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ABSTRACT

We show that if the intrinsic break energy of Gamma-Ray Bursts (GRBs) is determined by the product of more than three random variables the observed break energy distribution becomes almost lognormal including the redshift effect because of the central limit theorem. The excess from the lognormal distribution at the low break energy is possibly due to the high redshift GRBs. The same argument may also apply to the pulse duration, the interval between pulses and so on.

Subject headings: gamma rays: bursts — gamma rays: theory

1. INTRODUCTION

The central engine of the Gamma-Ray Bursts (GRBs) remains unknown, despite the great progress in the understanding of the afterglows. This is because the central engine is hidden from the direct observations. The GRB phase is considered to have an important information on the properties of the GRB activities. The GRBs are produced by the shocks within the irregular relativistic winds released by the central engine. The temporal structure of the light curve reflects the intrinsic behavior of the central engine (Kobayashi, Piran & Sari 1997). Since GRBs usually have very complex time structure, it is useful to study the GRB phase statistically.

Among the statistical properties of the observed quantities, lognormal distributions are frequently seen in GRBs. The lognormal distribution may be defined as the distribution of a random variable $x$ whose logarithm is normally distributed,

\begin{equation}
    f(x)dx = \begin{cases} 
    \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp \left[ -\frac{(\log x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right] d\log x, & \text{if } x > 0, \\
    0, & \text{if } x \leq 0, 
\end{cases}
\end{equation}
where \( f(x) \) is the probability density function for \( x \), and \( \mu \) and \( \sigma^2 \) are the sample mean and the variance of \( \log x \) (e.g., Crow & Shimizu 1988). This distribution is unimodal and positively skew. McBreen, Hurley, Long & Metcalfe (1994) pointed out that the total duration of the long and short bursts and the time interval between pulses are consistent with the lognormal distributions. Li & Fenimore (1996) showed that the pulse fluence and the pulse interval distributions within each burst are consistent with lognormal distributions. Nakar & Piran (2001) found that the pulse duration also have a lognormal distribution. The break energy distribution is also lognormal (Preece et al. 2000; see below).

Lloyd, Fryer & Ramirez-Ruiz (2001) suggested that \( \sim 10\% \) of GRBs might have the redshift larger than 6 so that the redshift distribution might be wide. Therefore it is quite strange that the observed break energy distribution and the duration distribution are lognormal since it does not seem that the observed lognormal distribution reflects the redshift distribution of the GRBs. Even if the break energy distribution is lognormal at the source, the observed break energy should be smaller than the intrinsic one by a factor of \( (1 + z) \) while the observed duration should be longer than the intrinsic one by a factor of \( (1 + z) \). These factors change by order of unity between \( z = 0 \) and \( z \sim 6 \).

Lognormal distributions often appear in nature, such as in economics, biology, geology and so on (Crow & Shimizu 1988). In astrophysics also there are other examples than GRBs. Soft gamma-ray repeaters such as SGR 1806-20 and SGR 1900+14 have the time intervals between the bursts (Hurley et al. 1994; Göğüş et al. 1999, 2000) and the burst durations (Göğüş et al. 2001) compatible with the lognormal distribution. In the field of the star formation, the Miller/Scalo stellar initial mass function has the lognormal form (Larson 1973; Elmegreen & Mathieu 1983; Adams & Fatuzzo 1996). The Vela pulsar’s variability near the peak of the average pulse profile is also lognormally distributed (Cairns, Johnston & Das 2001). Even theoretically in the internal shocks of GRBs, the conversion efficiency of the kinetic energy into the internal energy approaches 100 % when the distribution of the Lorentz factor is lognormal with large dispersion (Beloborodov 2000; Kobayashi & Sari 2001).

