

## Photon Contribution to the “Super-hard” Pomeron

Hung Jung Lu

*Department of Physics, University of Arizona*

*Tucson, Arizona 85721, U.S.A.*

Joseph Milana

*Department of Physics, University of Maryland*

*College Park, Maryland 20742, U.S.A.*

(Original, December 5, 1995; revised March 29, 1996)

### Abstract

It is shown that direct photons provide a leading twist mechanism for diffractive jet production in which the jets carry away all of the momentum lost by the proton. Two-photon processes are thus expected to asymptotically dominate “super-hard” pomeron events in  $ep$  collisions. We report the expected rates from these events for recent ZEUS and H1 data cuts. We also estimate the direct photon contribution to the “super-hard” pomeron events observed by the CERN UA8 group for  $p\bar{p}$  collisions. It is again shown that direct photons are the leading twist mechanism for these events. We find that direct photons are an appreciable fraction of the events seen by UA8.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Jet events with large rapidity gaps in the forward proton direction have been observed at the DESY HERA  $ep$  collider, both in the deep-inelastic regime [1,2] and in the photoproduction regime [3,4]. In the now popular convolution picture of the pomeron [5], the virtual or quasi-real photon emitted from the electron collides with the partons inside the pomeron, leading to the production of hard jets, well-separated in the phase space from the forward-going proton. For the diffractive photoproduction events, Collins, Frankfurt and Strikman [6] have argued that a special subclass of diffractive events would be produced at higher twist in the jet-system invariant mass due to the color singlet structure of the dijet system. These are events where the pomeron transfers all of its energy into the hard-jet system. Such events are strictly impossible in convolution pictures due to the assumed, normal vanishing of parton structure functions at  $x \rightarrow 1$ . These predictions, restated in Ref. [7], are explicitly manifested in models [8,9] where these events have been generated assuming a two gluon substructure for the exchanged pomeron.<sup>1</sup>

Events where the initial proton scatters off diffractively but generates hard-jet systems in the central rapidity region are also known as diffractive hard-jet events, or simply, hard diffraction. These events have been previously observed at  $p\bar{p}$  collision. The UA8 experiment at the CERN  $Spp\bar{p}S$  Collider [10] has studied the production of jet event in the single diffractive regime. That is,

$$p + \bar{p} \rightarrow p + (\text{jets} + X), \tag{1.1}$$

or its conjugate reaction (reverse the roles of  $p$  and  $\bar{p}$ ). In the above process, the incident antiproton interacts with a soft pomeron component of the proton to generate the hard-jets, while the diffracted proton preserves most (  $> 90\%$  ) of its initial beam energy. It is

---

<sup>1</sup>The possibility [8] of differing small- $x$  behavior for the superhard and “normal” pomeron type events may however complicate testing these predictions.

observed in this experiment that an unexpected large fraction of the pomeron's momentum participates in the hard scattering a significant fraction of the time. The hypothetical pomeron therefore seems to contain a point-like component, capable of transferring all its energy into the hard jet system. The predictions of Collins, Frankfurt and Strikman [6] is hence that factorization is violated at the leading twist level in hard diffractive processes. More data, determining the superhard pomeron cross-section as a function of the transverse momentum  $P_{\perp}$  of the jets, is however still needed before these interpretations of the UA8 results are properly confirmed. <sup>2</sup>

Here we study the contribution of direct photon from the proton to the above hard-jet events at DESY HERA and CERN  $Spp\bar{p}S$  colliders. Although this contribution is suppressed by the electromagnetic coupling, it provides a mechanism that is leading twist in the jet-pair invariant mass. Hence in the case of  $ep$  collisions, it is expected to asymptotically dominate all hadronic mediated dijet events in which the jets carry away all of the momentum lost by the proton. We find that at the present energy and luminosity level, the two-photon contribution accounts for about 5% of the observed large rapidity gap, two-jet event cross section recently reported by the ZEUS [3] and H1 [4] collaborations at HERA (assuming 100% detector efficiencies). It is however worth stressing that in both experiments the final state proton's momentum was not determined and hence what fraction of these diffractive events involved a total transfer of the proton's momentum to the two jets could not be determined.

In the case of the  $p\bar{p}$  events of Eq. (1.1), direct photons are again the leading twist mechanism. Due to the failure of factorization of the hadronic mechanism, this fact requires

---

<sup>2</sup>What is at issue is the role of Sudakov effects [11] known to play a crucial role in elastic scattering events at large momentum transfers [12]. See section III(a) below. Indeed it is due to these Sudakov effects that it was argued in Ref. [13] that exclusive hard double diffractive events would be higher twist, in contradistinction to the proposed mechanisms of Refs. [14–16].

a separate argument to demonstrate. Nevertheless the conclusion that asymptotically, direct photons dominate is once again valid. In application to realistic energies, we find that direct photons contribute 15% of the events observed at UA8. While this result indicates that the (higher-twist) hadronic mechanisms are still dominant, direct photons are clearly relevant. The two mechanisms (strong vs. electromagnetic) may in fact be quite comparable as their contributions must be added to obtain the  $S$ -matrix.

