

MPI-PhT/96-76

August 1996

## **A Short Review and Some New Results on Polarization <sup>1</sup>**

**Bodo Lampe**

Max Planck Institut für Physik  
Föhringer Ring 6, D-80805 München

### **Abstract**

At the moment I am writing a long review [1] on polarization in deep inelastic scattering. Therefore I thought it might be a good idea to present the highlights here. Some of my own results will be discussed in the end.

One of the main issues in polarized DIS experiments is the question of how the proton spin at high energies is composed out of the spins of its constituents, possibly

$$+\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}\Delta\Sigma + \Delta g + L_z \quad (1)$$

where  $\Delta\Sigma = \Delta(u + \bar{u}) + \Delta(d + \bar{d}) + \Delta(s + \bar{s})$  is the contribution from the quark spins. In the (static) constituent models, like SU(6), one has  $\Delta\Sigma(SU_6) = 1$  but experimentally it seems that this rule is violated by a large amount ( $\Delta\Sigma_{exp} \approx 0.25$ ). This experimental fact is also in disagreement with the rather crude Ellis-Jaffe sum rule [2] which predicts  $\Delta\Sigma_{EJ} \approx 0.65$  on the basis of the approximation  $\Delta s = \Delta\bar{q} = \Delta g = 0$ . It will probably turn out that both the gluon and the strange quark are needed to understand the proton spin structure.

In general, one is not only interested in the first moment  $\Delta g$ , but also in the  $x$ -dependence of the polarized gluon density  $\delta g(x)$ , although I think that  $\Delta g$  has a particular significance, because it gives the gluon contribution to the spin  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the proton and, as we shall see, is dynamically related to the anomaly [3]. The present experiments do not really give good information about  $\delta g(x)$ , because in DIS the gluon is a higher order effect. I shall come back to the question of determining  $\delta g(x)$  at the end of this talk.

In principle, to determine the first moment  $\Delta g = \int_0^1 dx \delta g(x)$  very precisely it is necessary to know the small- $x$  behaviour. From the theoretical side, it can be said that the polarized structure function behaves much more moderate than the unpolarized one. Although this question is not quantitatively settled [4], [5] one can get qualitative insight by inspection of the AP evolution kernels. Whereas the unpolarized kernel  $P_{gg}$  has a  $\frac{1}{x}$  singularity for  $x \rightarrow 0$  (corresponding to a  $\frac{1}{x}$  singularity of the unpolarized structure function  $F_2$ ), the polarized kernels are all perfectly finite suggesting a more or less constant behaviour of  $g_1$  for  $x \rightarrow 0$ . Some authors [4] have argued in favor of a somewhat more singular behavior, but the singularities are certainly integrable and would not modify the value of  $\Delta g$  too much. I do not want to discuss these approaches in further detail here because they are incomplete and not fully consistent.

The most important and precise information about the proton spin comes from the CERN data [6]. These measurements essentially have been confirmed at SLAC. There are also neutron and deuteron data available. They can be used to check the

$\Delta g$ .

The total of present measurements have been used to extract informations about the parton densities. In particular the valence quark densities  $\delta u_v(x)$  and  $\delta d_v(x)$  are now known to some accuracy [7], [8]. In contrast to the valence quarks, the polarized sea quarks and gluons are hardly fixed, because they enter the analysis only as a higher order effect. It has been attempted to determine the magnitude of the first moment  $\Delta g$  [9], which has a better chance because it is an average. As an essential input the presently known  $Q^2$ -dependence of the data (both theoretically and experimentally) was used, in which the polarized gluon plays some role. On the basis of this, a value  $\Delta g \approx 1.3 \pm 0.5$  was quoted. My opinion is that the error here is underestimated but the order of magnitude of  $\Delta g$  looks reasonable. To determine the polarized gluon density, other experiments will probably be superior to DIS, like eg. direct photon production at RHIC ( $\delta q \otimes \delta g \rightarrow \gamma^* q$ ) or heavy quark production. I shall come back to this issue later.

