

Perturbative QCD in the Regge limit: Prospects at ILC

S. Wallon^{1†}

¹ LPT, Université Paris-Sud, CNRS, Orsay, France

Abstract

After recalling the theoretical and experimental status of QCD in the Regge limit and the requirement of high energy scattering process of onium-onium type for testing this limit, we show that the International Linear Collider would be a major step in this field.

1 QCD in the Regge limit: theoretical status

1.1 LL BFKL Pomeron

At high energy ($s \gg -t$), consider the elastic scattering amplitude of two *IR safe (hard) probes* (Fig.1). Small values of α_S ($M_1^2 \gg \Lambda_{QCD}^2$) are compensated by large $\ln s$, calling for a resummation of $\sum_n (\alpha_S \ln s)^n$ series, resulting in the effective BFKL ladder [1], the Leading Log hard Pomeron (Fig.2). Optical theorem gives $\sigma_{tot} \sim s^{\alpha_P(0)-1}$ with $\alpha_P(0)-1 = C \alpha_S$. Since $C > 0$, Froissart bound is violated at perturbative order. The large N_c color dipole model [2, 3], based on perturbation theory on the light-cone, is equivalent to BFKL approach at the level of diagrams and amplitude [4].




Figure 1: Scattering at $s \gg -t$.




Figure 2: BFKL resummation.

1.2 k_T factorization ($\gamma^* \gamma^* \rightarrow \gamma^* \gamma^*$ case)

Using the Sudakov decomposition $k = \alpha p_1 + \beta p_2 + k_\perp$, the $d^4k = \frac{s}{2} d\alpha_k d\beta_k d^2k_\perp$ integration of Fig.3 reduces at large s in a 2-d integration, when setting $\alpha_k \simeq 0$ ($\beta_k \simeq 0$) in the upper (resp. lower) blob and integrating over β_k (resp. α_k). The tensor connecting upper and lower blob simplifies since only *non-sense* gluon polarizations propagates (along p_1 (p_2) in upper (lower) blob) at large s . This results into the representation (involving impact factors \mathcal{J})




Figure 3: k_T factorization.

$$\mathcal{M} = is \int \frac{d^2 \underline{k}}{(2\pi)^4 \underline{k}^2 (\underline{r} - \underline{k})^2} \mathcal{J}^{\gamma^* \rightarrow \gamma^*}(\underline{k}, \underline{r} - \underline{k}) \mathcal{J}^{\gamma^* \rightarrow \gamma^*}(-\underline{k}, -\underline{r} + \underline{k}).$$

1.3 LL BFKL Pomeron: limitations

First, at LL the scale s_0 entering in the $Y = \ln s/s_0$ resummation is not fixed. Running and scale

[†] talk presented at EDS07

fixing of α_S are not prescribed at LL. Second, energy-momentum is not conserved in the BFKL approach (this remains at any order: NLL, NNLL, ...), but naturally implemented (vanishing of the first moment of the splitting functions) in the usual collinear renormalisation group approach (à la




Figure 4: Diffusion along the BFKL ladder.

DGLAP [5]), since one starts with non local matrix elements. The energy-momentum tensor corresponds to their first moment, protected by radiative corrections. Third, diffusion along the ladder spoils the IR safeness of the BFKL Pomeron: at fixed α_S , there is a gaussian diffusion of k_T , with a cigar-like picture [6]. The more s increases, the larger is the broadness. Setting $t = \ln Q^2 / \Lambda_{QCD}^2$ (fixed from the probes) and $t' = \ln k^2 / \Lambda_{QCD}^2$ ($k^2 \sim -k_T^2 =$ virtuality of an arbitrary exchanged gluon along the chain), the typical width of the cigar is $\Delta t' \sim \sqrt{\alpha_S Y}$ (Fig.4a). The Non-Perturbative domain is touched when $\Delta t' \sim \sqrt{\alpha_S Y} \sim t$. In a simple running implementation, the border of the cigar touches NP for $Y \sim bt^3$ ($b = 11/12$) while the center of the cigar approaches NP when $Y \sim bt^2$ ("banana structure" of Fig.4b). A more involved treatment of LL BFKL with running coupling [7] showed that the cigare is "swallowed" by NP in the middle of the ladder (Fig.4c): one faces tunneling when $Y \sim t$, meaning that IR safety is doubtful.

