

SMALL x BEHAVIOUR OF PARTON DISTRIBUTIONS IN PROTON

A.V. Kotikov¹

Laboratoire Physique Theorique ENSLAPP
LAPP, B.P. 110, F-74941, Annecy-le-Vieux Cedex, France

Abstract

The paper presents the QCD description of the hard and semihard processes in the framework of the Wilson operator product expansion. The smooth transition between the cases of the soft and hard Pomeron is obtained.

¹ On leave of absence from Particle Physics Laboratory, JINR, Dubna, Russia.
e-mail: KOTIKOV@LAPPHP0.IN2P3FR, KOTIKOV@SUNSE.JINR.DUBNA.SU

The recent measurements of the deep-inelastic (DIS) structure function (SF) F_2 by the H1 [1] and ZEUS [2] collaborations open a new kinematical range to study proton structure. The new HERA data show the strong increase of F_2 with decreasing x . However, the data of the NMC [3] and E665 collaboration [4] at small x and smaller Q^2 is in the good agreement with the standard Pomeron or with the Donnachie-Landshof picture where the Pomeron intercept: $\alpha_p = 1.08$, is very close to standard one. The interpretation of the fast changing of the intercept in the region of Q^2 between $Q^2 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2$ and $Q^2 = 10 \text{ GeV}^2$ (see Fig.3 in [5]) is yet absent. There are the arguments in favour of that is one intercept (see [6]) or the superposition of two different Pomeron trajectories, one having an intercept of 1.08 and the one of 1.5 (see Fig.4 in [5]).

The aim of this article is the possible "solution" of this problem in the framework of Dokshitzer-Gribov-Lipatov-Altarelli-Parisi (DGLAP) equation [7]. It is good known (see, for example, [8]), that in the double-logarithmical approximation the DGLAP equation solution is the Bessel function, or $\exp((Q^2) \ln(1-x))$, where (Q^2) is known Q^2 -dependent function². However, we will seek the "solution"³ of DGLAP equation in the Regge form (we use the parton distributions (PD) multiplied by x and neglect the nonsinglet quark distribution at small x):

$$f_a(x; Q^2) \sim x f_a(x; Q^2); \quad (a = q; g) \quad (\alpha_p = 1 + \dots) \quad (1)$$

where $f_a(x; Q^2)$ is nonsingular at $x \rightarrow 0$ and $f_a(x; Q^2) \sim (1-x)$ at $x \rightarrow 1$ ⁴. The similar investigations were already done and the results are good known (see [9], [12]–[16])⁵. The aim of this letter is to expand these results to the range where $x \rightarrow 0$ (and Q^2 is not large) following to the observed early (see [13, 14])⁶ method to replace the Mellin convolution by a simple product. Of course, we understand that the Regge behaviour (1) is not in the agreement with the double-logarithmic solution, however the range, where $x \rightarrow 0$ and the Q^2 values are nonlarge, is really the Regge regime and a "solution" of DGLAP equation in the form of (1) would be worthwhile. This "solution" may be understood as the solution of DGLAP equation together with the condition of its Regge asymptotic at $x \rightarrow 0$.

Consider DGLAP equation and apply the method from [14] to the Mellin convolution in its r.h.s. (in contrast with standard case, we use below $(Q^2) = \alpha_s(Q^2) = (4/\pi)$):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} f_a(x; t) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=a,b} \hat{\alpha}_{ai}(\alpha; x) f_a(x; t) \quad (a; b) = (q; g) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=a,b} \tilde{\alpha}_{ai}(\alpha; 1 + \dots) f_a(x; t) + O(x^1) \quad \alpha_{ab}(\alpha; n) = \alpha_{ab}^{(0)}(n) + \alpha_{ab}^{(2)}(n) + \dots; \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

²More correctly, α is Q^2 -dependent for the solution of DGLAP equation with the boundary condition: $f_a(x; Q_0^2) = \text{const}$ at $x \rightarrow 0$. In the case of the boundary condition: $f_a(x; Q_0^2) \sim \exp(\ln(1-x))$, α is lost (see [9]) its Q^2 -dependence

³We use the term in "solution" because we will work in the leading twist approximation in the range of Q^2 : $Q^2 > 1 \text{ GeV}^2$, where the higher twist term may give the sizeable contribution (see, for example, [10]). Moreover, our "solution" is the Regge asymptotic with unknown parameters rather than the solution of DGLAP equation. The parameters are found from the agreement of the r.h.s. and l.h.s. of the equation.

