QCD at High Energy (hadron-hadron, lepton-hadron, gam m a-hadron)

J.Huston

Physics and A stronom y Dept., M ichigan State University, East Lansing, M I 48824 USA E-m ail: huston@pamsu.edu

This talk sum m arizes recent QCD results from HERA, the Tevatron Collider and Tevatron xed target experiments.

1 Introduction

As in plied by the title of this talk, the topics to be discussed cover a very wide range, encom passing QCD results from the Tevatron p collider, the HERA ep collider and the Tevatron xed target experiments. In my talk, I will not try for a totally comprehensive review, but instead will discuss some of the important experimental and phenom enological developm ents in perturbative QCD since the last Rochester conference. I will not be covering deep inelastic scattering results per se, which will be discussed in the summary talk of Tony Doyle; instead I will present results which emphasize the details of the hadronic nal state in DIS and photoproduction events. Similarly, I will not discuss di raction which will be the subject of the review talk by Martin Erdm ann. M any of the recent developm ents in the theory/phenom enology world, along with a discusion of our current understanding of s, will be contained in the talk of YuriDokshitzer.

The main them e of my talk will be the success with which perturbative QCD has been applied to the data from Ferm ilab and from HERA. There are enough mysteries left, how ever, to make life interesting (and to provoke the need for larger data samples), with several of the mysteries involving the remaining uncertainties in the gluon distribution. DG LAP-based perturbative QCD predictions remain very successful and the search for convincing evidence for BFKL e ects continues.

2 Tevatron Collider

In the Tevatron collider, 900 GeV protons collide with 900 GeV antiprotons leading to a center-ofm assenergy of 1.8 TeV, the highest energy currently accessible. The Tevatron collider completed a very successful R un 1 in 1996 with each experiment (CDF and D0) accumulating on the order of 100 pb¹ of data. Most analyses have been published or are nearing publication.

2.1 Inclusive Jet P roduction at the Tevatron

The inclusive jet cross section in the central rapidity region has been m easured by both the CDF and D0 experin ents at a center of m ass energy of 1.8 TeV. Jets are de ned <u>using an iterative</u> xed cone algorithm with a radius R ($^{2} + ^{2}$) of 0.7.¹ The m easurem ent spans the transverse energy range from 15 G eV/c to the order of 500 G eV/c; in this range the jet cross section drops by over 9 orders of m agnitude. The highest E_T jet events probe the sm allest distance scales (10 17 cm) currently accessible. Any new physics that m ight exist at these distance scales, such as com positeness, m ight m anifest itself in the jet cross section m easurem ent.

The jet cross sections from both experim ents are corrected for detector m easurem ent and resolution e ects and are compared to next-to-leading order (NLO) QCD calculations.2;3;4 The theoretical uncertainties in inclusive jet production are greatly reduced at NLO as com pared to leading order. The two program s that are currently in use are JETRAD³ and EKS.⁴ JETRAD generates the NLO inclusive jet cross section by a Monte Carlo phase space slicing technique while EKS is an analytical calculation. Both program s are in plem entations of the sam e m atrix elem ents⁵ and give essentially equivalent results when the sam e cuts/conditions are applied. At NLO, the sensitivity of the jet cross section to the renorm alization/factorization scale is reduced, but still present. The value of this scale should be proportional to the hardness of the scatter. It is convenient to set the renorm alization and factorization scale equal to a multiple of the E_T of the measured jet. One can also set these scales to a multiple of the maximum of all jets in the event (E_{Tmax}), at the cost of introducing another variable into the prescription. Typically, E_{T jet}=2 is used in the EKS program while $E_{Tmax}=2$ is used in JETRAD.^a E_{T jet}=2 m ay be a m ore \natural" choice for an inclusive jet cross section, but E_{Tmax} /2 is also acceptable. The use of E $_{\rm T\,m\,\,ax}$ =2 rather than E $_{\rm T\,\,jet}$ =2 leads to a reduction in the jet cross section of 7% at $E_T = 50 \text{ GeV}/\text{c}$ decreas-

^a In the JETRAD program, each M onte C arlo event has 2 or 3 partons in the nal state, leading to a possibility of either 2 or 3 jets. The E_T of each individual jet is not known until a jet clustering algorithm has been applied (the two lower E_T partons m ay be clustered if they are close together). The only scale known unam biguously at the time of the event generation is the E_T of the m ost energetic parton ($E_{Tm ax}$). A version of JETRAD also exists in which a second pass ism ade through the generated events, allowing the use of the scale $E_{T int}$.





Figure 1: The inclusive jet cross section from CDF for Run 1A and Run 1B compared to the NLO QCD prediction using the CTEQ 3M parton distributions.

ing to < 1% at $E_T = 100 \text{ GeV}/\text{c}$. The e ect on the NLO inclusive jet cross section of variations in the renorm alization/factorization scale, the value of R_{sep} (the minimum separation of the two partons for them to be considered as two separate jets), and the choice of parton distribution functions (pdf's) is investigated in more detail in R ef. 6.

The picture that has been adopted for jet production is that the nalstate consists of 2 or 3 partons from the hard scatter accompanied by an underlying event due to the collision of the proton and antiproton rem nants. The underlying event is taken to be identical to that observed in minimum bias events and its contribution to the jet cone energy is subtracted before any com parisons to theory. This picture has been successful but may be incom plete; there may be additional contributions to the underlying event from double parton scattering and higher order radiation e ects that may not be included in the subtracted m in in um bias level and m ay not be correctly described by the NLO QCD calculations. 7;8;9 A uniform extra contribution to the jet energy m ight m anifest itselfas a jet pro le broader in experim ent than in theory. Such an e ect has already been observed by both CDF and D0. The main impact of any underestimate of the underlying energy level in jet events would be on lower energy jets.

The CDF collaboration has previously published the

Figure 2: The CDF inclusive jet cross section from Run 1B com – pared to NLO QCD predictions using the CTEQ 4M and CTEQ 4HJ parton distributions.

inclusive jet cross section from Run 1A (19.1 pb¹) for 0:1 < j j < 0:7.¹⁰ A linear comparison of (D ata-Theory)/Theory is shown in Figure 1 along with the prelim inary results from Run 1B (87 pb¹). G ood agreem ent with the NLO prediction is observed except at the highest values of transverse energy. The excess is inconsistent with the (highly correlated) system atic error of the m easurem ent and cannot be explained by a di erent choice of renorm alization and/or factorization scale, or by a di erent choice of conventional parton distribution function.

The CTEQ collaboration has perform ed a global pdf t using the Run 1A jet data from CDF, giving a large emphasis in the t to the high E_T data. The resulting t (CTEQ 4H J) contains a gluon distribution substantially greater (by a factor of 2 at x=0.5) than that in conventional pdf's.¹¹ The larger gluon distribution at high x leads to a greater cross section at high E_T (20% at 450 G eV/c). The increased jet cross section prediction does not pass directly through the center of the high E_T data points, but does pass through the bottom of the error bars. The CDF jet cross section from Run 1B is shown in Figure 2 com pared to the NLO QCD predictions using the CTEQ 4M and CTEQ 4H J pdf's.

For high E_T jet production, the dom inant subprocess is $\overline{q}q$ scattering. The gq subprocess com prises only 20% of the cross section and the gg subprocess contribution is minimal. For this reason, an increase in the gluon



Figure 3: The ratio of gluon distributions consistent with the D IS and DY data sets to the gluon distribution from CTEQ4M. The gluon distribution from CTEQ4HJ is also shown for comparison.

distribution of a factor of 2 leads to only a 20% increase in the jet cross section. The quark distributions are also free to change in this t, but are tightly constrained by the highly precise deep inelastic scattering (D IS) and D rell-Yan (D Y) data at these x values.

It may seem suprising that the gluon distribution has this degree of exibility. A recent CTEQ paper explored the uncertainty in the gluon distribution by perform ing a gluon parameter scan, utilizing the DIS and DY data used in the CTEQ4 t.¹² The resulting pdf's were excluded if there were any clear con icts with any of the data sets. The pdf's that remain are shown in Figure 3 and indicate that the gluon is tightly constained at lower x. D IS and DY data provide little constraint, how ever, on the high x gluon distribution and this is dem onstrated in the much wider variation observed in the large x region. (The CTEQ 4HJ gluon distribution is also indicated for com parison purposes.) In previous pdf's this constraint has been provided either by xed target direct photon data¹³ and/or jet data from the Tevatron collider.¹⁴ Due to evolution e ects, the gluon distribution is more tightly constrained (for x < 0.2) at high Q² than at low Q².