1.4 Higher order corrections

Higher order corrections to BFKL kernel are known at NLL order ($\alpha_S \sum_n (\alpha_S \ln s)^n$ series) [8], now for arbitrary impact parameter. Impact factors are known in some cases at NLL ($\gamma^* \rightarrow \gamma^*$ at $t = 0$ [9], forward jet production [10], $\gamma^* \rightarrow \rho$ in forward limit [11]). This leads to *very large corrections with respect to LL*. The main part of these corrections can be obtained from a physical principle, based on a kinematical constraint along the gluon ladder (which is subleading with respect to LL BFKL) [12]. However this could have nothing to do with NLL correction: in principle this constraint would be satisfied when including LL+NLL+NNLL+NNNLL+... . This constraint is more related to improved collinear resummed approaches (see below) for which the vanishing of the first moment of the splitting function is natural. The above perturbative instabilities require an improved scheme. Either one can use a physical motivation to fix the scale of the coupling¹: this is the basis of BLM scheme, applied for the $\gamma^* \gamma^* \rightarrow X$ total cross-section [13] and for the $\gamma^* \gamma^* \rightarrow \rho \rho$ exclusive process [14, 15]. Or one can use a resummed approach inspired by compatibility with usual renormalization group approach [16]. For example in $\gamma^*(Q_1) \gamma^*(Q_2) \rightarrow X$, one includes *both* full DGLAP LL for $Q_1 \gg Q_2$ and anti-DGLAP LL $Q_1 \ll Q_2$, fixes the relation between Y and s in a symmetric way compatible with DGLAP and implement running of α_S . Coming back to the IR diffusion problem, this scheme enlarges the validity of perturbative QCD. A simplified version [17] at fixed α_S results in performing in the LL BFKL Green function

$$\frac{1}{k^3 k'^3} \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi i} \int \frac{d\gamma}{2\pi i} \left(\frac{k^2}{k'^2} \right)^{\gamma-1/2} \frac{e^{\omega Y}}{\omega - \omega(\gamma)}$$

the replacement $\omega - \omega(\gamma) \rightarrow \omega - \omega(\gamma, \omega)$. The ω integration is performed through contour closing

¹The running of the coupling constant should be implemented at NLL, while scale is fixed starting from NNLL.

around the pole at $\omega = \omega(\gamma, \omega)$, and the γ integration is made using the saddle point approximation at large Y . This takes into account the main NLL corrections (within 7 % accuracy).

1.5 Non-linear regime and saturation

The Froissart bound should be satisfied at asymptotically large s and for each impact parameter b , amplitudes should fulfil $T(s, b) < 1$. Various unitarization and saturation models have been developed. First, the *Generalized Leading Log Approximation*, taking into account any *fixed* number n of t -channel exchanged reggeons, leads to the Bartels, Jaroszewicz, Kwiecinski, Praszalowicz equation [18], a 2-dimensional quantum mechanical problem (time $\sim \ln s$) with n sites. It is an *integrable model* in the large N_c limit [19], the XXX Heisenberg spin chain (its *non-compact* symmetry group $SL(2, C)$ makes the solution non-trivial). Solution of BJKP (i.e. energy spectrum \Rightarrow *intercept*) exists for arbitrary n , describing both Pomeron $P = C = +1$ and Odderon $P = C = -1$ exchanges. For Odderon, $\alpha_O < 1$ [20] but it decouples from Born impact factors. A *critical* solution ($\alpha_O = 1$) coupled to Born impact factors can be obtained either from the perturbative Regge approach [21] or from the dipole model [22]. Second, the *Extended Generalized Leading Log Approximation* [23], in which the number of reggeon in t -channel is non conserved, satisfies full unitarity (in all sub-channel) and is an *effective 2-d field theory* realizing the Gribov idea of Reggeon field theory in QCD. Its simplest version, leading to the Balitski-Kovchegov equation [24, 25], involves *fan-diagrams* (with singlet sub-channels). Loops (in terms of Pomerons) corrections are unknown, and obtaining them would be a major step. Another effective field theory approach has been developed separately [26]. Precise relationships between effective approaches remains to be clarified. Third, the multipomeron approach makes contact with AGK cutting rules of pre-QCD [27]. In the large N_c limit, this is the dominant contribution when coupling to Born impact factors (leading with respect to BJKP), and it leads to unitarization. Fourth, during the last decade, the Color Glass Condensate [28] and B-JIMWLK equation were elaborated. This effective field theory is based on the scattering picture of a probe off the field of a source, which is treated through a renormalisation group equation with respect to a longitudinal scale, with an explicit integration out of modes below this scale. The approach of Balitski [25] relies on the scattering of Wilson loops and computation of interaction of one loop with the field of the other (related to the eikonal phase approach à la Nachtmann). The mean field approximation of the B-JIMWLK equation leads to the BK equation. There is at the moment no clear one-to-one correspondence between ELLA and CGC, except in the peculiar BK limiting case. Loops (in terms of Pomerons) corrections are also unknown. Toy models in 1+0 dimensions are under developpement (Reggeon field theory) to understand these corrections. Very interesting links exist between saturation models and statistical physics (reaction-diffusion models of the FKPP class) [29]. These models provide a saturation scale $Q_s(Y)$ growing with Y : above this scale the scattering amplitude T is small (color transparency), and below it saturates. This reduces the contribution of gluons with $k^2 < Q_s^2$ and may solve the IR diffusion problem.

