. Inverse Fourier transform of (83) gives [25]

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_{\mathbf{y}} \rho_{\mathbf{z}} &= \rho^3 + \rho (\rho_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_{\mathbf{y}} \rho_{\mathbf{z}}^2) + \\ &+ \rho (\rho_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_{\mathbf{z}} \rho_{\mathbf{y}}^2) + \rho (\rho_{\mathbf{y}} \rho_{\mathbf{z}} \rho_{\mathbf{x}}^2) \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

The W BGA approximations given in Eqs. (82) and (84) can be contrasted to the Kirkwood superposition approximation,

$$\rho_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_{\mathbf{y}} \rho_{\mathbf{z}} = \frac{1}{\rho^3} \rho_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_{\mathbf{y}} \rho_{\mathbf{z}} \rho_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_{\mathbf{y}} \rho_{\mathbf{z}} \quad (85)$$

which is known to describe A+A problem correctly (at least the decay exponent).

It is interesting to note that instead of (85) one could carry out Kirkwood superposition approximation in a different way, e.g. as $\rho_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_{\mathbf{y}} \rho_{\mathbf{z}} = \rho_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_{\mathbf{y}} \rho_{\mathbf{x}} \rho_{\mathbf{z}} \rho_{\mathbf{y}} \rho_{\mathbf{z}}$. (There is no such ambiguity when only single occupancy

of site is allowed.) When multiple site occupancy is allowed, as considered here, we argue that Eq. (85) is more accurate way to implement Kirkwood superposition approximation.

By looking at equation (84) it is possible to understand W BGA better. Eq. (84) suggests that W BGA is somewhat equivalent to the additive expansion of correlation functions. It has been argued that such additive approximation is inferior to the Kirkwood superposition approximation [4,5]. This in turn explains why W BGA fails to describe the A+A reaction.

Clearly, to correctly describe A+A reaction one has to use Kirkwood superposition approximation, which we modify further in the spirit of W BGA, assuming that higher order products of annihilation operators $a_{\mathbf{k}}; b_{\mathbf{k}}$ with $\mathbf{k} \neq 0$ are small, and accounting for them only in limit (extracting a_0 or b_0 out of field theoretic averages). This is done in two stages. First, Kirkwood superposition approximation in Eq. (85) is rephrased in the k-space which gives [26]

$$\rho_{\mathbf{k}_1} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_2} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_3} = \frac{(\rho_{\mathbf{k}_1} + \rho_{\mathbf{k}_2} + \rho_{\mathbf{k}_3})^3}{n^3 V^{3-2}} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_1} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_2} \rho_{\mathbf{k}_3} \quad (86)$$

To get the improved form for three body terms one inserts (86) into (81) which gives

$$\rho_q^{(3)} = \frac{2}{n^3 V^2} \sum_{q;l} \rho_{\mathbf{q}} \rho_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{l}} \rho_{\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{l}} \quad (87)$$

The expression above was obtained by using symmetry properties of $\rho_{\mathbf{k}} = \rho_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\rho_{\mathbf{q}} = \rho_{\mathbf{q}}$. Also upon inserting (86) into (81) the two terms on the right hand side of (81) contribute equally resulting in factor two in (87). Equation above is too complicated to be used in practise and we approximate it further.

In the spirit of W BGA the terms in (86) which contain large number of correlation functions with k-vector different from zero are neglected. This is done in two stages, first sum over \mathbf{q} is split into $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{q} \neq \mathbf{k}$ parts, and then for each of sums various contributions from sum over \mathbf{l} are distilled to extract non-vanishing $\mathbf{k} = 0$ operators. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_q^{(3)} &= \frac{2}{n^3 V^2} \rho_{\mathbf{k}} \left(\rho_{\mathbf{0}} \rho_{\mathbf{k}} + \rho_{\mathbf{0}} \rho_{\mathbf{k}} \right) + \\ &+ \sum_{q \neq k} \rho_{\mathbf{q}} \left(\rho_{\mathbf{k}} \rho_{\mathbf{q}} + \rho_{\mathbf{k}} \rho_{\mathbf{q}} + \rho_{\mathbf{q}} \rho_{\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k}} \right)^5 \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

where terms of the type $\rho_{\mathbf{k}} \rho_{\mathbf{q}} \rho_{\mathbf{l}}$ with $\mathbf{k}; \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{l} \neq 0$ have been neglected. Eq. (88) is still complicated to be used, at least to obtain analytic result. First term on the right hand side of (88) can be neglected since it leads to mean field behavior (as shown in section IV B). Second term can be absorbed into the one of the three terms under the

sum sign, e.g. under the first term. Second and third terms under the sum sign couple correlation functions in a non-trivial way and are neglected in the following for simplicity reasons. With $\rho_0 = n^2/V$, and applying recipe just described gives

$$-\frac{(3)}{nV} \sum_{k \neq 0} \frac{2}{k} \sum_{q \neq 0} X_{kq} \quad (89)$$

which is midway between WBG A-II (Eq. 83) and Kirkwood superposition approximation (Eq. 86). It is interesting to note that equation above is very close to the shortened Kirkwood superposition approximation discussed in refs. [4,5]. Using approximation above to decouple three body density, and particular form for ρ_{xy}^{AA} used throughout this section, gives following equations of motion,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} k = -2D k^2 - (n^2 + \rho_0) k - \frac{n^2}{n} \quad (90)$$

which should be contrasted with Eq. (48). The most convenient way to solve (47) and (90) is to introduce k as $k = n^2 \tilde{k}$ and $n^2 + \rho_0 = n^2$ where

$$1 + \frac{1}{V} \sum_{k \neq 0} X_k \quad (91)$$

\tilde{k} with $k = 0$ is set equal to V and does not change in time (thermodynamic limit). Applying change of variables just described modifies Eq. (47) into

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} n(t) = -n(t) n^2(t) \quad (92)$$

where effective reaction rate

$$n^2(t) = n^2(t) \quad (93)$$

was introduced. Same change of variables transforms Eq. (90) into

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} k = -2D k^2 - k \quad (94)$$

Equation (94) can be solved for all k and $k \neq 0$ (pretending that $n(t)$ is known), and after summing over $k \neq 0$ one gets following integralequation

$$n(t) = 1 - \int_0^t dt' G(t - t') n^2(t') \quad (95)$$

Solution of the equation above can be found by Laplace transform which gives

$$(s) = \frac{1}{s[1 + g(s)]} \quad (96)$$

Also, one can integrate Eq. (92) which gives

$$n(t) = \frac{n_0}{1 + n_0 \int_0^t dt' n^2(t')} \quad (97)$$

It is not possible to obtain closed expression for $n(t)$ and $n^2(t)$. However, asymptotic form of $n(t)$ can be extracted.

