

Sum rules and dualities for generalized parton distributions: Is there a holographic principle?

K. Kumerički^a, D. Müller^b, K. Passek-Kumerički^c

^a*Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, University of Zagreb
P.O.B. 331, HR-10002 Zagreb, Croatia*

^b*Institut für Theoretische Physik II, Ruhr-Universität Bochum
D-44780 Bochum, Germany*

^c*Theoretical Physics Division, Rudjer Bošković Institute
P.O.Box 180, HR-10002 Zagreb, Croatia*

Abstract

To leading order approximation, the physical content of generalized parton distributions (GPDs) that is accessible in deeply virtual electroproduction of photons or mesons is contained in their value on the cross-over trajectory. This trajectory separates the t -channel and s -channel dominated GPD regions. The underlying Lorentz covariance implies a correspondence between these two regions through their relation to GPDs on the cross-over trajectory. This point of view leads to a family of GPD sum rules which are a quark analogue of finite energy sum rules and it guides us to a new phenomenological GPD concept. As an example, we discuss the constraints from the JLab/Hall A data on the dominant u -quark GPD H . The question arises whether GPDs are governed by some kind of holographic principle.

Keywords: generalized parton distributions, deeply virtual Compton scattering, sum rules, duality, holographic principle

PACS numbers: 11.30.Cp, 13.60.Fz, 11.30.Ly, 11.55.Hx

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Mainstream GPD models versus experiment	5
2.1	GPD basics and terminology	5
2.2	Ad hoc GPD phenomenology	8
2.3	A fitting procedure	11
2.4	Lessons from failure and success: a speculative GPD picture	12
3	GPD duality and families of GPD sum rules	14
3.1	Preliminaries	14
3.2	Sum rules	16
3.3	Deconvolution and duality	19
4	Phenomenological applications	22
4.1	Strategy to access GPDs	22
4.2	Revealing GPDs from experimental measurements	27
5	Outlook	31

1 Introduction

Generalized parton distributions (GPDs) [1, 2, 3] are partonic amplitudes which contain the non-perturbative physics of perturbatively factorized exclusive leptonproduction amplitudes [4, 5]. Depending on the parton momentum fractions, a GPD is interpreted either as the probability amplitude of a meson-like t -channel exchange or as the s -channel exchange of a parton. Compared to parton distribution functions (PDFs) and distribution amplitudes, they reveal the partonic content of hadrons, proton in particular, from a complementary perspective, see reviews [6, 7]. For instance, the partonic angular momentum, naturally defined by the decomposition of the angular momentum tensor in terms of quark and gluonic degrees of freedom, is given by the first Mellin moment of certain GPDs [8]. Quantification of such partonic decomposition of the proton spin is one of the main goals for measurements of GPD related processes.

During the last decade, experimental effort has been undertaken to measure deeply virtual Compton scattering (DVCS) [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19] and production of mesons, e.g., Refs. [20, 21, 22, 23, 24], yielding an increasing amount and precision of experimental data. On the other hand, GPDs are intricate functions, depending on the parton's longitudinal momentum fraction (x), the skewness (η), the momentum transfer squared (t), and the factorization scale (μ^2 — usually equated to the virtuality Q^2 of the probe). This makes their extraction from experimental measurements, where they enter as a convolution with a hard-scattering amplitude, a rather awkward task. Since the partonic momentum fraction dependence of GPDs is integrated out in the amplitude, the degrees of freedom that can be constrained by experiment do not provide the momentum fraction shape of GPDs for fixed η . Consequently, GPD moments, including the angular momentum of quarks, cannot be directly revealed.

The analysis of deeply virtual exclusive processes is based on GPD ansätze and models which take into account that GPDs in certain limits reduce to form factors and PDFs. As the basic GPD ansatz, written in essence as a product of form factor and PDF, the popular VGG code [25] successfully describes the first DVCS beam spin asymmetry measurements at HERMES [10] and CLAS [11], but fails in the case of more recent data on the unpolarized DVCS cross section, measured by the Hall A collaboration [14]. Other GPD models proposed up to now [26, 27, 28, 29] are similarly (un)successful in describing DVCS observables measured in fixed target experiments. In collider kinematics, no published GPD model, which is (a) mathematically consistent, (b) has a reasonable t -dependence, and (c) satisfies the evolution equation, is able to describe the DVCS data at leading order (LO) accuracy. Taking into account radiative corrections, the measured DVCS cross section can be described, as advocated in Refs. [30, 31], and fitted in Refs. [32, 33]. Also, Regge inspired modelling of off-shell amplitudes [34] can be tuned to be consistent with experimental data [35, 36]. If unitarity constraints are taken into account in the fixed

target kinematics, the model [35] is in fair agreement with the unpolarized DVCS cross section measurement [37]. Thereby, it provides a physical interpretation in terms of hadronic degrees of freedom, where the desired view inside the nucleon cannot be delivered.

Thus, although GPD modelling is guided by relation of GPDs to PDFs and form factors, by Regge phenomenology, various model calculations, lattice simulations etc., resulting models are only partially able to describe experimental data. This, in combination with the spread out implicit belief that resulting GPD models might be realistic in a more general way, leads then to endless discussions, such as 'Which model is right, A or B?' (when both are maybe wrong) or 'GPDs or not GPDs?', to claims that GPDs can be constrained from present lattice data, and to 'a conjectured proof' of the breakdown of the GPD formalism (for some details see [38]). Sometimes, criticism of GPD *models* is unjustly extended to GPD *representations*. In our opinion it is unclear whether sufficient understanding of GPDs is reached in the proposed models. Below we will demonstrate that there should be *no problem* to describe presently measured DVCS observables within the GPD formalism. What should be questioned, however, is the present phenomenological approach, which is based on GPD models that are more or less constructed *ad hoc*.

Since it turns out that models created in the first decade of GPD phenomenology are inefficient at present, we would like to come back to two basic questions, which should be clearly answered:

- What GPD information can be revealed from experimental data?
- What do we learn from this information?

Both above questions have been addressed in the momentum fraction representation and, more recently, in the framework of the 'dual' GPD parameterization [39, 40, 29]. We will recall the known partial answers to those questions in momentum fraction representation and add a rarely recognized GPD aspect, namely, duality [41, 33], with the focus on the phenomenological applicability. Before we give the technicalities in the main body of the paper, we shortly outline the answers here. In our opinion it does not matter in which representation they are formulated.

The answer to the first question arises from analyticity and it has been clearly spelled out for fixed resolution scale in Ref. [42]. Let us recall that the DVCS amplitude is considered to be a holomorphic function, see, e.g., Refs. [43, 44, 42, 33, 45, 46], whose real part can be expressed in terms of its imaginary part, i.e., its s - and u -channel discontinuities, via a single variable dispersion relation for fixed t . Moreover, to LO the imaginary part is given by the GPD on its *cross-over trajectory* ($\eta = x$), that separates the meson-like t -channel interpretation of the *central region* ($|x| \leq \eta$) from the partonic s -channel exchange view of the *outer region* ($\eta \leq x \leq 1$). Hence, apart from this trajectory the GPD for fixed resolution scale cannot be experimentally accessed. The dispersion relation gives us a considerable handle on the GPD at the cross-over trajectory

and constraints its functional form, even if the modulus and phase of the amplitude are measured only in a restricted phase space. Therefore, the answer to the first question guides us to a simple phenomenological concept in which the dispersion relation is used to pin down the value of the GPD on the trajectory $\eta = x$.

Suppose we know now the GPD at its cross-over trajectory from an (ideal) measurement for fixed photon virtuality Q^2 , as illustrated below in Fig. 1. The deconvolution problem, which then pops up, is how the GPD at $\eta = x$ is related to its value at any η , i.e, for the whole support. Lorentz covariance guarantees that a GPD possesses a duality property [41, 33], i.e., it can be mapped from the outer region into its central one, where the GPD is continuous on the cross-over trajectory. Obviously, one can draw a priori any surface over the outer region of the GPD support that connects the curves given by the GPD at $\eta = x$ and $\eta = 0$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$, see Fig. 1. Positivity constraints, see Ref. [47] and references therein, lead to constraints on these surfaces. The dual surfaces in the central region are then governed by Lorentz covariance. Each of these surfaces corresponds to a GPD model and so the deconvolution problem has infinite solutions¹. We stress that evolution of GPD with change of resolution scale provides a supplementary handle on the deconvolution problem, as advocated in Ref. [48]. However, for a small lever arm in the photon virtuality only if some holographic principle exists, rigidly relating shape of this surface to values along the $\eta = x$ trajectory, the deconvolution problem can be strictly solved. But even if this hypothetical principle remains unknown, one still has various theoretical and phenomenological tools at hand to address the deconvolution problem and, in particular, the related problem of decomposition of the quark angular momentum.

In this paper we introduce a new set of such tools, namely GPD sum rules, and we illustrate how an alternative phenomenological approach to DVCS might look like. The outline is as follows. To shed light on unrealistic features of GPD models, presently used in phenomenology, we give in Sect. 2 a short overview of experimental findings and their confrontation with GPD models, mainly for the DVCS process. The reader who is not interested in this phenomenological aspect can safely skip this section. In Sect. 3 we employ previous results [41, 33] to clearly spell out that GPDs have an internal duality, relating the outer and central regions. We derive then various GPD sum rules. In Sect. 4 we discuss the phenomenological applications of these sum rules and also give a preliminary example for fixed target kinematics. Finally, in Sect. 5 we summarize and conjecture that GPDs should be governed by a holographic principle, which might be naturally related both to the duality interpretation of strong interaction phenomena, reviewed, e.g., in Ref. [49], and to the AdS/CFT conjecture [50, 51, 52].

¹ The problem with present GPD models is that usually one solution is picked up, with parameterization of the GPD at the cross-over trajectory being too rigid.

2 Mainstream GPD models versus experiment

Numerous experimental, theoretical, and phenomenological efforts, reviewed in Refs. [6, 7], have been spent during the first decade of the GPD phenomenology in an attempt to go beyond the basic GPD ansatz, given by the product of PDF and elastic form factor. Fortunately, there is tremendous progress on the experimental side and, certainly, some theoretical understanding is reached, too. Unfortunately, some rather hypothetical elements became an important part of the mainstream phenomenology, while at the same time some well-understood theoretical features are incompletely implemented. In what follows, we would like to make it clear that the observed phenomenological problem, namely, that certain GPD models fail to describe DVCS data [14, 24, 53, 29], indicates only that the ad hoc GPD model approach in its present form is an inefficient tool for the future and that any general conclusion about the GPD formalism drawn from the failure of certain GPD models should be considered as a speculation (sometimes already ruled out). Below we shortly describe the situation and attempt to separate different problems, which are often mixed up. Thereby, we consider the experimental findings as fact, cf. Ref. [29], and like to spell out the first lessons. In the future, this might be useful for setting up models for GPDs at the cross-over trajectory $\eta = x$ and for addressing the deconvolution problem.

2.1 GPD basics and terminology

GPD models, used in phenomenology so far, are mainly based on a spectral representation for Green functions of light-ray operators [1, 54] or on the collinear conformal partial wave expansion² [56], known in various versions [57, 58, 59, 60, 41, 61, 62]. In the former case they are named double distribution representation [54]. In the latter case they are named ‘dual’ [63] or Mellin-Barnes representation [41], which essentially represent the same collinear conformal $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ partial wave expansion, however, written down in two different realizations. The name ‘dual’ primarily refers in our understanding to the uses of crossing symmetry [1, 64, 65], which is on the other hand independent of the chosen representation. For the sake of clarification, we follow the authors of Ref. [63] and denote their representation with the name ‘dual’ in quotation marks. The term dual (without quotation marks) we use for a general GPD property, as used above and explained further in Sect. 3. This concept was partially utilized for evolution kernels [66, 1] and has been adopted to GPDs [41], supplemented by a constructive proof [33]. As emphasized in Ref. [41] it is also tied to crossing, again independently of the representation. The term Mellin-Barnes representation refers to a specific integral representation of the collinear conformal partial wave expansion, closely related to the well-known Sommerfeld-Watson transform, in which internal

²The group theoretical aspects and QCD applications of the collinear conformal group are given in Ref. [55].

GPD duality is manifestly incorporated, cf. Ref. [61, 62].

The double distribution representation arises directly from diagrammatical considerations [1, 54]. We consider it to be the most general representation that inherits properties of field theory. The expansion of the GPD in collinear conformal partial waves arises naturally from the solution of the evolution equation to LO accuracy. In the double distribution representation the partonic quantum numbers are the momentum fractions of two partons, while in the ‘dual’ parameterization, beside the conformal spin, the angular momentum of the $SO(3)$ partial wave expansion in the t -channel appears as a label. This makes contact to hadronic physics [63], in particular to Regge phenomenology [33]. In the minimalist version of this model the expansion of conformal moments in terms of $SO(3)$ t -channel partial waves is restricted to the leading one. The inclusion of the next-leading $SO(3)$ partial wave has been called minimal ‘dual’ parameterization [63]. More recently it has been understood how the inclusion of non-leading $SO(3)$ partial waves can be effectively achieved in the ‘dual’ parameterization [40]. The minimalist and minimal version in the ‘dual’ parameterization corresponds to the leading and next-leading $SO(3)$ partial wave approximation. We use the terminology: leading (i.e., minimalist) $SO(3)$ partial wave and next-leading (i.e., minimal) $SO(3)$ partial wave approximation [33].

Since all named GPD representations present by definition the same field theoretical object, it simply follows that any GPD model, as long as it respects basic properties, e.g., Lorentz covariance, can be represented in any of these representations. We emphasize that the one-to-one correspondence of the double distribution and overlap light-cone wave function representation [67, 68, 69] should hold on general field theoretical grounds, too. This has been demonstrated within wave function models in Refs. [70, 71, 72]. In the overlap light-cone wave function representation the positivity constraints [47], derived from the positivity of the norm in the Hilbert space, are explicit³. These constraints are exactly valid at LO approximation, however, their power drastically diminishes if one calculates the physical amplitude. One also might introduce further representations, e.g., an expansion with respect to a complete basis of orthogonal polynomials [56, 75], however, they can be in principle expressed in the two considered ones. Also from experience we know that the expansion of GPDs with respect to a complete basis of orthogonal polynomials turns out to be numerically inefficient at smaller values of x_{Bj} [76].