⁴Consideration of the more complicated behaviour in the form $x \sim (\ln(1-x))^b I_{2g}(\sqrt{\ln(1-x)})$ is given in [9] and will be considered in this content in the forthcoming article [11]

⁵In the double-logarithmical approximation the similar results were obtained in [17]

⁶The method is based on the earlier results [18]

where $t = \ln(Q^2 = s)$. The $\hat{\alpha}_{ab}(\epsilon; x)$ are the splitting functions corresponding to the anomalous dimensions $(AD)_{ab}(\epsilon; n) = \int_0^1 dx x^{n-1} \hat{\alpha}_{ab}(\epsilon; x)$. Here the functions $\hat{\alpha}_{ab}(\epsilon; 1 + \epsilon)$ are the $(AD)_{ab}(\epsilon; n)$ expanded from the integer argument n to the noninteger one $1 + \epsilon$. The functions $\tilde{\alpha}_{ab}(\epsilon; 1 + \epsilon)$ (marked lower as AD, too) can be obtained from the functions $\hat{\alpha}_{ab}(\epsilon; 1 + \epsilon)$ replacing the term $1 =$ by the one $1 = \tilde{}$:

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{}} = \frac{1}{\sim} = \frac{1}{-1} \tilde{\prime}(x; \epsilon)x \quad (3)$$

This replacement (3) is appeared very naturally from the consideration the Mellin convolution at $x \rightarrow 0$ (see [14]) and preserves the smooth and nonsingular transition to the case $\epsilon = 0$, where

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{}} = \ln \frac{1}{x} \tilde{\%}(x) \quad (4)$$

The concrete form of the functions $\tilde{\prime}(x; \epsilon)$ and $\tilde{\%}(x)$ depends strongly on the type of the behaviour of the PD $f_a(x; Q^2)$ at $x \rightarrow 0$ and in the case of the Regge regime (1) they are (see [13, 14]):

$$\tilde{\prime}(x; \epsilon) = \frac{(\epsilon + 1) \Gamma(1 - \epsilon)}{\Gamma(\epsilon + 1)} \text{ and } \tilde{\%}(x) = \Gamma(\epsilon + 1) \Gamma(1 - \epsilon); \quad (5)$$

where $\Gamma(\epsilon + 1)$ and $\Gamma(1 - \epsilon)$ are the Eulerian Γ - and Γ -functions, respectively. As it can be seen, there is the correlation with the PD behaviour at large x .

If ϵ is not small (i.e. $x \gg 1$), we can replace $1 = \tilde{}$ to $1 =$ in the r.h.s. of Eq.(2) and obtain its solution in the form (hereafter $t_0 = t(Q^2 = Q_0^2)$):

$$\frac{f_a(x; t)}{f_a(x; t_0)} = \frac{M_a(1 + \epsilon; t)}{M_a(1 + \epsilon; t_0)}; \quad (6)$$

where $M_a(1 + \epsilon; t)$ is the analytical expansion of the PD moments $M_a(n; t) = \int_0^1 dx x^{n-1} f_a(x; t)$ to the noninteger value $n = 1 + \epsilon$.

This solution is good known one (see [13] for the first two orders of the perturbation theory, [15] for the first three orders and [16] containing a resummation of all orders, respectively). Note that recently the fit of HERA data was done in [19] with the formula for PD $f_q(x; t)$ very close ⁷ to (6) and the very well agreement (the χ^2 per degree of freedom is 0.85) is found at $\epsilon = 0.40 \pm 0.03$. There are also the fits [20] of the another group using equations which are similar to (6) in the LO approximation.

The new results in our investigations are in the follows. Note that the Q^2 -evolution of $M_a(1 + \epsilon; t)$ contains the two: $\tilde{+}$ and $\tilde{-}$ components, i.e. $M_a(1 + \epsilon; t) = \sum_{i=\pm} M_a^i(1 + \epsilon; t)$,

⁷The used formula (Eq.(2) from [19]) coincides with (6) in the leading order (LO) approximation, if we save only $f_g(x; Q^2)$ in the r.h.s. of (2) (or put $q_{qq} = 0$ and $q_{gg} = 0$ formally). Eq.(6) and Eq.(2) from [19] have some differences in the next-to-leading order (NLO), which are not very important because they are corrections to the $\tilde{-}$ correction.

and in principle the every component evolves separately and may have the independent (and not equal) intercept. Here for the simplicity we restrict ourselves to the LO analysis and give NLO formulae lower without large intermediate equations.

