1 Introduction

W ith the advent of very energetic hadronic colliders like LHC and SSC, whose aim is to have access to the mechanism of electroweak symmetry breaking, a precise estim ate of inclusive production of neutral clusters is m andatory to pin down signals due to Higgs particle or new physics [1]. Perturbative QCD is the appropriate fram ework to perform such a calculation provided large transfer m om enta are involved. For this purpose leading order (hereafter denoted as LO) predictions - based on evaluations of partonic cross sections at tree level and evolution of structure and fragmentation functions at one loop level - are too rough. A consistent calculation at next to leading order (hereafter denoted as NLO) needs a NLO evaluation of parton-parton subprocesses which has been performed by our group 2] a few years ago utilizing existing results on the O $\binom{3}{5}$ m atrix element [3] and two loop evolved structure and fragm entation functions. Various sets of structure functions based on a NLO analysis using deep inelastic lepton nucleon scattering data, D rell-Y an production and direct photon production at hadronic accelerators are available in the literature [4, 5, 6].

Up to now such an analysis has not been perform ed for pions fragm entation functions since the only available derivation at NLO has been done for heavy quarks [7]. The param etrizations presently available [8] are based on a LO analysis of rather old et e data and sem i inclusive deep inelastic m uon nucleon scattering. Our aim is to perform a complete NLO evaluation of neutral pions inclusive production from hadronic colliders in order to estimate, as precisely as possible, the ⁰ rates at LHC and SSC. The rst step will consist in perform ing an extraction of pions fragmentation functions at NLO using e^+e^- data and hadronic data on one particle inclusive production. This will be done using three di erent methods. The rst one, which does not exactly correspond to a NLO analysis but rather to an improved LO approximation, is based on the M onte-C arb simulator HERW IG [9], whereas the second and the third ones are obtained from a two loop evaluation of evolution kernels previously computed [10, 11] together with NLO calculation of one hadron inclusive production from e⁺e [12] and hadronic colliders [2] using respectively natural and optim ized scales. A swewill see it is not possible to extract an unique set of fragmentation functions which ts e^+e data around $\frac{1}{S} = 30 \text{ GeV}$ [14, 15, 16, 17, 18] and hadronic data from xed target dom ain [19, 20] to collider range [21, 22, 23]. W e will therefore take di erent sets corresponding to di erent hypotheses on input fragm entation functions.

The paper is organized as follows. We recall the expressions of one particle inclusive production from e^+e^- and hadronic collisions and also give the evolution equations for fragmentation functions in section 2. Then in section 3 we discuss the extraction of various sets of fragmentation functions, rst from HERW IG simulation and after through an exact NLO derivation. Predictions at LHC using the di erent sets previously obtained are displayed in section 4 together with a discussion of the resulting theoretical uncertainty. We give our conclusions in section 5.

2 One particle inclusive production at next-to-leading order

Let us consider the inclusive production of a hadron H via the generic reaction A + B ! H where A and B stand for hadrons and/or leptons. The cross-section can be written as a convolution of the fragmentation functions D $_{1}^{H}$ (z;M $_{\rm f}^{2}$) with the partonic cross-section:

$$E_{H} \frac{d_{A+B!H}}{d^{3}P_{H}} = \frac{X}{1} \frac{z_{H}}{z^{2}} D_{1}^{H} (z; M_{f}^{2}) E_{1} \frac{d_{A+B!1}}{d^{3}P_{1}} (\frac{z_{H}}{z}; ; s(^{2}); M_{f}^{2};);$$
(1)

where z_H is the reduced energy of the hadron $H : z_H = 2E_H = S$ and is the scattered angle of the parton 1. The inclusive production of the parton 1 via the reaction A + B! That the following perturbative development:

$$E_{1} \frac{d_{A+B!1}}{d^{3}P_{1}} (\frac{z_{H}}{z}; ; s(^{2}); M_{f}^{2};)) \frac{0}{A+B!1} (\frac{z_{H}}{z};) + \frac{s(^{2})}{2} \frac{1}{A+B!1} (\frac{z_{H}}{z}; ; M_{f}^{2}) +$$
(2)

:

Finally D $_{1}^{H}$ (z;M $_{f}^{2}$) represents the number of hadrons H inside the parton 1 carrying the fraction of impulsion z from H, evolved at the scale M $_{f}^{2}$. These fragmentation functions satisfy A ltarelli-Parisi type evolution equations:

$$\frac{(\frac{2}{9} D_{q}^{H} (z; M_{f}^{2}))}{(\frac{2}{9} \ln (M_{f}^{2}))} = \frac{s (M_{f}^{2})}{2} Z_{z}^{2} \frac{dy}{y} P_{qq}^{T} (y; s (M_{f}^{2})) D_{q}^{H} (\frac{z}{y}; M_{f}^{2}) + P_{gq}^{T} (y; s (M_{f}^{2})) D_{q}^{H} (\frac{z}{y}; M_{f}^{2}) + P_{gq}^{T} (y; s (M_{f}^{2})) D_{q}^{H} (\frac{z}{y}; M_{f}^{2}) = \frac{s (M_{f}^{2})^{2}}{2} Z_{z}^{2} \frac{dy}{y} P_{qq}^{T} (y; s (M_{f}^{2})) D_{q}^{H} (\frac{z}{y}; M_{f}^{2}) + P_{gq}^{T} (y; s (M_{f}^{2})) D_{q}^{H} (\frac{z}{y}; M_{f}^{2}) + P_{gq}^{T} (y; s (M_{f}^{2})) D_{q}^{H} (\frac{z}{y}; M_{f}^{2}) + P_{gq}^{T} (y; s (M_{f}^{2})) D_{q}^{H} (\frac{z}{y}; M_{f}^{2}) :$$

$$(4)$$

The evolution kernels have the perturbative developm ent:

$$P_{ij}^{T}(x; s(M_{f}^{2})) = P_{ij}^{0}(x) + \frac{s(M_{f}^{2})}{2}P_{ij}^{T1}(x) +$$

