Universality of the preasymptotics in the hadron and photon diffraction

S. M. Troshin and N. E. Tyurin

Institute for High Energy Physics,
Protvino, Moscow Region, 142284 Russia

Abstract

We note that it is premature to make a conclusion on the multiplicity of the Pomerons on the basis of the available experimental data since the interactions have a preasymptotic nature.

The straitforward interpretation of the recent HERA data on the deep–inelastic scattering together with the analysis of the data on hadron–hadron scattering in terms of the Regge model could lead to the unexpected conclusion on the existence of the various Pomerons [1] or the various manifestations of the unique Pomeron in the different processes depending on the typical scale of the process [2]. The approaches [3, 4] contending the dominance of the soft Pomeron do not rule out existence of the hard Pomeron either.

Indeed, soft hadronic reactions imply that the Pomeron's intercept $\alpha_{\mathcal{P}} = 1.08$ [1], small–x dependence of the structure function $F_2(x, Q^2)$ leads to $\alpha_{\mathcal{P}} = 1.4$-$1.5$ [5, 6] and the measurements of the diffractive cross–section in the deep inelastic scattering provide $\alpha_{\mathcal{P}} = 1.23$ [7]. So, does this mean that we have few Pomerons or we have few different manifestations of the same Pomeron depending on the particular process? Probably both options are not to be considered as the firm ones, since the experimental data used for these statements were obtained at not high enough energies where, in fact, the preasymptotic regime of interactions does take place. The above conclusions are based on the presumed dominance of the Pomeron contribution already in the preasymptotic energy region and do not take into account the unitarity effects which become very essential as one goes beyond this region. What is called a Pomeron is to be interpreted as a true asymptotical contribution of the driving mechanism.

In this note we argue that all the three classes of the processes described above are related to the similar mechanisms and the corresponding energy dependence of the cross-sections can be well described by the universal functional energy dependence of the type $a + b\sqrt{s}$. Such dependence is valid for the preasymptotic energy region only and beyond this region unitarity changes the picture drastically. We consider for illustration the unitarized chiral quark model [8]. However, the conclusions seem to be of a more general meaning.

In this model the elastic scattering amplitude in the impact parameter representation has the following form

$$F(s, b) = U(s, b)[1 - iU(s, b)]^{-1} \tag{1}$$

where $U(s, b)$ is the generalized reaction matrix which in the case of a pure imaginary amplitude is

$$U(s, b) = ig(N - 1)^N[1 + \alpha\sqrt{s}/\langle m_Q\rangle]^N \exp(-\tilde{M}b). \tag{2}$$

In Eq. (1) $g > 0$, N is the total number of the constituent quarks in the colliding hadrons, $\tilde{M} = \sum_{Q=1}^{N} m_Q/\xi$ and b is the impact parameter of the colliding hadrons [8]. Fit to the total hp cross-sections gives small values for the parameters g and α ($g, \alpha \ll 1$) [9]. It means that at $s \ll s_0$ the second term in the square brackets in Eqs. (1) and (2) is small and we can expand over it. The numerical value of s_0 is determined by the equation $|U(s, 0)| = 1$ and is [9]

$$\sqrt{s_0} = 2\,\mathrm{TeV}.$$

The value of s_0 is on the verge of the preasymptotic energy region, i.e. the Tevatron energy is at the beginning of the road to the asymptotics. Evidently the HERA energy range $W(= \sqrt{s_{\gamma p}}) \leq 300$ GeV is in a preasymptotic domain.

The above model gives the linear with $\sqrt{s}$ dependence for the total cross–sections according to Eqs. (1) and (2):

$$\sigma_{tot}^{hp,\gamma p} = a + b\sqrt{s}, \tag{3}$$

where parameters a and b are different for different processes. It was shown [9] that this dependence is in a good agreement with the experimental data.

The same dependence for the total cross–section of $\gamma^* p$ scattering is implied by the small–x behavior of the structure function $F_2(x,Q^2)$ observed experimentally [5, 6] and obtained in the model [10]:

$$F_2(x,Q^2) = a(Q^2) + b(Q^2)/\sqrt{x}. \qquad (4)$$

The experimental data indicate the critical behavior of the function $b(Q^2)$ at $Q^2 \simeq 1$ (GeV/c)^2.

The third value for the Pomeron intercept $\alpha_{\mathcal{P}} = 1.23$ has been obtained from the analysis of the experimental data on the diffractive cross–section in deep–inelastic scattering [7] where the dependence of $d\sigma^{diff}_{\gamma^* p\to XN}/dM_X^2$ on W was parametrized according to the Regge model and the Pomeron dominance has been assumed:

$$d\sigma^{diff}_{\gamma^* p\to XN}/dM_X^2 \propto (W^2)^{2\alpha_{\mathcal{P}}-2}. \qquad (5)$$

The data demontrate linear rise of the differential cross–section $d\sigma^{diff}_{\gamma^* p\to XN}/dM_X^2$ with W, i.e. we observe here just the same functional dependence on the c.m.s. energy as it was observed for $\sigma^{hp,\gamma p,\gamma^* p}_{tot}$. Regarding the preasymptotic nature of the interaction mode we arrive to the universal c.m.s. energy dependence in the framework of the model used above.

