Single-Spin Asymmetries in $p^{\uparrow}p \to \pi X$ and Chiral Symmetry

Mauro Anselmino^a, Alessandro Drago^b, and Francesco Murgia^c

^aDipartimento di Fisica Teorica, Università di Torino

and INFN, Sezione di Torino, V. Giuria 1, 10125 Torino, Italy

and INFN, Sezione di Ferrara, 44100 Ferrara, Italy

^cINFN, Sezione di Cagliari, Via A. Negri 18, 09127 Cagliari, Italy

(March 1997)

Abstract

We study a possible origin of single spin asymmetries in the large p_T inclusive production of hadrons in the scattering of unpolarized protons or leptons on transversely polarized nucleons. Such asymmetry is related to the single-spin asymmetry for the process $p^{\uparrow} \rightarrow q + X$ or, equivalently, to the off-diagonal matrix element of the quark density operator $\bar{\psi}\gamma^+\psi$; this quantity need not be zero if transverse momentum and spin-isospin interactions are taken into account. The different signs for the large single spin asymmetries observed in $p^{\uparrow}p \rightarrow \pi^+X$ and $p^{\uparrow}p \rightarrow \pi^-X$ can be explained as a consequence of chiral symmetry. Crucial tests of the model are suggested.

PACS Number(s): 13.88.+e, 13.85.Ni, 12.38.-t, 12.39.Fe

Typeset using REVT_FX

^bDipartimento di Fisica, Università di Ferrara

It has become very popular to use chiral Lagrangians to study nucleon spin structure functions. They have been used, for example, to understand the reduction of the proton spin fraction carried by the quarks [1]. In this paper we show that chiral symmetry plays a crucial rôle in the single-spin asymmetries observed in the inclusive production of pions in the scattering of transversely polarized protons off unpolarized ones [2]. In particular we shall show that the opposite sign of the asymmetry for positive and negative pions can be related to the underlying chiral symmetry of the model describing the nucleon. This mechanism can be tested by measuring single-spin asymmetries in inclusive hadronic processes, $p^{\uparrow}p \to \gamma X$ and $p^{\uparrow}p \to hX$, or in the Deep Inelastic Scattering (DIS) of unpolarized (or longitudinally polarized) leptons on transversely polarized nucleons.

The main point of this paper is the analysis of a new quantity introduced in Refs. [3] and [4]:

$$\Delta^{N} f_{a/p^{\uparrow}}(x_{a}, \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp a}) = \sum_{\lambda} \left[\hat{f}_{a,\lambda_{a}/p^{\uparrow}}(x_{a}, \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp a}) - \hat{f}_{a,\lambda_{a}/p^{\downarrow}}(x_{a}, \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp a}) \right]$$
(1)

$$=\sum_{\lambda_a} \left[\hat{f}_{a,\lambda_a/p^{\uparrow}}(x_a, \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp a}) - \hat{f}_{a,\lambda_a/p^{\uparrow}}(x_a, -\boldsymbol{k}_{\perp a}) \right], \qquad (2)$$

where $\hat{f}_{a,\lambda_a/p^{\uparrow(\downarrow)}}(x_a, \mathbf{k}_{\perp a})$ is the number density of partons a with helicity λ_a , momentum fraction x_a and intrinsic transverse momentum $\mathbf{k}_{\perp a}$ in a transversely polarized proton. Eq. (2) follows from Eq. (1) by rotational invariance and explicitly shows that $\Delta^N f_{a/p^{\uparrow}}(x, \mathbf{k}_{\perp}) =$ 0 when $\mathbf{k}_{\perp} = 0$.

This new quantity can be regarded as a single spin asymmetry or analysing power for the $p^{\uparrow} \rightarrow a + X$ process; if we define the polarized number densities in terms of *distribution amplitudes* as

then we have, in the helicity basis,

$$\Delta^{N} f_{a/p^{\uparrow}}(x_{a}, \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp a})$$

$$= 2 \operatorname{Sm} \oint \sum_{\lambda_{a}} \left[\mathcal{G}_{\lambda_{X}, \lambda_{a}; +}^{a/p}(x_{a}, \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp a}) \ \mathcal{G}_{\lambda_{X}, \lambda_{a}; -}^{a/p *}(x_{a}, \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp a}) \right]$$

$$\equiv 2 I_{+-}^{a/p}(x_{a}, \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp a}), \qquad (4)$$

where + and - stand respectively for the proton helicity $\lambda_p = 1/2$ and $\lambda_p = -1/2$. In equations above \oint stands for a spin sum and phase space integration of the undetected particles, considered as a system X. Notice that, in the absence of quark transverse motion $(\mathbf{k}_{\perp} = 0)$, angular momentum conservation implies $\lambda_p = \lambda_a + \lambda_X$ so that, once more, we see that $I_{+-}(x, \mathbf{k}_{\perp} = 0) = 0$. It is useful to compare the previous function with well known distribution functions:

