

Nonlinear effects and the behavior of total hadronic and photonic cross sections

A. V. Giannini*

Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, SP, Brazil

F. O. Durães†

Curso de Física, Escola de Engenharia, Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie, São Paulo, SP, Brazil

(Dated: December 2, 2024)

In this work we use an eikonalized minijet model where the effects of the first nonlinear corrections to the DGLAP equations are taken into account. The contributions coming from gluon recombination effects are included in the DGLAP+GLRMQ approach for the free proton in the context of saturation models. The parameters of the model are fixed to fit total pp and $\bar{p}p$ cross sections, including the very recent data from LHC, HiRes and P. Auger Collaboration. Glauber and multiple scattering approximations are then used to describe the inclusive inelastic proton-air cross section. Photoproduction cross sections, without change of parameters fixed before, are also obtained from the model using Vector Meson Dominance and the Additive Quark Model. We show and discuss the main results of this study as well as the implications of saturation effects in the behavior of total hadronic and photonic cross sections.

PACS numbers: 11.80.Fv, 24.85.+p, 25.75.Bh, 13.85.Tp

I. INTRODUCTION

The growth of total hadronic cross sections with energy has been studied for decades and many phenomenological and theoretical efforts have been made to explain it.

One of the most important explanations for this behavior was proposed in the 70's [1] based on QCD (Quantum Chromodynamics): the behavior of hadronic cross sections with the center of mass energy (\sqrt{s}) was very similar to the production of jets, indicating that partons would be playing a role in these interactions. This basic idea has led to an approach, called minijet model, which takes into account that the total hadronic cross sections can be decomposed as $\sigma_0 + \sigma_{pQCD}$, where σ_0 characterizes a nonperturbative contribution to the process (generally taken as energy-independent at high energies) and σ_{pQCD} represents the semihard contributions, calculated in perturbative QCD (pQCD) with use of an arbitrary cutoff at low transverse momenta p_{Tmin} ($> \Lambda_{QCD}$) [2].

This simple model, however, violates the unitarity of the S -matrix for these process and, consequently, the Froissart bound, which states that total hadronic cross sections cannot grow faster than $\ln^2(s)$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$ [3]. At high energies, the perturbative component of this model is dominated by gluons with very small (Bjorken- x) fractional momentum and pQCD calculations, based on linear QCD evolution (DGLAP [4] and BFKL equations [5]), show that the minijet cross-section grows very rapidly, dictated by a power-like energy behavior.

To explain the experimental data quantitatively, this idea was reformulated based on the eikonal representation to ensure unitarity and to contain this strong level of growth. Since then several models (Eikonalized Minijet

Models - EMM) have been proposed [6] and, in general, good descriptions of the experimental data have been obtained. Nevertheless, many questions about the dynamics of interaction between partons in this regime still remain open.

Parallel to these developments, significant progress were achieved in theoretical physics of small- x and the results from HERA, with kinematical ranges extended upwards in Q^2 (the four-momentum transfer to the proton) and also downwards in x , changed our view of the structure of the proton [7]. Deep inelastic scattering experiments showed a rapid increase in the density of gluons as x decreases and reinforced the hypothesis that this growth could be related to nonlinear effects in gluon evolution equations. One now know that for values $x \leq 10^{-4}$, gluons dominate the hadron wave functions but, of course, it is expected that the growth of gluon densities “saturates” at a given time.

The understanding of this expectation is related to the momentum transfer, \mathbf{k}_\perp , and, therefore, to the transverse size of a gluon ($\propto 1/|\mathbf{k}_\perp|$) in semihard interactions. For large momentum transfer, the BFKL evolution predicts a large number of small size gluons per unit of rapidity produced through $g \rightarrow gg$ interactions. For small momentum transfer, on the other hand, the produced gluons overlap themselves in the transverse area and fusion processes, $gg \rightarrow g$, become also important.

This simple scenario shows that a typical scale, Q_s , called “saturation scale”, tell us that these latter processes are small for $\mathbf{k}_\perp^2 > Q_s^2$. For high enough momentum transfer, $\mathbf{k}_\perp^2 < Q_s^2$, however, Q_s tell us that the recombination of gluons (fusion processes) cannot be neglected because the gluon density is large and grows with lowering x . At very high energies, smaller and smaller values of Bjorken- x can be accessed and, under these conditions, the recombination mechanism becomes more and more effective resulting in a decrease in the population

* avgiannini@usp.br

† fduraes@if.usp.br; duraes@mackenzie.br

of gluons and, therefore, in the idea of “saturation” of partonic distributions mentioned above.

