Single spin asymmetry in inclusive pion production, Collins e ect and the string model

(revised version)

X . A rtru

Institut de Physique Nucleaire de Lyon, IN 2P 3-CNRS et Universite Claude Bernard, F-69622 Villeurbanne Cedex, France

> J.C zyzew ski* Institute of H igh-Energy P hysics, University of N ijn egen, Toernooiveld 1, NL-6525 ED N ijn egen, The N etherlands

H.Yabuki Department of Mathematics, Hyogo University of Teacher Education, Yashiro, Hyogo, 673-14 Japan

A bstract

We calculated the single spin asymmetry in the inclusive pion production in the fragmentation region of transversely polarized proton-proton collisions. We generated the asymmetry at the level of fragmentation function (Collins e ect) by the Lund coloured string mechanism. We compared our results to the presently available experimental data. We obtained a qualitative agreement with the data after assuming that the transverse polarizations of the u and the d quarks in the proton are +1 and {1, respectively, at $x_B = 1$.

TPJU 13/95 hep-ph/9508239 August 1995

^{*} On leave from Institute of Physics, Jagellonian University, ul. Reymonta 4, PL-30-059 K rakow, Poland

1. Introduction

Q uantum C hrom odynam ics predicts that single transverse spin asym m etries are suppressed in hard collisions, as a consequence of helicity conservation (chiral invariance) in the subprocess. These asymmetries indeed appear as interferences between helicity amplitudes which dier by one unit of helicity, therefore they vanish in the limit m_{quark} ! 0, or equivalently Q^2 ! 1 (Q measures the hardness of the subprocess). Nevertheless, a number of high p_T reactions persist in showing large asymmetries [1].

These facts do not invalidate QCD but mean that the approach to the asymptotic regime in p₂ is very slow, as regards polarization. However, in spite of their \nonasymptotic "character, it is not unreasonable to think that the mechanisms of the asymmetries lie at the parton level. In other words, the asymmetries would be manifestations of quark transverse spin (or transversity). Thus, we could extract information from them about the quark transversity distribution in the nucleon and/or the transversely polarized quark fragmentation. In this paper, we shall present a model for the spin asymmetry in the reaction

$$p'' + p! + X$$
 (1:1)

which, unlike previous approaches [2,3], involves the transverse spin asymmetry of the polarized quark fragmentation [4,5], which hereafter will be referred to as the Collins e ect.

The paper is organized as follows: section 2 gives a very short review of the experimental data. In section 3, we explain how the Collins asymmetry can give rise to the observed single spin asymmetry in reaction (1.1) and deduce lower bounds on the transverse polarizations of the quarks in the proton, as well as on the size of the Collins e ect. Section 4 presents a quantitative model based on string fragmentation and section 5 gives the numerical results. Section 6 contains discussion of our results and conclusions.

2. M ain features of single spin asymmetry in inclusive pion production

A strong polarization e ect has been observed in recent years by the Ferm ilab E 704 collaboration in the reaction (1.1) with 200 G eV transversely polarized projectile protons [6-8]. The asymmetry is de ned as

$$A_N(x_F;p_?) = \frac{\#}{\#};$$
 (2:1)

assuming that "refers to the + 2 direction (vertical upwards), and the transverse m om entum $p_{\rm ?}$ of the pion points towards the + 2 direction ($p_{\rm beam}$ is along the 2 axis). In other words, positive $A_{\rm N}~$ m eans that for upward polarization, the pions tend to go to the left. $x_F~=~2p_z^{\rm C\,M}=^{P}$ s is the longitudinalm om entum fraction of the produced pion and $p_{\rm ?}$ is its transverse m om entum .

The data covered two kinem atical regions:

- Projectile fragmentation region, x_F 0.2. In this region the 200G eV E 704 data [6-8] show large asymmetries for all pions; positive for + and 0 and negative for . The asymmetries vary from about 0 at x_F 0.2 to about + 0.4, + 0.15 and 0.4, for +, 0 and respectively, at x_F 0.7 0.8 and $p_2 > 0.7$ G eV. The earlier 13.3 and 18.5G eV data [9] showed the asymmetry of + reaching 0.1 at $x_F = 0.6$ but that of consistent with zero. However, that measurement was done for + and in dimension of the regimes.

- Central region, x_F 0. Ref. [10] reported large positive asymmetry of 0 for the transverse momentum fraction $x_T = 2p_T = \overline{s} > 0.4$. However, the reanalysis of that data [11] showed the asymmetry consistent with zero in the whole x_T range covered. Form er experiments, at 13.3, 18.5, 24 and 40G eV, [12] observed signi cant asymmetries in the central region and high p_2 .

