Interpreting virtual photon interactions in term s of parton distribution functions

Jir Chyla and Marek Tasevsky

Institute of Physics, N a Slovance 2, Prague 8, Czech Republic

A bstract

Interactions of virtual photons are analyzed in terms of photon structure. It is argued that the concept of parton distribution functions is phenom enologically very useful even for highly virtual photons involved in hard collisions. This claim is illustrated on leading order expressions for $F_2(x;P^2;Q^2)$ and e ective parton distribution function $D_e(x;P^2;Q^2)$ relevant for jet production, as well as within the next{to{leading order QCD calculations of jet cross{sections in electron{proton collisions.

1 Introduction

Parton distribution functions (PDF) are, together with the colour coupling s, the basic ingredients of perturbative QCD calculations. It is worth emphasizing that in quantum eld theory it is di cult to distinguish e ects of the \structure" from those of \interactions". Within the Standard M odel (SM) it makes good sense to distinguish fundamental particles, which correspond to elds in its lagrangian L_{SM} (leptons, quarks and gauge bosons) from composite particles, which appear in the mass spectrum but have no corresponding eld in L_{SM} . For the latter the use of PDF to describe their \structure" appears natural, but the concept of PDF turns out to be phenom enologically useful also for some fundamental particles, in particular the photon. PDF are indispensable for the real photon due to strong interactions between the $q\bar{q}$ pair to which it couples electrom agnetically. For massless quarks this coupling leads to singularities, which must be absorbed in PDF of the photon, sim ilarly as in the case of hadrons. A lthough PDF of the real photon satisfy inhom ogeneous evolution equations, their physical meaning remains basically the same as for hadrons.

For nonzero photon virtualities there is no true singularity associated with the coupling $! q\bar{q}$ and one therefore expects that for su ciently virtual photon its interactions should be calculable perturbatively, with no need to introduce PDF. The main aim of this paper is to advocate the use of PDF also for virtual photons involved in hard collisions.

Throughout this paper we shall stay within the conventional approach to evolution equations for PDF of the photon. The reform ulation of the whole fram ework for the description of hard collisions involving photons in the initial state, proposed recently by one of us [1], a exts the analysis of diget production in photon (proton collisions, which is the main subject of this paper, only marginally. This stands in sharp contrast to QCD analysis of F_2 which is a exted by this reform ulation quite signi cantly.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 the notation and basic facts concerning the evolution equations for PDF of the realphoton and the properties of their solutions are recalled. In Section 3 the physical content of PDF of the virtual photon is analyzed and its phenom enological relevance illustrated within the LO QCD. This is further underlined in Section 4 by detailed analysis of NLO QCD calculations of dijet cross{sections in ep collisions, followed by the sum mary and conclusions in Section 5.

2 PDF of the real photon

In QCD the coupling of quarks and gluons is characterized by the renorm alized colour coupling (\couplant" for short) $_{s}$ (), depending on the renorm alization scale and satisfying the equation

$$\frac{d_{s}()}{d\ln^{2}} \qquad (_{s}()) = \frac{0}{4} \frac{2}{s}() \frac{1}{16^{2}} \frac{3}{s}() + ; \qquad (1)$$

where, in QCD with n_f massless quark arours, the rst two coe cients, $_0 = 11 2n_f=3$ and $_1 = 102 38n_f=3$, are unique, while all the higher order ones are ambiguous. As we shall stay in this paper within the NLO QCD, only the rst two, unique, terms in (1) will be taken into account. However, even for a given rhs. of (1) its solution $_s()$ is not a unique function of , because there is an in nite number of solutions of (1), di ering by the initial condition. This so called renorm alization scheme (RS) ambiguity 1 can be param eterized in a number of ways. One of them makes use of the fact that in the process of renorm alization another dimensional param eter, denoted usually , inevitably appears in the theory. This param eter depends on the RS and at the NLO even fully species it. For instance, $_s()$ in the familiar MS and \overline{MS} RS are two solutions of the same equation (1), associated with di erent $_{RS}$. At the NLO the variation of both the renorm alization scale and the renorm alization scheme RS of $_{RS}$ g is redundant. It su ces to x one of them and vary the other, but we stick to the common practice of considering both of them as free param eters. In this paper we shall work in the standard \overline{MS} RS of the couplant.

