

TRANSITION FROM PHOTOPRODUCTION TO
DEEP-INELASTIC SCATTERING IN JETPRODUCTION AT
HERA IN NLO QCD

B. POTTER

II. Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Hamburg
Luruper Chaussee 149, D-22761 Hamburg, Germany
e-mail: poetter@mail.desy.de

We present results from NLO QCD calculations on the production of jets in ep collisions at HERA in a continuous range of photon virtuality Q^2 . Special attention is given to the collinear singularities from the virtual photon and the resolved virtual photon component of the cross sections. Comparisons with dijet data from H1 are shown and the infrared sensitivity of dijet cross sections is discussed.

1 Introduction

High E_T jet production in ep scattering experiments is a very important field to study QCD. The electron interacts with the proton via a photon with virtuality Q^2 . Two regions of photon virtuality have been studied now for quite some time, one being the region of nearly on-shell photons $Q^2 \ll 0 \text{ GeV}^2$ (photoproduction regime), the other being the region of large Q^2 (deep-inelastic regime). Perturbative QCD calculations exist in NLO for photoproduction^{1,2} and deep-inelastic scattering^{3,4,5} and the comparison of data and theory gives satisfying results.

It is well known that in photoproduction the photon can either interact directly or via its parton content with the partons from the proton, which gives the direct and resolved components of the cross section. In deep-inelastic scattering the resolved component is believed to be negligible. The question arises, up to which virtualities the resolved virtual photon component needs to be considered in the jet cross sections. Only limited data exist for extracting information on the parton content of the virtual photon. Two LO parameterizations of the virtual photon structure function are available.^{6,7} Some calculations of jet production with resolved virtual photons exist in LO.⁸ However, LO calculations show a large scale and scheme dependence and do not depend on any jet algorithm. This situation is improved appreciably by doing NLO calculations. These have been performed recently taking care of the initial state singularities of the virtual photon.^{9,10} Here we present a computer program based on these calculations, in which the direct and resolved virtual photon components are implemented in NLO QCD for calculating jet cross sections in ep collisions.

2 Jetproduction in a Continuous Range of Photon Virtuality

The deep inelastic scattering (DIS) cross section normally does not contain a resolved component. We will label the component with the direct coupling of the photon to the subprocess as DIR. It is available in NLO QCD⁵. The DIR cross section contains terms of the type $P_q \ln(Q^2 = E_T^2)$ that become large for $Q^2 \sim E_T^2$ and spoil the convergence of the perturbative expansion. They have to be subtracted from the DIR component and absorbed into the parton distribution function (PDF) of the virtual photon⁹. The subtraction is done such that the photoproduction limit is obtained by taking $Q^2 \rightarrow 0$. The full cross section is then a sum (SUM) of the resolved (RES), available in NLO QCD¹, and the subtracted direct (DIRS) cross sections. The components DIR, DIRS and RES can be calculated with the NLO program JetViP.

We show the limiting cases of large and small Q^2 in the following. All calculations presented in this paper are done in the hadronic cms, except those for photoproduction, which are done in the laboratory frame. Fig. 1 a and b show the single-jet inclusive cross section integrated over the whole kinematically allowed y -range with $y \in [0.1; 0.6]$ as a function of E_T in LO and NLO for the two Q^2 -ranges $Q^2 \in [0.5; 1] \text{ GeV}^2$ and $Q^2 \in [500; 1000] \text{ GeV}^2$ with the scale $\mu^2 = Q^2$. The predictions by JetViP (lines) are compared with those made by DISENT⁴ (histograms) for the purely deep-inelastic scattering component DIR. The agreement between the two programs is very good in both Q^2 bins. As can be seen, the NLO correction lies a factor of 4 above the LO curve for the smaller Q^2 bin. This is in contrast to the deep inelastic region shown in Fig. 1 b, where the NLO curve is only 25% above the LO curve. The large correction for the small Q^2 -region stems from the large logarithm described above and indicates the necessity to introduce a resolved photon component. The other limiting case, photoproduction, is shown in Fig. 2 for inclusive single-jet cross sections for $y \in [0.05; 0.6]$ with the scale $\mu^2 = E_T^2$. The left plot in Fig. 2 shows the E_T spectrum, integrated over the kinematically allowed y -region for the subtracted direct DIRS (dashed) and resolved (full) cross sections in NLO QCD, compared to the predictions from a program by M. Klaseen for photoproduction (dots)¹. The agreement is perfect for both components. This also holds for the right plot in Fig. 2, which shows the y -distribution integrated over $E_T > 5 \text{ GeV}$. We conclude that JetViP reproduces the limiting cases of DIS and photoproduction very well.

3 Transition from Low to High Q^2

We have calculated single- and dijet cross sections for the intermediate Q^2 bins shown in Tab. 1.¹⁰ We use the scale $\mu^2 = Q^2 + E_T^2$ in the transition region.




Figure 1 a,b: Inclusive single-jet cross sections in DIS in LO (lower) and NLO (upper) compared to DISENT⁴ (histograms) for two different Q^2 -bins.




Figure 2: Inclusive single-jet cross sections in photoproduction for the direct (dashed) and resolved (full) components compared to KLASER/KRAMER¹ (dots).




Figure 3 a-d: Inclusive single-jet cross section $d^{1jet=d}$ integrated over $E_T > 5$ GeV as a function of η for four of the bins given in table 1.¹⁰

Table 1: Considered Q^2 -bins covering the range of low and medium photon virtuality.

