

The Ratio of $\sigma_L(W^2, Q^2)/\sigma_T(W^2, Q^2)$ in the Color Dipole Picture*

Dieter Schildknecht [†]

Fakultät für Physik - Universität Bielefeld
Universitätsstrasse 25 - D-33615 Bielefeld
and

Max-Planck Institute für Physik (Werner-Heisenberg-Institut)
Föhringer Ring 6 - D-80805 München

The transverse size of $q\bar{q}$ fluctuations of the longitudinal photon is reduced relative to the transverse size of $q\bar{q}$ fluctuations of the transverse photon. This implies $R(W^2, Q^2) = 0.375$ or, equivalently, $F_L(W^2, Q^2)/F_2(W^2, Q^2) = 0.27$ for $x \cong Q^2/W^2 \ll 1$ and Q^2 sufficiently large, while $R(W^2, Q^2) = 0.5$, if this effect is not taken into account. Forthcoming experimental data from HERA will allow to test this prediction.

In this written version of my talk, I will restrict myself to a brief summary of our prediction on the ratio of the longitudinal to the transverse photoabsorption cross section. I refer to the recent paper [1] for details and a more complete list of references.

At low values of $x \cong Q^2/W^2 \ll 1$, in terms of the imaginary part of the virtual Compton-scattering amplitude, deep inelastic scattering (DIS) proceeds via forward scattering of (timelike) quark-antiquark, $q\bar{q}$, fluctuations of the virtual spacelike photon on the proton. In its interaction with the proton, a $q\bar{q}$ fluctuation acts as a color dipole. A massive $q\bar{q}$ fluctuation is identical to the $(q\bar{q})^{J=1}$ vector state originating from a timelike photon in e^+e^- annihilation at an e^+e^- energy equal to the mass, $M_{q\bar{q}}$, of the $q\bar{q}$ state.

Validity of the color-dipole picture (CDP) requires the lifetime of a $q\bar{q}$ fluctuation, L , to be large,

$$L = \frac{W^2}{x + \frac{M_{q\bar{q}}^2}{W^2}} \cdot \frac{1}{M_p} \equiv L_0 \frac{1}{M_p}, \quad (1)$$

i.e.

$$L_0 = \frac{1}{x + \frac{M_{q\bar{q}}^2}{W^2}} \gg 1. \quad (2)$$

Besides $x \ll 1$, at any given γ^*p center-of-mass energy, W , the mass of the contributing $q\bar{q}$ states, $M_{q\bar{q}}$, is limited. In view of the subsequent discussions, we note the relation between the $q\bar{q}$ mass and the transverse momentum of the quark (antiquark), $\vec{k}_\perp$, that is given by

$$M_{q\bar{q}}^2 = \frac{\vec{k}_\perp^2}{z(1-z)}, \quad (3)$$

where $0 \leq z \leq 1$ denotes the usually employed variable that is related to the $q\bar{q}$ rest-frame angle between the γ^*p axis and the three-momentum of the (massless) quark,

$$\sin^2 \vartheta = 4z(1-z). \quad (4)$$

*Talk presented at DIS 2008, London

[†]Supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, contract number SCHI 189/6-2

The coupling strength of a timelike photon of mass $M_{q\bar{q}}$ to a $q\bar{q}$ state of mass $M_{q\bar{q}}$ is determined by the longitudinal and transverse components of the electromagnetic current [2],

$$\sum_{\lambda=-\lambda'=\pm 1} |j_L^{\lambda,\lambda'}|^2 = 8M_{q\bar{q}}^2 z(1-z) \quad (5)$$

and

$$\sum_{\lambda=-\lambda'=\pm 1} |j_T^{\lambda,\lambda'}(+)|^2 = \sum_{\lambda=-\lambda'=\pm 1} |j_T^{\lambda,\lambda'}(-)|^2 = 2M_{q\bar{q}}^2(1-2z(1-z)). \quad (6)$$

where $j_T^{\lambda,\lambda'}(+)$ and $j_T^{\lambda,\lambda'}(-)$ refer to positive and negative helicity of the transverse photon. The $q\bar{q}$ pair consists of a quark and antiquark of opposite helicity.