Inserting small s expansion of $g(s)$ (see Eqs. 66 and 67) into (96) gives

$$(s) \sim \begin{cases} \frac{(8-D)^{d-2}}{(1-d)^{d-2}} s^{d-2} & d < 2 \\ \frac{8-D}{s[\varepsilon + \ln(-s)]} & d = 2 \\ \frac{1}{1+g(0)} s^{-1} & d > 2 \end{cases} \quad (98)$$

for $s \rightarrow 0$. Taking inverse Laplace transform of equation above gives leading order behavior for effective reaction rate constant,

$$n(t) \sim \begin{cases} \frac{(8-D)^{d-2}}{(1-d)^{d-2}} t^{d-2-1} & d < 2 \\ \frac{8-D}{\ln t} & d = 2 \\ \frac{1}{1+g(0)} t^{-1} & d > 2 \end{cases} \quad (99)$$

when $t \rightarrow 1$. To find inverse Laplace transform of (s) for $d = 2$ (second line Eq. 98) is somewhat involved, please see appendix C for details. Finally, inserting (99) into (97) gives following asymptotics

$$n(t) \sim \begin{cases} (1-d)^{d-2} (1+d)^{d-2} (8-D)^{d-2} & d < 2 \\ \frac{\ln 8-D}{8-D} t & d = 2 \\ \frac{1}{1+g(0)} t^{-1} & d > 2 \end{cases} \quad (100)$$

where $g(0)$ entering in the third row can easily be found from (66).

V. WBG A APPLIED TO THE A+B REACTION

Equations of motion for density and correlation functions describing A+B model result from (35)-(36) and (40)-(42) by using (46) with $\rho_0 = 0$. For simplicity reasons, we focus on $n_A = n_B = n$ case and omit labels A and B. Also, as in the previous section $n_0 = n_{0,A} = n_{0,B}$. Applying procedure outlined above leads to the equations for particle densities

$$\frac{\partial n}{\partial t} = -n^2(1 + c) \quad (101)$$

where c is given by the AB correlation function,

$$c_k(t) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{k \neq 0} c_k^{AB}(t) \quad (102)$$

Equations for correlators $c_k^{AA} = c_k^{BB}$ and c_k^{AB} are given by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} c_k^{AB} + 2Dk^2 c_k^{AB} = (n_A^2 + c_k^{AB}) - 2n_k(c_k^{AB} + c_k^{AB}) \quad (103)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} c_k^{AA} + 2Dk^2 c_k^{AA} = 2n_k(c_k^{AA} + c_k^{AB}) \quad (104)$$

The most convenient way to solve equations above is to diagonalise them by subtraction and addition. The final result is that correlations of AB pairs are governed by

$$c_k(t) = \int_0^t dt' [G(t; t') + I(t; t')] [n_k(t')^2 + c_k(t')] \quad (105)$$

and for AA (or BB) pairs as

$$c_k(t) = \int_0^t dt' [G(t; t') - I(t; t')] [n_k(t')^2 + c_k(t')] \quad (106)$$

The $I(t; t')$ appearing in equations (105) and (106) has the same form as in (76) with trivial change of n_k into c_k . Same type of analysis as in the subsection IV B leads to conclusion that approximation $G(t; t') + I(t; t') \approx G(t; t')$ can be used, which in turn leads to $d=4$ density decay exponent. Interestingly enough, both W BGA-I and W BGA-II approaches lead to correct $d=4$ exponent when used to solve A+B model.

In some sense the W BGA approach seems to be suited rather well for A+B reaction. Quite the contrary can be said for A+A reaction as shown previously. To understand workings of W BGA on the more general model the ABBA model will be studied in the next section.

VI. W BGA APPLIED TO THE ABBA MODEL

The ABBA model was suggested in refs. [14,15] and it has a number of interesting properties. The model is obtained as the special case of the general two species model discussed in section II where A+A and B+B reactions occur with same reaction rate λ , while A+B with reactions rate μ , and $\mu > \lambda$ is taken. The fact that A and B species have equal diffusion constants is very important since it leads to survival of minority species. Minority species is the one with smaller concentration at $t=0$, and we chose B to be minority, i.e. $n_{0,A} > n_{0,B}$. By survival it is meant that particle density ratio saturates to constant $u(t) = n_A(t)/n_B(t) \rightarrow \text{const}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. (The mean field analysis predicts vanishing of minority species

$u(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$). Also, similar model has been studied in ref. [27] where it was shown that if $D_A \neq D_B$ only one type of species survives.)

The goal of the present section is to understand strengths and weaknesses of W BGA approach by testing it on the ABBA model which combines A+A and A+B reactions. These reactions have been studied in previous sections but now they are allowed to occur simultaneously. It is interesting to see how W BGA approach performs in such situation. Clearly, there are plenty of possibilities how to combine A+A and A+B reactions, but the way they are combined in the ABBA model gives rise to many interesting effects. (For example, there is survival of minority species, recovery of initial density ratio, dependence of amplitudes on initial densities and reaction rates [28], please see refs. [14,15] for details).