Many studies were made in the latest two decades exploring this subject and, currently, one believes that an effective theory, the Color Glass Condensate (CGC) [8–10], correctly describes the behavior of very small- x gluons in hadronic wave functions by an infinite hierarchy of coupled evolution equations for the correlators of Wilson lines.

According to this picture, the (highly dense) system formed at these extreme conditions is characterized by the limitation on the maximum phase-space parton density that can be reached in the hadron wave function and an x - or energy-dependent momentum scale, $Q_s(x)$, which separates dense and dilute regimes. In the low density regime the formalism reproduces the BFKL dynamics for partons with transverse momentum much larger than this “saturation momentum”. On the opposite side, the saturation scale becomes large for $Q_s(x) \gg \Lambda_{QCD}$ and the formalism predicts that partons saturate in the hadron wave function with occupation numbers of order $1/\alpha_s(Q_s)$. In this case the coupling constant becomes weak ($\alpha_s(Q_s) \ll 1$) and the high energy limit of QCD can be studied using weak coupling techniques [11, 12].

In this work we study the influence of gluon recombination process assuming that such a system may be formed in hadronic and photonic collisions at very high energies. As mentioned above, at very small x -values, parton distribution functions are governed by BFKL dynamics and this mechanism leads to nonlinear power corrections to the DGLAP evolution equations. We also adopt here the first nonlinear (GLRMQ) terms calculated by Gribov, Levin and Ryskin [13], and after by Mueller and Qiu [14], to describe experimental cross sections and make predictions.

In what follows we briefly present the standard formulations of the eikonalized minijet model for hadronic and photonic cross sections, of the inelastic proton-air cross section and describe the main ingredients used in our calculations. We then present the strategy used to fix the parameters of the model, show and discuss our main results and, in the last section, we outline our conclusions.

II. EIKONALIZED MINIJET MODEL WITH SATURATION EFFECTS

One of the most important contributions to predict the behavior of hadronic cross sections with the energy from the QCD parton model was proposed by Durand and Pi [15] in the late 80’s using a formalism consistent with unitarity constraints. Many QCD-inspired models used today have their origins based on this “eikonal” formulation, which provides a framework where the minijet cross-sections are unitarized via multiple scattering.

In this work we have used an unitarized version of the minijet model [16] where the total, elastic and inelastic

$pp(\bar{p})$ cross sections are given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{tot}^{pp(\bar{p})}(s) &= 2 \int d^2\vec{b} \{1 - e^{-Im \chi(b,s)} \cos[Re \chi(b,s)]\}, \\ \sigma_{el}^{pp(\bar{p})}(s) &= \int d^2\vec{b} |1 - e^{i\chi(b,s)}|^2, \\ \sigma_{inel}^{pp(\bar{p})}(s) &= \int d^2\vec{b} [1 - e^{-2Im \chi(b,s)}].\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

The eikonal function $\chi(b, s)$ in the above expressions contains the energy and the transverse momentum dependence of matter distribution in the colliding particles and, through the impact parameter distribution in the b -space, it is given by $\chi(b, s) = Re [\chi(b, s)] + i Im [\chi(b, s)]$.

The real part of $\chi(b, s)$ represents only about 4% in the ratio of the real to the imaginary part of the forward elastic amplitude for $pp(\bar{p})$ processes and therefore, as a first approximation, we assume $Re \chi(b, s) = 0$ in this work. We also assume that multiple partonic interactions are Poisson distributed with an average number separated in soft and hard processes in a given inelastic collision, $n(b, s) \equiv 2 Im \chi(b, s) = n_{soft}(b, s) + n_{hard}(b, s)$, and can be factorized in b and s as [16]:

$$\begin{aligned}n(b, s) &= W(b, \mu_{soft}) \sigma^{soft}(s) \\ &+ \sum_{k,l} W(b, \mu_{hard}) \sigma_{kl}^{hard}(s),\end{aligned}\quad (2)$$

where $W(b, \mu_{soft})$ and $W(b, \mu_{hard})$, which represent the effective overlap functions of the nucleons at impact parameter b , are related to the nucleon form factor in hadronic and partonic levels (normalized so that $\int W(b, \mu) d^2\vec{b} = 1$), and $\sigma^{soft}(s)$ and $\sigma_{kl}^{hard}(s)$ represent the behavior of the total cross sections with energy in soft and hard (minijet production (m_j)) regimes in $pp(\bar{p})$ collisions.

