

hep-ph/9610268
DFTT 61/96
Edinburgh 96/25

DOUBLE ASYMPTOTIC SCALING '96

Stefano Forte

*INFN, Sezione di Torino,
via P. Giuria 1, I-10125 Torino, Italy*

and

Richard D. Ball¹

*Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, Scotland*

Abstract

We review recent HERA data on the structure function F_2 at small x and large Q^2 . We show that the salient features of the data are revealed by comparing them to the double asymptotic scaling behaviour which F_2 is predicted to satisfy in perturbative QCD.

Invited talk given at
QCD96
Montpellier, July 1996
to be published in the proceedings

October 1996

¹Royal Society University Research Fellow

Double Asymptotic Scaling '96 *

Stefano Forte^a and Richard D. Ball^{b†}

^aINFN, Sezione di Torino, via P. Giuria 1, I-10125 Torino, Italy

^bDepartment of Physics and Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, Scotland

We review recent HERA data on the structure function F_2 at small x and large Q^2 . We show that the salient features of the data are revealed by comparing them to the double asymptotic scaling behaviour which F_2 is predicted to satisfy in perturbative QCD.

Double asymptotic scaling of the structure function $F_2(x, Q^2)$ in the two variables $\sigma \equiv \sqrt{\xi\zeta}$ and $\rho \equiv \sqrt{\xi/\zeta}$ (where $\xi \equiv \frac{x_0}{x}$ and $\zeta \equiv \frac{\alpha_s(Q_0)}{\alpha_s(Q)}$) [1] is a simple consequence [2] of the QCD evolution equations at small x and large Q^2 , and manifests the basic structure of asymptotic freedom in perturbative QCD [3]. Because double scaling is spoiled if the dominant behaviour of F_2 at large σ and ρ is not governed by perturbative evolution, plots of F_2 as a function of the scaling variables σ and ρ were proposed in ref. [1] as a means of testing graphically the validity of the QCD prediction. Indeed, this analysis showed at a very early stage that, contrary to widespread expectation, perturbative QCD in the leading log Q^2 approximation accurately describes the behaviour of the structure functions measured at HERA.

While the availability of much more precise data on F_2 [4,5] now justifies a full NLO analysis [6–8] based on the Altarelli-Parisi equations, whose applicability in this regime is now established beyond reasonable doubt, many instructive features of the small x , large Q^2 behaviour of F_2 are apparent from its double scaling behaviour.

The basic double scaling behaviour of the data is displayed in Fig. 1, which shows all data on F_2 which pass the cuts $\rho, \sigma > 1, Q^2 > 5 \text{ GeV}^2$ (so that the leading-order approximation is valid), as determined in the 1994 HERA run by H1 [4] (a) and ZEUS [5] (b), plotted versus σ (with $x_0 = 0.1$ and $Q_0 = 1 \text{ GeV}$), after rescaling of the leading one-loop sub-asymptotic behaviour [1]. Independence of $\ln F_2$ from ρ (ρ scaling) is demonstrated by the fact that all data lie on the same line.




Fig. 1a




Fig. 1b

*Presented by SF

†Royal Society University Research Fellow.





Fig. 2a





Fig. 2b

In order to test for σ scaling, however, we must make sure that the slope 2γ of this line is that predicted in perturbative QCD, i.e. that the observed scaling is not an accidental consequence of the particular kinematic region covered by the HERA experiments. Note that the value of $\gamma = \sqrt{12/\beta_0} = 6/\sqrt{33-2n_f}$ is an absolute, parameter-free prediction of perturbative QCD. A simple way of doing so is to scale away the full asymptotic prediction, i.e. to rescale the data by the factor

$$R_F = N\rho\sqrt{\sigma}e^{-2\gamma\sigma+\delta\sigma/\rho}, \quad (1)$$

with N an arbitrary normalisation.

The result is displayed in fig. 2, where, as a cross-check, the dependence on ρ is also shown explicitly. Clearly both the H1 (a) and ZEUS (b) data are in good agreement with the QCD prediction, which is attained asymptotically at large σ . The (rescaled) data are now plotted on a linear





Fig. 3a





Fig. 3b

scale: as a consequence, because of the definition of the scaling variables, deviations from the predicted behaviour which are linear in x or $\log Q^2$ would appear as exponential scaling violations.

For example, we can immediately exclude that the data behave as a scale-independent fixed power: in fig. 3 the H1 data are compared to the function $Ax^{-\lambda}$ (A is an arbitrary constant) with (a) $\lambda = 0.08$ and (b) $\lambda = 0.35$.³ This is of some theoretical relevance because a (scale independent) power-like behaviour $F_2 \sim x^{-\lambda}$ would correspond to the dominance of a fixed Regge pole. The value $\lambda = 0.08$ is that corresponding to the “soft pomeron” which dominates high-energy elastic proton-proton scattering [9], while $\lambda \gtrsim 0.35$ is supposed to be [10] the smallest value one

³In this and subsequent plots the three curves correspond to $\rho=1.1, 2.2, 3.3$ on the σ plot, and $\sigma = 1, 1.5, 2$ on the ρ plot (dot-dashed, solid and dashed curves, respectively), which bracket the HERA kinematic region.




