

Sum Rules for Nucleon GPDs and Border Function Formulation

A. V. Radyushkin^{1,2,3}

¹*Physics Department, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA 23529, USA*

²*Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility, Newport News, VA 23606, USA*

³*Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, JINR, Dubna, Russian Federation*

The newly developed approach to model nucleon generalized parton distributions (GPDs) H and E is based on two types of their representation in terms of double distributions. Within this approach, we re-consider the derivation of GPD sum rules that allow to use border functions $H(x, x)$ and $E(x, x)$ instead of full GPDs $H(x, \xi)$ and $E(x, \xi)$ in the integrals producing Compton form factors of deeply virtual Compton scattering. Using factorized DD Ansatz to model GPDs, we discuss the relation between the border functions and underlying parton densities. We find that a substantial contribution to $H(x, x)$ border function comes from the extra term required by new DD representations and related to $E(x, \xi)$ GPD.

PACS numbers: 11.10.-z, 12.38.-t, 13.60.Fz

I. INTRODUCTION

Building theoretical models for Generalized Parton Distributions (GPDs) [1–4] (for reviews see [5–11]) is a rather complicated task, since they should satisfy several nontrivial requirements such as polynomiality [5], positivity [12–14], hermiticity [1], time reversal invariance [5], etc., that follow from general principles of quantum field theory. In particular, an efficient way to impose the polynomiality property (which states that x^n moment of a GPD $H(x, \xi; t)$ must be a polynomial in ξ of the order not higher than $n + 1$) is to construct GPDs from Double Distributions (DDs) $F(\beta, \alpha; t)$ [1, 3, 14, 15]. (Another way to satisfy the polynomiality condition is to use “dual parameterization” [16–20]).

In the course of development of GPD theory, it was realized that the simplest $F(\beta, \alpha; t) \rightarrow H(x, \xi; t)$ reconstruction method [21], derived from the analysis of scalar composite operators in scalar field theories, does not produce the highest, $(n + 1)^{\text{st}}$ power of the skewness parameter ξ that is required for vector operators. For pion GPDs, to handle this problem, a parametrization involving two DDs was formulated [22], with the second DD $G(\beta, \alpha)$ capable of generating the required ξ^{n+1} power. It was also proposed [22] to use a “DD plus D” decomposition, in which the second DD $G(\beta, \alpha)$ is reduced to a function $D(\alpha)$ of one variable, the D -term, that is solely responsible for the ξ^{n+1} contribution. Later, it was emphasized [23] that the two-DD description is redundant (which is natural since the pion is described by just one GPD $H(x, \xi; t)$): the total contribution is determined by $\partial F(\beta, \alpha)/\partial \beta + \partial G(\beta, \alpha)/\partial \alpha$ combination, and one can reshuffle terms between F and G provided that this sum is unchanged (this is analogous to performing a “gauge transformation” [23]). The choice $G(\beta, \alpha) = \delta(\beta)D(\alpha)$ may be called “Polyakov-Weiss” gauge. In this gauge, the non-D-term part is given by just one function $F_D(\beta, \alpha)$. Another choice, “one-DD” gauge corresponds to $F_O(\beta, \alpha) = \beta \mathcal{F}(\beta, \alpha)$, $G_O(\beta, \alpha) = \alpha \mathcal{F}(\beta, \alpha)$. The combination of F and G cor-

responding to the one-DD gauge naturally appears for matrix elements of twist-2 vector operators [24].

For nucleon, a straightforward parametrization involves 3 double distributions [22, 25, 26], one of which is redundant (there are only two GPDs, $H(x, \xi; t)$ and $E(x, \xi; t)$), i.e., as in pion case, one can perform gauge transformations that do not change the total sum. Again, imposing symmetrization of indices involved in the definition of local twist-2 operators, one obtains a natural parametrization in terms of just two DDs \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} [9].

Within the DD approach, the problem of constructing a model for a GPD converts into a problem of building a model for the relevant DD. The advantage of using DDs as a starting point (apart from satisfying the polynomiality condition) is a simple physical picture they imply: $F(\beta, \alpha; t)$ behave like usual parton distribution functions (PDFs) with respect to its variable β and as a meson distribution amplitude (DA) with respect to α (and also as a form factor with respect to the invariant momentum transfer t).

The *factorized DD ansatz* (FDDA) [14, 27] proposes to build a model DD $F(\beta, \alpha)$ (in the simplified formal $t = 0$ limit) as a product of the usual parton density $f(\beta)$ and a profile function $h(\beta, \alpha)$ that has an α -shape of a meson DA. Given the ambiguity of DDs involved, one should decide, in which gauge the FDDA is applied. Originally, FDDA in case of pion was used for the “DD+D” decomposition, or in Polyakov-Weiss gauge. A pion GPD model based on one-DD gauge was built in our paper [28]. The complication is that applying FDDA to a one-DD representation one should reconstruct GPD from $f(\beta)/\beta$. The extra $1/\beta$ factor combined with the Regge $\beta^{-\alpha}$ singularity of the parton density $f(\beta)$ results in a non-integrable singularity for $\beta = 0$. In our construction [28] (see also [29]), we separated DD $\mathcal{F}(\beta, \alpha)$ in the “plus” part $[f(\beta, \alpha)]_+$ that gives zero after integration over β , and the D -term part $\delta(\beta)D(\alpha)/\alpha$. For DDs singular in small- β region, such a separation serves also as a renormalization prescription substituting a formally divergent integral over β by “observable” D -term.

For the nucleon, the analog of “DD+D” construction

has the structure $H_{DD} + D$ for GPD H and $E_{DD} - D$ for GPD E . In fact, the combination that has the simplest DD representation is $A = H + E$, whereas $B = -E$ has a DD representation identical in structure to one-DD representation of the pion case [9, 30]. Using FDDA, one would reconstruct A from the forward function $f(x) + e(x)$ (which, roughly speaking, is equivalent to taking $H + E = H_{DD} + E_{DD}$), while B is reconstructed from $-e(x)/x$, which requires special treatment of the $x = 0$ singularity. The result for E may be written as $E = E_{DD} + \xi E_+^1 - D$ [30], where $E_+^1(x, \xi)$ is an extra term specific to the one-DD parametrization. Unlike the D -term, it does not vanish at the border point $x = \xi$. As a result, $H = H_{DD} - \xi E_+^1 + D$, i.e. GPD H also acquires an extra term affecting its value at border point $x = \xi$.

The importance of knowing GPDs at the border point was realized from the earliest papers on deeply virtual Compton scattering (DVCS) [2, 31]. In particular, the imaginary part of the Compton amplitude $\mathcal{C}(\xi)$, at the leading order given by $H(\xi, \xi)$, determines the magnitude of the single-spin asymmetry [2, 31] and, hence, is directly measurable in DVCS experiments. However, the real part of the leading order $\mathcal{C}(\xi)$ (measurable through DVCS cross section) is given by the principle value (PV) integral of $H(x, \xi)/(x - \xi)$ and, thus, apparently requires to know $H(x, \xi)$ for all range of x and ξ values. But, from the dispersion relation considerations [32, 33], it was argued that one can substitute $H(x, \xi)$ by the border function $H(x, x)$ in the PV integral (one should also add a subtraction constant Δ determined by the D term). Thus, to calculate the whole leading-order Compton amplitude $\mathcal{C}(\xi)$ (or form factor $\mathcal{C}(\xi; t)$, if the t -dependence is taken care of) it is sufficient to know the border functions, i.e., GPDs for $x = \xi$. In pion case, the relation that allows to substitute $H(x, \xi)$ by $H(x, x)$ in the integral for Compton amplitude (“GPD sum rule”) was established [32, 33] using double distribution representation for GPDs. For the nucleon case, the derivation was done [34] assuming “ $H_{DD} + D$, $E_{DD} - D$ ” decomposition. As argued in our paper [30] and outlined above, the actual decomposition in the nucleon case is somewhat more involved. In the present paper, we apply the technique of Ref. [30] to rederive GPD sum rules for the nucleon case. Another goal is to build simple (but realistic) models for border functions of nucleon GPDs and analyze their properties.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sect. II, we give a brief review of GPD sum rules that relate the difference between full GPD $H(x, \xi)$ and border function $H(x, x)$ with D term. In particular, we present the derivation of the GPD sum rule for the simplest case that is similar to that originally given in Refs. [32–34]. In Sect. III, we discuss nucleon GPDs and DDs. Sum rules for nucleon GPDs are considered in Sect. IV. In Sect. V, we consider “secondary” GPD sum rules for the nucleon, that correspond to formally taking $\xi = 0$ limit of original GPD sum rules. Models for the border functions of nucleon GPDs are considered in Sect. VI. In final section, we summarize the results of the paper.