In the following, we will drop the superscript index T. The A ltarelli-Parisi kernels have been computed up to two loops order by Curci, Furm anski and Petronzio [11]. In the LO approximation one keeps only the rst order in the perturbative development of the partonic cross-section and in the evolution kernels whereas at NLO one keeps the rst and second terms in the perturbative expansion for both partonic cross-section and evolution kernels. We can split these fragmentation functions into a non-singlet and a singlet part:

$$D_{i}(z;M_{f}^{2}) = \frac{1}{2} D_{q_{i}}^{H}(z;M_{f}^{2}) D_{q_{i}}^{H}(z;M_{f}^{2})$$
(5)

$$D_{i}^{+}(z;M_{f}^{2}) \qquad \frac{1}{2} D_{q_{i}}^{H}(z;M_{f}^{2}) + D_{q_{i}}^{H}(z;M_{f}^{2}) \qquad \frac{1}{2N_{f}} D_{s}(z;M_{f}^{2}) \qquad (6)$$

$$D_{S}(z;M_{f}^{2}) \qquad D_{q_{i}}^{N_{f}}(z;M_{f}^{2}) + D_{q_{i}}^{H}(z;M_{f}^{2}) : \qquad (7)$$

In the evolution equations the singlet part D $_{\rm S}$ is coupled to the gluon fragm entation function whereas the non-singlet parts D and D $^+$ are decoupled. Note a m isprint in ref. [11] and the correspondence with our notation:

$$P_{qq}^{i} = P_{GG}$$

$$P_{qq}^{i} = P_{GF} = (2N_{f})$$

$$P_{qq}^{i} = 2N_{f}P_{FG}$$

$$P_{qq}^{i} = P_{FF}:$$

O noe input fragm entation functions have been speci ed at som e reference scale M $_{\rm f0}$ the evolution equations are solved using an inverse M ellin transform technique. Let us consider now in detail the partonic cross-sections.

2.1 e⁺e ! ⁰

The partonic cross sections from $e^{\scriptscriptstyle +} e^{\scriptscriptstyle -}$ collisions read at next-to-leading order:

$$E_{q_{i}} \frac{d_{e^{+}+e^{+}|q_{i}|}}{d^{3}P_{q_{i}}} (y; ; s({}^{2});M_{f}^{2}) = \frac{6}{Q^{2}y} e_{i}^{2} \frac{3}{8} (1 + \cos^{2}) (1 + y) + \frac{s({}^{2})}{2} P_{qq}^{0} (y) \ln \frac{Q^{2}}{M_{f}^{2}} + K_{q}^{T} (y) + \frac{3}{4} (1 + \cos^{2}) \frac{s({}^{2})}{2} K_{q}^{L} (y)$$

$$(8)$$

$$E_{g} \frac{d_{e^{+}+e^{+}|g}}{d^{3}P_{g}}(Y; ; s({}^{2});M_{f}^{2}) = \frac{12_{0}}{Q^{2}Y_{i=u,d;s;c;:::}} X_{e_{1}}^{2} \frac{3}{8}(1 + \cos^{2}) \frac{s({}^{2})}{2} P_{gq}^{0}(Y) \ln \frac{Q^{2}}{M_{f}^{2}} + K_{g}^{T}(Y) + \frac{3}{4}(1 - \cos^{2}) \frac{s({}^{2})}{2} K_{g}^{L}(Y);$$
(9)

where $_0$ is the usual point like cross-section

$$_{0} = \frac{4^{2}}{3Q^{2}};$$

is the QED coupling constant and Q² is the invariant mass of the e^+e^- pair. The functions K^T_q, K^L_q, K^T_g and K^L_g have been extracted from the reference [12] (see also [13]).

$$K_q^T(x) = C_F \left(\frac{3}{2}(1-x) - \frac{3}{2}\frac{1}{(1-x)_+} + 2\frac{1+x^2}{1-x}\ln(x)\right)$$

+
$$(1 + x^2)$$
 $\frac{\ln(1 - x)}{1 - x}$ + $\frac{2^2}{3} - \frac{9}{2}$ $(1 - x)$; (10)

$$K_{g}^{T}(x) = C_{F} \left(\frac{1+(1-x)^{2}}{x}(\ln(1-x)+2\ln(x))-2\frac{1-x'}{x}\right)$$
 (11)

$$K_{q}^{L}(\mathbf{x}) = C_{F}$$
(12)

$$K_{g}^{L}(x) = 2C_{F} \frac{1-x}{x}$$
 (13)

In the above equations two scales are involved: the renormalization scale at which the running coupling constant $_{\rm s}$ is evaluated and the fragmentation scale M $_{\rm f}$ at which fragmentation functions are evolved. The choice for these scales is rather arbitrary. Note that for every y, K $_{\rm g}^{\rm T}$ (y) is negative, so the choice M $_{\rm f}^2 = Q^2$ leads to a negative contribution to the partonic cross-section E $_{\rm g}$ d $_{\rm e^+\,e^+\,g^-}$.

The running coupling of QCD $_{\rm s}$ is dened at the next-to-leading logarithm approximation by the approximate analytical formula:

$$s(^{2}) = \frac{1}{b\ln(^{2}=^{2})} \left[1 - \frac{b^{0}}{b} \frac{\ln\ln(^{2}=^{2})}{\ln(^{2}=^{2})}\right]^{\#} :$$
(14)

In section 3 we will also use for s the num erical solution of the equation:

$$\frac{1}{a^{(2)}} + b^{0} \ln \frac{b^{0} a^{(2)}}{1 + b^{0} a^{(2)}} = b \ln \frac{2^{2}}{2}; \qquad (15)$$

with:

$$b = \frac{33 \ 2N_{f}}{12}$$
; $b^{0} = \frac{153 \ 19N_{f}}{24^{2}}$;

which is more appropriate than eq.(14) for small scales \cdot . Indeed for large the two de nitions agree but for small \cdot they can dier by more than 20 %.

2.2 pp! ⁰

The partonic cross-sections for hadronic collisions are given by [2]:

$$E_{1}\frac{d_{p+p!}}{d^{3}P_{1}}(y; ; s(^{2});M_{f}^{2}) = \frac{1}{S} \frac{X^{2} V}{s_{j}} \frac{dv}{1 V} \frac{dv}{1 V} \frac{Z^{1}}{V_{W} = v} \frac{dw}{w}$$

$$= \frac{1}{S} \frac{X^{2} V}{s_{j}} \frac{dv}{1 V} \frac{dv}{1 V} \frac{Z^{1}}{V_{W} = v} \frac{dw}{w}$$