Bin number	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
Q^2 -range in GeV^2	[1;5]	[5;11]	[11;15]	[15;20]	[20;30]	[30;50]	[50;100]

In Fig. 3 we show single-jet inclusive spectra for the bins I, II, IV and VII in the hadronic cm.s. , integrated over $E_T > 5 \text{ GeV}$ with $y \in [0.05; 0.6]$. We use the CTEQ4M proton PDF¹² and the SaS photon PDF.⁷ We show the two components RES and DIRS and their sum (SUM, upper full curve) which should be compared to the deep-inelastic result DIR. In addition to the NLO resolved, we have plotted the LO resolved (lower full curve) component. For all four Q^2 bins the DIR cross section is always smaller than the cross section obtained from the sum of DIRS and the NLO resolved cross section. This difference originates essentially from the NLO corrections to the resolved cross section, as is obvious when we add the LO resolved curve to the DIRS contribution in Figs. 3 a{d}. The sum of these agrees quite well with the DIR curve (for a detailed discussion see¹⁰).

Next we consider the exclusive dijet rate R_2 , which measures the cross section for two-jet production normalized to the total ep scattering cross section, as a function of Q^2 , as measured by H1.¹¹ The data were obtained in the bins II to VII by requiring for both jets $E_T > 5 \text{ GeV}$ in the hadronic cm.s. (the specific cuts and details of the jet finding can be found in¹¹). Symmetric cuts $E_{T_1}; E_{T_2} > 5 \text{ GeV}$ are problematic from the theoretical viewpoint since the so defined cross section is infrared sensitive. With symmetric cuts on the E_T 's there remains no transverse energy of the third jet, so that there is very little or no contribution from the three-body processes. In order to avoid this sensitivity one needs additional constraints on the E_T 's. This problem has already been discussed in connection with photoproduction.^{13;14} The H1 collaboration have chosen two additional constraints on the two largest E_T 's: (i) mode: if $E_{T_1} > E_{T_2}$ ($E_{T_2} > E_{T_1}$) then $E_{T_1} > 7 \text{ GeV}$ ($E_{T_2} > 7 \text{ GeV}$); (ii) mode:




Figure 4: Dijet rate R_2 as a function of Q^2 measured by H1,¹¹ compared to NLO predictions by JetViP. (a) mode; (b) mode.¹⁰

$E_{T_1} + E_{T_2} > 13 \text{ GeV}$. In Fig. 4 a and b we show our result in the two modes for the DIS and the DIS and RES components for the six Q^2 bins II-VI. In the first Q^2 bin the SUM of DIS and RES is 50% larger than the DIS (DIS) cross section. In the smaller Q^2 bins SUM agrees better with the experimental data¹¹ than the DIS cross section. In the larger Q^2 bins the difference of the cross sections DIS and SUM is small and it can not be decided which of these cross sections agrees better with the data due to the experimental errors.

Acknowledgments

It is a pleasure to thank G. Kramer for his collaboration. Useful discussions with G. G. Rindhammer, H. Jung, H. Kuster and M. Wobisch are acknowledged. This work was supported by Bundesministerium für Forschung und Technologie, Bonn, Germany, under Contract 05 7 HH 92P (0), and by EEC Program Human Capital and Mobility through Network Physics at High Energy Colliders under Contract CHRX-CT93-0357 (DG12 COMA).

References

1. M. Krasen, G. Kramer Z. Phys. C 72 (1996) 107; C 76 (1997) 489;
M. Krasen, T. Kleinwort, G. Kramer, hep-ph/9712256, DESY 97-234.
2. B.W. Harris, J.F. Owens, FSU-HEP-971020, hep-ph/9712299.
3. T. Brodtkorb, J.G. Komer, E.M. Irkes, G.A. Schuler, Z. Phys. C 44 (1989) 415; E.M. Irkes, hep-ph/9711224, TTP 97-39 (and references therein).
4. S. Catani, M.H. Seymour, Phys. Lett. B 378 (1996) 287; Nucl. Phys. B 485 (1997) 291.
5. D. Gaudenz, Phys. Rev D 49 (1994) 3291.
6. M. Glück, E. Reya, M. Stratmann, Phys. Rev. D 51 (1995) 3220.
7. G.A. Schuler, T. Sjöstrand, Z. Phys. C 68 (1995) 607, Phys. Lett. B 376 (1996) 193.
8. M. Glück, E. Reya, M. Stratmann, Phys. Rev. D 54 (1996) 5515; D. de Florian, C. Garcia Canal, R. Sassot, Z. Phys. C 75 (1997) 265; J. Chyla, J. C. Vach, Proceedings of the Workshop 1995/96 on "Future Physics at HERA", eds. G. Ingelman, A. de Roeck, R. Klanner, DESY 1996.
9. M. Krasen, G. Kramer, B. Potter, Eur. Phys. J. C 1 (1998) 261;
B. Potter, DESY 97-138, July 1997, hep-ph/9707319 (unpublished).
10. G. Kramer, B. Potter, DESY 98-046, April 1998, hep-ph/9804352.
11. M. Wobisch on behalf of the H1 Collaboration, these proceedings.
12. H.L. Lai et. al., Phys. Rev. D 55 (1997) 1280.
13. M. Krasen, G. Kramer, Phys. Lett. B 366 (1996) 385.
14. S. Frixione, G. Ridol, Nucl. Phys. B 507 (1997) 315.