The specific GPD models are all more or less constrained by the same phenomenological input, PDFs, form factors, and sometimes model or lattice estimates. Roughly spoken, the difference in the physical content of various GPD models at $\eta = x$ is more or less accidental and arises from simplifications, mainly done for convenience, in a given representation. Obviously, the model de-

³Contributions to positivity constraints related to GPDs are listed in Ref. [73], which gives also an alternative derivation of the general form of these constraints. The solution of these general constraints can be interpreted as a two body light-cone wave function overlap representation for a collective spectator [74].




Figure 1: The left panel displays the spectator model of Ref. [72], as specified there in Eq. (25), with $t = t_{\min} - 0.25 \text{ GeV}^2$. The red solid curve visualizes the experimentally accessible information for fixed photon virtuality, i.e., the GPD at the cross-over trajectory $\eta = x$, while the dashed is an example curve that can be used to evaluate the real part of CFFs via Eq. (4). In the right panel the same GPD at $\eta = x$ (solid) is displayed versus the Bjorken-like variable $X = 2x/(1+x)$ and it is compared with a VGG-like (dashed) and the leading SO(3) partial wave approximation of the Mellin-Barnes (dash-dotted) ansatz. Both ansätze are based on the zero skewness spectator GPD model and possess a factorized t -dependence.

pendence is still visible in the described deeply virtual amplitudes; however, the parameterization thereof is effectively not under control. This is illustrated in the right panel of Fig. 1, where we show the GPD at its cross-over trajectory within the spectator model (solid) of Ref. [72], the leading SO(3) partial wave approximation in the Mellin-Barnes representation (dash-dotted), and a VGG-like ansatz (dashed). For the latter two models we have used a factorized t -dependence, and the form factor and PDF were evaluated in the spectator model. There is one rule which GPD model builders like to follow, namely, they mostly avoid invisible degrees of freedom. In other words, one relies on the implicit assumption that the holographic principle holds true. Exceptions to this rule are the pion pole contribution [77, 78] and the so-called D -term [79], where the latter is entirely related to the subtraction constant in the dispersion relation [42]. In the SO(3) t -channel partial wave expansion both of these exceptions are assigned to $J = 0$ contributions, shown for the subtraction constant in Sect. 4. In the context of the parton model [80], and within its field theoretical model realization for forward Compton scattering [81], such a $J = 0$ term relates low and high energy physics. We emphasize that there are various possibilities to embody the $J = 0$ terms into GPD models, see, e.g., Refs. [79, 82, 65, 71, 33, 72], and they might lead to rather different theoretical GPD ‘predictions’.

We finally recall that the first sophisticated GPD ansatz was elaborated in Ref. [83] for $t = 0$ via a double distribution ansatz, which factorizes in a PDF and a *single* variable profile function whose shape, viewed as a meson distribution amplitude, was assumed to be convex. For shortness, we call this the Radyushkin's double distribution ansatz (RDDA). Because of its convenient parameterization, it was adopted by many model builders in various t -decorated versions and within generalizations of the profile function; however, the convexity of its shape was not touched. In particular, the RDDA [83] has been utilized in Ref. [78] to build up a GPD model, guided by results of the chiral quark soliton model (χ QSM), decorated with a factorized or Regge inspired t -dependence, and based on certain PDF parameterizations. This GPD model is now numerically implemented in the popular VGG code [25]. Here a descendant of the D -term has been also utilized to parameterize the GPD E in terms of the quark angular momentum. We follow the common terminology and call this code VGG model. We note that VGG results might be different from other GPD models that were written down in a similar fashion within RDDA, e.g., in Ref. [26].

It was already emphasized in Refs. [83, 84] that more realistic GPD models should possess an intricate interplay of momentum fraction and momentum transfer squared dependence. It turned out that guidance for a more realistic t -dependence comes from field theory inspired models. Such an improvement is now implemented in GPD models for the pion [70] and nucleon [71, 72], formulated in double distribution representation. All these investigations started from overlap representations with power-law wave functions, and, aiming at different goals, they finally provided rather similar expressions for the resulting double distributions. Such models can be also obtained from the evaluation of (general) triangle diagrams. To emphasize the physical content of these GPD models, one might also denote them as collective spectator quark models. For both zero skewness and $\eta = x$ the t -dependence of these GPD models dies out in the limit $x \rightarrow 1$, see, e.g., discussion in Ref. [72]. The behavior in the former case coincides with lattice measurements of generalized form factors [85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91]. A more general double distribution ansatz in the form of a factorized RDDA within the common improvement of Regge behavior has been written down for certain proton GPDs in Ref. [72], for the pion case see Ref. [70]. We have also convinced ourselves that one should not insist on convex shape of the profile function, and could, e.g., add 'higher' modes, to get rather flexible GPD models. Certainly, this is the road to go if one likes to overcome the ad hoc GPD model approach.

2.2 Ad hoc GPD phenomenology

The qualitative failure of the VGG model in describing virtual electroproduction of ρ^0 mesons in the resonance, i.e., large x_{Bj} , region [24] is partly related to its ad hoc t -dependence. Certainly,

here one has to be concerned about the applicability of perturbative QCD (and, by the way, also about the onset of the Regge regime). However, since the Feynman mechanism is somehow incorporated in the GPD formalism, we expect that the t -dependence of the hadronic amplitude is qualitatively embodied in the GPD, see Ref. [92, 93] for a perhaps more appropriate realization of the GPD formalism in this kinematics. It turned out that the t -dependence of the aforementioned spectator GPD model at $\eta = x$ diminishes in the large x_{Bj} region, as seen in the experiment [72]⁴. The notorious normalization problem of the cross section in this kinematical region is to LO approximation entirely related to the end-point behavior of the VGG model. It was cured in Ref. [24] by a D -term inspired addendum, concentrated in the central GPD region. It is invisible in the forward kinematics and thus violates the hypothetical holographic principle. In fact it is demonstrated in Fig. 1, that a simple spectator model (solid curve) possesses in comparison to a VGG like ansatz (dashed curve) an enhancement effect in the large momentum fraction region. We will also illustrate in Sect. 4.2 that one can easily construct GPD ansätze which could fix the normalization problem in a different manner. Certainly, this has to be taken with care, since in the resonance region one might expect both large radiative and power suppressed corrections.

The DVCS amplitude is accessible in the deeply virtual electroproduction of photons, where due to the interference of the bremsstrahlung and DVCS processes one can also reveal the phase of the DVCS amplitude. The VGG model also fails to describe the beam spin asymmetry or polarized cross section for unpolarized proton in the fixed target JLab kinematics, see e.g., Ref. [14], since here it does not offer the possibility to decrease the normalization of the resulting amplitudes, compared to the basic GPD ansatz. We should here also emphasize that the ‘easy to tune’ options in GPD codes indirectly advise our experimental colleague to attempt for a ‘serious’ phenomenological GPD interpretation, which generates in our opinion more confusion as clarification⁵. The normalization problem was already studied in Refs. [26, 27] and to some extent cured by reducing the amount of sea quark contributions (introducing so-called model B). In fact, adjusting the normalization of the DVCS amplitude by suppression of sea quark contributions⁶

⁴We would like to give an example for dubious conclusions, yielding the question “GPDs or not GPDs?”. It was stated that “*the very flat t slopes observed can only arise from GPD contributions not constrained by the FF [form factor] sum rule*” [24]. The authors of this Ref. were informed that simple spectator GPD models, formulated in double distribution representation and satisfying the form factor sum rule, explains the observation [72].

⁵ For instance, it was found in Ref. [19] that the D -term within the VGG model is disfavored from the HERMES DVCS measurements. Since the χ QSM [78, 94] and now also lattice calculations, e.g., in Ref. [91], indicate that the D -term related part in GPDs is sizeable, our interpretation of this statement is that the VGG model, the incorporation of the D -term, or the combination of both, is improper. Also the model dependent constraints on the quark angular momentum in Ref. [19] illustrate that the model dependence is not under control.

⁶ Sea quark contributions and in our understanding also valence singlet quark ones are neglected in Ref. [75]. Hence, we can hardly judge on this model, which is ‘pinned down’ by physical, phenomenological, and lattice data.

makes it possible to describe existing DVCS data, related to beam spin asymmetries or polarized cross section measurements. Even semi-quantitative discussions [26, 27] seem to provide empirical understanding, when employed within the impulse approximation in prediction of beam spin asymmetry for DVCS on nuclei [95]. If this ‘prediction’ turns out to be in disagreement with increasingly precise experimental data, it will be exciting to employ the GPD formalism as a tool to explore the interplay of nucleon and partonic degrees of freedom beyond the impulse approximation. The minimal(ist) version of the ‘dual’ parameterization [63] has been confronted with DVCS data in Refs. [28] and [29] and describes spin asymmetries or polarized cross sections, too. Finally, all these GPD models fail to describe the unpolarized DVCS cross section, measured by the Hall A collaboration at JLab [14].

The understanding of GPD aspects from experimental data of the H1 and ZEUS collaborations [9, 12, 13, 18] in collider kinematics was in poor stage, too. Claims that the DVCS cross section can be described within published GPD models to LO accuracy, are based on a problematic implementation of t -dependence [26, 28], violation of the perturbatively predicted scale change [28, 96]⁷ or basic GPD properties [96]⁸.

We stress that the authors of Ref. [96] understood very well the physical content of the LO normalization problem. Although they started to analyze the model problems within the RDDA, they finally gave up on the double distribution representation. Armed with the aligned jet model, a reasonable physical picture, however, violating Lorentz covariance, they came up with an inconsistent GPD model (see footnote 8), which must be rejected. Restoring Lorentz covariance in their model one simply finds a PDF which is decorated with t -dependence — a special case of the RDDA. ‘Solutions’ in the spirit of Ref. [96] (even critique on the double distribution representation) forms also the basis of the work in Ref. [75], see also footnote 6.

The normalization problem can be naturally overcome by inclusion of radiative corrections as advocated in Refs. [30, 31]. However, it was at the same time observed that GPD ansätze within different PDF parameterizations, describing the same set of unpolarized deeply inelastic scattering (DIS) data, result in rather different DVCS predictions, noted in Ref. [76]. This is quite understandable if one remembers that already the description of the unpolarized DIS structure functions is a fine tuning problem. There the perturbative expansion of the evolution is unstable in the small x_{Bj} region, see discussion in Ref. [97], and the same thing now happens in the

⁷The authors of Ref. [28] agree that their successful description of data arise from a GPD model that induces a unrealistic shrinkage effect of the diffractive forward peak. Moreover, the incorporation of the suggestion (32) in Ref. [96] violates the LO scale change prediction.

⁸ The aligned jet GPD model [96] is based on a truncated Taylor expansion in η for all GPD moments. The inconsistency of the proposal [96] was revealed in Ref. [45]. According to Eq. (21), the moments in the ‘full’ model, evaluated from Eq. (21, [96]), are η independent and the resulting GPD is the PDF decorated with a t -dependence.




Figure 2: The left panel shows a preliminary LO fit result [101] to the HERA DVCS data set versus the photon virtuality Q^2 : ZEUS [12] with $W = 89$ GeV (triangle, solid curve) and H1 with $W = 82$ GeV within the HERA I [13] (empty circle, dash-dotted curve) and HERA II [18] (full circle, dash-dotted curve) run. In the right panel we show the skewness ratio R , defined in Ref. [18] as observable, (solid curve) to LO approximation, i.e., $R \approx H(x, x, t = 0, Q^2)/H(2x, 0, t = 0, Q^2)$ for fixed $W = 82$ GeV, and the ratio $r \equiv H(x, x, t = 0, Q^2)/H(x, 0, t = 0, Q^2)$ for fixed $x = 10^{-3}$ (dashed curve). Note that $R \approx 2^{\alpha(0, Q^2)} r$ with $\alpha(0, Q^2 \sim 4 \text{ GeV}^2) \sim 1.2$.

DVCS case [33]. We emphasize that this does not disqualify the perturbative approach to DIS and DVCS at small x_{Bj} , because the evolution operator is universal, i.e., process independent. Also, a resummation procedure might stabilize the perturbative results, for a discussion see, e.g., Ref. [98]. In particular, it will be phenomenologically important for a perturbative GPD analysis of the deeply virtual vector meson electroproduction, see Ref. [99] for details.

2.3 A fitting procedure

We already felt for some time that the ad hoc GPD ansatz approach is not an appropriate framework to reveal the partonic content of the proton and that an insight in the perturbative GPD approach is needed, too. We started to explore an alternative framework for DVCS in the small x_{Bj} kinematics [100, 33, 101] up to next-to-next-to-leading order [102, 103, 104, 105, 32] and would like here to present what we have learned. Since radiative corrections to DVCS amplitude (or DIS structure function F_T) can be essentially absorbed by a scheme change [26], the description of experimental DVCS data at LO accuracy is the indispensable key to a GPD understanding.

In the small x_{Bj} kinematics the functional form of the amplitude simplifies drastically and the Reggeised t -channel view gives guidance for modelling. This is a pure empirical recipe, where one has to replace the classical Pomeron trajectory by an effective one. Thereby, it is crucial to have full control over the normalization of the DVCS amplitude. This can be achieved within invisible

terms that die out in the forward kinematics. The use of conformal symmetry enabled us to study the GPD approach up to next-to-next-to-leading order in perturbation theory [105, 32, 33]. The numerical advantages of the Mellin-Barnes representation allows then a simultaneous fitting procedure of DVCS and DIS data. The essential lesson from our GPD fits is that a leading SO(3) partial wave approximation (minimalist ‘dual’ model) does not work in the small x_{Bj} regime at LO, but only at perturbative next-to-leading order or beyond [33]. Within the conformal partial wave expansion, a more flexible parameterization of GPDs is worked out by several researchers, however, it is only partly published [106, 107, 39, 101]. After such an improvement experimental data for collider kinematics can be fitted at LO accuracy either within the inclusion of the next-leading SO(3) partial wave [106] or a flexible model dependent SO(3) partial wave resummation [101]. A preliminary fitting results to the DVCS cross section, measured by the H1 [13, 18] and ZEUS [12] collaborations, versus the photon virtuality Q^2 [101] is displayed in the left panel of Fig. 2. Our result is that the dominant sea quark GPD at low x shows to LO accuracy almost no skewness effect [101], see solid curve in the right panel of Fig. 2. We should here give attention to a different GPD interpretation of the same DVCS data. Namely, the measured ratio R [18], and our corresponding GPD fit (dashed line), might be viewed as a large skewness effect. Actually, using better suited r function, we reinterpret this as a (almost) no skewness effect. Such a vanishing skewness effect was for a lower resolution scale advocated in Ref. [43], but it turns out that it holds for the experimental lever arm of $\sim 3 \dots 80 \text{ GeV}^2$ [18]. In the published GPD models this no-skewness property was either never present or, if it was taken at a low input scale [43], the ansatz spoils it due to the evolution [43]. Unfortunately, the large evolution effect was propagated as a ‘prediction’ [108], it is ‘naturally’ implemented in approximated versions of conformal partial wave GPD representations, and occurs in a weaker form for RDDA, see Ref. [109]. We add that in the phenomenology of diffractive vector meson production it is often taken for granted that the GPDs possess a positive non-zero skewness effect, e.g., in Ref. [110].