The \dressed" ² PDF result from the resummation of multiple parton collinear emission o the corresponding \bare" parton distributions. As a result of this resummation PDF acquire dependence on the factorization scale M. This scale de nes the upper limit on some measure t of the o {shellness of partons included in the de nition of D (x; M)

$$D_{i}(x;M) = \frac{Z_{M^{2}}}{dtd_{i}(x;t)}; \quad i = q;\overline{q};G; \quad (2)$$

where the unintegrated PDF $d_i(x;t)$ describe distributions of partons with the momentum fraction x and xed o {shellness t. Parton virtuality $jp^2 m^2$ jor transverse mass $m_T^2 p_T^2 + m^2$, are two standard choices of such a measure. Factorization scale dependence of PDF of the photon is determined by the system of coupled inhom ogeneous evolution equations

$$\frac{d (x;M)}{d \ln M^2} = k_q + P_{qq} + P_{qG} \quad G; \qquad (3)$$

$$\frac{dG(x;M)}{d\ln M^2} = k_G + P_{GG} + P_{GG} \quad G; \qquad (4)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}q_{\mathrm{NS}}(\mathbf{x};\mathrm{M})}{\mathrm{d}\ln\mathrm{M}^{2}} = N_{\mathrm{NS}}k_{\mathrm{q}} + P_{\mathrm{NS}} \quad q_{\mathrm{IS}};$$
(5)

where

$$q_{NS}(x;M) = e_{i}^{2} \quad he^{2}i (q_{i}(x;M) + \overline{q}_{i}(x;M));$$
(7)

- .

¹ In higher orders this am biguity includes also the arbitrariness of the \cos cients $_{i}$; i 2.

 $^{^{2}}$ In the follow ing the adjective \dressed" will be dropped, and if not stated otherwise, all PDF will be understood to pertain to the photon.

$$NS = 6n_f he^4 i he^2 i^2$$
; $= 6n_f he^2 i$: (8)

To order the splitting functions P $_{ij}$ and k_i are given as power expansions in $\ _s$ (M):

$$k_{q}(x;M) = \frac{1}{2} k_{q}^{(0)}(x) + \frac{s(M)}{2} k_{q}^{(1)}(x) + \frac{s(M)}{2} k_{q}^{(2)}(x) + \frac{s(M)}{2} k_{q}^{(2)}(x) + \frac{s(M)}{4}$$
(9)

$$k_{\rm G}({\bf x};{\bf M}) = \frac{1}{2} \qquad \frac{s({\bf M})}{2} k_{\rm G}^{(1)}({\bf x}) + \frac{s({\bf M})}{2} k_{\rm G}^{(2)}({\bf x}) + ; \qquad (10)$$

$$P_{ij}(x;M) = \frac{s(M)}{2} P_{ij}^{(0)}(x) + \frac{s(M)}{2} P_{ij}^{(1)}(x) + ; \quad (11)$$

where the leading order splitting functions $k_q^{(0)}(x) = x^2 + (1 - x)^2$ and $P_{ij}^{(0)}(x)$ are unique, while all higher order ones $k_q^{(j)}; k_G^{(j)}; P_{k1}^{(j)}; j$ 1 depend on the choice of the factorization scheme (FS). The equations (3-5) can be rewritten as evolution equations for $q_i(x;M); \overline{q}_i(x;M)$ and G (x;M) with inhom egenous splitting functions $k_{q_i}^{(0)} = 3e_i^2 k_q^{(0)}$. The photon structure function $F_2(x;Q^2)$, m easured in deep inelastic scattering of electrons on photons is given as a sum of convolutions

$$\frac{1}{x}F_{2}(x;Q^{2}) = q_{NS}(M) \quad C_{q}(Q=M) + \frac{1}{2}NSC +$$
(12)

$$he^{2}i(M) = C_{q}(Q=M) + \frac{1}{2}he^{2}iC + he^{2}i\frac{s}{2}G(M) = C_{G}(Q=M)$$
 (13)

of photonic PDF and coe cient functions C $_{q}(x)$; C $_{G}(x)$; C $_{(x)}$ adm itting perturbative expansions

$$C_q(x;Q=M) = (1 x) + \frac{s()}{2}C_q^{(1)}(x;Q=M) + ;$$
 (14)

$$C_{G}(x;Q=M) = \frac{s()}{2}C_{G}^{(1)}(x;Q=M) + ;$$
 (15)