1.6 Onium-onium scattering as a gold plated experiment: $\gamma^{(*)}\gamma^{(*)}$ at colliders

Tests of perturbative QCD in the Regge limit require observables which are free of IR divergencies, by selecting external or internal probes with transverse sizes $\ll 1/\Lambda_{QCD}$ (*hard* γ^* , *heavy* meson (J/Ψ , Υ), *energetic* forward jets) or by choosing large t . They should be governed by the


"soft" perturbative dynamics of QCD (BFKL) and *not* by its *collinear* dynamics (DGLAP [5], ERBL [30]): probes should have comparable transverse sizes. They should allow control of k_T spreading, that is the transition from linear to non-linear (saturated regime), meaning the possibility of varying s for fixed transverse size of the probes. It should give access both to forward (i.e. inclusive) and non-forward (i.e. exclusive processes) dynamics, both testing linear and non-linear regimes. $\gamma^{(*)}\gamma^{(*)}$ scattering satisfies all these requirements.

2 Inclusive and Exclusive tests of BFKL dynamics

2.1 Hadron-hadron colliders

Mueller-Navelet jets

This test of BFKL at $t = 0$ is based on the measure for two jets at large p_T (hard scale) separated by a large rapidity $\Delta\eta$ (Fig.5). The signal is a decorrelation of relative azimuthal angle between emitted jets when increasing $\Delta\eta$. Studies were made at LL [31], NLL [32] and resummed NLL [33]. Tevatron I data [34] agreed [35] with the modified BFKL approach [12] (see section 1.4). The measurement should be performed soon at CDF for $\Delta\eta$ up to 12, and presumably at LHC.



Diffractive high energy double jet production

The idea is to measure two jets with a gap in rapidity (Fig.6), with hard scales provided by the energies E_T of the jets [36]. This tests BFKL at $t \neq 0$. Taking into account non perturbative gap survival rapidity [37], one can correctly describe the Tevatron data [38].




Figure 5: Mueller-Navelet jets.

High p_T jet production

This has been studied at LL and NLL [39]. It relies on computation of impact factors, kernel and Green function at LL and NLL order. The effective jet vertex requires a precise definition of the emitted jet (made of one or two s -channel emitted particle at NLL), and modeling of proton impact factor (the only hard scale is p_T^2).




Figure 6: Diffractive high energy jet production.

2.2 HERA

DIS and diffractive DIS

Q^2 being the only hard scale for DIS, a model for the proton is needed [40]. BFKL (at $t = 0$) and DGLAP (NLL) both describe the data [41]. Diffractive DIS [43], corresponding experimentally to a gap in the detector between the proton remnants and the jets [42], can be described both within collinear and BFKL approaches [44].




Figure 7: Exclusive vector meson production at large t .

Energetic forward jet and π^0 production

It is a test of BFKL at $t = 0$, with hard scales given by the γ^* virtuality and the jet energy [45]. Data [46] favor BFKL but cannot exclude a partonic scenario [47].

Exclusive vector meson production at large t

This test of BFKL at large t , which provides the hard scale (Fig.7) [48], was made for H1, ZEUS

data and favor BFKL (Fig.8). Problems with data remains for the spin density matrix.

2.3 $\gamma^*\gamma^*$ at LEP2

The LEP2 available energy ($\sqrt{s_{e^+e^-}} = 183$ to 202 GeV) allowed tests of the total $\gamma^*\gamma^*$ cross-section. This process was studied with LL BFKL [49],

dipole model [50,51], modified LL BFKL (based on kinematical constraints) [52] (Fig.9a), NLL BFKL [13] (Fig.9b). Fig.9c displays the comparison [52] between modified LL BFKL, including quark box (simulating usual DGLAP for $Q_1 \sim Q_2$), soft Pomeron and reggeon contributions, and OPAL data. Born 2 gluon exchange and quark exchange are too small in the large Y set of the data. LL BFKL is too high (even including quark mass effects [53]). Scenarios with modified BFKL or NLL BFKL with BLM scale fixing were plausible, but lack of statistics [54] (minimal detection angle of only 30 mrad, luminosity and energy limited) forbade any conclusion.




Figure 9: Modified LL BFKL (a) and BLM scale-fixed NLL BFKL (b) predictions versus Born. OPAL data versus modified LL (c).

3 Onium-onium scattering at ILC collider

3.1 Sources of photons

The direct $\gamma\gamma$ cross-section (box diagram) is out of reach experimentally. For example, $\sigma^{\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} \sim 10^{-64}(\omega_\gamma/\text{eV})^6 \text{cm}^2$, that is 10^{-65}cm^2 for visible light ($\omega \sim 1 \text{ eV}$)! Photons can be produced either, using the Fermi, Weizsäcker, Williams idea that the field of a charged particle is a flux of equivalent photon (which are almost real), from a high luminosity collider (Ap, pp, e^+p, e^+e^-) or from Compton backscattering to pump the energy of electrons of a storage ring or of a collider.