## II. TWO-PHOTON PROCESS JET EVENTS AT HERA




FIG. 1. Two-photon jet processes at HERA. (a) direct contribution, (b) resolved  $\gamma_e$  contribution, (c) resolved  $\gamma_p$  contribution, (d) twice-resolved contribution.

In this section we analyze the two-photon mechanisms and their contribution to the generation of jet events at HERA in the diffractive regime. The scattering mechanisms are illustrated in Fig. 1, where we have only shown some representative diagrams. The actual number of diagrams is large, especially for the twice resolved mechanism of Fig. 1 (d).

For the two-photon processes, quasi-real photons are generated from the incoming electron and proton. The parent beam particles scatter off diffractively, leaving the photons to interact and generate the hard jet event in the central-rapidity region. The underlying photons ( $\gamma_e, \gamma_p$ ) can interact either directly, as in Fig. 1 (a), or via the resolved photon mechanisms (see [17] and references there-in), as in Fig. 1 (b), (c) and (d). The processes (a) and (b) are to be compared to the emission of a “super-hard” pomeron from the proton, where all the energy lost by the proton has gone into the hard jet system.

The photon content of the electron and of the proton can be adequately described by the equivalent photon formalism (EPA) [18]. This *ep* analogy of the two-photon mechanism at  $e^+e^-$  colliders [17,19] has been pointed out in Ref. [20]. For the photon distribution inside the electron, we use the expression

$$f_{\gamma|e}(x_1) = \frac{\alpha_{\text{em}}}{2\pi} \left[ \ln \left( \frac{1-x_1}{x_1^2} \frac{Q_{\text{max}}^2}{m_e^2} \right) \frac{1+(1-x_1)^2}{x_1} - \frac{2(1-x_1)}{x_1} \right], \quad (2.1)$$

where  $x_1$  is the momentum fraction of the electron carried by its emitted photon,  $\alpha_{\text{em}} \sim 1/137$  the QED coupling constant,  $m_e$  the mass of the electron, and  $Q_{\text{max}}^2$  is the maximum transverse momentum squared as allowed by the experimental cut. For instance, in the case of HERA ZEUS experiment [3], the diffractive events are selected with  $Q_{\text{max}}^2 \sim 4 \text{ GeV}^2$ .

For the proton, the derivation of the equivalent photon formula mimics the electron case, except that now one has to take into account the Dirac ( $F_1$ ) and Pauli ( $F_2$ ) form factors, which appear in the photon–proton vertex as

$$\bar{u}\Lambda_\mu u = ie\bar{u} \left[ \gamma_\mu F_1(q^2) + \frac{i}{2m_p} \sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu F_2(q^2) \right] u, \quad (2.2)$$

with  $\sigma_{\mu\nu} = \frac{i}{2} [\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu]$  and  $q^\nu$  the four–momentum flowing into the vertex. (Note: EPA for heavy nuclei have studied in [21].) The resulting photon distribution is

$$f_{\gamma|p}(x_2) = \frac{\alpha_{\text{em}}}{2\pi} \int_{x_2^2 m_p^2 / (1-x_2)}^\infty \frac{dQ^2}{Q^2} \left[ 2 \left( F_1^2(Q^2) + \frac{Q^2}{4m_p^2} F_2^2(Q^2) \right) \times \right. \\ \left. \left( \frac{1-x_2}{x_2} - \frac{m_p^2}{Q^2} x_2 \right) + \left( F_1(Q^2) + F_2(Q^2) \right)^2 x_2 \right]. \quad (2.3)$$

Using as experimental input that the electric and magnetic form factors are well described as dipoles [22] ( $G_E(Q^2) \approx G_D(Q^2) \approx G_M(Q^2)/\mu_p$ ), one obtains that

$$\begin{aligned}
F_1(Q^2) &= G_D(Q^2) \frac{1 + \frac{\mu_p Q^2}{4m^2}}{1 + \frac{Q^2}{4m^2}} \\
F_2(Q^2) &= G_D(Q^2) \frac{\mu_p - 1}{1 + \frac{Q^2}{4m^2}} \\
G_D(Q^2) &= \frac{1}{(1 + Q^2/Q_0^2)^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

with  $m_p \sim .938$  GeV,  $Q_0^2 \sim 0.71$  GeV<sup>2</sup>,  $\mu_p = 2.7928$  and  $Q^2 = |t| \sim p_t^2$  the momentum transfer squared of the proton carried by its photon. In the small- $x$  region, the photon's distribution is roughly given by

$$f_{\gamma|p}(x_2) \sim \frac{\alpha_{\text{em}}}{\pi x_2} \left[ 2 \ln \left( \frac{1}{x_2} \right) - 1.627 \right]. \tag{2.5}$$

The large logarithm arises from the Dirac form factor and in practice the Pauli form factor is ignorable for either very low (e.g. the HERA data to be discussed below) or very high  $Q^2$ .<sup>3</sup> The UA8 data to be discussed in section III falls into neither of these categories.

