

NT@UW-22-03

Color Transparency and Light Front Holographic QCD

Gerald A. Miller*

Department of Physics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA

(Dated: March 7, 2022)

Color transparency, the reduction of initial- or final-state interactions in coherent nuclear processes, is a natural prediction of QCD provided that small-sized or point-like configurations (PLCs) are responsible for high-momentum transfer, high-energy, semi-exclusive processes. I use the FMS criteria for the existence of PLCs to show that the wave functions of light front holographic QCD, as currently formulated, do not contain a PLC.

Color transparency is the amazing prediction of QCD that initial- and final-state interactions are reduced in high-momentum transfer, high-energy coherent reactions [1–4]. Strong interactions are strong: when hadrons hit nuclei they generally break up the nucleus or themselves. Indeed, a well-known semi-classical formula states that the intensity of a beam of hadrons falls exponentially with the penetration distance through nuclei. This effect is known as absorption. It is remarkable that QCD indicates that, under certain specific conditions, the strong interactions can effectively be turned off and hadronic systems can move freely through a nuclear medium.

This phenomenon is based on three requirements:

- High momentum transfer coherent reactions are dominated by point-like color-singlet components of the struck hadron wave function, denoted as PLCs. This statement was a prediction initially based on perturbative QCD (pQCD). For example, early pQCD calculations [5–10], of the pion elastic electromagnetic form factor (see Fig. 1a) were interpreted [11] in the following manner: A high-momentum, Q , photon hits one of the partons that greatly increases the relative momentum to Q . The system can only stay together only by exchanging a gluon carrying that momentum. That gluon has a range of only $1/Q$ so that the partons must be close together, making a small-sized system or point-like configuration (PLC). The validity of pQCD for computation of electromagnetic form factors is a sufficient but not necessary condition for involvement of a PLC [12].
- Small objects have small cross sections. It has been widely reported that the imaginary part of the forward scattering amplitude, f of a rapidly moving color singlet object is proportional to the square of the transverse separation, b , between positive and negative color charges. The dominant contribution to f , at high energies is given by

two-gluon exchange [13–15], and the remarkable feature is that, in the limit that b approaches 0, f vanishes because color-singlet point particles do not exchange colored gluons. This feature is expressed concisely as $\lim_{b \rightarrow 0} \sigma(b^2) \propto b^2$. This reduced interaction, caused by interference between emission by quarks of different colors in coherent processes, is the basic ingredient behind QCD factorization proofs, is widely used [16] and not questioned.

- A PLC, once created, will expand as it moves. This is because a PLC is not an eigenstate of the Hamiltonian. The expansion effect is diminished if the PLC moves with sufficiently high momentum.

If all three requirements are satisfied for a given coherent process the effects of color transparency will be evident.

The second and third items are based on many calculations, many experiments and basic principles of quantum mechanics. The interesting dynamical question is the validity or lack thereof of the idea the PLCs are involved. This question is intimately connected with the origin of hadronic electromagnetic form mechanism at high momentum transfer. In the perturbative QCD mechanism, the large momentum transfer is taken up by the exchange of high-momentum gluons. For this to occur, all of the partons must be at the same transverse spatial location. Although it is natural to suppose that PLCs dominate coherent high-momentum transfer processes, it is far from obvious that this is the case [9, 10, 17]. For example, the momentum transfer can involve a single quark of high momentum. This is the Feynman mechanism, see Fig. 1, (first stated by Drell & Yan [18]). The spectator system is not required to shrink to a small size and color transparency effects involving protons would not be expected to occur. In this picture, a reasonably valid relation between elastic and deep inelastic scattering is obtained. See also [19]. A more recent example of a process that favors the Feynman mechanism appears in [20]. See also [21]. Note that Feynman remarked, “if a system is made of 3 particles, the large Q^2 behavior depends

* miller@uw.edu

not on the singularity when just two come together, but rather when all three are on top of one another". Furthermore, "such pictures are too simple and inadequate".