$$= \frac{1}{S} \frac{1}{s_{j}} \frac{V_{W}}{V_{W} = v} \frac{dv}{w}$$

$$= \frac{1}{S} \frac{1}{s_{j}} \frac{V_{W}}{V_{W} = v} \frac{dv}{w}$$

$$= \frac{1}{S} \frac{1}{s_{j}} \frac{V_{W}}{V_{W} = v} \frac{dv}{w}$$

$$= \frac{1}{S} \frac{1}{V} \frac{dv}{V_{W} = v} \frac{dw}{w}$$

$$= \frac{1}{S} \frac{1}{s_{j}} \frac{1}{s_{j}} \frac{dv}{V_{W}} \frac{1}{v} \frac{dv}{v_{W} = v} \frac{dw}{w}$$

$$= \frac{1}{S} \frac{1}{v} \frac{1}{v} \frac{dv}{v_{W}} \frac{1}{v} \frac{dv}{v_{W}} \frac{1}{v} \frac{dv}{v_{W}} \frac{1}{v} \frac{dv}{v_{W}} \frac{1}{v} \frac{dv}{v_{W}} \frac{1}{v} \frac{dv}{v_{W}} \frac{1}{v} \frac{1}{v} \frac{dv}{v_{W}} \frac{1}{v} \frac{1}{v}$$

The variables V, W are de ned by

$$V = 1 \frac{y}{2}(1 \cos); W = \frac{y(1 + \cos)}{2 y(1 \cos)};$$

and we also have

$$\mathbf{x}_1 = \frac{\mathbf{V} \mathbf{W}}{\mathbf{v} \mathbf{w}}; \ \mathbf{x}_2 = \frac{1 \quad \mathbf{V}}{1 \quad \mathbf{v}}$$

and $s = x_1 x_2 S$. At NLO sixteen subprocesses contribute to the cross-section. The term s ⁰ correspond to the lowest order 2 ! 2 parton scattering subprocesses whereas the term s K contain the one loop corrections to these subprocesses. In the hadronic case, we have three scales: the renormalization scale for the initial state M (the scale of the distribution functions) and the factorization scale for nal state M f (the scale of the fragmentation functions). Schem atically, the hadronic cross-section can be written

$$E_{0} \frac{d_{p+p!}}{d^{3} P_{0}}^{2} = \frac{2}{s} \binom{2}{A} + \frac{3}{s} \binom{2}{2} 2bA \ln \frac{2}{2}^{2} + B \ln \frac{M^{2}}{2}^{2} + C \ln \frac{M_{f}^{2}}{2}^{2} + D :$$
(17)

We show explicitly the dependence of the hadronic cross-section upon the three scales , M and M $_{\rm f}$. The four functions A, B, C and D depend on the scales M and M $_{\rm f}$ via the structure and fragm entation functions. In addition, A, B and C are scheme independent. We always use the $\overline{\rm M}$ S scheme for nal factorization whereas the initial factorization scheme is xed by the set of structure functions used.

Let us discuss now the partonic cross-sections. In order to determ ine the kinem atical region where each partonic reaction dom inates we have plotted in gures 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d the partonic cross-sections $E_1 d_{p+p!} = d^3 \tilde{P}_1$ for $l = g, u + \overline{u} + d + d, s + \overline{s} + c + \overline{c}$ against P_t at the leading log level for various center of m ass energies. We think it is meaningless to use next-toleading form ulae since the dependence on $\ln (M_f^2)$ is not balanced. We have used ABFOW structure functions [6]. We see that for the low penter-of-m ass energy experiments WA70 [19] ($\overline{S} = 23 \text{ GeV}$) and E706 [20] ($\overline{S} = 31 \text{ GeV}$) the gluon and the valence quarks contributions are of the same order at low $P_{tl},$ whereas when P_{tl} becomes larger, the valence quarks dom inate. For ISR experiments [21], [22] (S = 63 GeV) the glue contribution dom in a tes up to P_{t1} ' 10 G eV. For the UA 2 experiment [23], when the pseudo rapidity = 1.4, the glue contribution is important up to P_{tl} ' 35 GeV. Finally for LHC, in the P_{tl} range between 30 and 1000 GeV the glue contribution represents (60 -80) % of the partonic cross-section. In all cases the "sea" contribution (s,c) is always negligible.

In order to estim ate the z range we are sensitive to we will study in table I the integrand of eq. (1), i.e.:

$$< z > = \frac{{}^{R} \frac{dz}{z} {}^{P} {}_{1} D_{1}^{0} (z; M_{f}^{2}) E_{1} \frac{d_{p+p!}}{d^{3} P_{1}^{\prime}}}{{}^{R} \frac{dz}{z^{2}} {}^{P} {}_{1} D_{1}^{0} (z; M_{f}^{2}) E_{1} \frac{d_{p+p!}}{d^{3} P_{1}^{\prime}}}$$
(18)

with z varying between $2E_{0} = \frac{p_{-}}{S}$ and 1. Note that the partonic cross-sections reach their maximum for z = 1 while the fragm entation functions decrease with z. As we can infer from Table I the large z region is kinem atically favored. We have used set I of fragm entation functions which will be discussed later.

A salready mentioned the fragmentation functions are known less accurately than the structure functions. Up to now they have been extracted at LO [8] from e^+e^- annihilation and semi inclusive deep inelastic muon nucleon scattering. No extraction from hadronic colliders data has been performed so far. In the following we will carry out an extraction of ⁰ fragmentation functions at NLO accuracy, using three di erent approaches.

3 Extraction of ⁰ fragm entation functions.

3.1 Selection of experim ental data.

We rst discuss the experimental data we will use to extract the ⁰ fragmentation functions. We rst consider e⁺ e collisions. The JADE collaboration [18] has published data at $\overline{S} = 14$; 22:5 and 34:4 GeV. We use the data at 34:4 GeV, covering mainly the low z_H range (up to $z_H = 0.209$). Data from the TPC collaboration [17] at $\overline{S} = 29$ GeV are given as $\frac{1}{had} \frac{d}{dz_H}$, therefore a value of R = 4.00 is assumed to bring them to the usual form $\frac{S}{dz_H}$. Data from the TASSO collaboration [16] at $\overline{S} = 34:6$ GeV extend up to $z_H = 0.728$. The broadest z_H range is covered by data from the CELLO collaboration, extending from $z_H = 0.049$ to $z_H = 0.919$ at $\overline{S} = 35$ GeV [15] and from $z_H = 0.094$ to $z_H = 0.919$ at $\overline{S} = 35$ GeV. [15] and from $z_H = 0.094$ to $z_H = 0.209$ to $z_H = 0.919$ at $\overline{S} = 35$ GeV. [15] and from $z_H = 0.094$ to $z_H = 0.209$ to $z_H = 0.919$ at $\overline{S} = 35$ GeV. [15] and from $z_H = 0.094$ to $z_H = 0.924$ for the cut on the low erenergy of the ⁰ at 2 GeV. Data obtained at LEP are for the moment not constraining. However, cross checks have been perform ed with the 2 points surviving the cut of data from the Argus collaboration [25] at $\overline{S} = 10$ GeV and the 4 points from the L3 collaboration [26] at $\overline{S} = 91$ GeV.