Photon colliders: hadron and nucleus colliders

To produce high energy $\omega = zE_{Ze}$ photons with high luminosity, the equivalent photon approximation

$$P_{\gamma/Ze}(z, Q^2) \sim Z^2 \alpha_{em}/(z Q^2)$$

implies that one can use either a high energy (to compensate the $1/z$ pole) and high luminosity hadron collider (LHC, Tevatron), or a heavy nucleus collider (Z^2 then balance the lower luminosity) (RHIC, LHC)². At LHC, both modes would give comparable fluxes of photons. However, $\gamma\gamma$ events are polluted by pure (soft) hadronic interactions between source of photons, since hadrons or nucleus are sensitive to strong interaction. One needs to select peculiar ultraperipheral events for which the typical impact parameter b between hadrons (nucleus) exceeds $1/\Lambda_{QCD}$. This is possible experimentally with very forward detectors, with (anti)tagging protons: forward detector at CDF (with coming data), LHC detectors (Roman pots) suggested at 420 m (FP420 at CMS and ATLAS) and 220 m (RP200 at ATLAS) from the Interaction Point at LHC. These last detectors are very promising for both $\gamma\gamma$ and hadronic diffractive physics (ex: Higgs exclusive production, MSSM, QCD), but they suffer from non trivial problems with fast time trigger (long

²see Nystrand's talk

distance from IP to the detector to be compared with the rate of events at high luminosity). Combining both detectors would increase acceptance. Note that b is not directly reconstructed, and that survival probability have to be taken into account (non-perturbative ingredient). The above situation should be contrasted with processes involving e^\pm , which are not directly affected by strong interaction. This is the key reason why e^+e^- colliders are the cleanest solution in principle for $\gamma^{(*)}\gamma^{(*)}$ physics, both from a theoretical and from an experimental point of view.

Photon colliders: $e \rightarrow \gamma$ conversion

At e^+e^- colliders, a small number of photons, of soft spectrum ($dn_\gamma \sim 0.03 d\omega/\omega$), is produced:

$$L_{\gamma\gamma}(W_\gamma/(2E_e) > 0.1) \sim 10^{-2} L_{e^+e^-} \quad \text{and} \quad L_{\gamma\gamma}(W_\gamma/(2E_e) > 0.5) \sim 0.4 \cdot 10^{-3} L_{e^+e^-}.$$

To produce a photon collider, the Novosibirsk group suggested [55] to reconsider the use of Compton backscattering of a laser on the high energy electron beam of a collider [56]. Due to the u -channel diagram of Fig.10, which has an almost vanishing propagator, the cross-section is peaked in the backward direction. In this direction, almost all the energy of the incoming electron is transferred to the outgoing photon (up to 82 % at ILC 500 GeV). The limit comes from the fact that one does not want to reconvert γ in e^+e^- pairs!). The corresponding number of equivalent photons is of the order of 1 if the beam has a small size, with laser flash energy of 1 – 10 J. The photon beam follows the direction of the incoming electron beam with an opening angle of $1/\gamma_e$. Due to the very good focussing of electrons beams expected at ILC, this is the main effect limiting the luminosity in γ mode: the distance b between conversion region and Interaction Point is ~ 1.5 mm, making impossible to use a magnet to deflect the low energy outgoing electron beam. It has been suggested to use a non zero scattering angle between the two incoming beams to remove them (see Fig.11). In order to compensate the potential lost luminosity with non zero scattering angle, *crab-cross* scattering is studied (the paquet is not aligned with the direction of its propagation, like a crab). The luminosity could reach $0.17 L_{e^+e^-}$, a very interesting value since the cross-sections in $\gamma\gamma$ are usually one order of magnitude higher than for e^+e^- .

The matrix element of the Compton process is helicity-conserving except for the term proportional to the electron mass, which is helicity-flip, and *dominates in the backward region*. This provides a very elegant way of *producing quasi monochromatic photons of maximal energy and given polarization*, by using $2\lambda_e P_c = -1$ (λ_e = mean electron helicity and P_c = mean laser photon circular polarization), see Fig.12. Note that WW distribution is sharply peaked around almost on-shell and soft photons: in γe or $\gamma\gamma$ mode, in order to use perturbative QCD, one needs to provide hard scales, from the outgoing state ($J/\Psi, \dots$) or from large t . Ingoing γ^* hard states are provided only in e^+e^- mode with double tagged outgoing leptons.



Figure 10: u -channel diagram for Compton scattering.




Figure 11: $\gamma\gamma/\gamma e$ collider with cross-crab angle.




Figure 12: Spectrum (left) and average helicity (right) of the Compton-scattered photons.

3.2 ILC project

The ILC budget estimate is 6.65 G\$, comparable to the cost of the LHC when including pre-existing facilities.