FIG. 1. High momentum transfer reaction mechanisms. Top picture: a pQCD mechanism. Other diagrams of the same order are not shown. Middle picture: Initial state in the Feynman mechanism. Bottom picture: final state in the Feynman mechanism. The final state has a good overlap with the turned around version of the initial state.

Models of Generalized Parton Distributions (GPDs) [22] access both the longitudinal and transverse structure of nucleons so that measurements thereof can distinguish the different mechanisms. It has been said [23] that GPDs parameterize soft dynamics akin to the Feynman mechanism. Specific models of GPDs, for example [24] also favor the Feynman mechanism. More generally, a review of the history teaches us [25] that there are only two proposals for the mechanism responsible for high momentum elastic reactions.

Frankfurt, Miller & Strikman (FMS) introduced [12] a criteria to determine whether or not a given model of a hadronic wave function admits the existence of a PLC. They found that a PLC could arise from non-perturbative effects as well as from perturbative QCD. The aim of this paper is to use the FMS criteria to see if the relativistic light-front wave functions obtained from light front holographic QCD (see the review [26]) admit the existence of a PLC.

The first step is to discuss the FMS criterion. The idea is that a PLC is originated via a hard probing interaction T_H involving nucleons initially bound in a nucleus. The soft interactions between the PLC and the surrounding medium are proportional to the square of the transverse separation distance [13–15] between constituents, $b^2 = \sum_{i < j} (b_i - b_j)^2$, where the constituents are labelled i, j, \dots in first-quantized notation. Consider a high-momentum transfer process on a nucleon. Denote the initial nucleon state as $|\psi(p)\rangle$ and the final state as

$|\psi(p+q)\rangle$. Then represent the high momentum transfer operator as $T_H(q)|\psi\rangle$. With this notation the form factor $F(Q^2)$ is given by the matrix element

$$F(Q^2) = \langle \psi(p+q) | T_H(q) | \psi(p) \rangle. \quad (1)$$

The key question is whether the state $T_H(q)|\psi(p)\rangle$ is a PLC that does not interact with the medium. The interaction with the surrounding medium is proportional to b^2 , the square of the transverse separation between a struck parton and the remainder of the system. The first-order term in the interaction is proportional to the matrix element $\langle \psi(p+q) | b^2 T_H(q) | \psi(p) \rangle$. This term is small if the operator T_H produces a PLC. The relevant comparison is with the form factor $F(Q^2)$ that is the process amplitude in the absence of final state interactions. Thus FMS defined the quantity $b^2(Q^2)$ as

$$b^2(Q^2) = \frac{\langle \psi(p+q) | b^2 T_H(q) | \psi(p) \rangle}{\langle \psi(p+q) | T_H(q) | \psi(p) \rangle} \equiv \frac{F_{b^2}(Q^2)}{F(Q^2)} \quad (2)$$

If $b^2(Q^2) = b^2(0)$ final state interactions of normal magnitudes occur. If $b^2(Q^2)$ drops with increasing values of Q^2 , then the model wave function is said to admit the existence of a PLC.

Now turn to evaluating $b^2(Q^2)$ for wave functions obtained from holographic techniques used represent relativistic light front wave functionst, as discussed in the review [26]. I briefly discuss that approach. Light-front quantization is a relativistic, frame-independent approach to describing the constituent structure of hadrons. The assumed simple structure of the light-front (LF) vacuum allows a definition of the partonic content of a hadron in QCD and of hadronic light-front theory [27]. The spectrum and light-front wave functions of relativistic bound states are obtained in principle from the eigenvalue equation $H_{LF}|\psi\rangle = M^2|\psi\rangle$ that becomes an infinite set of coupled integral equations for the LF components. This provides a quantum-mechanical probabilistic interpretation of the structure of hadronic states in terms of their constituents at the same light-front time $x^+ = x^0 + x^3$, the time marked by the front of a light wave [28]. The matrix diagonalization [27] of the frame-independent LF Hamiltonian eigenvalue equation in four-dimensional space-time has not been achieved, so other methods and approximations [26] are needed to understand the nature of relativistic bound states in the strong-coupling regime of QCD.