$$C (x;Q=M) = C^{(0)}(x;Q=M) + \frac{s()}{2}C^{(1)}(x;Q=M) + (16)$$

The renorm alization scale , used as argument of $_{\rm s}$ () in (14-16) is in principle independent of the factorization scale M. Note that despite the presence of $as argument of _s()$ in (14(16), the coe cient functions C $_{\rm q}$; C $_{\rm G}$ and C , sum m ed to all orders of $_{\rm s}$, are actually independent of it, because the {dependence of the expansion parameter s () is cancelled by explicit dependence ofC_q⁽ⁱ⁾;C_c⁽ⁱ⁾;C⁽ⁱ⁾;i 2 on . On the other hand, PDF as well as the coe cient functions $C_{q}; C_{G}$ and C do depend on both the factorization scale M and factorization scheme, but in such a correlated m anner that physical quantities, like F_2 , are independent of both M and the FS, provided expansions (9(11) and (14(16) are taken to allorders in $_{\rm s}$ (M) and $_{\rm s}$ (). In practical calculations based on truncated form s of (9{11) and (14{16) this invariance is, however, lost and the choice of both M and FS makes num erical di erence even for physical quantities. The expressions for $C_q^{(1)}$; $C_G^{(1)}$; $C_G^{(1)}$ given in [2] are usually claimed to correspond to \sqrt{MS} factorization scheme". As argued in [3], this denomination is, however, incomplete. The adjective \overline{MS} concerns exclusively the choice of the RS of the couplant s and has nothing to do with the choice of the splitting functions $P_{ii}^{(1)}$. The choices of the renorm alization scheme of the couplant s and of the factorization scheme of PDF are two completely independent decisions, concerning two di erent and in general unrelated rede nition procedures. Both are necessary in order to specify uniquely the results of xed order perturbative calculations, but we may combine any choice of the RS of the couplant with any choice of the FS of PDF. The coe cient functions C $_{\rm q}$; C $_{\rm G}$; C depend on both of them, whereas



Figure 1: D iagram s de ning the pointlike parts of nonsinglet quark and gluon distribution functions. The resummation involves integration over parton virtualities M^2 .

the splitting functions depend only on the latter. The results given in [2] correspond to \overline{MS} RS of the couplant but to the \m inim al subtraction" FS of PDF ³. It is therefore m one appropriate to call this full speci cation of the renorm alization and factorization schemes as $\overline{MS} + MS$ scheme". A blough the phenomenological relevance of treating and M as independent parameters has been demonstrated [5], we shall follow the usual practice of setting = M.

2.1 Pointlike solutions and their properties

The general solution of the evolution equations (3-5) can be written as the sum of a particular solution of the full inhom ogeneous equation and the general solution of the corresponding hom ogeneous one, called hadronic ⁴ part. A subset of the solutions of full evolution equations resulting from the resummation of series of diagrams like those in Fig. 1, which start with the pointlike purely QED vertex $! q\bar{q}$, are called pointlike (PL) solutions. In writing down the expression for the resummation of diagrams in Fig. 1 there is a freedom in specifying some sort of boundary condition. It is common to work within a subset of pointlike solutions specifying the value of the scale M₀ at which they vanish. In general, we can thus write (D = $q;\bar{q};G$)

$$D (x; M^{2}) = D^{PL} (x; M^{2}) + D^{HAD} (x; M^{2}):$$
(17)

Due to the fact that there is an in nite number of pointlike solutions $q^{PL}(x;M^2)$, the separation of quark and gluon distribution functions into their pointlike and hadronic parts is, however, am - biguous and therefore these concepts have separately no physical meaning. In [6] we discussed num erical aspects of this am biguity for the Schuler{Sjostrand sets of parameterizations [7].

To see the most important feature of the pointlike part of quark distribution functions that will be crucial for the following analysis, let us consider in detail the case of nonsinglet quark distribution function $q_{NS}(x;M)$, which is explicitly de ned via the series

$$q_{NS}^{PL}(x;M_{0};M) = \frac{1}{2}k_{NS}^{(0)}(x) \frac{\sum_{M^{2}}^{2} d}{M_{0}^{2}} + \frac{\sum_{N^{2}}^{1} \frac{dy}{y} P_{qq}^{(0)}}{x} \frac{x}{y} \frac{\sum_{M^{2}}^{2} d}{M_{0}^{2}} \frac{1}{1} \frac{s(1)}{2} k_{NS}^{(0)}(y) \frac{\sum_{M^{2}}^{1} d}{M_{0}^{2}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{y} \frac$$

³See Section 2.6 of [4], in particular eq. (2.31), for discussion of this point.

 $^{^4}$ Som et in es also called \VDM part" because it is usually modelled by PDF of vector mesons.



Figure 2: Comparison, left in the nonsinglet and right in the singlet channels, of the functions $xk_i(x) = x_i k_q^{(0)}$; i = NS; with the function (21) and its analogue in the singlet channel.

$$\frac{Z_{1}}{x} \frac{dy}{y} P_{qq}^{(0)} \frac{x}{y} = \frac{X_{1}}{y} \frac{dw}{w} P_{qq}^{(0)} \frac{y}{w} = \frac{Z_{M^{2}}}{W_{0}^{2}} \frac{d_{1}}{1} \frac{s(1)}{2} \frac{Z_{1}}{M_{0}^{2}} \frac{d_{2}}{2} \frac{s(2)}{2} \frac{s(2)}{2} \frac{z}{2} \frac{k_{NS}^{(0)}}{2} \frac{w}{M_{0}^{2}} \frac{d_{3}}{3} + ; (18)$$

where $k_{NS}^{(0)}(x) = k_{NS} k_{q}^{(0)}(x)$. In term s of m on ents de ned as