Reference Design Report for ILC

$\sqrt{s}_{e^+e^-}$ should be 500 GeV, with a luminosity of 125 fb^{-1} per year within 4 years of running, with a possible scan in energy between 200 GeV and 500 GeV. An upgrade at 1 TeV, with a luminosity of 1 ab^{-1} within 3 to 4 years is planned (see Fig.13 for the rather intricate structure needed for the packets) [57]. There are non trivial technological problem for extracting the outgoing beam. At the moment, 3 options are considered for the scattering angle: 2 mrad, 14 mrad and 20 mrad, with in each case a hole in the detector at that angle to let the outgoing beam get through toward the beam dump (reducing the acceptance in the forward calorimeter). Crab-cross scattering is needed to get high luminosity. Two interaction regions are highly desirable: one which could be at low crossing-angle, and one compatible with $e\gamma$ and $\gamma\gamma$ physics (through single or double laser Compton backscattering). $\gamma\gamma$ mode leads to the severe constraint that $\alpha_c > 25 \text{ mrad}$ ³. The mirrors could be placed either inside or outside the detector, depending on the chosen technology, with *almost no space for any forward detector in a cone of 95 mrad* (Fig.14). If the cheaper option suggested by Telnov (single detector + single interaction point + single extraction line, without displacement of the detector between 2 interaction points) would be chosen, diffractive physics could become very difficult.

Detectors at ILC

Each of the 4 detector concepts (GLD, LDC, Sid and 4th (sic)) involves a very forward electromagnetic calorimeter for luminosity measurement, with tagging angle for outgoing leptons down to 5 mrad (10 years ago, 20 mrad was almost impossible!). It is ideal for diffractive physics, which cross-sections are sharply peaked in the very forward region. The luminosity is enough to get high statistics, even for exclusive events. For example, LDC (Fig.15a) contains a BeamCal at 3.65 m from the vertex [58]. The main background is due to beamstrahlung photons, leading to energy deposit in cells close from the beampipe (Fig.15b). This implies cutting-off the cells for lepton tagging with $E_{min}=100 \text{ GeV}$, $\theta_{min} = 4 \text{ mrad}$ (and to lower energies for large angles).




Figure 13: Packet structure for ILC.




Figure 14: Quad, electron and laser beams.




Figure 15: LDC (a). Beamstrahlung in BeamCal (b).

3.3 $\gamma^*\gamma^* \rightarrow \text{hadrons}$ total cross-section

In comparison to LEP, s would be higher, the luminosity would be much higher (a factor $\sim 10^3$), and detectors would give access to events closer to the beampipe (LEP: $\theta_{min} \geq 25$ to 30 mrad). One can thus hope to get a much better access to QCD in perturbative Regge limit. To have enough statistics in order to see a BFKL enhancement at TESLA, it was considered to be important to get access down to $\theta_{min} \simeq 25$ to 20 mrad [50]. Probably this could be extended

³last quadrupole ($\phi = 5 \text{ cm}$) at 4m from IP and horizontal disruption angle = 12.5 mrad, thus $0.125 + 5/400 = 25 \text{ mrad}$.

up to 30 mrad due to the expected luminosity (a factor 2 to 3 of luminosity higher than TESLA project). With detection down to 4 mrad, this is thus not anymore a critical parameter⁴. In a modified LL BFKL scenario, one expects around 10^4 events per year with $\theta_{min} \simeq 10$ mrad.

3.4 $\gamma^{(*)}\gamma^{(*)}$ exclusive processes and other QCD studies

In the $\gamma\gamma$ case (e^+e^- without tagging or $\gamma\gamma$ collider option), one can consider any diffractive process of type $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow J/\Psi J/\Psi$ [59] (or other heavy produced state). The hard scale is provided by the charmed quark mass, with an expected number of events for ILC around $9 \cdot 10^4$. Due to the small detection angle offered by Beamcal, one could also investigate the process $\gamma^*\gamma^* \rightarrow \rho_L^0 \rho_L^0$ [14, 60–63] from $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^- \rho_L^0 \rho_L^0$ with double tagged out-going leptons [64]. The channel $\gamma^*\gamma^*$ is also a gold place for production of C even resonances, such as π^0 , η , η' , f_2 . It would be a good place where looking for the elusive odderon, in processes like $\gamma^{(*)}\gamma^{(*)} \rightarrow \eta_c \eta_c$ [65]. Beside the regge limit, ILC would be also a nice place for finding exotic states like $q\bar{q}g$ with $J^{PC} = 1^{-+}$ [66]. Finally, it could have a great potential for photon structure studies [67].