At low energies the hard contribution to the eikonal function is very small. In order to describe pp and $p\bar{p}$ scattering at ISR energies we parameterize the soft contribution as [17]:

$$\begin{aligned}W(b, \mu_{soft}) &= \frac{\mu_{soft}^2}{96\pi} (\mu_{soft} b)^3 K_3(\mu_{soft} b), \\ \sigma_{soft}^{pp}(E_{lab}) &= 47 + \frac{46}{E_{lab}^{1.39}}, \\ \sigma_{soft}^{p\bar{p}}(E_{lab}) &= 47 + \frac{129}{E_{lab}^{0.661}} + \frac{357}{E_{lab}^{2.7}},\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

where μ_{soft} is an adjustable parameter, K is the modified Bessel functions and E_{lab} is the proton energy in the laboratory system (cross-sections are in mb).

The hard contribution is described by the minijet production in leading order (LO) pQCD where partons are produced back-to-back in the transverse plane according to the differential cross section [18]:

$$\frac{d\sigma_{kl}^{mj}}{dy}(s) = \kappa \int dp_T^2 dy_2 \sum_{i,j} x_1 f_{i/h_1}(x_1, Q^2) x_2 f_{j/h_2}(x_2, Q^2) \frac{1}{1 + \delta_{kl}} \left[\delta_{fk} \frac{d\hat{\sigma}^{ij \rightarrow kl}}{d\hat{t}}(\hat{t}, \hat{u}) + \delta_{fl} \frac{d\hat{\sigma}^{ij \rightarrow kl}}{d\hat{t}}(\hat{u}, \hat{t}) \right], \quad (4)$$

where h_1 and h_2 denote the colliding hadrons and $d\hat{\sigma}^{ij \rightarrow kl}/d\hat{t}$ the subprocess cross sections [19].

The rapidities of the final state partons k and l are labeled by y ($\equiv y_1$) and y_2 and the transverse momentum of each parton by p_T ($\geq p_{T_{min}}$, the smallest transverse momentum of parton scatterings allowed). The fractional momenta of the colliding partons i and j are $x_{1,2} = p_T/\sqrt{s}(e^{\pm y} + e^{\pm y_2})$, i.e., the incoming partons are collinear with the beams. The factor $1/(1 + \delta_{kl})$ is a statistical factor for identical particles in the final state.

In our calculations we have assumed $\kappa = 1$ and only considered the process $gg \rightarrow gg$, $gq(\bar{q}) \rightarrow gq(\bar{q})$ and $gg \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ ($q \equiv u, d, s$). We also have parameterized the ‘‘hard’’ overlap functions in impact parameter space, $W(b, \mu_{gg})$, $W(b, \mu_{gq} \equiv \sqrt{\mu_{qq}\mu_{gg}})$ and $W(b, \mu_{qq})$, as Fourier transforms of a dipole form factor (see eq. (3)) [20]. The (free) parameters μ_{qq} and μ_{gg} represent masses which describe the ‘‘area’’ occupied by quarks and gluons, respectively, in the colliding protons.

As discussed before, even in conventional eikonalized minijet models the rise of the total $pp(\bar{p})$ cross section with energy is related to the increasing probability of perturbative small- x gluon-gluon collisions: gluon distribution functions governed by DGLAP evolution and contributions of partons with $p_T \geq p_{T_{min}}$ dominate the integrand of eq. (4) increasing very fast the rise of total cross-section with energy. The numerical evaluation of this partonic contribution strongly depends upon $p_{T_{min}}$, the chosen set of parton densities ($f_{i,j/h_{1,2}}(x_{1,2}, Q^2)$) and, of course, their evolution in this regime.