To a first semiclassical approximation, where quantum loops and quark masses are not included, the relativistic bound-state equation for light hadrons can be reduced to an effective LF Schrödinger equation. The technique is to identify the invariant mass of the constituents as a key dynamical variable, ζ , which measures the separation of the partons within the hadron at equal light-front time [29]. Thus, the multi-parton problem in QCD is reduced, in a first semi-classical approximation, to an effective one dimensional quantum field theory

by properly identifying the key dynamical variable. In this approach the complexities of the strong interaction dynamics are hidden in an effective potential.

It is remarkable that in the semiclassical approximation described above, the light-front Hamiltonian has a structure which matches exactly the eigenvalue equations in AdS space [26]. This offers the possibility to explicitly connect the AdS wave function $\Phi(z)$ to the internal constituent structure of hadrons. In fact, one can obtain the AdS wave equations by starting from the semiclassical approximation to light-front QCD in physical space-time. This connection yields a relation between the coordinate z of AdS space with the impact LF variable ζ [29], thus giving the holographic variable z a precise definition and intuitive meaning in light-front QCD.

Light-front holographic methods were originally introduced [30, 31] by matching the electromagnetic current matrix elements in AdS space [32] with the corresponding expression derived from light-front quantization in physical space-time [18, 19]. It was also shown that one obtains identical holographic mapping using the matrix elements of the energy-momentum tensor [33] by perturbing the AdS metric around its static solution [34], thus establishing a precise relation between wave functions in AdS space and the light-front wave functions describing the internal structure of hadrons.

The light front wave functions that arise out of this light front holographic approach provide a new way to study old problems that require the use of relativistic-confining quark models. The study of the existence of a PLC by evaluating $b^2(Q^2)$ is an excellent example of such a problem.

I evaluate two examples. The first [31] is an early representation of the pion wave function as a $q\bar{q}$ system.

$$\psi(x, b) = \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sqrt{x(1-x)} e^{-b^2 \kappa^2 x(1-x)/2}. \quad (3)$$

I use the normalization $1 = \int dx d^2b |\psi(x, b)|^2$ throughout this paper. The wave function of Eq. (3) appears in many models. The form factor is given by

$$F(Q^2) = \int dx d^2b e^{i\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{b}(1-x)} |\psi(x, b)|^2, \quad (4)$$

and evaluation yields

$$F(Q^2) = 1 - e^{Q^2/4\kappa^2} \Gamma(0, Q^2/4\kappa^2), \quad (5)$$

with Γ being the incomplete Gamma function. This form factor falls asymptotically as $\sim 1/Q^2$, providing a nice example of how a non-perturbative wave function can yield a power-law falloff. The limit for $Q^2 \rightarrow 0$ is also interesting:

$$\lim_{Q^2 \rightarrow 0} F(Q^2) = 1 + (\gamma_E + \log(Q^2/4\kappa^2))Q^2/4\kappa^2 + \dots (6)$$

because of the appearance of the log.

The quantity $F_{b^2}(Q^2)$ is obtained by inserting a factor b^2 into the integrand:

$$\begin{aligned} F_{b^2}(Q^2) &= \int dx d^2b b^2 e^{i\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{b}(1-x)} |\psi(x, b)|^2 \\ &= -\nabla_Q^2 \int \frac{dx}{(1-x)^2} d^2b e^{i\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{b}(1-x)} |\psi(x, b)|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Observe that F_{b^2} is not simply obtained by differentiating the form factor with respect to Q^2 . This is because of the factor $1-x$ that appears in the exponential function. Evaluation of the integral over the transverse coordinates yields

$$F_{b^2}(Q^2) = \frac{1}{\kappa^2} \int \frac{dx}{x^2(1-x)} e^{-\frac{Q^2}{4\kappa^2}} (x + \frac{Q^2}{4\kappa^2}(1-x)). \quad (8)$$

The value of $F_{b^2}(Q^2)$ is infinite for all values of Q^2 because of the divergence (related to the $\log Q^2$ term in the form factor) as x approaches unity. This shows that the simple wave function of [31] is not suitable for use in evaluating high energy forward cross sections for pion-nucleus interactions.

