

---



---

**COMMENTS**


---



---

*Comments are short papers which criticize or correct papers of other authors previously published in the **Physical Review**. Each Comment should state clearly to which paper it refers and must be accompanied by a brief abstract. The same publication schedule as for regular articles is followed, and page proofs are sent to authors.*

---

### Comment on “Strangeness enhancement in $p+A$ and $S+A$ interactions at energies near 200A GeV”

Marek Gaździcki

*Institut für Kernphysik, Universität Frankfurt, August-Euler-Strasse 6, D-60486 Frankfurt, Germany*

Ulrich Heinz

*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Regensburg, D-93040 Regensburg, Germany*

(Received 30 January 1996)

We critically discuss the recent analysis of strangeness production in nuclear collisions at 200A GeV/c performed by Topor Pop *et al.* We point out various problems in connection with the interpretation of the data and the numerical model results. We also argue that the term “strangeness enhancement” is used in a misleading way. [S0556-2813(96)05209-0]

PACS number(s): 25.75.-q, 24.10.Jv, 24.85.+p, 25.40.Ve

In a recent publication Topor Pop and collaborators (TP\*) [1] discuss the production of strange particles in nuclear collisions at CERN SPS energies within microscopic models. Their analysis and conclusions are mainly based on the comparison of the data from the NA35 experiment [2] with the HIJING model [3].

In this Comment we wish to point out that the analysis procedure used by TP\* is problematic, both with respect to the interpretation of the data and to the way these are compared to the model. The results presented in TP\* do not support the conclusions drawn by the authors.

We wish to first comment on problems with the procedure of TP\* and afterwards on inconsistencies in the interpretation of their results.

(I) In the abstract of Ref. [1] one reads, “The HIJING model is used to perform a *linear* extrapolation from  $pp$  to  $AA$ .” In order to justify this procedure a comparison between  $p+p$  data [4] and the HIJING model is done in Sec. III A of Ref. [1]. From this comparison TP\* conclude, “We note that the *integrated* multiplicities for neutral strange particles  $\langle \Lambda \rangle$ ,  $\langle \bar{\Lambda} \rangle$ , and  $\langle K_S^0 \rangle$  are reproduced at the level of three standard deviations for  $pp$  interactions at 200 GeV. However, the values for  $\langle \bar{p} \rangle$  and  $\langle \bar{\Lambda} \rangle$  are significantly over predicted by the model.” This, together with Figs. 1(a) and 2(a) of Ref. [1], is taken as evidence that the HIJING model is sufficiently accurate in its reproduction of  $\Lambda$  and kaon production in  $p+p$  collisions to allow for a meaningful extrapolation to  $p+A$  and  $A+A$  data.

An inspection of Table I in Ref. [1] leads, however, to the opposite conclusion: The yields of  $\langle \Lambda \rangle$  and  $\langle K_S^0 \rangle$  are significantly overpredicted by HIJING (six to seven standard deviations [5] for  $\Lambda$  and nine to ten standard deviations for  $K_S^0$ ). The yields of  $\bar{p}$  and  $\bar{\Lambda}$  seem also to be overpredicted by HIJING but they agree with the model within three standard deviations.

Furthermore, Fig. 1(a) of Ref. [1] shows that HIJING also fails to reproduce the  $\Lambda$  rapidity spectrum in  $p+p$  collisions. In fact it was shown previously by one of the authors of TP\* that the HIJING model underpredicts the stopping of baryons in nuclear collisions [6]. This biases the form of the  $\Lambda$  rapidity distribution, producing characteristic forward-backward peaks [see Figs. 1(a)–1(d) in Ref. [1]] which are not observed or (in the case of  $p+p$  collisions) are significantly lower in the data.

We therefore conclude that the HIJING model has severe shortcomings in its reproduction of the  $p+p$  data which eliminate it as a candidate for “a *linear* extrapolation from  $pp$  to  $AA$ .” A detailed discussion of the effect of strangeness enhancement in  $AA$  cannot be reliably based on the comparison with this model.

(II) In Sec. III C of Ref. [1] the rapidity and the transverse mass (momentum) spectra of strange particles are compared with the HIJING and VENUS models. This analysis is misleading and the ensuing discussion of the transverse mass spectra is very questionable since the authors do not restrict the calculated spectra to the rapidity acceptance of the experimental data. The failure to properly account for experimental acceptances is also reflected in the following misleading statement in the introduction of Ref. [1]: “In addition, there have been substantial changes in the final published data [2] relative to earlier comparisons to preliminary data” [7,8]. In fact the experimental data published in [7,8] are fully consistent with the recently published results [2]; the differences are entirely due to an improved acceptance for strange particles in  $S+S$  collisions following modifications of the NA35 setup [2] which then also allowed for an analysis of strangeness production in  $S+Ag$  and  $S+Au$  collisions [2].

We expect that taking into account the experimental acceptances will result in lowering the model points by a factor of up to about 3. One should also note that different data sets have significantly different acceptances. These acceptance cuts cannot be neglected in the analysis of the transverse mass spectra, as done by TP\*, since they influence both the spectral shapes and the local yields of strange particles.