We start from equations of motion given in section III which describe very general two species reaction-diffusion model. Assumptions in Eq. (46) describe content of the ABBA model. Using (46) in Eqs. (35)–(36) gives

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} n_A = n_A^2 + \lambda n_A n_B + \lambda A A + \lambda A B \quad (107)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} n_B = n_B^2 + \lambda n_A n_B + \lambda B B + \lambda A B \quad (108)$$

where

$$A = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{k \neq 0} c_k^{AA}; \quad B = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{k \neq 0} c_k^{BB} \quad (109)$$

Also, Eqs. for correlators (40)–(42) simplify to

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} c_k^{AA} = 2Dk^2 c_k^{AA} + n_A^2 + \lambda A A + 2(\lambda n_A + \lambda n_B) c_k^{AA} + 2\lambda n_A c_k^{AB} \quad (110)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} c_k^{BB} = 2Dk^2 c_k^{BB} + n_B^2 + \lambda B B + 2(\lambda n_B + \lambda n_A) c_k^{BB} + 2\lambda n_B c_k^{AB} \quad (111)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} c_k^{AB} = 2Dk^2 c_k^{AB} + (\lambda n_B + \lambda n_A) c_k^{AB} + (\lambda n_A + \lambda n_B) c_k^{AB} + (\lambda n_A c_k^{BB} + \lambda n_B c_k^{AA}) \quad (112)$$

The equations above will be solved in the next two subsections within W BGA-I and W BGA-II approaches.

A. The W BGA-I approximation

In the framework of W BGA-I all seemingly $O(n^3)$ terms of the type n_k with $k \neq 0$ are thrown away in (110)–(112). Following similar steps as in subsection IV A gives

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial t} n_A &= (\dot{I}_{AA} + \dot{I}_{AB}) \quad (113) \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t} n_B &= (\dot{I}_{BB} + \dot{I}_{AB}) \quad (114)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\dot{I}_{AA} = n_A^2 \int_0^t dt G(t-t^0) \dot{I}_{AA}(t^0) \quad (115)$$

$$\dot{I}_{BB} = n_B^2 \int_0^t dt G(t-t^0) \dot{I}_{BB}(t^0) \quad (116)$$

$$\dot{I}_{AB} = n_A n_B \int_0^t dt G(t-t^0) \dot{I}_{AB}(t^0) \quad (117)$$

where $\dot{I}_{AA} = n_A^2 \int_0^t dt G(t-t^0) \dot{I}_{AA}(t^0)$ for \dot{I}_{AA} ; \dot{I}_{BB} for \dot{I}_{BB} ; \dot{I}_{AB} for \dot{I}_{AB} . To solve Eqs. (113)–(116) it is possible to employ same technique as in section IV B. Equations above can be approximated by

$$\dot{I}_{AA} = n_A^2 G(t;0) \dot{I}_{AA}(t) \quad (118)$$

$$\dot{I}_{BB} = n_B^2 G(t;0) \dot{I}_{BB}(t) \quad (119)$$

$$\dot{I}_{AB} = n_A n_B G(t;0) \dot{I}_{AB}(t) \quad (120)$$

where

$$\dot{I}_{AA}(t) = \left(\dot{I}_{AA} + \dot{I}_{AB} \right) \int_0^t dt G(t-t^0) \dot{I}_{AA}(t^0); \quad \dot{I}_{BB}(t) = \left(\dot{I}_{BB} + \dot{I}_{AB} \right) \int_0^t dt G(t-t^0) \dot{I}_{BB}(t^0); \quad \dot{I}_{AB}(t) = \left(\dot{I}_{AB} \right) \int_0^t dt G(t-t^0) \dot{I}_{AB}(t^0) \quad (121)$$

By integrating Eqs. (113) and (114) a useful relationship can be derived for \dot{I}_{AA} , \dot{I}_{BB} , \dot{I}_{AB} ;

$$\dot{I}_{AA}(t) + \dot{I}_{AB}(t) = n_{0,A} \dot{I}_{AA}(t) + n_{0,B} \dot{I}_{AB}(t) \quad (122)$$

$$\dot{I}_{BB}(t) + \dot{I}_{AB}(t) = n_{0,B} \dot{I}_{BB}(t) + n_{0,A} \dot{I}_{AB}(t) \quad (123)$$

Using (118)–(120) gives $(n_A + n_B)^2 G(t) (\dot{I}_{AA} + \dot{I}_{BB} + 2\dot{I}_{AB})$, and adding (122) and (123) finally gives

$$(n_A + n_B)^2 G(t) (n_{0,A} + n_{0,B}) \quad (124)$$

Also from (118) and (119) $n_A^2 \dot{I}_{AA} + n_B^2 \dot{I}_{BB} = G(t) (\dot{I}_{AA} + \dot{I}_{BB})$ and subtraction of (122) and (123) gives

$$n_A^2 \dot{I}_{AA} + n_B^2 \dot{I}_{BB} = G(t) (n_{0,A} \dot{I}_{AA} + n_{0,B} \dot{I}_{BB}) \quad (125)$$

After solving (124) and (125) for n_A and n_B one gets

$$n = \frac{n(0)}{n_{0,A} + n_{0,B}} (8 - D t)^{d=4}; \quad \dot{I}_{AA} = \dot{I}_{BB} \quad (126)$$

According to W BGA-I both particles decay with $d=4$ exponent and amplitudes given above. The W BGA-I predicts same decay exponent as for the pure $A+A$ model. As in the case of $A+A$ reaction, the value for $d=4$ exponent obtained here is not correct. The computer simulation and ϵ -expansion analysis of this reaction suggest $d=2$ exponent [14,15]. To see what happens when $O(n^3)$ terms are kept in (110)–(112) we proceed with W BGA-II calculation.

