D rell-Y an processes, transversity and light-cone wavefunctions

B. Pasquini, M. Pincetti, S. Bo

Dipartimento di Fisica Nucleare e Teorica,

Universita degli Studi di Pavia and INFN, Sezione di Pavia, Pavia, Italy

(Dated: April 16, 2024)

The unpolarized, helicity and transversity distributions of quarks in the proton are calculated in the overlap representation of light-cone wavefunctions truncated to the lowest order Fock-space components with three valence quarks. The three distributions at the hadronic scale satisfy an interesting relation consistent with the So er inequality. Results are derived in a relativistic quark model including evolution up to the next-to-leading order. P redictions for the double transverse-spin asymmetry in D rell-Y an dilepton production initiated by proton-antiproton collisions are presented. A symmetries of about 20{30% are found in the kinematic conditions of the PAX experiment.

PACS num bers: 13.88.+ eHb, 13.85.0 k, 12.39 K i

I. IN TRODUCTION

At the parton level the quark structure of the nucleon is described in terms of three quark distributions, namely the quark density $f_1(x)$, the helicity distribution $g_1(x)$ (also indicated f(x)), and the transversity distribution $h_1(x)$ (also indicated f(x)). The rst two distributions, and particularly $f_1(x)$, are now well established by experiments in the deep-inelastic scattering (D IS) regime and well understood theoretically as a function of the fraction x of the nucleon longitudinalm on enture carried by the active quark [1]. Information on the last leading-twist distribution is missing on the experimental side because $h_1(x)$, being chiral odd, decouples from inclusive D IS and therefore can not be measured in such a traditional source of information. Nevertheless some theoretical activity has been developed in calculating $h_1(x)$ and noting new experimental situations where it can be observed (for a recent review see Ref. [2]). Am ong the di erent proposals the polarized D rell-Y an (D Y) dilepton production was recognized for a long time as the cleanest way to access the transversity

distribution of quarks in hadrons β {6]. As a matter of fact, in pp and pp DY collisions with transversely polarized hadrons the leading order (LO) double transverse-spin asymmetry of lepton-pair production involves the product of two transversity distributions, thus giving direct access to them . However, such a measurement is not an easy task because of the technical problem s of maintaining the beam polarization through the acceleration. The recently proposed experimental programs at RHIC [7] and at GSI [8] have raised renewed interest in theoretical predictions of the double transverse-spin asymmetry in proton-(anti)proton collisions with dilepton production [9{11].

As reviewed in [2], $h_1(x)$ has been calculated in a variety of models, including relativistic bag-like, chiral soliton, light-cone, and spectator models. In all these calculations the antiquark transversity is rather small and the d-quark distribution turns out to have a much smaller size than the u-quark distribution.

In this paper h_1 (x) and the other quark distributions are derived within the fram ework of the overlap representation of light-cone wavefunctions (LCW Fs) originally proposed in Refs. [12] to construct generalized parton distributions (GPDs). A Fock-state decomposition of the hadronic state is performed in terms of N-parton Fock states with coe cients representing the momentum LCW F of the N partons. Direct calculation of LCW Fs from rst principles is a di cult task. On the other hand, constituent quark models (CQM s) have been quite successful in describing the spectrum of hadrons and their low energy dynam ics. At least in the kinem atic range where only quark degrees of freedom are e ective, it is possible to assume that at the low-energy scale valence quarks can be interpreted as the constituent quarks treated in CQM s. In the region where they describe emission and reabsorption of a single active quark by the target nucleon, quark GPD s are thus linked to the non-diagonal one-body density matrix in momentum space and can be calculated both in the chiral-even and chiral-odd sector [13{15]. Sea e ects represented by the m eson cloud can also be integrated into the valence-quark contribution to GPD s [16]. In such an approach the quark distributions, being the forward lim it of GPD s, are related to the diagonal part of the one-body density matrix in momentum space.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sect. II the overlap representation of LCW Fs is brie y reviewed with the aim of linking the parton distributions to CQM s. Results for the three valence quark distributions are discussed at the hadronic scale and after evolution up to the next-to-leading (NLO) in Sect. III. The application to double transverse-spin asymmetry in DY collisions is presented in Sect. IV, and some conclusions are drawn in the nal Section.