References

- [1] E.A. Kuraev, L.N. Lipatov and V.S. Fadin, Phys. Lett. B **60**, 50-52 (1975); Sov. Phys. JETP **44**, 443-451 (1976); Sov. Phys. JETP **45**, 199-204 (1977); Ya.Ya. Balitskii and L.N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **28**, 822-829 (1978).
- [2] N.N. Nikolaev and B.G. Zakharov, Zeit. für Phys. C **49**, 607-618 (1991); Zeit. für Phys. C **53**, 331-346 (1992); N.N. Nikolaev, B.G. Zakharov and V.R. Zoller, Phys. Lett. B **328**, 486-494 (1994).
- [3] A.H. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. B **415** (1994) 373-385. A.H. Mueller and B. Patel, Nucl. Phys. B **425**, 471-488 (1994); Nucl. Phys. B **437**, 107-126 (1995);
- [4] Z. Chen and A.H. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. B **451** 579-604 (1995); H. Navelet and S. Wallon, Nucl. Phys. B **522**, 237 (1998).
- [5] V. N. Gribov and L. N. Lipatov, Yad. Fiz. **15**, (1972) 781 [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **15**, 438 (1972)]; G. Altarelli and G. Parisi, Nucl. Phys. B **126**, 298 (1977); Y. L. Dokshitzer, Sov. Phys. JETP **46**, 641 (1977) [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **73**, 1216 (1977)].
- [6] J. Bartels and H. Lotter, Phys. Lett. B **309**, 400 (1993).
- [7] M. Ciafaloni, D. Colferai, G. P. Salam and A. M. Stasto, Phys. Lett. B **541**, 314 (2002).
- [8] G. Camici and M. Ciafaloni, Phys. Lett. B **412**, 396 (1997) [Erratum-ibid. B **417**, 390 (1998)]; Phys. Lett. B **430**, 349 (1998); V. S. Fadin and L. N. Lipatov, Phys. Lett. B **429**, 127 (1998).
- [9] J. Bartels, S. Gieseke and C. F. Qiao, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 056014 (2001) [Erratum-ibid. D **65**, 079902 (2002)].
- [10] J. Bartels, D. Colferai and G. P. Vacca, Eur. Phys. J. C **24**, 83 (2002); Eur. Phys. J. C **29**, 235 (2003).
- [11] D. Y. Ivanov, M. I. Kotsky and A. Papa, Eur. Phys. J. C **38**, 195 (2004).
- [12] J. Kwiecinski, A. D. Martin and P. J. Sutton, Z. Phys. C **71**, 585 (1996); B. Andersson, G. Gustafson, H. Kharraziha and J. Samuelsson, Z. Phys. C **71**, 613 (1996); B. Andersson, G. Gustafson and J. Samuelsson, Nucl. Phys. B **467**, 443 (1996).
- [13] S. J. Brodsky, V. S. Fadin, V. T. Kim, L. N. Lipatov and G. B. Pivovarov, JETP Lett. **70**, 155 (1999); JETP Lett. **76**, 249 (2002) [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **76**, 306 (2002)].
- [14] R. Enberg, B. Pire, L. Szymanowski and S. Wallon, Eur. Phys. J. C **45**, 759 (2006) [Erratum-ibid. C **51**, 1015 (2007)]; Acta Phys. Polon. B **37**, 847 (2006).
- [15] D. Y. Ivanov and A. Papa, Nucl. Phys. B **732**, 183 (2006); Eur. Phys. J. C **49** 947 (2007).

⁴Note that within a γe and $\gamma\gamma$ option, the Tel'nov suggestion would forbid any forward detector below 100 mrad.

