

# New Physics with Tagged Forward Protons at the LHC<sup>1</sup>

V.A. KHOZE<sup>a,b</sup>, A.D. MARTIN<sup>a</sup> AND M.G. RYSKIN<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Physics and Institute for Particle Physics Phenomenology,  
University of Durham, DH1 3LE, UK

<sup>b</sup> Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina, St. Petersburg, 188300, Russia

## Abstract

The addition of forward proton detectors to LHC experiments will significantly enlarge the potential for studying New Physics. A topical example is Higgs production by the central exclusive diffractive process,  $pp \rightarrow p + H + p$ . We discuss the exclusive production of Higgs bosons in both the SM and MSSM. Special attention is paid to the backgrounds to the  $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  signal.

---

<sup>1</sup> Presented by V.A. Khoze at the 21st Workshop Les Rencontres de Physique de la Vallée d'Aoste, La Thuile, Aosta Valley, 4-10 March, 2007.

# 1 Introduction

The use of diffractive processes to study the Standard Model (SM) and New Physics at the LHC has only been fully appreciated within the last few years; see, for example [1, 2, 3, 4], or the recent reviews [5, 6, 7], and references therein. By detecting protons that have lost only about 1-3% of their longitudinal momentum [8, 9], a rich QCD, electroweak, Higgs and BSM programme becomes accessible experimentally, with the potential to study phenomena which are unique to the LHC, and difficult even at a future linear collider. Particularly interesting are the so-called central exclusive production (CEP) processes which provide an extremely favourable environment to search for, and identify the nature of, new particles at the LHC. The first that comes to mind are the Higgs bosons, but there is also a potentially rich, more exotic, physics menu including (light) gluino and squark production, searches for extra dimensions, gluinonia, radions, and indeed any new object which has  $0^{++}$  (or  $2^{++}$ ) quantum numbers and couples strongly to gluons, see for instance [2, 10, 11]. By “central exclusive” we mean a process of the type  $pp \rightarrow p + X + p$ , where the  $+$  signs denote the absence of hadronic activity (that is, the presence of rapidity gaps) between the outgoing protons and the decay products of the centrally produced system  $X$ . The basic mechanism driving the process is shown in Fig. 1.

There are several reasons why CEP is especially attractive for searches for new heavy objects. *First*, if the outgoing protons remain intact and scatter through small angles then, to a very good approximation, the primary active di-gluon system obeys a  $J_z = 0$ , C-even, P-even, selection rule [12]. Here  $J_z$  is the projection of the total angular momentum along the proton beam axis. This selection rule readily permits a clean determination of the quantum numbers of the observed new (for example, Higgs-like) resonance, when the dominant production is a scalar state. *Secondly*, because the process is exclusive, the energy loss of the outgoing protons is directly related to the mass of the central system, allowing a potentially excellent mass resolution, irrespective of the decay mode of the centrally produced system. *Thirdly*, in many topical cases, in particular, for Higgs boson production, a signal-to-background ratio of order 1 (or even better) is achievable [3, 11], [13]-[18]. In particular, due to  $J_z = 0$  selection, leading-order QCD  $b\bar{b}$  production is suppressed by a factor  $(m_b/E_T)^2$ , where  $E_T$  is the transverse energy of the  $b, \bar{b}$  jets. Therefore, for a low mass Higgs,  $M_H \lesssim 150$  GeV, there is a possibility to observe




Figure 1: The basic mechanism for the exclusive process  $pp \rightarrow p + X + p$ . The system  $X$  is produced by the fusion of two active gluons, with a screening gluon exchanged to neutralize the colour.

the main  $b\bar{b}$  decay mode [2, 3, 6], and to directly measure the  $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  Yukawa coupling constant. The signal-to-background ratio may become significantly larger for a Higgs boson in certain regions of the MSSM parameter space [13, 19].