II. PRELIMINARIES: GPD SUM RULES

A. Formulation

The Compton amplitude describing DVCS is given by Compton form factors which have the generic structure

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_H(\xi) &= \int_{-1}^1 \frac{H(x, \xi)}{x - \xi + i\epsilon} dx \\ &= -i\pi H(\xi, \xi) + P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{H(x, \xi)}{x - \xi} dx. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

It is well-known that the imaginary part $\text{Im } \mathcal{C}(\xi)$ is given by the GPD $H(x, \xi)$ on the diagonal $x = \xi$. From dispersion relation considerations, the real part $\text{Re } \mathcal{C}(\xi)$ for ξ outside the $(-1, 1)$ interval should also be expressed, up to a subtraction constant, through an integral over the imaginary part

$$\text{Re } \mathcal{C}_H(\xi) = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{H(x, x)}{x - \xi} dx + \text{const}. \quad (2)$$

This implies that, for physical ξ , the principal value integrals of $H(x, \xi)$ and $H(x, x)$ with $1/(x - \xi)$ differ by a constant:

$$P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{H(x, x) - H(x, \xi)}{x - \xi} dx = \Delta. \quad (3)$$

This expectation was confirmed [32] using the formalism of double distributions.

Namely, assume that $H(x, \xi)$ is a sum of the “DD” part $H_{DD}(x, \xi)$ given by the double distribution (DD) representation

$$H_{DD}(x, \xi) = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{F}(\beta, \alpha) \delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) d\beta d\alpha \quad (4)$$

and the D term part $\text{sgn}(\xi)D(x/\xi)$, with $D(x/\xi)$ vanishing for $x = \pm\xi$ and outside the $|x| > |\xi|$ region. For the DD part, using Eq. (4) one has

$$\begin{aligned} &P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{H_{DD}(x, x) - H_{DD}(x, \xi)}{x - \xi} dx \\ &= P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{dx}{x - \xi} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{F}(\beta, \alpha) d\beta d\alpha \\ &\quad \times \left[\delta(x(1 - \alpha) - \beta) - \delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) \right] \\ &= P \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{F}(\beta, \alpha) d\beta d\alpha \\ &\quad \times \left[\frac{1/(1 - \alpha)}{\beta/(1 - \alpha) - \xi} - \frac{1}{\beta - \xi(1 - \alpha)} \right] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Thus, as noticed in Refs. [32, 34], seemingly different delta-functions have converted $1/(x - \xi)$ into identical expressions. As a result,

$$P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{H_{DD}(x, x)}{x - \xi} dx - P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{H_{DD}(x, \xi)}{x - \xi} dx = 0. \quad (6)$$

The D term gives zero contribution into $H(x, x)$, while its contribution into $H(x, \xi)$ produces the claimed constant

$$\text{sgn}(\xi) P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\theta(|x| < |\xi|) D(x/\xi)}{x - \xi} dx = - \int_{-1}^1 \frac{D(\alpha)}{1 - \alpha} d\alpha . \quad (7)$$

As a result, the constant Δ is related to D term by

$$\Delta \equiv \int_{-1}^1 \frac{D(\alpha)}{1 - \alpha} d\alpha . \quad (8)$$

Thus, the Compton form factor $\mathcal{C}_H(\xi)$ is expressed through a one-dimensional *border function* $H(\xi, \xi) \equiv \mathfrak{h}(\xi)$

$$\mathcal{C}_H(\xi) = -i\pi \mathfrak{h}(\xi) + P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\mathfrak{h}(x)}{x - \xi} dx + \Delta . \quad (9)$$

As discussed in Ref. [30], in the nucleon case GPD H is given by a sum of two terms that have different-type DD representations. The first of them is the same as in Eq.(4), while the other has a more singular structure similar to the pion “one-DD” representation [28]. As a result, the structure of $H(x, \xi)$ GPD is more complicated than it was assumed in the “DD+D” Ansatz. One of the goals of the present paper is to reanalyze the sum rule within the framework of Ref. [30], and study to which extent the original proofs still work.

III. NUCLEON GPDS

A. Definitions of DDs and GPDS

In the nucleon case, for unpolarized target, one can parametrize

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle p' | \bar{\psi}(-z/2) \not{z} \psi(z/2) | p \rangle |_{\text{twist}-2} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} e^{-i\beta(Pz) - i\alpha(rz)/2} \left\{ \bar{u}(p') \not{z} u(p) \mathcal{A}(\beta, \alpha) \right. \\ &+ \left. \frac{\bar{u}(p') u(p)}{2M_N} [2\beta(Pz) + \alpha(rz)] \mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) \right\} d\beta d\alpha + \mathcal{O}(z^2) . \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Here, the functions \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} are DDs corresponding to the combinations $A = H + E$ and $B = -E$ of usual GPDs H and E (see Ref. [9]). These GPDs may be expressed in terms of relevant DDs as

$$A(x, \xi) = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}(\beta, \alpha) \delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) d\beta d\alpha \quad (11)$$

and

$$B(x, \xi) = x \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) \delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) d\beta d\alpha . \quad (12)$$

Notice that we have two different types of relations between GPDs and DDs: $A(x, \xi)$ is obtained from its DD $\mathcal{A}(\beta, \alpha)$ in a straightforward “classic” way of Eq.(4),

while $B(x, \xi)$ is calculated from $\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha)$ using the formula with extra factor of x involved (like in the “one-DD” representation for the pion GPD, see Refs. [28, 30]). The difference is due to the factor $[2\beta(Pz) + \alpha(rz)]$ in the \mathcal{B} part.

B. Structure of DD representation

In the forward limit, we have

$$A(x, 0) = H(x, 0) + E(x, 0) = f(x) + e(x) \quad (13)$$

and

$$B(x, 0) = -E(x, 0) = -e(x) . \quad (14)$$

The first formula suggests the splitting

$$\mathcal{A}(\beta, \alpha) = \mathcal{F}(\beta, \alpha) + \mathcal{E}_A(\beta, \alpha) , \quad (15)$$

with $\mathcal{F}(\beta, \alpha)$ and $\mathcal{E}_A(\beta, \alpha)$ producing “DD parts”

$$F_{DD}(x, \xi) = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{F}(\beta, \alpha) \delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) d\beta d\alpha \quad (16)$$

and

$$E_{DD}(x, \xi) = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}_A(\beta, \alpha) \delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) d\beta d\alpha \quad (17)$$

of GPDs $H(x, \xi)$ and $E(x, \xi)$. The forward limit of $B(x, \xi)/x$, i.e., $-E(x, 0)/x$ is obtained by integrating $\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha)$ over α . This observation suggests the representation

$$\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) = -\frac{\mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)}{\beta} . \quad (18)$$

Since both $\mathcal{E}_A(\beta, \alpha)$ and $\mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)$ produce $e(x)$ in the forward limit, we have

$$\int_{-1}^1 [\mathcal{E}_A(\beta, \alpha) - \mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)] d\alpha = 0 . \quad (19)$$

In our paper [30], the model $\mathcal{E}_A(\beta, \alpha) = \mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)$ was used. It should be emphasized, however, that this is just a model assumption. In particular, the same parton distribution in the forward limit may be produced by DDs with different α profiles.