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 Z_{1} \\
 f(n) & x^{n} f(x) dx \\
 0 & (19)
\end{array}$$

this series can be resummed in a closed form

$$q_{NS}^{PL}(n;M_{0};M) = \frac{4}{s(M)} 41 \qquad \frac{s(M)}{s(M_{0})} \frac{1 2P_{qq}^{(0)}(n)}{s(M)} \frac{3}{5} a_{NS}(n); \qquad (20)$$

where

$$a_{\rm NS}(n) = \frac{k_{\rm NS}^{(0)}(n)}{1 - 2p_{\rm qq}^{(0)}(n) = 0};$$
(21)

It is straightforward to show that (18) or, equivalently, (20), satisfy the evolution equation (5) with the splitting functions k_q and P_{ij} including the rst terms $k_q^{(0)}$ and $P_{qq}^{(0)}$ only.

Transforming (21) to the x (space by means of inverse M ellin transformation we get $a_{NS}(x)$ shown in Fig. 2. The resummation softens the x dependence of $a_{NS}(x)$ with respect to the rst term in (18), proportional to $k_{NS}(x)$, but does not change the logarithmic dependence of q_{NS} on M. In the nonsinglet channel the e ects of gluon radiation on q_{NS}^{PL} are significant for x > 0.6 but small elsewhere, whereas in the singlet channel such e ects are marked also for x < 0.5 and lead to a steep rise of $x q_{NS}^{PL}$ at very small x. As emphasized long time ago by authors of [8] the logarithmic dependence of q_{NS}^{PL} on lnM has nothing to do with QCD and results exclusively from integration over the transverse momenta (virtualities) of quarks coming from the basic QED ! $q\bar{q}$ splitting. For M =M₀ ! 1 the second term in brackets of (20) vanishes and therefore all pointlike solutions share the same large M behaviour

$$q_{NS}^{PL}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{M}_{0};\mathbf{M}) ! \frac{4}{s(\mathbf{M})} a_{NS}(\mathbf{x}) \qquad q_{NS}^{AP}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{M}) / \ln \frac{\mathbf{M}^{2}}{2}; \qquad (22)$$



Figure 3: The u and c quark and gluon distribution functions of the real photon for SaS1D (upper solid curves) and SaS2D (upper dotted curves) param eterizations at $M^2 = 100 \text{ GeV}^2$. The VDM and pointlike parts of both param eterizations are plotted separately, the latter as solid and dotted curves peaking at large x. For quarks the splitting term s (23) corresponding to SaS1D and SaS2D (upper and lower dashed curves) are overlayed to show the elects of resummation (18).

de ning the so called asymptotic pointlike solution $q_{NS}^{AP}(x;M)$ [9,10]. The fact that for the asymptotic pointlike solution (22) $_{s}(M)$ appears in the denominator of (22) has been the source of misleading claims that q(x;M) = 0 ($=_{s}$). In fact, as argued in detail in [1], q(x;M) = 0 () as suggested by explicit construction in (18). We shall return to this point in Section 4.2 when discussing the factorization scale invariance of nite order approximations to dijet cross{sections.

The arbitrariness in the choice of M $_0$ relects the fact that as M $_0$ increases, less of the gluon radiation e ects is included in the resummation (20) de ning the pointlike part of quark distribution function q^{PL} but included in hadronic one. The latter is usually modelled by the VDM ansatz and will therefore be called \VDM " in the following. As we shall see, the hadronic and pointlike parts have very dilement behaviour as functions of x and M .

2.2 Properties of Schuler{Sjostrand param eterizations

P ractical aspects of the am biguity in separating PDF into their VDM and pointlike parts can be illustrated on the properties of SaS1D and SaS2D parameterizations [7]⁵. W hat makes the SaS approach particularly useful for our discussion is the fact that it provides separate parameterizations of the VDM and pointlike parts ⁶ of both quark and gluon distributions.

In Fig. 3 distribution functions xu (x; M²), xc(x; M²) and xG (x; M²) as given by SaS1D and SaS2D parameterizations for M² = 100 GeV² are compared. To see how much the resummation of gluon radiation modiles the rst term in (18) we also plot the corresponding splitting terms

$$q^{\text{split}}(x; M_0^2; M^2) = \frac{1}{2} 3e_q^2 x^2 + (1 x)^2 \ln \frac{M^2}{M_0^2}$$
 (23)

In Fig. 4 the scale dependence of VDM and pointlike parts of u and c quark and gluon distribution functions is displayed. In the upper six plots we compare them as a function of x at M² = $25;100;1000 \text{ GeV}^2$, while in the lower three plots the sam e distributions are rescaled by the factor

⁵The properties of SaS1M and SaS2M param eterizations are similar.

 $^{^{6}}$ C alled for short \pointlike quarks" and \pointlike gluons" in the following.