In this Letter, we will consider a possible origin of the observed lognormal distributions in GRBs from the viewpoint of the central limit theorem.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\)The lognormal distribution of the time interval between pulses and the pulse fluence might be reproduced by a fine tuning of model parameters (Spada, Panaitescu & Mészáros 2000).
2. BREAK ENERGY DISTRIBUTIONS

Figure 1 shows the histogram of the break energy $E_b$ taken from the electronic edition of Preece et al. (2000).\(^2\) The $\chi^2$ test of all data gives the probability of $1.4 \times 10^{-185}$ (the reduced $\chi^2$ is 16.5 with 66 degrees of freedom) that the data was taken from the lognormal distribution. Therefore the null hypothesis that the break energy distribution is lognormal fails. However, if we exclude the data in the high and low energy ends, the fit becomes good as shown in Figure 1. The $\chi^2$ test of the data between 70.8 keV and 708 keV gives the probability of 0.497 (the reduced $\chi^2$ is 0.963 with 17 degrees of freedom) that the data was taken from the lognormal distribution, with $\mu = 2.38 \pm 0.004$ ($E_b \simeq 238$ keV) and $\sigma = 0.240 \pm 0.004$ (1$\sigma$ width is between 137 keV and 413 keV). The improvement of the lognormal fit to the break energy distribution excluding the high and low energy ends may suggest that the soft and hard bursts originate from a different class of GRBs or emission mechanisms. Anyway, hereafter we will assume that the observed break energy distribution is lognormal.

Now let us assume that the intrinsic break energy distribution is lognormal. Next we numerically calculate the observed break energy distribution assuming that the redshift distribution has the form,

$$f(z)dz = \begin{cases} 
A(1+z)^{a-1}(1+z_0)^{b-1}dz, & \text{if } 0 < z < z_0, \\
A(1+z_0)^{a-1}(1+z)^{b-1}dz, & \text{if } z_0 < z,
\end{cases}$$

(2)

where $b < 0$. This redshift distribution\(^3\) rises as $\propto (1+z)^{a-1}$ to a redshift of $z_0$ and then declines as $\propto (1+z)^{b-1}$, and it is similar to that in Figure 8 of Lloyd, Fryer & Ramirez-Ruiz.

\(^2\)It is not known whether the paucity of the soft and hard bursts is real or not, because harder bursts have fewer photons (Cohen, Piran & Narayan 1998; Lloyd & Petrosian 1999; but see Brainerd et al. 1999) and there may exist relatively many soft bursts with low luminosities, so called X-ray rich GRBs (or X-ray flushes or Fast X-ray transients) (Strohmayer et al. 1998; Heise et al. 2001; Kippen et al. 2001). Here we assume that the selection effect is small.

\(^3\)The normalization in equation (2) can be calculated as

$$A = [(1+z_0)^{a+b-1}(a^{-1} - b^{-1}) - (1+z_0)^{b-1}a^{-1}]^{-1},$$

(3)

and the mean and the variance of log($1+z$) are

$$\mu_z = \frac{(1+z_0)^a(a^{-1} - b^{-1})[\ln(1+z_0) - a^{-1} - b^{-1}] + a^{-2}}{(\ln 10)(1+z_0)^{a(a^{-1} - b^{-1}) - a^{-1}}},$$

(4)

$$\sigma_z^2 = \frac{[(1+z_0)^{2a}(a^{-1} - b^{-1})^2(a^{-2} + b^{-2}) + a^{-4}]
- (1+z_0)^a(a^{-1} - b^{-1})[\ln(1+z_0) - 2b^{-1}\ln(1+z_0) + 2(a^{-2} + b^{-2})]
\times (\ln 10)^{-2}(1+z_0)^a(a^{-1} - b^{-1}) - a^{-1}]^{-2}.}$$

(5)
To mimic Figure 1, we generate 155 bursts with each burst having 35 spectra for each realization. We take the mean and the variance of the intrinsic break energy distribution as $\mu = 2.38 + \xi \mu_z$ and $\sigma^2 = (0.240)^2 - (\zeta \sigma_z)^2$ with $\xi$ and $\zeta$ being constants, so that the mean and the variance of the observed break energy are close to that in Figure 1, where $\mu_z$ and $\sigma_z^2$ are the mean and the variance of the observed break energy distribution do not coincide with $(\xi, \zeta) = (0.9, 0.8)$ for $z_0 = 0$, $(\xi, \zeta) = (1.0, 0.9)$ for $(z_0, a) = (3, 2)$, $(\xi, \zeta) = (1.0, 0.8)$ for $(z_0, a) = (3, 3)$ and $(\xi, \zeta) = (1.0, 0.8)$ for $(z_0, a) = (3, 5)$. But the main conclusion does not depend on the precise values of these factors.