Let us discuss now experimental data from hadronic colliders. Data in hadronic reactions have been selected for this study taking into account statistical and system atic accuracy. W henever possible, reconstructed ⁰ are preferred. For SPS xed target energies, the available data in pp reactions are in reasonable agreement and we will use the data in the central rapidity range at $\overline{S} = 23 \text{ GeV}$, from the W A 70 collaboration [19]. The FNAL xed target range overlaps with the lower ISR energy range. The recent data at $\overline{S} = 31 \text{ GeV}$ from pB e reactions obtained by the E 706 collaboration [20] are in agreement with some of the ISR results. Resolved ⁰ at $\overline{S} = 62.8 \text{ GeV}$ taken from table 5 (m ore precisely data corresponding to the super-retracted geometry) of K ourkoum elis et al. [22] are used. They will be compared with other data available at this energy. W e will use also the more recent data from the AFS collaboration [21], which however show a di erent P_t dependence. At collider energies, the latest data from the UA2 experiment at $\overline{S} = 630 \text{ GeV}$ with average pseudo rapidity = 1:4 will be used [23]. C ross checks have been m ade

with data at $\frac{p}{S} = 540 \text{ GeV}$ with average pseudo rapidity = 0 although ⁰ are not disentangled from direct photons.

3.2 Fragm entation functions from HERW IG.

p - W e rst consider the ⁰ inclusive production in e⁺ e annihilation at M_{f0} = p - S = 30 GeV, as simulated by the M onte Carlo generator HERW IG. As well known, this event generator includes the QCD parton shower to leading and next to leading accuracy – in particular the kinem atical corrections due to the phase space boundaries are summed up to all orders – as well as the hadronisation of the color singlet clusters into the physical particles. Furtherm ore HERW IG has been shown [24] to describe with good accuracy the observed features of PETRA and LEP data. Then we will use the ⁰ distribution generated by each quark avor which originates from the photonic vertex, as a realistic description of the quark fragmentation into ⁰. Owing to the symmetry of quarks and antiquarks fragmenting into ⁰ we extract the quark fragmentation functions from :

$$\frac{d_{e^+e}!}{dz_H} (z_H; M_{f0}^2) = 6_0 \sum_{q}^{X} e_q^2 D_q^{(0)} (z_H; M_{f0}^2);$$
(19)

where the pointlike cross section $_0$ has been previously de ned. The reaction $e^+e^-! = ^0 + X$ has been therefore decomposed into each contribution $e^+e^-!$ uu, dd, ss, cc and bb. The generated distributions are parametrized as

$$D_{i}^{0}(z; M_{f0}^{2}) = N_{i}z^{i}(1 z)^{i}$$
 (20)

and analyzed using the m inimization procedure M INUIT. The coe cients N $_{\rm i}$ are constrained by the norm alization condition:

where the average values hn i_i are given by HERW IG for each quark avor, in agreem ent with the total observed multiplicity hn i. The parameters N_i; i and i are extracted from the ⁰ inclusive distribution generated, for each avor, in the x range $025 z_H$ $025 z_H$ 0

As an illustration of the accuracy of the m ethod and also of its limitations, the 0 inclusive cross-section obtained from eqs. (19) and (20), together with the results of table II, are compared in gure 2 with the CELLO data [15] at $\overset{P}{S}$ = 35 GeV. The agreement is reasonable in the range $z_{\rm H}$ $_{\rm S}$. So far we have not included the contribution from the gluon fragmentation function. Indeed from the analysis of the three jet events it would be possible, in principle, to extract from HERW IG the appropriate information. The corresponding accuracy is how ever unsatisfactory, due to the limited sensitivity to hard gluon e ects in e^+e annihilation.

For this reason we have followed a di erent approach. To extract the gluon fragmentation function from HERW IG we have analyzed the subprocess gg ! gg ! 0 + X from pp annihilation at M $_{f0} = \frac{P}{s}$ 30 GeV, in analogy to the quark case. In order to eliminate the background from the fragmentation of the spectator partons we have considered the pions lying only within a cone of sem i aperture = 35 :40 rad around the direction of the parent gluons em itted at 90 deg. The value of is found by an appropriate angular study of the generated distribution. W ith a parametrization of the form (20) we not the values of the parameters N_g; $_{g}$ and $_{g}$ given in table III. A fler inclusion of the gluon fragmentation function and use of NLO evolved fragmentation functions together with NLO terms in the 0 inclusive cross section the agreement with CELLO data is improved as can be inferred from gure 3 up to z_{H} ' 0.8

We compare now our predictions at NLO to experimental data from hadronic colliders. We rst consider the data from CERN ISR [21,22], for S = 63 GeV, compared in gures 4 and 5 with our predictions for $= M = M_f = P_t$ and $= M = M_f = P_t=2$ using the quark fragmentation functions from table II and the two gluon sets from table III, with = 0.35 and = 0.40. The agreement is satisfactory within the theoretical and experimental uncertainties.

Let us focus now on the UA2 data at the SppS collider [23]. We will use two sets of quite precise data, for P_t 15 GeV and '0 and, for 15 P_t 45 GeV and '1:4. The comparison with the theoretical predictions is shown in gures 6 and 7 for = M = M_f = P_t =2; P_t and for the two gluon sets of fragmentation functions. The agreement is quite good, and slightly favors the set corresponding to = 0:35. The dependence on the renormalization, factorization and fragmentation scales at NLO will be discussed later.

In the next subsection we will extract the 0 fragmentation functions at next to leading order using two dimensions hypotheses at the reference scale M $_{f0}^{2}$ = 2 G eV 2 .

3.3 Set I: fragm entation functions with natural scales.

For this set, we take $_{s}$ as given by equation (14) and = 190 MeV, corresponding to the set of structure functions we will use [4, 5].