- [16] G. P. Salam, JHEP **9807**, 019 (1998); M. Ciafaloni and D. Colferai, Phys. Lett. B **452**, 372 (1999); M. Ciafaloni, D. Colferai and G. P. Salam, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 114036 (1999).
- [17] V. A. Khoze, A. D. Martin, M. G. Ryskin and W. J. Stirling, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 074013 (2004).
- [18] J. Bartels, Nucl. Phys. B **151** 293 (1979); Nucl. Phys. B **175**, 365-401 (1980); T. Jaroszewicz, Acta Phys. Pol. B **11**, 965-973 (1980); J. Kwiecinski and M. Praszalowicz, Phys. Lett. B **94**, 413-416 (1980);
- [19] L. N. Lipatov, Phys. Lett. B **309**, 394 (1993); Padova preprint DFPD-93-TH-70, hep-th/9311037; JETP Lett. **59**, 596 (1994); L.D. Faddeev and G.P. Korchemsky, Phys. Lett. B **342**, 311 (1995); G.P. Korchemsky, Nucl. Phys. B **443**, 255 (1995).
- [20] R. A. Janik and J. Wosiek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1092 (1999); G. P. Korchemsky, J. Kotanski and A. N. Manashov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 122002 (2002); S. E. Derkachov, G. P. Korchemsky, J. Kotanski and A. N. Manashov, Nucl. Phys. B **645**, 237 (2002).
- [21] J. Bartels, L. N. Lipatov and G. P. Vacca, Phys. Lett. B **477**, 178 (2000).
- [22] Y. V. Kovchegov, L. Szymanowski and S. Wallon, Phys. Lett. B **586**, 267 (2004).
- [23] J. Bartels, DESY 91-074 (unpublished); J. Bartels and M. Wüsthoff, Z. Phys. C **66**, 157 (1995); J. Bartels and C. Ewerz, JHEP **9909**, 026 (1999).
- [24] Yu.V. Kovchegov, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 034008 (1999); Phys. Rev. D **61**, 074018 (1999).
- [25] I. Balitsky, Nucl. Phys. D **463** (1996) 99; Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2024 (1998); Phys. Rev. D **60**, 014021 (1999); Phys. Lett. B **518**, 235 (2001).
- [26] R. Kirschner, L. N. Lipatov and L. Szymanowski, Nucl. Phys. B **425**, 579 (1994); Phys. Rev. D **51**, 838 (1995); L.N. Lipatov, Nucl. Phys. B **452**, 369 (1995); E. N. Antonov, L. N. Lipatov, E. A. Kuraev and I. O. Cherednikov, Nucl. Phys. B **721**, 111 (2005).
- [27] J. Bartels and M. G. Ryskin, Z. Phys. C **76**, 241 (1997); J. Bartels, M. Salvadore and G. P. Vacca, Eur. Phys. J. C **42**, 53 (2005).
- [28] J. Jalilian-Marian, A. Kovner, A. Leonidov and H. Weigert, Nucl. Phys. B **504**, 415 (1997); Phys. Rev. D **59**, 014014 (1999); J. Jalilian-Marian, A. Kovner and H. Weigert, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 014015 (1999); A. Kovner, J. G. Milhano and H. Weigert, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 114005 (2000); E. Iancu, A. Leonidov and L. McLerran, Nucl. Phys. A **692**, 583 (2001); Phys. Lett. B **510**, 133 (2001); E. Ferreira, E. Iancu, A. Leonidov and L. McLerran, Nucl. Phys. A **703**, 489 (2002); H. Weigert, Nucl. Phys. A **703**, 823 (2002).
- [29] S. Munier and R. Peschanski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 232001 (2003) Phys. Rev. D **69**, 034008 (2004); Phys. Rev. D **70**, 077503 (2004); E. Iancu, A. H. Mueller and S. Munier, Phys. Lett. B **606**, 342 (2005).
- [30] G.P. Lepage and S.J. Brodsky, Phys. Lett. B **87**, 359 (1979); A.V. Efremov and A.V. Radyushkin, Phys. Lett. B **94**, 245 (1980).
- [31] A. H. Mueller and H. Navelet, Nucl. Phys. B **282**, 727 (1987); V. Del Duca and C. R. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 2150 (1995).
- [32] A. S. Vera, Nucl. Phys. B **746**, 1 (2006); A. S. Vera and F. Schwennsen, Nucl. Phys. B **776**, 170 (2007).
- [33] C. Marquet and C. Royon, arXiv:0704.3409 [hep-ph].
- [34] S. Abachi *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 595 (1996).
- [35] J. Kwiecinski, A. D. Martin, L. Motyka and J. Outhwaite, Phys. Lett. B **514**, 355 (2001).
- [36] A. H. Mueller and W. K. Tang, Phys. Lett. B **284**, 123 (1992).
- [37] R. Enberg, G. Ingelman and L. Motyka, Phys. Lett. B **524**, 273 (2002).
- [38] B. Abbott *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **440**, 189 (1998); F. Abe *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1156 (1998).
- [39] O. Kepka, C. Royon, C. Marquet and R. Peschanski, arXiv:hep-ph/0609299; arXiv:hep-ph/0612261; A. S. Vera and F. Schwennsen, arXiv:0708.0549 [hep-ph].
- [40] A. J. Askew, K. J. Golec-Biernat, J. Kwiecinski, A. D. Martin and P. J. Sutton, Phys. Lett. B **325**, 212 (1994); H. Navelet, R. Peschanski, C. Royon and S. Wallon, Phys. Lett. B **385**, 357 (1996); S. Munier and R. Peschanski, Nucl. Phys. B **524**, 377 (1998).