Figure 4: Factorization scale dependence of parton distributions functions u(x;M);c(x;M) and G (x;M) of the real photon. D ashed and solid curves correspond, in the order indicated by the arrow s, to pointlike and VDM parts of these distributions at M² = 25;100 and 1000 G eV². In the lower part SaS1D quark distribution functions $xu(x;M^2;P^2)$ rescaled by $\ln(M^2=M_0^2)$ for the real photon (left) and by $\ln(M^2=P^2)$ for the virtual one, are plotted and compared to the predictions of the splitting term (23).



Figure 5: F_2 (x;Q²) as given by SaS1D (solid curves) and SaSD2 (dotted curves) param eterizations. The full results are given by the upper, the pointlike and VDM contributions parts by two lower curves. The dashed curves describe the contributions of the splitting term (23).



Figure 6: D_e (x;M²) as given by SaS1D and SaSD 2 param eterizations. Solid curves show the full results, dashed ones the VDM contributions. The pointlike parts are separated into the contributions of pointlike quarks (dotted curves) and pointlike gluons (dash {dotted}). Thick dashed curves correspond to the splitting term (23).

 $\ln (M^2=M_0^2)$. D ividing out this dom inant scale dependence allows us to compare the results directly to curves in Fig. 2. Finally, in Figs. 5 and 6 SaS predictions for two physical quantities, F_2 and e ective parton distribution function D_e , relevant for jet production in p and collisions,

$$F_{2}(x;Q^{2}) = \sum_{q}^{X} 2xe_{q}^{2}q(x;Q^{2});$$
 (24)

$$D_{e} (x; M^{2}) \qquad X^{h_{f}} \qquad q_{i} (x; M^{2}) + \overline{q}_{i} (x; M^{2}) + \frac{9}{4} G (x; M^{2}) \qquad (25)$$

are displayed and compared to results corresponding to the splitting term (23). Figures 3{6 illustrate several in portant properties of PDF of the real photon:

There is a huge di erence between the importance of the VDM components of light quark and gluon distribution functions in SaS1D and SaS2D parameterizations: while for SaS2D the VDM component is dominant up to x = 0.75, for SaS1D the pointlike one takes over above x = 0.1!

Factorization scale dependence of VDM and pointlike parts di er substantially. W hile the form er exhibits the pattern of scaling violations typical for hadrons, the latter rises, for quarks as well as gluons, with M for all x. For pointlike gluons this holds despite the fact that $G^{PL}(x;M^2)$ satis es at the LO standard hom ogeneous evolution equation and is due to the fact that the evolution of $G^{PL}(x;M^2)$ is driven by the corresponding increase of $P^{PL}(x;M^2)$.

The approach of \mathbb{Q}^{L} (x; \mathbb{M}^{2}) to the asymptotic pointlike solution (22) is slow ⁷. For experimentally relevant values of \mathbb{M} and except for x close to 1 the elects of \mathbb{M} ultiple gluon emission on pointlike quarks are thus small.

As the factorization scale M increases the VDM parts of both quark and gluon distribution functions decrease relative to the pointlike ones, except in the region of very sm all x.

D espite huge di erences between SaS1D and SaS2D param eterizations in the decom position of quark and gluon distributions into their VDM and pointlike parts, their predictions for physical observables F_2 and D_e are much closer.

The most prominent e ects of multiple parton emission on physical quantities appear to be the behaviour of F_2 (x;Q²) at large x and the contribution of pointlike gluons to jet cross{ sections, approximately described by D_e (x;M²).

3 PDF of the virtual photon

For the virtual photon the initial state singularity due to the splitting $! q\bar{q}$ is shielded o by the nonzero initial photon virtuality P² and therefore in principle the concept of PDF does not have to be introduced. In practice this requires, roughly, P² > 1 G eV², where perturbative QCD becomes applicable. Nevertheless, PDF still turn out to be phenomenologically very useful because

their pointlike parts include the resum m ation of parts of higher order QCD corrections,

the hadronic parts, though decreasing rapidly with P^2 , are still vital at very sm all x.

 $^{^7}$ T he fact that for the c{quark the SaS2D param eterization is close to the curve corresponding to q^{sp lit} (x;M $_0^2$;M 2), whereas SaS1D lies substantially below, re ects the fact that M₀ > m_c for SaS2D, but M₀ < m_c for SaS1D

Both of these aspects de ne the \nontrivial" structure of the virtual photon in the sense that they are not included in the splitting term (23) and thus are not part of existing NLO unsubtracted direct photon calculations. One m ight argue that the calculable e ects of resummation should be considered as \interaction" rather than \structure", but their uniqueness m akes it natural to describe them in terms of PDF.