Therefore this simulation shows that the average probability can reach $\sim 0.5$ even when the variance of the redshift distribution is comparable to the observed one $\sigma_z^2 \sim (0.240)^2$, although it is slightly stronger condition to preserve the lognormal form than $\sigma_z^2 < (0.240)^2$. At first glance it is strange that the simulations do not reflect the redshift distribution contrary to the argument in Section 1. In the next section we will show that it is not strange but natural due to the central limit theorem.

Figure 3 shows the histogram of the observed break energy for one experimental realization with $(z_0, a, b) = (3, 3, -3)$. The $\chi^2$ test of the data between 70.8 keV and 708 keV gives the probability of 0.128 (the reduced $\chi^2$ is 1.39 with 17 degrees of freedom) that the data was taken from the lognormal distribution, with $\mu = 2.37 \pm 0.004$ ($E_b \simeq 235$ keV) and $\sigma = 0.256 \pm 0.004$ (1$\sigma$ width is between 130 keV and 423 keV). It is interesting to note the excess of soft bursts relative to the lognormal fit as in Figure 1. The average redshifts of these soft bursts are relatively high.

---

4Since we truncate the data in the high and the low energy ends as in Figure 1, the mean and the variance of the observed break energy distribution do not coincide with $\mu = 2.38$ and $\sigma^2 = (0.240)^2$, respectively, if we take the mean and the variance of the intrinsic break energy distribution as $\mu = 2.38 + \mu_z$ and $\sigma^2 = (0.240)^2 - \sigma_z^2$, respectively. We estimate the factors, $\xi$ and $\zeta$, in front of $\mu_z$ and $\sigma_z$ through trial and error, so that the mean and the variance of the observed break energy are close to that in Figure 1. We use $(\xi, \zeta) = (0.9, 0.8)$ for $z_0 = 0$, $(\xi, \zeta) = (1.0, 0.9)$ for $(z_0, a) = (3, 2)$, $(\xi, \zeta) = (1.0, 0.8)$ for $(z_0, a) = (3, 3)$ and $(\xi, \zeta) = (1.0, 0.8)$ for $(z_0, a) = (3, 5)$. But the main conclusion does not depend on the precise values of these factors.
3. LOGNORMAL DISTRIBUTIONS

The standard model of the GRB emission is the optically thin synchrotron shock model (e.g., Piran 1999). A similar discussion in the following will be applied to the inverse Compton model. Let us consider a slow (rapid) shell with a Lorentz factor $\gamma_s$ ($\gamma_r$), a mass $m_s$ ($m_r$) and a width $l_s$ ($l_r$). When a separation between two shells is $L$, the collision takes place at a radius $R_s \simeq 2L\gamma_s^2$. At the collision, the forward and the reverse shock are formed. Here we consider the reverse shock propagating into the rapid shell. The discussion for the forward shock is similar. We assume that a fraction of electrons $\zeta_e$ is accelerated in the shock to a power law distribution of Lorentz factor $\gamma_e$, $N(\gamma_e)d\gamma_e \propto \gamma_e^{-p}d\gamma_e$ for $\gamma_e \geq \gamma_{\min} \equiv [(p-2)/(p-1)](\epsilon_n u'/\zeta_e n'm_c c^2)$, where $n'$ and $u'$ are the number density and the internal energy density in the local frame, respectively, $p \gtrsim 2$, and we assume that a fraction $\epsilon_e$ of the internal energy goes into the electrons. We also assume that a fraction $\epsilon_B$ of the internal energy goes into the magnetic field, $B^2 = 8\pi\epsilon_B u'$. The local frame quantities, $u'$ and $n'$, can be calculated using the shock jump conditions (Blandford & McKee 1976; Sari & Piran 1995). We assume that the unshocked shells are cold and the shocked shells are extremely hot. If the Lorentz factor of the shocked region is $\gamma_s$, the relative Lorentz factor of the unshocked and the shocked region is given by $\gamma_{\text{rel}} \simeq (\gamma_r/\gamma + \gamma/\gamma_s)/2 \simeq \gamma_r/2\gamma$, so that $u' = (\gamma_{\text{rel}} - 1)n'm_p c^2 \simeq \gamma_{\text{rel}} n'm_p c^2$. The number densities of the unshocked and the shocked region are given by $n'_s = m_r/4\pi m_p R_s^2 l_s \gamma_r \simeq m_r/16\pi m_p L^2 \gamma_s^2 l_s \gamma_r$ and $n' = (4\gamma_{\text{rel}} + 3)n'_r \simeq 4\gamma_{\text{rel}} n'_s$, respectively. Thus, the characteristic synchrotron energy is given by