$$f_1^a(x_a) = \oint \int d\mathbf{k}_{\perp a} \{ |\mathcal{G}_{\lambda_X,+;+}^{a/p}(x_a, \mathbf{k}_{\perp a})|^2 +$$

$$|\mathcal{G}_{\lambda_X,-;+}^{a/p}(x_a, \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp a})|^2\}$$
(5)

$$g_{1}^{a}(x_{a}) = \oint \int d\boldsymbol{k}_{\perp a} \{ |\mathcal{G}_{\lambda_{X},+;+}^{a/p}(x_{a},\boldsymbol{k}_{\perp a})|^{2} - |\mathcal{G}_{\lambda_{X},-;+}^{a/p}(x_{a},\boldsymbol{k}_{\perp a})|^{2} \}$$

$$h_{1}^{a}(x_{a}) = \oint \int d\boldsymbol{k}_{\perp a} \, \mathcal{G}_{\lambda_{X},+;+}^{a/p}(x_{a},\boldsymbol{k}_{\perp a}) \, \mathcal{G}_{\lambda_{X},-;-}^{a/p *}(x_{a},\boldsymbol{k}_{\perp a}) \, .$$

$$(6)$$

In the last equation we have neglected terms which vanish when integrated on k_{\perp} .

According to the usual operatorial definition of quark densities using light cone variables [5] Eq. (4) can be written as

$$I_{+-}^{a/p}(x, \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp}) = \Im \int \frac{dy^{-} d\boldsymbol{y}_{\perp}}{(2\pi)^{3}} e^{-ixp^{+}y^{-} + i\boldsymbol{k}_{\perp} \cdot \boldsymbol{y}_{\perp}} \\ \times \langle p, -|\bar{\psi}_{a}(0, y^{-}, \boldsymbol{y}_{\perp}) \frac{\gamma^{+}}{2} \psi_{a}(0)|p, +\rangle \\ = \Im \int \hat{f}_{a/p}(x, \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp}; -, +)$$
(8)

where in the last line we have adopted the notations of Ref. [5]. This definition coincides with the previous one, Eq. (4), as it can be seen using completeness: $\bar{\psi}_a \gamma^+ \psi_a = \psi_{a+}^{\dagger} \psi_{a+} = \sum_X \psi_{a+}^{\dagger} |X\rangle \langle X|\psi_{a+}$. The I_{+-} function corresponds therefore to the imaginary part of the off-diagonal matrix elements of the same operator appearing in the definition of f_1 .

In Ref. [5] it is argued that such off-diagonal matrix elements are zero due to the timereversal invariance of QCD, and indeed this is proved by exploiting the time-reversal and parity transformation properties of free Dirac spinors. In terms of distribution amplitudes for the process $p^{\uparrow} \rightarrow q + X$ this can be understood by observing that no time-reversal even observable can be constructed with 2 independent momenta and one spin vector. In Ref. [4] soft initial state interactions between the colliding protons were invoked to avoid the problem, assuming that such interactions do not violate the factorization scheme. This is what happens in the fragmentation of a transversely polarized quark, which might give origin to single spin asymmetries – the so called Collins or sheared jet effect [5,6] – due to final state interactions of the fragmenting quark.

We show here that time-reversal invariance does not necessarily imply for the off-diagonal matrix elements (8) to be zero, even when neglecting initial state interactions, provided some spin-isospin interactions are present in the quark Lagrangian, as it happens in chiral models.

In the proof of the vanishing of I_{+-} via time reversal, it is crucial that the quark fields ψ are expanded on a basis of eigenstates of the Hamiltonian. On the other hand, when a spin-isospin interaction is present, the eigenstates of the Dirac Hamiltonian correspond to combinations of spin and flavour. If the quark field acts on a fixed flavour component, it cannot create or destroy eigenstates of the chiral Hamiltonian. Therefore the intermediate states $|X\rangle$ obtained *e.g.* destroying a quark of specific flavour in the spin up proton at time t = 0 are not eigenstates of the chiral Hamiltonian and will evolve in a complicated way in the pionic field, oscillating in spin and flavour up to the time $t = y_0$.

If the I_{+-}^a function, corresponding to a specific flavour a, is indeed different from zero, it also follows that $I_{+-}^u = -I_{+-}^d$, because the usual demonstration can be applied to the flavour averaged quantity, where one can expand the fields ψ in eigenstates of the Dirac Hamiltonian. Actually this result holds only in first approximation and a more precise analysis shows that $|I_{+-}^u|$ is not exactly equal to $|I_{+-}^d|$. This point will be clarified later.