The fact that, after integration over α , the DD $\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha)$ gives $-e(x)/x$ while $\mathcal{A}(\beta, \alpha)$ produces the combination $f(x) + e(x)$ that does not involve $1/x$ factor, is an evidence that $\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha)$ is more singular for small β than $\mathcal{A}(\beta, \alpha)$. Because of possible singularity of $\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha)$ for $\beta = 0$, we write it in the “DD₊ + D” representation:

$$\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) = \mathcal{B}_+(\beta, \alpha) + \delta(\beta) \frac{D(\alpha)}{\alpha} , \quad (20)$$

where $D(\alpha)$ is the D-term, and

$$[\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha)]_+ = \mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) - \delta(\beta) \int_{-1+|\alpha|}^{1-|\alpha|} \mathcal{B}(\gamma, \alpha) d\gamma \quad (21)$$

is the “plus” part of $\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha)$ that gives zero after integration over β .

C. D term

In principle, the function $D(\alpha)/\alpha$ may have an unintegrable singularity for $\alpha = 0$. Then it makes sense to split the D term contribution into the “plus part” and $\delta(\alpha)$ contribution. This will correspond to representation

$$\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) = [\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha)]_+ + \delta(\beta) \left(\frac{D(\alpha)}{\alpha} \right)_+ + \delta(\beta)\delta(\alpha)\mathcal{D}, \quad (22)$$

with \mathcal{D} corresponding to the \mathcal{B} part of the matrix element of the local operator $\bar{\psi}(0)\gamma_\mu\psi(0)$.

In fact, the first analysis of the D term in the literature [22] uses the chiral soliton model expression for the pion DD, which in the present notations may be written as

$$\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) = \delta(\alpha) \frac{1}{|\beta|} - \delta(\beta) \frac{1}{|\alpha|}, \quad (23)$$

where both the forward distribution $f(\beta) = 1/|\beta|$ and the D term part $D(\alpha)/\alpha = 1/|\alpha|$ are singular. Note that we can rewrite this expression as

$$\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) = \delta(\alpha) \left(\frac{1}{|\beta|} \right)_+ - \delta(\beta) \left(\frac{1}{|\alpha|} \right)_+, \quad (24)$$

that has the structure of Eq. (22) with the constant \mathcal{D} equal to zero.

In what follows, we will assume that $D(\alpha)/\alpha$ is regular for $\alpha = 0$, so we will use the shorter representation (20). In accordance with it, we split GPD B into the part coming from the “plus” part of DD

$$\frac{B_+(x, \xi)}{x} \equiv \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) \left[\delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) - \delta(x - \xi\alpha) \right] d\beta d\alpha \quad (25)$$

and that generated by the D-term

$$\frac{B_D(x, \xi)}{x} \equiv \int_{-1}^1 \frac{D(\alpha)}{\alpha} \delta(x - \xi\alpha) d\alpha. \quad (26)$$

The latter integral gives an explicit expression

$$B_D(x, \xi) = \text{sign}(\xi) \theta(|x| < |\xi|) D(x/\xi), \quad (27)$$

but sometimes it is instructive to use the integral representation as well. In the $\xi = 0$ limit, we obtain an important relation

$$\frac{B_D(x, 0)}{x} = \delta(x) \int_{-1}^1 \frac{D(\alpha)}{\alpha} d\alpha. \quad (28)$$

In other words, though the forward limit of $B(x, \xi)$ is $B(x, 0) = -e(x)$, the forward limit of $B(x, \xi)/x$ is

$$\frac{B(x, 0)}{x} = - \left(\frac{e(x)}{x} \right)_+ + \delta(x) \int_{-1}^1 \frac{D(\alpha)}{\alpha} d\alpha. \quad (29)$$

A similar result holds for the border function:

$$\frac{B(x, x)}{x} = - \left(\frac{E(x, x)}{x} \right)_+ + \delta(x) \int_{-1}^1 \frac{D(\alpha)}{\alpha(1-\alpha)} d\alpha. \quad (30)$$

IV. SUM RULES FOR NUCLEON GPDS

A. Sum rule for $A(x, \xi)$

Since $A(x, \xi)$ is given by the simplest DD representation

$$A(x, \xi) = \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{A}(\beta, \alpha) \delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) d\beta d\alpha \quad (31)$$

of Eq. (4) type, the sum rule

$$P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{A(x, x) - A(x, \xi)}{x - \xi} dx = 0 \quad (32)$$

is derived just as it was done for $F_{DD}(x, \xi)$ above (see Eqs. (5)–(6)).

B. Sum rule for $B(x, \xi)$

1. Naive construction

Let us now apply the same construction for the contribution to the sum rule (1) coming from GPD $B(x, \xi)$. Using Eq. (12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{B(x, x)}{x - \xi} dx \\ &= P \int_{-1}^1 x \frac{dx}{x - \xi} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) \delta(x(1 - \alpha) - \beta) d\beta d\alpha \quad (33) \\ &= P \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) \frac{\beta/(1 - \alpha)}{\beta - \xi(1 - \alpha)} d\beta d\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{B(x, \xi)}{x - \xi} dx \quad (34) \\ &= P \int_{-1}^1 x \frac{dx}{x - \xi} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) \delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) d\beta d\alpha \\ &= P \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) \frac{\beta + \xi\alpha}{\beta - \xi(1 - \alpha)} d\beta d\alpha \\ &= P \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) \left[\frac{\beta/(1 - \alpha)}{\beta - \xi(1 - \alpha)} - \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \right] d\beta d\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{B(x, x) - B(x, \xi)}{x - \xi} dx = \int_{\Omega} \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) d\beta d\alpha. \quad (35)$$

Defining formally

$$\int_{-1+|\alpha|}^{1-|\alpha|} \mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) d\beta = \frac{D(\alpha)}{\alpha} \quad (36)$$

one obtains

$$P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{B(x, x) - B(x, \xi)}{x - \xi} dx = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{D(\alpha)}{1 - \alpha} d\alpha . \quad (37)$$

However, if the forward distribution $e(x)$ is singular for small x , e.g., has a Regge behavior $e(x) \sim x^{-a}$ with $a > 0$, we expect that $\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha)$ has a non-integrable singularity $\sim \beta^{-1-a}$ for $\beta \rightarrow 0$ (the function $\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha)$ is even in β for the C -even “quark + antiquark” combination encountered in DVCS).

To avoid explicit infinities, we will apply the “DD₊+D” separation to the generic relation (1). The derivation of the sum rule then proceeds in the following way.

2. “Plus” part

Using Eq. (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{B_+(x, x)}{x - \xi} dx &= P \int_{-1}^1 x \frac{dx}{x - \xi} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) \\ &\times \left[\delta(x(1 - \alpha) - \beta) - \delta(x(1 - \alpha)) \right] d\beta d\alpha \\ &= P \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) \left[\frac{\beta/(1 - \alpha)}{\beta - \xi(1 - \alpha)} - 0 \right] d\beta d\alpha , \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{B_+(x, \xi)}{x - \xi} dx &= P \int_{-1}^1 x \frac{dx}{x - \xi} \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) \\ &\times \left[\delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) - \delta(x - \xi\alpha) \right] d\beta d\alpha \\ &= P \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) \left[\frac{\beta + \xi\alpha}{\beta - \xi(1 - \alpha)} + \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \right] d\beta d\alpha \\ &= P \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) \frac{\beta/(1 - \alpha)}{\beta - \xi(1 - \alpha)} d\beta d\alpha . \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Similarly to the case of GPD A , apparently different delta-functions have converted $1/(x - \xi)$ into identical expressions. As a result,

$$P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{B_+(x, x)}{x - \xi} dx - P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{B_+(x, \xi)}{x - \xi} dx = 0 . \quad (40)$$

Again, we deal with the situation when the difference of two integrals vanishes, but each integral does not necessarily vanish.

3. “D” part

For the integral involving the border function, we have

$$P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{B_D(x, x)}{x - \xi} dx = 0 , \quad (41)$$

because the integrand in (41) vanishes for $x \neq 0$ since then $B_D(x, x) = 0$, while for $x = 0$ it is given by the $x\delta(x)$ distribution that produces zero after integration with a function that is finite for $x = 0$, which is the case if $\xi \neq 0$. The second piece is given by

$$\begin{aligned} P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{B_D(x, \xi)}{x - \xi} dx &= \text{sgn}(\xi) P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\theta(|x| < |\xi|) D(x/\xi)}{x - \xi} dx \\ &= - \int_{-1}^1 \frac{D(\alpha)}{1 - \alpha} d\alpha . \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

For the difference of the two integrals we obtain

$$P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{B_D(x, x)}{x - \xi} dx - P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{B_D(x, \xi)}{x - \xi} dx = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{D(\alpha)}{1 - \alpha} d\alpha . \quad (43)$$

Combining the results for the “plus” and D -parts gives

$$P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{B(x, x) - B(x, \xi)}{x - \xi} dx = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{D(\alpha)}{1 - \alpha} d\alpha , \quad (44)$$

formally the same result as the naive construction.