2.4 Lessons from failure and success: a speculative GPD picture

From a phenomenological failure of present GPD models one can mainly conclude that its ad hoc realization was improper. It is senseless to criticize GPD representations in general, which will just lead to a step backwards. GPD features which have been understood in one representation can be incorporated in the other representation, too. Furthermore, from the confrontation of experimental findings and present GPD models one can not provide a reliable partonic interpretation. Critique of the perturbative approach offered so far from the outcome of such confrontation should be considered as speculation. In particular from what was said above for DVCS, it follows that perturbative GPD analysis for deeply virtual vector meson electroproduction at small x_{Bj} also has

to be reconsidered and extended to next-to-leading order.

The failure of the mainstream ad hoc GPD models should be an incentive to learn the lessons and find improved versions. This has been achieved to some extent with respect to the interplay of momentum fraction and t -dependence [70, 71, 72]. Pragmatical solutions to fit data within the GPD formalism are obvious, namely, one has to exploit degrees of freedom that are invisible in the zero skewness case, e.g., a more flexible profile functions. This sounds simple, however, it requires some technical efforts and, more importantly, GPDs are intricate functions and so one can easily get ‘lost’. Even in the in some sense much simpler case of small x_{B_j} kinematics, three different groups of authors attempted in a period of five years for a GPD interpretation of the ZEUS/H1 DVCS data, where two of them gave up basic (and realistic) GPD properties. In our opinion the message from that for the analysis of fixed target experiments is that one should first utilize dispersion relation technique, to pin down the GPD on its cross-over trajectory.

Nevertheless, we attempt in the following to catch the possible qualitative features of a ‘more realistic’ GPD at its cross-over trajectory from the phenomenological findings and we would like to share our speculations how it might look away from this trajectory. These unorthodox considerations are disputable and we consider the outcome only as a working hypothesis.

Let us shortly summarize the phenomenological findings. Present ad hoc GPD models, perhaps apart from the VGG one, are in the valence region consistent with (beam) spin asymmetry and polarized cross section measurements. If they are tuned to experimental data they might possess some kind of predictive power for certain observables. There is now a clear understanding of the dominant sea quark GPD in the small x_{B_j} region, namely, the skewness effect to LO accuracy is compatible with zero. The extension of such an ansatz to larger values of x induces a wrong scale dependence. The large size of the unpolarized DVCS cross section in the valence region is hardly understandable within present GPD models. The virtual ρ^0 electroproduction data [24] in the large x_{B_j} region are consistent with respect to the t -dependence of simple spectator models. A precise quantitative understanding of the cross section is for various reasons rather challenging. We add that the employment of unitarity constraints in the Regge inspired model analysis [37] indicates that for DVCS already the valence region cannot be correctly described with a few Reggeised t -channel exchanges.

Since the real part of the DVCS amplitude can be determined from a dispersion relation, a GPD ansatz at the cross-over trajectory must simultaneously give the correct description for the imaginary part of the amplitude in the whole phase space. This is certainly not the case for present GPD models, however, this GPD aspect can be straightforwardly analyzed using the growing amount of DVCS data. On qualitative grounds we conclude from experimental findings that a GPD on its cross-over trajectory is at small x governed by the Reggeised t -channel view,

where the skewness effect might be zero, while at large x there is a large skewness effect and the t -dependence diminishes. Such a behavior is supported by field theory inspired spectator models [70, 71, 72], see, e.g., discussion in Ref. [72], where, however, the Regge behavior at small x is absent. Implementing Regge-behavior from the s -channel view, along the line of Ref. [111], yields at $t = 0$ Regge ‘improved’ RDDA that possesses an experimentally unfavored large skewness effect at small x . To find a more realistic behavior it is perhaps more appropriate to have the t -channel view by considering the diagrammatical ladder, as started in Ref. [43]. That this is a reliable concept has been demonstrated for PDFs, see, e.g., Ref. [112]. We finally mention that due to the evolution the GPD value in the outer region is reduced and ‘flows’ into the central region to ‘fill’ it, i.e., yielding to a growing value of the GPD. From the experimental observation that the skewness effect at very small x ‘generically’ does not depend on the resolution scale, one might draw a speculative conclusion. Namely, loosely spoken the ‘flow’ into the central region has already stopped and the GPD in this region is mostly ‘filled’ at a resolution scale of about two GeV or perhaps even less. This seems to fit the qualitative experimental findings at large x_{Bj} , indicating a ‘big’ GPD contribution in the central region [24]. Utilizing the evolution equation, this pictorial speculation can be exactly formulated as a mathematical problem, however, this is beyond the scope of the paper.

3 GPD duality and families of GPD sum rules

In this section we deliver the tools that allow for a straightforward GPD analysis of photon electroproduction data in fixed target kinematics. Thereby, we adopt well-known techniques, utilized in the phenomenology of on-shell processes and combine them with the duality property of GPDs [41, 33].

3.1 Preliminaries

To address the problems, we consider virtual Compton scattering off proton in the generalized Bjorken region [1]:

$$\gamma^*(q_1) p(p_1) \rightarrow \gamma^{(*)}(q_2) p(p_2), \quad Q^2 = -(q_1 + q_2)^2/4 \rightarrow \infty, \quad (1)$$

where the momentum transfer squared $t \equiv \Delta^2 = (p_2 - p_1)^2$ and the two scaling variables

$$\xi = \frac{Q^2}{P \cdot q}, \quad \eta = -\frac{\Delta \cdot q}{P \cdot q}, \quad (2)$$

are fixed. Here $P = p_1 + p_2$, $\Delta = p_2 - p_1$ and $q = (q_1 + q_2)/2$. We will always take the values of ξ and η to be positive. In the twist-two approximation the crossing-invariant (i.e., for $s \leftrightarrow t$)

photon asymmetry parameter is given by their ratio:

$$\vartheta = \frac{q_1^2 - q_2^2}{q_1^2 + q_2^2} \simeq \frac{\eta}{\xi}. \quad (3)$$

The amplitude is parameterized in terms of the Compton form factors (CFFs), which in perturbative LO, Born or hand-bag approximation, read for leading twist-two [1]:

$$\mathcal{F}(\xi, \vartheta, t, Q^2) \stackrel{\text{LO}}{=} \int_{-1}^1 dx \left(\frac{1}{\xi - x - i\epsilon} \mp \frac{1}{\xi + x - i\epsilon} \right) F(x, \eta = \vartheta\xi, t, \mu^2 = Q^2). \quad (4)$$

Here the scale μ^2 is a factorization scale at which the hard-scattering part and GPDs are factorized and it is equated to the characteristic scale Q^2 of the process (common choice). The explicit dependence of the hard-scattering part on μ^2 appears at next-to-leading order. In our shorthand notation CFFs will be denoted as \mathcal{F} and the GPDs with F , cf. Ref. [26]:

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{H}}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}} \end{array} \right\}(\xi, \vartheta, t, Q^2), \quad F = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} H, E \\ \tilde{H}, \tilde{E} \end{array} \right\}(x, \eta = \vartheta\xi, t, \mu^2) \quad \text{for parity} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{even} \\ \text{odd} \end{array} \right\}. \quad (5)$$

The sign \mp on the r.h.s. of Eq. (4) refers to the symmetry with respect to x . This convention will be consistently used below without an explicit reference to it. Note that antisymmetry (symmetry) with respect to x corresponds to parity even (odd) CFFs, which also have signature $+1(-1)$. This definite signature originates from symmetry under the exchange of s and u channel. Here we did not indicate fractional charge squared factors, which can be easily restored by replacing F with $\sum_{a=u,d,\dots} Q_a^2 {}^a F$. The GPDs $F(x, \eta, t, Q^2)$ are real valued functions that are symmetric in η [113], and their j -th Mellin moments are polynomials in η of order $j + 1$ (polynomiality property). To be on safer ground concerning the analyticity hypothesis, we consider in the following only the Euclidean region, i.e., $|\vartheta| \leq 1$. This is ensured by the condition $\xi > \eta$. Unfortunately, apart from contribution to virtual two-photon exchange corrections [114], the CFFs are only accessible in DIS ($\vartheta = 0$, i.e., $\eta = 0$) and DVCS ($\vartheta = 1$, i.e., $\eta = \xi$). In the former case we extract PDFs, equal to GPDs with $\eta = 0$ and $t = 0$, and in the latter we find the GPDs on the cross-over trajectory $x = \eta$. For pedagogical reason, however, we will first do a gedanken experiment and suppose that the Compton amplitude can be ‘measured’ in the whole Euclidean region.

The obvious part of the answer to the question ‘What GPD information can be revealed from experiment?’ is that the imaginary part of the CFF (4) is given by the GPD combination:

$$F^\mp(x, \eta, t, Q^2) \equiv F(x, \eta, t, Q^2) \mp F(-x, \eta, t, Q^2) \stackrel{\text{LO}}{=} \frac{1}{\pi} \Im \mathcal{F}(\xi = x, \vartheta = \eta/x, t, Q^2). \quad (6)$$

This formula tells us that by varying the photon asymmetry parameter, i.e., $0 \leq \vartheta \leq 1$, the GPD is scanned in the outer region

$$0 \leq \eta \leq x = \xi \leq 1.$$

This is analogous to DIS, where the structure functions are to LO equal to PDFs. The r.h.s. in Eq. (6) and so the GPD $F^\mp(x, \eta, t, Q^2)$ with $\eta \leq x$ might be viewed as the spectral function for this Compton scattering process, given by the s -channel cut. Hence, the outer region of the GPD $F(x, \eta, t, Q^2)$ with $\eta \leq x$ is expressed by the difference or sum of s - and u -channel cuts. In accordance with the standard definition of PDFs, the GPD (6) is understood for $\eta \leq x$ as the combination $F^\mp(x \geq \eta, \eta, \dots) = [{}^qF + \bar{q}F](x, \eta, \dots)$ of quarks and anti-quarks, where

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} {}^qF \\ \bar{q}F \end{array} \right\} (x, \eta, \dots) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} F(x, \eta, \dots) \\ \mp F(-x, \eta, \dots) \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{quark} \\ \text{anti-quark} \end{array} \right. \text{ for } x \geq \eta. \quad (7)$$

The definite symmetry of F^\mp GPDs under reflection $x \rightarrow -x$ allows to extend them uniquely to negative values $x \leq -\eta$. The support extension into the central region $x \in [-\eta, \eta]$ should be done in such a way that the polynomiality condition is satisfied. As we will see in Sect. 3.3 below, analyticity guarantees that this procedure is unique.

3.2 Sum rules

To get deeper into the problem, we consider the CFFs as holomorphic functions of Mandelstam variables which satisfy the Schwartz reflection principle. Furthermore, we assume that for fixed (negative) value of t in the Euclidean region the CFFs possess only elastic poles, as well as s - and u -channel discontinuities on the real axis. Hence, CFFs satisfy a single variable dispersion relation, where t and the photon virtualities are considered as fixed variables, see, e.g., Refs. [43, 44, 42, 33, 45]. Taking into account that they have definite signature, this can be equivalently rewritten in terms of the crossing-symmetric variable $\nu = (s - u)/4M$, related to the energy of the initial photon, or in terms of the scaling variable $\xi = Q^2/2M\nu$, originally defined in Eq. (2):

$$\mathcal{F}(\xi, \vartheta, t, Q^2) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^1 d\xi' \left(\frac{1}{\xi - \xi' - i\epsilon} \mp \frac{1}{\xi + \xi' - i\epsilon} \right) \Im \mathcal{F}(\xi' - i0, \vartheta, t, Q^2) + \mathcal{C}(\vartheta, t, Q^2). \quad (8)$$

For convenience, we set here the upper integration limit $\xi_{\text{cut}} = \xi_{\text{pol}} = 1/(1 + t/4Q^2)$ to one, according to the Bjorken limit, so that the elastic pole is included in the imaginary part, rather than in the subtraction constant. We emphasize that the correct upper bound can be easily restored by the substitution $1 \rightarrow 1/(1 + t/4Q^2)$. The subtraction constant is fixed by the value of the CFFs at $\xi = \infty$:

$$\mathcal{C}(\vartheta, t, Q^2) = \mathcal{F}(\xi = \infty, \vartheta, t, Q^2). \quad (9)$$

This constant appears in the CFFs \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{E} , vanishes for the CFFs $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$, and is perturbatively predicted to be zero for the combination $\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{E}$, see Ref. [33].