In this paper we shall concentrate only on the forward fragm entation region.

3. Possible explanations of the asym m etry

3.1 Generalities from the parton model.

In the factorized parton m odel, the cross section for p + p + X in the forward hem isphere is a convolution of the parton distribution $q(x;q_2)$, the parton-hadron scattering cross section $^{}_{q+B+q^0+X}$ $^{}_{q+q^0}$ and the parton fragmentation function D $_{=q^0}(z;\tilde{h}_2)$. In shorthand notations,

$$A_{!} \qquad q \qquad \gamma_{q! q^{0}} \qquad D_{=q^{0}} \qquad (3:1)$$

Each factor in this equation m ay or m ay not depend on spin. Transverse polarization can act at three di erent levels:

- a) in a dependence of $q(x;q_2)$ on the azim uth of q_2 (hereafter referred to as Sivers e ect [2,13]).
- b) in a single spin asymmetry in $_{q! q^0}$ hereafter referred to as Szwed mechanism [3]. In this case, (but not necessarily in case a), the quark q has to inherit a part of the polarization of the proton.
- c) in a dependence of D $_{=q^0}(z;\tilde{h}_2)$ on the azim uth of \tilde{h}_2 hereafter referred to as Collins e ect [4,5]. Here, a transfer of polarization has to occur not only from the proton to quark q but also from q to q^0 .

32 The Collinse ect.

A coording to Collins [4,5], the fragmentation function of the transversely polarized quark q takes the form

$$D_{=q}(\mathcal{P}_{q};z;h_{?}) = D_{=q}(z;h_{?}) 1 + A_{=q}(z;h_{?})\mathcal{P}_{q}jsin['(\mathcal{P}_{q}) '(h_{?})]; \quad (32)$$

where P_q is the quark polarization vector $(\mathcal{P}_q j \ 1)$, \tilde{h}_2 is the pion transverse m om entum relative to the quark m om entum q and ' (a) is the azim uth of a around q. The factors after A can be replaced by jq \tilde{h}_2 $j^{-1} P_q$ (q \tilde{h}_2). Such a dependence is allowed by P- and T- invariance but still remains to be measured.

The Collins e ect is the reciprocal of the Sivers e ect. However, Collins argued that the latter is prohibited by time reversal invariance [4], while the former is not. As for the mechanism b), it vanishes for massless quarks due to chiral symmetry: single spin asym m etry in $q! q^0$ is not compatible with conservation of quark helicity. Therefore it should be small for hard or sem i-hard scattering at high energy. In conclusion, am ong the sources of asym m etry a), b) and c) discussed above, we have a preference for the Collins e ect illustrated by Fig. 1.**

3.3 Consequence for the single spin asym metry.

Let us consider the hypothesis that the E704 asym m etry is due to the Collins e ect. In the parton m odel, the polarized inclusive cross section reads

$$\frac{d}{d^{3}p} = \frac{X}{a_{,b;c;d}} \frac{Z}{dxq_{a}(x)} \frac{dyq_{b}(y)}{dyq_{b}(y)}$$

$$Z = \frac{d}{dcos^{2}d''} \frac{d^{q_{a}+q_{b}!}q_{c}+q_{d}}{d'} \frac{Z}{dzd^{2}h_{?}} D_{=q_{c}}(P'_{q_{c}};z;h_{?}) \quad (p = ze = h_{?}); \quad (3:3)$$

where ${\tt c}$ is the momentum of the scattered quark. The transverse polarization of that quark is given by

$$\mathbf{P}_{q_c} = \mathbf{R} \ \mathbf{P}_{beam} \ \frac{? \ \mathbf{q}_a(\mathbf{x})}{\mathbf{q}_a(\mathbf{x})} \ \hat{\mathbf{D}}_{N N} \ (\hat{}): \tag{3:4}$$

R is the rotation about p_{beam} e which brings p_{beam} along e,

$$_{2} q(x) q''(x) q\#(x);$$
 (3:5)

also called $h_1(x)$, is the quark transversity distribution [15,16] in the proton polarized upwards, and \hat{D}_{NN} ([^]) is the coe cient of the spin transfer, norm alto the scattering plane, in the subprocess. Form ula (3.1) results from integration of (3.3) over the momentum fraction y of the parton of the target. q_b and q_1 in (3.3) m ay also be replaced by gluons. This does not change the results concerning the asymmetry.