II. THE OVERLAP REPRESENTATION FOR PARTON DISTRIBUTIONS

In the overlap representation of LCW Fs [12] the proton wave function with fourmomentum p and helicity is expanded in terms of N -parton Fock-space components, i.e.

$$\dot{p}; i = \int_{N;}^{X} dx \int_{N} d^{2} \tilde{k}_{2} \int_{N} \int_{N}^{[f]} (r) f ; ;k_{1}; ...; k_{N} i;$$
(1)

where ${}^{[f]}_{N}$; is the momentum LCW F of the N-parton Fock state N; k_1 ; k_1 ; k_N i. The integration measures in Eq. (1) are dened as

$$[dx]_{N} = \bigvee_{i=1}^{\Psi} dx_{i} \quad 1 \qquad \chi^{N} \\ \sum_{i=1}^{i} x_{i} \quad ; \qquad [d^{2}\mathcal{R}_{?}]_{N} = \frac{1}{(16^{3})^{N-1}} \bigvee_{i=1}^{\Psi} d\mathcal{R}_{?,i} \quad 2 \qquad \chi^{N} \\ \sum_{i=1}^{i} \mathcal{R}_{?,i} \quad p_{?} \quad ; \quad (2)$$

where $x_i = k_i^+ = p^+$ is the fraction of the light-cone m on entum of the i-th parton and $\tilde{k}_{?,i}$ its transverse m on entum. The argument r of the LCW F represents the set of kinematical variables of the N partons, while the index labels the quantum numbers of the parton composition and the spin component of each parton.

Making use of the correct transform ation of the wave functions from the (canonical) instant-form to the (light-cone) front-form description, ^[c]! ^[f], and limiting ourselves to the lowest order Fock-space components with three valence quarks, a direct link to wave functions derived in CQM s was established in Refs. [13, 14]. Thus ^[f]_{i3;} explicitly becomes

where $M_0 = !_1 + !_2 + !_3$ is the mass of the noninteracting three-quark system, with $!_i \qquad k_i^0 = (k_i^+ + k_i^-) = \frac{p}{2}$, and the matrices $D_{i}^{1=2}(R_{cf}(k_i))$ are given by the spin-space representation of the M elosh rotation R_{cf} ,

$$D^{1-2}(\mathbf{R}_{cf}(\mathbf{k})) = h \, \mathbf{\hat{R}}_{cf}(\mathbf{x}\mathbf{M}_{0};\mathbf{\hat{k}}_{?}) \, \mathbf{j} \, \mathbf{i}$$

$$= h \, \mathbf{\hat{j}}_{-q} \frac{\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{x}\mathbf{M}_{0}}{(\mathbf{m} + \mathbf{x}\mathbf{M}_{0})^{2} + \mathbf{\hat{k}}_{2}^{2}} \, \mathbf{j} \, \mathbf{i}; \qquad (4)$$

In this approach the ordinary (unpolarized) parton distributions of avor q [17] can be recovered taking into account that in this case the M elosh rotation m atrices com bine to the identity m atrix:

$$f_{1}^{q}(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{j=1}^{X X^{3}} [d\mathbf{x}]_{3} [d\mathbf{k}_{2}]_{3} (\mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}_{j}) j^{\text{[f]}}(f\mathbf{x}_{i}g; f\mathbf{k}_{2}; ig; f_{i}g; f_{i}g)^{2};$$
(5)

where the helicity of the nucleon can equivalently be taken positive or negative. A nalogously, the following simple expressions are obtained for the polarized quark distribution of avor q [14]

$$g_{1}^{q}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\substack{j \ q \ j \ q}}^{X} \frac{X^{3}}{sign} \left(j \right) \left[d\mathbf{x}_{3} d\mathbf{k}_{2} \right]_{3} (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x}_{j}) j_{+}^{[f]} (f\mathbf{x}_{i}g; f\mathbf{k}_{2}; ig; f_{i}g; f_$$

and for the quark transversity distributions h_1^q (x) [15]:

$$h_{1}^{q}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{x}^{3} \\ & & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & \\ & & & \\ & & \\ & &$$

where i is the transverse-spin component of the quark and, as usual, the transversity basis for the nucleon spin states is obtained from the helicity basis as follows:

$$\dot{p};"i = \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}}(\dot{p};+i+\dot{p}; i); \quad \dot{p};\#i = \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}}(\dot{p};+i+\dot{p}; i):$$
(8)

Expressions (5), (6) and (7) exhibit the well known probabilistic content of parton distributions. Eq. (5) gives the probability of nding a quark with a fraction x of the longitudinal momentum of the parent nucleon, irrespective of its spin orientation. The helicity distribution $g_1^q(x)$ in Eq. (6) is the number density of quarks with helicity + m inus the number density of quarks with helicity + . The transversity distribution $h_1^q(x)$ in Eq. (7) is the number density of quarks with transverse polarization #, assuming the parent nucleon to have helicity +. The transverse polarization minus the number density of quarks with transverse polarization #, assuming the parent nucleon to have transverse polarization #.