D0 has presented at this conference a measurement of the inclusive jet cross section for j j < 0.5 (and 0:1 < j j < 0.7 for direct comparison to CDF) with a substantially reduced systematic error.^{15;16} The cross



Figure 4: A comparison of the D0 inclusive jet cross section and NLO QCD (JETRAD) predictions obtained using three di erent parton distribution sets. The band represents the total experim ental uncertainty.



Figure 5: A comparison of the D 0 inclusive jet cross section and a NLO QCD (JETRAD) prediction using the CTEQ4HJ parton distribution set.

section for j j < 0.5 is compared to NLO QCD predictions with several pdf's in Figure 4. Good agreement is observed with perhaps some sign of an excess at moderate to high E_T when the CTEQ 3M and CTEQ 4M pdf's are used. The data is uniform ly larger than the prediction using the MRST pdf. This latter deviation is due to the substantially weaker MRST gluon distribution at high x (see Section 3.1).

Taking into account the correlations in the system – atic errors, reasonable 2 values are obtained for all 3 pdf's. The M R ST prediction agrees in shape with the D 0 data, although not in norm alization. The best 2 agreement (nom inally better than M R ST) is obtained with the C T E Q 4H J pdf (shown in Figure 5 for 0.1 < j j < 0.7).

A reanalysis of data from SLAC and NMC, taking into account nuclear binding e ects in the deuteron, predicts a larger d quark distribution at high x than found in m odern pdf's.¹⁷ O ne of the consequences of this larger high x d quark distribution would be an enhanced high E_T jet cross section (by about 10% at the highest E_T values).



Figure 6: The top plot shows the norm alized com parison of the D 0 inclusive jet cross section to NLO QCD predictions (EKS) along with a similar comparison of the Run 1A CDF inclusive jet cross section. The CTEQ 3M parton distribution set is used. The middle plot indicates the di erence between the D 0 inclusive jet cross section and a sm ooth t through the Run 1A CDF inclusive jet cross section, norm alized to the latter. The band represents the uncertainty on the D 0 data. A com parison of the CDF and D 0 jet system atic errors is shown at the bottom.

A direct comparison of the CDF Run 1A and D0 jet cross sections is shown in Figure 6. A side from a normalization shift of 5%, the two experiments obtain very similar jet cross sections, with the most noticeable dierence being in the last two data points. A normalization shift of this magnitude is to be expected since CDF and D0 use dierent values for the total inelastic pp cross section. D0 has calculated a low probability for their jet data to agree with the physics curve drawn through the CDF Run IA data, but if the correlated errors for both experiments are taken into account, there is agreement between the two at the 46% level of probability.

2.2 Dijet Cross Sections at the Tevatron

Both experiments have reported results for the dijet mass cross section and observe agreement with each other and with NLO predictions, albeit with an excess at high dijet mass consistent with that predicted by the CTEQ 4HJ pdf, as shown in Figure 7.^{18;19}

D 0 has used the dijet m ass cross section ratio of j j < 0.5 over 0.5 < j j < 1.0 to test for com positeness. At the 95% CL lim it, a compositeness scale of 2.4 TeV can be excluded. ¹⁹ P revious measurem ents of the dijet angular distribution provided an exclusion of < 2.0 TeV.

CDF has presented a m easurem ent of the di erential



Figure 7: A comparison of the CDF (preliminary) and DO 19 dijet mass cross sections to the NLO QCD predictions using the CTEQ 4M, CTEQ 4HJ and MRST parton distribution sets.

dijet cross section in which one jet (the trigger jet) is required to be central (0:1 < j j < 0:7), while the other jet (the probe jet) can have any rapidity value up to 3.0.18 The di erential dijet cross section is then plotted versus the transverse energy of the trigger jet, for the 4 di erent probe jet rapidity intervals. The m easurem ent presented in this way takes best advantage of the better $et E_T$ resolution CDF has in the central rapidity region. This measurem ent also directly probes higher x values than the inclusive jet cross section. The dijet cross section is sensitive to the high x gluon distribution and anything unusual that m ay occur at high x and Q^2 . This can be seen from Figure 8 where $\hat{t} = 2E_{T}^{2} \cosh^{2}()(1 \tanh())$ is plotted versus $x_{m ax}$ for the dijet cross section bins. The box in the upper right-hand corner indicates the region of phase space where a possible excess at HERA has been probed.^b

A comparison of the m easured dijet cross sections to predictions using the CTEQ 4M, CTEQ 4H J and MRST pdf's is shown in Figure 9. An excess is observed at high E_T (corresponding to high x) for each of the probe jet rapidity bins. The size of the excess is decreased when the CTEQ 4H J pdf is used. A detailed conclusion m ay wait, though, until a m ore detailed study of the adequacy of the NLO predictions is carried out for the high E_T , high

 $^{^{\}rm b}{\rm For}$ those of you who still do not get the P rince joke, please send em ail to m e at the address given.



Figure 8: A plot of the f vs $x_{m ax}$ reach for the CDF di erential dijet analysis. The box in the upper right hand corner indicates the kinem atic region where an possible excess at HERA has been probed.

region. (At very high x, multiply nalstates are common and NLO phase spacemay not be adequate.) The MRST predictions are uniform ly below the data at all E $_{\rm T}$ values due to the weaker gluon distribution discussed previously.

W henever two jets of roughly equal E_T values are separated by a large rapidity interval, the emission of gluons in the rapidity region between the two jets generates logarithm ic contributions $[(_s \ln (s=p_T^2))^n]$ to the dijet cross section which need to be resummed using the BFKL equation.²⁰ Naive BFKL predictions lead to behavior that di ers dram atically from that obtained from

xed-order perturbative predictions. The imposition of kinematic constraints on the calculations, however, supresses the BFK L-like behavior at the Tevatron and reduces the chances of unam biguous observation of BFK L signatures. The kinematic environment at the LHC will be more favorable for observation of BFK L-like behavior.²¹

2.3 Jet P roduction at 630 G eV and the x_T Scaling Ratio

CDF and D0 have both presented m easurements of the inclusive jet cross section at 630 GeV, and of the x_T scaling ratio.¹⁵ A comparison of the cross sections of the two experiments to NLO predictions is shown in Figure 10. For both experiments, deviations from the NLO predictions are observed for jet E_T values below 90–100 GeV/c.

CDF Preliminary



Figure 9: A com parison of the CDF di erential dijet cross section to NLOQCD (JETRAD) predictions using the CTEQ4M, CTEQ4HJ and MRST parton distribution sets. The system atic error band is indicated at the bottom for each probe jet rapidity interval.

W hen the scaled cross section ratio $(1=(2_p)E_T^3d=dE_T$ for 630/1800) is plotted versus $x_T \ (= 2E_T = 5)$, m any of the system atic uncertainties cancel for both experiment and theory. A naive parton m odel prediction would give a value for the ratio of 1.0; QCD e ects change the prediction to closer to 2 (with some dependence on x_T as observed). Both experiments have measured an x_T scaling ratio lower than the theoretical prediction for $x_T < 0.3$. (See Figure 11.) A similar discrepancy was observed for an earlier comparison of 546 GeV jet data to 1800 GeV jet data.²² The reason for the discrepancy is still under theoretical investigation and m ay be due to a combination of e ects (underlying event subtraction, initial state k_T and additional non-perturbative jet fragmentation effects (\splashout")).⁹

2.4 W + Jet(s) Production at the Tevatron

A nother ratio of observables with reduced system atic errors is the ratio of W + jet(s) production to W production. This measurement is naively sensitive to the value of $_s$ and, in fact, was originally proposed as a means of measuring $_s$. D 0 has reported an exclusive measurement of W + 1 jet production to W + 0 jet production at several recent conferences. The jets were measured with the standard D 0 jet algorithm using a cone radius of 0.7.