The differential cross section for the two-jet production mechanism as shown in Fig. 1 is given by

$$d\sigma_{ep} = f_{\gamma|e}(x_1) f_{\gamma|p}(x_2) dx_1 dx_2 d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}. \tag{2.6}$$

The  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow 2$  jets cross section receives contribution from all the mechanisms shown in Fig. 1,

$$d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma} = d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(a)} + d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(b)} + d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(c)} + d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(d)}. \tag{2.7}$$

where  $d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(a)}$  is the direct photon contribution,  $d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(b)}$  is the resolved  $\gamma_e$  contribution,  $d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(c)}$  is the resolved  $\gamma_p$  contribution, and  $d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(d)}$  is the ‘‘twice-resolved’’ contribution.

---

<sup>3</sup>Similarly, resonance excitation such as the  $\Delta(1232)$  which couples to the proton through a Pauli type vertex [23] is likewise ignorable.

### A. Direct Photons are Leading Twist

The direct photon contribution consists of the  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow q\bar{q}$  differential cross section

$$d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(a)} = \frac{12\pi\alpha_{\text{em}}^2}{x_1x_2s} \left( \sum_q Q_q^4 \right) \frac{1+z^2}{1-z^2} dz, \quad (2.8)$$

where we have summed over the final quark colors.  $Q_q$  is the electric charge of the quark of flavor  $q$ ,  $\sum Q_q^4 = 34/81$  for 4 light-quark flavors ( $u, d, s, c$ ). We have used the integration variable  $z = \cos\theta$  with the angle  $\theta$  being the scattering angle in the parton center-of-mass system. The total center-of-mass energy squared of the  $ep$  system is  $s = 4E_eE_p$ . Currently at HERA  $E_e = 26.7$  GeV and  $E_p = 820$  GeV, thus  $\sqrt{s} = 296$  GeV.

Observe that the contribution of the direct photon is leading twist. Inserting Eq. (2.8) into Eq. (2.6) one finds that the contribution of direct photons to the cross-section is parametrically

$$d\sigma_{ep}^{(a)} \propto \frac{\alpha_{\text{em}}^3}{x_1x_2s} \frac{1+z^2}{1-z^2} dz \frac{dx_2}{x_2} f_{\gamma|e}(x_1) dx_1 \quad (2.9)$$

where we have focussed on the leading  $x_2^{-1}$  behavior of  $f_{\gamma|p}(x_2)$ . The contribution of a hadronic mediated pomeron is higher-twist for this class of dijet events. Parametrically, two groups modeling the pomeron with a two gluon substructure find [8,9] that the hadronic, superhard pomeron dijet cross-section behaves as

$$d\sigma_{ep}^{gg} \propto \frac{1}{bP_{\perp}^2} \frac{\alpha_{\text{em}}\alpha_s^2}{x_1x_2s} \frac{1+z^2}{1-z^2} dz \frac{dx_2}{x_2} f_{\gamma|e}(x_1) dx_1, \quad (2.10)$$

where  $P_{\perp}$  is the transverse momentum of each jet and  $b \approx 4$  GeV<sup>-2</sup> enters in the proton-pomeron's hadronic form factor,  $e^{bt}$ .

The necessity of adding an extra gluon to the color singlet, dijet system has resulted in the hadronic mechanism being higher twist. Asymptotically ( $P_{\perp}^2 \rightarrow \infty$ ) the direct-photon mechanism dominates in this class of diffractive events.

## B. Resolved Photon Contributions

The resolved  $\gamma_e$  cross section is given by (taking into account the quark-antiquark symmetry in the parton distribution function inside photon)

$$d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(b)} = \left[ 2 \sum_q f_{q|\gamma}(y_1, p_t^2) d\sigma_{q\gamma}(x_1 x_2 y_1 s) + f_{g|\gamma}(y_1, p_t^2) d\sigma_{g\gamma}(x_1 x_2 y_1 s) \right] dy_1, \quad (2.11)$$

where  $y_1$  is the momentum fraction of  $\gamma_e$  carried by its parton,  $f_{q|\gamma}(y_1, p_t^2)$  and  $f_{g|\gamma}(y_1, p_t^2)$  are the parton distribution functions inside photon, where we have used the transverse momentum squared  $p_t^2 = x_1 x_2 y_1 (1 - z^2) s / 4$  as the factorization scale. The parton-photon cross sections are

$$d\sigma_{q\gamma}(\hat{s}) = \frac{2\pi}{3\hat{s}} Q_q^2 \alpha_{\text{em}} \alpha_s \frac{5 + 2z + z^2}{1 + z} dz, \quad (2.12)$$

$$d\sigma_{g\gamma}(\hat{s}) = \frac{2\pi}{\hat{s}} \left( \sum_q Q_q^2 \right) \alpha_{\text{em}} \alpha_s \frac{1 + z^2}{1 - z^2} dz. \quad (2.13)$$

Similarly, the resolved  $\gamma_p$  contribution is given by

$$d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(c)} = \left[ 2 \sum_q f_{q|\gamma}(y_2, p_t^2) d\sigma_{q\gamma}(x_1 x_2 y_2 s) + f_{g|\gamma}(y_2, p_t^2) d\sigma_{g\gamma}(x_1 x_2 y_2 s) \right] dy_2, \quad (2.14)$$

with  $y_2$  the momentum fraction of  $\gamma_p$  carried by its parton, and  $p_t^2 = x_1 x_2 y_2 (1 - z^2) s / 4$  the transverse momentum squared.