Still, the importance of the “DD₊+D” separation should not be underestimated. It emphasizes the fact that the D term cannot be defined simply as the result of integration of $\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha)$ over β . The integral over β diverges, and the role of the D term in this case is to substitute the divergent integral by a finite function $D(\alpha)/\alpha$. In this sense, the “DD₊+D” separation serves as a renormalization prescription, and demonstrates the subtraction nature of the D term, in particular, its role as a separate independent entity that, in general, cannot be reconstructed from the behavior of the DD $\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha)$ in the $\beta \neq 0$ region.

C. Sum rules for $H(x, \xi)$ and $E(x, \xi)$

Since $B(x, \xi) = -E(x, \xi)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{E(x, \xi)}{x - \xi} dx \\ = P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{E(x, x)}{x - \xi} dx - \int_{-1}^1 \frac{D(\alpha)}{1 - \alpha} d\alpha . \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Similarly, using $H(x, \xi) = A(x, \xi) + B(x, \xi)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{H(x, \xi)}{x - \xi} dx \\ = P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{H(x, x)}{x - \xi} dx + \int_{-1}^1 \frac{D(\alpha)}{1 - \alpha} d\alpha . \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

V. SECONDARY GPD SUM RULE

A. Compton form factors and border function

The derivation above confirms the result that the Compton form factor $\mathcal{C}_H(\xi)$ is expressed through a one-

dimensional *border function* $H(\xi, \xi) \equiv \mathfrak{h}(\xi)$

$$\mathcal{C}_H(\xi) = -i\pi\mathfrak{h}(\xi) + P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\mathfrak{h}(x)}{x - \xi} dx + \Delta. \quad (47)$$

The integral over x here has opposite infinitely large canceling contributions from $x \sim \xi$ region where $\mathfrak{h}(x) \sim \mathfrak{h}(\xi)$. One can exclude them by writing

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_H(\xi) = & -i\pi\mathfrak{h}(\xi) + P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\mathfrak{h}(\xi)}{x - \xi} dx \\ & + P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\mathfrak{h}(x) - \mathfrak{h}(\xi)}{x - \xi} dx + \Delta. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

The first integral here can be taken explicitly, and the second one is regular for $x = \xi$ needing thus no P prescription. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_H(\xi) = & \mathfrak{h}(\xi) [\ln(1 - x_{\text{Bj}}) - i\pi] \\ & + \int_{-1}^1 \frac{\mathfrak{h}(x) - \mathfrak{h}(\xi)}{x - \xi} dx + \Delta, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where $x_{\text{Bj}} = 2\xi/(1 + \xi)$ is the Bjorken variable.

B. Proposing secondary sum rule

In this formulation, the description of DVCS becomes similar to that of DIS, with the change of usual parton distributions $f(x)$ by border functions $\mathfrak{h}(x)$. So, what can we say about the difference between these two functions?

When the D term $D(x/\xi)$ vanishes at the border point $x = \xi$ (which is the usual assumption), it is not visible in the border function $\mathfrak{h}(x)$. It is also not visible in the forward distribution $f(x)$, i.e., these two functions are apparently determined by the DD part of GPD $H(x, \xi)$ only. Now, if one takes formally the $\xi \rightarrow 0$ limit of the sum rule (6) for the DD part, one arrives at the sum rule

$$\int_{-1}^1 \frac{H_{DD}(x, x) - H_{DD}(x, 0)}{x} dx \stackrel{?}{=} 0 \quad (50)$$

or

$$\int_{-1}^1 \frac{\mathfrak{h}(x) - f(x)}{x} dx \stackrel{?}{=} 0 \quad (51)$$

relating the “minus first moments” of these two functions.

Note that for the C -even amplitudes studied in DVCS and DIS, both $f(x)/x$ and $\mathfrak{h}(x)/x$ are even functions of x . Hence, one may rewrite Eq. (51) as

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\mathfrak{h}(x) - f(x)}{x} dx \stackrel{?}{=} 0. \quad (52)$$

It is straightforward to see that this relation cannot be true as a general statement. E.g., take a constant DD,

$$\mathcal{F}^{\text{const DD}}(\beta, \alpha) = \frac{1}{2} \text{sgn}(\beta) \theta(|\beta| + |\alpha| \leq 1).$$

Then

$$f(x)^{\text{const DD}} = \text{sgn}(x)(1 - |x|),$$

while

$$\mathfrak{h}^{\text{const DD}}(x) = \frac{\text{sgn}(x)}{1 + |x|}.$$

Thus, $f(x)^{\text{const DD}} < \mathfrak{h}^{\text{const DD}}(x)$ for $x > 0$. In general, $\mathfrak{h}(x) > f(x)$ for positive x if one uses the usual modeling of GPDs based on factorized DD Ansatz with positively definite, monotonically decreasing $f(x)$. Thus, in all these cases, the sum rule (52) does not hold. Moreover, if the difference $\mathfrak{h}(x) - f(x)$ does not vanish in the $x \rightarrow 0$ limit, then the integral in (52) simply diverges. Since none of the functions $\mathfrak{h}(x)$, $f(x)$ is expected to vanish for $x = 0$, the integrals for $\mathfrak{h}(x)/x$ and $f(x)/x$ separately diverge. Obviously, singularities of even functions $\mathfrak{h}(x)/x$ and $f(x)/x$ for $x = 0$ cannot be regularized by the principle value prescription.

Furthermore, if one takes formally $\xi = 0$ in the basic sum rule (46) one gets

$$P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{H(x, x) - H(x, 0)}{x} dx \stackrel{?}{=} \Delta. \quad (53)$$

Again, the integrand involves an even function of x with a non-integrable singularity for $x = 0$.

1. Secondary sum rule for GPD $B(x, \xi)$

A puzzling feature of Eq. (53) is the presence of the D-term-dependent constant Δ for a sum rule involving functions $H(x, x)$ and $H(x, 0)$ that apparently are insensitive to the D term contribution. However, as we have seen in Sec. III C, the “DD₊+D” separation gives a $\delta(x)$ contribution for $B(x, x)/x$ and $B(x, 0)/x$ with coefficients proportional to integrals of the D term. Through $H = A + B$ these contributions appear in expressions for GPD H as well. In particular, one can easily see from Eq. (28) that

$$\int_{-1}^1 \frac{B(x, \xi)}{x} dx = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{D(\alpha)}{\alpha} d\alpha \quad (54)$$

for any ξ , including $\xi = 0$. In the $\xi=0$ limit this gives

$$\int_{-1}^1 \frac{B(x, 0)}{x} dx = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{D(\alpha)}{\alpha} d\alpha. \quad (55)$$

For the integral involving the border function, using Eq. (30) we get

$$\int_{-1}^1 \frac{B(x, x)}{x} dx = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{D(\alpha)}{\alpha(1 - \alpha)} d\alpha. \quad (56)$$

Thus,

$$\int_{-1}^1 \frac{B(x, x) - B(x, 0)}{x} dx = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{D(\alpha)}{1 - \alpha} d\alpha \equiv \Delta. \quad (57)$$

The nonzero result on the right hand side comes from the $\delta(x)$ terms in the expressions (28),(30) for $B(x, x)/x$ and $B(x, 0)/x$. The remaining terms $[B(x, x)/x]_+$ and $[B(x, 0)/x]_+$ have “plus”-structure and each automatically produces zero contribution into the sum rule. In other words, the actual difference between the border function $B(x, x)$ and the forward distribution $B(x, 0)$ in the region $x \neq 0$ has no reflection in the sum rule (57).