At large x_F , the dom inant quark avours are $q_a = q_c = u$ for + production and $q_a = q_c = d$ for production. Furtherm ore, the hard scattering occurs predom inantly at sm all $^{\circ}$ and \hat{D}_{NN} ($^{\circ}$) is close to unity, as in the case of the \hat{t} -dhannel one-gluon exchange where $\hat{D}_{NN} = 2\hat{s}\hat{u}=(\hat{s}^2 + \hat{u}^2); \hat{s}$ and \hat{u} being the M andelstam variables of the parton subprocess. Thus, the results of E 704 collaboration im ply

$$\frac{2 u(x)}{u(x)} A(z;h_{2}) about 0:4;$$
(3:6)

$$\frac{2 d(x)}{d(x)} A(z;h_{2}) \text{ about } 0:4; \qquad (3:7)$$

for xz ' x_F ' 0.8. x m eans the most probable value of x. The inequalities take into account the fact that integration over q_2 and $\hat{}$ always dilutes the Collins asymmetry. It

^{**} We shall not discuss other approaches [14] not relying on the factorized parton description (Eq. (3.1) or (3.3)). They are not necessarily in contradiction with the present one.

m eans that we get at least a lower bound of 0.4 separately for j $_{?}$ u=uj, j $_{?}$ d=djat large x and A (z;h_?) jat large z and for the most probable value of h_?.

4. Sim ple m odel of single-spin asym m etry

In order to make the conclusions of the previous section more quantitative, we have constructed a simple model based on the string model [17] of quark fragmentation.

We consider only the valence quarks of the projectile proton. We assume that the quark elastic-scattering cross-section $d^=dq_2$ in (3.3) depends only on the transverse momentum q_2 of the scattered quark. Since the scattering angle is in our case very sm all we assume $D_{NN} = 1$ in Eq. (3.4). A fler scattering, the quark spans a string between itself and the target. The string decays according to the recursive Lund recipe [17], for which we use the Standard Lund splitting function:

$$f(z) = (1 + C)(1 - z)^{C};$$
 (4:1)

z being the fraction of the nullplane m om entum $p^{+} = p^{0} + p^{3}$ of the string taken away by the next hadron. f(z) = $D^{\operatorname{rank}=1}$ (z) corresponds to the production rate of the leading*** hadron. This gives for all ranks the fragm entation function [17]:

D (z) =
$$(1 + C)\frac{1}{z}(1 - z)^{C} = \frac{1}{z}f(z)$$
: (4.2)

Thus, for all the other (subleading) hadrons originating from the string we get:

D^{rank 2}(z) =
$$(1 + C)\frac{1-z}{z}(1-z)^{C} = f(z)\frac{1-z}{z}$$
: (4.3)

The transverse m om enta, relative to the direction of the string, of the quark ($K_{q?}$) and the antiquark ($K_{q?}$) of every pair created in the string balance each other (local com pensation of the transverse m om entum) and are distributed according to

being the string tension.

Each quark-antiquark pair created during the string breaking is assumed to be in a ${}^{3}P_{0}$ state (vacuum quantum numbers) [18], i.e., with parallel polarizations. A coording to the Lund mechanism for inclusive polarization [17], their polarizations are correlated to the transverse momentum $k_{q?}$ of the antiquark by

$$P'_{q}(k_{q?}) = \frac{L}{+L} \frac{\hat{z} \quad \tilde{k}_{q?}}{k_{q?}};$$
 (4:5)

^{***} W e call "leading" or " rst-rank" the hadron which contains the original quark spanning the string.

where \hat{z} is the unit vector along the z direction, is the parameter determining the correlation and L is the classical orbital angular momentum of the qq pair:

$$L = \frac{2 k_{q?}}{m_{q}^{2} + k_{q?}^{2}} , \frac{2 k_{q?}^{2}}{2 k_{q?}^{2}}$$
(4:6)

(see Fig. 2 for the schem atic explanation).

In order that q_0 and q_1 of Fig.2 combine into a pion, they have to form a spin singlet state, the probability of which is

$$\frac{1}{4} (1 \quad \vec{P}_{q_0} \quad \vec{P}_{q_1}); \qquad (4:7)$$

in accordance with the projection operator on the singlet state $\frac{1}{4}$ s(q₀) s(q), s being the quark spin operator. The polarization of the leading quark q₀ is

$$P'_{q_0}(x) = \frac{? q_0(x)}{q_0(x)} \quad \hat{Y}:$$
 (4.8)

The factor (4.7) causes the Collins e ect: if q_0 in Fig. 2 is polarized upwards then q_1 and the pion which contains q_1 tends to go to the left-hand-side of the \hat{z} direction.