3.3.1 De nition

W e assum e for this case an SU (2) sym m etry:

$$D_{u}^{\circ}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{u}^{\circ}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{d}^{\circ}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{d}^{\circ}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{V}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) + D_{S}(z;M_{f0}^{2})$$
(22)

Then, we take

$$D_{s}^{0}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{s}^{0}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{c}^{0}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{c}^{0}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{s}^{0}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{s}(z;M_{f0}^{2});$$
(23)

and

$$D_{g}^{0}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{G}(z;M_{f0}^{2}):$$
 (24)

W e param etrize the di erent functions of z as follows

$$D_V (z; M_{f0}^2) = N_V (1 z)^v$$
 (25)

$$D_{\rm S} (z; M_{\rm f0}^2) = N_{\rm s} (1 z)^{\rm s}$$
 (26)

$$D_{G}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = N_{g}(1 z)^{g}$$
: (27)

At the initial scale M $_{f0}$, we start with four avors. The b quark contribution is taken into account in the evolution. Fixing the threshold at 4 m $_{b}^{2}$, so we have:

$$D_{b}^{0}(z; M_{f}^{2}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \text{if } M_{f}^{2} < 4m_{b}^{2} \\ N_{s}(1 z)^{s} & \text{if } M_{f}^{2} = 4m_{b}^{2} \end{pmatrix}$$
(28)

So we are left with six parameters to be determined with the help of experimental data.

3.3.2 Choice of the scale

We use the standard approach to x all the scales to the same value which is some natural scale of the problem. More precisely, for e^+e^- collisions, we take = $M_f = \frac{P}{S}$ whereas for p collisions, we set the three scales equal and proportional to the transverse momentum of the ⁰:

$$= M = M_f = CP_t$$

where c is a constant to be xed by the t to experimental data.

3.3.3 Results for set I

First of all, for e⁺ e collisions, we lim it ourselves to a ⁰ energy greater than 2 GeV because we don't trust perturbation theory for low ⁰ energies. Therefore for \overline{S} ' 30 GeV, we will only use z values greater than 0.1. As it can be inferred from eqs (25-27) we have not used a factor z in the input param etrizations since in this z range it does not in prove the t but only leads to correlations. W ith six param eters, a big correlation still occurs between N_v and _v, so we x _v = 1. Then N_s, N_g and _g rem ain slightly correlated. A good t to CELLO [15], TASSO [16], TPC [17] and JADE [18] data leading to a ² = 26:3 for 29 points is obtained for values of the param eters given in table IV (system atic errors have been added in quadrature to statistical errors).

U sing set I of fragm entation functions we will now evaluate the NLO crosssections for inclusive ⁰ production in hadronic collisions and compare them to experimental data from low center of mass energies up to the CERN collider one. Here, the situation is less clear. First, if we keep constant the value of the parameter c it is impossible to obtain a good t in the whole energy domain. For example, setting c' 1:5, the ISR data can be described but the theoretical predictions are by far too low for W A 70 and E 706 and too high for UA2. A simple solution to this problem is to allow c to vary with the hadronic kinematical variables, in particular $\frac{1}{5}$. A correct description of the data requires c' 0:39 for W A 70 [19] (see gure 8a), c' 0:5 for E 706 [20](see gure 8b), c' 1:5 for ISR experiment [21, 22] (see gure 8c) and c' 5:5 for UA2 [23] (see gure 8d). In particular for the ISR energy range, the data from AFS collaboration [21] are marginally consistent with those of reference [22] since the transverse momentum dependence in the two experiments is diment. Therefore it is very dimensional dependence in the two experiments is diment. Therefore it is very dimensional of K ourkoum elies et al. [22] with $^2 = 20.6$ for 14 points using $= M = M_f = 1:3P_t$ and of the AFS collaboration [21] with $^2 = 122$ for 11 points using $= M = M_f = 1:6P_t$. Notice that the slope of the UA2 data is not correctly reproduced, with a $^2 = 50.2$ for 11 points. The 2 have been calculated with statistical errors, allowing the overall norm alization to vary within the systematic error.

A comment is in order here. The approach followed so far is rather simple. When the energy grows up the scales needed to describe data have also to increase. As stated above an acceptable t of UA2 data [23] in the forward direction can be obtained for the choice of scales $= M = M_f = 5.5P_t$ which is a priori a large scale. The compensation occurring between the leading and next-to-leading terms concerning the scale dependence is much more elective at high energies. At low energy, since we prevent the scale to be less than $M_{f0} = \frac{P}{2} \text{ GeV}$, this compensation does not occur and the behavior of the leading and next-to-leading cross-sections is quite the same. In other words, we are not in a good region to perform perturbation theory.

This approach m ight be criticized. Indeed it is not very predictive, since the scales change with the energy. In other words one adds a new parameter which acts as an overall norm alization for each experiment. Notice that the norm alization of the glue fragmentation function N_g is strongly correlated to the choice m ade for the scale. More precisely, we could perfectly india value for N_g which describes the UA2 data with c = 0.5. But in this case we couldn't describe the other data at low er energies.

3.4 Set II: fragm entation functions with optim ized scales.

For this set, we take the numerical solution of equation (15) for $_{\rm s}$ and = 230 M eV, since we will use the ABFOW set of structure functions [6].

3.4.1 De nition

W e assum e also for this case an SU (2) sym m etry:

$$D_{u}^{0}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{u}^{0}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{d}^{0}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{d}^{0}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{u}^{0}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{u}(z;M_{f0}^{2}):$$
(29)

Then we take:

$$D_{s}^{0}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{s}^{0}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{s}(z;M_{f0}^{2}); \qquad (30)$$

$$D_{c}^{0}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{c}^{0}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{c}(z;M_{f0}^{2}); \qquad (31)$$

and

$$D_{g}^{0}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = D_{g}(z;M_{f0}^{2}):$$
(32)

W e param etrize these di erent functions of z in the following way:

$$D_{u}(z; M_{f0}^{2}) = N_{u} z^{1} (1 z)^{u}$$
 (33)

$$D_{s}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = N_{s}z^{1}(1 z)^{s}$$
 (34)

$$D_{c}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = N_{c} z^{1} (1 z)^{\circ}$$
 (35)

$$D_{q}(z;M_{f0}^{2}) = N_{q} z^{1} (1 z)^{q}$$
: (36)

So we are left with eight parameters to be determ ined with the help of experimental data. Since we will use the optimized procedure for the determ ination of the scales, it is much simpler not to change the number of avors. So, in this case, we will neglect the b contribution. This assumption is motivated by the fact that $(e^+ e ! ! bb) = 1=4$ $(e^+ e ! ! cc)$ and in pp collision the b production is suppressed due to the weak b content of the proton.