It is worth mentioning that, by tagging both of the outgoing protons, the LHC is effectively turned into a gluon-gluon collider. This will open up a rich, ‘high-rate’ QCD physics menu (especially concerning diffractive phenomena), which will allow the study of the skewed, unintegrated gluon densities, as well as the details of rapidity gap survival; see, for example, [2, 7, 20]. Note that CEP provides a source of practically pure gluon jets; that is we effectively have a ‘gluon factory’ [12]. This provides an ideal laboratory in which to study the detailed properties of gluon jets, especially in comparison with quark jets. The forward-proton-tagging approach also offers a unique programme of high-energy photon-interaction physics at the LHC; see, for example, [21, 22].

## 2 Central Exclusive Higgs production

The ‘benchmark’ CEP new physics process is Higgs production. Studies of the Higgs sector are at the heart of the recent proposal [9] to complement the LHC central detectors with proton taggers placed at 420 m either side of the interaction point.

Our current understanding is, that if a SM-like Higgs boson exists in Nature, it will be detected at the LHC. However, various extended models predict a large diversity of Higgs-like bosons with different masses, couplings and CP-parities. The best studied extension of the SM up to now is the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) [23], in which there are three neutral Higgs bosons, the scalars  $h$  and  $H$ , and the pseudoscalar  $A$ .

The forward proton tagging mode is especially advantageous for the study of the MSSM sector [13, 19]. Note that when using the “standard” non-diffractive production mechanisms, there is usually an important region of MSSM parameter region, where the LHC can detect only the Higgs boson with SM-like properties. To check that a discovered state is indeed a scalar Higgs boson, and to distinguish between the Higgs boson(s) of the SM or the MSSM and those from of extended Higgs theories will be highly non-trivial task. Without forward proton tagging, it would require interplay with observations at the Next Linear Collider. Moreover, within the MSSM, the weak-boson-fusion channel becomes of no practical use for the production of the heavier scalar  $H$  or the pseudoscalar  $A$  boson. On the other hand, in the forward proton mode the pseudoscalar  $A$  is practically filtered out, and the detection of the  $H$  boson should be achievable [13, 19]. In addition, in some MSSM scenarios, CEP provides an excellent opportunity for probing the CP-structure of the Higgs sector, either by measuring directly the azimuthal asymmetry of the outgoing tagged protons [24] or by studying the correlations between the decay products [25].

In Fig. 2 we show, for reference purposes, the total CEP cross section for the SM Higgs boson times branching ratio for the  $WW$  and  $b\bar{b}$  channels, as a function of the Higgs mass. We




Figure 2: The cross section times branching ratio for CEP of the SM Higgs [14].

see that the expected total cross section for the CEP of a SM Higgs, with mass 120 GeV, is 3 fb, falling to just less than 1 fb for a mass of 200 GeV; see [1].

With a good understanding of the detectors and favourable experimental conditions, the rate for the SM Higgs of mass 120 GeV for the integrated LHC luminosity of  $\mathcal{L} = 60 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  would be quite sizeable (around 100 events). However, with the presently envisaged LHC detectors, there are various experimental problems. First of all, trigger signals from protons detected at 420 m cannot reach the central detector in time to be used in the Level 1 trigger. For this, we have to rely on the central detector. Other factors may also strongly reduce the current expectations for the detected signal rate, in particular, the  $b$ -tagging efficiency, the jet energy resolution etc. At high luminosities there is also a potentially dangerous problem of backgrounds due to the overlapping events in the same bunch crossing (the so-called “pile-up” events). In summary, with the current hardware, the expectation is that there will be not more than a dozen SM Higgs signal events for an integrated LHC luminosity of  $\mathcal{L} = 60 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ . Whether experimental ingenuity will increase this number remains to be seen. Indeed, it is quite possible that “clever” hardware and the use of optimized cuts will increase the rate. For example, the number of  $h \rightarrow WW^*$  events would double if the trigger thresholds on single leptons could be reduced [14]. Further improvement of the  $b$ -tagging efficiency and of the jet energy resolution would be particularly welcome. Note that the forward-proton mode offers the possibility to study the combined event rate using the so-called ‘trigger cocktail’.