The dispersion relation (8) states that both the imaginary and real part of CFFs contain, up to a possible subtraction constant, the same information

$$\Re\mathcal{F}(\xi, \vartheta, t, Q^2) = \frac{1}{\pi} \text{PV} \int_0^1 d\xi' \left(\frac{1}{\xi - \xi'} \mp \frac{1}{\xi + \xi'} \right) \Im\mathcal{F}(\xi' - i0, \vartheta, t, Q^2) + \mathcal{C}(\vartheta, t, Q^2). \quad (10)$$

Let us have a loosely look to this statement without discussing mathematical refinements. After extending the support of $\Im\mathcal{F}(\xi, \dots)$ to $|\xi| > 1$ and using the symmetry property, we express Eq. (10) as (singular) Fredholm integral equation of the first kind with constant limits ($\pm\infty$). In shortness, the real part of $\mathcal{F}(\xi, \dots) - \mathcal{C}(\dots)$ is the Hilbert transform of its imaginary part. The inversion reads then

$$\Im\mathcal{F}(\xi, \vartheta, t, Q^2) = \frac{1}{\pi} \text{PV} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\xi' \frac{1}{\xi' - \xi} [\Re\mathcal{F}(\xi', \vartheta, t, Q^2) - \mathcal{C}(\vartheta, t, Q^2)]. \quad (11)$$

Alternatively, by again making use of the spectral condition $\Im\mathcal{F}(\xi, \dots) = 0$ for $|\xi| > 1$, we can take the solution of the Fredholm integral equation with constant limits of integration (± 1), e.g., from Ref. [115]:

$$\Im\mathcal{F}(\xi, \vartheta, t, Q^2) = \frac{\sqrt{1 - \xi^2}}{\pi} \text{PV} \int_{-1}^1 d\xi' \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \xi'^2}} \frac{\Re\mathcal{F}(\xi', \vartheta, t, Q^2)}{\xi' - \xi} \quad \text{for } |\xi| \leq 1. \quad (12)$$

In conclusion, assuming the specific analytic properties, we can state that the imaginary and real part of CFFs, having definite signature and a vanishing subtraction constant, have a one-to-one correspondence in the ‘accessible’ region $0 \leq \xi \leq 1$. This correspondence seems to become imperfect in the case of non-vanishing subtraction constant (9). As in Ref. [33], we will argue below that this might not be the case, if the $\xi \rightarrow 0$ asymptotic is given by Regge behavior, as it is commonly assumed.

In a real experiment one accesses only a limited phase space region. To pin down CFFs in inaccessible regions one can again employ their holomorphic property, but now expressed as family of sum rules. To give an example, we remind that Regge asymptotics of on-shell amplitudes yield finite energy sum rules (FESRs), which are widely used in phenomenology. Pragmatically, we suppose that off-shell CFFs possess the high energy asymptotic power like behavior $\xi^{-\alpha(t)}$, where $\alpha(t)$ is an effective Regge trajectory, which might depend on Q^2 . We introduce now a duality parameter v that divides the low ($v < \xi'$) and high ($\xi' < v$) energy region in the dispersion

integral (10). Expanding in the vicinity of $\xi = 0$ yields FESRs⁹

$$\int_v^1 d\xi \xi^{-m-2} \Im \mathcal{F}(\xi, \dots) = \pi S_{m+1}(v, \dots), \quad \text{with} \quad (13)$$

$$S_n(v, \dots) = \frac{-2^{-1}}{n!} \frac{d^n}{d\xi^n} \left[\Re \mathcal{F}(\xi, \dots) - \mathcal{C}(\dots) - \frac{1}{\pi} \text{PV} \int_0^v d\xi' \left(\frac{1}{\xi - \xi'} \mp \frac{1}{\xi + \xi'} \right) \Im \mathcal{F}(\xi', \dots) \right]_{\xi=0}.$$

For odd (even) m they are valid for signature $+1(-1)$. We emphasize that the $m = -1$ case deserves special attention. The resulting FESR is closely related to what is called inverse moment. For real Compton scattering the form of this specific FESR can be found in Ref. [117].

The concealed part of the answer to the question ‘What GPD information can be revealed from experiment?’, arises from the analyticity of the amplitude, which ties the real and imaginary parts by the single variable dispersion relation (8), advocated in Ref. [42]. Plugging the LO result (6) for the imaginary part into the dispersion relation (8), it becomes obvious that the real part of the amplitude (4), up to a possible subtraction constant, is also expressed by the outer GPD region:

$$\Re \mathcal{F}(\xi, \vartheta, t, Q^2) \stackrel{\text{LO}}{=} \text{PV} \int_0^1 dx \left(\frac{1}{\xi - x} \mp \frac{1}{\xi + x} \right) F^\mp(x, \eta = \vartheta x, t, Q^2) + C(\vartheta, t, Q^2). \quad (14)$$

This ‘dispersion relation’ tells us that for given $|\vartheta| \leq 1$ the variation of the real part with respect to ξ is governed by the value of the GPD on the trajectory $\eta = \vartheta x$. Note that we have introduced a new symbol for the subtraction constant fixed to LO:

$$\mathcal{C}(\vartheta, t, Q^2) \stackrel{\text{LO}}{=} C(\vartheta, t, Q^2). \quad (15)$$

Compared to the LO formula (4), in which the whole GPD support contributes to the real part, the observation, manifested in Eq. (14) looks perhaps at the first moment rather surprising. It is a consequence of analyticity and the decomposition of the CFFs in terms of GPDs, which posses definite properties under Lorentz transformations, clearly visible in the operator product expansion approach (OPE) [44, 33]. The consequence is that the GPD in both the central and the outer region know about each other and talk to each other via the trajectory $\eta = \vartheta x$ [66, 1, 41]. To obtain the equality that governs this cross-talk, we combine formula (14) with the LO amplitude (4) and find a *family of GPD sum rules* (GPDSRs) [42, 45]:

$$\int_0^1 dx \left(\frac{1}{\xi - x} \mp \frac{1}{\xi + x} \right) [F^\mp(x, \eta = \vartheta \xi, t, Q^2) - F^\mp(x, \eta = \vartheta x, t, Q^2)] = C(\vartheta, t, Q^2), \quad (16)$$

⁹Assuming that $\Im \mathcal{F} \approx \pi \sum_\alpha \beta_\alpha \xi^{-\alpha} / \Gamma(\alpha + 1)$ is approximately valid for $|\xi| \leq v$ one straightforwardly finds for $\alpha > 0$ and $n > 0$: $S_n \approx \sum_\alpha \frac{\beta_\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha+1)} \frac{v^{-\alpha-n}}{\alpha+n}$. To obtain the textbook form of S_n for on-shell amplitudes [49], one might now rewrite the FESR (13) in terms of the variables $\nu = Q^2/2M\xi$ and $N = Q^2/2Mv$ and take instead of the Bjorken limit the on-shell one. To find the more general form, including $\alpha < 0$ one should follow the line of Ref. [116], where the $\alpha = 0$ case has to be treated separately, e.g., as in Ref. [117].




Figure 3: In the left panel the integration paths in the sum rule (16) along the $\eta = \vartheta x$ (solid, red) and horizontal $\eta = \vartheta \xi$ (dashed, blue) trajectories are displayed. The right panel visualizes the approximate duality relation of a GPD with the s - and t -channel view on the hadronic amplitude. For on shell amplitudes duality between the s - and t -channel view has been conjectured at the end of the sixties. Quark-hadron duality was conjectured in particular in DIS while modelling GPDs in the central region by the crossed t -channel contribution was proposed in [63].

parameterized by ϑ . Here we have dropped the principal value prescription, since the integrand can be considered as integrable at $x = \xi$. The GPDSR family (16) is visualized in the left panel of Fig. 3. It relates integral along the $\eta = \vartheta x$ trajectory (solid) in the outer GPD region to a family of integrals along the horizontal $\eta = \vartheta \xi$ trajectories (dashed), traversing both inner and outer regions.

3.3 Deconvolution and duality

Let us suppose that the GPD in the outer region and the subtraction constant are known from a ‘measurement’. Finding the GPD in the central region can then be considered as a deconvolution problem. Decomposing the integral regions into the central and the outer one, one can view the GPDSR family (16) as a Fredholm type integral equation of the first kind, which allows to solve the deconvolution problem. This mapping is an integral transformation that requires the continuation in the region $\eta > 1$. Such extension is already defined in the double distribution representation¹⁰

$$F(x, \eta, t) = (1 - x)^p \int_0^1 dy \int_{-1+y}^{1-y} dz \delta(x - y - \eta z) f(y, z, t). \quad (17)$$

¹⁰ The factor $(1 - x)^p$ in our representation (17) is motivated by the form of positivity constraints [47] and appears in the model of Ref. [72]. For the GPD E we have $p = 1$ and thus a non-vanishing subtraction constant. For GPD $H + E$ and the two parity odd GPDs $p = 0$ and the subtraction constant is absent.

One can verify that (anti)symmetrized GPDs within this representation satisfy the GPDSR family (16). The double distribution representation has been utilized in Ref. [72] to solve the deconvolution problem for a simple spectator model, formulated in the light cone wave function overlap representation, see also Ref. [71].

Within the GPDSR family (16) the deconvolution problem can also be solved by a constructive method that explicitly avoids the continuation into the region $\eta > 1$. This method resembles the derivation of the standard factorization formula (4) from the short distance OPE and the dispersion relation (8) in the Euclidean region, see Refs. [44, 33].

We go now in reversed direction along the line of Ref. [33]. Expanding the integral kernel in the GPDSR family (16) in powers of $1/\xi$, relates integral Mellin moments,

$$\int_{-1}^1 dx x^j F(x, \eta = \vartheta x, t, \mu^2) \quad \text{for } j \geq 0,$$

of the GPD at the trajectory $\eta = \vartheta x$ to usual Mellin moments of the GPD with argument $\eta = \vartheta \xi$:

$$f_j(\eta, t, \mu^2) = \int_{-1}^1 dx x^j F(x, \eta, t, \mu^2) \quad \text{for } j \geq 0. \quad (18)$$

The latter are defined in terms of expectation values of local operators with spin $j + 1$. Lorentz covariance (or polynomiality condition) enforces

$$f_j(\eta, t, \mu^2) = \sum_{\substack{n=0 \\ \text{even}}}^{j+1} f_j^{(n)}(t, \mu^2) \eta^n, \quad (19)$$

where $f_j^{(j+1)} = 0$ for $f = \{h + e, \tilde{h}, \tilde{e}\}$ (for details see, e.g., [6, 7]). After reordering, we equate the coefficients in front of ξ^{-j-1}

$$\int_0^1 dx x^j F^\mp(x, \vartheta x, t, Q^2) = \sum_{\substack{n=0 \\ \text{even}}}^{\infty} \vartheta^n f_{j+n}(t, Q^2), \quad (20)$$

and thus find the coefficients of the polynomial (19):

$$f_j^{(n)}(t, Q^2) = \frac{1}{n!} \frac{d^n}{d\vartheta^n} \int_0^1 dx x^{j-n} F^\mp(x, \vartheta x, t, Q^2) \Big|_{\vartheta=0} \quad \text{for } j - n \geq 0, \quad (21)$$

where $j = 1, 3, 5 \dots$ and $j = 0, 2, 4 \dots$ for $-$ and $+$ type of GPDs, respectively, and $j - n \geq 0$ with n even. If a subtraction constant is present in \mathcal{E} , the Mellin moments with $n = j + 1$ appear and are evaluated from

$$e_j^{(j+1)}(t, Q^2) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{(j+1)!} \frac{d^{j+1}}{d\vartheta^{j+1}} C(\vartheta, t, Q^2) \Big|_{\vartheta=0}. \quad (22)$$

Note that $h_j^{(j+1)}(t, Q^2) = -e_j^{(j+1)}(t, Q^2)$.

All possible techniques are now at hand to construct the GPD from the moments (19,21): standard inverse Mellin transform, expansion with respect to conformal eigenfunctions [56, 57, 58, 41], and introduction of double distribution as generating function for the Mellin moments [1, 83], see, e.g., Ref. [118]. All of them are based or related to the uniqueness of analytic continuation of the even or odd Mellin moments, ensured by Carlson theorem [119]. Thereby, the Mellin moments $e_j^{(j+1)}$ might either be considered connected with a ‘regular part’ of the GPD, e.g., as in Eq. (17), or, alternatively, they can be included in the D -term addenda of a GPD [79]. It is mostly a matter of taste and convenience (as long as the whole GPD is considered as known) which representation one prefers [65]. Only in the case that the spectral function, i.e., $\Im\mathcal{m}\mathcal{F}$, possesses unexpected analytic properties, such as ‘invisible’ terms, like $x\delta(x)$, one has to treat the $e_j^{(j+1)}$ terms separately from the double distribution part. In any case, after convolution of the GPD with the hard scattering part one has the representation for the subtraction constant, cf. Eq. (22):

$$C(\vartheta, t, Q^2) = 2 \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \text{odd}}}^{\infty} \vartheta^{j+1} e_j^{(j+1)}(t, Q^2) \quad \text{with} \quad C(\vartheta = 0, t, Q^2) = 0, \quad (23)$$

where the normalization at $\vartheta = 0$ is the perturbative prediction, arising from gauge invariance, i.e., from absence of gauge dependent non-local operators in the short distance OPE.

That the outer region can be uniquely restored from the central one is known and was again clearly spelled out in Ref. [41]. Hence, both regions contain the same information and so they are dual to each other. In anticipation of phenomenological applications we will now express the relation of the central region to the outer one in terms of GPDSRs, having the form of FESRs. Note that GPDs and their sum rules depend on the perturbative approximation and scheme conventions that are used in the factorization approach.

Specific GPDSRs are obtained by dividing the integral regions in the GPDSR family (16) into the ‘low’ and ‘high energy’ ones, by means of the duality parameter ν . By expanding the integral kernel in Eq. (16) around $\xi = 0$ we find the desired GPDSRs:

$$\int_{\nu}^1 dx x^{-m-2} \left[\sum_{\substack{n=0 \\ \text{even}}}^{m+1} \frac{(\vartheta x)^n}{n!} \frac{d^n}{d\eta^n} F^{\mp}(x, \eta, t, Q^2) \Big|_{\eta=0} - F^{\mp}(x, \vartheta x, t, Q^2) \right] = \delta S_{m+1}^{\mp}(\nu, \vartheta, t, Q^2), \quad (24)$$

where $m \geq -1$ is odd (even) for $-$ ($+$) type GPDs. The ‘high energy’ part $\delta S_n^{\mp}(\nu, \vartheta, t, Q^2)$ is obtained from the Taylor coefficients:

$$\delta S_n^{\mp} = \frac{2^{-1}}{n!} \frac{d^n}{d\xi^n} \left[\int_0^{\frac{\nu}{\xi}} dx \left(\frac{1}{1-x} \mp \frac{1}{1+x} \right) [F^{\mp}(x\xi, \vartheta\xi, \dots) - F^{\mp}(x\xi, x\vartheta\xi, \dots)] - C(\dots) \right]_{\xi=0}. \quad (25)$$

Utilizing such sum rules allows us to relate the GPD at the trajectory $\eta = \vartheta x$ with its behavior in the vicinity of $\eta = 0$. The strength of the skewness effect is then controlled by the ‘high energy’

constants $\delta S_n^\mp(\nu, \vartheta)$. Note that the mapping of the GPD from the central region to the outer one can be done by the support extension [1, 41], also (implicitly) done in the conformal partial wave expansion approach, see [41, 62] for a discussion.