The model given in Eq. (3) is very simple, so the next step is to use the universal light front wave functions of Ref. [24]. This work presented a universal description of generalized parton distributions obtained from Light-Front Holographic QCD, and I use their models for light-front wave functions, presented as functions of the number τ of constituents of a Fock space component. Regge behavior at small x and inclusive counting rules as $x \rightarrow 1$ are incorporated. Nucleon and pion valence quark distribution functions are obtained in precise agreement with global fits. The model is described by the quark distribution $q_\tau(x)$ and the profile function $f(x)$ with

$$q_\tau(x) = \frac{1}{N_\tau} (1-w(x))^{\tau-2} w(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}} w'(x), \quad (9)$$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{4\lambda} [(1-x) \log(\frac{1}{x}) + a(1-x)^2], \quad (10)$$

and $w(x) = x^{1-x} e^{-a(1-x)^2}$.

The value of the universal scale λ is fixed from the ρ mass: $\sqrt{\lambda} = \kappa = m_\rho/\sqrt{2} = 0.548$ GeV [26, 35]. The flavor-independent parameter $a = 0.531 \pm 0.037$. The u and d quark distributions of the proton are given by a linear superposition of q_3 and q_4 while those of the pion are obtained from q_2 and q_4 . Ref. [24] also presents the universal light front wave function:

$$\psi_{\text{eff}}^{(\tau)}(x, \mathbf{b}) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \sqrt{\frac{q_\tau(x)}{f(x)}} (1-x) e^{-\frac{(1-x)^2}{8f(x)} \mathbf{b}^2}, \quad (11)$$

in the transverse impact space representation. The transverse coordinate b again represents the relative distance between a struck parton and the spectator system.

The form factor for a given value of τ is given by

$$F^{(\tau)}(Q^2) = \int dx q_\tau(x) e^{-Q^2 f(x)}, \quad (12)$$

and $F_{b^2}^{(\tau)} Q^2$, obtained by inserting a factor b^2 into the above integrand, is given by:

$$F_{b^2}^{(\tau)} Q^2 = \int dx \frac{q_\tau(x)}{4f(x)} e^{-Q^2 f(x)} \left(1 - \frac{Q^2}{16f(x)} (1-x)^2\right). \quad (13)$$

Consider first the case of $\tau = 2$. The use of Eq. (9) and Eq. (10) shows that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} \frac{q_2(x)}{f(x)} = \frac{4\lambda}{(1-x)} + \dots \quad (14)$$

Thus the same divergence that haunted the wave function of Eq. (3) reappears for the more sophisticated $\tau = 2$ wave function of [24]. The functions $b_\tau^2(Q^2) = F_{b^2}^{(\tau)} Q^2 / F^{(\tau)} Q^2$ for $\tau = 3, 4$ are shown in Fig. 2.




FIG. 2. $b_\tau^2(Q^2)$ in units of GeV^{-2} . The numbers refer to the value of τ , the number of constituents in the Fock state.

Observe that $b_\tau^2(Q^2)$ rises with increasing values of Q^2 ,

so that these wave functions do not admit the existence of PLCs. Furthermore, observe the surprising effect that constituents with larger number of partons have smaller values of $b^2(Q^2)$ and so interact less strongly with a surrounding medium.

The summary of this work is that light front holographic wave functions do not contain a PLC, so they do not predict the appearance of color transparency no matter how large the value of Q^2 . Adding a perturbative QCD tail to the momentum-space wave function could change this result. The wave functions of light front holographic QCD are suitable for describing the soft dynamics involved the time evolution of a wave packet and were used [36] to interpret the recent striking experimental finding [37], that color transparency does not occur in $(e, e'p)$ reactions with Q^2 , up to 14.2 GeV^2 . The result is that the Feynman mechanism is responsible for the proton form factor at high momentum transfer.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the U. S. Department of Energy Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics under Award Number DE-FG02-97ER-41014. I thank the organizers R. Dupre, D. Dutta, M. Sargsian and M. Strikman of the 2021 workshop on “The Future of Color Transparency and Hadronization Studies at Jefferson Lab and Beyond” for re-stimulating my interest in this subject. I thank S. J. Brodsky for making this paper necessary.