Putting together Eqs (4.1), (4.4) and (4.7), we get the contribution of the leading pions to the fragmentation function of the polarized quark q:

$$D_{=q}^{\operatorname{rank}=1}(z;\tilde{n}_{?}) = c_{1}D^{\operatorname{rank}=1}(z) (h_{?})(1 P_{q} P_{q}(\tilde{n}_{?})); \qquad (4:9)$$

where P_q is given by (4.5) and (4.6). c_1 is the probability that the avours of q and q combine into the pion of the appropriate charge. We do not take into account the vector m esons since at high x_F the pions are mostly produced directly. Therefore we om it the factor $\frac{1}{4}$ of Eq. (4.7).

W e do not introduce the Collins e ect in subleading ranks. The subleading fragm entation function is spin independent and reads:

$$D_{=q}^{\operatorname{rank} 2}(z;\tilde{h}_{?}) = c_{2}D^{\operatorname{rank} 2}(z) (h_{?}); \qquad (4:10)$$

where (h_2) is the distribution of the transverse momentum of the produced pion with respect to the direction of the fragmenting quark. It is the convolution of the transverse momentum distributions of its constituents (4.4) and is also a Gaussian function but of the twice larger variance. c_2 is the avour factor analogical to that of Eq. (4.9).

We do not take into account the second string which is spanned by the remnant diquark of the projectile. A large part of the energy of that string goes into the leading baryon and it does not contribute much to the pion spectrum at high $x_{\rm F}$.

Our nal form ula for the polarized cross-section reads:

$$\frac{d}{dx_{F} d^{2} p_{?}} = \begin{cases} X & Z & Z \\ q=u; d & dxq(x) & d^{2} q_{2} \frac{d^{2}}{d^{2} q_{2}} & dzd^{2} \tilde{h}_{?} D_{=q}(z; \tilde{h}_{?}) \\ & r \frac{r}{z^{2} x^{2}} \frac{4p_{?}^{2}}{s} & (p_{?} - zq_{2} - \tilde{h}_{?}); \end{cases}$$
(4:11)

where

$$D_{=q}(z;\hbar_{?}) = D_{=q}^{\operatorname{rank}=1}(z;\hbar_{?}) + D_{=q}^{\operatorname{rank}=2}(z;\hbar_{?}): \qquad (4:12)$$

Since the production rate varies with the azim uthal angle of the pion m om entum like in (3.2) then, in order to obtain the asymmetry at given values of p_2 and x_F , we need to compare d (x_F ; p_2 ;) only at = 0 and = . Thus, for the transverse spin asymmetry we get:

$$A_{N} (x_{F}; p_{?}) = \frac{d (x_{F}; p_{?}; 0) d (x_{F}; p_{?};)}{d (x_{F}; p_{?}; 0) + d (x_{F}; p_{?};)}$$
(4:13)

5. Num erical results

For the num erical calculations we param etrized the quark distributions as follows:

$$u(x) = \frac{16}{3} x^{1=2} (1 x)^{3=2}$$
$$d(x) = \frac{15}{16} x^{1=2} (1 x)^{2}:$$
(5:1)

O ne has to note that the scale of the process we are dealing with here is usually below 1G eV. This means that one cannot use the quark distributions obtained from the deeply inelastic scattering at high Q^2 . In this region we have to use a parametrization being between the large Q^2 region, where, at high x, u(x) (1 x)³ and d(x) (1 x)⁴ and the dual parton m odel region, where the quark-diquark splitting function, q(x) (1 x).

We have used the string tension = $0:197 \text{ GeV}^2$ (it corresponds to 1 GeV/fm) and the parameter of the fragmentation function C = 0:5. In pair creation we have used the avour abundances with the ratio u : d : s = 3 : 3 : 1, which determines the coe cients in Eqs (4.9) and (4.10) to be $c_1 = 3=7$, $c_2 = 9=49$ for charged and $c_2 = 18=49$ for neutral pions^X.

^X In this model, every uu or dd m eson is considered as a 0 (no 0); it gives ($^{+}$) + () = (0), instead of 2 (0) as required by isospin. Nevertheless, Eq. (5.8) below remains true.

The quark scattering cross-section was param etrized as

$$\frac{d}{d^2 q_2} = \frac{1}{(q_2^2 + M^2)^3}$$
(5.2)

with the parameter M² = 0.5G eV² making this cross-section normalizable.

