## On the extreme behaviour of $g_1(x, Q^2)$ at $x \to 0$ .

S. M. Troshin

Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino, Moscow Region, 142284 Russia

## Abstract

On the basis of the U-matrix form of s-channel unitarization, we consider constraints unitarity provides for the spin structure function  $g_1(x, Q^2)$  at  $x \to 0$ . Corresponding constraint for the spin structure function  $h_1(x, Q^2)$  is given along.

PACS: 11.80.Fv, 13.60.Hb, 13.88.+e spin structure functions, unitarity, low-x

The problem of spin structure of a nucleon during the last decade has become a very significant one. Experiments in this field continue to bring new facts which can change earlier interpretations. As it appears now, the behaviour of the function  $g_1$  at  $x \to 0$  is becoming crucial in the evaluation of the total hadron helicity carried by quarks. Recent experimental results indicate that the function  $g_1(x)$  might have a rising behaviour at  $x \to 0$  [1] contrasting to a smooth Regge dependence  $g_1 \sim x^{-\alpha_{a_1}}$  (with  $-0.5 < \alpha_{a_1} < 0$ ) used in the experimental analysis. Indeed, the dependence  $g_1^n(x) = -0.2/x^{0.8}$  observed at small x in the experiment E154 at SLAC [1] when taken as an extrapolation to x = 0 could significantly change the first moment of the structure function  $g_1$ . Thus, the problem of small-x seems to be important in both cases of unpolarized and polarized DIS.

It has been discussed in several papers basing on some general considerations [2], DLA in QCD [3] and on the model approaches [4, 5, 6]. Various forms have been discussed including the extreme one  $xg_1 \sim \log^2 x$ . In this note we consider bound for  $g_1$  by taking account of unitarity in the direct channel. Corresponding constraint for the transversity  $h_1$  is given also.

For that purpose it is convinient to use the relation between the distribution functions and the discontinuities in the helicity amplitudes of the forward antiquark-hadron scattering [7] which is based on the dominance of the "handbag" diagrams in DIS:

$$q(x) = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im}[F_1(s,t) + F_3(s,t)]|_{t=0}$$
  

$$\Delta q(x) = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im}[F_3(s,t) - F_1(s,t)]|_{t=0},$$
(1)

where  $s \simeq Q^2/x$  and  $F_i$  are the helicity amplitudes for the elastic quark-hadron scattering in the notations for the nucleon-nucleon scattering, i.e.

$$F_1 \equiv F_{1/2,1/2,1/2,1/2}, \ F_2 \equiv F_{1/2,1/2,-1/2}, \ F_3 \equiv F_{1/2,-1/2,1/2,-1/2}, \ F_4 \equiv F_{1/2,-1/2,-1/2,1/2}$$

and

$$F_5 \equiv F_{1/2,1/2,1/2,-1/2}.$$

We consider a quark-hadron scattering similar to a hadron-hadron scattering. It can be justified when considering quark as a structured hadronlike object. Arguments in favour of such approach can be found in [8, 9]. We do not discuss here a possible influence of the off-mass-shell effects.

Unitary representation for helicity amplitudes in the U-matrix form of unitarization provides the following relations [10] in the impact parameter representation:

$$F_{\Lambda_1,\lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\lambda_2}(s,b) = U_{\Lambda_1,\lambda_1,\Lambda_2,\lambda_2}(s,b) + i\rho(s)\sum_{\mu,\nu} U_{\Lambda_1,\lambda_1,\mu,\nu}(s,b)F_{\mu,\nu,\Lambda_2,\lambda_2}(s,b),$$
(2)

where  $\lambda_i$  and  $\Lambda_i$  are the quark and hadron helicities, respectively, and b is the impact parameter. The kinematical function  $\rho(s) \simeq 1$  at  $s \gg 4m^2$ . Explicit solution of Eqs. (2) has a rather complicated form:

$$F_1(s,b) = \frac{\hat{U}_1(s,b)[1-iU_1(s,b)] - i\hat{U}_2(s,b)U_2(s,b)}{[1-iU_1(s,b)]^2 - [U_2(s,b)]^2},$$

$$F_3(s,b) = \frac{\tilde{U}_3(s,b)[1-iU_3(s,b)] - i\tilde{U}_4(s,b)U_3(s,b)}{[1-iU_3(s,b)]^2 - [U_4(s,b)]^2},$$

where

$$\tilde{U}_i(s,b) = U_i(s,b) + 2U_5(s,b)F_5(s,b)$$

and

$$F_5(s,b) = \frac{U_5(s,b)}{[1 - iU_1(s,b) - iU_2(s,b)][1 - iU_3(s,b) - iU_4(s,b)] - 4U_5^2(s,b)}.$$

However, in the approximation when the helicity-flip functions are much less than the helicity nonflip ones one can get simple expressions

$$F_{1,3}(s,b) = \frac{U_{1,3}(s,b)}{1 - iU_{1,3}(s,b)}.$$
(3)

The functions  $F_i(s,t)$  are the corresponding Fourier–Bessel transforms of the functions  $F_i(s,b)$ :

$$F_{1,3}(s,t) = \frac{s}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty b db F_{1,3}(s,b) J_0(b\sqrt{-t}).$$
(4)