Figure 3: Contours for the ratio  $R$  of the  $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  signal events in the MSSM over those in the SM in CEP process in the  $M_A$ - $\tan\beta$  plane. The ratio is shown for the  $M_h^{\max}$  benchmark scenario (with  $\mu = +200$  GeV). The values of the mass of the lighter CP-even Higgs boson,  $M_h$ , are indicated by dashed contour lines. The dark shaded region is excluded by the LEP Higgs searches.

As we already mentioned, in the MSSM, the CEP cross sections can be an order-of-magnitude or more higher [19]. This is illustrated in Fig. 3, which shows the contours for the ratio  $R$  of signal events in the MSSM over those in the SM in the CEP of  $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  in the  $M_A$ - $\tan\beta$  plane, see [19].

As discussed above, the exclusive Higgs signal is particularly clean, and the signal-to-background ratio is quite favourable, at least, at an instantaneous luminosity  $L \sim 2 \times 10^{33} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , when the effect of pile-up can be kept under control, see [26, 19]. However, without improving the LHC hardware, the expected event rate in the SM case is quite limited, and so it is important to test various ingredients of the adopted theoretical scheme [1, 12, 2] by studying the related processes at the existing experimental facilities, HERA and the Tevatron. Various such tests have been performed so far, see for example, [6, 27, 28] and references therein. Quite recently the predictions for the non-perturbative so-called survival factor have been confronted with HERA data on the leading neutron spectra [29].

The straightforward checks come from the study of processes which are mediated by the same mechanism as CEP of the Higgs boson, but with rates which are sufficiently high, so that they may be observed at the Tevatron (as well as at the LHC). The most obvious examples are those in which the Higgs is replaced by either a dijet system, or a  $\chi_c$  meson, or a  $\gamma\gamma$  pair. The reported preliminary CDF data on these CEP processes (see for example, [30, 31, 32]) show a reasonable agreement with the theoretical expectations by Durham group, see also [33].

Especially impressive are the recent CDF data [31, 32] on exclusive production of a pair of high  $E_T$  jets,  $p\bar{p} \rightarrow p + jj + \bar{p}$ . As discussed in [1, 2] such measurements could provide an effective  $gg^{PP}$  ‘luminosity monitor’ just in the kinematical region appropriate for Higgs production. The corresponding cross section was evaluated to be about  $10^4$  times larger than that for the production of a SM Higgs boson. Since the dijet CEP cross section is rather large, this process appears to be an ideal ‘standard candle’. A comparison of the data with analytical predictions [1, 2] is given in Fig. 4. It shows the  $E_T^{\min}$  dependence for the dijet events with  $R_{jj} \equiv M_{\text{dijet}}/M_{\text{PP}} > 0.8$ , where  $M_{\text{PP}}$  is the invariant energy of the incoming Pomeron-Pomeron system. The agreement with the theoretical expectations [1, 2] lends credence to the predictions for the CED Higgs production [31].




Figure 4: The cross section for ‘exclusive’ dijet production at the Tevatron as a function  $E_T^{\min}$  as measured by CDF [31]. These preliminary CDF data correspond to the cross section integrated over the domain  $R_{jj} \equiv M_{\text{dijet}}/M_{\text{PP}} > 0.8$  and  $E_T > E_T^{\min}$ . A jet cone of  $R < 0.7$  is used. The curves are the pure exclusive cross section calculated [2] using the CDF event selection. The solid curve is obtained by rescaling the parton (gluon) transverse momentum  $p_T$  to the measured jet transverse energy  $E_T$  by  $E_T = 0.8p_T$ . The dashed curve assumes  $E_T = 0.75p_T$ . The rescaling procedure effectively accounts for the hadronization and radiative effects, and for jet energy losses outside the selected jet cone. This prescription for parton jet energy loss is in agreement with the out-of-cone energy measurements in CDF [34].