Figure 10: A comparison of the CDF and D0 inclusive jet cross sections at 630 GeV to NLO QCD predictions using the MRSA' parton distribution set. The shaded band indicates the D0 system – atic error.

The result was in serious disagreement with the NLO QCD predictions and no choice of scale or pdf provided any signi cant in provement.

CDF has measured the ratio of W + 1 jet to inclusive W production (R_{10}) using a jet cone radius of 0.4²³ and (new for this conference) 0.7.24 A comparison of both cone size results to NLO QCD predictions ²⁵ in Figure 12 indicates good agreement. In Figure 13, the CDF data is compared to NLO predictions using a variety of pdf's corresponding to di erent _s values. The theoretical predictions have a surprisingly small dependence on the value of $_{s}$. The experimental ratio of R₁₀ with 0.7 cones to R₁₀ with 0.4 cones is shown in Figure 14 along with the theoretical predictions. The experim ental ratio is larger than the theoretical one, which is another indication that jets at the Tevatron are broader than the theoretical predictions. A subtraction of an extra underlying event energy contribution would im prove the agreem ent of the experim ental jet shape with theory, and thus improve the agreem ent of the experimental R_{10} (0.7/0.4) ratio with the theoretical one.

3 Tevatron Fixed Target

Ratio of Scaled Cross-Sections: CDF and DZero



Figure 11: A comparison of the scaled inclusive jet cross sections (630/1800) for CDF and D0 to NLO QCD predictions. The shaded band gives the D0 system atic errors.

3.1 Direct Photon Production

D irect photon production has long been viewed as an ideal vehicle for m easuring the gluon distribution in the proton.²⁶ The quark-gluon C ompton scattering subprocess (gq! q) dominates production in all kinematic regions of pp scattering, as well as for low to moderate values of parton m om entum fraction x in pp scattering. A s mentioned previously, the gluon distribution is relatively well constrained at low x (x < 0:1) by D IS and D Y data, but less so at larger x. Consequently, direct photon data have been incorporated in several moderm global parton distribution function analyses and can, in principle, provide a m a pr constraint on the gluon distribution at moderate to high x.^{13;14}

A pattern of deviations of direct photon data from NLO predictions has been observed, 27 how ever, with the deviations being particularly striking for the E 706 experim ent. 28 The origin of the deviations lies in the e ects of initial state soft gluon radiation, or $k_{\rm T}$. D irect evidence of this $k_{\rm T}$ has long been evident from D rell-Y an, diphoton and heavy quark measurem ents. $^{29;30}$ The values of $hk_{\rm T}$ i per parton vary from $1~{\rm G}$ eV /c at $\,$ xed target energies to 3–4 G eV /c at the Tevatron collider. The grow th is approximately logarithm ic with center of mass energy.

Perturbative QCD corrections at the NLO level are insu cient to explain the size of the observed $k_{\rm T}$ and full resummation calculations are required to explain D rell-



Figure 12: The ratio of (R₁₀ (D ata) R₁₀ (Q C D)) to R₁₀ (Q C D) for N LO Q C D predictions calculated using DYRAD. The parton distribution function set used is M RSA', and the baseline renormalization and factorization scale is M_W. Also shown are curves using other Q² scales.



Figure 13: The ratio R₁₀ at E_{Tm in} = 30 GeV for both 0.4 and 0.7 jet cones, compared to DYRAD predictions as a function of $_{\rm s}$ (M $_{\rm Z}$). The CDF data are shown as horizontal bands. The theoretical values for the MRSA' and CTEQ4 pdf fam ilies are shown as solid circles and open squares, respectively.



Figure 14: The ratio of R_{10} with a jet cone size of 0.7 to R_{10} with a jet cone size of 0.4 for both CDF data and NLO QCD theory. Theory predictions are shown for several choices of scale.

Y an, W /Z and diphoton distributions.³¹ T hese resum m ation calculations correctly describe the growth of the hk_T i with center-ofm ass energy. In a k_T type of resum m ation calculation, there are typically two scales involved, which are in portant to the problem, and which di er greatly in m agnitude from each other. In the case of direct photon production, the two scales are the m ass and p_T (or k_T) of the photon-jet system. Instead of exam ining the e ects of the soft gluon resummation on the photon-jet m ass cross section per se, one can instead look at the e ects on the $p_{\rm t}$ distribution of the photon alone.

Currently, there is no rigorous k_T resummation calculation available for single photon production. The calculation is quite challenging in that the nal state parton takes part in soft gluon emission and in color exchange with the initial state partons, in contrast with the D rell-Yan and diphoton cases. A lso, the calculation is complicated by the fact that several overlapping power-suppressed contributions can contribute. In lieu of a rigorous calculation of the resummed direct photon p_T distribution, the elects of soft gluon radiation can be approximated by a convolution of the NLO cross section with a G aussian k_T smearing function.^{29;32} The value of hk_T i to be used for each kinematic regime is taken directly from relevant experimental observables, rather than from a theoretical prediction.

The behavior of the $k_{\rm T}\,$ sm earing correction is quite di erent for the Tevatron collider and for $\,$ xed target energies. In Figure 15 is shown the comparison of NLO theory calculations (with and without the $k_{\rm T}\,$ corrections)



Figure 15: The CDF and D0 isolated direct photon cross sections, compared to NLO QCD theory without $k_{\rm T}$ (dashed) and with $k_{\rm T}$ enhancement for $hk_{\rm T}$ i = 3.5 GeV/c (solid), as a function of $p_{\rm T}$.

to the direct photon data from CDF and D0. The value of $hk_{\rm T}\,i$ used (3.5 GeV/c) was taken directly from diphoton m easurem ents at the Tevatron. 33

There are two points to note: (1) the agreem ent with the data is in proved if the k_T correction is taken into account and (2) the k_T sm earing e ects fall o roughly as $1=p_T^2$. The latter behavior is the expectation for such a power-suppressed type of e ect.

The $k_{\rm T}$ correction obtained for E 706 at a center of m assenergy of 31.6 G eV is shown in Figure 16. The value of $hk_{\rm T}$ i of 1.2 G eV was obtained from m easurements of several kinematic variables in the experiment. 29 The $k_{\rm T}$ sm earing e ect is much larger here than observed at the collider and does not have the $1=p_{\rm T}^2$ fallo . This can be understood from the following argument. At low $p_{\rm T}$ an $hk_{\rm T}$ i value of 1.2 G eV /c is non-neglible compared to the $p_{\rm T}$ in the hard scattering, and the addition of the $k_{\rm T}$ sm earing both increases the size of the cross section and steepens the slope. At high $p_{\rm T}$ (corresponding to large x), the unm odi ed NLO cross section becomes increasingly steep (due to the rapid fallo of the parton densities) and hence the e ect of the sm earing again becomes larger.

For both the xed target and collider cases, the $k_{\rm f}$ sm earing increases the size of the observed cross section. The direct photons are only m easured above a given threshold. The direct photon $p_{\rm T}$ distribution is steep and the net e ect of the $k_{\rm f}$ sm earing (or a more complete re-



Figure 16: The variation of $k_{\rm T}$ enhancements (ratio of cross sections with and without the $k_{\rm T}$ corrections) relevant to E 706 direct photon data at 31.6 G eV, for di erent values of average $k_{\rm T}$. Also shown is the $k_{\rm T}$ correction for E 706 used in the recent M RST t.

sum m ation treatm ent) is to transport events from below the threshold to above the threshold, thus increasing the observed cross section.

The uncertainty in the value of $k_{\rm T}$ i is estimated by the E706 authors 29 to be $0.2~{\rm GeV}$. The e ect of this variation on the $k_{\rm T}$ correction is shown in Figure 16 and can be observed to be quite sizeable. A loo shown is the $k_{\rm T}$ correction used in the recent M RST paper. 34 The M RST paper uses an analytic $k_{\rm T}$ sm earing correction technique with an $k_{\rm T}$ i per parton value of 1.3 G eV/c. $^{\rm c}$

The E706 direct photon cross sections for pBe collisions at p = 31.6 GeV is shown in Figure 17 along with the NLO theoretical predictions for the range of k_T corrections.^{28;29;35} Very good agreem ent is obtained with the use of the nom inal value of hk_T i; the experimental cross section diers both in magnitude and shape from the NLO prediction with no k_T correction. Also shown in the gure are the data and theoretical predictions for $^{\circ}$ production. NLO calculations for $^{\circ}$ production have

a greater uncertainty than those for direct photon production since they involve parton fragmentation. How – ever, the k_T elects are expected to be generally similar to those observed in direct photon production, and the ° data can be used to extend tests of the consequences

 $^{^{\}rm c} The MRST$ paper quotes a smaller value for the $hk_{\rm T}$ i used for E 706. This smaller value is equivalent to 1.3 GeV/c in the convention used in this talk and in Reference 29.



