

Comment on Phys. Rev. Lett. 109, 152005 (2012)

A. Harindranath,¹ Rajen Kundu,² Asmita Mukherjee,³ and Raghunath Ratabole⁴

¹*Theory Division, Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, 1/AF Bidhan Nagar, Kolkata 700064, India*

²*Department of Physics, RKMVC College, Rahara, Kolkata, 700118, West Bengal, India*

³*Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Powai, Mumbai 400076, India*

⁴*Department of Physics, BITS Pilani K K Birla Goa Campus, NH17B, Zuarinagar, Goa 403726, India*

(Dated: 30 November 2012)

On the basis of research work published by us a decade ago we point out that the identification of transverse spin done in Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 152005 (2012) is incorrect.

PACS numbers: 11.15.-q, 12.38.Aw, 12.38.Bx, 13.88.+e, 13.60.Hb

At present, understanding the helicity and transverse spin structure of the proton in the context of Deep Inelastic Scattering (DIS) is of great interest. Intense experimental and theoretical research activities have been going on in this field for more than a decade. Ref. [1] (also see Ref. [2] which is a comment on it) is one of latest papers on this subject. As authors of Ref. [2] have already pointed out, the identification of transverse spin done in Ref. [1] is incorrect. The correct identification of helicity and transverse spin and the associated sum rules in terms of the intrinsic spin operator in light front QCD were investigated by us [3–5] a decade ago. In the following we elaborate on this.

It is well-known that since DIS is a lightcone dominated process, the most appropriate theoretical tool to study it is provided by Light Front Quantization (for a review, see Ref. [6]). In order to understand the spin structure of proton which is a composite object and investigate any sum rule associated with it, one should start from the intrinsic spin operators $\mathcal{J}^i, i = 1, 2, 3$ which can be constructed from the Pauli-Lubanski operator. It is well-known that \mathcal{J}^i 's are frame independent (see for example, Refs. [7–9]) whereas the usual rotation operators (which form part of the Poincare generators) are frame dependent. As correctly pointed out in Ref. [2] any angular momentum sum rule, based on rotation operators that are part of Poincare generators, will have frame dependence. The solution to this problem is to start from intrinsic spin operators \mathcal{J}^i . Construction of \mathcal{J}^i in light front QCD is carried out in Ref. [5]. It is well known that the transverse rotation operators and hence the transverse spin operators in light front theory are dynamical (interaction dependent) whereas helicity operator (whose explicit construction and a perturbative analysis in light

front QCD is carried out in Ref. [3] in the total transverse momentum zero frame) is kinematical (interaction free).

We have shown in Ref. [4, 5] that just like the helicity operator \mathcal{J}^3 , the transverse spin $\mathcal{J}^i, i = 1, 2$ of the composite state can be separated in the gauge $A^+ = 0$ into orbital-like (explicit dependence on the coordinates x^- and x^\perp) contribution \mathcal{J}_{II}^i and coordinate-independent parts \mathcal{J}_{II}^i and \mathcal{J}_{III}^i . What is the phenomenological relevance of this separation? Most interestingly, the proton matrix element of \mathcal{J}_{II}^i is shown to be directly related to the integral of the well-known transverse polarized structure function g_T just as the proton matrix element of the coordinate-independent quark intrinsic part of \mathcal{J}^3 is related to the polarized structure function g_1 . Based on $\mathcal{J}^i, i = 1, 2$ in light front QCD, in Ref. [5], a transverse spin sum rule was proposed and verified for a dressed quark to $\mathcal{O}(g^2)$ in perturbation theory.

[1] X. Ji, X. Xiong and F. Yuan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 152005 (2012) [arXiv:1202.2843 [hep-ph]].

[2] E. Leader and C. Lorce, arXiv:1211.4731 [hep-ph].

[3] A. Harindranath and R. Kundu, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 116013 (1999) [hep-ph/9802406].

[4] A. Harindranath, A. Mukherjee and R. Ratabole, Phys. Lett. B **476**, 471 (2000) [hep-ph/9908424].

[5] A. Harindranath, A. Mukherjee and R. Ratabole, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 045006 (2001).

[6] S. J. Brodsky, H. -C. Pauli and S. S. Pinsky, Phys. Rept. **301**, 299 (1998) [hep-ph/9705477].

[7] K. Bardakci and M. B. Halpern, Phys. Rev. **176**, 1686 (1968).

[8] D. E. Soper, Ph. D. thesis (1971), <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/pubs/slacreports/slac-r-137.htm>

[9] H. Leutwyler and J. Stern, Annals Phys. **112**, 94 (1978).