The twice-resolved cross section  $d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(c)}$  is substantially more complicated than the previous cases. The underlying parton  $2 \rightarrow 2$  matrix elements can be found in Ref. [24]. Taking into account the quark-antiquark symmetry of the parton distribution functions inside photon, we have

$$d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(d)} = \frac{\pi \alpha_s^2}{2x_1 x_2 y_1 y_2 s} \left\{ 4 \sum_{q \neq q'} f_{q|\gamma}(y_1, p_t^2) f_{q'|\gamma}(y_2, p_t^2) \mathcal{M}_I^2 \right. \\ + 2 \sum_q f_{q|\gamma}(y_1, p_t^2) f_{q|\gamma}(y_2, p_t^2) \left[ \mathcal{M}_{II}^2 + (N_f - 1) \mathcal{M}_{III}^2 + \mathcal{M}_{IV}^2 + \mathcal{M}_V^2 \right] \\ + f_{g|\gamma}(y_1, p_t^2) f_{g|\gamma}(y_2, p_t^2) \left[ 4 \mathcal{M}_{VI}^2 + \mathcal{M}_{VIII}^2 \right] \\ \left. + 2 \sum_q \left[ f_{q|\gamma}(y_1, p_t^2) f_{g|\gamma}(y_2, p_t^2) + f_{g|\gamma}(y_1, p_t^2) f_{q|\gamma}(y_2, p_t^2) \right] \mathcal{M}_{VII}^2 \right\} dy_1 dy_2 dz. \quad (2.15)$$



In the previous expression,  $N_f$  is the number of light-quark flavors,  $p_t^2 = x_1 x_2 y_1 y_2 (1 - z^2) s / 4$  is the transverse momentum squared, and the amplitudes are given by [24]

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_I^2 &= \frac{4}{9} \frac{\hat{s}^2 + \hat{u}^2}{\hat{t}^2} \\
\mathcal{M}_{II}^2 &= \frac{2}{9} \left( \frac{\hat{s}^2 + \hat{u}^2}{\hat{t}^2} + \frac{\hat{s}^2 + \hat{t}^2}{\hat{u}^2} \right) - \frac{4}{27} \frac{\hat{s}^2}{\hat{u}\hat{t}} \\
\mathcal{M}_{III}^2 &= \frac{4}{9} \frac{\hat{t}^2 + \hat{u}^2}{\hat{s}^2} \\
\mathcal{M}_{IV}^2 &= \frac{4}{9} \left( \frac{\hat{s}^2 + \hat{u}^2}{\hat{t}^2} + \frac{\hat{t}^2 + \hat{u}^2}{\hat{s}^2} \right) - \frac{8}{27} \frac{\hat{u}^2}{\hat{s}\hat{t}} \\
\mathcal{M}_V^2 &= \frac{16}{27} \frac{\hat{u}^2 + \hat{t}^2}{\hat{u}\hat{t}} - \frac{4}{3} \frac{\hat{u}^2 + \hat{t}^2}{\hat{s}^2} \\
\mathcal{M}_{VI}^2 &= \frac{1}{6} \frac{\hat{u}^2 + \hat{t}^2}{\hat{u}\hat{t}} - \frac{3}{8} \frac{\hat{u}^2 + \hat{t}^2}{\hat{s}^2} \\
\mathcal{M}_{VII}^2 &= \frac{\hat{s}^2 + \hat{u}^2}{\hat{t}^2} - \frac{4}{9} \frac{\hat{s}^2 + \hat{u}^2}{\hat{u}\hat{s}} \\
\mathcal{M}_{VIII}^2 &= \frac{9}{8} \left( \frac{\hat{s}^2 + \hat{u}^2}{\hat{t}^2} + \frac{\hat{s}^2 + \hat{t}^2}{\hat{u}^2} + \frac{\hat{u}^2 + \hat{t}^2}{\hat{s}^2} + 3 \right), \tag{2.16}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{t} = -(1 - z)\hat{s}/2$ ,  $\hat{u} = -(1 + z)\hat{s}/2$ , and  $z = \cos \theta$ , with  $\theta$  the scattering angle in the parton center-of-mass system. We have multiplied a factor 1/2 to the amplitudes involving identical particle final states.

### C. Results

At HERA, the existence of a large rapidity gap in the forward (proton) direction has been employed [3,4] as a selection criterion for diffractive events. The diffracted proton's momentum is however not determined and thus no information resembling a “structure” function decomposition of the pomeron *a la* UA8 [10] is available. The relative number of superhard pomeron events, where all the momentum lost by the proton is carried away by the jets is thus unknown.