A few remarks are in order here. As in the case of set I, the non singlet part D_i is always zero due to our assumptions. We did not take $D_s^{\circ} = D_c^{\circ}$ because in this case the sum over the four avors of D_i^+ weighted by the square electric charge is zero:

X
$$e_{i}^{2} D_{i}^{+}(z;M^{2}) + D_{i}^{+}(z;M^{2}) = 0$$
:
i= u,d;s;c

So, there is no non-singlet contribution to the cross-section. Therefore we could parametrize directly the singlet and the glue with four parameters only. The e^+e^- data could be correctly described, but the glue is very constrained and it will not be possible to thadronic data in the whole energy range.

3.4.2 Choice of the scale

For set II, we use optimized scales according to the procedure of Politzer and Stevenson [28]. Concerning e⁺ e collisions, our approach is the following. Firstly since the scale does not appear at lowest order, we cannot optimize with respect to it. Therefore we set = M_f and perform an optimization only with respect to the scale M_f. Therefore, a priori, our optimized scale depends on the choice m ade for the input fragm entation functions. We have not found a way to get rid from this sensitivity. In practice, the optimized point changes slow ly when the input is modiled and in addition, since we are in a stable region, it does not matter if we are not exactly on the optimized point. The optimized scale M_f^{opt} is of order of $\overline{S}=8$ varying slow ly with z. Furtherm ore, we nd no optimization scale for z 0.03 for $\overline{S} = 35 \text{ GeV}$, z 0.05 for $\overline{S} = 29$ GeV and z 1 for $\overline{S} = 22 \text{ GeV}$. For lower values of \overline{S} , it is not possible to optimize. W e also use an optim ization procedure for hadronic collisions. So we require that:

$$\frac{\varrho}{\varrho \ln (2 = 2)} E_{0} \frac{d_{p+p!}}{d^{3} p'_{0}} = 0$$
(37)

$$\frac{\varrho}{\varrho \ln (M^{2} = 2)} E_{0} \frac{d_{p+p!}}{d^{3} \dot{P}_{0}} = 0$$
(38)

$$\frac{\varrho}{\varrho \ln (M_{\rm f}^2 = {}^2)} E_{0} \frac{d_{\rm p+p!}}{d^3 p'_{0}} = 0:$$
(39)

The rst equation can be computed analytically:

$$\frac{(2)}{(2 \ln (2 - 2))} = \frac{d_{p+p!}}{d^{3} p_{0}} = \frac{4}{s} (2) b_{0} + 3(1 + b_{s} (2)) 2bA \ln \frac{2}{2} + B \ln \frac{M^{2}}{2} + C \ln \frac{M^{2}}{f} + D$$
(40)

having used

$$\frac{(0 + s)(^{2})}{(0 + 1)(^{2} = ^{2})} = b + \frac{2}{s}(^{2})(1 + b^{0} + s)(^{2}):$$
(41)

Note that terms of order of $\frac{3}{s}$ have been cancelled as it should be. Now, we determ ine the scale in order to cancel the right-hand side of eq (40). This ensures us that the corrective term K will be negative with a magnitude of roughly 10 % of the lowest order. Then we compute numerically the value of the scales M and M f which have to full lithe equations (38) (39), the scale being now a function of M , M f. We require that the factorization scales must be greater than $\frac{1}{2}$ G eV and that the renormalization scale is such that the running coupling constant s is less than 34. W ith these constraints it will be impossible to optimize in low Pt range. More precisely, for low center of m ass energies ($\frac{1}{5}$ 63 G eV), the optimization is not possible for Pt 5 G eV. Therefore these regions are not appropriate to apply an optimization procedure.

3.4.3 Results for set II

First we freeze s, c and g according to the counting rules. There are still too m any parameters, so we $x N_g$ and t to e^+e^- data with four parameters N_u , u, N_s and N_c . The fragmentation functions extracted are then used to evaluate hadronic cross sections. Then we vary N_g^- re tring e^+e^- data and apply the new input to pp data. This procedure is repeated until a reasonable description of hadronic data is reached. G ood tsofe⁺e data (CELLO [14,15], TASSO [16], TPC [17] and JADE [18]) leading to a ² ' 1 per d.o.f. are obtained for the two sets - hereafter denoted as set IIa and set IIb - displayed in Table V and Table V I (see gures 9 and 10 using set IIb). The two sets di er m ainly for the gluon norm alization. As can be seen from inspection of gures 11a, 11b, 12a and 12b a rather good t of the latest UA2 data at S = 630 GeV [23], AFS [21] and K ourkoum elis et al data [22] can be obtained leading to a ² ' 50 for 31 points. K ourkoum elis et al. data favor the set characterized

by the largest glue (set IIb) whereas UA2 data are better tted by the other set (set IIa). Notice that we have taken into account the system atic errors of the data which a ect the overall norm alization. The ² are 3:46 (4:28) for the 11 AFS points, 31:54 (23:52) for the 9 K ourkoum elis et al. points and 14:91 (20:00) for the 11 UA2 points with the param eters of set IIa (IIb). Inside the system atic errors we can also describe UA2 data at $\overline{S} = 540 \text{ GeV}$ and = 1:4. On the other hand we are not able to describe WA70 and E706 data with the values of N_g found before. This is not very surprising since the corrective term is found to be huge, and although we can nd an optimization point this is not very stable suggesting that we are not in the appropriate region to trust perturbation theory.

4 P redictions at future hadron colliders.

As we have seen present data do not allow to extract the 0 fragmentation functions unequivocally. To this aim the forthcoming information from ep HERA collider should be very helpful. W ith these limitations we will now estimate the 0 rates at LHC using the various sets of fragmentation functions previously derived.

Let us consider rst set I of fragmentation functions. In order to describe hadronic data we had to increase the scales $= M = M_f \text{ from } \frac{P_t}{2} \text{ at } S' 20$ GeV up to $5P_t$ at S = 630 GeV. An extrapolation to LHC energy would lead to $= M = M_f'$ 50P_t which seems by far an unnatural scale. To estimate the sensitivity to scales we show in gure 13 the ratio of cross sections at LHC for the two scales $50P_t$ and P_t at = 0. As can be inferred from the gure the rates di er by at most a factor of two. To estimate the uncertainty due to structure functions we have taken the set of structure functions of HMRS [5] using the \overline{M} S scheme and the set of M or ng-Tung [4] using the D IS scheme. The predictions di er by at most 20%. Sim ilarly the ratio of predictions using set II is displayed in gure 14.