### 3 The backgrounds to the $p + (h, H \rightarrow b\bar{b}) + p$ signal

The importance of the  $p + (h, H \rightarrow b\bar{b}) + p$  process, in particular as a SUSY Higgs search mode, means that the physical backgrounds to this reaction must be thoroughly addressed. Recall that the unique advantage of the  $b\bar{b}$  CEP process is the  $J_z = 0$  selection rule, which requires the LO  $gg^{PP} \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  background to vanish in the limit of massless quarks and forward going protons<sup>2</sup>. However, there are still four main sources of background [3, 6, 16]. These are the contributions from the following subprocesses.

- (i) The prolific (LO)  $gg^{PP} \rightarrow gg$  subprocess can mimic  $b\bar{b}$  production since we may misidentify the gluons as  $b$  and  $\bar{b}$  jets.
- (ii) An admixture of  $|J_z| = 2$  production, arising from non-forward going protons, which contributes to the (QHC<sup>3</sup>) LO  $gg^{PP} \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  background.
- (iii) Because of non-zero mass of the quark there is a contribution to the  $J_z = 0$  (QHNC) cross section of order  $m_b^2/E_T^2$ . This term currently raises the main concern. The problem is that the result is strongly affected by the (uncomfortably large) higher-order QCD effects see [36, 16]. In particular, the one-loop double logarithmic contribution exceeds the Born term, and the final result becomes strongly dependent on the NNLO effects, as well as on the scale  $\mu$  of the QCD coupling  $\alpha_S$  and on the running  $b$  quark mass. There is no complete calculation of these higher-order effects for the  $gg^{PP} \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  process, but only estimates based on a seemingly plausible hypotheses regarding the NNLO effects [16]. The validity of these estimates has an accuracy not better than a factor of 2-4. This contribution is the main source of the theoretical uncertainty in the current predictions for the non-pile-up background. The good news is that this contribution decreases with increasing  $E_T$  much faster than the other background terms [13, 24].
- (iv) Finally, there is a possibility of NLO  $gg^{PP} \rightarrow b\bar{b}g$  background contributions, which for large angle, hard gluon radiation do not obey the selection rules, see [3, 16]. Of course, in principle, the extra gluon may be observed experimentally and the contribution of such background events reduced. However, there are important exceptions [3, 16]. First, the extra gluon may go unobserved in the direction of a forward proton. This background is reduced by requiring the approximate equality  $M_{\text{missing}} = M_{b\bar{b}}$ . Calculations [17] show that this background does not exceed 5% of the SM Higgs signal, and so it may be safely neglected. The remaining danger is large-angle hard gluon emission which is collinear with either the  $b$  or  $\bar{b}$  jet, and, therefore, unobservable. This background source results in a sizeable contribution which should be included, see [19].

---

<sup>2</sup>This is an example of the so called Maximally Helicity Violating (MHV) rule, see for review [35].

<sup>3</sup>It is convenient to consider separately the quark helicity-conserving (QHC) and the quark helicity-non-conserving (QHNC) amplitudes [16]. These amplitudes do not interfere, and their contributions can be treated independently.

There are also other (potentially worrying) background sources, which after a thorough investigation [16, 17], have been omitted in the final expression for the  $b\bar{b}g$  background in [19]. This is either because their contributions are numerically small from the very beginning, or because they can be reduced to an acceptable level by straightforward experimental cuts. Among these, there is the NNLO QHC (“cut non-reconstructible”) contribution to the exclusive process, which comes from the one-loop box diagrams. This contribution is not mass-suppressed and is potentially important, especially for large  $M_H$ . However, for masses below 300 GeV, this contribution is comparatively small.

Next, a potential background source can arise from the collision of two soft Pomerons. This can result in the two main categories of events:

- (a) central Higgs boson production accompanied by two (or more) additional gluon jets,
- (b) production of a high  $E_T$   $b\bar{b}$ -pair accompanied by the gluon jets.