The large rapidity gap criterion is used because in general one expects a gap of size  $\sim \ln(1/x_2)$  separating the hadron fragments from the proton, although the actual size of the rapidity gap varies from event to event, and depends on the details of the hadronization

physics. For  $d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(a)}$  and  $d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(b)}$ , we expect most hadron fragments to be produced in phase space region well separated from the forward proton. However, for  $d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(c)}$  and  $d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(d)}$ , since the forward going  $\gamma_p$  is broken, only a fraction of these events will contain a large rapidity gap between the diffracted proton and the jet hadron fragments. The precise fraction depends on the details of the hadronization process. Here we will limit ourselves to the perturbative results, and keep in mind that the gap event cross section is somewhere between  $d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(a)} + d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(b)}$  and  $d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(a)} + d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(b)} + d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(c)} + d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}^{(d)}$ .

Experimentally, in order to observe well-defined jet, a minimum transverse momentum cut  $p_{t\min}$  is introduced. Also, an additional cut in rapidity is used at HERA in order to separate the diffractive events from the proton dissociation events. We will therefore also consider a maximum rapidity cut  $\eta_{\max}$  in the forward direction (proton's direction) for the jet rapidities. The laboratory-frame rapidities of  $q$  and  $\bar{q}$  jets are

$$\eta_{\text{jet}} = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left( \frac{E_p}{E_e} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \ln \left( \frac{x_2 y_2}{x_1 y_1} \right) \pm \ln \tan \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right), \quad (2.17)$$

where for the cases (b), (c) and (d) we take  $y_2 = 1$ ,  $y_1 = 1$  and  $y_1 = y_2 = 1$ , respectively. Experimentally, detector limit also imposes cuts in the momentum fraction  $x_1$  carried by  $\gamma_e$ . Summarizing, the cross section is subjected to the constraints

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \eta_{\text{jet}} = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left( \frac{E_p}{E_e} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \ln \left( \frac{x_2 y_2}{x_1 y_1} \right) \pm \frac{1}{2} \ln \left( \frac{1+z}{1-z} \right) < \eta_{\max}, \\ p_t^2 = \frac{1}{4} x_1 x_2 y_1 y_2 s (1-z^2) > p_{t\min}^2, \\ x_{1\min} < x_1 < x_{1\max}, \\ Q_{\min}^2 < Q^2 < Q_{\max}^2. \end{array} \right. \quad (2.18)$$

Table 1 gives the kinematic constraints as used by the HERA ZEUS [3] and H1 [4] groups. In Fig. 2 we plot the obtained cross section as function of  $p_t$ . The solid lines represent the contributions from (a) and (b) (unbroken  $\gamma_p$ ), and the dotted lines represent the combined contributions from (a), (b), (c) and (d). The integrated cross section between  $p_t = 4$  GeV and  $p_t = 12$  GeV are given in Table 2. For ZEUS we have  $\sigma(a+b) = 10.3$  [pb] and  $\sigma(a+b+c+d) = 13.7$  [pb], and for H1  $\sigma(a+b) = 3.2$  [pb] and  $\sigma(a+b+c+d) = 4.5$  [pb]. At ZEUS, the integrated luminosity is  $0.55$  [pb<sup>-1</sup>], and 132 two-jet events have been

TABLE I. Experimental kinematic cuts used at HERA ZEUS and H1 groups

	ZEUS	H1
$\eta_{\max}$	1.5	1.5
$p_{t\min}$	4 GeV	4 GeV
$Q_{\min}^2$	0 GeV <sup>2</sup>	$3 \times 10^{-8}$ GeV <sup>2</sup>
$Q_{\max}^2$	4 GeV <sup>2</sup>	$10^{-2}$ GeV <sup>2</sup>
$x_{1\min}$	0.05	0.25
$x_{1\max}$	0.80	0.70

TABLE II. Integrated cross section for ZEUS and H1 from  $p_t = 4$  GeV to  $p_t = 12$  GeV

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
ZEUS	9.57 pb	0.75 pb	2.03 pb	1.38 pb
H1	2.92 pb	0.29 pb	0.71 pb	0.59 pb

observed with the given kinematic cuts. At H1, the integrated luminosity is  $0.289$  [ $\text{pb}^{-1}$ ], and 19 two-jet events have been observed with the corresponding kinematic cuts. Although no information on detector efficiency is given in [3,4], it appears that the two-photon mechanism contributes to the observed large-gap two-jet events at about the 5% level. However, we remind the reader that experimentally no detailed momentum decomposition of these dijet events is available and the “normal” Ingelman-Schlein [5] type of process with broken proton final state may have substantial contribution. The most relevant rate for our discussion, the superhard pomeron type events where the diffractive proton is unaccompanied by any additional beam jet hadrons, has not been measured.

### III. PHOTON-PARTON PROCESSES IN HADRON COLLIDERS

In this section we analyze the direct photon contribution to two-jet events at the CERN  $Spp\bar{S}$  collider. The scattering mechanisms are shown in Fig. 3. For concreteness, we assume




FIG. 2. Two-photon jet event cross section, according to the ZEUS and H1 kinematic cuts given in Table I. The solid lines are obtained by considering only the direct and resolved  $\gamma_e$  contribution (a+b). The dotted lines include also the resolved  $\gamma_p$  and the twice resolved contributions (a+b+c+d).