$$E_b = \frac{h\gamma_s \gamma_r^2}{m_e c(1+z)} \simeq 260 \left[\frac{p-2}{p-1}\right]^{1/2} \epsilon_e \epsilon_B \frac{1/2}{\zeta_e} m_{s,28}^{1/2} \gamma_{s,9}^{1/2} L_{10}^{-1/2} \gamma_{r,9}^{-2/3} \gamma_{rel}^{1/2} (1+z)^{-1} \text{keV},$$

where we assume that the source is at a redshift $z$. Note that the relative Lorentz factor of the unshocked and shocked region $\gamma_{\text{rel}}$ depends on the relative Lorentz factor of the rapid and slow shell $\gamma_{rs} \simeq (\gamma_r/\gamma_s + \gamma_s/\gamma_r)/2 \simeq \gamma_r/2\gamma_s$ and the ratio between the number densities in these shells $f \equiv n'_s/n'_r = m_{s,9} \gamma_r l_{s,4} \gamma_s$ (Sari & Piran 1995). For the ultrarelativistic shock case $\gamma_{rs}^2 \gg f$, $\gamma_{\text{rel}} \sim \gamma_{rs}^{1/2} f^{1/4}/\sqrt{2} = (m_{s,9} \gamma_s^{3/4} / m_{r,15} \gamma_r^{3/4})^{1/2}/2$.

Equation (6) shows that the break energy is written in the form of a product of many variables. For such a variable made from the product of many variables, the lognormal distribution may have a very simple origin, that is, the central limit theorem (Crow & Shimizu 1988; Montroll & Shlesinger 1982). Let a variable $q$ be written in the form of a product of variables,

$$q = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n.$$  

Then,

$$\log q = \log x_1 + \log x_2 + \cdots + \log x_n.$$
When the individual distributions of $\log x_i$ satisfy certain weak conditions that include the existence of second moments, the central limit theorem is applicable to the variable $\log q$, so that the distribution function of $\log q$ tends to the normal distribution as $n$ tends to infinity.

As an example, we numerically generated random variables $x_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \ldots$) whose logarithms are uniformly distributed between 0 and 1. Figure 4 shows the histogram of the product of these three variables, $q = x_1 x_2 x_3$, for $10^4$ experimental realizations. The distribution of $q$ agrees with the lognormal distribution quite well. It is surprising that the $\chi^2$ test gives the probability of 0.483 (the reduced $\chi^2$ is 1.00 with 278 degrees of freedom) that the distribution of $q$ is taken from the lognormal distribution. This example shows that the lognormal distributions may be achieved by a relatively small number of variables (Yonetoku & Murakami 2001). Note that when the number of the variables is two, i.e., $q = x_1 x_2$, the probability that the distribution is taken from the lognormal distribution was only $1.64 \times 10^{-5}$, so that a product of only one more variable may make a distribution lognormal.

Therefore the lognormal distribution of the break energy may be a natural result from the central limit theorem. We may say, “Astrophysically, not $n = \infty$ but $n = 3$ gives the lognormal distribution !!”. The effect of the redshift is just to add one variable in equation (6) if the redshift in the observed data is randomly chosen.