2. Secondary sum rule for GPD $A(x, \xi)$

Similarly, taking formally the $\xi \rightarrow 0$ limit of the sum rule

$$P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{A(x, x) - A(x, \xi)}{x - \xi} dx = 0 \quad (58)$$

for GPD $A(x, \xi)$, one deals with the difference of two divergent integrals

$$P \int_{-1}^1 \frac{A(x, x) - A(x, 0)}{x} dx \stackrel{?}{=} 0, \quad (59)$$

which cannot be regularized by the principal value prescription. Since there is no D term for $A(x, \xi)$, the idea of “DD₊+D” separation only suggests to treat $A(x, x)/x$ and $A(x, 0)/x$ as “plus” distributions, in which case each term in (59) gives an automatic zero. Again, the resulting “sum rule” contains no information about the difference between $A(x, x)$ and $A(x, 0)$.

Summarizing, the $\xi \rightarrow 0$ limit of the dispersion sum rule (1) produces divergent integrals, which may be regularized by using “DD₊+D” separation, but the resulting sum rule contains no information about the difference between border function and forward distribution.

However, one may try to study this difference incorporating various models for GPDs, in particular, the *factorized DD Ansatz*.

VI. MODELING BORDER FUNCTIONS

A. Border function $A(x, x)$

1. Factorized DD Ansatz

In the forward limit $\xi = 0$, GPD $A(x, \xi)$ converts into the forward distribution $f(x) + e(x) \equiv a(x)$, i.e.,

$$a(x) = \int_{-1+|x|}^{1-|x|} \mathcal{A}(x, \alpha) d\alpha. \quad (60)$$

Thus, the forward distribution $a(x)$ is obtained by integrating over vertical lines $\beta = x$ in the (β, α) plane. For nonzero ξ , GPDs are obtained from DDs through integrating them along the lines $\beta = x - \xi\alpha$ having $1/\xi$

slope. The reduction formula (60) suggests the *factorized DD Ansatz*

$$\mathcal{A}(\beta, \alpha) = h_A(\beta, \alpha) a(\beta), \quad (61)$$

where $a(\beta)$ is the forward distribution, while $h_A(\beta, \alpha)$ determines DD profile in the α direction and satisfies the normalization condition

$$\int_{-1+|\beta|}^{1-|\beta|} h_A(\beta, \alpha) d\alpha = 1. \quad (62)$$

The usual choice for the profile function is

$$h^{(N)}(\beta, \alpha) = \frac{\Gamma(2N+2)}{2^{2N+1}\Gamma^2(N+1)} \frac{[(1-|\beta|)^2 - \alpha^2]^N}{(1-|\beta|)^{2N+1}}. \quad (63)$$

The width of the profile is governed by the parameter N .

The border function corresponding to such an Ansatz for positive x is given by

$$\begin{aligned} A^{(N)}(x, x) &= \frac{(1-x)^N}{(1+x)^{N+1}} \frac{\Gamma(2N+2)}{\Gamma^2(N+1)} \\ &\times \int_0^1 \gamma^N (1-\gamma)^N \varphi^{(N)}(x_0\gamma) d\gamma, \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

where $x_0 = 2x/(1+x)$ and

$$\varphi^{(N)}(\beta) = \frac{a(\beta)}{(1-\beta)^{2N+1}}. \quad (65)$$

2. Border function $H_A(x, x)$

Since $A = H + E$, with the forward limits $f(x)$ and $e(x)$ of the functions $H(x, \xi)$ and $E(x, \xi)$ having, in general, different x -dependence, it makes sense to use different factorized Ansätze for these two parts. It is usually assumed that $f(x)$ and $e(x)$ have the same x^{-a} Regge behavior for small x , but differ in the $x \rightarrow 1$ region, with $f(x)$ having $\sim (1-x)^3$ behavior and $e(x)$ being closer to $\sim (1-x)^5$.

As an example, let us take the forward function $f(\beta) = \beta^{-a}(1-\beta)^3$ with β^{-a} Regge behavior for small β and the usual $(1-\beta)^3$ behavior for $\beta \rightarrow 1$. Choosing $N = 1$ profile, we have

$$H_A^{(1)}(x, x) = \frac{1-x}{(1+x)^2} \frac{x_0^{-a}}{(1-a/2)(1-a/3)}. \quad (66)$$

Changing to $N = 2$ profile produces

$$\begin{aligned} H_A^{(2)}(x, x) &= \frac{1-x}{(1+x)^2} \frac{x_0^{-a}}{(1-a/3)(1-a/4)(1-a/5)} \\ &\times [5-a - (4-a-(2-a)x_0)_2 F_1(1, 3-a, 6-a, x_0)]. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

Note that imaginary part of the Compton amplitude is given by border function for $x = \xi = x_{Bj}/(2-x_{Bj})$. In

this case, $x_0 \rightarrow x_{\text{Bj}}$ and $(1-x)/(1+x) \rightarrow 1-x_{\text{Bj}}$. In these variables,

$$H_A^{(N)}(\xi, \xi) = \left(1 - \frac{x_{\text{Bj}}}{2}\right) (1-x_{\text{Bj}})^N \frac{\Gamma(2N+2)}{\Gamma^2(N+1)} \times \int_0^1 \gamma^N (1-\gamma)^N \varphi^{(N)}(x_{\text{Bj}}\gamma) d\gamma. \quad (68)$$

For small x_{Bj} , we have

$$H_A^{(1)}(\xi, \xi) = \frac{x_{\text{Bj}}^{-a}}{(1-a/2)(1-a/3)} + \dots \quad (69)$$

and

$$H_A^{(2)}(\xi, \xi) = \frac{x_{\text{Bj}}^{-a}}{(1-a/3)(1-a/4)(1-a/5)} + \dots, \quad (70)$$

i.e., the same (up to overall factor) Regge behavior x_{Bj}^{-a} as in case of forward distribution. For $a = 1/2$, the *GPD enhancement factor* (see, e.g., Ref. [14])

$$R \equiv \frac{H_A(\xi, \xi)}{f(x_{\text{Bj}})} \Big|_{x_{\text{Bj}} \rightarrow 0} \quad (71)$$

equals $8/5=1.6$ in case of $N = 1$ profile, and $32/21 \approx 1.5$ for $N = 2$. Taking the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit, we obtain an infinitely narrow profile, and $H_A(\xi, \xi)$ coincides with $f(\xi)$. Then $R \rightarrow (\xi/x_{\text{Bj}})^{-a} \rightarrow 2^a$, which is ≈ 1.4 for $a = 0.5$. Thus, R does not change significantly when the profile broadens from the infinitely narrow one to that corresponding to $N = 1$.

For a flat $N = 0$ profile, we have

$$H_A^{(0)}(x, x) = \frac{x_0^{-a}}{1+x} \left[\frac{1}{1-a} - \frac{x_0}{1-a/2} + \frac{x_0^2}{3-a} \right] \quad (72)$$

and $R = 1/(1-a)$, i.e., $R = 2$ for $a = 1/2$.

3. Border function $E_A(x, x)$

For modeling $E_A(x, \xi)$, we will take $e(x) = x^{-a}(1-x)^5$ as the forward limit. In this case, the simplest analytic expression is obtained for $N = 2$ profile, which gives

$$E_A^{(2)}(x, x) = \frac{(1-x)^2}{(1+x)^3} \frac{x_0^{-a}}{(1-a/3)(1-a/4)(1-a/5)} \quad (73)$$

or

$$E_A^{(2)}(\xi, \xi) = \frac{x_{\text{Bj}}^{-a}(1-x_{\text{Bj}})^2(1-x_{\text{Bj}}/2)}{(1-a/3)(1-a/4)(1-a/5)}. \quad (74)$$

For $N = 1$ profile, the result is also rather simple:

$$E_A^{(1)}(x, x) = \frac{1-x}{(1+x)^2} x_0^{-a} \left[\frac{1}{(1-a/2)(1-a/3)} - \frac{x_0}{(1-a/3)(1-a/4)} + \frac{6x_0^2}{(4-a)(5-a)} \right]. \quad (75)$$

B. Border function $B(x, x)$

It should be emphasized that the model $A(x, \xi) = H_A(x, \xi) + E_A(x, \xi)$ is just a model for the sum $H(x, \xi) + E(x, \xi)$, with $H(x, \xi)$ and $E(x, \xi)$ not necessarily coinciding with $H_A(x, \xi)$ and $E_A(x, \xi)$. This situation is similar to the “DD plus D” scenario, where one has $H(x, \xi) = H_{DD}(x, \xi) + D$ term and $E(x, \xi) = E_{DD}(x, \xi) - D$ term, so that $H_{DD}(x, \xi) + E_{DD}(x, \xi)$ gives a model for $H(x, \xi) + E(x, \xi)$ while $H(x, \xi) \neq H_{DD}(x, \xi)$ and $E(x, \xi) \neq E_{DD}(x, \xi)$. As shown in Ref. [30], the difference between $H(x, \xi)$ and $H_A(x, \xi)$ (and between $E(x, \xi)$ and $E_A(x, \xi)$) in our construction is even more serious: it does not reduce to the D term only and contains a term that changes the border function.