In these cases the Higgs boson or the  $b\bar{b}$  pair are produced in the collision of two gluons (from the Pomeron wave functions) via the hard subprocesses ( $gg \rightarrow H$  or  $gg \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ ) similar to the usual inelastic event. In both processes the mass,  $M_{bb}$ , of the central  $b\bar{b}$  system (resulting either from the Higgs decay or from the QCD background) is not equal to the ‘Pomeron-Pomeron’ mass  $M_{PP} = M_{\text{missing}}$ , measured by the proton detectors. The suppression of such backgrounds is controlled by the requirement that  $|M_{\text{missing}} - M_{bb}|$  should lie within the  $\Delta M_{bb}$  mass interval. These backgrounds were carefully evaluated in [17], and it was found that they are quite small. Indeed, if we use the MRW2006 DPDFs [37], and take  $\Delta M_{bb} \simeq 24$  GeV, then the  $g\bar{b}bg$  and  $gHg$  contributions are each less than about 6% of the SM Higgs signal.

Finally, a potential background could result from the emissions of additional gluons. A particular case, caused by the QCD  $b\bar{b} + \text{gluons}$  process, was already addressed in the item (iv) above. There may also be a contribution coming from the  $H + ng$  production process. This contribution is suppressed by the requirement that the  $t$ -channel two-gluon exchange across the gap region should be colourless. Thus, there is no single gluon radiation, and the non-zero contribution starts from  $n = 2$ . Next, we have to impose the mass matching condition discussed in the item (iv) above. Numerically, this background appears to be small (about 15% of the SM Higgs signal [17]) and, again, it can be neglected. It should be noted that the effect of gluon emission off the screening gluon (see Fig. 1) is also numerically small.

In summary, the main background contributions come from exclusive dijet production as listed in the items (i)-(iv) above. Within the accuracy of the existing calculations [12, 3, 16], the overall background to the  $0^+$  Higgs signal in the  $b\bar{b}$  mode can be approximated by the following formula, see [19]

$$\frac{d\sigma^B}{dM} \approx 0.5 \text{ fb/GeV} \left[ 0.92 \left( \frac{120}{M} \right)^6 + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{120}{M} \right)^8 \right], \quad (1)$$



where the first term in the square brackets corresponds to the processes listed in items (i), (ii) and (iv), while the last term comes from the mass-suppressed term described in item (iii). We emphasize that this approximate expression may be used only for the purposes of making quick estimates of the background, since no detector simulation has been performed. We expect that such a simulation, together with the optimization procedure, will further reduce the effect of background.

## 4 Detecting the exclusive Higgs $\rightarrow WW$ signal

Although the  $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  signal has special advantages, we have discussed problems which arise, in the SM case, to render it challenging from an experimental perspective. In [14, 15], attention was turned to the  $WW$  decay mode. Triggering on this channel is not a problem, since the final state is rich in high- $p_T$  leptons. Efficiencies of about 20% can be achieved if the standard leptonic and di-leptonic trigger thresholds are applied. The advantages of forward proton tagging are, however, still explicit. Even for the gold-plated double leptonic decay channel, the mass resolution will be very good, and, of course, the observation of the Higgs with the tagged protons immediately establishes its quantum numbers.

It was demonstrated in [14, 15] that there would be a detectable signal with a small and controllable background for the CEP production of a SM-like Higgs boson in the mass interval between 140 GeV and 200 GeV. Unfortunately, with the standard lepton triggers and experimental acceptances and selections [14], currently we can expect only a handful of  $WW^*$  events from a 120 GeV SM Higgs for  $\mathcal{L} = 60 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ . The rate of detected events could rise after further modifications of hardware. For example, the reduction of the Level 1 leptonic trigger thresholds would allow the statistics to double. As shown in [19], the situation would improve in favourable regions of the MSSM parameter space, but here, unlike the  $b\bar{b}$  mode, the expected rise, as compared to SM, is not dramatic, no more than a factor of 4-5. In order to fully exploit all the advantages of the  $WW$  channel more dedicated experimental studies are needed.