The main ingredient of our model is the introduction of nonlinear terms in the evolution of parton densities above. In the context of saturation models, we adopt these corrections and make use of EHKQS parton distribution functions [21, 22], where the GLRMQ terms are present. This allows us to test the dynamic responsible for the rise of total $pp(\bar{p})$ cross sections with energy in the presence of saturation effects.

In order to compare these two different regimes, we use here GRV98(LO) [23] and CTEQ6L [24] for the parton densities, as a baseline. They are governed by DGLAP evolution equations (linear regime), where, therefore, saturation effects are clearly absent.

At this point, we would like to call attention for the latest LHC results: they have provided very valuable information on high-energy multiparticle production, improving our theoretical understanding of soft and semi-hard parton dynamics, and showed the need for adjustments and even the reformulation of hypotheses employed in models that propose to establish the behavior of hadronic cross sections with energy.

It is also important to note that the recent cosmic ray data from HiRes and P. Auger collaborations have al-

lowed a deeper understanding about the nature of produced particles at very high energies and stimulated many discussions between the accelerator and cosmic-ray communities on common issues in these areas [12, 25].

The energy dependence of total hadronic cross-sections is probably the most important question for the cosmic-ray community. The phase space regions of relevance to the development of air showers are not directly accessible in the currently accelerator experiments, and, because of that, descriptions and interpretations of data in cosmic rays physics at high energies depend crucially on the predictions coming from phenomenological models.

For this reason it is very interesting to test the range of the model presented in this work and to verify if it permits a satisfactory description of data to other processes. Obviously, our first choice is the inelastic proton-air cross section.

In the Glauber multiple collision model [26] the inelastic proton-nucleus cross-section, $\sigma_{inel}^{pA}(s)$, can be derived in the eikonal limit (straight line trajectories of colliding nucleons) from the corresponding inelastic nucleon-nucleon (NN) cross-section, $\sigma_{inel}^{NN}(s)$. At the center-of-mass energy \sqrt{s} and the geometry of the pA collision, it is simply determined by the impact parameter of the reaction:

$$\sigma_{inel}^{pA}(s) = \int d^2\vec{b} \left[1 - e^{-\sigma_{inel}^{NN}(s) T_A(b)} \right]. \quad (5)$$

The thickness function $T_A(b)$ ($\equiv \int dz \rho_A(b, z)$, with $\int d^2\vec{b} T_A(b) = A$) gives the number of nucleons in the nucleus A per unit area along a direction z , separated from the center of the nucleus by an impact parameter b , and $\rho_A(b, z)$ is the nuclear density of nucleus A . In what follows we have used $A_{air} = 14.5$, $\rho_A(b, z) = \rho_0 \{1 + \exp[(r - R_A)/a_0]\}^{-1}$ with $r = \sqrt{b^2 + z^2}$, $R_A = 1.19 A^{1/3} - 1.61 A^{-1/3}$ (fm), $a_0 = 0.75$ fm.

Our second choice to test the model are the γp and $\gamma\gamma$ cross sections. The data on these processes can be derived from the pp forward scattering amplitude using Vector Meson Dominance (VMD) and the Additive Quark Model with the introduction of a probability ($P_{had}^{\gamma p(\gamma)}$) that the photon interacts as a hadron [6, 20].

Assuming, in the spirit of the VMD, that at high energies the photon behaves as a hadronic state composed by two quarks, after the substitutions $\sigma^{s,h} \rightarrow \frac{2}{3}\sigma^{s,h}$ and $\mu_{s,h} \rightarrow \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\mu_{s,h}$ in both, soft and hard components of eq. (2), the γp cross section can be written as:

$$\sigma_{tot}^{\gamma p}(s) = 2 P_{had}^{\gamma p} \int d^2\vec{b} \{1 - e^{-Im \chi^{\gamma p}(b,s)} \times \cos [Re \chi^{\gamma p}(b,s)]\}, \quad (6)$$




FIG. 1. Total pp and $\bar{p}p$ cross sections. Solid and dashed lines represent the results of the model (eq. (1)) and the experimental data are from references [27–31].