B. The W BGA-II approximation

In the W BGA-II approximation, when all terms are kept in Eqs. (110)–(112), it is useful to rewrite these equations in the vector form

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} n_A \\ n_B \end{pmatrix} + 2D k^2 \begin{pmatrix} n_A \\ n_B \end{pmatrix} = P(t) \begin{pmatrix} n_A \\ n_B \end{pmatrix} \quad (127)$$

where the matrix P is given by

$$P = n_A \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 4 + 2u & 0 \\ 0 & 4u + 2 & 2u \\ u & & (2 + u)(1 + u) \end{pmatrix} \quad (128)$$

with $u = n_B/n_A$.

Vector equation (127) is very hard to solve analytically. However, there are some guidelines how to extract late time asymptotics. At the W BGA-I level it appears that ABBA model and the $A+A$ model are very similar. In the following it will be assumed that such similarity can be extrapolated to the presently studied W BGA-II level. This implies that mean field behavior should be expected from Eq. (127).

To get the feeling for what follows it is useful to analyze Eqs. (107) and (108) at the mean field level by neglecting fluctuations and setting $\dot{I}_{AA} = \dot{I}_{BB} = \dot{I}_{AB}$. Carrying out such procedure gives

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} n_A = n_A^2 + n_A n_B \quad (129)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} n_B = n_B^2 + n_A n_B \quad (130)$$

Equations above can be solved approximately for large t (please see refs. [15] for details) and one obtains

$$n_A = \frac{1}{t} \quad (131)$$

$$n_B = \frac{n_{0,B}}{[n_{0,A} t]} \quad (132)$$

provided $n_{0,A} > 1$ and $n_{0,B} > n_{0,A}$. For $n_{0,A} = 1$ or $n_{0,B} = n_{0,A}$ solution is trivial, and it can be easily shown that in such case the ABBA model belongs to the $A+A$ universality class. These simple cases are not

considered here. Initial imbalance in particle concentration leads to faster diminishing of minority species, i.e. $u(t) = n_B(t)/n_A(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ given $0 < u(0) < 1$.

In the following we assume the mean field ansatz (131)–(132) and try to solve (127) with it. The validity of such mean field ansatz will be checked self-consistently at the end. For large times, and with mean field behavior ($u \rightarrow 0$), the matrix P can be approximated by

$$P \approx \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 4 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (133)$$

with

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 4 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (134)$$

The fact that P (in the approximate form) is constant matrix multiplied by time dependent function implies that $[P(t); P(t^0)] = 0$ (dot over symbol P denotes time derivative). This being the case, Eq. (127) can be treated as scalar equation and calculation similar to the one in the subsection IV B gives

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 4 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} n_A(t) \\ n_B(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 4 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} n_A(t^0) \\ n_B(t^0) \end{pmatrix} \quad (135)$$

where matrix $J(t; t^0)$ is given by

$$J(t; t^0) = G(t; t^0) \exp \left[\int_{t^0}^t G(t; t^0) dt \right] \quad (136)$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} n_A(t) \\ n_B(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} n_A(t^0) \\ n_B(t^0) \end{pmatrix} \quad (137)$$

Please compare Eqs. (75)–(76) and (135)–(136). They are very similar, the only difference being in the matrix character of (135)–(136). Following same steps as in section IV B the Eq. (135) can be approximated as

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 4 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} n_A(t) \\ n_B(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 4 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} n_A(t^0) \\ n_B(t^0) \end{pmatrix} \quad (138)$$

Now we proceed to show that, as in the case of (77), the second term on the right hand side of equation (138) can be neglected.

Matrix can be diagonalized as $U = U^{-1} U$. The is diagonal matrix containing eigenvalues

$$\lambda_1 = 4; \lambda_2 = 2; \lambda_3 = 2 + \quad (139)$$

and matrix U contains eigenvectors

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 4 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (140)$$

Inserting (131) into (137), and assuming large t , leads to

$$\begin{pmatrix} n_A(t) \\ n_B(t) \end{pmatrix} = \text{const} + \ln t \quad (141)$$

and using (141) in (136) gives

$$J(t; 0) = \text{const} t^{d=2} U \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 4 & 0 \end{pmatrix} U^{-1} \quad (142)$$

Finally, the second term on the right hand side of (138) can be calculated explicitly. Inserting (142) into (138), and assuming that $I = A; B$ are constants (can be checked for self consistency at the end), results in

$$\begin{pmatrix} n_A(t) \\ n_B(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} n_A(t^0) \\ n_B(t^0) \end{pmatrix} + t^{d=2} (c_1 t^{\lambda_1} + c_2 t^{\lambda_2} + c_3 t^{\lambda_3}) \quad (143)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} n_A(t) \\ n_B(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} n_A(t^0) \\ n_B(t^0) \end{pmatrix} + t^{d=2} c_4 t^{\lambda_2} \quad (144)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} n_A(t) \\ n_B(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} n_A(t^0) \\ n_B(t^0) \end{pmatrix} + t^{d=2} (c_5 t^{\lambda_2} + c_6 t^{\lambda_3}) \quad (145)$$

The explicit form of constants c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5 and c_6 is not interesting since aim is to show that terms containing these constants are sub-leading to the mean field terms. By studying equation above row by row, it is possible to show that for λ_1 terms involving constants are sub-leading to the mean field terms.

To see that terms originating from $J(t; 0)$ are sub-leading one really has to calculate U explicitly. For example, not knowing that contribution from λ_1 is absent in (144), there would be a need to compare t^2 (asymptotics of the mean field n_B^2 term in 144) with $t^{(d=2+\lambda_1)}$ (coming from $J(t; 0)$ and λ_1 eigenvalue). One would conclude that $\lambda_1 = 4$ can not be too large if mean field asymptotics is to hold. In reality, there is no such bound on ratio λ_1 since eigenvalue λ_1 does not appear in Eq. (144), but this can only be seen after explicit calculation.

Main findings so far is that W BGA describes ABBA and A + A model in the same way. For both models the W BGA-I (W BGA-II) predict $d=4$ (mean field) density decay exponents. In the next section attempt will be made to improve W BGA method in order to obtain correct value of density decay exponent for ABBA model.