From (5) and (6), we see that the transition of a longitudinal photon to a $q\bar{q}$ pair prefers $z \neq 0$, while a transverse photon prefers $z = 0$. Transverse photons produce (relatively) small- $k_\perp$ pairs of mass $M_{q\bar{q}}$ according to (3), while longitudinal photons produce (relatively) large- $k_\perp$ pairs. From (3) with (5) and (6), one finds that the ratio of the average transverse momenta is given by [1]

$$\rho = \frac{\langle \vec{k}_\perp^2 \rangle_L}{\langle \vec{k}_\perp^2 \rangle_T} = \frac{4}{3}. \quad (7)$$

From the uncertainty relation, the ratio of the effective transverse sizes is then given by

$$\frac{\langle \vec{r}_\perp^2 \rangle_L}{\langle \vec{r}_\perp^2 \rangle_T} = \frac{1}{\rho} = \frac{3}{4}. \quad (8)$$

Longitudinal photons, γ_L^* , produce “small-size” pairs, while transverse photons, γ_T^* , produce “large-size” pairs. The ratio of the average sizes is given by (8).^a

The transition from a timelike photon interacting with the proton via a $q\bar{q}$ pair of mass $M_{q\bar{q}}$ to a spacelike photon fluctuating into a mass continuum of $q\bar{q}$ vector states is provided by the CDP [4]. In a formulation that expresses the photoabsorption cross section in terms of the scattering of $(q\bar{q})_{L,T}^{J=1}$ longitudinal and transverse $q\bar{q}$ vector states, one obtains

$$\sigma_{\gamma_{L,T}^*}(W^2, Q^2) = \frac{2\alpha R_{e^+e^-}}{3\pi^2} Q^2 \int d^2r'_\perp K_{0,1}^2(r'_\perp Q) \sigma_{(q\bar{q})_{L,T}^{J=1}p}(r'_\perp, W^2). \quad (9)$$

where, taking care of the size effect (8),

$$\sigma_{(q\bar{q})_{L,T}^{J=1}p}(r'_\perp, W^2) = \rho \sigma_{(q\bar{q})_{L,T}^{J=1}p}(r'_\perp, W). \quad (10)$$

In (9) and (10), $r'_\perp$ is related to the transverse size of the $q\bar{q}$ pair by

$$\vec{r}'_\perp = \vec{r}_\perp \sqrt{z(1-z)}. \quad (11)$$

To incorporate the coupling of the $q\bar{q}$ pair to two gluons, the $(q\bar{q})^{J=1}$ interaction in (10) has to vanish as $\vec{r}'_\perp{}'^2 \rightarrow 0$ (“color transparency”). Due to the strong decrease of the modified Bessel functions $K_{0,1}(r'_\perp Q)$ for large values of $r'_\perp Q$, the integral in (9) for large Q^2

^aIn my presentation at DIS 2008 I incorrectly stressed helicity independence, $\rho = 1$, as a necessity. See, however, ref. [3], where helicity independence was introduced as a hypothesis.

is dominated by $r'_\perp \rightarrow 0$, and, accordingly, from (9) with (10) and color transparency, we have for $x \ll 1$ and Q^2 sufficiently large,

$$R(W^2, Q^2) \equiv \frac{\sigma_{\gamma_L^* p}(W^2, Q^2)}{\sigma_{\gamma_T^* p}(W^2, Q^2)} = \frac{\int d^2 r'_\perp r'^2_\perp K_0^2(r'_\perp Q)}{\rho \int d^2 r'_\perp r'^2_\perp K_1^2(r'_\perp Q)} = \frac{1}{2\rho} = \frac{3}{8} = 0.375. \quad (12)$$

Equivalently, in terms of the structure functions,

$$\frac{F_L(W^2, Q^2)}{F_2(W^2, Q^2)} = \frac{1}{1 + 2\rho} = \frac{3}{11} \simeq 0.27. \quad (13)$$

In (12) and (13), the equality [5]

$$\int_0^\infty dy y^3 K_0^2(y) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty dy y^3 K_1^2(y) \quad (14)$$

was used, and the value of $\rho = \frac{4}{3}$ from (8) was inserted. The predictions (12) and (13) are independent of a specific ansatz for the color-dipole cross section. They rely on the CDP in the $r'_\perp$ representation (9) combined with color transparency and the $q\bar{q}$ transverse-size effect incorporated into the proportionality (10).

The parameter ρ from (10), making use of the first equality in (13), can be determined from measurements of DIS at different electron-proton center-of-mass energies, $\sqrt{s}$, for fixed values of x and Q^2 . The reduced cross section of DIS is given by

$$\sigma_r(x, y, Q^2) = F_2(x, Q^2) \left(1 - \frac{y^2}{1 + (1 - y)^2} \frac{1}{1 + 2\rho} \right), \quad (15)$$

where $y = Q^2/xs$. The slope of a straight-line fit of $\sigma_r(x, y, Q^2)$ as a function of $0 \leq y^2/(1 + (1 - y)^2) \leq 1$ determines ρ . A value of

$$\rho = 1 \quad (16)$$

corresponds to helicity independence, i.e. equality of the forward-scattering amplitudes of $(q\bar{q})_h^{J=1}$ fluctuations of the photon on the proton for helicities $h = 0, h = +1$ and $h = -1$. A deviation from $\rho = 1$ rules out helicity independence. The reduced transverse size of longitudinally polarized $(q\bar{q})^{J=1}$ states relative to transversely polarized $(q\bar{q})^{J=1}$ states implies a value of $\rho = 4/3$.