## 5 Conclusion

The installation of proton-tagging detectors in the distant forward regions around the ATLAS and/or CMS central detectors would add unique capabilities to the existing LHC experimental programme. The calculation of the rates of CEP processes show that there is a real chance that new heavy particle production could be observed in this mode. For a Higgs boson this would amount to a direct determination of its quantum numbers. For certain MSSM scenarios, the tagged-proton channel may even be the Higgs discovery channel. Moreover, with sufficient luminosity, proton tagging may provide direct evidence of CP-violation within the Higgs sector. There is also a rich QCD, electroweak, and more exotic physics, menu. This includes searches

for extra dimensions, light gluino and squark production, gluinonia, radions, and, indeed, any object which has  $0^{++}$  or  $2^{++}$  quantum numbers and which couples strongly to gluons [2].

Here we focused on the unique advantages of CEP Higgs production. The events are clean, but the predicted yield for the SM Higgs for an integrated luminosity of  $\mathcal{L} = 60 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  is comparatively low, after experimental cuts and acceptances. Further efforts to optimize the event selection and cut procedure are very desirable. The signal-to-background ratio in the  $b\bar{b}$  mode is about 1, depending crucially on the accuracy with which  $M_{\text{missing}}$  can be measured. In the MSSM there are certain regions of parameter space which can be especially ‘proton tagging friendly’ [13, 19]. Here the signal-to-background ratios in the  $b\bar{b}$  channel can exceed the SM by up to two orders of magnitude. Moreover, the observation of the decay of Higgs to  $b\bar{b}$  would allow a direct determination of the  $b$  Yukawa coupling.

From the experimental perspective, the simplest exclusive channel in which to observe a SM Higgs boson with mass between 140 GeV and 200 GeV is the  $WW$  decay mode. According to studies in [14], there will be a detectable signal at  $\mathcal{L} = 60 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ , and the non-pile-up backgrounds are small and controllable. However, contrary to the  $b\bar{b}$  case, no dramatic rise in the rate is expected within the MSSM.

Potentially, the pile-up events could endanger the prospects of CEP studies at high luminosities. Currently the situation is far from being hopeless, but further detailed studies are needed. The pile-up is currently under very intensive scrutiny by both, ATLAS and CMS; for a detailed discussion, see [26], (see also [18, 19]).

## 6 Acknowledgements

We thank Brian Cox, Albert De Roeck, Sven Heinemeyer, Risto Orava, James Stirling, Andy Pilkington, Marek Tasevsky, Koji Terashi and Georg Weiglein for useful discussions. VAK is very grateful to Giorgio Bellettini, Giorgio Chiarelli and Mario Greco for the kind invitation and warm hospitality at La Thuile. This work was supported by INTAS grant 05-103-7515, by grant RFBR 07-02-00023, by Federal Program of Russian Ministry of Industry, Science and Technology RSGSS-5788.2006.02.

## References

- [1] V.A. Khoze, A.D. Martin and M.G. Ryskin, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C14** (2000) 525, hep-ph/0002072.
- [2] V.A. Khoze, A.D. Martin and M.G. Ryskin, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C23** (2002) 311, hep-ph/0111078.