-
- [1] L. L. Frankfurt, G. A. Miller, and M. Strikman, “The Geometrical color optics of coherent high-energy processes,” *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **44**, 501–560 (1994), [arXiv:hep-ph/9407274](#).
 - [2] Pankaj Jain, Bernard Pire, and John P. Ralston, “Quantum color transparency and nuclear filtering,” *Phys. Rept.* **271**, 67–179 (1996), [arXiv:hep-ph/9511333](#).
 - [3] D. Ashery, “High momentum diffractive processes and hadronic structure,” *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **56**, 279–339 (2006).
 - [4] D. Dutta, K. Hafidi, and M. Strikman, “Color Transparency: past, present and future,” *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **69**, 1–27 (2013), [arXiv:1211.2826 \[nucl-th\]](#).
 - [5] Glennys R. Farrar and Darrell R. Jackson, “The Pion Form-Factor,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43**, 246 (1979).
 - [6] A. V. Efremov and A. V. Radyushkin, “Factorization and Asymptotical Behavior of Pion Form-Factor in QCD,” *Phys. Lett. B* **94**, 245–250 (1980).
 - [7] G. Peter Lepage and Stanley J. Brodsky, “Exclusive Processes in Quantum Chromodynamics: The Form-Factors of Baryons at Large Momentum Transfer,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43**, 545–549 (1979), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **43**, 1625–1626 (1979)].
 - [8] G. Peter Lepage and Stanley J. Brodsky, “Exclusive Processes in Quantum Chromodynamics: Evolution Equations for Hadronic Wave Functions and the Form-Factors of Mesons,” *Phys. Lett. B* **87**, 359–365 (1979).
 - [9] A. Duncan and A. H. Mueller, “Asymptotic behavior of composite-particle form factors and the renormalization group,” *Phys. Rev. D* **21**, 1636–1650 (1980).
 - [10] A. Duncan and A.H. Mueller, “Asymptotic behavior of exclusive and almost exclusive processes,” *Physics Letters B* **90**, 159–163 (1980).
 - [11] Alfred H. Mueller, “Topics in High-Energy Perturbative QCD Including Interactions with Nuclear Matter,” in *17th Rencontres de Moriond on Elementary Particle Physics: I. Electroweak Interactions and Grand Unified Theories* (1982) pp. 13–43.
 - [12] L. Frankfurt, G.A. Miller, and M. Strikman, “Precocious dominance of point-like configurations in hadronic form-factors,” *Nucl. Phys. A* **555**, 752–764 (1993).
 - [13] F. E. Low, “A Model of the Bare Pomeron,” *Phys. Rev. D* **12**, 163–173 (1975).