3.1 Equivalent photon approximation

All the present know ledge of the structure of the photon comes from experiments at the ep and e^+e^- colliders, where the incoming leptons act as sources of transverse and longitudinal virtual photons. To order their respective unintegrated uxes are given as

$$f_{T}(y;P^{2}) = \frac{1+(1-y)^{2}}{2}\frac{1}{P^{2}}\frac{1}{P^{2}}\frac{2m_{e}^{2}y}{P^{4}}; \qquad (26)$$

$$f_{L}(y;P^{2}) = \frac{2(1-y)}{2}\frac{1}{P^{2}}$$
 (27)

The transverse and longitudinal uxes thus coincide at y = 0, while at y = 1, f_L vanishes. The $1=P^2$ dependence of the rst terms in (26-27) results from the fact that in both cases the vertex where photon is emitted is proportional to P^2 . This is due to helicity conservation for the transverse photon and gauge invariance for the longitudinal one. The term proportional to $m_e^2 = P^4$ in (26) results from the fact that the helicity conservation at the e evertex is violated by term sproportional to electron m ass. No such violation is permitted in the case of gauge invariance, hence the absence of such term in (27). Note that while for $P^2 = m_e^2 y^2 = (1 - y)$ their ratio is nite and approaches $2(1 - y) = (1 + (1 - y^2))$.

3.2 Lessons from QED

The de nition and evaluation of quark distribution functions of the virtual photon in pure QED serves as a useful guide to parton model predictions of virtuality dependence of the pointlike part of quark distribution functions of the virtual photon. In pure QED and to order the probability of nding inside the photon of virtuality P² a quark with mass m_q, electric charge e_q, momentum fraction x and virtuality = $m_q^2 - k^2 - M^2$ is dened as (k denotes its four-momentum)

$$q_{QED}(x;m_q^2;P^2;M^2) = \frac{Z_M^2}{2} g_{q_min}^2 \frac{W(x;m_q^2;P^2)}{2} d;$$
 (28)

where the function W $(x; m_{\alpha}^{2}; P^{2}; M^{2})$ can in general be written as

$$W (x; m_q^2; P^2; M^2) = f(x) \frac{p_T^2}{1 x} + g(x) m_q^2 + h(x) P^2 +$$

= f(x) + g(x) $\frac{f(x)}{1 x} m_q^2 + (h(x) xf(x)) P^2 + : (29)$

In the collinear kinem atics, which is relevant for nding the lower lim it on $\$, the values of m_q ; x; and p_T are related to initial photon virtuality P² as follows

$$= xP^{2} + \frac{m_{q}^{2} + p_{T}^{2}}{1 x}; \quad) \qquad {}^{m \text{ in}} = xP^{2} + \frac{m_{q}^{2}}{1 x}: \qquad (30)$$

The functions f(x);g(x) and h(x), which determ ine the terms singular at small , are unique functions that have a clear parton model interpretation: so long as M^2 eq. (28) describes the ux of quarks that are almost collinear with the incoming photon and \live" long with respect to 1=M . On the other hand, the terms indicated in (29) by dots are of the type $k+1=s^k;k=1,which$ upon insertion into (28) yield contributions that are not singular at = 0 and therefore do not admit simple parton model interpretation. In principle we can include in the de nition (28) even part of these nonpartonic contributions, but we prefer not do that. Substituting (29) into (28) and perform ing the integration gives, in units of $3e_q^2 = 2$,

$$q_{QED}(x;m_{q}^{2};P^{2};M^{2}) = f(x)\ln \frac{M^{2}}{\min} + f(x) + \frac{g(x)m_{q}^{2} + h(x)P^{2}}{\min} + \frac{m \ln}{M^{2}} : (31)$$

In practical applications the factorization scale M is identified with some kinematical variable characterizing hardness of the collision, like $\sqrt{Q^2}$ in D IS or E_T^{jet} in jet production. For $min = M^2$ the expression (31) simplifies to

$$q_{QED}(x;m_q^2;P^2;M^2) = f(x)\ln \frac{M^2}{xP^2 + m_q^2 = (1 - x)} \qquad f(x) + \frac{g(x)m_q^2 + h(x)P^2}{xP^2 + m_q^2 = (1 - x)}:$$
(32)

For x $(1 x)P^2 m_q^2$ this expression reduces further to

$$q_{QED}(x;0;P^{2};M^{2}) = f(x) \ln \frac{M^{2}}{xP^{2}} f(x) + \frac{h(x)}{x}$$
 (33)

Provided $m_{q}^{2} \in 0$ (32) has a nite limit for P²! 0, corresponding to the real photon

$$q_{QED}(x;m_q^2;0;M^2) = f(x) \ln \frac{M^2(1-x)}{m_q^2} f(x) + g(x)(1-x):$$
 (34)