Fig. 4

may obtain from a computation of the pomeron intercept based on the Lipatov equation [11] in the presence of infrared cutoffs. Larger values of λ would lead to yet stronger violations of double scaling.

Of course such a power-like behaviour might instead only apply at some starting scale Q_0 as an initial condition to perturbative evolution. The leading asymptotic behaviour of F_2 then depends on the kinematic region [1]: when $\rho < \frac{2}{\lambda}$ the double scaling rise dominates over the boundary condition and F_2 displays double scaling, while for larger values of ρ the boundary condition is reproduced, up to calculable subleading corrections, i.e. [1]

$$F_2 \sim x^{-\lambda} \left(\frac{t}{t_0} \right)^{\gamma^2/\lambda - \delta} + O\left(\frac{1}{\sigma}\right). \quad (2)$$

When $\lambda = 0.35$ the transition occurs around $\rho \approx 3.5$: it follows that fig. 3b allows us to exclude any boundary condition which is more singular than $\lambda \approx 0.35$. Thus, the observation of double scaling excludes strongly rising boundary conditions [1].

The behaviour eq. 2 corresponds essentially to approximating the Mellin-space anomalous dimensions $\gamma^{ij}(N)$ which characterise the evolution of singlet parton distributions with the value which they take at $N = \lambda$. It is sometimes claimed [12] that a fixed Regge pole might dominate the anomalous dimension (rather than the structure function F_2 , as assumed in producing the curves of fig. 3). The behaviour eq. 2 would then be applicable everywhere: of course, this would mean a breakdown of usual perturbative




Fig. 5

evolution in the region $\rho < \frac{2}{\lambda}$ where instead double scaling should hold. Comparison in fig. 4 of the resulting behaviour (eq. 2 with $\lambda = 0.35$) to the data shows that this scenario is in any case clearly excluded by the data essentially because of its large deviation from the perturbative prediction as ρ decreases, and because the growth with σ is too steep.

Given that the data seem to exclude most of the commonly proposed alternatives to double scaling, one may wonder whether it is possible to mimic the perturbative double scaling prediction of eq. 1 by a simpler functional form. In ref. [13] a good fit to the H1 data [4] was obtained by assuming $F_2 = a + b \log \frac{Q^2}{Q_0^2} \log \frac{x_0}{x}$, with a and b free parameters. The corresponding best-fit [13] curves are displayed in fig. 5, which shows that indeed there is reasonable agreement with double scaling in the HERA region. The agreement is only local, however: for example at large σ and moderate ρ , i.e. at very large Q^2 and small x (where no data are available) the linear growth in $\ln Q^2$ leads to a discrepancy with double scaling, which corresponds instead to a rise of F_2 weaker than any power of $\ln Q^2$. This parametrisation thus lacks any predictive power: the slope of the rise is fitted to the data rather than being predicted, and thus cannot be reliably extrapolated outside the data region. It does however show that, due to the slow variation of ξ and ζ with Q^2 and x , the double scaling behaviour of eq. 1 admits simple local approximations.

Despite its success in describing the data, it is clear from fig. 2 that double scaling is only correct




Fig. 6

asymptotically. Indeed, a rise is visible in the ρ plot at large ρ , where Q^2 is low and the data get close to the boundary condition, while the data on the σ plot appear to drop somewhat, except at the largest σ values, indicating that the slope of the rise of F_2 is sub-asymptotically smaller than the predicted one.

We may investigate whether these violations of double scaling may be understood in a simple way by seeing whether they are reduced by the inclusion of a two loop correction to the leading double scaling behaviour. The correction may be computed [14] by determining the NLO correction to the leading singularity of the anomalous dimensions in N (which has the same location and strength as at leading order), and deriving the corresponding two loop asymptotic behaviour, which turns out to be scheme independent. We can then once again test graphically this two loop correction by rescaling the data to the two loop asymptotic prediction, i.e. with the rescaling factor

$$R_F^{2l} = \left[1 + \frac{\rho}{\gamma} (\epsilon \alpha_s(Q^2) - \epsilon' \alpha_s(Q_0^2)) \right] R_F$$

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{\beta_0 \pi} \left(\frac{103}{27} + \frac{3\beta_1}{\beta_0} \right) \quad (3)$$

$$\epsilon' = \epsilon + \frac{78}{\pi \beta_0 \gamma^2},$$

where β_1 is the two loop coefficient of the β function, and R_F is given by eq. 1, with ζ computed using the two-loop expression for α_s . Fig. 6 shows that indeed the two loop correction eq. 4 removes the main systematic violation of double scaling, namely the sub-asymptotic fall in the σ plot. The two loop correction also has the effect of mov-




Fig. 7

ing upwards the optimal reference scale Q_0 , to $Q_0 = 1.8$ GeV (this is the main cause of the change of scale in the plots of fig. 6 compared to the previous one-loop plots).