- [14] S. Nussinov, “Colored Quark Version of Some Hadronic Puzzles,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **34**, 1286–1289 (1975).
- [15] J. F. Gunion and Davison E. Soper, “Quark Counting and Hadron Size Effects for Total Cross-Sections,” *Phys. Rev. D* **15**, 2617–2621 (1977).
- [16] S. Donnachie, Hans Gunter Dosch, O. Nachtmann, and P. Landshoff, *Pomeron physics and QCD*, Vol. 19 (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- [17] R. P. Feynman, *Photon-Hadron Interactions* (W. A. Benjamin, Inc., Reading, MA, 1972).
- [18] S.D. Drell and Tung-Mow Yan, “Connection of Elastic Electromagnetic Nucleon Form-Factors at Large Q^2 and Deep Inelastic Structure Functions Near Threshold,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **24**, 181–185 (1970).
- [19] Geoffrey B. West, “Phenomenological model for the electromagnetic structure of the proton,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **24**, 1206–1209 (1970).
- [20] A. V. Radyushkin, “Nonforward parton densities and soft mechanism for form factors and wide-angle compton scattering in qcd,” *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 114008 (1998).
- [21] Matthias Burkardt and Gerald A. Miller, “Color transparent GPDs?” *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 034015 (2006), [arXiv:hep-ph/0312190](#).
- [22] X. Ji, “Generalized parton distributions,” *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **54**, 413–450 (2004).
- [23] M. Diehl, “Generalized parton distributions,” *Phys. Rept.* **388**, 41–277 (2003), [arXiv:hep-ph/0307382](#).
- [24] Guy F. de Teramond, Tianbo Liu, Raza Sabbir Sufian, Hans Gunter Dosch, Stanley J. Brodsky, and Alexandre Deur (HLFHS), “Universality of Generalized Parton Distributions in Light-Front Holographic QCD,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 182001 (2018), [arXiv:1801.09154 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [25] A. V. Belitsky and A. V. Radyushkin, “Unraveling hadron structure with generalized parton distributions,” *Phys. Rept.* **418**, 1–387 (2005), [arXiv:hep-ph/0504030](#).
- [26] Stanley J. Brodsky, Guy F. de Teramond, Hans Gunter Dosch, and Joshua Erlich, “Light-Front Holographic QCD and Emerging Confinement,” *Phys. Rept.* **584**, 1–105 (2015), [arXiv:1407.8131 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [27] Stanley J. Brodsky, Hans-Christian Pauli, and Stephen S. Pinsky, “Quantum chromodynamics and other field theories on the light cone,” *Phys. Rept.* **301**, 299–486 (1998), [arXiv:hep-ph/9705477](#).
- [28] Paul A.M. Dirac, “Forms of Relativistic Dynamics,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **21**, 392–399 (1949).
- [29] Guy F. de Teramond and Stanley J. Brodsky, “Light-Front Holography: A First Approximation to QCD,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 081601 (2009), [arXiv:0809.4899 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [30] Stanley J. Brodsky and Guy F. de Teramond, “Hadronic spectra and light-front wavefunctions in holographic QCD,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 201601 (2006), [arXiv:hep-ph/0602252](#).
- [31] Stanley J. Brodsky and Guy F. de Teramond, “Light-Front Dynamics and AdS/QCD Correspondence: The Pion Form Factor in the Space- and Time-Like Regions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 056007 (2008), [arXiv:0707.3859 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [32] Joseph Polchinski and Matthew J. Strassler, “Deep inelastic scattering and gauge / string duality,” *JHEP* **05**, 012 (2003), [arXiv:hep-th/0209211](#).
- [33] Stanley J. Brodsky and Guy F. de Teramond, “Light-Front Dynamics and AdS/QCD Correspondence: Gravitational Form Factors of Composite Hadrons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 025032 (2008), [arXiv:0804.0452 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [34] Zainul Abidin and Carl E. Carlson, “Gravitational form factors of vector mesons in an AdS/QCD model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 095007 (2008), [arXiv:0801.3839 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [35] Stanley J. Brodsky, Guy F. de Teramond, Hans Gunter Dosch, and Cedric Lorce, “Universal Effective Hadron Dynamics from Superconformal Algebra,” *Phys. Lett. B* **759**, 171–177 (2016), [arXiv:1604.06746 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [36] Olivia Caplow-Munro and Gerald A. Miller, “Color transparency and the proton form factor: Evidence for the Feynman mechanism,” *Phys. Rev. C* **104**, L012201 (2021), [arXiv:2104.11168 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [37] D. Bhetuwal *et al.* (Hall C), “Ruling out color transparency in quasi-elastic $^{12}\text{C}(\text{e},\text{e}'\text{p})$ up to Q^2 of 14.2 (GeV/c) 2 ,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 082301 (2021), [arXiv:2011.00703 \[nucl-ex\]](#).