FIG. 3. Photon-parton jet processes at  $p\bar{p}$  collider. (a) photon-gluon fusion, (b) “Compton” scattering.

that the direct photon originates from the proton, although experimentally the conjugate reaction with photon coming from the antiproton is also accounted. We recall that it was in these events that the superhard pomeron was first reported [10]. Having shown that direct photons are the leading twist contribution to the superhard dijet diffractive events at  $ep$  colliders, it is thus natural to speculate if the UA8 events were not simply due to direct photons. This speculation is further fed by the fact that hadronic mechanisms are once again higher-twist.

### A. Hadronic Mechanism is Higher Twist




FIG. 4. (a)The simplest mechanism for diffractive jet production in hadron collisions. The gluon labeled ‘s’ is an arbitrarily soft gluon. This mechanism however does not lead to the superhard events seen at UA8 due to gluon bremsstrahlung, shown in (b).

The simplest hadronic mechanism for diffractively producing two jets at hadronic colliders is shown in Fig. 4a. The gluon labeled “s” is an arbitrarily soft gluon. It’s sole purpose is to guarantee that the proton is reformed as a color singlet. As discussed in Ref.

[6], the unitarity cancellation over all such soft gluon attachments that occurs in the case of inclusive processes cannot be implemented due to the constraint that a proton is selected to be found in the final state. Nevertheless, the contribution of this hadronic mechanism to the superhard events seen by UA8 is asymptotically ignorable due to Sudakov suppression.

Unless constrained otherwise, the hot gluon that enters the hard interaction will radiate, as shown in Fig. 4b. Such radiation will appear in the final state as momentum not associated with the dijet system. Hence it will not contribute to the “superhard” pomeron events seen by UA8 wherein all the energy lost by the diffracted proton appears in the dijet system.

To prevent the radiation depicted in Fig. 4b from occurring, the soft gluon (labeled “s”) must be drawn into the hard interaction. This introduces a Sudakov form factor [11] which amounts to an effective fractional power of suppression of the hadronic mechanism, i.e.  $(\Lambda_{QCD}/E_{\perp})^{\alpha(E_{\perp})}$ . In the case of elastic scattering of protons at high momentum transfers, it is known that for uncorrelated quark scattering (the so-called Landshoff mechanism [25])  $\alpha(E_{\perp}) \approx 1$  [12]. For the present case  $\alpha(E_{\perp})$  has not been calculated<sup>4</sup>. However one can nevertheless conclude that due to these Sudakov effects, the hadronic mechanism is higher-twist and hence that asymptotically (i.e. for fixed  $t$  and fixed fractional energy loss of the proton) direct photons will also dominate the superhard pomeron type events as reported by UA8. The extension to double-diffractive hard events is obvious.

The fact that in hadronic colliders, the hadronic mechanism is not suppressed by clear full power of  $1/E_{\perp}$ , in contradistinction to the case for HERA, is a manifestation that in this class of events the hadronic mechanism does not factorize [6]. From the above arguments and those of Section (IIa), we see that factorization is in fact broken at the higher-twist level. It becomes now a quantitative question whether in any particular process the overall

---

<sup>4</sup>And indeed represents one of the most important open theoretical problems in the field of hard diffractive scattering.

numerical factors of  $\alpha_{\text{em}}$  suppresses the leading twist, direct photon mechanism. We now address this question in the case of the UA8 data.

### B. Direct Photons at UA8

The cross section for the direct photon contribution to two-jet events, as shown by the mechanisms in Fig. 3, is given by

$$d\sigma_{p\bar{p}} = f_{\gamma|p}(x_1) \left[ \sum_{q,\bar{q}} f_{q|\bar{p}}(x_2, \sim 4p_t^2) d\sigma_{q\gamma}(x_1 x_2 s) + f_{g|\bar{p}}(x_2, \sim 4p_t^2) d\sigma_{g\gamma}(x_1 x_2 s) \right] dx_1 dx_2, \quad (3.1)$$

where the cross section  $d\sigma_{q\gamma} = d\sigma_{\bar{q}\gamma}$  and  $d\sigma_{g\gamma}$  are as given in formulas (2.12) and (2.13). Note that we've taken the scale of the quark and gluon distribution amplitudes at the total invariant mass of the dijet system. We will return to the sensitivity of our results upon this choice.