Such a param etrization, with the power-law decrease advocated by Field and Feynm an [19], gives, up to the overall norm alization, a good agreem ent with the experim ental inclusive spectra of pions. We show the comparison to the 400G eV and 360G eV experim ental data [20,21] in Fig. 3.

As it was noted in section 2, if one assumes the Collins e ect to be responsible for the observed asymmetry, then the E 704 data implies $_{2}$ u=u = $_{2}$ d=d at high x thus indicating a violation of SU (6), where $_{2}$ u=u = 2=3 and $_{2}$ d=d = 1=3. For the num erical calculations of the single spin asymmetry, we assumed that

$$_{2}u=u = _{2}d=d = P(x) = P_{max}x^{n}$$
: (5:3)

W e found that $P_{max} = 1$ and n = 2 gives the best agreement with the experimental x_F dependence of the asymmetry.

Such a transversity does not violate the positivity constraints derived recently by So er [22]. The So er's inequality relates the transversity distribution $_{?}q = h_{1}$ to the helicity distribution $q = g_{1}$ and reads:

If one takes into account only the valence quarks, then the helicity asymmetries of the proton, measured in the deeply inelastic scattering, is:

$$A_{1}^{p} = \frac{4 u + d}{4u + d}$$
(5:5)

and that of the neutron equals:

$$A_{1}^{n} = \frac{u+4 d}{u+4d} :$$
 (5:6)

Thus, if we assume that 2 u=u = 2 d=d = P(x), then the So er's inequality in plies

$$A_1^p(x) = 2P(x) = 1;$$

 $A_1^n(x) = 2P(x) = 1:$ (5:7)

The above inequalities are satis ed by the present data if one assumes $P(x) = x^2$. This is shown in Fig. 4 where $A_1^p(x)$ measured by SMC [23] and E143 [24] and $A_1^n(x)$ measured by the E142 collaboration [25] are plotted together with the curves representing Eqs (5.7). One can see that $P(x) = x^2$ is well within the limits and P(x) = x is still allowed by the data, as well as the powers of x higher than 2.

We plot the results of our calculation of the transverse spin asymmetry in Figs. 5{8. The full lines and the dashed ones in Figs 7 and 8 show the predictions of our model obtained with the parameter of Eq. (4.5) equal 1 [17].

These predictions are in reasonable agreem ent with most of the data. Only the asymmetry measured by the E704 collaboration at 0.7G eV < p_2 < 2G eV (Fig. 5a) is strongly underestimated. Our model gives the opposite asymmetries for + and and predicts the increase of the absolute values of the asymmetries with x_F . Nevertheless, it cannot accout for the very strong p_2 dependence of the asymmetries measured by E704. We got agreem ent with the low- p_2 data but underestimate the high- p_2 ones.

However, the p_2 dependence of the E 704 data was discussed recently by A restor [26] from the purely experimental point of view and was found to be questionable. Also the asymmetries of ⁰, measured by E 704 in the central region, showed initially a very strong p_2 dependence [10] but after reanalysis [11] showed no such dependence at all and are consistent with zero. Both the lack of the strong p_2 dependence of the asymmetry and its very smallm agnitude in the central region are in agreement with the Collins elect.

In the previous version of this paper [27] we were able to obtain the strong $p_{?}$ dependence of the asymmetry at high x_{F} but it was only due to the fact that we neglected the quark scattering and assumed only the exponentially falling intrinsic $q_{?}$ distribution of the leading quark, similar to the $h_{?}$ distribution in the fragmentation. In the present approach, the $q_{?}$ distribution (5.2) in quark scattering is much atter than the $h_{?}$ distribution (4.4). Thus, at high $p_{?}$ the contribution of the transverse momentum of the fragmentation (which determines the asymmetry) to the total $p_{?}$ saturates. This makes the asymmetries rise at rather low $p_{?}$ and then atten at higher $p_{?}$.

We checked, by forcing in (4.5) to be 0, that the strong enough Collins e ect (satisfying the inequalities (3.6) and (3.7)) can account for the magnitude of the experimental asymmetries of Fig. 5a. Nevertheless, = 0 (100% spin- k_2 correlation in string breaking independent of k_2) is not thinkable. It does not change the p_2 dependence either; so large Collins e ect leads to strong overestimation of the lower p_2 data.

As regards the region where both x_F and $p_?$ are low (small x_F points of Fig. 5b), the calculated asymmetry can be slightly overestimated. At so low $p_?$ and rather small x_F , the pions produced in the decay of the second string, spanned by the diquark, can contribute signi cantly and wash out the asymmetry.