C. The hybrid of W BGA /Kirkwood applied to A + A and B + B sectors

How deep the weakness of W BGA goes? What needs to be changed in equations of motion (110)–(112) in order to get correct decay exponent? To answer these questions we begin by modifying the A + A and B + B reaction sectors in (110)–(112) by using the recipe from section IV C. It was already remarked in the section II that contributions to H describing different reaction sectors enter additively, and this feature is reflected in equations of motion (110)–(112). Because of this it is possible to focus on terms describing influence of A + A and B + B reactions, i.e. terms proportional to ρ , which govern decay exponents of the ABBA model. At the moment terms proportional to ρ in (110)–(112) that describe A + B reaction will not be changed.

If one is to follow procedure described in section IV C, the $O(n^3)$ term in Eq. (110) has to be modified as

$$4 n_A \frac{A A}{k} \rightarrow 2 \frac{A A}{k} \frac{n_A^2 + A A}{n_A} \quad (146)$$

and likewise for Eq. (111)

$$4 n_B \frac{B B}{k} \rightarrow 2 \frac{B B}{k} \frac{n_B^2 + B B}{n_B} \quad (147)$$

This gives a new set of, hopefully better, equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{A A}{k} = & 2D K^2 \frac{A A}{k} \frac{n_A^2 + A A}{n_A} \\ & 2 \left(\rho \frac{A A}{k} + n_A \frac{A B}{k} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (148)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{B B}{k} = & 2D K^2 \frac{B B}{k} \frac{n_B^2 + B B}{n_B} \\ & 2 \left(\rho \frac{B B}{k} + n_B \frac{A B}{k} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (149)$$

Equation (112) stays the same, although the Eq. (112) contains term proportional to ρ which should be modified if one follows the principle outlined above. However, at the moment, Eq. (112) will not be changed.

It is useful to employ similar notation to the one used in section IV B;

$$n_k n_k \quad (150)$$

and

$$1 + \frac{1}{V} \sum_{k \neq 0} X_k \quad (151)$$

with $\rho = A/B$. Using (150) and (151) in Eqs. (113) and (114) results in

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} n_A = \left(K_A^2 \frac{A A}{k} + n_A n_B \frac{A B}{k} \right) \quad (152)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} n_B = \left(K_B^2 \frac{B B}{k} + n_A n_B \frac{A B}{k} \right) \quad (153)$$

Implementing same notation in Eqs. (148), (149) and (112) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{A A}{k} = & 2D K^2 \frac{A A}{k} \frac{A A}{k} \\ & 2 \rho \left(1 - \frac{A B}{k} \right) \frac{A A}{k} - 2 \rho \frac{A B}{k} \end{aligned} \quad (154)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{B B}{k} = & 2D K^2 \frac{B B}{k} \frac{B B}{k} \\ & 2 \rho \left(1 - \frac{A B}{k} \right) \frac{B B}{k} - 2 \rho \frac{A B}{k} \end{aligned} \quad (155)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{A B}{k} = & 2D K^2 \frac{A B}{k} \frac{A B}{k} \\ & \left[n_A \left(2 - \frac{A A}{k} \right) + n_B \left(2 - \frac{B B}{k} \right) + \right. \\ & \left. + (n_A + n_B) \left(1 - \frac{A B}{k} \right) \right] \frac{A B}{k} \\ & \left(\rho \frac{A A}{k} + n_B \frac{B B}{k} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (156)$$

The numerical solution of the set of equations above is shown in Fig. 2 (dotted line). The full line is a result of Monte Carlo simulation where particle densities are obtained as ensemble averages over 500 runs (simulation is repeated 500 times with a shift in the random number generator). The Eqs. (154)–(156) do not describe ABBA model properly, not even qualitatively, since minority species die out faster (the particle density ratio grows to infinity) while the simulation shows that density ratio should saturate to a constant value (full line). Thus the attempt of modifying terms describing A + A and B + B reaction sector in AA and BB correlation functions by using shortened Kirkwood superposition approximation does not cure weaknesses of W BGA approach. The inspection of individual density decays reveals that the equations above correctly describe decay of majority species, i.e. $n_A \sim (\text{const}) t^{-d/2}$, but fail to describe decay of minority species n_B .

In the following more terms will be modified by using Kirkwood superposition approximation. The dash-dot line in Fig. 2 shows a solution of equations (not shown here) obtained from modifying A + A and B + B reaction sectors using shortened Kirkwood superposition approximation in the Eq. (112) describing time evolution of AB correlation function. Equations obtained in this way are identical to the (154)–(156) with only difference that Eq. (156) changes in a way that term proportional to ρ drop out. In Fig. 2 it can be seen that even if all proportional terms are modified the density ratio curve climbs to infinity, which indicates that minority species dies out, which is not correct behavior. However, the overall trend

gets better as the dash-dot curve lies below dotted one and is pushed towards simulation curve.

To continue this line of incremental changes the equations of motion were studied where even the $A+B$ reaction sector was modified using shortened Kirkwood superposition approximation (all terms proportional to were modified). Equations obtained in this way are same as in (154)–(156) the only difference being in the fact that all seemingly $O(n)$ terms drop out. Thus in the (154)–(156) only diffusion term and terms ρ_{AA} , ρ_{BB} and ρ_{AB} are kept in (154), (155) and (156) respectively. These equations are not shown explicitly to save the space but it should be clear how they look like. The numerical solution for this set of equations is shown in Fig. 2 as dashed line. [It is possible to analytically extract density decay asymptotics for this truncated set of equations which gives $n_A(t) \sim (\text{const})t^{-d=2}$ and $n_B(t) \sim (\text{const})t^{-d=4}$.]

The set of equations where Kirkwood superposition approximation has been applied fully agrees with the numerical simulation much better than the rest which are mixture of W BGA and Kirkwood superposition approximation. This is strong indication that, at least for the ABBA model, the Kirkwood superposition approximation is superior to the W BGA method. For example, in Fig. 2, the trend in all curves improve as the content of superposition approximation is increased in equations of motion (dotted line is worse as it climbs fastest, dash-dot line is a bit better, while only dashed line where superposition approximation is implemented fully saturates to constant). As the goal of the present study is to understand W BGA method better, the more detailed analysis of ABBA reaction based on Kirkwood superposition approximation will be presented in forthcoming publication.