In the instant form it is convenient to separate the spin-isospin component from the space part of the proton wave function and to assume SU (6) symmetry, i.e.

$$(f\tilde{k}_{i}g;f_{i}g;f_{i}g) = (\tilde{k}_{1};\tilde{k}_{2};\tilde{k}_{3}) \quad (_{1};_{2};_{3};_{1};_{2};_{3});$$

$$(9)$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1; & 2; & 3; & 1; & 2; & 3 \end{pmatrix}$$

= $\frac{1}{2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & h & 0 \\ 1 & 2; & 3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & h & 0 \\ 1 & 2; & 3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & h & 0 \\ 1 & 2; & 3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2; & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2; & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2; & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2; & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2; & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2; & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2; & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2; & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2; & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2; & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2; & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2; & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2; & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2; & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2; & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2; & 1$

5

with the superscripts 0 and 1 referring to the total spin or isospin of the pair of quarks 1 and 2. Thus we nd

$$f_{1}^{q}(\mathbf{x}) = 2_{q^{1=2}} + \frac{Z_{q^{1=2}}}{Q^{1=2}} + \frac{Q_{1}}{Q^{1=2}} \left[d\mathbf{x}_{3} d\mathbf{k}_{2} d\mathbf{k}_{2} d\mathbf{k}_{2} d\mathbf{k}_{3} d\mathbf{k}_{2} d\mathbf{k}_{3} d\mathbf{k}$$

$$g_{1}^{q}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{4}{3} g_{1=2}^{q-1=2} \frac{1}{3} g_{q-1=2}^{q-1=2} [d\mathbf{x}]_{3} [d\mathbf{k}_{2}]_{3} (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x})j (f\mathbf{x}_{i}g; f\mathbf{k}_{2}; g)]^{2} \mathbf{M}; \quad (12)$$

$$h_{1}^{q}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{4}{3} g_{1=2}^{q-1=2} \frac{1}{3} g_{q-1=2}^{q-1=2} [d\mathbf{x}]_{3} [d\mathbf{k}_{2}]_{3} (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{x})j (f\mathbf{x}_{i}g; f\mathbf{k}_{2}; g)]^{2} \mathbf{M}_{T}; \quad (13)$$

where [15, 18]

$$M = \frac{(m + x_{3}M_{0})^{2}}{(m + x_{3}M_{0})^{2} + \tilde{\kappa}_{2,3}^{2}}; \qquad (14)$$

$$M_{T} = \frac{(m + x_{3}M_{0})^{2}}{(m + x_{3}M_{0})^{2} + \tilde{\kappa}_{2,3}^{2}};$$
(15)

and the expectation values on the norm alized nucleon momentum wavefunction of the contribution coming from M elosh rotations satisfy

$$2hM_{T}i = hM_{i} + 1$$
: (16)

Therefore the following relations hold

$$h_{1}^{u}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}g_{1}^{u}(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{3}f_{1}^{u}(\mathbf{x}); \qquad h_{1}^{d}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}g_{1}^{d}(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{6}f_{1}^{d}(\mathbf{x}); \qquad (17)$$

which are compatible with the So er inequality [19]:

$$h_1^q(x)j = \frac{1}{2} [f_1^q(x) + g_1^q(x)]$$
: (18)

In the nonrelativistic limit, corresponding to $\aleph_2 = 0$, i.e. $M_T = M = 1$, one obtains $h_1^u = g_1^u = \frac{2}{3}f_1^u$ and $h_1^d = g_1^d = -\frac{1}{3}f_1^d$ as expected from general principles [6].

III. RESULTS

A san application of the general form alism reviewed in the previous section we consider the valence-quark contribution to the parton distributions starting from an instant-form SU (6) sym metric wave function of the proton, Eqs. (9) and (10), derived in the relativistic quark model of Ref. [20]. In particular, we use the Lorentzian shape wavefunction of Ref. [20] with parameters tted to the magnetic moments of the proton and the neutron and the

axial-vector coupling constant G_A and giving also a good agreem ent with the experimental nucleon electroweak form factors in a large Q^2 range. Furthermore, we note that SU (6) symmetry is broken in the LCW F ^[f] [21] as a consequence of the transformation (3).

The distributions in Eqs. (11), (12) and (13) are de ned at the hadronic scale Q $_0^2$ of the model. In order to make predictions for experiments, a complete knowledge of the evolution up to NLO is indispensable. According to Ref. [22] we assume that twist-two matrix elements calculated at some low scale in a quark model can be used in conjunction with QCD perturbation theory. Starting from a scale where the long-range (con ning) part of the interaction is dom inant, we generate the perturbative contribution by evolution at higher scale. In the case of transversity the Dokshitzer-Gribov-Lipatov-Altarelli-Parisi (DGLAP) Q^2 evolution equation [23] is simple. In fact, being chirally odd, the quark transversity distributions do not m ix with the gluon distribution and therefore the evolution is of the non-singlet type. The leading order (LO) anom abus dimensions were rst calculated in Ref. [24] but promptly forgotten. They were recalculated by Artru and Mekh [25]. The one-bop coe cient functions for D rell-Y an processes are known in di erent renorm alization schemes [26{28]. The NLO (two-loop) anom alous dimensions were also calculated in the Feynman gauge in Refs. [29, 30] and in the light-cone gauge [31]. The two-bop splitting functions for the evolution of the transversity distribution were calculated in Ref. [31]. The LO DGLAP Q 2 evolution equation for the transversity distribution h_1 (x) was derived in Ref. [25] and its num erical analysis is discussed in Refs. [32, 33].