The asymmetry of 0 is a combination of the $^{+}$ and ones:

$$A_{N} (^{0}) = \frac{(^{+}) A_{N} (^{+}) + () A_{N} ()}{(^{+}) + ()} :$$
 (5:8)

This relation follows from the isospin symmetry for isoscalar targets. For the proton target it holds provided that the isospin correlations are of short range in rapidity; this is the case in the multiparticle production. Nevertheless, we show in Fig. 6 the comparison of our results to the E 704 data [7,8] on ⁰ production in pp and pp collisions. Here there is no discrepancy between the model and the data. Note that our model predicts the same asymmetry for the proton and the antiproton beam s.

For completeness we show in Fig.7 the earlier data measured with 13.3 and 18.5 GeV polarized protons [9]. Here the agreem ent of the model and the data is also good. Only

the asymmetry of calculated in the model tend to overestimate the data, particularly at low x_F . However, the data has been measured at very low p_2 and the contribution of the diquark fragmentation can be not negligible also here.

Finally, in Fig.8 we show the predictions of the model for the asymmetry of charged kaons. Since in this model the asymmetry is a purely leading e ect, the asymmetry of K vanishes. Measuring this asymmetry and its x_F dependence would provide information on whether and to what extent the asymmetry is limited to the leading particle. From the point of view of our model, the nonvanishing asymmetry of K would be an indication of the Collins e ect in higher-rank hadrons.

The asymmetry of K $^+$ is predicted to be similar to that of the positive pions.

6. D iscussion and conclusions

To sum marize, we have calculated the single transverse spin asym metry in high-energy pp collisions in a simple model involving the Collins e ect (asym metry arising at the level of fragm entation of a quark into hadrons). We parametrized the Collins e ect by the Lund mechanism of polarization in the coloured string model.

W e got qualitative agreem ent with the data when we assum ed that:

- a) The transverse polarization of the u and d quarks in the transversely polarized proton are close to unity but of the opposite sign ($\mathbf{P}_u = \mathbf{P}_{proton}, \mathbf{P}_d = \mathbf{P}_{proton}$) at m om entum fraction x close to 1.
- b) The dependence of the quark transversity (or polarization) on the momentum fraction x is close to be proportional to x^2 .

However, the Collinse ect cannot explain the very strong $p_{?}$ dependence of the E 704 data. Some additional mechanism of the asymmetry would be needed in order to account for the E 704 data for charged pions at $p_{?} > 0.7$ GeV. A part of this set, our model gives good agreement with the data. Presently, we do not not any mechanism which could remove the above discrepancy.

The quark transversities we inferred at large x:

$$\frac{2^{2} u(x)}{u(x)} = \frac{2^{2} d(x)}{d(x)} ! 1 \quad (for x ! 1) \quad (6:1)$$

are, in fact, not unreasonably large. Consider a covariant model of the baryon consisting of a quark and a bound spectator diquark [16,28]; then

$$q''(x) = \frac{x}{16^{-2}} \int_{1}^{2} dq^{2} \frac{g(q^{2})}{q^{2} m_{q}^{2}} \int_{1}^{2} \frac{X}{dq^{2} m_{q}^{2}} \int_{1}^{2} \frac{x}{dq^{2} m_{q}^{2}} \int_{1}^{2} \frac{g(q^{2})}{dq^{2} m_{q}^{2}} \int_{1}^{2} \frac{x}{dq^{2} m_{q}^{2}} \int_{1}^{2} \frac{x}{dq^{2}} \int_{1}^{2} \frac{x$$

where $g(q^2)$ is the q qq B form factor, V = 1 for a scalar diquark, V = 5 "for a 1 diquark of polarization" and

$$q_{\rm m}^2 = {\rm xm}_{\rm B}^2 - \frac{{\rm x}}{1-{\rm x}} {\rm m}_{\rm qq}^2$$
: (6:3)

Form ula (6.2) is similar to the covariant W eizsacker {W illiam s form ula, but for a $spin \frac{1}{2}$ cloud"). Independently of $g(q^2)$, this model predicts the following behaviour at x ! 1:

- for a 1⁺ spectator diquark, helicity is fully transm itted ($_L q(x)=q(x) ! 1$), transversity is fully reversed ($_2 q(x)=q(x) ! 1$). In particular, $P_d(x) ! 1$.
- for a 0⁺ diquark, $_{2}q(x)$ and $q^{+}(x)$ coincide and, for $g(q^{2})$ decreasing faster than q^{2} , they exceed $\frac{2}{3}q(x)$ as x ! 1

Thus, a dom inance of the scalar spectator for the u quark and the pseudo-vector one for the d at x = 1 could lead to the large opposite transversities as in (6.1).