V II. C O N C L U S I O N S

The goal of this study was to test workings of W BGA and to relate some seemingly independent calculation schemes available in the literature. In particular, this work has addressed few important issues.

(1) It was shown that W BGA-I is equivalent to the dressed tree calculation introduced in ref. [19], and this equivalence holds for any model where particles annihilate in pairs. Furthermore, it was shown that for the $A+A$ reaction the dressed tree calculation results in $d=4$ density decay exponent. Thus the contradictory claims of refs. [19] and [6] have been sorted out.

(2) The W BGA method describes $A+B$ reaction well, but does not work for $A+A$ and ABBA models, and it is reasonable to expect that there are more models that can not be described by W BGA. In the case of ABBA model W BGA predicts faster vanishing of minority species which is suggestive of the $A+B$ like be-

havior rather than the behavior of the ABBA model as found in refs. [14,15]. This bias towards $A+B$ type behavior is very hard to get rid of as successively correcting more and more terms in equations of motion for ABBA model by using Kirkwood superposition approximation results in faster vanishing of minority species. The vanishing of minority species persists until all terms are modified by Kirkwood superposition approximation. The W BGA emphasize $A+B$ reaction sector too strongly in the ABBA model.

(3) Findings of this work suggest that formalism employed by Mattis-Glasser in [6] where small n_0 expansion is introduced (and applied to study $A+B$ model) is somewhat questionable. This procedure works on $A+B$ model, but might not work for other models. It can be shown (by rescaling $a^\nu n_0!$, a^ν and $a=n_0!$) that for the type of models studied in here, the small n_0 approximation of ref. [6] amounts to taking away three body terms in Hamiltonian given in Eq. (21) or (28) (e.g. operators of the type $a^\nu aa$ and likewise any mixture of a or b operators). The neglect of these terms amounts exactly to W BGA-I approach, i.e. neglect of seemingly $O(n^3)$ terms in equations of motion for correlation functions; for example, equations (54)–(55) of section IV A ($A+A$), or equations (113)–(117) from section V I A (ABBA). In here it has been shown that W BGA-I set of equations result in incorrect $d=4$ density decay exponent when used for $A+A$ and ABBA models. For these reasons, small n_0 expansion, which effectively means taking away three body term in Hamiltonian, can not be trusted if used beyond $A+B$ model.

(4) The Kirkwood superposition approximation was formulated for the case of lattice dynamics with multiple occupancy of lattice sites allowed. There is strong indication from the present analysis that Kirkwood superposition approximation is superior to the W BGA method, at least when applied to the $A+A$ and ABBA models. However, one has to be careful in claiming superiority of Kirkwood superposition approximation over W BGA approach since in here it was shown that Kirkwood superposition approximation describes ABBA model qualitatively, but it remains to be seen whether it works on the $A+B$ model which W BGA describes well. Similar study (where only single occupancy of lattice sites was allowed and reaction range was assumed short but finite) showed that Kirkwood superposition approximation can describe $A+B$ reaction [4], and claim of superposition approximation superiority is likely to be correct but, nevertheless, such claim has to be tested thoroughly.

The application of Kirkwood superposition approximation to the ABBA and $A+B$ models will be presented in the forthcoming publication as there are many interesting technical details that need to be sorted out. For example, from present study there are some indications (results not shown here) that when using Kirkwood superposition approximation for extremely short range re-

action, such as on-site reaction studied here, care has to be taken so that thermodynamic limit is accounted for properly. It seems that one has to approach Kirkwood superposition approximation through formalism developed in section IV C.

To conclude, it would be interesting to have a relatively simple approximation at hand, not far away from pair approximation, which could be used to extract qualitative asymptotics for arbitrary reaction-diffusion model. Clearly such program is ambitious since in reality one is bound to make approximation which is related to the particular model but, nevertheless, it is worth a try. The $A+A$ and $A+B$ reaction-diffusion models (or combination of them) are excellent benchmark models and any successful approximation should strive to describe these reactions properly. Present study is an attempt in this direction.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Prof. Malte Henkel and the staff at the Laboratoire de Physique des Matériaux, Université Henri Poincaré Nancy I, for warm hospitality where part of this work was done.

APPENDIX A: APPROXIMATION FOR $G(t-t^0)$

In Eq. (52) sum over k can be approximated as integral

$$G(t-t^0) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int d\mathbf{p} e^{-2D\mathbf{p}^2(t-t^0)} \quad (\text{A } 1)$$

The equality sign is strictly valid in thermodynamic limit only when $V \rightarrow \infty$ has been taken. It is useful to approximate integral above further by changing bounds of integration

$$G(t-t^0) \approx \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{-1}^1 d\mathbf{p} e^{-2D\mathbf{p}^2(t-t^0)} \quad (\text{A } 2)$$

corresponds to a large cutoff for the k -vector summation (it regularizes UV divergences of theory). The comparison of (A 1) and (A 2) quickly reveals that Λ is a constant roughly equal to $\frac{1}{2D}$. The evaluation of integral above gives Eq. (53) with $\Lambda = \frac{1}{2D}$. It is convenient to choose $\Lambda = \frac{1}{8D}$ and $\Lambda = 2$ since this gives correct value for $G(0) = 1$. For large $t-t^0$ particular value of Λ appears to be irrelevant, i.e. absent from final expressions for particle density for large times. However, this really depends on the critical dimension of the field theory.