1. Consider DGLAP equation for the "+" and "-" parts (hereafter $s = \ln(\ln t - \ln t_0)$):

$$\frac{d}{ds} f_a^{\pm}(x;t) = \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{\pm}^a f_a^{\pm}(x;t) + O(x^1); \quad (7)$$

where

$$\gamma_{\pm}^a = \frac{1}{2} \left(\gamma_{gg}^a \pm \gamma_{qq}^a \right) \frac{r}{\gamma_{gg}^a \pm \gamma_{qq}^a + 4 \gamma_{gq}^a}$$

are the AD of the "+" components (see, for example, [21])

The "-" component $\sim (1 + \gamma_{\pm}^a)$ does not contain the singular term (see [13, 15] and lower) and its solution have the form:

$$\frac{f_a^{\pm}(x;t)}{f_a^{\pm}(x;t_0)} = e^{d_{\pm}(1 + \gamma_{\pm}^a)s}; \text{ where } d_{\pm} = \frac{(1 + \gamma_{\pm}^a)}{2} \quad (8)$$

The "+" component $\sim_+ (1 + \gamma_+^a)$ contains the singular term and $f_a^+(x;t)$ have the solution similar (8) only for $x^+ \gg 1$:

$$\frac{f_a^+(x;t)}{f_a^+(x;t_0)} = e^{d_+(1 + \gamma_+^a)s}; \text{ if } x^+ \gg 1 \quad (9)$$

The both intercepts $1 + \gamma_+^a$ and $1 + \gamma_-^a$ are unknown and should be found, in principle, from the analysis of the experimental data. However there is the another way. From the small Q^2 (and small x) data of the NMC [3] and E665 collaboration [4] we can conclude that the SF F_2 and hence the PD $f_a(x;Q^2)$ have the asymptotics for $x \rightarrow 0$ and $Q^2 \rightarrow (1-2) \text{ GeV}^2$. Thus we know that the values of γ_+ and γ_- is approximately zero at $Q^2 \rightarrow 1 \text{ GeV}^2$.

Consider Eqs.(7) with $\gamma_{\pm}^a = 0$ and with the boundary condition $f_a(x;Q_0^2) = A_a$ at $Q_0^2 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2$. For the "-" component we already have the solution: the Eq.(8) with $\gamma_{\pm}^a = 0$ and $d_{\pm}(1) = 16f = (27 - \gamma_-)$, where f is the number of the active quarks and γ_{\pm} are the coefficients in the β -expansion of QCD β -function. For its "+" component Eq.(7) can be rewritten in the form (hereafter the index $1 + \gamma_+^a$ will be omitted in the case $\gamma_+^a \neq 0$):

$$\ln \left(\frac{1}{x} \right) \frac{d}{ds} + (s) + \frac{d}{ds} \ln(A_a^+) = \frac{1}{2} \gamma_+^a \ln \left(\frac{1}{x} \right) + \gamma_+^a \quad (10)$$

where γ_+^a and γ_-^a are the coefficients of the singular and regular parts at $x \rightarrow 0$ of AD $\gamma_{\pm}^a(1 + \gamma_{\pm}^a)$:

$$\gamma_{\pm}^a(1 + \gamma_{\pm}^a) = \gamma_{\pm}^a \frac{1}{2} + \gamma_{\pm}^a; \quad \gamma_+^a = 24; \quad \gamma_-^a = 22 + \frac{4f}{27}$$

The solution of Eq.(10) is

$$f_a^+(x;t) = A_a^+ x^{\hat{d}_+} e^{\bar{d}_+ s}; \quad (11)$$

where

$$\hat{d}_+ = \frac{\alpha_+}{2} + \frac{4}{3}; \quad \bar{d}_+ = \frac{1}{2} - \alpha_+ + \frac{\alpha_+}{3} + \frac{101}{81}$$

Hereafter the symbol ' marks the case $f = 3$.

As it can be seen from (11) the $\alpha_+ = 0$ of the α_+ -component of PD is very nonstable from the (perturbative) viewpoint, because $d(\alpha_+) = ds \neq 0$, and for $Q^2 > Q_0^2$ we have already the nonzero power of x (i.e. pomeron intercept $\alpha_p > 1$). This is in the agreement with the experimental data. Let us note that the power of x is positive for $Q^2 < Q_0^2$ that is in principle also supported by the NMC [3] data, but the use of this analysis to $Q^2 < 1 \text{ GeV}^2$ is open the question.

Thus, we have the DGLAP equation solution for the α_+ component at Q^2 is close to $Q_0^2 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2$, where Pomeron starts in its movement to the subcritical (or Lipatov [22, 23]) regime and also for the large Q^2 , where pomeron have the Q^2 -independent intercept. In principle, the general solution of (7) should contain the smooth transition between these pictures but this solution is absent⁸. We introduce the some "critical" value of Q^2 : Q_c^2 , where the solution (9) is replaced by the solution (11). The exact value of Q_c^2 may be obtained from the fit of experimental data. Thus, we have in the LO of the perturbation theory:

$$\begin{aligned} f_a(x;t) &= f_a^-(x;t) + f_a^+(x;t) \\ f_a^-(x;t) &= A_a^- \exp(-d_- s) \\ f_a^+(x;t) &= \begin{cases} A_a^+ x^{\hat{d}_+} \exp(\bar{d}_+ s); & \text{if } Q^2 < Q_c^2 \\ f_a^+(x;t_c) \exp(-d_+ (1 + \alpha_+)(s - s_c)); & \text{if } Q^2 > Q_c^2 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} t_c &= t(Q_c^2); \quad s_c = s(Q_c^2) \\ A_q^+ &= (1 - \alpha_+)A_q + \alpha_+ A_g; \quad A_g^+ = \alpha_+ A_g + (1 - \alpha_+)A_q \\ \text{and } A_a^- &= A_a - A_a^+ \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

and the values of the coefficients α_+ , α_- and α_0 may be found, for example, in [21].