In all the analyses [7], [8] and [9] the AP splitting functions have been used which are now known to 2-loop accuracy [10]. As is well known, 2-loop splitting functions are needed for a 1-loop(=NLO) analysis of structure functions. Although the corrections  $\delta P_{ij}^{2loop}$  to the leading order  $\delta P_{ij}^{1loop}$  appearing in the Altarelli-Parisi equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} \Delta \Sigma(x, Q^2) \\ \Delta g(x, Q^2) \end{pmatrix} = (\delta P^{1loop} + \delta P^{2loop}) \otimes \begin{pmatrix} \Delta \Sigma \\ \Delta g \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

turn out to be quite small numerically, they are important to know from a principle point of view because they essentially fix the ambiguities from higher orders.

The calculations of the  $\delta P_{ij}^{2loop}$  have been done in the  $\overline{MS}$ -scheme. This has the advantage that the calculation is manageable and furthermore in alignment with with the unpolarized analysis which is also usually done in the  $\overline{MS}$ -scheme. Unfortunately, the treatment of  $\gamma_5$  (not present in the unpolarized case) in these calculations is such that the contribution from the anomaly is not transparent.<sup>2</sup> Let me explain how this comes about: In the framework of the operator expansion, the connection between polarized DIS and the anomaly can be easily established. Namely, the matrix element of the anomalous axial vector singlet operator  $j_{\mu,S}^5 = \sum_q \bar{q} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 q$  appears as the leading twist contribution to the first moment of the singlet component of  $g_1$ ,

---

<sup>2</sup>It would be desirable to have a prescription of  $\gamma_5$  in dimensional regularization in which the contribution from the anomaly becomes explicit. I do not know whether such a prescription exists,

i.e.

$$\int_0^1 dx g_{1,S}^p(x, Q^2) \sim \langle PS | j_{\mu,S}^5 | PS \rangle \quad (3)$$

This well known fact has been used in many analyses in the past, eg. recently by [11]. Note that the singlet part  $\int_0^1 dx g_{1,S}^p$  can be obtained from the experimentally available  $\int_0^1 dx g_1^p$ , because the nonsinglet parts are known due to low energy information from  $\beta$ -decays.

Due to its anomaly, the matrix element of  $j_{\mu,S}^5$  has an anomalous component,

$$\langle PS | j_{\mu,S}^5 | PS \rangle \sim \Delta\Sigma - n_f \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \Delta g(Q^2) \quad (4)$$

where the first term  $\Delta\Sigma$  is the ordinary quark-photon scattering contribution and the second term  $\sim \Delta g$  is the contribution from the anomaly. Unfortunately, the representation (4) depends on the regularization scheme. It is true only in suitable chirality preserving schemes where transitions between quarks of different helicities are forbidden to any order in perturbation theory. In such schemes  $\Delta\Sigma$  is  $Q^2$ -independent. In the  $\overline{MS}$ -scheme used by [10] with their particular  $\gamma_5$  prescription, chirality is not conserved and one has  $\langle PS | j_{\mu,S}^5 | PS \rangle \sim \Delta\Sigma(Q^2)$ , i.e. the anomalous piece has effectively been absorbed into a redefinition of  $\Delta\Sigma$  (see the footnote).

In the previous paragraphs the reader should have realized, among other things, the difficulties to extract the polarized gluon distribution and in particular its first moment from inclusive deep inelastic data. These problems have been anticipated several years ago by theoretical studies [12, 13], and they are in fact not surprising in view of the subtleties in determining the unpolarized gluon density in unpolarized DIS experiments [14].

A popular way out of this dilemma is the study of semi-inclusive cross sections, and in particular of charm production, because the production of heavy quark hadrons is triggered in leading order by the photon-gluon fusion mechanism and is therefore sensitive to the gluon density inside the proton, whereas the heavy quark content of the proton is usually negligible at presently available  $Q^2$ -values.