However, the overall ρ scaling deteriorates somewhat. Even though part of the ρ scaling violations, in particular those at large ρ , are presumably the result of boundary effects, this suggests that the part of the two loop anomalous dimension not included in the determination of the asymptotic behaviour eq. 4 may actually be important in most of the HERA region. Otherwise, stated, this suggests that the summation of logs of Q^2 may still have a leading role over the summation of logs of $\frac{1}{x}$. This is consistent with the result of ref. [7], where it was shown that the observed perturbative evolution of F_2 is most accurately described by two-loop Altarelli-Parisi evolution, while the inclusion of the summation of logs of $\frac{1}{x}$ in the evolution equation inevitably makes the agreement with the data worse.

This also suggests that a more accurate description of the data requires a full two loop computation. The results of such a computation [7,8] are also displayed in fig. 6. The curves here correspond to $\rho=2, 3, 4$ on the σ plot, and $\sigma = 1, 1.2, 1.4$ on the ρ plot (dot-dashed, solid and dashed curves, respectively). The remarkable accuracy of the two loop computation is however best shown by plotting the ratio R of the data to the best fit versus the two scaling variables (fig. 7). This fit is obtained with only two free parameters, namely the exponents λ_q and λ_g which characterise the small x behaviour $x^{-\lambda_i}$ of the input singlet quark




Fig. 8

and gluon distributions (see ref. [8] for details of the fitting procedure). This is possible because the dominant double scaling behaviour is largely independent of the details of the input parton distributions [1]. In fact, in most of the HERA region any starting distribution leads to essentially the same behaviour, provided only that λ_i are not too large (i.e. $\lambda \lesssim 0.35$, as discussed above).

The availability of data at low x and Q^2 (i.e. large ρ and large σ) however, allows now to put more stringent bounds on the acceptable values of the exponents λ_i than the asymptotic double scaling analysis alone would allow. Indeed, the full two loop fit [8] leads to the values $\lambda_q = 0.25 \pm 0.02$ and $\lambda_g = 0.09 \pm 0.09$ at $Q_0 = 2\text{GeV}$ in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme: hence the values, say, $\lambda_q = \lambda_g = 0.35$ are excluded by several standard deviations, even though they would only lead to violations of double scaling at large $\rho \gtrsim 3.5$. This is apparent in the plot of the data/theory ratio determined with these values (fig. 8): the excessive rise of the boundary condition leads the computed F_2 to overshoot the data close to the boundary, and thus to a systematic fall as ρ increases.

The precise values taken by the exponents λ_i of course depend on the particular parameterisation adopted, on the factorization scheme and on the value of the starting scale, and thus do not have any direct physical meaning. It is nevertheless significant that the data require that at low Q^2 singlet parton distributions, and the gluon distribution in particular, do not rise strongly with $\frac{1}{x}$, in qualitative agreement with expectations based on the soft pomeron of Regge theory [9].

The description of scaling violations afforded by standard two-loop Altarelli-Parisi evolution is now accurate enough that scaling violations due to the summations of logs of $\frac{1}{x}$ may be excluded phenomenologically [7]. This, together with the success of double scaling, which implies the absence of strong nonperturbative boundary effects which would spoil the perturbatively generated behaviour, opens the way to very accurate QCD phenomenology at HERA, such as, for instance, precision determinations of α_s [8]. A complete theoretical understanding of the underlying reasons for this happy state of affairs is however still missing, and will certainly require going beyond the simple picture of double asymptotic scaling summarised here.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank S. Narison for insisting that this material be presented at the conference, and for his hospitality in Montpellier.

REFERENCES

1. R. D. Ball and S. Forte *Phys. Lett* **B335** (1994) 77; **B336** (1994) 77.
2. A. de Rújula et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D10** (1974) 1649.
3. F. Wilczek, [hep-th/9609099](#).
4. H1 Collaboration, *Nucl. Phys.* **B439** (1995) 471.
5. ZEUS Collaboration [hep-ex/9607002](#).
6. R. D. Ball and S. Forte *Phys. Lett* **B358** (1995) 365
7. S. Forte and R. D. Ball, [hep-ph/9607291](#).
8. R. D. Ball and S. Forte, [hep-ph/9607289](#).
9. A. Donnachie and P. V. Landshoff, *Nucl. Phys.* **B244** (1984) 322; **B267** (1986) 690
10. J. C. Collins and J. Kwieciński, *Nucl. Phys.* **B316** (1989) 307.
11. V. S. Fadin, E. A. Kuraev and L. N. Lipatov, *Phys. Lett.* **60B** (1975) 50; *Sov. Phys. JETP* **44** (1976) 443; **45** (1977) 199; Y. Y. Balitski and L. N. Lipatov *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **28** (1978) 822.
12. See for example H. Navelet et al. [hep-ph/9609293](#).
13. W. Buchmüller and D. Haidt, [hep-ph/9605428](#).
14. S. Forte and R. D. Ball, *Acta Phys. Pol.* **B26** (1995) 2097.