The previous discussion is rather general, and does not refer to any specific chiral model. It can be applied both to sigma-model or to Nambu–Jona–Lasinio model. We show now more explicitly how the previous idea is realized in the sigma-model, whose Lagrangian reads:

$$\mathcal{L} = i \, \bar{\psi} \gamma^{\mu} \partial_{\mu} \psi - g \bar{\psi} \left(\sigma + i \gamma_5 \vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{\pi} \right) \psi + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_{\mu} \sigma)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_{\mu} \vec{\pi})^2 - U \left(\sigma, \vec{\pi} \right) , \qquad (9)$$

where $U(\sigma, \vec{\pi})$ is the usual mexican-hat potential. In this model the nucleon consists of three valence quarks, moving in a background of chiral fields. The pion and the sigma fields are assumed to be time-independent.

We want to show that: 1) at the single-quark level time reversal mixes states of different flavour, but 2) the physical nucleon state obtained from this model satisfies the usual time reversal relation.

To study time-reversal for the single-quark state we write the Dirac equation. It reads:

$$[k_{\mu}\gamma^{\mu} - g(\sigma + i\gamma_5 \vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{\pi})]u(k) = 0.$$

We seek now the time reversed solution of the same equation, corresponding to the substitution $\mathbf{k} \to -\mathbf{k}$. Using the standard procedure one obtains the equation:

$$[k_{\mu}\gamma^{\mu} - g(\sigma - i\gamma_5 \vec{\tau}^T \cdot \vec{\pi})]\gamma_5 C u^*(\tilde{k}) = 0,$$

where $\tilde{k} = (k_0, -\mathbf{k})$ and $C = i\gamma_0\gamma_2$. As it can be seen, if the pion field is absent the time-reversed solution is given by $\gamma_5 Cu^*(\tilde{k})$. On the other hand, the term containing the pion has been modified by the previous transformation. To compensate, one needs to introduce an isospin rotation. Since $(-i\tau_2)(-\vec{\tau}^T)(i\tau_2) = \vec{\tau}$, the time reversed solution reads $(-i\tau_2)\gamma_5 Cu^*(\tilde{k})$ and therefore under time-reversal the isospin of the single quark is reversed. Actually, quark states of fixed isospin are not eigenstates of the chiral hamiltonian. A good example is provided by the hedgehog which is used in most practical calculations in chiral models. In the mean field approximation, taking the hedgehog form for the mean pion field, $\vec{\pi} = \hat{r}\phi(r)$, the spin-isospin wave function of a positive energy S-eigenstate of the chiral hamiltonian is given by $|h\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|u+\rangle - |d-\rangle]$.

We study now the problem of time reversal for the physical nucleon. The mean field solution for the three-quark 1S-state does not correspond to a specific spin and flavour state, but it is a superposition of nucleon and delta. An eigenstate of spin and flavour can be obtained using the so-called projection technique, developed by many authors [7]. They introduce the projector:

$$P^{J}_{MM_{T}} \equiv (-1)^{J+M_{T}} \frac{2J+1}{8\pi^{2}} \int d^{3}\Omega \, \mathcal{D}^{J*}_{M,-M_{T}}(\Omega) R(\Omega), \tag{10}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_{M,K}^{J}(\Omega)$ are the Wigner functions and $R(\Omega)$ is the rotation operator. Due to the symmetry of the hedgehog (grand-spin zero state), this rotation can be performed either on spin or on isospin. In the following we shall assume a rotation in spin space.

A baryon state reads:

$$|J = T, J_3 = M, T_3 = M_T \rangle = P^J_{MM_T} |\psi_h\rangle, \tag{11}$$

where $|\psi_h\rangle$ is the mean field solution, made of three hedgehog quarks surrounded by a coherent state of pions in hedgehog configuration. Both the quarks and the pions contribute to the spin and flavour of the proton, because the pions carry orbital angular momentum L = 1. This projection technique has been used in many calculations, including the evaluation of structure functions [8].

It is straightforward to check that the above defined nucleon state satisfies the usual relation under time reversal. In particular we want to check that the operator representing time reversal is given by

$$\mathcal{T} = KR_T(\sigma)\,,$$

where K is the complex conjugate operator and $R_T(\sigma) = -i\sigma_2$. The projector operator under time reversal transforms as:

$$\mathcal{T}P^{J}_{MM_{T}}\mathcal{T}^{\dagger} = (-1)^{M-M_{T}}P^{J}_{-M,-M_{T}}$$

= $(-1)^{J-M}P^{J}_{-M,M_{T}}R_{T}(\tau)$, (12)

where $R_T(\tau) = -i\tau_2$. Since the hedgehog state is invariant under the combined action of $R_T(\sigma)R_T(\tau)$, it follows that

$$\mathcal{T}P^J_{MM_T}|\psi_h\rangle = (-1)^{J-M}P^J_{-MM_T}|\psi_h\rangle,$$

which is the usual time-reversal transformation.