The strategy described in our paper [30] is to build a model for $B(x, \xi) = -E(x, \xi)$, using the DD representation (12) and then get a model for $H(x, \xi) = A(x, \xi) + B(x, \xi)$.

1. Structure of $B(x, \xi)$

Taking the forward limit $\xi = 0$ in Eq. (12) that defines $B(x, \xi)$, we get

$$b(x) = -e(x) = x \int_{-1+|x|}^{1-|x|} \mathcal{B}(x, \alpha) d\alpha. \quad (76)$$

This reduction formula suggests the Ansatz

$$\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) = -h_B(\beta, \alpha) \frac{e(\beta)}{\beta}, \quad (77)$$

that reconstructs DD $\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha)$ from the forward function $e(\beta)/\beta$ that has an extra factor $1/\beta$ singular in the $\beta \rightarrow 0$ limit. In general, we can define

$$\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) = -\frac{\mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)}{\beta}, \quad (78)$$

with DD $\mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)$ having the same projection

$$e(\beta) = \int_{-1+|\beta|}^{1-|\beta|} \mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha) d\alpha, \quad (79)$$

on the β axis as $\mathcal{E}_A(\beta, \alpha)$. Because of possible singularity of $\mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)/\beta$ at $\beta = 0$, we write it in the “DD₊ + D” representation:

$$\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha) = -\left(\frac{\mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)}{\beta}\right)_+ + \delta(\beta) \frac{D(\alpha)}{\alpha}, \quad (80)$$

where $D(\alpha)$ is the D-term. As a result, we have

$$\begin{aligned} B(x, \xi) &= -x \int_{\Omega} \left[\left(\frac{\mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)}{\beta}\right)_+ - \delta(\beta) \frac{D(\alpha)}{\alpha} \right] \\ &\quad \times \delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) d\beta d\alpha \\ &= -E_{B+}(x, \xi) + \text{sgn}(\xi) D(x/\xi), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{E_{B+}(x, \xi)}{x} &= \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)}{\beta} \right)_+ \delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) d\beta d\alpha \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{\mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)}{\beta} \left[\delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) - \delta(x - \xi\alpha) \right] d\beta d\alpha . \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

Since $E_{B+}(x, \xi)/x$ is built from the “plus” part of a DD it should satisfy

$$\int_{-1}^1 E_{B+}(x, \xi) dx = \int_{\Omega} \left[\frac{\mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)}{\beta} \right]_+ d\beta d\alpha = 0 . \quad (82)$$

Being (for C -even combination) an even function of x , the function $E_{B+}(x, \xi)/x$ obeys

$$\int_0^1 \frac{E_{B+}(x, \xi)}{x} dx = 0 . \quad (83)$$

Using the relation $x = \beta + \xi\alpha$, we may extract from $E_{B+}(x, \xi)$ the component $E_B(x, \xi)$ that is obtained from DD $\mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)$ not divided by β . Namely, the function $E_{B+}(x, \xi)$ may be displayed as

$$\begin{aligned} E_{B+}(x, \xi) &= x \int_{\Omega} \frac{\mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)}{\beta} [\delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) - \delta(x - \xi\alpha)] d\beta d\alpha \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha) \delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) d\beta d\alpha \\ &+ \xi \int_{\Omega} \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha) [\delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) - \delta(x - \xi\alpha)] d\beta d\alpha \\ &\equiv E_B(x, \xi) + \xi E_{B+}^1(x, \xi) , \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

where

$$E_B(x, \xi) \equiv \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha) \delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) d\beta d\alpha \quad (85)$$

is constructed from $\mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)$ in the same way as $E_A(x, \xi)$ is obtained from $\mathcal{E}_A(\beta, \alpha)$, and

$$E_{B+}^1(x, \xi) \equiv \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta} \mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha) \right)_+ \delta(x - \beta - \xi\alpha) d\beta d\alpha \quad (86)$$

is the extra term. Since $E_{B+}^1(x, \xi)$ is built from the “plus” part of a DD, its x -integral from -1 to 1 is equal to zero, but in fact it vanishes also for a simpler reason that $E_{B+}^1(x, \xi)$ is an odd function of x . So, in this case, we cannot make any conclusions about the magnitude of the x -integral of $E_{B+}^1(x, \xi)$ from 0 to 1 .

Thus, we can represent GPD B as

$$B(x, \xi) = -E_B(x, \xi) - \xi E_{B+}^1(x, \xi) + \text{sgn}(\xi) D(x/\xi) , \quad (87)$$

and GPD H as

$$\begin{aligned} H(x, \xi) &= H_A(x, \xi) + E_A(x, \xi) - E_B(x, \xi) \\ &- \xi E_{B+}^1(x, \xi) + \text{sgn}(\xi) D(x/\xi) . \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

This formula is quite general. In particular, it does not involve factorized DD Ansatz assumptions.

The simplest model assumption is $\mathcal{E}_A(\beta, \alpha) = \mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)$. It was used in our paper [30]. However, if one chooses different profile functions $h_i(\beta, \alpha)$ when representing $\mathcal{E}_i(\beta, \alpha) = h_i(\beta, \alpha)e(\beta)$ (with $i = A, B$) one would get, in general, different results for $E_A(x, \xi)$ and $E_B(x, \xi)$. The modeling of $\mathcal{E}_i(\beta, \alpha)$ is performed in the same way as for $H_A(x, \xi)$. The new element is modeling of $E_{B+}^1(x, \xi)$. However, in practice it is simpler to build a model for the whole function $E_{B+}(x, \xi)$, and build GPD H using

$$\begin{aligned} H(x, \xi) &= H_A(x, \xi) + E_A(x, \xi) - E_{B+}(x, \xi) \\ &+ \text{sgn}(\xi) D(x/\xi) . \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

2. Border function $E_{B+}(x, x)$

We can get a factorized DD model for the border function $E_{B+}(x, x)$ by “recycling” our results for $E_A(x, x)$: we should just change $a \rightarrow a + 1$ and add the x factor in the examples considered above. In particular, with $N = 2$ profile, we get

$$E_{B+}^{(2)}(x, x) = \frac{5}{4} \left(\frac{1-x}{1+x} \right)^2 \frac{x_0^{-a}}{(1-a/2)(1-a/3)(1-a/4)} \quad (90)$$

or

$$E_{B+}^{(2)}(\xi, \xi) = \frac{5}{4} \frac{x_{\text{Bj}}^{-a}(1-x_{\text{Bj}})^2}{(1-a/2)(1-a/3)(1-a/4)} . \quad (91)$$

As expected, $E_{B+}^{(2)}(\xi, \xi)$ is larger than $E_A^{(2)}(\xi, \xi)$:

$$\frac{E_{B+}^{(2)}(\xi, \xi)}{E_A^{(2)}(\xi, \xi)} = \frac{5-a}{(2-a)(2-x_{\text{Bj}})} , \quad (92)$$

and, thus, the difference $E_A(\xi, \xi) - E_{B+}(\xi, \xi)$ is negative (for positive ξ).