A num erical solution of the DGLAP equation for the transversity distribution $h_1(x)$ was given at LO and NLO in Refs. [34, 35]. In Ref. [34] the DGLAP integrodi erential equation is solved in the variable Q^2 with the Euler m ethod replacing the Sim pson m ethod previously used in the cases of unpolarized [36] and longitudinally polarized [37] structure functions.

In the present analysis the FORTRAN code of Ref. [34] has been applied within the \overline{M} S renormalization scheme and the input distributions calculated at the hadronic scale according to the model explained in Sect. II were evolved up to NLO. The model scale $Q_0^2 = 0.079 \text{ G eV}^2$ was determined by matching the value of the momentum fraction carried by the valence quarks, as computed in the model, with that obtained by evolving backward the value experimentally determined at large Q^2 . The strong coupling $_{\rm s}(Q^2)$ entering the

code at NLO is computed by solving the NLO transcendental equation num erically,

$$\ln \frac{Q^2}{\frac{2}{NLO}} - \frac{4}{0 + \frac{1}{2}} \ln \frac{4}{0 + \frac{1}{2}} \ln \frac{4}{0 + \frac{1}{2}} = 0;$$
(19)

as obtained from the renorm alization group analysis [38]. It diers from the more fam iliar expression used in Ref. [34],

$$\frac{s(Q^{2})}{4} = \frac{1}{0 \ln (Q^{2} = \frac{2}{N \log 2})} \quad 1 \quad \frac{1}{0^{2}} \frac{\ln \ln (Q^{2} = \frac{2}{N \log 2})}{\ln (Q^{2} = \frac{2}{N \log 2})};$$
(20)

valid only in the lim it Q 2 $^2_{\rm N\,LO}$, where $_{\rm N\,LO}$ is the so-called QCD scale parameter.

Together with the input distributions at the hadronic scale the non-singlet (valence) contribution of the three parton distributions is shown in Figs. 1 to 3 at LO and NLO at di erent scales of Q^2 . In the case of the unpolarized and polarized distributions, Figs. 1 and 2 respectively, the result of evolution of the total distributions is also presented. Quite generally, the Q^2 dependence of the evolution is weak within a given order, while sm all e ects are introduced when going from LO to NLO, as exemplied by the dot-dashed curves at $Q^2 = 5 \text{ GeV}^2$ in Figs. 1 to 3. Thus, convergence of the perturbative expansion is very fast and one can safely lim it him self to LO.

The size of the d-quark distributions is always smaller than that of the u-quark distribution, particularly in the case of transversity, con m ing results obtained with other m odels (see, e.g., [9]).

Taking into account that the model at the hadronic scale only considers valence quarks and the sea is only generated perturbatively, the overall behavior of $f_1(x)$ is in reasonable agreement with available parametrizations [39]. One may notice the faster fall-o of the tail of $f_1^u(x)$ at large x in our model with respect to the parametrization [39] that will have some consequences in the predicted double transverse-spin asymmetry in Sect. IV. As for $g_1(x)$, the missing sea and gluon contributions are crucial to compare our model results with the available parametrizations [40]. Therefore, $g_1(x)$ is shown here for completeness, but it requires a more systematic study (e.g. along the lines of R ef. [16]) that goes beyond the goal of the present investigation focused on the double transverse-spin asymmetry.

However, comparison of $h_1(x)$ and $g_1(x)$ is here legitimate because $h_1(x)$ is determined by valence contributions, as it is $g_1(x)$ in our model. As can be see in Figs. 2 and 3 they are rather dierent not only after evolution, but especially at the hadronic scale of the model. This contrasts with the popular guess $h_1(x) = g(x)$ motivated on the basis of the nonrelativistic quark model.



Figure 1: Evolution of the parton distribution for the u (left panel) and d (right panel) quark. In the lower panels starting from the hadronic scale $Q_0^2 = 0.079 \text{ GeV}^2$ (upper curve), LO non-singlet distributions are shown at di erent scales ($Q^2 = 5 \text{ GeV}^2$, solid lines; $Q^2 = 9 \text{ GeV}^2$, dashed lines; $Q^2 = 16 \text{ GeV}^2$, dotted lines) together with NLO distributions at $Q^2 = 5 \text{ GeV}^2$ (dot-dashed lines). LO and NLO total distributions are shown in the upper panels with the same line convention. The param etrization of Ref. [39] NLO evolved at 5 GeV^2 is also shown by small stars.