We can re-arrange Eq. (3.1) into

$$d\sigma_{p\bar{p}} = \frac{2\pi\alpha_{\text{em}}\alpha_s}{x_1 x_2^2 s} f_{\gamma|p}(x_1) \left[ \frac{5 + 2z + z^2}{3(1+z)} F_2(x_2, 4p_t^2) + \frac{1+z^2}{1-z^2} \left( \sum_q Q_q^2 \right) x_2 g(x_2, 4p_t^2) \right] dx_1 dx_2 dz. \quad (3.2)$$

For the distribution function  $F_2(x_2, 4p_t^2) = \sum_{q,\bar{q}} Q_q^2 x_2 f_{q|p}(x_2, 4p_t^2)$  we use the recent parametrization [26] given by the ZEUS collaboration of their data

$$F_2(x, Q^2) = (1-x^2)^4 \left[ .35 + .017x^{-(.35+.0695\ln Q^2)} \right]. \quad (3.3)$$

For the gluon momentum density  $x_2 g(x_2, 4p_t^2)$  we use the low- $x$  approximation scheme of Prytz [27] to the evolution equations whereby one relates, at leading order, <sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>We obtain similar numerical results if we use the scheme of EKL [28] and take  $\omega_0 = .4$ . We also obtain similar numerical results for  $xg(x, Q^2)$  for  $Q^2 \approx 64\text{GeV}^2$  if we used the H1 parametrization [29] of their data. However this latter parametrization does not apply at larger  $Q^2$  for the low  $x_2$  values ( $\lesssim .01$ ) needed here.



TABLE III. Comparison of the experimental “Super-hard” pomeron events to direct-photon contributions

$x_p = 1 - x_1$	back-to-back two-jet events	single-side super-hard events ( $\times 50\% \times 30\%$ )	direct-photon cross section [pb]	expected direct-photon events ( $\times 0.423$ [pb $^{-1}$ ])
0.90 — 0.92	77	11.6	5.1	2.1
0.92 — 0.94	86	12.9	5.2	2.2
0.94 — 0.96	86	12.9	5.4	2.3
total	249	37.4	15.7	6.6

$$xg(x, Q^2) = \frac{27\pi}{10\alpha_s(Q^2)} \frac{dF_2(x/2, Q^2)}{d\ln Q^2}. \quad (3.4)$$

The proton’s momentum transfer squared at the UA8 experiment is in the range  $|t| = 0.9 \sim 2.3$  GeV $^2$ . For direct photon to alone be responsible for the diffraction of the proton, these are the limits that must enter the photon’s structure function,

$$f_{\gamma|p}(x_2) = \frac{\alpha_{em}}{2\pi} \int_{.9 \text{ GeV}^2}^{2.3 \text{ GeV}^2} \frac{dQ^2}{Q^2} \left[ 2 \left( F_1^2(Q^2) + \frac{Q^2}{4m_p^2} F_2^2(Q^2) \right) \times \right. \quad (3.5)$$

$$\left. \left( \frac{1-x_2}{x_2} - \frac{m_p^2}{Q^2} x_2 \right) + \left( F_1(Q^2) + F_2(Q^2) \right)^2 x_2 \right].$$

In Table III we present the integrated cross section with the kinematic cuts of the UA8 group. That is, we demand that the hard-jet cone-center rapidities be restricted to the interval  $[-2, 2]$ , that  $0.04 < x_1 < 0.10$ , and that  $p_t > 8$  GeV. From the table, we see that the direct–photons can account for 18% percent of the observed “super-hard” pomeron events. The most sensitive unknown quantity in this result is the gluon’s structure function. Had we for example chosen the scale in  $xg(x, Q^2)$  to be  $p_\perp^2$  instead of  $4p_\perp^2$ , we would have obtained that direct photons contribute 12% of the observed events. In either case, the relative fraction is significant.

## IV. CONCLUSION

Direct photons have been shown to be the leading twist mechanism for diffractive dijet production in which the jets carry away all of the momentum lost by the diffracted proton for either electron initiated or hadron initiated events. Asymptotically, they dominate all hadronic mechanisms.

In  $ep$  collisions, direct photons are predicted to asymptotically dominate all such “super-hard” pomeron, dijet events. At the present time the inability at HERA [3,4] to determine the final state proton’s momentum means no data on this particular class of hard diffraction events yet exists. While we wish to strongly stress the importance that such experiments be undertaken, we also want to suggest an alternative experiment that should indirectly indicate the relative importance of direct photons, namely, large rapidity gap, dilepton production at large transverse momentum.<sup>6</sup> From Eq. (2.8) the ratio of dijets to dileptons at the same large transverse momentum is simply

$$R_{\gamma\gamma} = \frac{N_c \sum_q Q_q^4}{\sum_l Q_l^4} = \frac{34}{81} \quad (4.1)$$

where we have summed over four light-quark flavors ( $u, d, s, c$ ) and included the  $\tau$ -lepton in the sum over leptons.  $N_c = 3$  is the number of colors. We note that to the extent that resolved photon contributions (i.e. as in Fig. (1b)) can be excluded, such dilepton events are absent in a convolution picture of the pomeron [5].

In  $p\bar{p}$  collisions, we have seen that direct-photons account for an appreciable fraction of the “super-hard” pomeron events observed by UA8 [10] at the CERN  $Spp\bar{S}$  collider. The moderately large values of  $t$  in these experiments is both playing a significant role in suppressing the direct-photon contribution (via the proton’s Dirac form factor) as well as what must be inferred as providing a significant scale to partially limit the effects of

---

<sup>6</sup>We thank Shmuel Nussinov for this suggestion. See also [30], where muon-pair production at HERA by the two-photon mechanism has been studied.