APPENDIX B: INTEGRATION OF SINGULAR KERNEL

In here the numerical treatment of Eqs. (54-55) is described in more detail. The general procedure for integrating expressions of the type

$$I_i[f] = \int_0^{t_i} ds K(t_i; s) f(s) \quad (\text{B } 1)$$

where $K(t; s)$ is singular when s approaches t is described in ref. [29]. The $i = 0; 1; 2; \dots$ and $t_i = i\hbar$. In here the particular focus is on the particular form of singular kernel originating from propagator $G(t; t^0)$;

$$K(t; s) = (t-s)^{-1} \quad (\text{B } 2)$$

The aim is to find quadrature formula which can integrate (B 1) exactly iff $f(s)$ is linear within interval $t_{i-1}; t_i$. Thus goal is to find coefficients w_{ij} in

$$I_i[f] \approx \sum_{j=0}^{X_i} w_{ij} f(t_j) \quad (\text{B } 3)$$

such that above equation turns equality for piecewise linear function $f(s)$. Implementing this procedure gives

$$I_i[f] \approx \sum_{j=0}^{X_i-1} \int_{s_j}^{s_{j+1}} ds K(t_i; s) f(s) \quad (\text{B } 4)$$

and after approximating $f(s)$ as linear function in intervals $t_j; t_{j+1}$ for $j = 0; \dots; i-1$

$$f(s) \approx \frac{s_{j+1}-s}{h} f(s_j) + \frac{s-s_j}{h} f(s_{j+1}) \quad (\text{B } 5)$$

gives (B 3) with

$$w_{i0} = \int_{s_0}^{s_1} ds K(t_i; s) \frac{h-s}{h} \quad (\text{B } 6)$$

$$w_{ij} = \int_{s_j}^{s_{j+1}} ds K(t_i; s) \frac{s-s_j}{h} + \int_{s_{j+1}}^{s_{j+2}} ds K(t_i; s) \frac{s_{j+1}-s}{h} \quad (\text{B } 7)$$

$$w_{ii} = \int_{s_{i-1}}^{s_i} ds K(t_i; s) \frac{s-s_{i-1}}{h} \quad (\text{B } 8)$$

and after performing integrals above with $K(t; s)$ given in (B 2)

$$w_{i0} = \frac{h^1}{(\frac{1}{2} - 1)(\frac{1}{2} - 2)} [(2 - i)(i + 1) + (i + 1)^2] \quad (B 9)$$

$$w_{ij} = \frac{h^1}{(\frac{1}{2} - 1)(\frac{1}{2} - 2)} [(i - j + 1)^2 + (i - j + 1)^2 - 2(i - j + 1)^2] \quad (B 10)$$

$$w_{ii} = \frac{h^1}{(\frac{1}{2} - 1)(\frac{1}{2} - 2)} [(1 + i)^2 + (1 + i)^2 - 2(1 + i)^2] \quad (B 11)$$

The pair of equations in (54-55) is discretized as follows. First the differential equation (54) is rewritten in integral form as $n(t) = n_0 + \int_0^t ds' (s)$ and trapezoidal rule is used to evaluate integral since all functions are well behaved. However, for Eq. (55) the rule (B3) and (B9)-(B11) designed for singular kernel is used. Implementation of this philosophy gives

$$n_i = n_0 + h \left[\frac{f_0}{2} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} f_j + \frac{f_i}{2} \right] \quad (B 12)$$

$$f_i = n_i^2 + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} w_{ij} f_j + w_{ii} f_i \quad (B 13)$$

where $n_i = n(t_i)$ and $f_i = f(t_i)$ for $i = 0; 1; 2; \dots$. Given that all n_j and f_j are known for $j = 0; 1; 2; \dots; i-1$ using equations above it is possible to calculate n_i and f_i . The iteration is started with $n_0 = n(0)$ and $f_0 = n_0^2$.

APPENDIX C: FINDING INVERSE LAPLACE TRANSFORM OF $\phi(s)$ FOR $d = 2$

In here inverse Laplace transform of $\phi(s)$ for $d = 2$ given in Eq. (98) will be found. Due to the presence of \log one has to use Bromowicz contour to perform integration over s . Also, function $\phi(s)$ does not have poles. This means that only contribution to $\phi(t)$ comes from the branch cut and one obtains

$$\phi(t) = 8 D \int_0^{\infty} \frac{du}{u} e^{-ut} \frac{1}{(\frac{1}{2} + \ln(u))^2 + \frac{1}{4}} \quad (C 1)$$

It is useful to re-scale integration variable as $u \rightarrow u$ with only change that time variable appears in combination $ut \rightarrow u$. In the following we set $t = 1$ but keep in mind that at the end of calculation t has to be changed into ut .

As t grows, due to the presence of $\exp(-ut)$, only smaller and smaller values for u contribute to the integral above and it is useful to split integration over u in the two intervals (a) from 0 to c and (b) from c to infinity, where $0 < c < 1$; $\phi(t) = \phi_a(t) + \phi_b(t)$. It is possible to find upper bound for ϕ_b as follows. Starting from

$$\phi_b(t) = \frac{8 D}{(\frac{1}{2} + \ln(c))^2 + \frac{1}{4}} \int_c^{\infty} \frac{du}{u} e^{-ut} \quad (C 2)$$

which, upon using the fact that for particular range of integration above $1 = u - 1 = c$ and performing remaining integration, gives

$$\phi_b(t) = \frac{8 D}{(\frac{1}{2} + \ln(c))^2 + \frac{1}{4}} \frac{e^{-ct}}{t} \quad (C 3)$$

It will be shown that $\phi_a(t)$ vanishes lot slower than $\phi_b(t)$. One can approximate expression for ϕ_a as

$$\phi_a = \frac{8 D}{(\frac{1}{2} + \ln(c))^2 + \frac{1}{4}} \int_0^c \frac{du}{u} e^{-ut} \frac{1}{(\ln u)^2} \quad (C 4)$$

and it can be shown that terms omitted do not influence leading order behavior for ϕ_a . By using partial integration expression above becomes

$$\phi_a = 8 D \int_0^c \frac{du}{u} e^{-ut} \frac{1}{\ln u} + O(e^{-ct}) \quad (C 5)$$

The integral over u is most conveniently calculated by changing variables $tu = v$ which gives

$$\phi_a(t) = \frac{8 D}{\ln t} \int_0^{ct} \frac{dv}{v} e^{-v} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\ln v}{\ln t}} \quad (C 6)$$

By sending upper integration limit to infinity, and expanding denominator in series over $\ln v = \ln t$ one gets

$$\phi_a = \frac{8 D}{\ln t} [1 + O(1/\ln t)] \quad (C 7)$$

Keeping in mind that transformation $t \rightarrow ut$ has to be made in the expression above gives result for $\phi(t)$ in Eq. (99).