Finally the ratio of the two predictions from the HERW IG fragmentation functions, for = 0.35, 0.40, evolved to NLO accuracy as discussed in section 32, are displayed in gure 15.

The situation is sum marized in gure 16 where we show the absolute rates at LHC for = 0 from the most plausible sets in the three approaches. This gives an estimate of the theoretical uncertainty which is of the order of a factor two. The uncertainty on structure functions is marginal compared to the poor determination of fragmentation functions.

To show the stability of the NLO corrections we display the cross section as a function of the scales and $M = M_f$ compared to the LO result for $P_t = 50$ GeV (gures 17) and for $P_t = 200$ GeV (gures 18). We vary the scales between $P_t=5$ and $5P_t$. The NLO cross sections exhibit a saddle point whereas the LO cross sections decrease m onotonically when the scales increase.

The uncertainty due to factorisation scheme, especially coming from fragmentation functions is expected to be tiny for the two following reasons. Firstly the evaluation done for one jet inclusive cross section has shown [2] that at collider energies its magnitude is of the order of 5% -if done correctly - and we can reasonably expect a same order of magnitude for one hadron inclusive cross section. Secondly a precise estimate doesn't seem mandatory compared to the large uncertainty coming from fragmentation functions.

5 Conclusions

We have performed a complete next to leading order analysis of inclusive ⁰ production from e⁺ e and hadronic data. For the rst time an attempt to extract sets of ⁰ fragmentation functions at NLO has been performed. The present quality of data does not allow us to derive a unique set tting all experimental data. For this purpose more accurate measurements from hadronic colliders in the large P_t domain, from e⁺ e colliders in the large z_H domain as well as complementary information from ep collisions will be very helpful. The theoretical uncertainties are mainly due to the poorly determined fragmentation functions. Nevertheless the absolute rates at future colliders like LHC and SSC can be predicted within a factor of two. This will certainly be of help for neutral background rejection at supercolliders.

N ote added in proof

A fler com pletion of this work the paper "H igher order QCD corrections to inclusive particle production in pp collision" by F.M.Borzum atiet al. [29] has appeared, where the 0 inclusive production has been discussed, using the old LO fragmentation functions of ref.[8] and the NLO results of our group [2].

A cknow ledgem ents

W e would like to thank P.Nason for providing us his fortran code for b fragm entation at next to leading order. W e are greatly indebted to G.Marchesini for enlightening discussions concerning HERW IG and also to P.Aurenche for advice on optim ization procedure. W e acknow ledge discussions on the ISR data with C.K ourkoum elis. Table captions

Table I: average fraction of energy of the fragm enting parton (see eq.18) from pp collisions.

Table II: parameters of the quark fragmentation functions (see eq.20) as obtained from HERW IG in e^+e^- annihilation at M₀ = 30 GeV.

Table III: parameters of the gluon fragmentation functions (see eq20) as obtained from HERW IG at M $_0$ = 30 GeV, with two hypotheses on the angle (see text).

Table IV : parameters for the $\,^0$ fragmentation functions (set I) obtained from $e^+\,e^-$ annihilation.

Table V :param eters for the $\,^0$ fragm entation functions (set IIa) obtained from optim ization procedure in $e^+\,e^-$ annihilation.

Table V I.P aram eters for the 0 fragm entation functions (set IIb) obtained from optim ization procedure in $e^{+}e^{-}$ annihilation.

_ n	n			n	
^r <u>S</u> =	= 23 GeV and = 0:	^P <u>S</u> =	= 63 GeV and = 0:	^P <u>S</u> =	= 630 GeV and = 1:4
P _t °	< z >	P _t °	< z >	P _t °	< z >
4.11	0.81	5.25	0.67	13	0.55
4.61	0.82	6.73	0.70	21	0.60
5.69	0.86	8.23	0.73	29.8	0.65
6.69	0.89	10.4	0.77	43.7	0.74

Table I

P rocess			Nq	< n >
e ⁺ e ! uu	0 : 95 0 : 02	3:67 0:19	1:20	2 : 95
e ⁺ e ! dd	0:95 0:02	3 : 67 0:15	1:24	2 : 87
e ⁺ e ! ss	0:88 0:02	5:32 0:23	1 : 68	2 : 73
e⁺e ! ∝	0:82 0:02	8:02 0:24	3:09	3:42
e ⁺ e ! bb	0:95 0:02	10:94 0:29	2 : 92	4:20

Table II

					Ng	< n >
0 : 35 rad	0:28	0:04	6 : 71	0:39	14 : 49	3 : 65
0 : 4 rad	0:37	0:04	5 : 79	0:36	12 : 93	4 : 55

Table III

P arton	i	i	N i
valence	0:	1:	0:19
sea	0:	5 : 2	3:5
gluon	0:	2 : 03	4 : 9

Table IV

Parton	i	i	N i
up	1:	0 : 94	0:11
strange	1:	3:0	0 : 55
charm	1:	4:	2 : 7
gluon	1:	2:	0 : 55

Table V

Parton	i	i	N i
up	1:	1:11	0:15
strange	1:	3:0	0:18
charm	1:	4:	2:5
gluon	1:	2:	0 : 75

TableVI

Fig. 1: relative inclusive partonic production in hadronic collisions as a function of the partonic transverse momentum P_{tl} at various energies: W A 70 experiment(gla), ISR experiments(glb), UA2(glc) and LHC(gld). The various curves refer to: pp ! u+d (fullline), pp ! s+c (dashed line) and pp ! g (dot-dashed line).

Fig. 2: LO inclusive ⁰ production in e^+e^- annihilation with the quark fragmentation functions extracted from HERW IG at $\overline{S} = 30 \text{ GeV}$, com – pared with experimental data at $\overline{S} = 35 \text{ GeV}$.

Fig. 3: NLO inclusive ⁰ production in e^+e^- annihilation with the quark and gluon fragmentation functions extracted from HERW IG and evolved at S = 35 GeV, compared with data.

Figs. 4: NLO inclusive ⁰ production in pp collisions at ISR energies for $= M = M_f = P_t; P_t=2$ for = 0.35 (see text). The fragmentation functions are from HERW IG.

Figs. 5: same as g 4, for = 0:40.