- [41] C. Adloff *et al.* [H1 Collaboration], *Eur. Phys. J. C* **21**, 33 (2001); S. Chekanov *et al.* [ZEUS Collaboration], *Eur. Phys. J. C* **21**, 443 (2001).
- [42] A. Aktas *et al.* [H1 Collaboration], *Eur. Phys. J. C* **48**, 715 (2006); *Eur. Phys. J. C* **48**, 749 (2006); ZEUS Collab., S. Chekanov *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **713**, 3 (2005); *Eur. Phys. J. C* **38**, 43 (2004).
- [43] G. Ingelman, P. Schlein, *Phys. Lett. B* **152**, 256 (1985).
- [44] S. Munier, R. Peschanski and C. Royon, *Nucl. Phys. B* **534**, 297 (1998); J. Bartels, J. Ellis, H. Kowalski, M. Wuesthoff, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **7**, 443 (1999); J. Bartels, C. Royon, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **14**, 1583 (1999); C. Royon, L. Schoeffel, S. Sapeta, R. Peschanski and E. Sauvan, *Nucl. Phys. B* **781**, 1 (2007).
- [45] A. H. Mueller, *J. Phys. G* **17**, 1443 (1991); J. Bartels, A. de Roeck and M. Loewe, *Z. Phys. C* **54**, 635 (1992); J. Kwiecinski, A. D. Martin and P. J. Sutton, *Phys. Rev. D* **46**, 921 (1992); J. Bartels, V. Del Duca and M. Wusthoff, *Z. Phys. C* **76**, 75 (1997); J. Kwiecinski, A. D. Martin and J. J. Outhwaite, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **9**, 611 (1999).
- [46] H1 Collab., S. Aid *et al.*, *Phys. Lett. B* **356**, 118 (1995); J. Breitweg *et al.* [ZEUS Collaboration], *Eur. Phys. J. C* **6**, 239 (1999).
- [47] P. Aurenche, R. Basu, M. Fontannaz and R. M. Godbole, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **42**, 43 (2005).
- [48] J. R. Forshaw and M. G. Ryskin, *Z. Phys. C* **68**, 137 (1995); J. Bartels, J. R. Forshaw, H. Lotter and M. Wusthoff, *Phys. Lett. B* **375**, 301 (1996); R. Enberg, J. R. Forshaw, L. Motyka and G. Poludniowski, *JHEP* **0309**, 008 (2003); *JHEP* **0312**, 002 (2003).
- [49] J. Bartels, A. De Roeck and H. Lotter, *Phys. Lett. B* **389**, 742 (1996); S. J. Brodsky, F. Hautmann and D. E. Soper, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 803 (1997) [Erratum-ibid. **79**, 3544 (1997)], *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 6957 (1997).
- [50] M. Boonekamp, A. De Roeck, C. Royon and S. Wallon, *Nucl. Phys. B* **555**, 540 (1999).
- [51] A. Bialas, W. Czyz and W. Florkowski, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **2**, 683 (1998).
- [52] J. Kwiecinski and L. Motyka, *Phys. Lett. B* **462**, 203 (1999); *Eur. Phys. J. C* **18**, 343 (2000).
- [53] J. Bartels, C. Ewerz and R. Staritzbichler, *Phys. Lett. B* **492**, 56 (2000).
- [54] G. Abbiendi *et al.* [OPAL Collaboration], *Eur. Phys. J. C* **24**, 17 (2002); P. Achard *et al.* [L3 Collaboration], *Phys. Lett. B* **531**, 39 (2002); A. Heister *et al.* [ALEPH Collaboration], arXiv:hep-ex/0305107; J. Abdallah *et al.* [DELPHI Collaboration], *Eur. Phys. J. C* **46**, 559 (2006);
- [55] I. F. Ginzburg, G. L. Kotkin, V. G. Serbo and V. I. Telnov, *JETP Lett.* **34**, 491 (1981) [*Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **34**, 514 (1981)]; *Nucl. Instrum. Meth.* **205**, 47 (1983); I. F. Ginzburg, G. L. Kotkin, S. L. Panfil, V. G. Serbo and V. I. Telnov, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **219**, 5 (1984).
- [56] F. R. Arutyunian and V. A. Tumanian, *Phys. Lett.* **4**, 176 (1963); F. R. Arutyunian I.I. Goldman and V. A. Tumanian, *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. (USSR)* **45**, 312 (1963); R. H. Milburn, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **10**, 75 (1963).
- [57] ILC, Basic Conceptual Design Report, <http://www.linearcollider.org>.
- [58] LDC outline document, <http://www.ilcldc.org>.
- [59] J. Kwiecinski and L. Motyka, *Phys. Lett. B* **438**, 203 (1998); J. Kwiecinski, L. Motyka and A. De Roeck, In *2nd ECFA/DESY Study 1998-2001* 556-564, [arXiv:hep-ph/0001180].
- [60] B. Pire, L. Szymanowski and S. Wallon, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **44**, 545 (2005).
- [61] B. Pire, M. Segond, L. Szymanowski and S. Wallon, *Phys. Lett. B* **39**, 642-651 (2006).
- [62] M. Segond, L. Szymanowski and S. Wallon, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **52**, 93 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0703166].
- [63] F. Caporale, A. Papa and A. S. Vera, arXiv:0707.4100 [hep-ph].
- [64] See talk "Studying QCD factorizations in exclusive $\gamma^* \gamma^* \rightarrow \rho_L^0 \rho_L^0$ ", arXiv:0710.0838 [hep-ph], slides: <https://indico.desy.de/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=372#9>
- [65] S. Braunewell and C. Ewerz, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 014021 (2004); for a review, see C. Ewerz, arXiv:hep-ph/0306137.
- [66] I. V. Anikin, B. Pire, L. Szymanowski, O. V. Teryaev and S. Wallon, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **47**, 71 (2006).
- [67] for a review, see M. Klasen, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 1221 (2002).
- [68] slides: <https://indico.desy.de/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=372>