As in the case of the photon uxes (26-27) the logarithm ic term, dom inant for large M², as well as the \constant" terms, proportional to f(x); g(x) and h(x), come entirely from the integration region close to ^{m in} and are therefore unique. At $= ^{m in}$ both types of the singular terms, i.e. $1= \text{ or } 1=^2$, are of the same order but the faster fall{o of the $1=^2$ terms in plies that for large M² the integral over , which gives (31), is dom inated by the weaker singularity 1=. In other words, while the logarithm ic term is dom inant at large M², the constant terms resulting from nonzero m² and P² come from the kinematical con gurations which are even more collinear, and thus more partonic, than those giving the logarithm ic term. The analysis of the vertex ! $q\bar{q}$ in collinear kinematics yields [12]

$$f_{T}(x) = x^{2} + (1 \quad x)^{2}; \quad g_{T}(x) = \frac{1}{1 \quad x}; \quad h_{T}(x) = 0;$$

$$f_{L}(x) = 0; \qquad \qquad g_{L}(x) = 0; \qquad \qquad h_{L}(x) = 4x^{2}(1 \quad x):$$
(35)

The expressions (31-32) exhibit explicitly the sm ooth transition between quark distribution functions of the virtual and real photon. This transition is governed by the ratio $P^2 = m^2$, which underlines why in QED ferm ion m assess are vital. On the other hand, as P^2 (or m ore precisely

^{m in}) increases toward the factorization scale M 2 , the above expressions for the quark distribution functions of the virtual photon vanish. This property holds not only for the logarithm ic term but also for the \constant" terms and has a clear intuitive content: virtual photon with lifetime

1=P 1=M does not contain partons living long enough to take part in the collision characterized by the interaction time 1=M .

For virtual photon and x $(1 \times)P^2$ m² the coe cient functions C^T (x; P²; Q=M); C^L (x; P²; Q=M) for transverse and longitudinal target photon polarizations are given as [13]

$$C_{jT}^{(0)}(x;P^{2};1) = 3(x^{2} + (1 x)^{2}) \ln \frac{1}{x^{2}} + 8x(1 x) 2;$$
 (36)

$$C_{jL}^{(0)}(x;P^{2};1) = 4x(1 x);$$
 (37)

whereas for the real photon, i.e. for $P^2 = 0$

$$C_{jT}^{(0)}(x;0;1) = 3(x^{2} + (1 - x)^{2}) \ln \frac{1 - x}{x} + 8x(1 - x) - 1;$$
 (38)

$$C_{iL}^{(0)}(x;0;1) = 0$$
(39)

The origins of the nonlogarithm ic parts of C $^{(0)}$ in (36-38) can then be identied as follows:

$$1 + 8x (1 \quad x) = \left| \frac{2 + 8x (1 \quad x)}{f_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{1}{\{z\}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{T}}(x)(1 \quad x)} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{f_{\text{T}}(x)} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{T}}(x)(1 \quad x)} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{T}}(x)(1 \quad x)} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \right|_{\text{for m assless quark}} \left| \frac{(x^2 + (1 \quad x)^2)}{g_{\text{for m assless quark}}}$$

The nonpartonic part itself can be separated into two pieces, coming from the interaction of the transverse target photon with transverse and longitudinal probing one

$$1 + 6x (1 x) = \underbrace{1 + 2x (1 x)}_{\text{from } TT} + \underbrace{4x (1 x)}_{\text{from } TT}$$
(41)

Except for a brief comment in the next subsection, we shall consider throughout the rest of this paper the contributions of the transverse polarization of the target virtual photon only. The importance of including in analyses of hard collisions of virtual photons the contributions of $_{\rm L}$ will be discussed in detail in separate publication [16].

3.3 W hat is measured in D IS on virtual photons?

In experiments at e^+e^- colliders the structure of the photon has been investigated via standard D IS on the photon with small but nonzero virtuality P². The resulting data were used in [14] to determ ine PDF of the virtual photon. In these analyses C⁽⁰⁾ was taken in the form

$$C^{(0)}(x; P^{2}; 1) = 3 (x^{2} + (1 x)^{2}) \ln \frac{1}{x^{2}} + 6x(1 x) 2;$$
 (42)

which, however, does not correspond to the structure function that is actually measured in e^+e collisions, but to the following combination

$$F_{2;}$$
 (x; P²; Q²) $F_{2;T}$ (x; P²; Q²) $\frac{1}{2}F_{2;L}$ (x; P²; Q²) (43)

of structure functions corresponding to transverse and longitudinal polarizations of the target photon. This combination results after averaging over the target photon polarizations by means of



Figure 7: The same as in Fig. 3 but for virtual photon with virtuality $P^2 = 3 \text{ GeV}^2$. The dashed curves displayed for u and c quarks correspond to the splitting term (23) with $M_0^2 = P^2$.

contraction with the tensor g = 2. The expression 2 + 6x(1 - x) follows also directly from the de nition (43) and considerations of the previous Section:

$$2 + 6x (1 x) = \underbrace{2 + 8x (1 x)}_{\text{from } T} \underbrace{2x (1 x)}_{\text{from } L} = 2$$
(44)