Figs. 6: NLO inclusive ⁰ production in pp collisions at <u>SppS</u> energies for $= M = M_f = P_t; P_t=2$ for = 0.35 and = 0.40, at S = 540 GeV and = 0. The fragmentation functions are from HERW IG.

Figs. 7: same as $g = 6 at^{p} = 630 \text{ GeV}$ and s = 1:4.

Figs. 8: NLO inclusive ⁰ production in hadronic collisions with set I fragmentation functions (see text) for various energies. The scales = $M = M_f = cP_t$ are indicated explicitly.

Fig. 9: NLO inclusive ⁰ production in e⁺e annihilation with set II of fragmentation functions compared to CELLO, TASSO and JADE data . The gluon parameter N_g takes the value N_g = 0:75. Data and theory have been multiplied by 0.1 at $\overline{S} = 22 \text{ GeV}$.

Fig. 10: Same as g9 for TPC data.

Figs. 11: NLO inclusive ⁰ production in pp collisions with set II fragmentation functions (see text) at ISR energies (squares correspond to AFS data whereas circles correspond to Kourkoum elis et al data). The gluon parameter N_g takes the value N_g = 0:55 (g 11a) and N_g = 0:75 (g 11b).

Figs. 12: same as g 11 at SppS energies.

Fig. 13: ratio of inclusive 0 cross sections predicted at LHC for = 0 using set I of fragmentation functions with $= M = M_{f} = 50P_{t}$ over $= M = M_{f} = P_{t}$.

Fig. 14: ratio of inclusive 0 cross sections predicted at LHC for = 0 using set IIb of fragmentation functions over set IIa.

Figs. 15: ratio of inclusive 0 cross sections predicted at LHC for = 0 using fragmentation functions from HERW IG.

Fig. 16: inclusive 0 cross sections predicted at LHC for = 0 using various fragm entation functions: HERW IG with = 0.35 (full line), set I with $= M = M_{\rm f} = 50P_{\rm t}$ (dot-dashed curve) and set II with N_g = 0.75 (dashed curve).

Figs. 17: inclusive ⁰ cross sections at LHC in pb using set I of fragm entation functions as a function of the scales and $M = M_f$ for $P_t = 50$ GeV and = 0.10 prediction : g17a.NLO prediction : g17b.

Figs. 18: same as g 17 for $P_t = 200 \text{ GeV}$ and = 0.

References

- [1] For a review see for example G.Altarelli, D.Denegri and F.Pauss, Proceedings of Aachen LHC W orkshop vol1CERN 90-10, G.Jarlskog and D. Reineds.
- [2] F A versa, P C hiappetta, M G reco and J Ph G uillet, Nucl. Phys. B 327, 105 (1989).
- [3] R K. Ellis and J.C. Sexton, Nucl. Phys. B269, 445 (1986).
- [4] J.G.Morn and W.K.Tung, Z.Phys.C 52, 13 (1989).
- [5] A.D.Martin, R.G.Roberts and W.J.Stirling, Phys.Rev.D 37, 1161 (1988); Mod.Phys.Lett A 4, 1135 (1989); P.N.Harriman, A.D.Martin, R.G.Roberts and W.J.Stirling, Phys.Rev.D 42, 798 (1990) and Phys. Rev.D 42, 3645 (1990).
- [6] P.Aurenche, R.Baier, M. Fontannaz, JF.Owens and M.Werlen, Phys. Rev.D 39, 3275 (1989).
- [7] B.Mele and P.Nason, Nucl. Phys. B 361, 626 (1991).
- [8] R. Baier, J. Engels and B. Petersson, Z. Phys. C2, 265 (1979); M. Anselm ino, P.K roll and E. Leader, Z. Phys. C18, 307 (1983).
- [9] G.Marchesiniand B.R.Webber, Nucl. Phys. B238, 1 (1984); ibidem 310, 461 (1989).
- [10] G.Altarelli and G.Parisi, Nucl. Phys. B126 (1977) 298.
- [11] G Curci, W Furm anski and R Petronzio, Nucl. Phys. B175, 27 (1980).
- [12] G A ltarelli, R K E llis, G M artinelli and S.Y Pi, Nucl. Phys B160, 301 (1979).
- [13] R Baier and K Fey, Z. Phys. C2 (1979) 339.
- [14] CELLO collab.: H.J.Behrend et al, Z.Phys.C20, 207 (1983).
- [15] CELLO collab.: H.J.Behrend et al, Z.Phys.C47, 1 (1990).
- [16] TASSO collab.: W .Braunschweig et al., Z.Phys.C33, 13 (1986).
- [17] TPC collab.: H.A ihara et al., Z.Phys.C27, 187 (1985).
- [18] JADE collab.: W .Bartelet al, Z.Phys.C28, 343 (1985).
- [19] W A 70 collab.: M .Bonesiniet al, Z.Phys.C 38, 371 (1988).
- [20] E 706 collab.: G. A lverson et al., Phys. Rev. D 45, 3899 (1992).
- [21] AFS collab.: T. Akesson et al, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 51, 836 (1990).

- [22] C.Kourkoum elis et al, Z.Phys.C5, 95 (1980).
- [23] UA 2 collab. 630 G eV: R. Ansari et al., Z. Phys. C 41, 395 (1988); UA 2 collab. 540 G eV: M. Banner et al., Z. Phys. C 27, 329 (1985).; M. Banner et al., Phys. Lett. B 115, 59 (1982).
- [24] B R.Webber, CERN-TH 6706/92 (1992).
- [25] ARGUS collab.: H.A lbrecht et al., Z. Phys. C 46, 15 (1990).
- [26] L3 Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B 259, 199 (1991).
- [27] W Furm anski and R Petronzio, Phys. Lett. B 97, 437 (1980).
- [28] PM Stevenson and H D Politzer, Nucl. Phys. B 277, 758 (1986).
- [29] F M Borzum ati, B A Kniehl, G K ram er, preprint DESY 92-135, Oct.92



Fraction of E_l $d\sigma {\langle d^3P_l}$



Fraction of E_{l} $d\sigma/d^{3}P_{l}$



Fraction of E_l $d\sigma {\left\langle d^3 P_l \right\rangle}$







Х



Х

















 $\mathbb E~d\sigma {\backslash} d^3 P~(pb {\backslash} GeV^2)$















 $[\]mathbb E~d\sigma {\backslash} d^3 P~(pb {\backslash} GeV^2)$





RATIO OF CROSS SECTIONS



RATIO OF CROSS SECTIONS











E qo q_{3} b (bp $e_{a_{s}}$)