### 4. PULSE FLUENCE/DURATION/INTERVAL DISTRIBUTIONS

Let us consider the lognormal distributions in other quantities related to GRBs. When the rapid shell catches up the slow one in the internal shock, using the conservation of the energy and the momentum, the Lorentz factor of the merged shell $\gamma_m$ and the internal energy $E_{\text{int}}$ produced by the collision are given by $\gamma_m \simeq [(m_r \gamma_r + m_s \gamma_s)/(m_r/\gamma_r + m_s/\gamma_s)]^{1/2}$ and $E_{\text{int}} = m_r \gamma_r + m_s \gamma_s - (m_r + m_s) \gamma_m$, respectively (e.g., Piran 1999). If we assume that a fraction $\epsilon_e$ of the internal energy goes into the electrons and a fraction $\epsilon_w$ of the energy radiated by the electrons is within the gamma-ray band, the observed energy is given by

$$E_{\text{obs}} = \epsilon_w \epsilon_e E_{\text{int}} (1 + z)^{-1} \sim \epsilon_w \epsilon_e m_r \gamma_r (1 + z)^{-1}. \quad (9)$$

Equation (9) shows that the observed energy, which is proportional to the pulse fluence, is written in the form of a product of five variables, $\epsilon_w, \epsilon_e, m_r, [\gamma_r - \gamma_m + (m_s/m_r)(\gamma_s - \gamma_m)] \sim \gamma_r$

---

5Although the fraction $\epsilon_e$ of the internal energy that goes into electrons may be a fundamental constant, there is still a large dispersion of order unity in $\epsilon_e$ deduced from the the afterglow observations (Panaitescu & Kumar 2001).
and \((1 + z)^{-1}\). Therefore the lognormal distribution of the pulse fluence may be a natural result from the central limit theorem.

The pulse duration is determined by three time scales: the hydrodynamic time scale, the cooling time scale, and the angular spreading time scale (Kobayashi, Piran & Sari 1997; Katz 1997; Fenimore, Madras & Sergei 1996). The cooling time scale is usually much shorter than the other two time scales in the internal shocks (Sari, Narayan & Piran 1996). The hydrodynamic time scale \(\sim \frac{l}{c}\) and the angular spreading time scale determine the rise and the decay time of the pulse, respectively. Since most observed pulses rise more quickly than they decay (Norris et al. 1996), we assume that the pulse duration is mainly determined by the angular spreading time \(\simeq \frac{R_s}{2c\gamma_m^2}\). Then, the pulse duration \(\delta t\) is given by

\[
\delta t \simeq \frac{(L/c)}{\gamma_s/\gamma_m}(1 + z),
\]

On the other hand, the interval between pulses \(\Delta t\) is determined by the separation between shells,

\[
\Delta t \simeq \frac{(L/c)}{1 + z},
\]

since all shells are moving towards us with almost the speed of light (Kobayashi, Piran & Sari 1997; Nakar & Piran 2001).

Equation (11) shows that the pulse interval \(\Delta t\) reflects the separation between shells \(L\), while equation (10) shows that the pulse duration \(\delta t\) is multiplied by one more factor \((\gamma_s/\gamma_m)^2\) other than \((L/c)(1 + z)\). Therefore, if we consider that the distribution of a product of variables tends to the lognormal distribution as the number of the multiplied variables increases, the distribution of the pulse duration \(\delta t\) may be closer to the lognormal distribution than that of the pulse interval \(\Delta t\). In fact, Nakar & Piran (2001) argued that the pulse duration \(\delta t\) has the lognormal distribution while the pulse interval \(\Delta t\) does not, as noticed by Li & Fenimore (1996). The pulse interval has an excess of long intervals relative to the lognormal distribution. This may suggest the existence of a different distribution, i.e., quiescent times (long periods with no activity) (Nakar & Piran 2001; Ramirez-Ruiz & Merloni 2001). But the central limit theorem may be also responsible for the lognormal distribution of the pulse duration \(\delta t\).

---

6The correlation between the pulse interval \(\delta t\) and the pulse duration \(\Delta t\) is broken when the separation between shells is too large to collide each other before the external shock. However, almost all quiescent times in Nakar & Piran (2001) are smaller than the limit \(\delta t \lesssim 100 \text{ sec} \frac{E_{52}}{n_1}^{-1/3} \frac{\gamma_{100}}{10^{-3}}\) so that shells may collide.
5. DISCUSSIONS

We considered the possible origin of the lognormal distributions in the break energy, the pulse fluence and the pulse duration as a result of the central limit theorem. Astrophysically the lognormal distribution may be achieved by a product of only a few variables. The effect of the redshift is just to add one variable to the product so that the redshift distribution is hidden.