In any case the So er inequality (18) at each order is always satis ed by the three quark distributions calculated with the LCW Fs of the present model (see Fig. 4). In contrast, saturation of the So er bound, i.e. assuming

$$\mathfrak{h}_{1}^{q}(\mathbf{x})\mathfrak{j} = \frac{1}{2} [\mathfrak{f}_{1}^{q}(\mathbf{x}) + g_{1}^{q}(\mathbf{x})]; \qquad (21)$$

is neither reached at the hadronic scale of the model nor is it a conserved property during



Figure 2: The same as in Fig. 1, but for the helicity distribution.

evolution. In fact, starting at the hadronic scale with the transversity distribution given by Eq. (21), the result of LO and NLO evolution diverges from that obtained when calculating the transversity according to Eq. (21) after separate evolution of f_1 and g_1 . Since the two sides of Eq. (21) give di erent results under evolution, in model calculations the choice of the initial hadronic scale is crucial. This fact should put some caution about the possibility of making predictions with the transversity distribution guessed from f_1 and g_1 as, e.g., in the case of the double transverse-spin asymmetry in DY processes (see Refs. [10, 11] and Fig. 7 below).

A similar situation occurs when the transversity distribution is derived from f_1 and g_1 according to the relations (17), with the di erence that these relations are exact at the hadronic scale when only valence quarks are involved.



Figure 3: Evolution of the transversity distribution for the u (left panel) and d (right panel) quark. Starting from the hadronic scale $Q_0^2 = 0.079 \text{ GeV}^2$ (upper curve), LO non-singlet distributions are shown at di erent scales ($Q^2 = 5 \text{ GeV}^2$, solid lines; $Q^2 = 9 \text{ GeV}^2$, dashed lines; $Q^2 = 16 \text{ GeV}^2$, dotted lines) together with NLO distributions at $Q^2 = 5 \text{ GeV}^2$ (dot-dashed lines).

IV. THE DOUBLE TRANSVERSE-SPIN ASYMMETRY

In order to directly access transversity via D rell-Y an lepton pair production one has to measure the double transverse-spin asymmetry A_{TT} in collisions between two transversely polarized hadrons:

$$A_{TT} = \frac{d "" d "#}{d "" + d "#};$$
(22)

with the arrows denoting the transverse directions along which the two colliding hadrons are polarized.

At LO, i.e. considering only the quark-antiquark annihilation graph, the double transverse-spin asymmetry for the process p"p" ! " X m ediated by a virtual photon is givenby

$$A_{TT}^{pp} = a_{TT} \frac{x^{q}}{e_{q}^{2}} \frac{h_{1}^{q}(x_{1};Q^{2})h_{1}^{q}(x_{2};Q^{2}) + (1 \$ 2)^{1}}{e_{q}^{2}} \frac{h_{1}^{q}(x_{1};Q^{2})f_{1}^{q}(x_{2};Q^{2}) + (1 \$ 2)^{1}};$$
(23)

where e_q is the quark charge, Q² the invariant m ass square of the lepton pair (dim uon), and



Figure 4: The transversity distribution obtained with the LCW Fs of the present m odel (thin lines) compared with the So er bound, Eq. (21), (thick lines) for the u (left panel) and d (right panel) quark. Solid lines for the results at the hadronic scale $Q_0^2 = 0.079 \text{ G eV}^2$, the dashed lines obtained by NLO evolution at $Q^2 = 9 \text{ G eV}^2$, respectively.

 $x_1x_2 = Q^2 = s$ where s is the M and elstam variable. The quantity a_{TT} is the spin asymmetry of the QED elementary process qq ! '' ', i.e.

$$a_{TT}(;) = \frac{\sin^2}{1 + \cos^2} \cos(2);$$
 (24)

with being the production angle in the rest frame of the lepton pair and the angle between the dilepton direction and the plane de ned by the collision and polarization axes.

A fter the rst simple encouraging estimates [5], som e phenom enological studies of DY dim uon production at RH IC have been presented [26, 27, 33, 42[45] indicating that accessing transversity is very di-cult under the kinematic conditions of the proposed experiments with pp collisions [7]. The main reason is that A_{TT}^{pp} in Eq. (23) involves the product of quark and antiquark transversity distributions. The latter are small in a proton, even if they were as large as to saturate the So er inequality; moreover, the QCD evolution of transversity is such that, in the kinematical regions of RH IC data, $h_1(x;Q^2)$ is much smaller than the corresponding values of $g_1(x;Q^2)$ and $f_1(x;Q^2)$. This makes the measurable A_{TT}^{pp} at RH IC

very sm all, no m ore than a few percents [33, 42, 45].

A more favorable situation is expected by using an antiproton beam instead of a proton beam [8{11,46]. In pp DY the LO asymmetry A_{TT}^{pp} is proportional to a product of quark transversity distributions from the proton and antiquark distributions from the antiproton which are connected by charge conjugation, e.g.

$$h_1^{u=p}(x) = h_1^{u=p}(x)$$
: (25)

Therefore one obtains

$$A_{TT}^{pp} = a_{TT} \frac{x^{q}}{e_{q}^{q}} \frac{h_{1}^{q}(x_{1};Q^{2})h_{1}^{q}(x_{2};Q^{2}) + h_{1}^{q}(x_{1};Q^{2})h_{1}^{q}(x_{2};Q^{2})}{e_{q}^{q}} \frac{h_{1}^{q}(x_{1};Q^{2})f_{1}^{q}(x_{2};Q^{2}) + f_{1}^{q}(x_{1};Q^{2})f_{1}^{q}(x_{2};Q^{2}))}{i};$$
(26)

so that in this case the asymmetry is only due to valence quark distributions.