The conclusion b), related to the x_F dependence, is model-dependent and does not need to be considered as a m prediction. One needs a good param etrization of the Collins e ect before one can deduce the x dependence of the quark transversity. Our param etrization is an approximation which should work only at reasonably high values of x_F . We took into account the Collins e ect only for the rst-rank (leading) hadrons, wherefrom A / z in (3.2). In the string model, the second-rank hadrons have the asymmetry of the opposite sign as compared to the rst-rank ones. M ore generally, the subsequent ranks are asymmetric in the opposite way to each other (as required also by local compensation of transverse m on entum). This should cause a faster decrease of A at low er z values, where the higher-rank hadrons are m ore in portant. Unfortunatly this feature was not possible to include in our simple sem i-analytical calculation, since the yields of rank-2 (and higher) hadrons do not have simple analytical form s. A ssum ing x $z = \frac{P}{x_F}$, a steeper A (for instance / z^2) would have to be compensated by a atter P_g(x) (for instance / x).

The contribution of vector m esons also should reduce A at lower z. M oreover, it has been shown that the vector m eson can also have a tensor polarization [29] which would result in the Collins e ect for the decay products. We did not include this possibility. A nother m echanism of asymmetry can be the interference between direct and resonance production [30].

The main conclusion of this paper is that the single spin asymmetry may be the rst experimental indication for the existence of the Collins elect. A more detailed experiment would be useful to select between this and alternative explanations. Besides its theoretical interest, the Collins elect may be the most electer "quark polarimeter" necessary for the measurements of the transversity distributions in the nucleons [5,31]. We hope that this elect will soon be tested directly, for instance in the azim uthal correlation of two pion pairs from opposite quark jets in e^+e annihilation.

A cknow ledgem ents

W e are grateful to J.Szwed for discussions. X A. and J.C. acknow ledge the nancial support from the IN 2P 3{Poland scientic exchange program m e. J.C. has been also supported by the Polish G overnm ent grants of KBN no.2 0054 91 01, 2 0092 91 01 and 2 2376 91 02 during com pletion of this work.

References

- K. Heller, 7th Int. Conf. on Polarization Phenom ena in Nuclear Physics, Paris 1990, p. 163, and references therein; P.R. Cam eron et al., Phys. Rev. D 32, 3070 (1985); T.A. Arm strong et al., Nucl. Phys. B 262, 356 (1985); S. Gourlay et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 56, 2244 (1986); M. Guanziroli et al., Z. Phys. C 37, 545 (1988)
- [2] D. Sivers, Phys. Rev. D 41, 83 (1990); Phys. Rev. D 43, 261 (1991)
- [3] J.Szwed, Proc. of the 9th International Sym posium \H igh Energy Spin Physics" held at Bonn, 6{15 Sep. 1990, Springer Verlag 1991; Phys. Lett. B 105, 403 (1981)
- [4] J.Collins, Nucl. Phys. B 396, 161 (1993)
- [5] J.Collins, S.F. Heppelm ann and G.A. Ladinsky, Nucl. Phys. B 420, 565 (1994)
- [6] E 704 Coll, D L. A dam s et al, Phys. Lett. B 264, 462 (1991)
- [7] E 704 Coll, D L. A dam s et al., Z. Phys. C 56, 181 (1992); E 704 Coll, B E. Bonner et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 1918 (1988)
- [8] E 704 Coll., D L. A dam s et al., Phys. Lett. B 261, 201 (1991)
- [9] B.E.Bonner et al., Phys. Rev. D 41, 13 (1990);
- [10] E 704 Coll, D L. A dam s et al, Phys. Lett. B 276, 531 (1992)
- [11] E 704 Coll., D L. A dam s et al., Protvino preprint IHEP-94-88, IFVE-94-88 (1994)
- [12] V D. Apokin et al., Phys. Lett. B 243, 461 (1990); M S. Am agbbeli et al., Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 50, 432 (1989); J. Antille et al., Phys. Lett. B 94, 523 (1980); S. Saro et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 995 (1990)
- [13] M.Anselm ino, M.Boglione, F.Murgia, INFN Cagliari preprints DFTT-47-94 and DFTT-48-94 (1994)
- [14] M.G. Ryskin, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 48, 708 (1988); C. Boros, Liang Zuo-tang and Meng Ta-chung, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 1751 (1993); H. Fritzsch, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 5, 625 (1990); P.G. Ratclie, Proc. 10th International Symposium on High Energy Spin Physics (Yam ada Conference XXXV), November 9–14, 1992, Nagoya, Japan (edited by T. Hasegawa, N. Norikawa, A. Masaike, S. Sawada), Universal A cadem y Press, Inc. p. 635
- [15] JP.Ralston and D E.Soper, Nucl. Phys. B 152, 109 (1979); JL.Cortes, B.Pire and JP.Ralston, Z.Phys. C 55, 409 (1992); R L. Ja e and X iangdong Ji, Nucl. Phys. B 375, 527 (1992)
- [16] X.Artru and M.Mekh, Z.Phys.C 45, 669 (1990)
- [17] B.Andersson, G.Gustafson, G.Ingelman, T.Sjostrand, Phys. Rep. 97 31 (1983)
- [18] A.LeYaouanc, L.O liver, O.Pene and J.-C.Raynal, Hadron Transitions in the Quark M odel (G ordon and B reach, 1988)
- [19] R D. Field, R P. Feynman, Phys. Rev. D 15, 2590 (1977)
- [20] NA 27 Coll., M. Aguilar-Benitez et al., Z. Phys. C 50, 405 (1991)
- [21] NA 23 Coll., J.L. Bailly et al., Z. Phys. C 35, 309 (1987)
- [22] J.So er, Phys.Rev.Lett. 74, 1292 (1995)
- [23] SM C Coll, D. A dam s et al, Phys. Lett. B 329, 399 (1994)
- [24] E143 Coll, K. Abe et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 346 (1995)
- [25] E142 Coll, D L. Anthony et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 959 (1993)
- [26] Yu.I. A restov, Phys. Lett. B 333, 255 (1994)