Due to its prominent decay mechanism,  $J/\psi$ -events are the most prominent among the charm quark production, and this fact has led to attempts to determine the unpolarized gluon density from the  $J/\psi$ -production cross section [15, 16]. Similar ideas hold in the case of polarized  $J/\psi$ -production. However, these suggestions are model

should measure the square of  $\delta g(x)$  and therefore be very sensitive to its magnitude. However, it is not clear whether in the cross section formula there is a factor  $g(x_1)g(x_2)$  or whether some independent 2-gluon correlation function  $K(x_1, x_2)$  appears. Furthermore, it has recently been stressed [17], that color octet contributions may appear in addition to the color singlet pieces in inelastic  $J/\psi$ -production. If true, this would upset the inelastic  $J/\psi$ -analysis because several new free parameters, the color octet matrix elements, would enter the game.

Therefore, from the theoretical point of view the cleanest signal for the gluon in heavy quark production is probably open charm production, although experimentally it has worse statistics due to the difficulties in identifying D-mesons. Instead of the deep inelastic process one may as well look at photoproduction, because the mass of the charm quark forces the process to take place in the perturbative regime. The advantage of photoproduction over DIS is its larger cross section. Two fixed target experiments, COMPASS at CERN and an experiment at SLAC are being developed to measure the polarized gluon distribution via photoproduction.

In leading order the inclusive polarized deep inelastic open charm production cross section is given by [18, 19]

$$\frac{d\Delta\sigma_c}{dQ^2 dy} = \frac{4\pi\alpha^2}{Q^2} \frac{2-y}{yS} g_1^c\left(\frac{Q^2}{yS}, Q^2\right) \quad (5)$$

where

$$g_1^c(x, Q^2) = \frac{\alpha_s}{9\pi} \int_{(1+\frac{4m_c^2}{Q^2})x}^1 \frac{dw}{w} \delta g(w, Q^2) \delta h\left(\frac{x}{w}\right) \quad (6)$$

is the charm contribution to the polarized structure function  $g_1$  and where

$$\delta h(z) = (2z-1) \ln \frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta} + (3-4z)\beta \quad (7)$$

is the parton level matrix element. One has  $\beta = \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_c^2}{\hat{s}}}$  where the Mandelstam variable  $\hat{s}$  is defined by  $\hat{s} = (p+q)^2 = Q^2 \frac{1-z}{z}$ . By combining these formulae with the unpolarized cross section one can obtain the polarization asymmetries  $\frac{d\Delta\sigma^c}{d\sigma^c}$ . If one plugs in the relatively large gluon contribution of reference [12], one gets asymmetries of the order 0.1 in a fixed target experiment which would operate well above charm threshold.

It is straightforward to obtain from the above expressions (5) – (7) the inclusive open charm photoproduction cross section by taking the simultaneous limits  $Q^2 \rightarrow 0$  and

$z \rightarrow 0$  while keeping  $\frac{Q^2}{z} \approx \hat{s}$  fixed:

$$\Delta\sigma_{\gamma p}^c(S_\gamma) = \frac{8\pi\alpha\alpha_s}{9S_\gamma} \int_{\frac{4m_c^2}{S_\gamma}}^1 \frac{dw}{w} \delta g(w, S_\gamma) (3v - \ln \frac{1+v}{1-v}) \quad (8)$$

where  $v = \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_c^2}{\hat{s}}}$  and  $\hat{s} = wS_\gamma$ . This integrated cross section depends only on the total proton-photon energy  $S_\gamma = (P+q)^2$  which for a fixed target experiment is given by  $S_\gamma = 2ME_\gamma$  where  $E_\gamma$  is the photon energy. By varying the photon energy it is in principle possible to explore the  $x$ -dependence of  $\delta g$ . Very high photon energies correspond to small values of  $x$ . However, as we shall see later, it is not trivial to obtain the first moment of  $\delta g$  from the cross section Eq. (8).