Figure 17: The photon and $^\circ$ cross sections from E 706 com pared to k_T -enhanced NLO QCD calculations. In the bottom plot, the quantity (D ata-T heory)/T heory is plotted, using k_T -enhanced calculations for several values of < k_T > . The error bars have experimental statistical and system atic errors added in quadrature.

of k_T sm earing. The presence of an additional k_T value of a magnitude sim ilar to that needed for single photon production leads to a substantially improved agreement between the ° data and theory.

The same comparison is made in Figure 18 using the CTEQ 4HJ pdf's. Good agreement is observed at low p_T but the theoretical prediction is larger than the data at high p_T . As mentioned previously, the dominant mechanism for direct photon production is gluon-quark scattering, so an increase in the gluon distribution in this range by a factor of 2 leads to an increase in the direct photon cross section by the same factor. Similar conclusions are obtained with the E706 data at $p_{\overline{s}} = 38.8 \, \text{GeV} \cdot 2^{29;35}$

A decrease in the $k_{\rm T}$ i per parton at high $p_{\rm T}$ would lead to a better agreem ent of the E706 data with the CTEQ 4HJ pdf predictions. There are several possible suppression m echanisms for soft gluon emission in this kinem atic region that are not taken into account in the sim ple $k_{\rm T}\,$ m odel discussed above. $^{29}\,$ (An experimental determ ination of the dependence of the < $k_{\rm T}\,$ > as a function of $p_{\rm T}$ =x is di cult due to the diminishing statistics at higher $p_{\rm T}$.) This possibility is currently under investigation.

A comparison of the CTEQ 4M and CTEQ 4H J gluon distributions and the gluon obtained by thing the $k_{\rm f}$ -



Figure 18: The photon cross section from E706 compared to $k_{\rm T}$ – enhanced NLO QCD calculations using the CTEQ4HJ parton distribution set.

corrected E706 data (along with the CTEQ4DIS and DY data sets)²⁹ is shown in Figure 19. As might have been expected from Figure 17, the gluon distribution obtained from this tagrees well with the CTEQ4M gluon distribution and lies below the CTEQ4HJ gluon distribution at high x. Also shown in the gure is the gluon distribution from the MRST pdf, which incorporates the $k_{\rm T}$ -corrected data from WA70 in the t.^d The larger $k_{\rm T}$ correction for E706 observed in Figure 16 in plies a sm aller gluon distribution as is observed in Figure 19.

As has been discussed, there is a great deal of theoretical uncertainty in the calculation of the xed target direct photon cross sections. Even if the G aussian k_T sm earing ansatz given above were form ally correct, the uncertainty in the value of hk_T i to be used leads to a large variation in the predicted cross section. This variation m akes the use of xed target direct photon data in pdf ts som ewhat problem atic. A more complete resum – m ation calculation should, with the appropriate experimental input, be able to predict the hk_T i per parton for each kinem atic condition and thus m ay be able to rescue the situation.

There has also been much recent interest in studying the e ects of resum ming large logarithm s of the form

 $^{^{\}rm d}$ In the M RST paper, the E706 data are not used directly in the ts, but the t results are compared to the data from E706 after applying an appropriate $k_{\rm T}$ correction. 36 G ood agreem ent is obtained.



Figure 19:A comparison of the CTEQ 4M , MRST and CTEQ 4HJ gluons and the gluon distribution derived from $\,$ ts that use E706 data. The g" and g# gluon densities correspond to the maximum variation in $hk_{\rm T}$ i that MRST allowed in their ts.

In (1 x_T).³⁷ As x_T approaches 1, for any hard scattering process, the perturbative cross section is enhanced by powers of ln (1 x_T) that have to be resummed at all orders. These types of elects should currently be negligible for direct photon production at the Tevatron collider (because data are only available for relatively small values of x_T), but may be in portant at xed target energies. The net elect for E706 is a signil cant increase in the cross section at high p_T .³⁸ A treatment that includes both k_T and threshold resummation elects may be necessary for a more satisfactory description of the xed target data. Recent theoretical progress has been made in this direction.³⁹

In the CTEQ 4 pdf ts (and the upcoming CTEQ 5 ts as well), the inclusive jet cross sections from CDF and D 0 provide an additional constraint on the gluon distribution at moderate to large x values. B ecause of the theoretical uncertainties mentioned above, the CTEQ 5

ts will not use xed target direct photon data.

4 HERA

HERA is a positron-proton collider $(27.5 \text{ GeV e}^+ \text{ on } 820 \text{ GeV protons})$ with a total center of mass energy of about 300 GeV. The large center-of mass energy available at HERA o ers a large phase space for the hadronic nal state in DIS events, thus allowing clean jet structures to



Figure 20: Diagram s indicating initial parton em ission in ep scattering.

be observed. As HERA has continued its successful operation, the data available for analysis by both of its experiments, H1 and ZEUS, has increased steadily. A long with the increase in statistics has come an increase in the level of understanding of the detector system atics, allow - ing form ore precise comparisons of data to perturbative QCD.

4.1 Parton Evolution D ynam ics

Of particular interest at HERA are measurements which discriminate among parton evolution schemes. D G LA P ⁴⁰ and B F K L ⁴¹ describe the evolution towards large values of Q² and $1=x_{B_{1}}$, respectively. DGLAP evolution resums terms of the form $\ln (Q^2 = Q_0^2)$ and involves a strong ordering in k_T of the gluon em issions with the hardest emissions occurring near the top of the gluon ladder. (See Figure 20a.) In the BFKL model, terms of the form ln (1=x) are resummed and gluon emissions are not ordered in transverse m om entum k_T . A solution of the parton evolution equation by CCFM 42 approxim ates the BFKL equation in the low x_{Bi} lim it and the D G LAP equation in the high $x_{B i}$ lim it. A lack of ordering sim ilar to that found in BFKL evolution has been incorporated in the color dipole model. In the color dipole model, gluon em ission originates from a color dipole that is stretched between the scattered quark and proton rem nant. The result is a cascade of independently radiating dipoles with the gluons not ordered in k_T . (See Figure 20c.) In addition, for processes where the photon structure is resolved, the hardest em issions given in the QCD matrix element may occur anywhere in the ladder, with increasingly soft emissions along the ladder tow ards both the proton and the photon. (See Figure 20b.) The results presented previously for the Tevatron collider and

xed target m easurem ents are all governed by DGLAP kinem atics. At HERA, results have been obtained in all of the kinem atic regim es discussed above.

A wide variety of leading order (in $_{\rm s}$) theoretical program s are available for comparison to the HERA data incorporating the above evolution schemes:



Figure 21: The di erential dijet cross sections from ZEUS at the parton level versus (a) Q², (b) $x_{B\,j}$, (c) and (d) $p_{T\,m\,ax}^2 = Q^2$. The inner(outer) error bars indicate the statistical error (statistical and system atic errors added in quadrature). The shaded area represents the error due to the uncertainty on the jet energy scale of 3.5%. The solid line indicates the NLO QCD predictions from M EP JET.

 ${\rm BFK\,L}$ calculations at the parton level and with fragmentation functions 43

the DGLAP-based parton shower Monte Carlo modelLEPTO $^{\rm 44}$

the CCFM-based Linked Dipole Chain model LDC $^{\rm 45}$

the color dipole M onte C arlo m odel AR IADNE (which assumes a chain of independently radiating dipoles spanned by color-connected partons 46

the resolved photon model RAPGAP 47

In addition, there are a num ber of DG LAP-based calculations in next-to-leading order of $_{\rm s}$, including D IS-ENT 48 , MEPJET 49 , D ISA STER++ 50 and JETV IP 51 , that are available in the form of exible M onte C arlo generators.