Q uantitative estimates of A_{TT}^{pp} for the kinematics of the proposed PAX experiment at GSI [8] were presented in Refs. [9[11]. On the basis of predictions from the chiral quark-soliton model [9], the LO DY asymmetries turn out to be large, of the order of 50%, increasing with Q² and almost entirely due to u-quarks. In contrast, they are in the range 20[40% in a phenomenological analysis [10, 11] where A_{TT}^{pp} is appropriately evolved at NLO starting from two extreme possibilities at some typical low scale $_0$ 1 GeV. One assumption was $h_1(x) = g_1(x)$, as in the nonrelativistic case. The second ansatz for the transversity was the saturation of So er's inequality according to Eq. (21). The two possibilities have been considered to give a lower and upper bound for the transversity and, consequently, for the A_{TT}^{pp} asymmetry.

NLO e ects hardly modify the asym metry since the K factors of the transversely polarized and unpolarized cross sections are similar to each other and therefore almost cancel out in the ratio [47]. In addition, NLO e ects are rather small on the quark distributions obtained in Sect. III (see Figs. 1{3}. Therefore, the following discussion is limited to LO.

U sing the unpolarized quark and transversity distributions derived in Sect. II, results for $s = 45 \text{ G eV}^2$ and di erent values of Q² are plotted in Fig.5 in terms of the rapidity

$$y = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{x_1}{x_2}$$
: (27)

An asymmetry of about 30% (comparable with Refs. [10, 11]) is obtained, with a Q^2 dependence in agreement with Ref. [9].



Figure 5: The double transverse spin asym m etry $A_{TT}^{pp} = a_{TT}$ calculated with the parton distributions of the present m odel as a function of the rapidity y at di erent scales: $Q^2 = 5 \text{ GeV}^2$, solid line; $Q^2 = 9 \text{ GeV}^2$, dashed line; $Q^2 = 16 \text{ GeV}^2$, dotted line.

This result con m s the possibility of m easuring the double transverse spin asymmetry under conditions that will be probed by the proposed PAX experiment. In such conditions, assuming the LO expression (26) for the observed asymmetry one could gain direct information on the transversity distribution following previous analyses [9{11], where the quark densities $f_1^{qrq}(x;Q^2)$ are taken from the GRV 98 parametrizations [39]. The resulting transversity distributions could be compared with model predictions.

A coording to this strategy, with the present m odel the antiquark distributions $h_1^q(x;Q^2)$ are identically vanishing and $h_1^q(x;Q^2)$ contains only valence quark contributions. A ssum ing a negligible sea-quark contribution the corresponding asymmetry would thus give direct access to $h_1^q(x;Q^2)$ and would look like that shown in Fig. 6. The results indicate a strong Q^2 dependence suggesting m oderate values of Q^2 , e.g. $Q^2 = 5$ to 10 G eV², in order to have an appreciable asymmetry of about 10{20% at the proposed PAX experiment at G SI [8]. It is remarkable that, contrary to the result of R ef. [9], in the present m odel Q^2 evolution produces a decreasing LO asymmetry with increasing Q^2 as a consequence of the opposite



Figure 6: The same as in Fig. 5 but assuming the GRV 98 [39] quark density.



Figure 7: The double transverse spin asym m etry $A_{TT}^{pp} = a_{TT}$ as a function of the rapidity y at Q² = 5 G eV² and s = 45 G eV². Solid curve: calculation with h₁ obtained with the LCW Fs of the present m odel. D ashed curve: calculation with an input h₁ = $\frac{1}{2}(g_1 + f_1)$. D otted curve: calculation with an input h₁ = g_1 .

 Q^2 dependence of the theoretical h_1 and the phenom enological f_1 . In fact, in the range of x-values explored by the chosen kinem atic conditions (x 0:3) h with its valence quark contribution has a larger fall-o with Q^2 than the GRV 98 f_1 as shown in Fig.1. Furtherm ore, one m ay notice that with the present m odel a much lower asymmetry is predicted than with the chiral quark-soliton m odel [9] and even lower than the phenom enological analysis of Refs. [10, 11].