We add that the ‘low energy’ and ‘high energy’ content might be related by a more elegant, however, quite formal way, using analytic (or canonical) regularization [120]. This is useful if one deals with GPD models formulated in Mellin space within meromorphic functions. The GPD inherits the Regge-like behavior of the CFFs, which we assume, and should not possess any ‘invisible’ terms. Under this assumption one can introduce analytic regularization at $x = 0$, indicated by (0) as the lower integration limit, in the sum rule (16) and expand the integral kernel in the vicinity of $\xi = 0$. An example is the evaluation of the subtraction constant from the ‘high energy’ limit of Eq. (16):

$$C(\vartheta, t, Q^2) = \lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} \int_0^1 dx \frac{2x}{x^2 - \xi^2} [E^-(x, \vartheta x, t, Q^2) - E^-(x, \vartheta \xi, t, Q^2)] . \quad (26)$$

It is obvious that interchanging the limit with the integration could render a nonintegrable singularity at $x = 0$. Before this interchange, one first has to introduce a regularization, which does not spoil the normalization condition $C(\vartheta = 0, t, Q^2) = 0$. In the absence of ‘invisible’ terms we can utilize analytic regularization and write as in Ref. [33]:

$$C(\vartheta, t, Q^2) = \int_{(0)}^1 dx \frac{2}{x} [E^-(x, \vartheta x, t, Q^2) - E^-(x, 0, t, Q^2)] . \quad (27)$$

It can be easily verified that this prescription, as well as Eq. (26), is consistent with the GPDSR (24) for $m = -1$. Under the assumption of Regge behavior, analogous relation should hold for the imaginary part of CFFs, too, as argued in Ref. [33] based on the knowledge of radiative corrections.

4 Phenomenological applications

4.1 Strategy to access GPDs

As we saw, the imaginary part of the CFFs in the region $x = \xi \in [0, 1]$ is a spectral function, considered as ‘measurable’ in our Compton gedanken experiment for $|\vartheta| \leq 1$. The real part, arising from the dispersion relation (8), is then immediately known, too, and must coincide with the ‘measured’ one in the region $x = \xi \in [0, 1]$. By means of Eq. (12), the logic can also be reversed: Having restricted ‘experimental access’, i.e., knowing the imaginary and real part of the CFFs only in a certain limited interval, one can use the dispersion integral (8) (and also Eq. (11)) as a ‘local’ sum rule, which restricts the shape of the spectral function in the ‘non-accessible’ region. Such restriction is possible even if one knows the real part only at one given value of ξ .

Various forms of sum rules can be derived and we only concentrate on the FESR ones, which relate the ‘low energy’ and ‘high energy’ regions. ‘Measuring’ the spectral function in dependence of ϑ , for $|\vartheta| \leq 1$, allows us to solve the deconvolution problem and to reveal the GPD. This can be expressed also in terms of GPDSRs in form of an integral equation (16) or in terms of FESR-like ones (24).

We now apply our results to the DVCS case, in particular, to the dominant CFF \mathcal{H} :

$$\vartheta = 1, \quad \mathcal{H}(\xi, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) \equiv \mathcal{H}(\xi, \vartheta = 1, t, \mathcal{Q}^2), \quad \mathcal{C}(\xi, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) \equiv \mathcal{C}(\xi, \vartheta = 1, t, \mathcal{Q}^2). \quad (28)$$

Here we introduce the photon virtuality $\mathcal{Q}^2 \approx 2Q^2$. Everything that was stated regarding the measurement of CFFs remains valid in DVCS kinematics. It is often easier to measure the imaginary part (via single spin asymmetries or polarized cross sections) than the real part of the amplitude. Hence, one might use the available experimental findings for the real part to reveal the imaginary part of the CFF outside of the accessible phase space.

We introduce two phenomenological parameters $\underline{\eta}$ and $\bar{\eta}$ to divide the ξ interval into the small ($\xi \leq \underline{\eta}$), valence ($\underline{\eta} \leq \xi \leq \bar{\eta}$), and large ($\bar{\eta} \leq \xi$) region. We assume that the CFF can be measured in the valence region $\underline{\eta} \leq \xi \leq \bar{\eta}$. The dispersion integral (8) might be then used to constrain the imaginary part in the large ξ' region $\bar{\eta} \leq \xi'$

$$\int_{\bar{\eta}}^1 d\xi' \frac{2\xi'}{\xi'^2 - \xi^2} [\Im\mathcal{H}(\xi', t, \mathcal{Q}^2) - \Im\mathcal{H}(\xi, t, \mathcal{Q}^2)] = \pi\mathcal{S}^{\text{exp}}(\xi, t, \mathcal{Q}^2|\bar{\eta}, \underline{\eta}) + \pi\mathcal{S}^{\text{mod}}(\xi, t, \mathcal{Q}^2|\underline{\eta}), \quad (29)$$

from the experimental knowledge of the region $\underline{\eta} \leq \xi' \leq \bar{\eta}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^{\text{exp}}(\xi, t, \mathcal{Q}|\bar{\eta}, \underline{\eta}) &= \Re\mathcal{H}(\xi, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) - \frac{1}{\pi} \ln\left(\frac{\xi^2}{1 - \xi^2}\right) \Im\mathcal{H}(\xi, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) \\ &+ \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\underline{\eta}}^{\bar{\eta}} d\xi' \frac{2\xi'}{\xi'^2 - \xi^2} [\Im\mathcal{H}(\xi', t, \mathcal{Q}^2) - \Im\mathcal{H}(\xi, t, \mathcal{Q}^2)], \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

the model estimate for the subtraction constant, and the extrapolation into the small ξ' region $\xi' \leq \underline{\eta}$:

$$\mathcal{S}^{\text{mod}}(\xi, t, \mathcal{Q}|\underline{\eta}) = -\mathcal{C}(t, \mathcal{Q}^2) + \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\underline{\eta}} d\xi' \frac{2\xi'}{\xi'^2 - \xi^2} [\Im\mathcal{H}(\xi', t, \mathcal{Q}^2) - \Im\mathcal{H}(\xi, t, \mathcal{Q}^2)]. \quad (31)$$

The subtraction constant is known to some extent, e.g., Refs. [78, 94, 91], and one might develop some understanding how Regge phenomenology should be employed for off-shell processes. In evaluating the amount arising from the very small ξ region one can use the DVCS measurements of the H1/ZEUS collaborations [9, 12, 13, 18]. Hence, the model dependent part is therefore somehow under control. The large ξ region which one reveals in this way is certainly challenging to measure in an experiment. As one realizes, even the knowledge of the CFF at one value of

ξ , i.e., $\underline{\eta} = \bar{\eta} = \xi$, leads to a highly nontrivial constraint. This sum rule (29) (with $\xi \leq \bar{\eta}$) can again be considered as a family of FESR. To see this, one simply expands the integral kernel with respect to $(\xi/\xi')^2$. We also note that the real part of the CFF \mathcal{H} can be measured in the crossed channel $\gamma^*\gamma^{(*)} \rightarrow N\bar{N}$ (or $N\bar{N} \rightarrow l^+l^-\gamma$) and then obtained by analytic continuation with respect to t .

The dispersion integral and crossing symmetry allows revealing the CFF as a physical quantity. The microscopic view on this quantity is given by perturbation theory, providing us, to LO accuracy, a partonic interpretation in terms of the GPD on the cross-over trajectory $\eta = x$:

$$H^-(x, x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) \stackrel{\text{LO}}{=} \frac{1}{\pi} \Im \mathcal{H}(\xi = x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) \quad \text{for} \quad \underline{\eta} \leq x \leq \bar{\eta}. \quad (32)$$

To that accuracy we write the physical sum rule (29) as a GPD one:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\bar{\eta}}^1 dx \frac{2x}{\xi^2 - x^2} [H^-(x, x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) - H^-(\xi, \xi, t, \mathcal{Q}^2)] + C(t, \mathcal{Q}^2) \\ & + \int_0^{\underline{\eta}} dx \frac{2x}{\xi^2 - x^2} [H^-(x, x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) - H^-(\xi, \xi, t, \mathcal{Q}^2)] \stackrel{\text{LO}}{=} \mathcal{S}^{\text{exp}}(\xi, t, \mathcal{Q}|\bar{\eta}, \underline{\eta}) \quad \text{for} \quad \underline{\eta} \leq \xi \leq \bar{\eta}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

It clearly states that in an experiment the GPD can be accessed only on the trajectory $\eta = x$.

The information which can be revealed away from this trajectory is governed by the GPDSR family (16), which we write in the form of an integral equation

$$\text{PV} \int_0^1 dx \frac{2x}{\eta^2 - x^2} H^-(x, \eta, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) = \text{PV} \int_0^1 dx \frac{2x}{\eta^2 - x^2} H^-(x, x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) + C(t, \mathcal{Q}^2). \quad (34)$$

The r.h.s. of this integral equation is considered as known and can be equated in an ideal experiment with the measured real part of the CFF (including the subtraction constant). The l.h.s. is nothing more than the real part of the LO result (4). In addition, we have the ‘boundary condition’ that $H^-(x, x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2)$ is equal to the imaginary part of the CFF. Knowing imaginary and real part of \mathcal{H} in an ideal experiment one would be able to measure the subtraction constant. However, the deconvolution problem cannot be solved¹¹ within the family of GPDSRs (34).

The invisible terms in an ideal DVCS experiment are the zero modes,

$$\int_0^1 dx \frac{2x}{\eta^2 - x^2} \delta H(x, \eta, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) \equiv 0, \quad (35)$$

in the integral equation (34) with the boundary conditions:

$$\delta H(x, \eta = x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) = 0, \quad \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \delta H(x, \eta, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) = x^\epsilon, \quad \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 1} \delta H(x, \eta, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) = (1-x)^\epsilon, \quad (36)$$

¹¹We recall that the scale dependence provides an additional handle on the deconvolution problem.

where $\{\underline{\epsilon}, \bar{\epsilon}\} > 0$. Due to the duality properties, governed by Lorentz covariance, it is clear that a priori any given function in the outer or central region, which satisfies the boundary conditions, defines a zero mode. A simple example for fixed \mathcal{Q}^2 is

$$\delta H^{\text{toy}}(x, \eta, t) = \frac{(\eta^2 - x^2)}{|x|} \frac{d}{dx} f(|x|, t) \quad (37)$$

with appropriate behavior of $f(x, t)$ at the boundaries $x = 0$ and $x = 1$. Hence, experimental data (at least for fixed scale) can be described by numerous GPD models. In our toy example, the zero mode might contribute to the forward case and might be visible for $t = 0$ in DIS. An example of a term visible in DVCS, but invisible in the forward kinematics, is given in Ref. [24]. Also, for GPD E^- , where phenomenological constraints for the forward limit do not exist, any GPD model which fits the data is as good as any other, obtained by a ‘gauge’ transformation. However, the zero mode might contribute to the first moment:

$$E^{-\text{fit}}(x, \eta, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) \rightarrow E^{-\text{fit}}(x, \eta, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) + \delta E(x, \eta, t, \mathcal{Q}^2), \quad \int_{-1}^1 dx x \delta E(x, \eta, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) \neq 0. \quad (38)$$

Obviously, different GPD models which are able to describe experimental data can provide different values for the desired first moment, which enters the quark angular momentum sum rule [8].

Although the GPDSR family (34) states that the central and the outer GPD region are related via the GPD on the cross-over trajectory, some information might be lost in DVCS and/or for forward kinematics. Only in the case that for GPDs the holographic principle applies, i.e., all information which is contained in the GPD can be obtained from its value on the cross-over trajectory $\eta = x$, the whole GPD can be revealed from an (ideal) measurement. Nevertheless, the GPD sum rules (34) provides us valuable information on the η -dependence of the GPD.

This can be seen if we decompose the integral into contributions from the central and outer regions. Neglecting a possible subtraction constant and supposing that the Regge behavior is η independent,

$$\int_0^\eta dx \frac{2x}{\eta^2 - x^2} [H^-(x, \eta, t) - H^-(x, x, t)] = \int_\eta^1 dx \frac{2x}{x^2 - \eta^2} [H^-(x, \eta, t) - H^-(x, x, t)], \quad (39)$$

we find that in the limit $\eta \rightarrow 0$ the l.h.s. vanishes and the r.h.s. must therefore satisfy an inverse moment sum rule. Taking now the limit $\eta \rightarrow 1$ and again assuming that the GPD is vanishing at the endpoint $x = 1$, we find another sum rule. These sum rules read:

$$\int_0^1 dx \frac{1}{x} [H^-(x, 0, t) - H^-(x, x, t)] = 0, \quad \int_0^1 dx \frac{x}{1 - x^2} [H^-(x, 1, t) - H^-(x, x, t)] = 0. \quad (40)$$

According to left sum rule, the GPD on the cross-over trajectory is entirely described by the physical content in the outer region, while for $\eta \rightarrow 1$, i.e., according to the right sum rule, it

is governed by that one in the central region. This suggests that for small η we will naturally have the partonic s -channel point of view, while for large η the t -channel point of view in terms of meson-like exchanges is more appropriate [63], see lower part of the right panel in Fig. 3. To match both regions one might sum up the t -channel exchanges, i.e., to Reggeise them. If one would like to incorporate phenomenological knowledge of hadronic physics in the GPD modelling, one might suppose that for small x and η one understands better the hadronic t -channel view in terms of mesonic Regge exchanges [33], while for large η and x the s -channel partial wave expansion in terms of few baryonic resonances is more useful [121]. Hence, one should relate the four sketches in the right panel of Fig. 3 horizontally rather than vertically.