Using the concrete AD values at $\alpha_+ = 0$ and $f = 3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_q^+ &= \frac{1}{27} \frac{4A_q + 9A_g}{\ln(\frac{1}{x}) - \frac{85}{108}} \\ A_g^+ &= A_g + \frac{4}{9} A_q - \frac{4}{27} \frac{9A_g - A_q}{\ln(\frac{1}{x}) - \frac{85}{108}} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

⁸The form $\exp(-s_+(1 + \alpha_+)) = (2 - \alpha_+)$ coincides with the both solution: Eq.(9) if $x^{\hat{d}_+} > 1$ and Eq.(11) when $\alpha_+ = 0$ but it is not the solution of DGLAP equation.

Thus, the value of the "+" component of the quark PD is suppressed logarithmically that is in the qualitative agreement with the HERA parametrizations of SF F_2 (see [24, 27]) (in the LO $F_2(x; Q^2) = (2=9)f_q(x; Q^2)$ for $f = 3$), where the magnitude connected with the factor x is 5–10% from the at (for $x \neq 0$) magnitude.

2. By analogy with the subsection 1 and knowing the NLO Q^2 -dependence of PD moments, we obtain the following equations for the NLO Q^2 -evolution of the both: "+" and "-" PD components (hereafter $s = \ln(Q^2/Q_0^2)$; $p = (Q^2/Q_0^2)$):

$$\begin{aligned} f_a(x;t) &= f_a(x;t) + f_a^+(x;t) \\ f_a(x;t) &= \tilde{A}_a \exp(d s - d^a p) \\ f_a^+(x;t) &= \begin{cases} \tilde{A}_a^+ x^{(\hat{d}_+ s + \hat{d}_{++}^a p)} \exp(-\bar{d}_+ s - \bar{d}_{++}^a p); & \text{if } Q^2 \leq Q_c^2 \\ f_a^+(x;t_c) \exp(-d_+(1+c)(s-s_c) - d_{++}^a(1+c)(p-p_c)); & \text{if } Q^2 > Q_c^2 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} s_c &= s(Q_c^2); p_c = p(Q_c^2); d_0 = (Q_0^2); d_c = (Q_c^2) \\ \tilde{A}_a &= 1 - d_0 K^a A_a + d_0 K^a A_a \\ d_{++}^a &= \hat{d}_{++}^a \ln\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) \%(\cdot) + \bar{d}_{++}^a; d_{++}^a = \frac{1}{2 d_0} - \frac{1}{2 d_0^2} K^a \\ \text{and } K^q &= \frac{1}{2 d_0 + \frac{(0)}{qq}}; K^g = K^q \frac{(0)}{qq} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The NLO AD of the "-" components are connected with the NLO AD $_{ab}^{(1)}$. The corresponding formulae can be found in [21].

Using the concrete values of the LO and NLO AD at $x = 0$ and $f = 3$, we obtain the following values for the NLO components from (15), (16) (note that we remain only the terms $O(1)$ in the NLO terms)

$$\begin{aligned} d^q &= \frac{16^h}{81} 2(3) + 9(2) \frac{779^i}{108} 1.97; d^g = d^q + \frac{28}{81} 2.32 \\ \hat{d}_{++}^q &= \frac{2800}{81}; \bar{d}_{++}^q = 32^h(3) + \frac{263}{216}(2) \frac{372607^i}{69984} 67.82 \\ \hat{d}_{++}^g &= \frac{1180}{81}; \bar{d}_{++}^g = \bar{d}_{++}^q + \frac{953}{27} 12(2) 52.26 \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A}_q^+ &= \frac{20}{3} d_0 A_g + \frac{4}{9} A_q^i + \frac{1}{27} \frac{4A_q(1 - 7.67 d_0) + 9A_g(1 - 8.71 d_0)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) \%(\cdot) \frac{85}{108}} \\ \tilde{A}_g^+ &= A_g + \frac{4}{9} A_q - 1 - \frac{80}{9} d_0 - \frac{4}{27} \frac{9A_g - A_q}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) \%(\cdot) \frac{85}{108}} \left(1 + \frac{692}{81} d_0\right) \\ \text{and } \tilde{A}_a &= A_a - \tilde{A}_a^+ \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