Indeed, in the framework of this model the hadron inelastic diffractive cross–section is given by the following expression [11]:

$$\frac{d\sigma^{diff}_{hp\to XN}}{dM_X^2} \simeq \frac{8\pi g^* \xi^2}{M_X^2}\eta(s,0), \qquad (6)$$

where

$$\eta(s,b) = \mathrm{Im}U(s,b)/[1 - iU(s,b)]^2$$

is the inelastic overlap function.

At the preasymptotic energies $s \ll s_0$ the energy dependence of inelastic diffractive cross–section resulting from Eq. (2) is determined by the generic form

$$\frac{d\sigma^{diff}_{hp\to XN}}{dM_X^2} \propto a + b\sqrt{s}. \qquad (7)$$

Inelastic diffractive cross–section for the $\gamma^* p$ interactions can be obtained using for example VMD model, i.e.

$$\frac{d\sigma^{diff}_{\gamma^* p\to XN}}{dM_X^2} \propto a(Q^2) + b(Q^2)W. \qquad (8)$$

The same functional dependence can be obtained using the "aligned jet" model [12] along with the unitarized chiral quark model [8].

It should be noted here that the above linear dependences for the cross–sections of different processes is the generic feature associated with the preasymptotic nature of the interaction dynamics at $s \ll s_0$. As one goes above this energy range the function $|U(s,b)|$ is rising and when $|U(s,0)| \geq 1$ the unitarity starts to play the major role and provides the $\ln^2 s$

rise of the total cross–sections at $s \gg s_0$ [8] and also the following behavior of the structure function $F_2(x,Q^2)$

$$F_2(x,Q^2) \propto \ln^2(1/x) \tag{9}$$

at $x \to 0$ [10]. At the same time unitarity leads to the decreasing dependence of the inelastic diffractive cross–section at $s \to \infty$

$$\frac{d\sigma^{diff}}{dM_X^2} \propto \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}\right)^N. \tag{10}$$

for the hp, γp and $\gamma^* p$ processes [11]. Such behavior is associated with the antishadow scattering mode which develops at small impact parameters at $s > s_0$.

Thus, we might expect the different asymptotic and universal preasymptotic behaviors for the different classes of the diffraction processes.

To summarize, we would like to emphasize that the unified description of the processes of hp, γp and $\gamma^* p$ diffraction scattering with the universal cross-section dependence on the c.m.s. interaction energy is possible. For the illustration we used the unitarized chiral quark model which has a nonperturbative origin and leads to the linear c.m.s. energy dependence of the cross–sections in the preasymptotic energy region for the above processes. Universality of such preasymptotic behavior agrees with the experiment.

The assumption on the existence of the different Pomerons results from the use of the asymptotic formulas in the preasymptotic energy region and the neglect of the unitarity effects at higher energies beyond this preasymptotic region. It should be taken with certain caution.

References

[1] P. V. Landshoff, in Proc. of the Summer School on Hadronic Aspects of Collider Physics, Zuoz(Engadin), August 1994, Ed. M. P. Locher, p. 135, hep-ph/9505396.

[2] A. Levy, Talk given at International Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics, Brussels, July-August 1995;
M. Bertini, M. Giffon, L. L. Jenkovszky, F. Paccanoni and E. Predazzi, Rev. Nuovo Cim. **19,** 1 (1996).

[3] A. Donnachie and P. V. Landshoff, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. **22,** 733 (1996).

[4] V. A. Petrov, Talk given at the High Energy Conference on Quantum Chromodynamics – QCD '96, Montepellier, France, July 1996, Preprint IHEP 96-69.

[5] H1 Collaboration, Nucl. Phys. B **407,** 515 (1993) ibid. B **439,** 379 (1995).

[6] ZEUS Collaboration, Phys. Lett. **B316,** 412 (1993); Z. Phys. C **65,** 379 (1995).

[7] ZEUS Collaboration, Z. Phys. C **70,** 391 (1996).

[8] S. M. Troshin and N. E. Tyurin, Nuovo Cim. A **106,** 327 (1993); in Proc. of the Vth Blois Workshop on Elastic and Diffractive Scattering, Providence, June 1993, Eds. H. M. Fried, K. Kang and C.–I Tan, p. 387; Phys. Rev. D **49,** 4427 (1994).

[9] S. M. Troshin, N. E.Tyurin and O. P. Yuschenko, Nuovo Cim. A **91,** 23 (1986); P. M. Nadolsky, S. M. Troshin and N. E. Tyurin, Z. Phys. C **69,** 131 (1995).

[10] S. M. Troshin and N. E. Tyurin, Preprint IHEP 96-29, to be published in Europhysics Letters.

[11] S. M. Troshin and N. E. Tyurin, Z. Phys. C **64,** 311 (1994).

[12] J. D. Bjorken and J. Kogut, Phys. Rev. D **8,** 1341 (1973); S. J. Brodsky, P. Hoyer and L. Magnea, NORDITA–96/68P, SLAC-PUB-7342, hep-ph/9611278.