Let us also discuss the problem of relating the GPD at the cross-over trajectory ($\eta = x$) with the zero skewness GPD ($\eta = 0$) from the point of view of Mellin moments. The subtraction constant that enters the DVCS process is according to Eq. (23) given by

$$C(t, \mathcal{Q}^2) = -2 \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ \text{odd}}}^{\infty} h_j^{(j+1)}(t, \mathcal{Q}^2). \quad (41)$$

A model dependent estimate of the constant for $t = 0$ was provided in the χ QSM [78]. The χ QSM model evaluation of the first term in the series (41), given in Ref. [94], is compatible with lattice measurements [91]. This allows to estimate the size of the constant $C(t, \mathcal{Q}^2)$, to judge on the convergence of the series (41), and to estimate its t -dependence. According to Eq. (20), the Mellin moments of the GPD at the trajectory $\eta = x$ are given by series

$$\int_0^1 dx x^j H^-(x, x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) = \sum_{\substack{n=0 \\ \text{even}}}^{\infty} h_{j+n}^{(n)}(t, \mathcal{Q}^2). \quad (42)$$

Instead of using the number of total derivatives n as label, one might use the angular momentum J of the t -channel SO(3) partial wave expansion. If we apply crossing symmetry to the GPDSR family (34), for details see, e.g., Ref. [41], and set $\eta^2 \approx 1/\cos^2 \theta$, where θ is the scattering angle in the t -channel center-of-mass frame, we obtain the LO approximation of the corresponding $\gamma\gamma^* \rightarrow p\bar{p}$ amplitude in terms of generalized distribution amplitudes $H^{(t)-}(z, \cos \theta, s, \mathcal{Q}^2)$ [1, 64]:

$$\int_0^1 dz \frac{2z}{1-z^2} H^{(t)-}(z, \cos \theta, s, \mathcal{Q}^2) = \int_0^1 dx \frac{2x \cos^2 \theta}{1-x^2 \cos^2 \theta} H^-(x, x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) + C(t, \mathcal{Q}^2) \Big|_{t \rightarrow s}. \quad (43)$$

In the CFF combination $\mathcal{H} + t\mathcal{E}/4M_N^2$, see Ref. [6], Legendre polynomials $P_J(\cos \theta)$ appear with $J = 0, 2, 4, \dots$ and the corresponding t -channel partial wave amplitudes $a_J(s, \mathcal{Q}^2)$ are found by utilizing the orthogonality relation for Legendre polynomials. Formula (43) tells us that they are also given from the Froissart–Gribov projection by analytic continuation in t :

$$a_J(s, \mathcal{Q}^2) \stackrel{\text{LO}}{\approx} 2 \int_0^1 dx \frac{\mathcal{Q}_J(1/x)}{x^2} \left[H^-(x, x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) + \frac{t}{4M_N^2} E^-(x, x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) \right] \Big|_{t \rightarrow s}, \quad (44)$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_J(z)$ are the Legendre functions of the second kind within $0 < \Re J$. The t -channel angular momentum J is a physical degree of freedom. One can easily write down the SO(3) partial wave expansion for the CFFs, where the partial wave amplitudes a_J are then expressed in terms of partonic degrees of freedom, e.g., as in Eq. (44) by the skewness $\eta = x$, alternatively, by the number of total derivatives in common GPD Mellin moments, or the conformal spin in conformal GPD moments [106]. Obviously, the perturbative approach ‘predicts’ the partial wave amplitudes in the phenomenological Regge approach in terms of GPDs. Since GPDs are unknown, it is more appropriate to employ the reverse logic. As far the partial wave amplitudes would be known, they provide a strong constraint on GPD models. Finally, we note that the subtraction constant $-C(s, \mathcal{Q}^2)$ is the $J = 0$ t -channel partial wave contribution. It is often assumed that it can be obtained by analytic continuation in J .

4.2 Revealing GPDs from experimental measurements

We address now the question: “What do we learn from a DVCS measurement?”. To have a partonic interpretation one is mostly interested in the GPD at $\eta = 0$. The extrapolation of $F^\mp(x, x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2)$ to $F^\mp(x, 0, t, \mathcal{Q}^2)$ is a model dependent procedure, which can be parameterized by a skewness function $S(x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2|F^\mp)$, defined by

$$F^\mp(x, x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) = \left[1 + S(x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2|F^\mp)\right] F^\mp(x, \eta = 0, t, \mathcal{Q}^2). \quad (45)$$

Note that we included t -dependence in the skewness function, since it is expected that this dependence at large x is rather different from that of the GPD at $\eta = 0$. The GPDSR family (16) provides us in the limit $\xi \rightarrow 0$ with a link between the measured GPD at $\eta = x$ and $\eta = 0$ and therefore a constraint for the skewness function. Since the limit might be intricate, we first have to regularize:

$$\int_{(0)}^1 dx \frac{1}{x} S^-(x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2|F^-) F^-(x, \eta = 0, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) = \frac{1}{2} C(t, \mathcal{Q}^2). \quad (46)$$

One might consider $F^\mp(x, x, t, \mathcal{Q}^2)$ as new functions, which are in an unknown manner connected to the GPD at $\eta = 0$. As emphasized above, the analytic regularization procedure might be reinterpreted in terms of partonic FESR. The constraint (46) on the skewness effect is rather weak; only the inverse moment is constrained, and so there are infinite degrees of freedom left, e.g., in the series (41). We might parameterize the skewness effect by relative deviation factors:

$$\delta_j(t, \mu^2|F) \equiv \sum_{\substack{n=2 \\ \text{even}}}^{\infty} \frac{f_{j+n}^{(n)}(t, \mu^2)}{f_j(t, \mu^2)} = \frac{\int_0^1 dx x^j S(x, t, \mu^2|F^\mp) F^\mp(x, \eta = 0, t, \mu^2)}{\int_0^1 dx x^j F^\mp(x, \eta = 0, t, \mu^2)}, \quad (47)$$

with, as before, j being odd (even) for $-$ ($+$) superscripts. The Mellin moments of CFFs are then given as product,

$$\int_0^1 d\xi \xi^j \Im \mathcal{F}(\xi, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) \stackrel{\text{LO}}{=} \pi \int_0^1 d\xi \xi^j F^\mp(x = \xi, \xi, t, \mathcal{Q}^2) = \pi f_j(t, \mathcal{Q}^2) [1 + \delta_j(t, \mathcal{Q}^2|F)] , \quad (48)$$

of the desired Mellin moment $f_j(t, \mathcal{Q}^2)$, surviving the forward limit, times the skewness effect.

For $t = 0$ the Mellin moments $h_j(t = 0, \mathcal{Q}^2)$ [$\tilde{h}_j(t = 0, \mathcal{Q}^2)$] are those of the PDFs and are constrained by phenomenological input. The lowest Mellin moments $f_{j=0}(t, \mathcal{Q}^2)$ are partonic form factors, related to observables. The deviation factors are built by a series (47) and the present state of the art in lattice measurements, to our best knowledge, allows the evaluation of the first term in this series for $j = 0$, i.e., the quantity $h_2^{(2)}$. As long as the forward limit is known (to some extent) a DVCS measurement of, e.g., \mathcal{H} allows to pin down the skewness effect for this quantity. In the case one wants to extract, for instance, the quark angular momentum in an ideal DVCS experiment,

$$e_1(t, \mathcal{Q}^2) \stackrel{\text{LO}}{=} \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\int_0^1 d\xi \xi \Im \mathcal{E}(\xi, t, \mathcal{Q}^2)}{1 + \delta_1(t, \mathcal{Q}^2|E)} , \quad (49)$$

one certainly needs to know the skewness effect, which might be different than that appearing in \mathcal{H} .

The conclusion is obvious. One must use additional information to reveal the quantities one likes to pin down. Lattice measurements can give only a hint on the size, and this we consider valuable. Model evaluations, e.g., within χQSM , can at least give estimates for the size of deviation factors. As in any of such model calculation, the matching of collective with current quark degrees of freedom induces uncertainties. Nevertheless, it is very important to quantify these deviation factors on a generic level. Further experimental constraints on them, available in the small x_{Bj} region, arise from the logarithmical scaling violation, governed by evolution. A discussion on revealing the quark angular momentum from present DVCS data should be given somewhere else. We would only like to note here that GPD model dependent constraints on the quark angular momentum require an understanding of the skewness effect. A minimal basic requirement for such a constraint is that the utilized GPD model describes all available DVCS data, including the presently challenging data on unpolarized cross section.

According to the above discussion, one strategy for extracting GPD information to LO accuracy might consist of following steps (suppose that we consider H or \tilde{H})

- model the t -dependency of the GPD at $\eta = 0$,
- parameterize the skewness function, defined in Eq. (45),

- fit parameters to measured observables (CFFs) by means of Eqs. (32) and (33).

Additionally, one might use the sum rule (29) to first pin down the imaginary part in the whole region from the knowledge of the real part.

Certainly, in the first step it is crucial to have a realistic model for the interplay of x - and t -dependence of the $\eta = 0$ GPD. Proposals for the functional form of the GPD at $\eta = 0$ are given in Ref. [122, 123, 124]. We like to suggest here another empirical recipe that allows to take advantage of theoretical/phenomenological knowledge on the generic level. Moreover, it has a power-like behavior at large $-t$ and can be in principle also used for positive values of t . Inspired by the simplicity of the Veneziano model [125] for on-shell amplitudes, we found it simple to set up GPD models at $\eta = 0$ in Mellin space by taking ratios of Γ functions, e.g., for the valence d -quark contribution:

$$h_j^{d\text{val}} = \frac{\Gamma(1+j-\alpha(t))\Gamma(1+j+P-\alpha)\Gamma(2-\alpha+\beta)}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\Gamma(1+j+P-\alpha(t))\Gamma(2+j-\alpha+\beta)}. \quad (50)$$

The generic values of the parameters arise from counting rules ($\beta = 3$, $P = 2$), Regge phenomenology ($\alpha(t) = 1/2 + t/\text{GeV}^2$), and for u -quarks we employ in addition SU(6) symmetry arguments, i.e., $h_j^{u\text{val}}/h_j^{d\text{val}} = 5$ for $j \rightarrow \infty$. These parameters are then understood as effective ones and are slightly tuned to phenomenological PDF parameterizations and form factor measurements. Lattice results [91] can be quantitatively reproduced within our ansatz if we adopt the found parameterization of the Regge trajectory $\alpha(t)$ to the large meson mass lattice world¹². The guidance for the parameterization of the skewness function $S(x, t, Q^2 = 2 \text{ GeV}^2 | H^-)$ comes from the functional form of the solution for positivity constraints [74], the expected large x behavior for GPDs at $\eta = x$ [126], and model results [72]. The skewness function satisfy the sum rule (46), where the t -dependence of the subtraction constant has been taken from the first coefficient of the D -term from the χ QSM result [94]. The small x behavior of the GPD H is taken from our LO fits to the H1/ZEUS data [101]. The modelling will be described in detail somewhere else.

In Fig. 4(a) we show various versions of the model for the dominant u -quark GPD H . Only the solid curve is rather similar to the model version B of Ref. [26]; the others two belong to a new class of GPD models. As argued in Sect. 2.4, they are enhanced in the large $X = 2x/(1+x)$ region. Note that such a shape resembles the shape of the energy spectrum function of an exclusive process, if $1/X$ is interpreted as energy (perhaps one would even expect a resonance structure before the ‘continuum’ starts). The u -quark GPD H is the dominant one in DVCS off unpolarized proton target and it might be revealed from the azimuthal dependence of the interference term. The

¹²We do not share the spread out believe, e.g., in Ref. [75], that present lattice data should be used as quantitative GPD constraints.




Figure 4: Panel (a) shows various models for the dominant u quark GPD H at $\eta = x$ versus the Bjorken like variable $X = 2x/(1+x)$ for fixed $t = -0.25 \text{ GeV}^2$. In panel (b) we confront these models with JLab/Hall A measurements of the observable $\Im m \mathcal{C}_{\text{unp}}^{\mathcal{L},p}$, defined in Eq. (51), for DVCS off unpolarized proton [14] for $x_{\text{Bj}} = 0.36$ and $Q^2 = 1.9 \text{ GeV}^2$.

quantity, which determines the magnitude of the dominant harmonic in the interference term,

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{unp}}^{\mathcal{L}} = F_1(t)\mathcal{H}(\xi, t, Q^2) + \xi [F_1(t) + F_2(t)] \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\xi, t, Q^2) - \frac{t}{4M^2} F_2(t) \mathcal{E}(\xi, t, Q^2) \Big|_{\xi = \frac{x_{\text{Bj}}}{2-x_{\text{Bj}}}}, \quad (51)$$

is shown in Fig. 4(b) for JLab/Hall A kinematics

$$x_{\text{Bj}} = 0.36, \quad Q^2 = 1.9 \text{ GeV}^2, \quad \text{and} \quad 0.15 \text{ GeV}^2 \leq -t \leq 0.35 \text{ GeV}^2.$$

The relative contribution of the terms involving CFFs $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ and \mathcal{E} we estimate to be on the level of 10%–40% and up to $\pm 10\%$, respectively, compared to the dominant \mathcal{H} term. Instead of exploiting the sum rule family (29), we confronted our GPD model with experimental data in the old fashioned way. We varied the unknown contributions and compensated this by tuning the skewness function for H . We emphasize that any curve in Fig. 4(a) that crosses one of the shown ones at $X = 0.36$ defines a GPD model, which is not ruled out by the JLab/Hall A data in panel (b). The GPD models are then selected by confronting them with the measurement for the real part for the observable (51). We found that the extracted values for this quantity are contaminated by DVCS squared terms and so there is a further contribution from the GPD \tilde{E} . Taking all this into account we had no problems to tune the model parameters to the measured values for $t = -0.25 \text{ GeV}^2$. However, we were only able to get a qualitative agreement with the measured t -dependence of this quantity. Whether this is an artifact of our own GPD model restrictions or it is due to power suppressed terms in the twist-three formalism of Ref. [26] remains for the moment an open question. This is in our opinion more a technicality than an issue, which, of course, must be investigated.