-
- [1] A. S. Mikhailov, Phys. Rep. 184, 307 (1989).
 - [2] V. Privman, "Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics in One Dimension", (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997)
 - [3] Comprehensive Chemical Kinetics, Vol. 25, "Diffusion-limited reactions", C. H. Bamford, C. F. H. Tipper and R. G. Compton Editors, (Elsevier, 1985).
 - [4] E. Kotomin and V. Kuzovkov, in Comprehensive Chemical Kinetics, Vol. 34, "Modern aspects of diffusion-controlled reactions", R. G. Compton and G. Hancock Editors, (Elsevier, 1996).
 - [5] E. Kotomin and V. Kuzovkov, Rep. Prog. Phys. 55, 2079 (1992).

- [6] D.C. Mattis and M.L. Glasser, Rev. Mod. Phys. 70 (3), 979 (1998).
- [7] J. Cardy, cond-mat/9607163, "Renormalisation group approach to reaction-diffusion problems".
- [8] A.S. Mikhailov and V.V. Yashin, J. Stat. Phys. 38 (1/2), 347 (1985).
- [9] For a very concise review of Smoluchowski approach and WGBA, please see A.A. Ovchinnikov, S.F. Timashev, and A.A. Belyy, "Kinetics of diffusion controlled chemical processes", (Nova Science, 1989).
- [10] For original work on weakly non-ideal Bose gases please see N.N. Bogolybov, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR (Ser. Fiz.) II, 77 (1974), or N.N. Bogoliubov, Lectures on Quantum Statistics, (Gordon and Breach, New York, 1967), pp. 107-119.
- [11] Y.B. Zeldovich, A.A. Ovchinnikov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 74 (5), 1588 (1978).
- [12] S.F. Burlatskii, A.A. Ovchinnikov, K.A. Pronin, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 92 (2), 625 (1987).
- [13] A.M. Gutin, A.S. Mikhailov, V.V. Yashin, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 92 (3), 941 (1987).
- [14] Z.K. Onkolli, H. Johannesson and B.P. Lee, Phys. Rev. E 59, R3787 (1999).
- [15] Z.K. Onkolli and H. Johannesson, Phys. Rev. E 62 (3), 3276 (2000).
- [16] A.M.R. Cadilhe, M.L. Glasser and V. Privman, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B 11, 109 (1997).
- [17] For example, one way to prepare system initially is to take given number of particles and distribute them randomly one by one on the lattice. This way of preparation leads to Poisson distribution of particle number at each lattice site. Also, it is clear that preparing system in this way does not lead to correlation among particles. Thus, saying that particles are distributed according to Poisson-distribution amounts to saying that there are no correlations among them.
- [18] The initial state of the system was prepared by allowing for birth and annihilation of particles and waiting long enough to establish stationary state. Once this stationary state was reached, particle birth was ceased and system continued to evolve by annihilation process solely.
- [19] B.P. Lee, J. Phys. A 27, 2633 (1994).
- [20] A.A. Lushnikov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 91, 1376 (1986).
- [21] B.P. Lee and J. Cardy, J. Stat. Phys. 80, 971 (1995).
- [22] M.G. Rudavets, J. Phys. A 26, 5313 (1993).
- [23] M. Bramson and J.L. Lebowitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61 (21), 2397 (1988).
- [24] Acting by time derivative on (23) gives, up to minus sign, $\hbar_0 \hat{p}_0 H j i$ which due to $\hbar_0 j H = 0$ (probability conservation) can be rewritten as $\hbar_0 \hat{p}_0 H - H a_0 j i$.
- [25] Inverse Fourier transform of $\hbar_{k_1} a_{k_2} a_{k_3} i$ is defined as $\hbar_{x,y,z} i = \frac{1}{V^{3/2}} \sum_{k_1, k_2, k_3} e^{i(k_1 x + k_2 y + k_3 z)} \hbar_{k_1} a_{k_2} a_{k_3} i$.
- [26] The Fourier transform of (85) is calculated by using $\hbar_{x,y} i = \frac{1}{V} \sum_k e^{ik(x,y)} \hbar_k a_k i$. Thus, translational invariance is ensured in form of $\hbar_{x,y} i$. The term $(k_1 + k_2 + k_3)$ appears in (86) as artifact of that.
- [27] M. Howard, J. Phys. A 29, 3437 (1996).
- [28] The density decay amplitude for $A + A$ model is independent of n_0 while the one of $A + B$ model depends only on n_0 (given that systems are observed below critical dimension, naturally).

- [29] I.M. Delves and J.L. McMahon, "Computational methods for integral equations", (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985).




FIG. 1. FIG. 1. The numerical solution of Eqs. (54-55) for $d = 1; 1.5; 2.5; 3$ (solid lines). The dotted lines indicate asymptotics as given by Eq. (74). Time is given in seconds and particle density $n(t)$ is dimensionless in units of particles per site. Initial density n_0 was set equal to 1, and reaction rate $= 1 \text{ s}^{-1}$ was used.




FIG .2. FIG 2. The numerical solution of Eqs. (152-156) for $d = 1$ with increasing amount of Kirkwood superposition approximation embedded (dotted, dash-dot and dashed line). Full curve is result of a Monte Carlo simulation (average of 500 runs). Parameters used are $L = 1000$, $n_A(0) = 2$, $n_B(0) = 1$, $\beta = 1$ and $\gamma = 2$.