To obtain the $\gamma\gamma$ cross section we apply the same procedure as before making the substitutions $\sigma^{s,h} \rightarrow \frac{4}{9}\sigma^{s,h}$ and $\mu_{s,h} \rightarrow \frac{3}{2}\mu_{s,h}$:

$$\sigma_{tot}^{\gamma\gamma}(s) = 2 P_{had}^{\gamma\gamma} \int d^2\vec{b} \{1 - e^{-Im \chi^{\gamma\gamma}(b,s)} \times \cos[Re \chi^{\gamma\gamma}(b,s)]\}, \quad (7)$$

where $P_{had}^{\gamma\gamma} = (P_{had}^{\gamma p})^2$.

The simplest VMD formulation only assumes the lightest vector mesons and in this case $P_{had}^{\gamma p}$ is given by $P_{had}^{\gamma p} = \sum_{V=\rho,\omega,\phi} \frac{4\pi\alpha_{em}}{f_V^2}$, where α_{em} is the QED coupling constant and f_V^2 is the $\gamma-V$ coupling. In this work, however, we consider $P_{had}^{\gamma p}$ as a free parameter fixed by the low energy γp data.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

First of all we would like to emphasize that the PDFs used here have different kinematic limits. Their ranges of validity are: $10^{-5} \leq x \leq 1$ and $1.4 GeV^2 \leq Q^2 \leq 10^4 GeV^2$ (EHKQS); $10^{-9} \leq x \leq 1$ and $0.8 GeV^2 \leq Q^2 \leq 10^6 GeV^2$ (GRV98); $10^{-6} \leq x \leq 1$ and $1.69 GeV^2 \leq Q^2 \leq 10^8 GeV^2$ (CTEQ6L). Although the last distribution incorporates some physics of small- x , only the first one is governed by nonlinear effects of QCD. Second, in our calculations were considered only contributions which respect the kinematic ranges (for both, x and Q^2) of the distributions above.

The strategy adopted in our calculations is as follows: while the soft contribution of the model is parameterized to describe the pp and $\bar{p}p$ scattering at low energies, at higher energies the hard parameters are fixed **in the nonlinear regime** (using the EHKQS parton distribution functions) to fit the latest LHC data and the re-

sults from HiRes and P. Auger collaborations (converted data).

In all figures bellow, we have adopted for left panels the values $p_{T_{min}}^2 = 1.4 GeV^2$, $\mu_{gg} = 1.65 GeV$ and $\mu_{qq} = 1.6 GeV$ and, for right panels, the values $p_{T_{min}}^2 = 1.69 GeV^2$, $\mu_{gg} = 1.6 GeV$ and $\mu_{qq} = 1.5 GeV$. In all cases we have fixed $\mu_{soft}^2 = 0.71 GeV^2$ (see eq. (3)) for the soft component. Solid curves show the results obtained with nonlinear evolution and dashed curves represent the results obtained with these same parameters (fixed considering saturation effects) in the linear regime. This procedure allows us to compare directly the two different dynamics used in our studies.

The relevant experimental data showed in the next figures considers only the most quoted ones in the literature and can be found in the references [20, 27–35].

Figure 1 shows the results of pp and $\bar{p}p$ total cross sections from the present model (eq. (1)). As can be seen the results obtained **with nonlinear evolution** produce a good description of data [27–31]. It should be noted that, with linear evolution, a better description of data could be obtained with different choices of parameters above. However, in this case, the comparison between the nonlinear and linear regimes, would make no sense. Comparing the solid curves with the dashed ones, we conclude that the rise of these cross sections at high energies is still dictated by the growth of gluon densities in small- x but it is suppressed due to the recombination of gluons, leading to a softening of these cross sections.

Figure 2 shows the ratios between the results presented in Figure 1 and the parametrization $\sigma(s) = 30 + 0.22 \ln^2(s/s_0) (mb)$, with $s_0 = 1 GeV^2$, similar to those shown in Particle Data Group (best fit) [27]. We have adopted it here because its “universal term”, $\propto \ln^2(s/s_0)$, permits a more satisfactory description of data at high energies, including the latest LHC data and




FIG. 2. Ratios between total pp and $\bar{p}p$ cross sections (solid and dashed lines of Figure 1) and the parametrization presented in the text.




FIG. 3. Total inelastic pp and $\bar{p}p$ cross sections. Solid and dashed lines represent the results of the model (eq. (1)) and the experimental data are from references [27–31].

the results from HiRes and P. Auger collaborations (converted data). This simple exercise, however, indicates us a very interesting result: the nonlinear dynamics favor more effectively than the linear one the respect to the Froissart's limit by the hadronic cross sections.