It is useful to change in Eqs.(15)–(18) from the quark PD to the SF $F_2(x;Q^2)$, which is connected in NLO approximation with the PD by the following way (see [21]):

$$F_2(x;Q^2) = (1 + (Q^2)B_q(1 +)^2 f_q(x;Q^2) + (Q^2)B_g(1 +)^2 f_g(x;Q^2); \quad (19)$$

where $\frac{2}{s} = \sum_{i=1}^P f_i = \langle e_f^2 \rangle$ is the average charge square of the active quarks: $\frac{2}{s} = (2/9$ and $5/18)$ for $f = (3$ and $4)$, respectively. The NLO corrections lead to the appearance in the r.h.s. of Eqs.(15) of the additional terms $1 + B = 1 + {}_0B$ and the necessity to transform \tilde{A}_q to C $F_2(x;Q^2)$ into the input parts. The final results for $F_2(x;Q^2)$ are in the form :

$$\begin{aligned} F_2(x;t) &= F_2(x;t) + F_2^+(x;t) \\ F_2(x;t) &= C \exp\left(\frac{d}{s} \ln p\right) (1 + B) = (1 + {}_0B) \\ &\quad \times \left[C + x^{\left(\frac{d}{3} + \frac{d}{81} p\right)} \exp\left(\frac{\bar{d}}{s} \ln p\right) (1 + B^+) = (1 + {}_0B^+) \right]; \quad \text{if } Q^2 < Q_c^2 \\ F_2^+(x;t) &= F_2^+(x;t_c) \exp\left[\frac{d}{s} \ln p\right] (1 + B) = (1 + {}_0B) \\ &\quad \times \left[1 + B^+ (1 + c) = 1 + {}_cB^+ (1 + c) \right]; \quad \text{if } Q^2 > Q_c^2 \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where

$$B = B_q + \frac{1}{\alpha_s} B_g; \quad C = \tilde{A}_q (1 + {}_0B)$$

with the substitution of \tilde{A}_q by C $F_2(x;Q_0^2)$ into Eq.(18) \tilde{A}_q according

$$C = (1 + {}_0B_q) \frac{2}{s} A_q + ({}_0B_g) \frac{2}{s} A_g; \quad (21)$$

For the gluon PD the situation is more simple: in Eq.(18) it is necessary to replace A_q by C according (21).

For the concrete values of the LO and NLO AD at $s = 0$ and $f = 3$, we have for Q^2 -evolution of $F_2(x;Q^2)$ and the gluon PD :

$$\begin{aligned} F_2(x;t) &= F_2(x;t) + F_2^+(x;t); \quad f_g(x;t) = f_g(x;t) + f_g^+(x;t) \\ F_2(x;t) &= C \exp\left(\frac{32}{81} \ln p\right) \left(1 + \frac{8}{9}\right) = \left(1 + \frac{8}{9} {}_0\right) \\ &\quad \times \left[C + x^{\left(\frac{4}{3} + \frac{2800}{81} p\right)} \exp\left[\frac{4}{3} \left(\ln p\right) + \frac{101}{108} \ln p\right] + \frac{2800}{81} \ln p - 67.32 \right] p \\ &\quad \times \left[1 + 6 \left[\ln\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) - \ln p\right] - \frac{101}{108} \right] = 1 + 6 \left[\ln\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) - \ln p\right] - \frac{101}{108} {}_0; \quad \text{if } Q^2 < Q_c^2 \\ F_2^+(x;t) &= F_2^+(x;t_c) \exp\left[\frac{d}{s} \ln p\right] (1 + B) = (1 + {}_0B) \\ &\quad \times \left[1 + B^+ (1 + c) = 1 + {}_cB^+ (1 + c) \right]; \quad \text{if } Q^2 > Q_c^2 \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

$$f_g(x;t) = A_g \exp\left(\frac{32}{81} \ln p\right) \left(1 + \frac{8}{9}\right) = \left(1 + \frac{8}{9} {}_0\right)$$

$$f_g^+(x;t) = \begin{cases} A_g^+ x^{\left(\frac{4}{3}s + \frac{1180}{81}p\right)} \exp \left[\frac{4}{3} \left(\ln \left(\frac{1}{x} \right) - \ln \left(\frac{1}{x_0} \right) + \frac{101}{108} \right) s + \left(\frac{1180}{81} \ln \left(\frac{1}{x} \right) - 52.26 \right) p \right] \\ 1 + 6 \left[\ln \left(\frac{1}{x} \right) - \ln \left(\frac{1}{x_0} \right) + \frac{101}{108} \right] s = 1 + 6 \left[\ln \left(\frac{1}{x} \right) - \ln \left(\frac{1}{x_0} \right) + \frac{101}{108} \right] s_0; \text{ if } Q^2 \leq Q_c^2 \\ f_g^+(x;t_c) \exp \left[d_+ (1 + s_c) (s - s_c) + d_{++}^a (1 + s_c) (p - p_c) \right] \\ 1 + B^+ (1 + s_c) = 1 + s_c B^+ (1 + s_c); \text{ if } Q^2 > Q_c^2 \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