In general, one can anticipate upper and lower limits for the theoretical asymmetry depending on the upper and low er bounds that the transversity has to satisfy. The saturated So er bound (21), i.e. $h_1 = \frac{1}{2}(g_1 + f_1)$, represents the upper bound of h_1 at any scale. The lower bound is given by the nonrelativistic approximation $h_1 = g_1$. At the hadronic scale the transversity calculated with any LCW Fs including valence quarks only should have interm ediate values satisfying the conditions in Eq. (17). Under evolution Eq. (17) does no longer hold, but still the evolved transversity has to lie in between the correspondingly evolved upper and lower bounds. A ssum ing the LCW Fs of the present model, the same asymmetry shown in Fig. 6 at $Q^2 = 5 \text{ GeV}^2$ is compared in Fig. 7 with the asymmetry calculated when the transversity is evolved starting from an input at the hadronic scale either given by the saturated So er bound $h_1 = \frac{1}{2}(g_1 + f_1)$ (dashed curve) or assuming the nonrelativistic approximation $h_1 = g_1$ (dotted curve), with f_1 and g_1 calculated in the present model. The di erence between the dotted and solid curves gives an estim ate of the relativistic e ects in the calculation of h_1 . On the other side, the model calculation with an input h_1 satisfying Eq. (17) leads to an asymmetry much lower than in the case of the saturated So er bound.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The unpolarized, helicity and transversity distributions of quarks in the proton are calculated in the overlap representation of light-cone wavefunctions truncated to the lowest order Fock-space components with three valence quarks. The light-cone wavefunctions have been de ned making use of the correct covariant connection with the instant-form wavefunctions used in any constituent quark model. The quark distributions have been evolved to leading order and next-to-leading order of the perturbative expansion with the remarkable result that NLO e ects are rather sm all compared to LO. The three distributions at the hadronic scale satisfy an interesting relation consistent with the So er inequality. In particular, the transversity distribution has been used to predict the double transverse-spin asymmetry in dilepton production with D rell-Yan collisions between transversely polarized beams of protons and antiprotons. As a function of rapidity the asymmetry calculated in the model is about 30% for $s = 45 \text{ GeV}^2$, slightly increasing with Q^2 . In contrast, when using phenom enological unpolarized quark distributions together with the transversity distribution derived in the present model, the asymmetry turns out to be smaller than previous predictions, e.g. about $10\{20\% \text{ at } Q^2 = 5 \text{ GeV}^2 \text{ and } s = 45 \text{ GeV}^2$, and rapidly decreases with increasing Q^2 . This is due to the di erent Q^2 dependence of the involved distributions in the allowed range of x values. As the transversity is unknown experimentally, this sensitivity to Q^2 is an in portant argument for future experiments. The present results suggest the possibility of measurable asymmetry for future solut access to the quark transversity distributions of the proposed PAX experiment, thus obtaining direct access to the quark transversity distribution.

Note added in the proof: During the revision process a phenom enological analysis of available data appeared [48] and the transversity distributions for up and down quarks were shown to have opposite sign and a smaller size than their positivity bounds in agreement with the results of the present model.]

A cknow ledgem ents

This research is part of the EU Integrated Infrastructure Initiative H adronphysics P roject under contract number R II3-C T -2004-506078.

- [1] B.Lam pe and E.Reya, Phys.Rep. 332, 1 (2000);
 - R L.Ja e, hep-ph/9710465;
 - M.D ittm ar et al, hep-ph/0511119.
- [2] V.Barone, A.Drago, and P.G. Ratclie, Phys. Rep. 359, 1 (2002);

V.Barone and P.G.Ratclie, Transverse Spin Physics, W orld Scientic, Singapore, 2003.

[3] J.P.Ralston and D. Soper, Nucl. Phys. B 152, 109 (1979).