Unitarity requires that  $\text{Im}U_{1,3}(s,b) \ge 0$ . Assume for simplicity that the functions  $U_{1,3}(s,b)$  are pure imaginary, i.e.  $U_{1,3}(s,b) \to iU_{1,3}(s,b)$ , and parametrice these functions in the form

$$U_1(s,b) = \frac{1}{2}(1-a)U(s,b)$$
(5)

$$U_3(s,b) = \frac{1}{2}(1+a)U(s,b), \tag{6}$$

where the function U(s, b) correspond to the unpolarized case and  $|a| \leq 1$ . To maximize the difference  $U_3(s, b) - U_1(s, b) = aU(s, b)$  we consider a as a constant. For the function U(s, b) we use simple form

$$U(s,b) = gs^{\lambda}e^{-\mu b}.$$
(7)

This is a rather general parameterization for U(s, b) which provides correct analytical properties in the complex *t*-plane. It follows also, for example, from the chiral quark model for *U*-matrix [11]. Note, that the following spectral representation is valid for the function U(s, b) [12]:

$$U(s,b) = \frac{\pi^2}{s} \int_{t_0}^{\infty} \rho(s,t) K_0(b\sqrt{t}) dt.$$
 (8)

Another form of U(s, b), e.g

$$U(s,b) = gs^{\lambda} e^{-b^2/\omega(s)}, \quad \omega(s) \sim \log s,$$

which also leads to the total cross-section saturating the Froissart-Martin bound would provide the same results, however, it does not respect analytical properties in the complex tplane. Indeed, as it follows from Eq. (8) the function U(s, b) should have a linear exponential dependence on the impact parameter at large b. Then using Eq. (7) as an explicit form for U(s, b) in Eqs. (3) and (4) it can be shown that Eqs. (1) provide at  $x \to 0$ 

$$\Delta q(x) \sim a/(1-a^2)\log x/x \text{ for } |a| \neq 1$$
  

$$\Delta q(x) \sim \log^2 x/x \text{ for } |a| = 1$$
(9)

and

$$q(x) \sim \log^2 x/x. \tag{10}$$

Since the above result are valid for each quark flavour the similar behaviour at  $x \to 0$  will take place for the function  $g_1(x)$ . Thus, unitarity together with parameterization of the Umatrix which provides saturation of the Froissart–Martin bound lead to the following upper bounds for the structure function  $g_1(x)$ :

$$g_1(x) \le \log x/x \quad (|a| \ne 1) \tag{11}$$

and

$$g_1(x) \le \log^2 x/x \quad (|a|=1).$$
 (12)

The latter bound has been obtained earlier in [2].

Using the relation between the function  $h_1^q(x)$  and corresponding quark-hadron helicity amplitude  $F_2(s,t)$  [7]:

$$h_1^q(x) = \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{Im} F_2(s, t)|_{t=0}$$
(13)

we can get similar upper bound for  $h_1(x)$  at small x. This function measures the number density of quarks in the transversity eigenstates and is determined as a matrix element of the twist-two transversity operator.

The unitary representation for the function  $F_2(s,t)$  has the following form [10]:

$$F_2(s,t) = \frac{s}{\pi^2} \int_0^\infty b db \frac{U_2(s,b)}{[1-iU_1(s,b)]^2} J_0(b\sqrt{-t}).$$
(14)

Using Eqs. (13), (14) and proceeding through the same steps as in the case of  $g_1(x)$  we arrive to the following extreme behaviour of  $h_1(x)$  at  $x \to 0$ :

$$h_1(x) \sim \log x/x. \tag{15}$$

Such behaviour of  $h_1(x)$  could be considered, in particular, as an indirect confirmation of the inequality obtained in [7].

To have such upper bounds seems to be useful nowadays when the experimental data indicate the possible rising behaviour of  $g_1(x)$  at small x and the studies of  $h_1(x)$  are planned at RHIC.

The author is grateful to N. E. Tyurin for his helpful comments and discussions.

## References

- G. Gates (E154 Collaboration), Talk given at 12th International Symposium on High-Energy Spin Physics, Amsterdam, September 10-14, 1996.
- [2] F. E. Close and R. G. Roberts, Phys. Lett. B336 (1994) 257.
- J. Bartels, B. I. Ermolaev and M. G. Ryskin, Z. Phys. C70 (1996) 273;
   J. Blümlein and A. Vogt, Preprint DESY 96-050.
- [4] S. D. Bass and P. V. Landshoff, Phys. Lett. B336 (1994) 537.
- [5] A. E. Dorokhov, N. I. Kochelev and Yu. A. Zubov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A8 (1993) 603.
- [6] S. V. Goloskokov, hep-ph/9604261.
- [7] R. L. Jaffe and X. Ji, Nucl. Phys. B375 (1992) 527;
   J. Soffer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74 (1995) 1292.
- [8] V. Del Duca, S. J. Brodsky and P. Hoyer, Phys. Rev. D46 (1992) 931.
- [9] J. D. Bjorken, SLAC-PUB-95-6949; SLAC-PUB-7096, 1996.
- [10] V. F. Edneral, S. M. Troshin and N. E. Tyurin, JETP Lett. 30 (1979) 330.
- [11] S. M. Troshin and N. E. Tyurin, Nuovo Cim. 106A (1993) 327; Phys. Rev. D49 (1994) 4427.
- [12] S. M. Troshin and N. E. Tyurin, Theor. Math. Phys. 50 (1982) 150.