5 Outlook

We have considered CFFs as holomorphic functions and discussed the phenomenological application of this property. To LO accuracy and for fixed photon virtuality one can in a DVCS measurement access the GPD only on its cross-over trajectory $\eta = x$. Combining dispersion relation and perturbation theory allows a derivation of partonic analogue of FESR, which relate the small and large x behavior of the GPD. Altogether, this sets up a new strategy for revealing GPDs from experimental DVCS measurements, utilizing well-known techniques from the phenomenology of on-shell hadronic processes. The proposed alternative LO GPD approach has numerous advantages with respect to the present ad hoc GPD ansatz approach. The LO GPDs can be considered as ‘super’ GPDs that contain all perturbative and non-perturbative corrections. If the assumed holomorphic properties hold true, the approach by definition cannot fail to describe DVCS data for fixed photon virtuality. All discussions about GPD models/ansätze and erroneous conclusions coming from their success or failure are avoided from the very beginning. The goal of this concept is to reveal GPDs at their cross-over trajectory $\eta = x$ only from DVCS data and to obtain a generic understanding of the skewness effect.

The partonic interpretation of the GPD to LO accuracy has been given here only from the principle point of view, where the appropriate choice of scaling variables was not discussed. This rather important problem is related to the minimization of not well-known higher twist contributions, by appropriate variable definitions. We recall that a partonic interpretation of the ‘measured’ GPD at the cross-over trajectory has already been pointed out in Ref. [127]. We like to particularize this interpretation. In the infinite momentum frame one might label the proton state by the center of plus-momentum, given as expectation value \mathbf{b}_\perp of the two generators for transversal Galilean boost [128]. The emission of a parton with momentum fraction $X = 2x/(1+x)$ leads to a change of the center of plus-momentum $\mathbf{b}_\perp^{\text{in}}$ of the initial nucleon. Since for $\eta = x$ the outgoing spectator system absorbs a quark with zero longitudinal momentum fraction, its center of plus-momentum will not change and it coincides with that one of the final state nucleon $\mathbf{b}_\perp^{\text{spec}} = \mathbf{b}_\perp^{\text{out}}$. The difference $\delta\mathbf{b}_\perp = \mathbf{b}_\perp^{\text{in}} - \mathbf{b}_\perp^{\text{spec}}$ can be now viewed as the transversal distance of the struck parton from the collective spectator system. One might now adopt the GPD wave function overlap interpretation in the impact parameter space [129], which tells that the Fourier conjugate variable of $\delta\mathbf{b}_\perp$ is simply the transverse momentum transfer Δ_\perp , directly observed in experiment. In other words, following the procedure of Ref. [127] gives us access to the transversal separation distance of the struck quark and collective spectator system¹³. A probabilistic GPD interpretation as for the zero skewness case, however, does not hold here anymore.

¹³This interpretation has been also presented in Ref. [130], including considerations on the t -behavior of GPDs at large $\eta = x$ as it arises also from power-like wave function models [70, 71, 72].

Also, the skewness effect can be addressed from the experimental side. In DVCS observables for unpolarized nucleon target one might first neglect the non-dominant CFFs $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, \mathcal{E} and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ as well as twist-three contributions. This seems to be justified to a certain extent, at least for HERMES kinematics. For the dominant quantity \mathcal{H} the corresponding GPDs in the zero skewness case are well constrained by PDFs and form factors. Guidance from model calculations and lattice data might be employed with care, too, to set up field theory inspired GPD models for the zero skewness case. The skewness function, which relates the GPD for zero skewness ($\eta = 0$) to the one on the cross-over trajectory ($\eta = x$) is constrained by GPD sum rules (GPDSR). It can then be directly fitted to experimental data. The limitation of this pragmatical approach for the collider experiments H1 and ZEUS is also obvious: the perturbative prediction of scale change, which gives us an additional handle on the skewness effect, cannot be implemented. Since the functional form of CFFs and GPDs drastically simplify in this kinematics, experimental data can be analyzed in the traditional manner within a flexible GPD parameterization in the small x region. This can be done in any GPD representation, however, it has been up to now only applied in the conformal approach.

We expect that a global LO analysis of present DVCS data can already provide a generic understanding of the GPD at the cross-over trajectory, in particular for the dominant GPD H . Once this understanding is reached one can address the deconvolution problem, i.e., to find a realistic parameterization of GPD models. This is particularly important if in dedicated experiments the CFFs \mathcal{E} and $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ are measured and one wants to access the GPDs E and \tilde{E} , where the former one gives access to the quark angular momentum. Realistic and flexibly parameterized GPD models should then open the road to inclusion of radiative corrections and the Wandzura-Wilczek approximation of twist-three GPDs, e.g., Ref. [131, 132], or to address quark-gluon-quark GPDs [133]. If experimental data for virtual electroproduction of mesons are analyzed within the GPD formalism, it might be inevitable to go to the next-to-leading order accuracy. The formalism has been worked out for the twist-two sector [102, 103, 104, 134, 135].

In this paper it has been clearly spelled out that GPDs have dual properties, i.e., the central and outer GPD regions are mathematically equivalent, where the former one arises by construction from the latter. This property is implemented in a GPDSR family and can be expressed in terms of GPD moments. Unfortunately, this is not sufficient for pinning down all possible degrees of freedom, i.e., to find a unique GPD model from (ideal) experimental DVCS measurements. There are two possible ways to determine the remaining degrees of freedoms.

The first way relies on the common QCD tools: phenomenological knowledge, counting rules, model calculations, and lattice simulations. Certainly, lattice simulations can only provide a flash on the skewness effect, while model calculations suffer from the matching problem of partonic and

collective degrees of freedom. A central task here is to understand the small x behavior of GPDs, e.g., along the line of Refs. [43] and [112]. We emphasize that phenomenological knowledge can be implemented from the point of the t -channel view for small x and also from the point of the s -channel view for large x , where both regions are tied together by GPDSR. This suggests to look for dual GPD models in which the meson-baryon duality conjecture, employed in the phenomenology of hadronic on-shell processes, is implemented. Crossing relations via the Froissart–Gribov projection provide an additional phenomenological handle.

The second way to address the problem is to develop a theoretical understanding of whether there is some holographic principle that tells us how the information about the GPD on the trajectory $\eta = x$ is related to its values in the central (or outer) region, which includes the $\eta = 0$ case. This question arises naturally if one relates the partonic GPD interpretation to the t - and s -channel hadronic point of view. We recall that the conjecture of duality originated in experimental findings about hadronic on-shell processes and was extensively studied within FESR, see, e.g., Ref. [49]. Thereby, the SO(3) partial wave expansions in both the t - and s -channel were utilized in the context of Regge phenomenology, which provides an empirical description of the strong interaction phenomena. It was also realized that duality phenomena could be partially explained within the quark model. In dual hadronic resonance models the underlying symmetry of duality is the SO(2,1) group. Finally, the quark model was gauged providing us QCD, and string theory was born out of dual hadronic resonance models, i.e, out of the group SO(2,1). Certainly, in QCD phenomenology quark-hadron duality, in particular duality between the deep-inelastic and the resonance kinematical regime (Bloom-Gilman duality), is an important phenomenological concept, for a review see Ref. [136]. Also conformal symmetry shows up in various QCD corners [137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 55] and integrability phenomena in the multi-color limit were discovered in QCD [142, 143, 144, 145, 146] and in supersymmetric Yang-Mill theories, e.g., Refs. [147, 148] and references therein. This integrability phenomena play a key role in getting a handle on the AdS/CFT conjecture [50, 51, 52]. Initiated by this conjecture, model dependent approaches to a supposed AdS/QCD duality were developed [149, 150, 151], see also Refs. [152, 153], and its application to high-energy physics is discussed, e.g., in Ref. [154]. From this more historical line, or, better to say, loop, we believe that it is rather worthy to study GPDs from the AdS/QCD point of view. Certainly, it is not expected that there is an exact answer for a partonic quantity, however, one might perhaps find guidelines for the parameterization of GPDs.

Acknowledgements

D.M. is grateful to the Rudjer Bošković Institute and the Department of Physics at the University of Zagreb for invitation and the warm hospitality during his stay, where this work has been

completed. He likes to thank his colleagues from Bochum for numerous fruitful discussions, in particular, K. Goeke, P. Pobylitsa, M. Polyakov, and P. Schweitzer. For discussion on different aspects in this paper we like to thank I.V. Anikin, S. Brodsky, M. Diehl, L. Favart, M. Furić, M. Guidal, V. Guzey, Ph. Hägler, P. Kroll, J. Noritzsch, A. V. Radyushkin, A. Schäfer, L. Schoeffel, O. V. Teryaev and M. Vanderhaeghen. K.K. and D.M. like also to thank B. Pire and F. Sebastian for invitation to the Journées GDR Nucléon meeting “Extracting GPDs”, where this work has been presented in a preliminary form. K.K. would like to thank the Institut für Theoretische Physik II at Ruhr-Universität Bochum for a kind hospitality. This work was supported in part by the BMBF (Federal Ministry for Education and Research), contract FKZ 06 B0 103 and by the Croatian Ministry of Science, Education and Sport under the contracts no. 119-0982930-1016 and 098-0982930-2864.

References

- [1] D. Müller, D. Robaschik, B. Geyer, F.-M. Dittes and J. Hořejši, Fortschr. Phys. **42**, 101 (1994), [hep-ph/9812448].
- [2] A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Lett. **B380**, 417 (1996), [hep-ph/9604317].
- [3] X. Ji, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 7114 (1997), [hep-ph/9609381].
- [4] J. Collins, L. Frankfurt and M. Strikman, Phys. Rev. **D56**, 2982 (1997), [hep-ph/9611433].
- [5] J. Collins and A. Freund, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 074009 (1999), [hep-ph/9801262].
- [6] M. Diehl, Phys. Rept. **388**, 41 (2003), [hep-ph/0307382].
- [7] A. V. Belitsky and A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Rept. **418**, 1 (2005), [hep-ph/0504030].
- [8] X. Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 610 (1997), [hep-ph/9603249].
- [9] H1, C. Adloff *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B517**, 47 (2001), [hep-ex/0107005].
- [10] HERMES, A. Airapetian *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 182001 (2001), [hep-ex/0106068].
- [11] CLAS, S. Stepanyan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 182002 (2001), [hep-ex/0107043].
- [12] ZEUS, S. Chekanov *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B573**, 46 (2003), [hep-ex/0305028].
- [13] H1, A. Aktas *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **C44**, 1 (2005), [hep-ex/0505061].

- [14] Jefferson Lab Hall A and Hall A DVCS, C. M. Camacho *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 262002 (2006), [nucl-ex/0607029].
- [15] HERMES, A. Airapetian *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 011103 (2007), [hep-ex/0605108].
- [16] CLAS, S. Chen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 072002 (2006), [hep-ex/0605012].
- [17] Jefferson Lab Hall A, M. Mazouz *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 242501 (2007), [0709.0450 [nucl-ex]].
- [18] H1, F. D. Aaron *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B659**, 796 (2008), [0709.4114 [hep-ex]].
- [19] HERMES, A. Airapetian *et al.*, Measurement of Azimuthal Asymmetries With Respect To Both Beam Charge and Transverse Target Polarization in Exclusive Electroproduction of Real Photons, 0802.2499 [hep-ex], 2008.
- [20] ZEUS, J. Breitweg *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **C6**, 603 (1999), [hep-ex/9808020].
- [21] H1, C. Adloff *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **C13**, 371 (2000), [hep-ex/9902019].
- [22] ZEUS, J. Breitweg *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **C12**, 393 (2000), [hep-ex/9908026].
- [23] HERMES, A. Airapetian *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B659**, 486 (2008), [0707.0222 [hep-ex]].
- [24] M. Guidal and S. Morrow, Exclusive ρ^0 electroproduction on the proton : GPDs or not GPDs ?, 0711.3743 [hep-ph], 2007.
- [25] M. Vanderhaeghen, P. A. M. Guichon and M. Guidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5064 (1998).
- [26] A. V. Belitsky, D. Müller and A. Kirchner, Nucl. Phys. **B629**, 323 (2002), [hep-ph/0112108].
- [27] A. Kirchner and D. Müller, Eur. Phys. J. **C32**, 347 (2003), [hep-ph/0302007].
- [28] V. Guzey and T. Teckentrup, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 054027 (2006), [hep-ph/0607099].
- [29] M. V. Polyakov and M. Vanderhaeghen, Taming Deeply Virtual Compton Scattering, 0803.1271 [hep-ph], 2008.
- [30] A. Freund and M. F. McDermott, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 091901 (2002), [hep-ph/0106124].
- [31] A. Freund and M. McDermott, Eur. Phys. J. **C23**, 651 (2002), [hep-ph/0111472].
- [32] K. Kumerički, D. Müller, K. Passek-Kumerički and A. Schäfer, Phys. Lett. B **648**, 186 (2007), [hep-ph/0605237].

- [33] K. Kumerički, D. Müller and K. Passek-Kumerički, Nucl. Phys. B **794**, 244 (2008), [hep-ph/0703179].
- [34] J. M. Laget, Phys. Lett. **B489**, 313 (2000), [hep-ph/0003213].
- [35] F. Cano and J. M. Laget, Phys. Lett. **B551**, 317 (2003), [hep-ph/0209362], Erratum-ibid. B571 (2003) 250.
- [36] M. Capua, S. Fazio, R. Fiore, L. Jenkovszky and F. Paccanoni, Phys. Lett. **B645**, 161 (2007), [hep-ph/0605319].
- [37] J. M. Laget, Phys. Rev. **C76**, 052201 (2007), [0708.1250 [hep-ph]].
- [38] K. Kumerički, D. Müller and K. Passek-Kumerički, Fitting DVCS at NLO and beyond, 0710.5649 [hep-ph], 2007.
- [39] M. V. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. **B659**, 542 (2008), [0707.2509 [hep-ph]].
- [40] M. V. Polyakov, Educing GPDs from amplitudes of hard exclusive processes, 0711.1820 [hep-ph], 2007.
- [41] D. Müller and A. Schäfer, Nucl. Phys. **B739**, 1 (2006), [hep-ph/0509204].
- [42] O. V. Teryaev, Analytic properties of hard exclusive amplitudes, [hep-ph/0510031], 2005.
- [43] L. Frankfurt, A. Freund, V. Guzey and M. Strikman, Phys. Lett. **B418**, 345 (1998), [hep-ph/9703449], Erratum-ibid. B429 (1998) 414.
- [44] Z. Chen, Nucl. Phys. **B525**, 369 (1998), [hep-ph/9705279].
- [45] M. Diehl and D. Y. Ivanov, Eur. Phys. J. **C52**, 919 (2007), [0707.0351 [hep-ph]].
- [46] I. V. Anikin and O. V. Teryaev, Phys. Rev. **D76**, 056007 (2007), [0704.2185 [hep-ph]].
- [47] P. V. Pobylitsa, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 094002 (2002), [hep-ph/0204337].
- [48] A. Freund, Phys. Lett. **B472**, 412 (2000), [hep-ph/9903488].
- [49] P. D. B. Collins, *An Introduction to Regge Theory and High Energy Physics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1977).
- [50] J. M. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 231 (1998), [hep-th/9711200].
- [51] S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov and A. M. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. **B428**, 105 (1998), [hep-th/9802109].