For $N = 1$ profile, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_{B+}^{(1)}(x, x) &= \frac{1-x}{1+x} x_0^{-a} \left[\frac{3/2}{(1-a)(1-a/2)} \right. \\ &\left. - \frac{x_0}{(1-a/2)(1-a/3)} + \frac{x_0^2}{4(1-a/3)(1-a/4)} \right] . \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

Again, $E_{B+}^{(1)}(\xi, \xi) > E_A^{(1)}(\xi, \xi)$.

3. Two-DD representation of the \mathcal{B} part

In the definition (10) of the nucleon DDs, the \mathcal{B} DD was accompanied by the $2\beta(Pz) + \alpha(rz)$ factor, which corresponds to “one-DD” representation. In principle, one can also use the “two-DD” representation, in which this contribution is given by expression

$$2(Pz)\mathcal{P}(\beta, \alpha) + (rz)\mathcal{R}(\beta, \alpha) \quad (94)$$

involving two DDs, \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{R} . The two-DD representation is redundant, in the sense that the “gauge transformation”

$$\mathcal{P}(\beta, \alpha) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\beta, \alpha) + \partial\chi(\beta, \alpha)/\partial\alpha, \quad (95)$$

$$\mathcal{R}(\beta, \alpha) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(\beta, \alpha) - \partial\chi(\beta, \alpha)/\partial\beta \quad (96)$$

does not change the total contribution. The one-DD representation corresponds to the gauge in which $\mathcal{P}(\beta, \alpha) = \beta\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha)$ and $\mathcal{R}(\beta, \alpha) = \alpha\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha)$. The D term contribution is contained in the $\mathcal{R}(\beta, \alpha)$ DD,

$$D(\alpha) = \int_{-1+|\alpha|}^{1-|\alpha|} \mathcal{R}(\beta, \alpha) d\beta, \quad (97)$$

and it cannot be changed by a gauge transformation. However, the remaining terms in \mathcal{R} may be totally reshuffled into $\mathcal{P}(\beta, \alpha)$ using the gauge function

$$\chi_D(\beta, \alpha) = -\text{sgn}(\beta) \int_{|\beta|}^{1-|\alpha|} \mathcal{R}(\gamma, \alpha) d\gamma \quad (98)$$

(cf. [23, 35]). As a result, $2(Pz)\mathcal{P}(\beta, \alpha) + (rz)\mathcal{R}(\beta, \alpha)$ converts into the expression

$$2(Pz)\mathcal{P}_D(\beta, \alpha) + (rz)\delta(\beta)D(\alpha) \quad (99)$$

in which the $\mathcal{R}_D(\beta, \alpha)$ DD reduces to the D term. Using these relations, one can find connection between $\mathcal{P}_D(\beta, \alpha)$ and the one-DD function \mathcal{B} . Writing $\mathcal{B}(\beta, \alpha)$ as $-e(\beta)h_B(\beta, \alpha)/\beta$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{P}_D(\beta, \alpha) = -e(\beta)h_B(\beta, \alpha) \quad (100)$$

$$+ \text{sgn}(\beta) \int_{|\beta|}^{1-|\alpha|} \frac{e(\gamma)}{\gamma} \frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha} [\alpha h_B(\gamma, \alpha)] d\gamma.$$

Since the total sum of terms related to (Pz) and (rz) structures is not changed under the gauge transformation, the GPD $P_D(x, \xi)$ obtained in “D-gauge” should coincide with GPD $B_+(x, \xi) = -E_{B+}(x, \xi)$ obtained in the “one-DD” gauge. In this sense, the expression for $\mathcal{P}_D(\beta, \alpha)$ given above corresponds to the decomposition $E_{B+}(x, \xi) = E_B(x, \xi) + \xi E_{B+}^1(x, \xi)$ of Eq. (84).

By writing $\mathcal{P}_D(\beta, \alpha) = -e(\beta)h_D(\beta, \alpha)$ one may introduce the profile function $h_D(\beta, \alpha)$ “generating” DD $\mathcal{P}_D(\beta, \alpha)$ from the forward distribution $e(\beta)$:

$$h_D(\beta, \alpha) = h_B(\beta, \alpha) + h_{\text{add}}(\beta, \alpha). \quad (101)$$

In addition to the profile term $h_B(\beta, \alpha)$ present in $\mathcal{E}_B(\beta, \alpha)$, it also contains the term $h_{\text{add}}(\beta, \alpha)$ produced by the gauge transformation. It satisfies

$$\int_{-1+|\beta|}^{1-|\beta|} h_{\text{add}}(\beta, \alpha) d\alpha = 0, \quad (102)$$

so that the total profile $h_D(\beta, \alpha)$ is still normalized to 1. This term depends both on the shape of the initial profile $h_B(\beta, \alpha)$ and on the form of the forward distribution $e(\beta)$. Being an even function of α , the additional profile function $h_{\text{add}}(\beta, \alpha)$ cannot be positive definite. In fact, the total profile $h_D(\beta, \alpha)$, in general, is also not positive definite, see Fig.1 for illustration referring to $N = 2$ profile and forward function $e(\beta) = (1 - \beta)^5/\sqrt{\beta}$.




FIG. 1. Normalized profile functions $h_B(\beta, \alpha)$ (red online) and $h_D(\beta, \alpha)$ (blue online) described in the text, for positive α and $\beta = 0.2$ (top), $\beta = 0.4$ (bottom).

The representation (99) corresponds to the “DD+D” modeling. Usually, in this approach some positive definite model profiles of Eq. (63) type are used to produce GPDs. Clearly, if one takes one of these profiles, the result for $P_D(x, \xi)$ will be different from that obtained using DD $\mathcal{P}_D(\beta, \alpha)$ of Eq. (100). This is an illustration of the fact that the choices of a profile Ansatz in different gauges should be correlated. In particular, using the same profile $h(\beta, \alpha)$ for $\mathcal{B}_D(\beta, \alpha)$ and $\mathcal{P}_D(\beta, \alpha)/\beta$ would produce different results for GPDs.

4. Model for u -quark border functions

Let us consider a model with “realistic” assumptions. Take the valence part of u -quark distribution in the proton. For the usual parton distribution $f_u(x)$, we will take the model

$$f_u(x) = \frac{5 \cdot 7}{2^4} \frac{(1-x)^3}{\sqrt{x}} \quad (103)$$

normalized by the number of u -quarks in the proton

$$\int_0^1 f_u(x) dx = 2. \quad (104)$$

The forward limit $e_u(x)$ of the u -quark GPD $E_u(x, \xi)$ is normalized

$$\int_0^1 e_u(x) dx = \kappa_u \quad (105)$$

to the u -quark contribution κ_u into the proton anomalous magnetic moment κ_p . It is given by $\kappa_u = 2\kappa_p + \kappa_n$, where κ_n is the anomalous magnetic moment of the neutron. Numerically, $\kappa_u = 1.673$. The model function

$$e_u(x) = \frac{7 \cdot 9 \cdot 11}{2^9} \kappa_u \frac{(1-x)^5}{\sqrt{x}} \quad (106)$$

satisfies the normalization constraint, has the same Regge behavior $1/\sqrt{x}$ for small x as $f_u(x)$, and has $(1-x)^5$ behavior for $x \rightarrow 1$, as suggested by form factor fits [36, 37].

For simplicity we take $N = 1$ profile while building H -GPD and $N = 2$ in case of E -GPD. Then, for the components of the border function

$$\mathfrak{h}_u(x) = \mathfrak{h}_{A,u}^{(1)}(x) + \mathfrak{e}_{A,u}^{(2)}(x) - \mathfrak{e}_{B,u}^{(2)}(x) \quad (107)$$

we have

$$\mathfrak{h}_{A,u}^{(1)}(x) = \frac{7}{2\sqrt{2}} \frac{1-x}{(1+x)^{3/2}\sqrt{x}}, \quad (108)$$

$$\mathfrak{e}_{A,u}^{(2)}(x) = \frac{33\kappa_u}{16\sqrt{2}} \frac{(1-x)^2}{(1+x)^{5/2}\sqrt{x}}, \quad (109)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{e}_{B,u}^{(2)}(x) = \frac{99\kappa_u}{32\sqrt{2}} \frac{(1-x)^2}{(1+x)^{3/2}\sqrt{x}}. \quad (110)$$

The ratio $\mathfrak{e}_{B,u}^{(2)}(x)/\mathfrak{e}_{A,u}^{(2)}(x) = \frac{3}{2}(1+x)$ is between 3/2 and 3 for x changing from 0 to 1, and the \mathfrak{e} -addition to the border function \mathfrak{h} is negative. The resulting reduction of \mathfrak{h} is quite sizable, but the net result for $\mathfrak{h}_u(x)$ is still positive, see Fig.2. One can see that in the middle region of x , the border function $\mathfrak{h}_u(x)$ in this particular model is rather close to the usual parton density $f_u(x)$.