It should be noted that the second argument of  $\delta g$  in Eqs. (6) and (8) is not certain. It might as well be  $4m_c^2$  or any number in between. This uncertainty reflects our ignorance about the magnitude of the higher order correction and could be resolved if a higher order calculation of these cross sections would be performed. The same statement holds true for the argument of  $\alpha_s$ . Therefore, in the equations presented below the energy arguments of  $\delta g$  and  $\alpha_s$  will be chosen to be more general,  $\mu_S$  and  $\mu_R$  respectively.

Eq. (8) was obtained after integration over the charm quark production angle ( $\hat{\theta}$  in the gluon photon cms). If one is interested in the  $p_T$  distribution or wants to introduce a  $p_T$ -cut, it is appropriate to keep the  $\hat{\theta}$  dependence in the fully differential cross section

$$d\Delta\sigma_{\gamma p}^c = \frac{e_c^2\alpha_s(\mu_R)}{16\hat{s}} dw \delta g(w, \mu_S) v d \cos \hat{\theta} (2 \frac{\hat{t}^2 + \hat{u}^2 - 2m_c^2\hat{s}}{\hat{t}\hat{u}} + 4m_c^2 \frac{\hat{t}^3 + \hat{u}^3}{\hat{t}^2\hat{u}^2}) \quad (9)$$

where  $\hat{s} = wS_\gamma$ ,  $\hat{t} = -\frac{\hat{s}}{2}(1 - v \cos \hat{\theta})$  and  $\hat{u} = -\frac{\hat{s}}{2}(1 + v \cos \hat{\theta})$ . It is possible to make a transformation to the transverse charm quark momentum by using  $p_T^2 = (\frac{\hat{s}}{4} - m_c^2) \sin^2 \hat{\theta}$ :

$$\sigma(p_{Tcut}) = \frac{e_c^2\alpha_s(\mu_R)}{16S_\gamma} \int_{\frac{4m_c^2}{S_\gamma}}^1 \frac{dw}{w} \delta g(w, \mu_S) \frac{v}{\frac{\hat{s}}{4} - m_c^2} \int_{p_{Tcut}^2}^{\frac{\hat{s}}{4} - m_c^2} \frac{dp_T^2}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{p_T^2}{\frac{\hat{s}}{4} - m_c^2}}} (2m_c^2 \frac{\hat{s}}{\hat{t}\hat{u}} - \frac{\hat{t}}{\hat{u}} - \frac{\hat{u}}{\hat{t}} - 2m_c^2 (\frac{\hat{t}}{\hat{u}^2} + \frac{\hat{u}}{\hat{t}^2})) \quad (10)$$

There are several good reasons to study the  $p_T$  distribution. First of all and in general, it gives more information than the inclusive cross section. Secondly and in particular, it can be shown that the integrated photoproduction cross section Eq. (8) as well as the corresponding DIS charm production cross section are not sensitive

of the order of  $p_T \geq 1$  GeV is introduced. Last but not least, it is experimentally reasonable to introduce a  $p_T$ -cut.

Let us dwell on the first moment discussion for a moment. It is true that the first moment is only one among an infinite set of moments and the most interesting quantity to know is the full  $x$ -dependence of  $\delta g$ . However, the first moment  $\Delta g$  certainly has its significance, because it enters the fundamental spin sum rule (1) and because it gives the contribution within the proton to the  $\gamma_5$  anomaly.