C om parisons between the data and the theory can be m ade either at the detector level (w ith an appropriate M onte C arlo simulation of the detector response), the hadron level (w ith corrections for acceptance and m igration) or at the parton level (correcting for hadronization e ects).



Figure 22: The dijet cross sections from H1 double di erential in Q 2 and % 1000 . Also shown are the NLO QCD predictions of DISENT .

4.2 Dijet Cross Sections in DIS

In D IS (in the naive quark-parton model), the virtual photon is absorbed by a single quark or antiquark in the proton. This results in one jet from the struck quark (antiquark) and one jet from the proton remnant (1+1 con guration). To rst order in $_{\rm s}$ (lowest order for dijet production), two jets (in addition to the proton remnant jet) with balanced transverse momentum are produced in the photon-proton center-of-mass(2+1 con-

guration). There are two subprocesses responsible for dijet production in D IS: boson-gluon fusion (g! $\overline{q}g$) and QCD Compton scattering (g! gg). At low x and Q², the large gluon density leads to the dominance of the boson-gluon fusion subprocess and allows for a direct sensitivity for the gluon distribution in an x region below the xed target direct photon experiments. The presence of the strong interaction vertex may allow a m easurement of s. Jet m easurements have been conducted with variations of both the iterative cone and k_T algorithm s, and in the lab, B reit and hadron center-ofm ass reference frames.

ZEUS has submitted to this conference a measurement of digt production in DIS events from a data sample corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 6.4 pb¹.^{52;53;54} Cuts were placed on Q² (7–100 GeV²), y (> 0.04) and the scattered positron energy (> 10 GeV). The jets were reconstructed with a cone algorithm (R=1) and were required to have a transverse energy greater than 4



Figure 23: The dijet cross sections from H 1 double di erential in Q² and x_{B-1} . Also shown are the NLO QCD predictions of DISENT.

G eV /c in both the laboratory and center-of-m ass fram es, and to have a pseudorapidity in the laboratory fram e in the range from -2 to +2. The di erential cross sections, corrected to the parton level, are shown in Figure 21. The corrections applied are typically 20-40%. The variable (= $x_{B,j} (1 + m_{jj}^2 = Q^2)$) is of particular interest since it is related to the momentum fraction of the quark or gluon em itted from the proton in the leading order Q CD picture.

As can be observed in F igure 21, the data span the range from $0.2 < p_T^2 = Q^2 < 30$, so the events are characterized by two scales, p_T^2 (square of jet transverse momentum) and Q^2 . A comparison of an exact NLO QCD calculation (MEPJET) to the data demonstrates that the theory adequately describes the shape of all of the distributions but has a norm alization o by approximately 34%. The di erence is comparable in size and of the same sign as the hadronization correction applied to convert the data to the parton level.

The di erence between theory and experiment observed by ZEUS might originate in the e ects of soft gluon radiation in the regime (sam eminimum transverse momentum cut on both of the jets) where such e ects may be important. It has been proposed to measure the dijet rate using asymmetric cuts on the transverse momenta of the two jets in order to minimize this type of correction to the NLO calculation.⁵⁵ P lacing an additional cut on the larger of the transverse morenta of the two jets decreases the m agnitude of both the predicted and m easured dijet cross sections, but the relative di erence between the two still rem ains substantial. Sim ilarly, increasing the cuts on the transverse m om enta of the two jets results in both the m easured and calculated cross sections decreasing, with the ratio of the two rem aining approxim ately constant.⁵⁴

H 1 hasm easured the dijet cross section in D IS events at HERA and from this measurement has extracted a determination of the gluon distribution in the x range from .01 to $0.1.^{52,53;56}$ T he analysis involves a large data sample (36 pb¹) and utilizes k_T jet algorithm s for jet determination in the B reit frame. The B reit frame, where the virtual photon collides head-on with the scattered quark, is well-suited for studies of dijet production. In this frame, the jet transverse energy directly re exts the hardness of the underlying QCD process. Three di erent variations of the k_T algorithm were utilized with the smallest hadronization corrections being present in the longitudinally invariant k_T algorithm. The double-di erential dijet cross sections (corrected to the hadron level) are shown in Figure 22 as a function of Q² and

and in Figure 23 as a function of Q^2 and $x_{B\,j}$, com – pared to the NLO program DISENT.Good agreement is observed but the data have not been corrected for hadronization e ects (which, however, are expected to be small).

M ost of the data presented above by H 1 are at higher Q² than the previously discussed ZEUS m easurement. There is some overlap, though, and the reason for the agreement by H 1 with NLO theory and the disagreement by ZEUS is stillunder study. It may be related to the two studies being carried out in dierent frames of reference, with dierent jet algorithm s and the jet corrections being to the hadron level for H 1 compared to the parton level for ZEUS.

To determ ine the gluon distribution, the dijet cross section distributions $d^2 = dQ^2 d$ and $d^2 = dQ^2 dx_{B\,j}$ were utilized (in the range 200 < Q^2 < 5000 G eV², where the NLO theory describes the data well) along with the H1 neutral current D IS data (to determ ine the quark densities in this x range). In the t, the data are com – pared to the product of the NLO QCD prediction and the hadronization correction. The results of the gluon

t are shown in Figure 24 for the x range 0.01 to 0.1 with a factorization scale (2) of 200 G eV 2 . The result is slightly higher than the gluon distributions obtained from æveralglobalanalyses (although com patible within the error) and is in good agreem ent at x = 0.01 with the gluon obtained from the QCD analysis of the H1F₂ data.

H1 has also reported a determ ination of the strong coupling constant $_{\rm s}$ from the dijet sam ple.^{52;57} A modi ed JADE kg jet algorithm was applied to a sam ple of NC DIS events in the Q² range from 200 10000 GeV².



Figure 24: The error band of the gluon density in the proton from a NLOQCD to the Hl dijet cross sections. The result is compared to the gluon densities from di erent parton distribution sets and the result from a t to the Hl structure function data.

The restriction of $Q^2 > 200 \text{ GeV}^2$ provides better acceptance for the nalstate jets and restricts the range of initial parton x to large values where the parton densities are better known.

The jet algorithm calculates the scaled quantities $m_{ij}^2 = W^2$ of pairs of calorim eter clusters (i,j), where W^2 is the total invariant m ass of all clusters and m_{ij} is the m ass of clusters i and j. The clusters with m inim um $m_{ij} = W^2$ are added together; this procedure is repeated until exactly (2+1) jets remain. The sm allest scaled jet m ass given by any combination of the (2+1) jets is de-

ned to be the observable y. A cut on y_2 ($y_2 > 0.01$) is imposed to increase the fraction of events with a clear (2+1) jet structure, thus enhancing the sensitivity to s. The H1 y_2 distribution, normalized to the num ber of D IS events in the kinem atic sample and corrected for detector and hadronization e ects, is shown in Figure 25, along with the predictions of the NLO program MEPJET.Predictions are shown for $\frac{(4)}{MS} = 100 \text{ MeV}$ and 600 M eV, along with the best t value of 320 M eV. This value of corresponds to a value of $_{s} (M_{z}^{2})$ of $0.002^{+0.007}_{0.018}$ (system atic). There is an additional 0:118 theory system atic error of $^{+0:007}_{0:008}$. This result is in agreement with the world average, albeit with a large error. The largest experim ental system atic error is due to the m odel dependence of the detector and hadronization corrections; one of the largest sources of theory uncertainty is due to the imperfect know ledge of the pdf's (and in particular the gluon distribution) in this kinem atic range. (G luon-initiated processes account for about 50% of the



Figure 25: The distribution of the di erential jet rate y_2 corrected for detector and hadronization e ects com pared to the NLO prediction from M EPJET. The full line shows the NLO prediction using the tted value of $_{\rm s}$.