- [4] JL.Cortes, B.Pire, and JP.Ralston, Z.Phys.C 55, 409 (1992).
- [5] X iangdong Ji, Phys. Lett. B 284, 137 (1992).
- [6] R.L.Ja e and X iangdong Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 552 (1991); Nucl. Phys. B 375, 527 (1992).
- [7] G.Bunce, N. Saito, J. So er, and W. Vogelsang, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 50, 525 (2000).
- [8] P.Lenisa, F.R athm ann et al. (PAX Collaboration), Technical proposal for Antiproton (Proton Scattering Experiments with Polarization, hep-ex/0505054.
- [9] A.V.E frem ov, K.Goeke, and P.Schweitzer, Eur. Phys. J.C 35, 207 (2004).
- [10] M.Anselm ino, V.Barone, A.Drago, and N.N.Nikolaev, Phys. Lett. B 594, 97 (2004).
- [11] V. Barone, A. Cafarella, C. Coriano, M. Guzzi, and P.G. Ratclie, Phys. Lett. B 639, 483 (2006).
- M.Diehl, Th.Feldmann, R.Jakob, and P.K roll, Nucl. Phys. B 596, 33 (2001);
 S.J.Brodsky, M.Diehl, and D.S.Hwang, Nucl. Phys. B 596, 99 (2001).
- [13] S.Bo, B. Pasquini, and M. Traini, Nucl. Phys. B 649, 243 (2003).
- [14] S.Bo, B. Pasquini, and M. Traini, Nucl. Phys. B 680, 147 (2004).
- [15] B.Pasquini, M.Pincetti, and S.Bo, Phys.Rev.D 72,094029 (2005).
- [16] B.Pasquiniand S.Bo, Phys.Rev.D 73,094001 (2006).
- [17] S.J.Brodsky and G.P.Lepage, in: A.H.Mueller (ed.), Perturbative Quantum Chromodynam ics, W orld Scientic, Singapore, 1989, p.93;
 S.J.Brodsky, H.-Ch.Pauli, and S.S.Pinsky, Phys.Rep. 301, 299 (1998).
- [18] I.Schm idt and J.So er, Phys.Lett.B 407, 331 (1997);
 Bo-Q iang Ma, I.Schm idt, and J.So er, Phys.Lett.B 441, 461 (1998).
- [19] J.So er, Phys.Rev.Lett. 74, 1292 (1995).
- [20] F.Schlum pf, J.Phys.Nucl.Part.Phys.G 20, 237 (1994).
- [21] F.Cardarelli and S.Simula, Phys. Rev.C 62, 065201 (2000).
- [22] R L. Ja e and G G. Ross, Phys. Lett. B 93, 313 (1980).
- [23] Yu L. Dokshitzer, JETP (Sov. Phys.) 46, 641 (1977) [Zh. Exsp. Teor. Fiz. 73, 1216 (1977)];
 V N. Gribov and L.N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 15, 438, 675 (1972) [Yad. Fiz. 15, 781, 1218 (1972)];
 - LN.Lipatov, Sov.J.Nucl.Phys. 20, 94 (1975) [Yad.Fiz. 20, 181 (1974)];
 - G.Altarelli and G.Parisi, Nucl. Phys. B 126, 298 (1977).
- [24] F.Baldracchini, N.S.Craigie, V.Roberto, and M. Socolovsky, Fortschr. Phys. 29, 505 (1981).

- [25] X.Artru and M.Mekh, Z.Phys.C 45, 669 (1990).
- [26] W. Vogelsang and A. Weber, Phys. Rev. D 48, 2073 (1993).
- [27] A P. Contogouris, B. Kam al, and J. Merebashvili, Phys. Lett. B 337, 169 (1994).
- [28] B.Kamal, Phys.Rev.D 53, 1142 (1996).
- [29] A.Hayashigaki, Y.Kanazawa, and Y.Koike, Phys. Rev. D 56, 7350 (1997).
- [30] S.Kum ano and M.M iyam a, Phys.Rev.D 56, R2504 (1997).
- [31] W .Vogelsang, Phys. Rev. D 57, 1886 (1998).
- [32] V.Barone, Phys. Lett. B 409, 499 (1997).
- [33] V.Barone, T.Calarco, and A.Drago, Phys.Lett. B 390, 287 (1997).
- [34] M. Hirai, S. Kum ano, and M. Miyama, Comp. Phys. Comm. 111, 150 (1996).
- [35] A.Cafarella and C.Coriano, Com p. Phys. Com m. 160, 213 (2004).
- [36] M. Miyam a and S. Kum ano, Com p. Phys. Com m. 94, 185 (1996).
- [37] M. Hirai, S. Kum ano, and M. Miyama, Comp. Phys. Comm. 108, 35 (1996).
- [38] T.Weigland W.Melnitchouk, Nucl. Phys. B 465, 267 (1996);

M. Traini, V. Vento, A. Mair, and A. Zambarda, Nucl. Phys. A 614, 472 (1997);

B.Pasquini, M. Traini, and S.Bo, Phys. Rev. D 71, 034022 (2005).

- [39] M.Gluck, E.Reya, and A.Vogt, Eur. Phys. J.C 5, 468 (1998).
- [40] M.Gluck, E.Reya, M. Stratmann, and W. Vogelsang, Phys. Rev. D 63, 094005 (2001);J.Blum lein and H.Bottcher, Nucl. Phys. B 636, 225 (2002);

Y.Goto et al, Phys.Rev.D 62, 034017 (2000); Int.J.M od.Phys.A 18, 1203 (2003).

- [41] O.Martin, A.Schafer, M.Stratmann, and W.Vogelsang, Phys. Rev. D 57, 3084 (1998).
- [42] O.Martin, A.Schafer, M.Stratmann, and W.Vogelsang, Phys. Rev. D 60, 117502 (1999).
- [43] C.Bourrely and J.So er, Nucl. Phys. B 423, 329 (1994).
- [44] C.Bourrely and J.So er, Nucl. Phys. B 445, 341 (1995).
- [45] V.Barone, T.Calarco, and A.Drago, Phys. Rev. D 56, 527 (1997).
- [46] A.Bianconi and M.Radici, Phys. Rev. D 72, 074013 (2005).
- [47] H.Shim izu, G.Sterman, W.Vogelsang, and H.Yokoya, Phys. Rev. D 71, 114007 (2005).
- [48] M.Anselmino, M.Boglione, U.D'Alesio, A.Kotzinian, F.Murgia, A.Prokudin, and C.Turk, Phys. Rev. D 75, 054032 (2007).