In massless DIS it is straightforward to find out what the contribution of the first moment to the cross section is. One can apply the convolution theorem to see that the contribution of  $\Delta g$  is given by the first moment of the parton matrixelement. If masses are involved, like  $m_c$ , the answer to this question is somewhat more subtle. Since the cross section is not any more a convolution of the standard form one has to write it artificially as  $\sigma(a, e) = \int_a^1 \frac{dw}{w} \delta g(w) H(\frac{a}{w}, e)$  where  $a = \frac{4m_c^2}{S_\gamma}$  for photoproduction and  $a = (1 + \frac{4m_c^2}{q^2})x$  for DIS charm production and  $e$  stands for external variables like  $e = p_{Tcut}^2, S_\gamma, \dots$  etc. Now one can apply the convolution theorem and the first moment  $\int_0^1 dz H(z, e)$  gives essentially the contribution from  $\Delta g$ . It turns out that both for the inclusive charm photoproduction and DIS (Eqs. (8) and (5)) the corresponding quantities  $\int_0^1 dz H(z, e)$  identically vanish [20]. This can be traced back to the small- $p_T$  behaviour of the matrixelement for  $\gamma g \rightarrow c\bar{c}$  which cancels the contribution of the large- $p_T$  region in  $\int_0^1 dz H(z, e)$  [21]. It is not really a surprise in view of the structure of the anomaly in massive QCD (cf. the appendix of ref. [22]).

Since the integrals  $\int_0^1 dz z^{n-1} H(z, e)$  keep being small in a neighbourhood of  $n=1$  one may conclude from this that these cross sections are not suited for determining the first moment of  $\delta g$ . Fortunately, the situation changes drastically if one includes a  $p_T$ -cut of greater than 1 GeV. In that case the sensitivity to  $\Delta g$  is re-established because the small- $p_T$  behaviour of the matrixelement for  $\gamma g \rightarrow c\bar{c}$  does not cancel the contribution of the large- $p_T$  region any more. In ref. [20] a more quantitative study of these facts will be carried out and the sensitivity of the above mentioned RHIC process to  $\Delta g$  will be analysed as well.

## References

[1] B. Lampe and E. Rem, Polarized Structure Functions and High Energy Polar

- [2] J. Ellis and R.L. Jaffe, 1974, Phys. Rev. D9, 1444; Erratum D10, 1669
- [3] G. Altarelli and B. Lampe, 1990, Z. Phys. C47, 315
- [4] B.I. Ermolaev, S.I. Manayenkov and M.G. Ryskin, 1996, Z. Phys. C69, 25
- [5] J. Blümlein and A. Vogt, 1996, Phys. Lett. B370, 149
- [6] D. Adams et al., (SM Collab.), 1994, Phys. Lett. B329, 399; Erratum: ibid. B339, 332
- [7] T. Gehrmann and W.J. Stirling, 1996, Phys. Rev. D53, 6100
- [8] M. Glück, E. Reya, M. Stratmann and W. Vogelsang, 1996, Phys. Rev. D53, 4775
- [9] R.D. Ball, S. Forte and G. Ridolfi, 1996, Phys. Lett. B378, 255.
- [10] R. Mertig and W.L. van Neerven, 1996, Z. Phys. C70, 637
- [11] M. Birkel and H. Fritzsch, 1996, Phys. Rev. D53, 6195
- [12] G. Altarelli and W.J. Stirling, 1989, Particle World 1, 40
- [13] R.D. Carlitz, J.C. Collins and A.H. Mueller, 1988, Phys. Lett. B214, 229
- [14] Polarization Working Group, in Proceedings of the HERA-Workshop, Hamburg 1991
- [15] E.L Berger and D. Jones, 1980, Phys. Rev. 23, 1521
- [16] M.G. Ryskin, R.G. Roberts, A.D. Martin and E.M. Levin, 1995, Durham DTP/95/96
- [17] G.T. Bodwin, E. Braaten and G. Lepage, 1995, Phys. Rev. D51, 1125
- [18] M. Glück, R.M. Godbole and E. Reya, 1988, Z. Phys. C38, 441
- [19] A.D. Watson, 1982, Z. Phys. C12, 123
- [20] B. Lampe and A. Ruffing, in preparation
- [21] L. Mankiewicz and A. Schäfer, 1990, Phys. Lett. B242, 455
- [22] B. Lampe, 1990, Z. Phys. C47, 105