(2+1) jet events used in the analysis.) There is a strong correlation between the t value of $_{\rm s}$ and the size of the gluon distribution as was observed in determ inations of $_{\rm s}$ in jet production at the Tevatron.^{14;52}

4.3 Forward Jet Production at HERA

O ne of the signi cant discoveries m ade at HERA was the steep rise of the proton structure function $F_2(x;Q^2)$ in the region of sm allx (x < 10³). In the BFKL approach, the leading terms in $\ln(1=x)$ which appear together with the $\ln Q^2$ terms in the evolution equation are resummed. The BFKL terms m ay lead to a steeper F_2 behavior, but from the existing F_2 data, it is not possible to unambiguously determ ine whether the BFKL mechanism plays a role in the HERA x range. The BKFL mechanism predicts additional contributions to the hadronic

nal state from high transverse m on entum partons travelling forward in the HERA frame. These forward-going partons m ay be detected experim entally as jets and m ay result in an enhancem ent of the forward jet cross section when compared to either exact NLO QCD calculations or parton shower m odel calculations based on DGLAP evolution. This is the same type of BFKL physics that w as discussed earlier for large dijet rapidity separation at the Tevatron. In this case, the large rapidity separation is between the current and forward jets.

As previously, there are two hard scales relevant for low x forward jet production: the squared momentum transfer of the photon, Q^2 , and the squared transverse



Figure 26: The hadron level forward jet cross section as a function of E $_{\rm T\,jet}^2 = Q^2$ from ZEUS. The data are compared to the RAP-GAP M onte Carlo m odel with direct and resolved contributions, to LEPTO and to AR IADNE. The shaded band corresponds to the uncertainty from the energy scale of the calorim eter.

energy of the jet E $_{\rm T}^2$ $_{\rm jet}.$ The variable E $_{\rm T}^2$ $_{\rm jet}=\!\!Q^2$ can be varied from very small values to very large values. A low value of $E_{\tau}^{2} = Q^{2}$ corresponds to the standard D IS regime where DGLAP dynamics is dominant. In the range where $E_{\tau}^{2} = Q^{2}$ is approximately 1, BFKL dynam – ics becomes important (and DGLAP parton evolution is suppressed) ^e while in the regime where $E_T^2 > Q^2$, the jet begins to probe the structure of the photon. The forward jet cross section from ZEUS (corrected to the hadron level) is shown in Figure 26.^{58;59} All three M onte Carlo program s shown describe the data well for $E_T^2 = Q^2 << 1$. ARTADNE and RAPGAP work in the BFKL region ($E_T^2 = Q^2$) while only RAPGAP is successful in the regime where $E_T^2 >> Q^2$. The RAPGAP M onte Carlo m odel contains resolved as well as direct photon contributions. A resolved virtual photon contribution could account for the excess of forward jets with respect to the standard DGLAP models. In Figure 27, the hadron level forward cross section is plotted as a function of B prken x. The agreement with RAP-GAP (with both resolved and direct components) is excellent. However, the amount of resolved contribution to the forward jet cross section has a wide range of uncertainty that makes de nitive conclusions di cult. The shaded band in Figure 27 indicates the variation in the RAPGAP prediction when the factorizaton scale is varied from $2^{2} = E_{T jet}^{2} = 2 + Q^{2}$ to $2^{2} = 4E_{T jet}^{2} + Q^{2}$. Due to the large scale dependence, a com parison to exact NLO



Figure 27: The hadron level forward jet cross section from ZEUS as a function of $x_{\rm B~j}$. The data are compared to the RAPGAP M onte C arlo m odelw ith direct and resolved contributions and to LEPTO. The shaded band on the top indicates the uncertainty due to factorization scale variation for the fullRAPGAP prediction while the shaded band on the bottom indicates the same uncertainty for the direct contribution alone.

calculations is needed but the appropriate hadronization corrections are large.

H1 has measured forward jet and dijet production requiring a transverse energy larger than 3.5 GeV/c in a cone of radius $1.0.^{58,60}$ A cut of $0.5 < \text{E}_{T\,jet}^2 = Q^2 < 2$ is applied to enhance BFKL e ects. The forward jet cross section is shown in Figure 28, as a function of x com pared to severalm odels. AR IADNE and RAPGAP (with a resolved photon contribution) lie closer to the data than does the DGLAP-based program LEPTO.NLO parton calculations using DGLAP parton densities, as for exam – ple DISENT, disagree with the data both in shape and normalization. The num erical BFKL calculations at the parton level lie above the data but describe the shape fairly well.

The forward dijet cross section is measured by H1 to be 6:0 0.8 (stat) 32 (sys) pb, in agreem ent with the predictions from ARIADNE and RAPGAP. The dijet cross section is roughly 1% of the forward jet cross section. Recent BFKL predictions⁶¹ predict on the other hand that 3-6% of the forward jet data should contain 2 or more forward jets.

Single high p_T particle production can also be used as a probe of QCD dynam ics in the forward region. The am -

^eSpeci cally, BFKL dynam ics is important in the forward jet region when E $_{\tau}^2 = Q^2$ is near one and $x_{jet} >> x_{B \ j}$.



Figure 28: A comparison of the H1 forward jet cross section to various QCD calculations.



Figure 29: The forward ° cross sections as a function of $x_{B,j}$ for four di erent values of the variable $x = E = E_{proton}$ H ere n is the number of °'s and N is the number of events in the distribution. C om parisons of four di erent QCD m odels are overlayed. For the plot on the lower right, a BFKL calculation is shown and has been been divided by two for presentation.

ZEUS 1995–1996 Preliminary



Figure 30: The m easured three-jet cross section with respect to the three-jet invariant m ass. The inner error bar gives the statistical error and the outer the sum of statistical and system atic errors in quadrature.

biguity of jet de nition in plicit in the forward jet search is m issing, and the sm aller spatial extent allows the m easurem ent to sm aller angles. In Figure 29, the forward ^o data from H1 is shown plotted vs x_{Bj} for several values of $x (= E = E_{proton})$. The observed rise with decreasing x_{Bj} again provides evidence of m ore hard partonic radiation than predicted by DGLAP typeM onte C arb m odels (such as LEPTO), and is m ore reasonably represented by RAPGAP, where the photon acts as a resolved object.

4.4 Multiget Photoproduction at HERA

The study of multijet photoproduction provides a direct test of perturbative QCD predictions beyond leading order. Multijet kinem atic observables have been previously studied for 3-6 jet production at Ferm ilab⁶⁶ and for 2 jet production at HERA.⁶⁷ ZEUS has now measured 3 jet nal states in photoproduction events at HERA.^{62,63}

Photoproduction events were selected by restricting the transverse m on entum to the positron to be less than 1 G eV and the photon-proton center-ofm ass energy to be in the range from 134 to 269 G eV. Jets were de ned using a k_T cluster jet algorithm with the rst two jets having a transverse energy greater than 6 G eV/c and the third a transverse energy greater than 5 G eV/c. The requirem ent of relatively high transverse energy for the jets ensures that the process can be calculated by perturbative QCD.

The three-jet invariant mass distribution is shown in Figure 30 and compared to the order $\frac{2}{s}$ calcula-



Figure 31: The distributions of the angles $\cos(3)$ and 3. The thick lines show the xed order perturbative QCD calculations and the thin lines represent the parton show er M onte C arb predictions. The dotted curve shows the distribution for a constant m atrix element.



Figure 32: The m easured cross section d =d $_3$ and the norm alized $_3$ distributions for ZEUS. The PYTHIA and HERW IG predictions are shown by solid and dashed lines respectively and the prediction from PYTHIA with color coherence switched o is shown by the dashed-dotted line.

tions.^{64;65} The two calculations are leading order for the variable under study (since there are three jets in the nalstate) but stillprovide good agreem ent with the data. The M onte C arb program sPYTHIA and HERW IG contain only 2 ! 2 m atrix elements but a third jet can be provided by gluon radiation. The M onte C arb program s predict the correct shape for the cross section but have a norm alization too low by 20-40%.

The distributions for $_3$ (the angle between the highest energy jet and the beam direction) and $_3$ (the angle between the plane containing the three jets and the plane containing the highest energy jet and the beam direction) are shown in Figure 31.

The $\cos(3)$ distribution shows the expected Rutherford scattering form ((1 $\cos(3)$)²). Both the 3 and 3 distributions di er dram atically from phase space and agree well with both the xed order calculations and the M onte C arbo m odels.