Our results for the inelastic pp and $\bar{p}p$ cross sections (eq. (1)) are showed in Figure 3 and compared to the experimental data, which include the most recent results from P. Auger Collaboration [31] and LHC [32], and the oldest ones from the Particle Data Group [27] ($\sigma_{inel}^{pp(\bar{p})}(s) = \sigma_{tot}^{pp(\bar{p})}(s) - \sigma_{el}^{pp(\bar{p})}(s)$). Evidently, the description of data is not so good as before. The relatively weak growth observed in these cross sections is related, on the one hand, to the kinematic limits of PDFs (which exclude lower values of $p_{T_{min}}$ and x than those used here)

and, on the other hand, because, as in other models (references cited in this work), the imaginary part of our eikonal function, which controls these cross section, does not contain diffractive processes. However, albeit complementary, this figure shows the role played by the saturation effects in describing these experimental data, and tells us that the inclusion of diffractive processes is really needed.

Figure 4 shows our results for the inelastic proton-air cross sections given by eq. (5). They take into account only the geometry of the collision $p - Air$ and the semi-hard dynamics of the model, via the imaginary part of the eikonal function, contained in the inelastic proton-proton cross sections. As discussed above, the parameters of the model were fixed only through the total experimental pp




FIG. 4. Inelastic proton-air cross sections. Solid and dashed lines represent the results of the model (eq. (5)) and the experimental data are from references [20, 31, 33].




FIG. 5. Total gamma-proton cross sections. Solid and dashed lines represent the results of the model (eq. (6)) and the experimental data are from references [27, 34].

and $\bar{p}p$ data cross sections, which do not provide a so satisfactory description of inelastic pp collisions, because diffractive processes are absent and we have restricted ourselves to the kinematic limits of the EHKQS distribution functions in the nonlinear regime. Despite that, the results obtained **with nonlinear evolution** describe satisfactorily the experimental data [20, 31, 33], in particular from HiRes and P. Auger collaborations. We consider their as a lower limit of our calculations, but, in our opinion, they may be compared, quantitatively, to the predictions of other models (see discussions presented in [31, 33]).

Figures 5 and 6 show our results for the total γp and

$\gamma\gamma$ cross sections, respectively given by equations (6) and (7). The probability that in these collisions the photon interacts as a hadron was fixed in ($P_{had}^{\gamma p} = 1/221$). The experimental data are from references [27, 34] and [35], respectively. The good agreement between our solid curves (nonlinear regime of the model) and the data is a nice surprise considering that these cross sections are determined by the same parameters used in pp and $\bar{p}p$ collisions and by the changes coming from the “weights” introduced by the VMD and Additive Quark Model in the present version of the eikonized minijet model.




FIG. 6. Total gamma-gamma cross sections. Solid and dashed lines represent the results of the model (eq. (7)) and the experimental data are from references [35].

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we have used an eikonized minijet model, where the effects of the first nonlinear corrections to the DGLAP equations are taken into account, to investigate the behavior of total hadronic and photonic cross sections.

Firstly, it is important to note that the same approach was used to investigate the behavior of cross sections measured in accelerators and cosmic rays experiments. Secondly, we would like to call attention for two very interesting and important results of our studies: a) the introduction of nonlinear corrections to the model allow for a very satisfactory description of total hadronic and photonic cross sections, simultaneously; b) even though

small and only manifest themselves at extremely high energies, the saturation effects attenuate the strong growth of total hadronic cross sections obtained by conventional eikonal models and contribute significantly to an asymptotic behavior which satisfies more comfortably the Froissart bound.

Finally, the fact that we have achieved a reasonable success in using this model, encourages us to test it (work in progress) as the description of other observables.

Acknowledgements: This work has been supported by the Brazilian funding agencies CAPES, CNPq and FAPESP. We would like to thank E.G.S. Luna, F.S. Navarra and V.P. Gonçalves for several instructive discussions.