FIG. 2. Model functions for u -quark valence contributions described in the text: usual parton density $f(x)$ (green online), border function $\mathfrak{h}_A(x)$ (blue online) and $\mathfrak{h}(x)$ (red online).

Our goal here is just to illustrate the basic principles of building models for the border functions, so we will not analyze other possibilities, like taking different profile functions for each ingredient of $\mathfrak{h}_u(x)$, building models for d -quark distributions, etc. Another feature that was not considered in this paper is the t -dependence of GPDs, which is very important in phenomenological applications. The usual first step in this direction is to take a t -dependent Regge parameter $a \rightarrow a(t)$, say, a linear Regge trajectory $a(t) = a(0) + \alpha't$. Similarly, for the D term contribution, one should take a t -dependent form factor $\Delta(t)$ (see Ref.[26] for details).

VII. SUMMARY

Summarizing, in this paper we re-derived GPD sum rules for the nucleon GPDs H and E based on their representation in terms of DDs \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} discussed in Ref. [30]. These sum rules, originally proposed in Refs. [32–34] allow to use border functions $\mathfrak{h}(x) = H(x, x)$ and $\mathfrak{e}(x) = E(x, x)$ instead of full GPDs $H(x, \xi)$ and $E(x, \xi)$ in the integrals producing (real part of) Compton form factors. The resulting description of DVCS (in $t = 0$ limit) in terms of functions $\mathfrak{h}(x)$, $\mathfrak{e}(x)$ depending on just one momentum fraction parameter x is closer to that of DIS that involves usual parton densities $f(x)$.

Taking formally $\xi = 0$ limit in GPD sum rules produces integrals involving the difference $\mathfrak{h}(x) - f(x)$ of border function $\mathfrak{h}(x)$ and parton density $f(x)$. However, both terms come in extremely singular combinations $\mathfrak{h}(x)/x$ and $f(x)/x$ that require subtraction prescription for $x = 0$ singularities. Unfortunately, after implementation of the subtraction procedure, the resulting “sum rule” contains no information about the difference between $\mathfrak{h}(x)$ and $f(x)$ for $x \neq 0$.

To study the interrelation between $\mathfrak{h}(x)$ and $f(x)$, we

used models for GPDs based on factorized DD Ansatz. In particular, we considered a model for the valence u -quark border function $\mathfrak{h}_u(x)$, and observed that the function $\mathfrak{h}_{A,u}(x)$ constructed from $f_u(x)$ in a standard way has a strong enhancement over $f_u(x)$. However, a more complicated $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{B}$ DD representation for the nucleon GPDs [30] requires an extra term $\mathfrak{e}_{A,u}(x) - \mathfrak{e}_{B,u}$ that considerably reduces the resulting border function $\mathfrak{h}_u(x)$ making it, in the middle region of x , rather close to the parton density $f_u(x)$. This observation illustrates the importance of taking into account the detailed structure of DD representations for nucleon GPDs.

While our discussion in the present paper refers to the

formal $t = 0$ limit, our results may be easily extended onto t -dependent Compton form factors by taking a t -dependent Regge parameter $a \rightarrow a(t)$ in models for input parton densities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank H. Moutarde and C. Mezrag for discussions and correspondence.

This work is supported by Jefferson Science Associates, LLC under U.S. DOE Contract No. DE-AC05-06OR23177.

-
- [1] D. Mueller, D. Robaschik, B. Geyer, F. M. Dittes, and J. Horejsi, Fortschr. Phys. **42**, 101 (1994), arXiv:hep-ph/9812448.
 - [2] X.-D. Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 610 (1997), arXiv:hep-ph/9603249.
 - [3] A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Lett. **B380**, 417 (1996), arXiv:hep-ph/9604317.
 - [4] J. C. Collins, L. Frankfurt, and M. Strikman, Phys. Rev. **D56**, 2982 (1997), arXiv:hep-ph/9611433.
 - [5] X.-D. Ji, J. Phys. **G24**, 1181 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9807358.
 - [6] A. V. Radyushkin, (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/0101225.
 - [7] K. Goeke, M. V. Polyakov, and M. Vanderhaeghen, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **47**, 401 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0106012.
 - [8] M. Diehl, Phys. Rept. **388**, 41 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0307382.
 - [9] A. V. Belitsky and A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Rept. **418**, 1 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0504030.
 - [10] S. Boffi and B. Pasquini, Riv. Nuovo Cim. **30**, 387 (2007), arXiv:0711.2625 [hep-ph].
 - [11] A. Radyushkin, Phys.Part.Nucl. **44**, 469 (2013).
 - [12] A. D. Martin and M. G. Ryskin, Phys. Rev. **D57**, 6692 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9711371.
 - [13] B. Pire, J. Soffer, and O. Teryaev, Eur. Phys. J. **C8**, 103 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9804284.
 - [14] A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 014030 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9805342.
 - [15] A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Lett. **B385**, 333 (1996), arXiv:hep-ph/9605431.
 - [16] M. V. Polyakov and A. G. Shuvaev, (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0207153.
 - [17] M. V. Polyakov, (2007), arXiv:0711.1820 [hep-ph].
 - [18] M. V. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. **B659**, 542 (2008), arXiv:0707.2509 [hep-ph].
 - [19] K. M. Semenov-Tian-Shansky, Eur. Phys. J. **A36**, 303 (2008), arXiv:0803.2218 [hep-ph].
 - [20] M. V. Polyakov and K. M. Semenov-Tian-Shansky, Eur. Phys. J. **A40**, 181 (2009), arXiv:0811.2901 [hep-ph].
 - [21] A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Rev. **D56**, 5524 (1997), arXiv:hep-ph/9704207.
 - [22] M. V. Polyakov and C. Weiss, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 114017 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9902451.
 - [23] O. V. Teryaev, Phys. Lett. **B510**, 125 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0102303.
 - [24] A. V. Belitsky, D. Mueller, A. Kirchner, and A. Schafer, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 116002 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0011314.
 - [25] B. Tiburzi, W. Detmold, and G. Miller, Phys.Rev. **D70**, 093008 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0408365 [hep-ph].
 - [26] C. Mezrag, H. Moutarde, and F. Sabatié, (2013), arXiv:1304.7645 [hep-ph].
 - [27] A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Lett. **B449**, 81 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9810466.
 - [28] A. Radyushkin, Phys.Rev. **D83**, 076006 (2011), arXiv:1101.2165 [hep-ph].
 - [29] A. V. Radyushkin, Int.J.Mod.Phys.Conf.Ser. **20**, 251 (2012).
 - [30] A. Radyushkin, Phys.Rev. **D87**, 096017 (2013), arXiv:1304.2682 [hep-ph].
 - [31] X.-D. Ji, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 7114 (1997), arXiv:hep-ph/9609381.
 - [32] O. V. Teryaev, (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0510031.
 - [33] I. V. Anikin and O. V. Teryaev, Phys. Rev. **D76**, 056007 (2007), arXiv:0704.2185 [hep-ph].
 - [34] M. Diehl and D. Y. Ivanov, Eur. Phys. J. **C52**, 919 (2007), arXiv:0707.0351 [hep-ph].
 - [35] B. C. Tiburzi, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 057504 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0405211.
 - [36] M. Diehl, T. Feldmann, R. Jakob, and P. Kroll, Eur.Phys.J. **C39**, 1 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0408173 [hep-ph].
 - [37] M. Guidal, M. Polyakov, A. Radyushkin, and M. Vanderhaeghen, Phys.Rev. **D72**, 054013 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0410251 [hep-ph].