where

$$C^+ = \frac{2}{27} \frac{h}{26} A_g + 2C^+ + \frac{A_g (1 - 9.74 s_0) + 2C (1 - 7.82 s_0)}{\ln \left(\frac{1}{x} \right) - \ln \left(\frac{1}{x_0} \right) + \frac{85}{108}} \quad (24)$$

$$A_g^+ = A_g \left(1 - \frac{28}{3} s_0 \right) + 2C \frac{2 - 2A_g (1 + \frac{590}{81} s_0) - C (1 + \frac{572}{81} s_0)}{27 \left[\ln \left(\frac{1}{x} \right) - \ln \left(\frac{1}{x_0} \right) + \frac{85}{108} \right]} \quad (25)$$

and $\tilde{A}_g = A_g - A_g^+$

Let us give some conclusions following from Eqs.(24)-(25). It is clearly seen that the NLO corrections reduce the LO contributions. Indeed, the value of the subcritical Pomeron intercept, which increases as $\ln(x_0)$ in the LO, obtains the additional term (s_0) with the large (and opposite in sign to the LO term) numerical coefficient. Note that this coefficient is different for the quark and gluon PD, that is in the agreement with the recent MRS(G) fit in [26] and the data analysis by ZEUS group (see [25]). The intercept of the gluon PD is larger than the quark PD one (see also [26, 25]). However, the effective reduction of the quark PD is smaller (that is in the agreement with W.-K. Tung analysis in [27]), because the quark PD part increasing at small x obtains the additional (s_0) but not $(1=\ln x)$ term, which is important at very small x .

Note that there is the fourth quark threshold at $Q_{th}^2 = 10 \text{ GeV}^2$ and the Q_{th}^2 value may be larger or smaller to Q_c^2 one. Then, either the solution in the r.h.s. of Eqs. (20,22,23) before the critical point Q_c^2 and the one for $Q^2 > Q_c^2$ contain the threshold transition, where the values of all variables are changed from ones at $f = 3$ to ones at $f = 4$. The (Q^2) is smooth because $\frac{f=3}{M_S} \rightarrow \frac{f=4}{M_S}$ (see also the recent experimental test of the favour independence of strong interactions into [28]).

For simplicity here we suppose that $Q_{th}^2 = Q_c^2$ and all changes initiated by threshold are done automatically: the first (at $Q^2 \leq Q_c^2$) solutions contain $f = 3$ and second (at $Q^2 > Q_c^2$) ones have $f = 4$, respectively. For the \backslash component we should use $Q_{th}^2 = Q_c^2$, too.

Note only that the Pomeron intercept $p = 1 - (d_+ s + \hat{d}_{++}^a p)$ increases at $Q^2 = Q_{th}^2$, because

$$p = \begin{cases} \frac{4}{3} s(Q_{th}^2; Q_0^2) - \frac{2800}{81} p(Q_{th}^2; Q_0^2); & \text{if } Q^2 \leq Q_c^2 \\ 1.44 s(Q_{th}^2; Q_0^2) - 38.11 p(Q_{th}^2; Q_0^2); & \text{if } Q^2 > Q_c^2 \end{cases}$$

that agrees with results [29] obtained in the framework of dual parton model. The difference

$$4 - p = 0.11 s(Q_{th}^2; Q_0^2) - 3.55 p(Q_{th}^2; Q_0^2)$$

depends from the values of Q_{th}^2 and Q_0^2 . For $Q_{th}^2 = 10 \text{ GeV}^2$ and $Q_0^2 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2$ it is very small:

$$4 - p = 0.012$$

3. Let us resume the obtained results. We have got the DGLAP equation \solution" having the Regge form (1) for the two cases: at small Q^2 ($Q^2 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2$), where SF and PD have the flat behaviour at small x , and at large Q^2 , where $SF \sim F_2(x; Q^2)$ fastly increases when $x \rightarrow 0$. The behaviour in the flat case is nonstable with the perturbative viewpoint because it leads to the production of the subcritical value of pomeron intercept at larger Q^2 and the its increase (like $4=3 \ln(Q_0^2/Q^2)$ in LO) when the Q^2 value increases⁹. The solution in the Lipatov Pomeron case corresponds to the well-known results (see [13, 15, 19]) with Q^2 -independent Pomeron intercept. The general \solution" should contains the smooth transition between these pictures. Unfortunately, it is impossible to obtain it in the case of the simple approximation (1), because the r.h.s. of DGLAP equation (7) contains the both: x and Const , terms. As a result, we used two above \solutions" gluing in some point Q_c^2 .