-
- [1] D. Cline, F. Halzen, and J. Luthe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **31**, 491 (1973).
 [2] T. K. Gaisser and F. Halzen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 1754 (1985).
 [3] M. Froissart, Phys. Rev. **123**, 1053 (1961).
 [4] Yu. Dokshitzer, Sov. Phys. JETP **46**, 1649 (1977); V.N. Gribov and L. N. Lipatov, Sov. Nucl. Phys. **15**, 438 (1972); G. Altarelli, G. Parisi, Nucl. Phys. B **126**, 298 (1977).
 [5] L. N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **23**, 338 (1976); E. A. Kuraev, L. N. Lipatov and V. S. Fadin, Sov. Phys. JETP **45**, 199 (1977); I. I. Balitsky and L. N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **28**, 822 (1978).
 [6] X-N. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **43** 104 (1991); X-N. Wang and M. Gyulassy, *ibid.* **44** 3501 (1991); M. M. Block, E. M. Gregores, F. Halzen e G. Pancheri, *ibid.* **60** 054024 (1999); E. G. S. Luna and A. A. Natale, *ibid.* **73**, 074019 (2006); G. Pancheri *et al.*, *ibid.* **84**, 094009 (2011); A. Grau, G. Pancheri, O. Shekhovtsova and Y. N. Srivastava, Phys. Lett. **B693**, 456 (2010).
 [7] A. Cooper-Sarkar, J. Phys. G **39**, 093001 (2012); M. Klein and R. Yoshida, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **61**, 343 (2008); J. Blumlein, *ibid.* **69**, 28 (2013); E. Iancu, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **191**, 281 (2009); L. Frankfurt, M. Strikman and C. Weiss, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **55**, 403 (2005); E. Iancu, K. Itakura and S. Munier, Phys. Lett. **B590**, 199 (2004); J. R. Forshaw, R. Sandapen and G. Shaw, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **19**, 5425 (2004).
 [8] J. Jalilian-Marian and Y. V. Kovchegov, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **56**, 104 (2006).
 [9] E. Iancu and R. Venugopalan, In *Hwa, R.C. (ed.) *et al.*: Quark gluon plasma* 249-3363 [hep-ph/0303204]; F. Gelis, E. Iancu, J. Jalilian-Marian and R. Venugopalan, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **60**, 463 (2010); F. Gelis,