Let us now suggest how the I_{+-} function can be computed. One can proceed as in the computation of the usual distribution functions, inserting a complete set of states between $\bar{\psi}$ and ψ and considering only the contributions coming from diquark states, which should dominate at large x. The I_{+-}^u function is dominated by the scalar diquark, while I_{+-}^d gets contributions from the vector diquark only. Since the scalar diquark is lighter than the vector one, I_{+-}^u extends to larger x than I_{+-}^d , in agreement with the results of the phenomenological analysis of Ref. [4]. It is therefore clear that $|I_{+-}^u|$ and $|I_{+-}^d|$ are not exactly equal. There is no contradiction with the previous considerations, where it has been shown that in first approximation $I_{+-}^u = -I_{+-}^d$, because that result holds at mean field level, where there is no difference between the mass of the scalar and of the vector diquark.

To conclude, we have shown that quark states of specific spin and flavour are not eigenstates of the Hamiltonian. It is indeed possible to build states of definite spin and flavour in chiral Lagrangians, but they correspond to a mixing of quarks and pions. As a consequence time reversal invariance does not forbid off-diagonal matrix element of the density operator, Eq. (8), to be different from zero, and this can lead to single spin asymmetries in $p^{\uparrow}p \rightarrow \pi^+ X$ and $p^{\uparrow}p \rightarrow \pi^- X$ processes, as suggested in Refs. [3] and [4] and in agreement with observation. Such asymmetries would then reveal, in this interpretation, the presence of an interaction which mixes states with different flavours. There might be another origin of single spin asymmetries in inclusive production of hadrons, related to spin and \mathbf{k}_{\perp} effects in the fragmentation of a polarized quark, as suggested in Refs. [5,6]; it might then be difficult to single out the specific mechanism discussed here if one considers only $p^{\uparrow}p \to \pi X$ processes or similar ones in which one merely observes a final large p_T hadron. However, the possible origin from the quark fragmentation can be excluded by looking at single spin asymmetries in $p^{\uparrow}p \to \gamma X$ (no fragmentation) or even in $p^{\uparrow}p \to \pi X$ or $\ell p^{\uparrow} \to \pi X$, by selecting a final π , or any other hadron, collinear with the jet $(\mathbf{k}_{\perp} = 0)$.

An analysis of single spin asymmetries in DIS has recently been performed [9], without taking into account the spin-isospin interactions considered here: these allow the unique possibility of observing single spin asymmetries in fully inclusive DIS processes, $\ell p^{\uparrow} \rightarrow \ell X$, with unpolarized or longitudinally polarized leptons scattering off protons (or neutrons) polarized perpendicularly to the scattering plane:

$$\frac{d\sigma^{\ell p^{\uparrow} \to \ell X}}{dx \, dQ^2} - \frac{d\sigma^{\ell p^{\downarrow} \to \ell X}}{dx \, dQ^2} = \sum_{q} \int d\boldsymbol{k}_{\perp} \, \Delta^N f_{q/p^{\uparrow}}(x, \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp}) \, \frac{d\hat{\sigma}^{\ell q \to \ell q}}{dQ^2}(x, \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp}) \,. \tag{13}$$

Our mechanism – related to the non vanishing of the off-diagonal matrix elements of the quark density operator – would be the only way of obtaining a non zero value for the single spin asymmetries (13). Such data might already be available from polarized DIS experiments and only need a dedicated analysis.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank P. Alberto, V. Barone, L. Caneschi and M. Fiolhais for many useful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] T.P. Cheng and Ling-Fong Li, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74 (1995) 2872
- [2] D.L. Adams et al., Phys. Lett. **B264** (1991) 462
- [3] D. Sivers, *Phys. Rev.* **D41** (1990) 83; D. Sivers, *Phys. Rev.* **D41** (1991) 261
- [4] M. Anselmino, M. Boglione and F. Murgia, *Phys. Lett.* B362 (1995) 164
- [5] J. Collins, Nucl. Phys. **B396** (1993) 161
- [6] X. Artru and J.C. Collins, Z. Phys. C69 (1996) 277
- [7] B. Golli and M. Rosina, *Phys. Lett.* B165 (1985) 347; M.C. Birse, *Phys. Rev.* D31 (1986) 118; T. Neuber, M. Fiolhais, K. Goeke and J.N. Urbano, *Nucl. Phys.* A650 (1993) 909
- [8] V. Barone, A. Drago and M. Fiolhais, Phys. Lett. B338 (1994) 433
- M. Anselmino, E. Leader and F. Murgia, preprint DFTT 51/96 and INFNCA-TH9617, e-Print Archive: hep-ph/9610407