The QCD phenomena of color coherence can be tested using the $_3$ distribution. In Figure 32 is shown the $_3$ data again, along with predictions of PYTHIA and HERW IG (both with color coherence im plan ented) and PYTHIA (with color coherence turned o). Color



Figure 33: The inclusive charged particle distribution from ZEUS, in the current fragm entation region of the B reit fram e. The inner error bar is the statistical and the outer error bar shows the statistical and system atic errors added in quadrature. The open points represent data from e^+e^- experiments divided by two to take into account q and \overline{q} production.

coherence disfavors gluon radiation into certain angular regions which are determ ined by the color ow of the primary scatter. PYTHIA with no color coherence predicts a much atter $_3$ distribution than observed in either the data or in HERW IG and (the color coherence version of) PYTHIA.

4.5 Jet Fragm entation at HERA

Fragmentation functions characterize the process of hadron formation in jet production and decay. A natural fram e to exam ine the details of jet fragm entation in D IS events is the Breit frame, de ned previously. The current region in the Breit fram e is analagous to a single hem isphere in e⁺ e collisions and the fragm entation properties of these quarks can be directly compared to the fragm entation of the struck quark in the proton. The ep Breit fram e equivalent of the e⁺ e scaled hadron m omentum, $x_p = 2p_{hadron} = 5$, is $x_p = 2p_{hadron} = Q$, where only hadrons in the current hem isphere are considered. The fragm entation function from the ZEUS experiment, plotted as a function of Q for di erent intervals of x_0 , is shown in Figure 33.68;69 Approximate scaling is observed at m oderate values of xp with clear scaling violations being apparent at both large x_p (decrease with Q 2) and small x_p (increase with Q²). The HERA data overlap the kinem atic range of the et e data and good agreem ent between both types of experim ents is observed.





F igure 34: The charged particle distributions $1=N dn=d \ln (1=x_p)$ as a function of Q . Only statistical errors are shown.

The small x_p region is better investigated using the variable = $\ln(1=x_p)$. The M odi ed Leading Logarithm Approximation (M LLA) together with Local Parton-H adron D uality (LPHD) predict both the shape of the distribution (\hum p backed⁰⁰) and the evolution of the peak and the width of the distribution with energy.⁷⁰ The charged particle distributions are plotted as a function of in Figure 34 for various Q values, and the values of peak and width are shown as a function of Q (\overline{s}) for H1 (e⁺ e experiments) in Figure 35.^{68;71} The observed peak and width of the distributions at HERA agree well with the e⁺ e data and with the M LLA predictions.

4.6 Jet Shapes

For cone jet algorithm s, a useful representation of the internal structure of a jet is given by the jet shape. At su ciently high energies, the jet shape should be calculable in perturbative QCD, with gluon jets broader than quark jets. At HERA, jet production has been observed in both neutral current (NC) and charged current (CC) D IS at high Q².^{68;72} A sm entioned previously, in D IS, jet studies can be carried out in di erent fram es. The appropriate fram e for jet shape studies is still under discussion and the e ects of boosting to di erent fram es have not been fully investigated yet.

ZEUS has carried out a comparison of jet shapes in NC and CC interactions at $Q^2 > 100 \text{ GeV}^2$, along with jets from e⁺e and $\overline{p}p$ and p collisions.⁷³ Jets



Figure 35: A comparison of H1 results showing the evolution of the peak (a) and the width (b) of the fragmentation function as a function of Q.A lso shown are e^+e^- results at the corresponding values of center-of-m ass energy. The solid line is a tofH1 data alone to M LLA/LPHD expectations.

are measured with an iterative cone algorithm, in the laboratory frame of reference, with a radius R of 1 and an E_T value of greater than 14 GeV. The jet shape was measured with the ZEUS calorimeter and corrected to the hadron level.

The integrated jet shape (r) (the fraction of jet energy inside a cone of radius r compared to the total inside radius R) is shown in Figure 36 for NC events, resolved photoproduction events (x^{obs} < 0:75) and direct photoproduction events ($x^{obs} > 0.75$).⁷³ In direct photoproduction events, the photon acts as a point-like ob ject while in resolved events the parton structure of the photon is probed. X ^{obs} m easures the fraction of the photon's energy that goes into the two highest E_{T} jets. The jets produced in NC DIS are narrower than those in dijet photoproduction, but closer to those dom inated by direct processes. In NC D IS events, most of the nal-state jets are quark jets (e^+ q! e^+ q); direct photoproduction is dom inated by the subprocess g! qq but has contributions from the subprocess q! qq. The resolved photoproduction events have a larger fraction still of nal-state gluon jets as evidenced by the larger jet width.

Jets from NC and CC D IS with Q² > 100G eV² and jet E_T values in the range from 37-45 GeV are compared to jets of sim ilar E_T values from CDF⁷⁴, DO⁷⁵ and (from e⁺ e collisions) OPAL⁷⁶ in Figure 37. For all three ex-



Figure 36: The measured integrated jet shape corrected to the hadron level from ZEUS in NC DIS, and in resolved and direct photoproduction.

periments, an iterative cone algorithm with a radius R of 1 is used. For the two collider experiments, an underlying event level corresponding to minimum bias events is subtracted. No such correction is needed for the $e^+ e$ events, or for the HERA D IS events (in the kinematic region being considered). The jets from the Tevatron C ollider are signi cantly broader than the D IS jets from HERA and the $e^+ e^-$ jets from OPAL. This di erence is primarily due to the larger fraction of gluon jets expected at the Tevatron with perhaps som e small part of the di erence being due to the extra contributions to the underlying event that m ay be present at the Tevatron.

H1 has carried out a m easurem ent of the internal jet structure in an inclusive D IS dijet sam ple in the kinematic domain $10 < Q^2 < 120 \text{ GeV}^2$ and $2x10^4 < x_{\text{B}j} < 8x10^3$.⁷² Jets were reconstructed in the Breit frame using both the iterative cone and k_T jet algorithms, with the requirement that $E_{\text{TB reit}} > 5 \text{ GeV}$ =c and $1 < _{\text{jet;lab}} < 2$. Jets become more collimated as $E_{\text{TB reit}}$ increases, with the dependence becoming more pronounced for the cone algorithm. For constant $E_{\text{TB reit}}$ jets are narrower (broader) towards the photon (proton) hem isphere. These dependences becom e sm aller as $E_{\text{TB reit}}$ increases. A possible explanation for this behavior is that the internal jet structure is in uenced by particles close to or produced by QCD radiation near the proton rem nant.

Jets de ned by the $k_{\rm F}$ algorithm tend to be more collimated than those de ned by the cone algorithm . The dependence on E $_{\rm T\,B\,reit}$ and $_{\rm B\,reit}$ is also stronger



Figure 37: The m easured integrated jet shapes corrected to the hadron level in NC and CC D IS events at ZEUS and in $\overline{p}p$ collisions at CDF and D0 and from e⁺ e collisions at OPAL.

for the cone algorithm. Generally, the jet shapes are well described by QCD M onte Carlo predictions with LEPTO having a tendency to produce broader jets towards the proton rem nant direction, HERW IG producing jets which are too narrow (especially at large E_{TB reit} and $_{\rm B\ reit}$), and AR IADNE lying between the two and giving a good overall description of the data.

5 Conclusions

DGLAP-based perturbative QCD calculations have been very successful in describing data involving jets and photons at both the Tevatron and at HERA.M ost of the areas in which the remaining disagreem ents/controversies exist involve either an uncertainty in the gluon distribution (the high E_T jet cross section at the Tevatron) or the in uence of two scales in the measurement (xed target direct photon production and forward jet production at HERA). For the case of forward jet production, BFKL e ects may or may not be important; a proper treatm ent of photon structure seems to describe the data both the BFKL region and beyond. Recent calculations of the forward jet production cross sections based on the BFKL approach showed unusually large next-to-leading order corrections, raising the question on their predictive power.⁷⁷ A deeper understanding of the origin of these large corrections is needed before a comparison to the data m ay be m eaningful.

For xed target direct photon production (particularly in the case of E 706), soft gluon e exts are extremely important, changing both the shape and normalization

of the cross section with both the $k_{\rm T}$ and Sudakov resummation formalisms being required. There has been a great deal of theoretical e ort on this problem; a successful resolution will allow the quantitative treatment of direct photon data in pdf ts again, provide a window on an area of very interesting physics, and nally, settle the question of the large x gluon distribution.