We have no idea about the origin of the lognormal distributions in the pulse interval $\Delta t$ and the total duration $\Delta T$. However the viewing angle may be one factor to be multiplied to the pulse interval $\Delta t$. Recently we suggested that the luminosity-lag relation could be explained by the variation in the viewing angle $\theta_v$ from the axis of the jet (Ioka & Nakamura 2001; Nakamura 2000). The duration of the pulse from the jet also depends on the viewing angle, and according to Figure 2 of Ioka & Nakamura (2001) we have

$$\Delta t \propto (L/c)(1 + z)(1 + \gamma^2 \theta_v^2),$$

when $\theta_v \sim \Delta \theta$ where $\gamma$ is the Lorentz factor of the jet and $\Delta \theta$ is the opening half-angle of the jet. The multiplied factor $(1 + \gamma^2 \theta_v^2)$ may be responsible for the lognormal distribution of the pulse interval $\Delta t$. Note that the total duration $\Delta T$ is equal to the lifetime of the central engine and thus does not depend on $\theta_v$.

We have not taken the redshift evolution of the quantities into account. If the redshifts of GRBs were measured, we could argue the correlation of observed quantities with the redshift. We may use some distance indicators, such as luminosity-lag relation (Norris, Marani & Bonnell 2000; Schaefer, Deng & Band 2001), and luminosity-variability relation (Fenimore & Ramirez-Ruiz 2000; Reichart et al. 2000). This is an interesting future problem. It is interesting to note that the evolution of the GRB luminosity function was suggested using the luminosity-variability relations (Lloyd, Fryer & Ramirez-Ruiz 2001). The number of physical variables is actually finite, and hence, it is important to investigate the departures from the lognormal form by the future observations.
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Fig. 1.— The break energy distribution taken from the electronic edition of Preece et al. (2000) is shown. The lognormal fitting of the data between 70.8 keV and 708 keV is shown by a solid line. The fitting range between 70.8 keV and 708 keV is shown by dotted lines. The $\chi^2$ test gives the probability of 0.497 (the reduced $\chi^2$ is 0.963 with 17 degrees of freedom) that the data was taken from the lognormal distribution, with the mean $\mu = 2.38 \pm 0.004$ ($E_b \simeq 238$ keV) and the standard deviation $\sigma = 0.240 \pm 0.004$ ($1\sigma$ width is between 137 keV and 413 keV).
Fig. 2.— The average probability that the simulated data is taken from the lognormal distribution for $10^4$ experimental realizations is shown as a function of the power law index of the redshift distribution $-b$ in equation (2). The simulated data is generated by calculating the observed break energy distribution assuming that the intrinsic break energy distribution is lognormal and the redshift distribution has the form in equation (2). Four cases are shown, $z_0 = 0$, $(z_0, a) = (3, 2)$, $(z_0, a) = (3, 3)$ and $(z_0, a) = (3, 5)$. 
Fig. 3.— One experimental realization of the observed break energy distribution for 
$(z_0, a, b) = (3, 3, -3)$ in equation (2) is shown. The lognormal fitting of the data between
70.8 keV and 708 keV is shown by a solid line. The fitting range between 70.8 keV and 708
keV is shown by dotted lines. The $\chi^2$ test gives the probability of 0.128 (the reduced $\chi^2$
is 1.39 with 17 degrees of freedom) that the data was taken from the lognormal distribution,
with $\mu = 2.37 \pm 0.004$ ($E_b \simeq 235$ keV) and $\sigma = 0.256 \pm 0.004$ ($1\sigma$ width is between 130 keV
and 423 keV). There is an excess of soft bursts relative to the lognormal fit as in Figure 1.
Fig. 4.— The distribution of the product of three random variables \( q = x_1 x_2 x_3 \), each distributing uniformly between 0 and 1 in the logarithmic space (that is \( 0 < \log x_i < 1 \)), for \( 10^4 \) experimental realizations is shown. The lognormal fitting of the data is shown by a solid line. The \( \chi^2 \) test gives the probability of 0.483 (the reduced \( \chi^2 \) is 1.00 with 278 degrees of freedom) that the distribution of \( q \) is taken from the lognormal distribution.