Sudakov radiation on the competing hadronic mechanism. It should be emphasized that in a complete calculation the hadronic mechanism must be added to the direct-photon's contribution to obtain the  $S$ -matrix amplitude. The relative size of the two contributions could be much closer in magnitude than even the above result indicates, depending upon their relative phase. Interesting interference effects are thus likely if either  $t$  or the dijet transverse momentum could be systematically varied. Such capabilities will hopefully be realized at the set of experiments presently being conducted at FNAL.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We also thank J. C. Collins, N. C. Mukhopadhyay, N. I. Sarcevic for discussions, H. Abramowicz for useful correspondence and J. Zsembery for providing us with the UA8 luminosity information. This work was supported in part by DOE Grant DOE-FG02-93ER-40762 and DOE-FG03-93ER-40792.

## REFERENCES

- [1] ZEUS Collaboration (M. Derrick et al.), Phys. Lett. **B315**, 481 (1993), *ibid* **332**, 228 (1994).
- [2] H1 Collaboration (T. Ahmed et al.), Nucl. Phys. **B429**, 477 (1994).
- [3] ZEUS Collaboration (M. Derrick et al.), Phys. Lett. **B346**, 399 (1995), preprint DESY-95-115.
- [4] H1 Collaboration (T. Ahmed et al.), Nucl. Phys. **B435**, 3 (1995).
- [5] G. Ingelman and P. Schlein, Phys. Lett. **B152**, 256 (1985).
- [6] J.C. Collins, L. Frankfurt and M. Strikman, Phys. Lett. **B307**, 161 (1993).
- [7] A. Berera and D. E. Soper, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 4328 (1994).
- [8] H.J. Lu and J. Milana, Phys. Lett. **B313**, 234 (1993).
- [9] A. Donnachie and P. V. Landshoff, Phys. Lett. **B285**, 172 (1992).
- [10] UA8 Collaboration, Phys. Lett. **B297**, 417 (1992).
- [11] A. H. Mueller, Phys. Lett. **B108**, 355 (1982).
- [12] J. Botts and G. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. **B325**, 62 (1989).
- [13] H.J. Lu and J. Milana, Phys. Rev. **D51**, 6107 (1995). Only the manifestly short-distance graphs were however included in the estimates reported here. The necessity of including additional “long-distance” processes with Sudakov suppression factors complicates some of the claims made concerning factorization.
- [14] A. Białas and P.V. Landshoff, Phys. Lett. **B256**, 540 (1991).
- [15] J. Pumplin, “Two Gluon Exchange Model Predictions for Double Pomeron Jet Production,” hep-ph/9412381, Michigan State University preprint MSUHEP-41222 (1994).

- [16] A. Berera and J. C. Collins, “Double Pomeron Jet Cross Sections,” hep-ph/9509258, Pennsylvania State University preprint PSU/TH/162 (1995). These authors state however that they expect large Sudakov corrections to their estimates.
- [17] M. Drees and R. M. Godbole, *Pramana J. Phys.* **41**, 83 (1993).
- [18] C. F. Weizsäcker, *Z. Phys.* **88**, 612 (1934), E. J. Williams *Phys. Rev.* **45**, 729 (1934).
- [19] S. J. Brodsky, T. Kinoshita and H. Terazawa, *Phys. Rev.* **D4**, 1532, (1971). R. Bhattacharya, J. Smith and G. Grammer, Jr. *Phys. Rev.* **D15**, 3267 (1977).
- [20] P.J. Bussey, in *Proceedings, Physics at HERA*, vol. **1** (1991).
- [21] E. Papageorgiu, *Phys. Rev.* **D40**, 92 (1989); M. Drees, J. Ellis, and D. Zeppenfeld, *Phys. Lett.* **B223**, 454 (1989); M. Grabiak, B. Müller, W. Greiner, B. Soff, and P. Kock, *J. Phys.* **G15**, L25 (1989); R. N. Cahn and J. D. Jackson, *Phys. Rev.* **D42**, 3691 (1990); J. Norbury, *Phys. Rev.* **D42**, 3696 (1990); B. Müller and A. J. Schramm *Phys. Rev.* **D42**, 3699 (1990).
- [22] L. Andivahis *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D50**, 5491 (1994).
- [23] R. M. Davidson, N. C. Mukhopadhyay, and R. S. Wittman, *Phys. Rev.* **D43**, 71 (1991).
- [24] V. D. Barger and R. J. N. Phillips, *Collider Physics*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co. (1987).
- [25] P.V. Landshoff, *Phys. Rev.* **D10**, 1024 (1974).
- [26] ZEUS Collaboration (M. Derrick *et al.*), *Zeitschrift fur Physik* **C65**, 379 (1995).
- [27] K. Prytz, *Phys. Lett.* **B311**, 286 (1993).
- [28] R. K. Ellis, Z. Kunszt and E. M. Levin, *Nucl. Phys.* **420**, 517 (1994).
- [29] H1 Collaboration (T. Ahmed *et al.*), *Nucl. Phys.* **B 439**, 471 (1995).
- [30] G. Levman, in *Proceedings, Physics at HERA*, vol. **1** (1991).