- [3] A. De Roeck, V.A. Khoze, A.D. Martin, R. Orava and M. Ryskin, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C25** (2002) 391, hep-ph/0207042.
- [4] B. Cox, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **753** (2005) 103, hep-ph/0409144.
- [5] for a recent review see: J. Forshaw, hep-ph/0508274, contributed to the workshop *HERA and the LHC: A Workshop on the Implications of HERA for LHC Physics*, hep-ph/0601012.
- [6] V.A. Khoze *et al.*, hep-ph/0507040, Gribov-75 Memorial Volume, *Quarks, Hadrons and Strong Interactions* (World Scientific, 2006) pp 129-144.
- [7] M.G. Ryskin, A.D. Martin and V.A. Khoze, hep-ph/0506272, Gribov-75 Memorial Volume, *Quarks, Hadrons and Strong Interactions* (World Scientific, 2006) pp 115-124.
- [8] M. Albrow and A. Rostovtsev, hep-ph/0009336.
- [9] FP420 R & D proposal, M.G. Albrow *et al.*, CERN-LHCC-2005-025.
- [10] A. Kisselev, V. Petrov and R. Ryutin, *Phys. Lett.* **B630** (2005) 100, hep-ph/0506034 and references therein.
- [11] P. J. Bussey, T. D. Coughlin, J. R. Forshaw and A. D. Pilkington, *JHEP* **0611**, 027 (2006), hep-ph/0607264.
- [12] V.A. Khoze, A.D. Martin and M. Ryskin, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C19** (2001) 477 [Erratum-ibid. **C20** (2001) 599], hep-ph/0011393.
- [13] A.B. Kaidalov, V.A. Khoze, A.D. Martin and M.G. Ryskin, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C33** (2004) 261, hep-ph/0311023.
- [14] B. Cox *et al.*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C45** (2006) 401, hep-ph/0505240.
- [15] V.A. Khoze, M. Ryskin and W.J. Stirling, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C44** (2005) 227, hep-ph/0504131.
- [16] V.A. Khoze, M. Ryskin and W.J. Stirling, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C48** (2006) 797, hep-ph/0607134.
- [17] V.A. Khoze, A.D. Martin and M. Ryskin, hep-ph/0702213.
- [18] B. Cox, F. Loebinger and A. Pilkington, to be published.
- [19] S. Heinemeyer, V.A. Khoze, M.G. Ryskin, W.J. Stirling, M. Tasevsky and G. Weiglein, to be published.
- [20] for a recent review see: E. Gotsman, E. Levin, U. Maor, E. Naftali and A. Prygarin, hep-ph/0511060; published in the proceedings of the workshop *HERA and the LHC: A Workshop on the Implications of HERA for LHC Physics*, hep-ph/0601012, p.221.

- [21] K. Piotrkowski, *Phys. Rev.* **D63** (2001) 071502, hep-ex/0009065.
- [22] V.A. Khoze, A.D. Martin and M.G. Ryskin, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C24** (2002) 459, hep-ph/0201301.
- [23] for reviews see, for example, M. Carena and H. Haber, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **50** (2003) 63, hep-ph/0208209;  
S. Heinemeyer, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A21** (2006) 2659, hep-ph/0407244.
- [24] V.A. Khoze, A.D. Martin and M. Ryskin, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C34** (2004) 327, hep-ph/0401078.
- [25] J. Ellis, J. Lee and A. Pilaftsis, *Phys. Rev.* **D71** (2005) 075007, hep-ph/0502251.
- [26] CMS and TOTEM diffractive and forward physics working group, CERN/LHCC 2006-039/G-124, CMS Note 2007/002, TOTEM Note 06-5, December 2006.
- [27] A. B. Kaidalov, V. A. Khoze, A. D. Martin and M. G. Ryskin, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C21** (2001) 521; *Phys. Lett. B* **559** (2003) 235.
- [28] A. D. Martin, V. A. Khoze and M. G. Ryskin, hep-ph/0605189.
- [29] A. B. Kaidalov, V. A. Khoze, A. D. Martin and M. G. Ryskin, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C47**, (2006) 385;  
V. A. Khoze, A. D. Martin and M. G. Ryskin, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C48**, (2006) 797.
- [30] M. Gallinaro (for the CDF Collaboration), hep-ph/0311192; hep-ph/0505159.
- [31] K. Goulianos, FERMILAB-CONF-06-429-E, Nov 2006; these proceedings.
- [32] K. Terashi [CDF and D0 Collaboration], hep-ex/0605084.
- [33] O. Kepka and C. Royon, arXiv:0704.1956 [hep-ph] and references therein.
- [34] K. Terashi, private communication.
- [35] M. L. Mangano and S. J. Parke, *Phys. Rept.* **200** (1991) 301.
- [36] V. Fadin, V.A. Khoze and A.D. Martin, *Phys. Rev.* **D56** (1997) 484, hep-ph/9703402.
- [37] A.D. Martin, M.G. Ryskin and G. Watt, *Phys. Lett.* **B644** (2007) 131.