- [52] E. Witten, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2**, 253 (1998), [hep-th/9802150].
- [53] M. Guidal, Discussion on the recent proton-DVCS results of Jefferson Lab, 0803.1592 [hep-ph], 2008.
- [54] A. V. Radyushkin, *Phys. Rev.* **D56**, 5524 (1997), [hep-ph/9704207].
- [55] V. M. Braun, G. P. Korchemsky and D. Müller, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **51**, 311 (2003), [hep-ph/0306057].
- [56] A. V. Belitsky, B. Geyer, D. Müller and A. Schäfer, *Phys. Lett.* **B421**, 312 (1998), [hep-ph/9710427].
- [57] A. G. Shuvaev, *Phys. Rev.* **D60**, 116005 (1999), [hep-ph/9902318].
- [58] J. D. Noritzsch, *Phys. Rev.* **D62**, 054015 (2000), [hep-ph/0004012].
- [59] I. I. Balitsky and V. M. Braun, *Nucl. Phys.* **B311**, 541 (1989).
- [60] N. Kivel and L. Mankiewicz, *Nucl. Phys.* **B557**, 271 (1999), [hep-ph/9903531].
- [61] A. Manashov, M. Kirch and A. Schäfer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 012002 (2005), [hep-ph/0503109].
- [62] M. Kirch, A. Manashov and A. Schäfer, *Phys. Rev.* **D72**, 114006 (2005), [hep-ph/0509330].
- [63] M. V. Polyakov and A. G. Shuvaev, On 'dual' parametrizations of generalized parton distributions, hep-ph/0207153, 2002.
- [64] M. Diehl, T. Gousset, B. Pire and O. V. Teryaev, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 1782 (1998), [hep-ph/9805380].
- [65] O. V. Teryaev, *Phys. Lett.* **B510**, 125 (2001), [hep-ph/0102303].
- [66] F.-M. Dittes, D. Müller, D. Robaschik, B. Geyer and J. Hořejši, *Phys. Lett.* **209B**, 325 (1988).
- [67] M. Diehl, T. Feldmann, R. Jakob and P. Kroll, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C8**, 409 (1999), [hep-ph/9811253].
- [68] S. J. Brodsky, M. Diehl and D. S. Hwang, *Nucl. Phys.* **B596**, 99 (2001), [hep-ph/0009254].
- [69] M. Diehl, T. Feldmann, R. Jakob and P. Kroll, *Nucl. Phys.* **B596**, 33 (2001), [hep-ph/0009255], Erratum-ibid. B605 (2001) 647.

- [70] A. Mukherjee, I. V. Musatov, H. C. Pauli and A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Rev. **D67**, 073014 (2003), [hep-ph/0205315].
- [71] B. C. Tiburzi, W. Detmold and G. A. Miller, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 093008 (2004), [hep-ph/0408365].
- [72] D. S. Hwang and D. Müller, Phys. Lett. **B660**, 350 (2008), [0710.1567 [hep-ph]].
- [73] P. Pobylitsa, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 034004 (2004), [hep-ph/0211160].
- [74] P. V. Pobylitsa, Phys. Rev. **D67**, 034009 (2003), [hep-ph/0210150].
- [75] S. Ahmad, H. Honkanen, S. Liuti and S. K. Taneja, Generalized parton distributions from hadronic observables, 0709.0016 [hep-ph], 2007.
- [76] A. V. Belitsky, D. Müller, L. Niedermeier and A. Schäfer, Phys. Lett. **B474**, 163 (2000), [hep-ph/9908337].
- [77] L. Mankiewicz, G. Piller and A. Radyushkin, Eur. Phys. J. **C 10**, 307 (1999), [hep-ph/9812467].
- [78] K. Goeke, M. V. Polyakov and M. Vanderhaeghen, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **47**, 401 (2001), [hep-ph/0106012].
- [79] M. V. Polyakov and C. Weiss, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 114017 (1999), [hep-ph/9902451].
- [80] W. I. Weisberger, Phys. Rev. **D5**, 2600 (1972).
- [81] S. J. Brodsky, F. E. Close and J. F. Gunion, Phys. Rev. **D5**, 1384 (1972).
- [82] A. V. Belitsky, D. Müller, A. Kirchner and A. Schäfer, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 116002 (2001), [hep-ph/0011314].
- [83] A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Lett. **B449**, 81 (1999), [hep-ph/9810466].
- [84] A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Rev. **D58**, 114008 (1998), [hep-ph/9803316].
- [85] LHPC and SESAM, P. Hägler *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 034505 (2003), [hep-lat/0304018].
- [86] LHPC, P. Hägler *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **A24S1**, 29 (2005), [hep-ph/0410017].
- [87] LHPC and SESAM, P. Hägler *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 112001 (2004), [hep-lat/0312014].
- [88] QCDSF, M. Göckeler *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 042002 (2004), [hep-ph/0304249].

- [89] QCDSF and UKQCD, M. Göckeler *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B627**, 113 (2005), [hep-lat/0507001].
- [90] R. G. Edwards *et al.*, PoS LAT **2006**, 121 (2006), [hep-lat/0610007].
- [91] LHPC, P. Hägler *et al.*, Nucleon Generalized Parton Distributions from Full Lattice QCD, 0705.4295 [hep-lat], 2007.
- [92] S. V. Goloskokov and P. Kroll, Eur. Phys. J. **C42**, 281 (2005), [hep-ph/0501242].
- [93] S. V. Goloskokov and P. Kroll, Eur. Phys. J. **C53**, 367 (2008), [0708.3569 [hep-ph]].
- [94] K. Goeke *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 094021 (2007), [hep-ph/0702030].
- [95] F. Ellinghaus, DVCS at HERMES: Recent Results, 0710.5768 [hep], 2007.
- [96] A. Freund, M. McDermott and M. Strikman, Phys. Rev. **D67**, 036001 (2003), [hep-ph/0208160].
- [97] W. L. van Neerven and A. Vogt, Nucl. Phys. **B588**, 345 (2000), [hep-ph/0006154].
- [98] S. Forte, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A21**, 769 (2006), [hep-ph/0509371].
- [99] D. Y. Ivanov, Exclusive vector meson electroproduction, 0712.3193 [hep-ph], 2007.
- [100] D. Müller, Pomeron dominance in deeply virtual Compton scattering and the femto holographic image of the proton, hep-ph/0605013, 2006.
- [101] K. Kumerički, D. Müller, K. Passek-Kumerički and A. Schäfer, In preparation.
- [102] A. V. Belitsky and D. Müller, Phys. Lett. **B417**, 129 (1998), [hep-ph/9709379].
- [103] A. V. Belitsky and D. Müller, Nucl. Phys. **B537**, 397 (1999), [hep-ph/9804379].
- [104] A. V. Belitsky, A. Freund and D. Müller, Nucl. Phys. **B574**, 347 (2000), [hep-ph/9912379].
- [105] D. Müller, Phys. Lett. **B634**, 227 (2006), [hep-ph/0510109].
- [106] K. Kumerički, D. Müller and K. Passek-Kumerički, Talk given at the conference Exclusive Reactions at High Momentum Transfer, New Port News, 2007, May 21-24; <http://conferences.jlab.org/exclusive/talks/DMueller.pdf>.
- [107] J. Noritzsch, Private communication.
- [108] A. G. Shuvaev, K. J. Golec-Biernat, A. D. Martin and M. G. Ryskin, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 014015 (1999), [hep-ph/9902410].

- [109] M. Diehl and W. Kugler, Phys. Lett. **B660**, 202 (2008), [0711.2184 [hep-ph]].
- [110] A. D. Martin, M. G. Ryskin and T. Teubner, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 014022 (2000), [hep-ph/9912551].
- [111] P. V. Landshoff and J. C. Polkinghorne, Phys. Rept. **5**, 1 (1972).
- [112] B. I. Ermolaev, M. Greco and S. I. Troyan, Nucl. Phys. **B594**, 71 (2001), [hep-ph/0009037].
- [113] X. Ji, J. Phys. **G24**, 1181 (1998), [hep-ph/9807358].
- [114] A. V. Afanasev and C. E. Carlson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 212301 (2005), [hep-ph/0502128].
- [115] A. D. Polyanin and A. V. Manzhirov, *Handbook of Integral Equations* (CRC Press LLC, Boca Raton, USA, 1998).
- [116] R. Dolen, D. Horn and C. Schmid, Phys. Rev. **166**, 1768 (1968).
- [117] M. J. Creutz, S. D. Drell and E. A. Paschos, Phys. Rev. **178**, 2300 (1969).
- [118] A. Belitsky, A. Kirchner, D. Müller and A. Schäfer, Phys.Lett. **B510**, 117 (2001), [hep-ph/0103343].
- [119] F. Carlson, *Sur une classe de séries de Taylor*, PhD thesis, Uppsala University, 1914.
- [120] I. M. Gelfand and G. E. Shilov, *Generalized Functions* Vol. I (Academic Press, New York, 1964).
- [121] F. E. Close and Q. Zhao, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 054001 (2002), [hep-ph/0202181].
- [122] M. Diehl, T. Feldmann, R. Jakob and P. Kroll, Eur. Phys. J. **C39**, 1 (2005), [hep-ph/0408173].
- [123] M. Guidal, M. V. Polyakov, A. V. Radyushkin and M. Vanderhaeghen, Phys. Rev. **D72**, 054013 (2005), [hep-ph/0410251].
- [124] S. Ahmad, H. Honkanen, S. Liuti and S. K. Taneja, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 094003 (2006), [hep-ph/0611046].
- [125] G. Veneziano, Nuovo. Cim. **A57**, 190 (1968).
- [126] F. Yuan, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 051501 (2004), [hep-ph/0311288].
- [127] J. P. Ralston and B. Pire, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 111501 (2002), [hep-ph/0110075].

- [128] J. Kogut and D. Soper, Phys. Rev. **D1**, 2901 (1970).
- [129] M. Diehl, Eur. Phys. J. **C25**, 223 (2002), [hep-ph/0205208], Erratum-ibid. C31 (2003) 277.
- [130] M. Burkardt, GPDs with $\zeta \neq 0$, [0711.1881 [hep-ph]], 2007.
- [131] I. V. Anikin, B. Pire and O. V. Teryaev, Phys. Rev. **D 62**, 071501 (2000), [hep-ph/0003203].
- [132] N. Kivel and M. V. Polyakov, Nucl. Phys. **B600**, 334 (2001), [hep-ph/0010150].
- [133] A. V. Belitsky and D. Müller, Nucl. Phys. **B589**, 611 (2000), [hep-ph/0007031].
- [134] A. V. Belitsky and D. Müller, Phys. Lett. **B513**, 349 (2001), [hep-ph/0105046].
- [135] D. Y. Ivanov, L. Szymanowski and G. Krasnikov, JETP Lett. **80**, 226 (2004), Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz 80 (2004) 255 , [hep-ph/0407207].
- [136] W. Melnitchouk, R. Ent and C. Keppel, Phys. Rept. **406**, 127 (2005), [hep-ph/0501217].
- [137] S. Brodsky, Y. Frishman, G. Lepage and C. Sachradja, Phys. Lett. **91B**, 239 (1980).
- [138] A. Efremov and A. Radyushkin, Phys. Lett. **B94**, 245 (1980).
- [139] L. N. Lipatov, Sov. Phys. JETP **63**, 904 (1986).
- [140] L. N. Lipatov, Phys. Lett. **B309**, 394 (1993).
- [141] D. Müller, Phys. Rev. **D58**, 054005 (1998), [hep-ph/9704406].
- [142] L. N. Lipatov, JETP Lett. **59**, 596 (1994).
- [143] L. D. Faddeev and G. P. Korchemsky, Phys. Lett. **B342**, 311 (1995), [hep-th/9404173].
- [144] G. P. Korchemsky, Nucl. Phys. **B443**, 255 (1995), [hep-ph/9501232].
- [145] V. M. Braun, S. E. Derkachov, G. P. Korchemsky and A. N. Manashov, Nucl. Phys. **B553**, 355 (1999), [hep-ph/9902375].
- [146] A. V. Belitsky, Nucl. Phys. **B574**, 407 (2000), [hep-ph/9907420].
- [147] N. Beisert, Phys. Rept. **405**, 1 (2005), [hep-th/0407277].
- [148] A. V. Belitsky, G. P. Korchemsky and D. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. **B735**, 17 (2006), [hep-th/0509121].
- [149] S. J. Brodsky and G. F. de Teramond, Phys. Lett. **B582**, 211 (2004), [hep-th/0310227].

- [150] G. F. de Teramond and S. J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 201601 (2005), [hep-th/0501022].
- [151] H. R. Grigoryan and A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Lett. **B650**, 421 (2007), [hep-ph/0703069].
- [152] J. Polchinski and M. J. Strassler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 031601 (2002), [hep-th/0109174].
- [153] R. C. Brower, J. Polchinski, M. J. Strassler and C.-I. Tan, JHEP **0712**, 005 (2007), [hep-th/0603115].
- [154] D. M. Hofman and J. Maldacena, Conformal collider physics: Energy and charge correlations, 0803.1467 [hep-th], 2008.