Note that our \solution" is some generation (or a application) of the solution of DGLAP equation in the momentum space. The last one have two: "+" and "-" components. The above our conclusions are related to the "+" component, which is the basic Regge asymptotic. The Pomeron intercept corresponding to "-" component, is Q^2 -independent and this component is the subasymptotical one at large Q^2 . However, the magnitude of the "+" is suppressed like $1=\ln(1-x)$ and (Q_0^2/Q^2) , and the subasymptotical "-" component may be important. Indeed, it is observed experimentally (see [24, 25]). Note, however, that the suppression (Q_0^2/Q^2) is really very slight if we choose a small value of Q_0^2 .

Our \solution" in the form of Eqs.(22)-(25) is in the very well agreement with the recent MRS(G) fit [26] and with the results of [19] at $Q^2 = 15 \text{ GeV}^2$. As it can be seen from Eqs.(22),(23), in our formulae there is the dependence on the PD behaviour at large x . Following to [32] we choose $\beta = 5$ that agrees in the gluon case with the quark counting rule [33]. This value is also close to the values obtained by CCFR group [34] ($\beta = 4$) and in the last MRS(G) analysis [26] ($\beta = 6$). Note that this dependence is strongly reduced for the gluon PD in the form

$$f_g(x; Q_0^2) = A_g(\beta)(1-x);$$

if we suppose that the proton's momentum is carried by gluon, is β -independent. We used $A_g(5) = 2.1$ and $F_2(x; Q_0^2) = 0.3$ when $x \rightarrow 0$.

For the quark PD the choice $\beta = 3$ is more preferable, however the use of two different values complicates the analysis. Because the quark contribution to the "+" component is not large, we put $\beta = 5$ to both: quark and gluon cases. Note also that the variable (Q^2) have (see [35]) the Q^2 -dependence determined by the LO AD $\frac{(0)}{NS}$. However this Q^2 -dependence is proportional and it is not important in our analysis.

Starting from $Q_0^2 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2$ (by analogy with [31]) and from $Q_0^2 = 2 \text{ GeV}^2$, and using two values of QCD parameter α_s : more standard one ($\frac{f=4}{MS} = 200 \text{ MeV}$) and ($\frac{f=4}{MS} =$

⁹The Pomeron intercept value increasing with Q^2 was obtained also in [30].

255 M eV) obtained in [26], we have the following values of the quark and gluon PD \intercepts" $\alpha_s = (d_s + \hat{d}_s + a)$ (here $\frac{f=4}{M S}$ is marked as α_s):
if $Q_0^2 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2$

Q^2	$\alpha_s(Q^2)$ = 200M eV	$\alpha_s(Q^2)$ = 200M eV	$\alpha_s(Q^2)$ = 255M eV	$\alpha_s(Q^2)$ = 255M eV
4	0.191	0.389	0.165	0.447
10	0.318	0.583	0.295	0.659
15	0.367	0.652	0.345	0.734

if $Q_0^2 = 2 \text{ GeV}^2$

Q^2	$\alpha_s(Q^2)$ = 200M eV	$\alpha_s(Q^2)$ = 200M eV	$\alpha_s(Q^2)$ = 255M eV	$\alpha_s(Q^2)$ = 255M eV
4	0.099	0.175	0.097	0.198
10	0.226	0.368	0.227	0.410
15	0.275	0.438	0.278	0.486

Note that these values of α_s are above the ones from [26]. Because we have the second (subasymptotical) part, the effective our \intercepts" have the smaller values.

As a conclusion, we note that BFKL equation (and thus the value of Lipatov Pomeron intercept) was obtained in [22] in the framework of perturbative QCD. The large- Q^2 HERA experimental data are in the good agreement with Lipatov's trajectory and thus with perturbative QCD. The small Q^2 data agrees with the standard Pomeron intercept $\alpha_p = 1$ or with Donnachie-Landshof picture: $\alpha_p = 1.08$. Perhaps, this range requires already the knowledge of nonperturbative QCD dynamics and perturbative solutions (including BFKL one) should be not applied here directly and are corrected by some nonperturbative contributions.

In our analysis Eq.(1) can be considered as the nonperturbative (Regge-type) input at $Q_0^2 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2$. Above Q_0^2 the PD behaviour obeys DGLAP equation, Pomeron moves to the subcritical regime and tends to its perturbative value. After some Q_c^2 , where its perturbative value was already attained, Pomeron intercept saves the permanent value. The application of this approach to analyse small x data invites further investigation.

References

- [1] H1 Collab.: T Ahmed et al, DESY preprint 95-006 (1995).
- [2] ZEUS Collab.: M Derrick et al, DESY preprint 94-143 (1994).
- [3] NM Collab.: P Amadruz et al, Phys.Lett. B 295, (1992) 159, B 309, (1993) 222.
- [4] E665 Collab.: in the B Badelek's report "Low Q^2 , low x in electroproduction. An overview.". In Proceeding de M oriond on QCD and high energy hadron interactions (1995) Les Arcs.