Let us now comment on the conclusions drawn by TP\* from their results. They write [1], “Our main conclusion therefore is that strangeness enhancement is a nonequilibrium effect clearly revealed in the lightest ion interactions.” This conclusion is based on the following TP\* observation: “The strangeness enhancement in the minimum bias  $p+S$  is striking because the number of target nucleons struck by the incident proton is on the average only 2.” The conclusion and its justification do *not* follow from the TP\* analysis. Its origin can be traced as follows: TP\* compare the  $\Lambda$  rapidity distribution for  $p+S$  interactions with the HIJING model [Fig. 1(b) in Ref. [1]]. They observe that HIJING underpredicts the  $\Lambda$  yield at midrapidity. This disagreement is called by TP\* the observation of a strangeness enhancement in  $p+S$  interactions. However, as argued above, the underprediction of midrapidity  $\Lambda$ 's by HIJING is in part a consequence of its weak baryon stopping. Figure 1(b) of Ref. [1] shows very clearly that the *under prediction* of midrapidity  $\Lambda$ 's in  $p+S$  collisions by HIJING is accompanied by an *over prediction* of  $\Lambda$ 's in the proton fragmentation region. This reflects the incorrect description of baryon stopping, in particular when accompanied by converting the leading baryon into a hyperon, in  $p+A$  collisions by the model. As such it has nothing to do with an enhanced production of strange particles.

Since the discovery of anomalously high production of strangeness in central nucleus-nucleus collisions at AGS and SPS energies [9,10], “strangeness enhancement” has been defined in a model-independent way as an increase of the ratio between the *total* multiplicity of strange quarks (particles) and that of nonstrange quarks (particles) when going from nucleon-nucleon ( $N+N$ ) interactions to nuclear ( $A+$

$A$ ) collisions. It can be quantified [11,12] by studying the change of the strangeness suppression factor  $\lambda_S$ , which is commonly used in the elementary particle physics, or by analyzing the factor  $E_S$  introduced in [2] in order to avoid experimental problems in the evaluation of  $\lambda_S$  for nuclear collisions. The compiled data on strangeness production in  $p+p$  [4] and  $p+A$  [12,2] interactions lead to the conclusion that *there is no strangeness enhancement in  $p+A$  interactions at 200 GeV/c*. This statement is based on eight independent measurements of strange and nonstrange particle production in  $p+A$  interactions, with  $A$  ranging from Mg to Au. The NA35 data from  $p+S$  collisions alone lead also to the same conclusion. The “strangeness enhancement” discussed by TP\* is concentrated at midrapidity and measured relative to a model calculation, and it is also accompanied by a “suppression” in the projectile fragmentation region. This addresses, in our opinion, different physics which is not correctly reproduced by the models even at the  $pp$  level.

On the other hand, *strangeness enhancement is observed in central nucleus-nucleus collisions* at all studied collision energies [13] (e.g., for central S+S and S+Ag collisions at 200 A GeV/c). Because of the model deficiencies discussed in this Comment, the analysis of TP\* does not allow us to trace the mechanism for this enhancement. The statement of TP\* that it is “clearly a nonequilibrium effect” which prohibits the use of “simplistic fireball models” for its interpretation has not been proved. None of the known microscopic and kinetic models based on hadronic and string dynamics (including HIJING and VENUS) is able to reproduce the strangeness enhancement effect observed at CERN SPS energies [14].

We suggest that the microscopic models should be returned to provide an accurate description of strange hadron spectra in  $pp$  collisions before using them to analyze  $pA$  collisions in an attempt to elucidate the origins of the exciting global strangeness enhancement in nucleus-nucleus collisions. New and better data on strange particle production and spectra in  $pA$  collisions would also be very useful.

- 
- [1] V. Topor Pop, M. Gyulassy, X.N. Wang, A. Andrighetto, M. Morando, F. Pellegrini, R.A. Ricci, and G. Segato, Phys. Rev. C **52**, 1618 (1995).
- [2] NA35 Collaboration, Th. Alber *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **64**, 195 (1994), and references therein.
- [3] X.-N. Wang and M. Gyulassy, Comput. Phys. Commun. **83**, 307 (1994), and references therein.
- [4] M. Gaździcki and O. Hansen, Nucl. Phys. **A528**, 754 (1991).
- [5] The experimental error of  $\langle \Lambda + \Sigma^0 \rangle$  quoted in Table I in [1] should be 0.01 instead of 0.015; see Tables 5 and 7 in Ref. [4].
- [6] M. Gyulassy, Nucl. Phys. **A590**, 431c (1995).
- [7] NA35 Collaboration, J. Bartke *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **48**, 191 (1990).
- [8] NA35 Collaboration, R. Stock *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **A525**, 221c (1991).
- [9] E802 Collaboration, O. Hansen, in *The Nuclear Equation of State*, edited by W. Greiner and H. Stöcker, Vol. 216 of *NATO Advanced Study Institute, Series B: Physics* (Plenum, New York, 1990), p. 97.
- [10] NA35 Collaboration, M. Gaździcki, in *The Nuclear Equation of State* [9], p. 103.
- [11] A. K. Wróblewski, Acta Phys. Pol. B **16**, 379 (1985).
- [12] H. Białkowska, M. Gaździcki, W. Retyk, and E. Skrzypczak, Z. Phys. C **55**, 491 (1992).
- [13] M. Gaździcki and D. Röhrich, Z. Phys. C **65**, 215 (1995).
- [14] NA35 Collaboration, M. Gaździcki *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **A590**, 197c (1995).