- T. Lappi and R. Venugopalan, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. E* **16**, 2595 (2007); E. Iancu, A. Leonidov and L. McLerran, hep-ph/0202270.
- [10] I. Balitsky, *Nucl. Phys.* **B463**, 99 (1996); Y. V. Kovchegov, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 034008 (1999); *ibid.* **61**, 074018 (2000).
- [11] J. P. Blaizot, *Nucl. Phys.* **A854**, 237 (2011), and references therein.
- [12] M. Deile (ed.), D. d'Enterria (ed.) and A. De Roeck (ed.), arXiv:1002.3527 [hep-ph].
- [13] L. V. Gribov, E. M. Levin and M. G. Ryskin, *Phys. Rep.* **100**, 1 (1983).
- [14] A. H. Mueller and J. Qiu, *Nucl. Phys.* **B268**, 427 (1986).
- [15] L. Durand and H. Pi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 303 (1987); A. Capella, J. Kwiecinsky and J. Tran Thanh, *ibid.* **58**, 2015 (1987); L. Durand and H. Pi, *Phys. Rev. D* **40**, 1436 (1989).
- [16] M. M. Block, F. Halzen and B. Margolis, *Phys. Rev. D* **45**, 839 (1992); R. M. Godbole, A. Grau, G. Pancheri and Y. N. Srivastava, *ibid.* **72**, 076001 (2005).
- [17] A. Grau, G. Pancheri and Y. N. Srivastava, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 114020 (1999).
- [18] J. F. Owens, *Rev Mod. Phys.* **59**, 465 (1987); I. Sarcevic, S. D. Ellis and P. Carruthers, *Phys. Rev. D* **40**, 1446 (1989); K. J. Eskola and K. Kajantie, *Z. Phys.* **C75**, 515 (1997).
- [19] B. L. Combridge, J. Kripfganz and J. Ranft, *Phys. Lett.* **B70**, 234 (1977).
- [20] M. M. Block, *Phys. Rep.* **436**, 71 (2006).
- [21] K. J. Eskola *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B660**, 211 (2003).
- [22] <http://r.jyu.fi/5U01>
- [23] M. Gluck, E. Reya and A. Vogt, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C5**, 461 (1998).
- [24] J. Pumplin *et al.*, *JHEP* **0207**, 012 (2002).
- [25] B. Alessandro *et al.*, arXiv:1101.1852 [hep-ex]; D. d'Enterria, R. Engel, T. Pierog, S. Ostapchenko and K. Werner, *Few Body Syst.* **53**, 173 (2012); D. d'Enterria, R. Engel, T. Pierog, S. Ostapchenko and K. Werner, *Astropart. Phys.* **35**, 98 (2011); M. Grothe, F. Hautmann and S. Ostapchenko, arXiv:1103.6008 [hep-ph]; S. Ostapchenko, *Phys. Lett. B* **703**, 588 (2011); R. Ulrich, R. Engel and M. Unger, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 054026 (2011).
- [26] R. J. Glauber and G. Matthiae, *Nucl. Phys.* **B21**, 135 (1970). For a recent application of the Glauber approach to pA collisions see *e.g.* T. Wibig and D. Sobczyk-ska, *J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys.* **24**, 2037 (1998); D. G. d'Enterria, nucl-ex/0302016.
- [27] J. Beringer, *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 010001 (2012).
- [28] G. Antchev, *et al.* (TOTEM Collaboration), CERN-PH-EP-2012-353 (2012).
- [29] G. Antchev, *et al.* (TOTEM Collaboration), CERN-PH-EP-2012-354 (2012).
- [30] K. Belov *et al.*, Proc. of 30th International Cosmic Ray Conference (ICRC 07), Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, Mexico City, Mexico (2008) ID 1216, Vol. 4 (HE part 1), pages 687-690.
- [31] P. Abreu, *et al.* (Pierre Auger Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 062002 (2012).
- [32] B. Abelev *et al.* (ALICE Collaboration), CERN-PH-EP-2012-238 (2012); G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), *Nature Commun.* **2**, 463 (2011); S. Chatrchyan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), CMS-PAS-FWD-11-001 (2011); CERN-PH-EP-2012-293 (2012).
- [33] M. Aglietta *et al.* (EAS-TOP Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 032004 (2009); G. Aielli *et al.* (ARGO-YBJ Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 092004 (2009); R. M. Baltrusaitis *et al.* (Flys Eye Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 1380 (1984); M. Honda *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 525 (1993); K. Belov, *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)* **151**, 197 (2006); H. H. Mielke *et al.*, *J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys.* **20**, 637 (1994); F. Siohan, *et al.*, *J. Phys. G*, **4**, 1169 (1978); I. De Mitri *et al.* (ARGO-YBJ Collaboration) Proc. of 30th Int. Cosmic Ray Conf., Merida, Mexico, 2007; G.B. Yodh *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **27**, 1183 (1983); S.P. Knurenko, V. R. Slepsova, I.E. Slepsov, N. N. Kalmykov and S. S. Ostapchenko, *Proc. of 26th Int. Cosmic Ray Conf.*, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1, 372 (1999); R. Ulrich *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **196**, 335 (2009).
- [34] S. Chekanov *et al.* (ZEUS Collaboration), *Nucl. Phys.* **B627**, 3 (2002); S. Aid *et al.*, (H1 Collaboration), *Z. Phys. C* **69**, 27 (1995); G.M. Vereshkov, O.D. Lalakulich, Yu.F. Novoseltsev, R.V. Novoseltseva, *Phys. Atom. Nucl.* **66**, 565 (2003).
- [35] G. Abbiendi *et al.* (OPAL Collaboration), *Eur. Phys. J. C* **14**, 199 (2000); M. Acciarri *et al.* (L3 Collaboration), *Phys. Lett.* **B408**, 450 (1997); **519**, 33 (2001); H. Aihara *et al.* (TPC/ 2γ Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **41**, 2667 (1990); S. E. Baru *et al.* (MD-1 Collaboration), *Zeit Phys. C* **53**, 219 (1992); C. Berger *et al.* (PLUTO Collaboration), *Phys. Lett.* **B149**, 421 (1984); *Zeit Phys. C* **26**, 353 (1984); D. Bintinger *et al.* (PEP/ 2γ Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54**, 763 (1985).