- [27] X. Artru, J. Czyzewski, H. Yabuki, preprint TPJU-12/94 (Cracow, 1994) and LYCEN/9423 (Lyon), hep-ph/9405426, unpublished
- [28] H.Meyer and P.J.Mulders, Nucl. Phys. A 528, 589 (1991)
- [29] X iangdong Ji, Phys. Rev. D 49, 114 (1994)
- [30] J.C. Collins and G.A. Ladinsky, PSU/TH/114 (hep-ph/9411444)
- [31] X. Artru, QCD and High Energy Hadronic Interactions (Ed. J. Trân Thanh Vân, Editions Frontieres, 1993), p. 47

Figure captions

- Fig.1 Inclusive pion production. Two events (a) and (b), symmetric with respect to the $\hat{y}\hat{z}$ plane, are represented. W ithout polarization, they would have the same probability. In the polarized case, the Collins e ect favours the case (a). The arrows labelled q_i represent the momenta of the quarks in the subprocess. The spins are denoted by the arch-like arrows. The Collins e ect acts at the last stage, where the quark q_c fragments into the pion carrying momentum p. h_2 is the pion's transverse momentum with respect to the quark q_c .
- Fig. 2 P roduction of the leading pion in a string spanned by the transversely spinning quark q_0 .
- Fig. 3 Inclusive cross-section for production of + and plotted versus x_F and p_2^2 . The 360G eV data come from [21] and the 400G eV data from [20]. The dashed curve corresponding to + and the solid one corresponding to show the results of Eq. (4.11) together with (5.1) and (5.2).
- Fig. 4 Longitudinal spin asymmetries of the proton and of the neutron measured in deeply inelastic scattering. The full squares are the E143 data [24], the full circles the SM C data [23] and the open squares represent the E142 data [25]. The values of A^p₁ and Aⁿ₁ allowed by the So er's inequality (5.4) if j₂ qj=q = x² are denoted by the hatched area. One can see that j₂ qj=q = x is also allowed by the present data.
- Fig. 5 Single spin asymmetry measured by E704 collaboration for charged pions at $0.2 < p_2 < 2.0 \text{ GeV}$ [6]. The curves are our model results calculated with quark transverse polarizations $_2 u=u = _2 d=d = x^2$ and = 1.
- Fig. 6 The asymmetry of ⁰'s produced in pp and pp collisions measured by the E704 collaboration [7,8]. The curve is our model prediction.
- Fig. 7 The single spin asym m etries of charged pions m easured with 13.3 and 18.5G eV proton beam s [9]. The dashed lines are the predictions of our m odel for 13.3G eV and the full ones are for 18.5G eV.
- Fig. 8 Transverse spin asymmetry of the charged kaons as predicted by our model. No asymmetry is predicted for K when the spin elects are assumed to act only on the leading hadron.



Fig. 1



Fig. 2