Both CDF and D0 are undergoing major upgrades for Run 2, which is scheduled to begin in the spring of 2000. Each experiment will put in place a greatly im – proved detector and will accumulate (from 2000 to 2003) a data sample on the order of 2 fb¹, a factor of 20 in– crease over Run 1. A data sample this size will enable the high E_T jet cross section to be probed in much more detail as well as allowing a variety of Tevatron QCD measurements to be performed with greater precision.

H1 and ZEUS will continue the analysis of the data taken with positrons in 1994–1997. HERA switched to electron running this year and plans to deliver approxim ately 60 pb¹ over the next two years. In 2000, the HERA machine will be upgraded for high lum inosity running, with yearly rates of 150 pb¹ expected.

A cknow ledgem ents

I would like to thank the organizers for a wonderful conference and a great excuse to vacation in the Paci c Northwest. I would also like to thank the National Science Foundation for funding and the following people for help in preparing this talk: L.Apanasevich, M.Begel, J. B lazey, C.Bromberg, T.Carli, S.Ellis, B.F laugher, B. Hirosky, D.K rakauer, S.Kuhlmann, S.Linn, D.Lueke, A.Maul, S.M of ill, D.Milstead, P.Nason, J.Repond, H.Schellman, D.Soper, G.Snow, G.Sterman, J.Terron, W.K.Tung, H.Weerts, M.Zielinski plus all of the participants in Parallel Session 3.

References

- F.Abe et al. (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 45, 1448 (1992); B.Abbott et al. (D 0 Collaboration), Ferm ilab-Pub-97-242-E (1997).
- 2. F.Aversa, M.Greco, P.Chiappetta and J.P.Guillet, Z.Phys. C 46, 253 (1990).
- 3. W .T. Giele, E.W. Glover, D.A. Kosower, Nucl. Phys. B 403, 633 (1993).
- 4. S.Ellis, Z.K unzst, D. Soper, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 2121 (1998); Z.K unzst, D. Soper, Phys. Rev. D 46, 192 (1992).
- 5. R K. Ellis, J.C. Sexton, Nucl. Phys. B 269, 445 (1996).
- 6. B.Abbott et al, Eur. Phys. J.C 5, 687 (1998).
- 7. J.Pumplin, Phys. Rev. D 57, 5787 (1998).

- G.Marchesiniand B.R.Webber, Phys. Rev. D 38, 3418 (1988).
- 9. S.Ellis, J.Huston and D.Soper, paper in preparation.
- 10. F. Abe et al, (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 438 (1996).
- 11. J.Huston et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 444 (1996).
- 12. J. Huston et al., hep-ph/9801444, submitted to Phys. Rev. D.
- 13. P.Aurenche et al, Phys. Rev. D 39, 3275 (1989);
 A.Martin, W J.Stirling, R.Roberts, Phys. Lett.
 B 304, 155 (1995).
- 14. H.L.Laiet al, Phys. Rev. D 55, 1280 (1997).
- 15. G. Blazey, in these proceedings.
- 16. D 0, contributed paper 470, hep-ex/9807018, subm itted to P hys. Rev. Lett.
- 17. U.K. Yang, in these proceedings.
- 18. J. Lam oureux, in these proceedings.
- 19. D 0, contributed paper 468, hep-ex/9807014, submitted to Phys. Rev. Lett.
- 20. L. Orr, in these proceedings.
- 21. L.Orrand W J.Stirling, hep-ph/9806371.
- 22. F. Abe et al, (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 1376 (1993).
- 23. F. Abe et al., (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 1367 (1998).
- 24. B.Flaugher, in these proceedings.
- 25. W .T. Giele, E.W. Glover, D.A. Kosower, Nucl. Phys. B 403, 633 (1993).
- 26. F. Halzen and D. Scott, Phys. Rev. D 21, 1320 (1980).
- 27. J.Huston et al, Phys. Rev. D 51, 6139 (1995).
- 28. L.Apanasevich et al, (E 706 Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 2642 (1998).
- 29. The e ect of k on direct photon cross sections and the impact on the determ ination of the gluon distribution is discussed in m ore detail in L.Apanasevich et al., hep-ph/9808467, subm itted to Phys. Rev.D.
- 30. S. Frixione et al, NPB 431, 453 (1994).
- 31. C. Balazs, C.-P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D 56, 5558 (1997) and references therein.
- 32. J.Owens, Rev. M od. Phys. 59, 465 (1987).
- 33. S. Linn, in these proceedings.
- 34. A. Martin, R. Roberts, W J. Stirling, Eur. Phys. J.C, 4 (463)1998.
- 35. C. Brom berg, in these proceedings.
- 36. I would like to thank Jam es Stirling and Dick R oberts for supplying the num bers for the M R ST $k_{\rm T}$ correction.
- 37. E. Laenen, G. Oderda, G. Sterman, hepph/9806467; S. Catani, M. Mangano, P. Nason, hep-ph/9806484.
- 38. M . M angano, private com m unication.

- 39. H-n. Li, hep-ph/9811340
- 40. V N. Gribov, L N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 15, 438 (1972); Y. Dokshitzer, Sov Phys. JETP 46, 641 (1977); G. Altarelli, G. Parisi, Nucl. Phys. B 126, 298 (1977).
- 41. E A.Kuraev, LN.Lipatov, V.S.Fadin, Sov. Phys. JETP 45, 1977 (199); Y.Y.Balitzki, LN.Lipatov, Sov. J.Nucl. Phys. 28, 822 (1978).
- 42. M. Ciafaloni, Nucl. Phys. B 296, 49 (1988); S. Catani, F. Fiorani, G. Marchesini, Phys. Lett. B 234, 339 (1990); G. Marchesini, Nucl. Phys. B 445, 49 (1995).
- 43. J.Bartels et al., Phys. Lett. B 384, 300 (1996).
- 44. G. Ingelman, A. Edin and J. Rathsman, Comp. Phys. Comm. 101, 108 (1997).
- 45. W J. Stirling, hep-ph/9804431; G. Salam, hepph/9805322, L. Lonnblad, hep-ph/9709424.
- 46. L.Lonnblad, Z.Phys. C 65, 285 (1995).
- 47. H Jung, http://wwwh1.desy.de/jung/rapgap/rapgap.htm l.
- 48. S.Cataniand M H.Seymour, Nucl. Phys. B 485, 291 (1997).
- 49. E.M inkes and D.Zeppenfeld, Phys. Lett. B 380, 205 (1996).
- 50. D.G raudenz, hep-ph/9710244.
- 51. B.Potter, hep-ph/9806437.
- 52. M. W objech, in these proceedings.
- 53. J. Repond, in these proceedings.
- 54. ZEUS, contributed paper 806.
- 55. G.K ram er and B.Potter, hep-ph/9804352.
- 56. H1, contributed paper 520.
- 57. H1, contributed paper 528.
- 58. D.M ilstead, in these proceedings.
- 59. ZEUS, contributed papers 804,804b.
- 60. H1, contributed paper 529.
- 61. J. Kwiecinski, C A M . Lewis, A D . Martin, Phys. Rev. D 57, 496 (1998).
- 62. L. Sinclair, in these proceedings.
- 63. ZEUS, contributed paper 800.
- 64. B.W. Harris and J.F.Owens, Phys. Rev. D 56, 4007 (1997).
- 65. M.Klasen, T.Kleinwort and G.Kramer ZPC 1,1 (1998).
- 66. F.Abe et al., (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 56, 2532 (1997) and references therein.
- 67. M. Derrick et al., (ZEUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B 384, 401 (1996).
- 68. D. Luke, in these proceedings.
- 69. ZEUS, contributed paper 809.
- 70. Y L. Dokshitzer, V A. Khoze, A H. Mueller, S.I Troyan, \Basics of Perturbative QCD", Editions Frontieres (1991).
- 71. H1, contributed paper 531.
- 72.H1, contributed paper 532.

- 73. ZEUS collaboration, hep-ex/9804101.
- 74. F. Abe et al, (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 713 (1993).
- 75. S.Abachiet al, (DOCollaboration), Phys. Lett. B 357, 500 (1995).
- 76. G.Alexander et al., (OPAL Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B 384, 353 (1996).
- 77. V S. Fadin, L N. Lipatov, Phys. Lett. B 429, 127 (1998).