The preliminary results from HERA on the measurements of $F_L(W^2, Q^2)$ presented [6] at DIS 2008 seem to disfavor helicity independence. The measurements were carried out at values of Q^2 and W^2 at which $F_2(W^2, Q^2) \cong 1.2$. According to (13), one finds $F_L \cong 0.4$ for $\rho = 1$ and $F_L \cong 0.33$ for $\rho = 4/3$. The prediction of $F_L \cong 0.33$ seems consistent with the data presented at DIS 2008.

An interesting upper bound on $R(W^2, Q^2)$ was recently derived [7] in the usual formulation of the CDP. The bound is given by

$$R(W^2, Q^2) \leq 0.37248, \quad (17)$$

or, in terms of ρ ,

$$\rho \gtrsim 1.34. \quad (18)$$

The bound is inconsistent with helicity independence, $\rho = 1$, and, strictly speaking, with our prediction of $\rho = 1.33$ from (7).

The usual CDP that implies the bound (17) is not explicitly formulated in terms of $(q\bar{q})^{J=1}$ vector state scattering and, in particular, it contains an $\vec{r}_\perp$ -dependent dipole cross section that is independent of $z(1-z)$. If a $z(1-z)$ dependence is allowed, the derivation of the upper bound (17) fails.

An example for a $z(1-z)$ -dependent dipole cross section is given by our ansatz [8]. It contains helicity independence and provides a successful representation of the experimental data for the total photoabsorption cross section. In fig. 1, we show the longitudinal photoabsorption cross section [9] compared with data available at the time [10]. Under theoretical input assumptions, the data were extracted by the H1 collaboration from the measured structure function $F_2(W^2, Q^2)$. There is a tendency for the theoretical prediction, based on $\rho = 1$, to overestimate the data, thus requiring $\rho > 1$.

The starting point of the present work is the CDP in a representation (“ $r'_\perp$ -representation”) that explicitly factorizes γ^*p scattering into three distinct steps, $\gamma^*(q\bar{q})_{L,T}^{J=1}$ coupling, propagation and scattering on the proton. Independently of the specific prediction on the parameter ρ , it is worth to be stressed that the separation data directly, via measurement of ρ , determine the relative magnitude of the scattering of longitudinally versus transversely polarized massive $(q\bar{q})^{J=1}$ vector states on the proton.




Figure 1: The predictions from the ansatz for the color-dipole cross section in ref. [8] are compared [9] with H1 data extracted from measurements of $F_2(W^2, Q^2)$ under theoretical input assumption.

References

- [1] M. Kuroda and D. Schildknecht, arXiv:0806.0202 [hep-ph].
- [2] G. Cvetič, D. Schildknecht, A. Shoshi, Eur. Phys. J. C13 (2000) 401.
- [3] D. Schildknecht, contribution to DIS 2007, Munich, April 2007, arXiv:0707.3379[hep-ph].
- [4] N.N. Nikolaev, B.G. Zakharov, Z. Phys. C49 (1991) 607.
- [5] I.S. Gradshteyn and I.M. Ryzhik, Academic Press, New York and London (1965) p. 693, formula 6.576-4.
- [6] Contributions to DIS 2008 by the H1 collaboration, presented by B. Antunovic and V. Chekelian, and by the ZEUS collaboration, presented by D. Kollar.
- [7] C. Ewerz, O. Nachtmann, hep-ph/0604087, Annals of Phys. 322 (2007) 1635, ibid. 322 (2007) 1670.
- [8] D. Schildknecht, B. Surrow, M. Tentyukov, Phys. Lett. B 499 (2001) 116;
G. Cvetič, D. Schildknecht, B. Surrow, M. Tentyukov, Eur. Phys. J. C20 (2001) 77;
D. Schildknecht, B. Surrow, M. Tentyukov, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 16 (2001) 1829.
- [9] D. Schildknecht and M. Tentyukov, hep-ph/0203028.
- [10] H1 Collaboration, C. Adloff et al., hep-ex/0012053.