- [5] A Levy, D E SY preprint 95-003 (1995).
- [6] J D . B jorken, In Proceeding of the International W orkshop on D IS, Eilat, Izrael, Feb.1994.
- [7] V N G rbov and L N Lipatov, Sov.JNuclPhys. 18, (1972) 438; L N Lipatov, Yad.F iz. 20, (1974) 181; G A Itarelli and G Parisi, NuclPhys. B 126, (1977) 298; Yu L D okshitzer, ZHETF 46 (1977) 641.
- [8] V N G rbov, E M Levin and M G Ryskin, Phys.Rep. 100 (1983) 1; E M Levin and M G Ryskin, Phys.Rep. 189 (1990) 267.
- [9] V I Vovk, A V K otikov and S J M axim ov, TeorM at.F iz. 84 (1990) 101; A V K otikov, S J M axim ov and I S. Parobij, P reprint ITP-93-21E (1993) K iev, TeorM at.F iz. (1995) in press.
- [10] M V irchiaux and A M ilsztain, Phys.Lett. B 274 (1992) 221.
- [11] A V K otikov, work in progress
- [12] L L Enkovszky, A V K otikov and F Paccanoni, Yad.F iz. 55 (1993) 2205.
- [13] A V K otikov, Yad.F iz. 56 (1993) N 9, 217.
- [14] A V K otikov, Yad.F iz. 57 (1994) 142; Phys.Rev. D 49 (1994) 5746.
- [15] R K Ellis, E Levin and Z Kunst, NuclPhys. 420B (1994) 514.
- [16] R K Ellis, F H autm ann and B R W ebber, Phys.Lett. B 348 (1995) 582.
- [17] N N N ikolaev, B G Zakharov and V R Zoller, Phys.Lett. B 328, (1994) 486; N N N ikolaev and B G Zakharov, Phys.Lett. B 327, (1994) 149.
- [18] C Lopez and F J Yndurain, NuclPhys. 171B (1980) 231; 183B (1981) 157; A M Cooper-Sarkar, G Ingelmann, K R Long, R G Roberts and D H Saxon, Z Phys. C 39 (1988) 281; A V K otikov, JIN R preprints P 2-88-139, E 2-88-422 (1988) D ubna (unpublished).
- [19] G M Frichter, D W M cKay and J P Ralston, Phys.Rev.Lett. 74 (1995) 1508.
- [20] M Bertini, P Desgrolard, M Gi on, L Jenkovszky and F Paccanoni, P reprint LYCEN/9366 (1993).
- [21] A J Buras, RevM odPhys. 52 (1980) 149.
- [22] E A Kuraev, L N Lipatov and V S Fadin, ZHETF 53 (1976) 2018, 54 (1977) 128; Ya. Ya Balitzki and L N Lipatov, Yad.F iz. 28 (1978) 822; L N Lipatov, ZHETF 63 (1986) 904.

- [23] M G iafaloni, NuclPhys. B 296, (1987) 249; S Catani, F Fiorani and G M archesini, Phys.Lett. B 234 (1990) 389, NuclPhys. B 336 (1990) 18; S Catani, F Fiorani, G M archesini and G O riani, NuclPhys. B 361 (1991) 645;
- [24] G W olf, D E SY preprint 94-022 (1994).
- [25] ZEUS Collab.: M Derrick et al, Phys.Lett. B 345, (1995) 576.
- [26] A D Martin, W S Stirling and R G Roberts, Preprint RAL-95-021, DTP/95/14 (1995).
- [27] W K Tung, NuclPhys. B 315 (1989) 378.
- [28] SLD Collab.: K Abe et al, preprint SLAC-PUB-6687 (1995), submitted to Phys.Rev.Lett..
- [29] A Capella, U Sukhatme, C -I Tan and J Tran Thanh Van, Phys.Rep. 236 (1993) 225; Phys.Rev. D 36 (1987) 109.
- [30] A Capella, A Kaidalov, C Merino, and J Tran Thanh Van, Phys.Lett. B 337 (1994) 358; M Bertini, M Gi on and E Predazzi, Preprint LYCEN/9504 (1995).
- [31] R D Ball and S Forte, Phys.Lett. B 336 (1994) 77; preprints CERN-TH-7422-94 (1994), CERN-TH-95-1 (1995).
- [32] A Donnachie and P V Landsho , NuclPhys. B 303 (1988) 634.
- [33] S Brodsky and G Farrar, Phys.Rev.Lett. 31 (1973) 1153; V M atveev, R M uradyan and A Tavkhelidze, Lett. Nouvo Cim . 7 (1973) D 654..
- [34] CCFR Collab.: R Z Quintas et al, Phys.Rev.Lett. 71 (1993) 1307.
- [35] D J G ross, Phys.Rev.Lett. 32 (1974) 1071.