Because the uxes (26(27) of transverse and longitudinal photons are di erent functions of y, any complete analysis of experimental data in terms of the structure functions $F_{2;T}(x;P^2;Q^2)$ and $F_{2;L}(x;P^2;Q^2)$ at xed $x;P^2;Q^2$ requires combining data for di erent y. This is in principle possible, but experimentally di cult to accomplish. The situation is simpler at small y, where $f_T(y;P^2) \doteq f_L(y;P^2) = f(y;P^2)$, and the data therefore correspond to the convolution of $f(y;P^2)$ with the sum $F_{2;T} + F_{2;L}$. The nonlogarithm ic term in C⁽⁰⁾ corresponding to this combination is, however, not 2 + 6x(1 - x), as used in [14], but 2 + 12x(1 - x), the sum of nonlogarithm ic term these two expressions is quite sizable.

Very recently, the GRS group [15] has changed their approach to the treatment of the target photon polarizations and argued in favor of neglecting the contribution of $_{\rm L}$ and using even for the virtual photon the same form of C $^{(0)}$ as for the real one. We disagree with their arguments, but leave the discussion of this point to future paper [16].

3.4 Virtuality dependent PDF

In realistic QCD the nonperturbative e ects connected with the con nem ent, rather than current or constituent quark masses, are expected to determ ine the long{range structure of the photon and hence also the transition from the virtual photon to the real one. For instance, within the SaS param eterizations the role of quark masses is taken over by vector meson masses for the VDM components and by the initial M_0 for the pointlike ones. As in the case of the real photon, we recall basic features of SaS param eterizations of the virtual photon, illustrated in Figs. 7{10.

W ith increasing P^2 the relative in portance of VDM parts of both quark and gluon distribution functions with respect to the corresponding pointlike ones decreases rapidly. For M² & 25 GeV² the VDM parts of both SaS1D and SaS2D parameterizations become negligible for



Figure 8: The same as in Fig. 4 but for virtual photon with P 2 = 3 G eV 2 .



Figure 9: V intuality dependence of photonic PDF at M² = 100 G eV². D ashed curves correspond to the pointlike and solid ones to the VDM parts, from above for P² = 0;1;3 G eV².



Figure 10: The same as in Fig. 5 but for virtual photon with $P^2 = 3 \text{ GeV}^2$.



Figure 11: D_e (x; P²; M²) as a function of x for M² = 25;100;1000 GeV² and P² = 3 GeV². Notation as in Fig. 6. In the splitting term M²₀ = P².

 P^{2} & 2 G eV², except in the region of very sm all x . 0.01. Consequently, also the ambiguity in the separation (17) is practically negligible in this region.

The general pattern of scaling violations, illustrated in Fig. 8, remains the same as for the real photon, but there is a subtle di erence, best visible when comparing in Fig. 4 the rescaled PDF for $P^2 = 0$ with those at $P^2 = 1$; 3 G eV². While for $P^2 = 0$, increasing M² softens the spectrum towards the asymptotic pointlike form (22), for $P^2 \& 1 \text{ G eV}^2$ quark distribution functions increase with M for practically all values of x. Moreover, while for $P^2 = 0$ the splitting term intersects the SaS1D curves qualitatively as in Fig. 2, for $P^2 \& 1 \text{ G eV}^2$ it is above them for all x. These properties relates the fact that SaS param eterizations of PDF of the virtual photon do not satisfy the same evolution equations as PDF of the real one. This di erence is form ally of power correction type and thus legitim ate within the leading twist approximation we are working in, but num erically nonnegligible.

As shown in Fig. 9 both VDM and pointlike parts decrease with increasing P^2 , but the VDM parts drop much faster than the pointlike ones.

The implications of these properties for physical quantities F_2 (x; P^2 ; Q^2) and D_e (x; P^2 ; M^2) are illustrated by Figs. 11 and 10. For F_2 (x; P^2 ; M^2) the nontrivial aspects of virtual photon structure are con ned mainly to the region of large x, where they reduce the predictions based on the splitting term (23). O by buy, only the pointlike quarks are relevant for this e ect. The e ects on D_e (x; P^2 ; M^2) worth emphasizing are the following:

For all scales M the contribution of the splitting term is above the one from pointlike quarks, the gap increasing with increasing P 2 and decreasing M 2 .

Pointlike quarks dom in ate D_e (x; P^2 ; M^2) at large x, whereas for x . 0:3, most of the pointlike contribution comes from the pointlike gluons. In particular, the excess of the pointlike contributions to D_e over the contribution of the splitting term, observed at x . 0:5, comes alm ost entirely from the pointlike gluons!

For x & 0.6 the full results are clearly below those given by the splitting term (23) with $M_0^2 = P^2$. In this region one therefore expects the sum of subtracted direct and resolved contributions to jet cross{sections to be sm aller than the results of unsubtracted direct calculations.

So far no restrictions were in posed on transverse energies and pseudorapidities ⁸ of jets produced in p collisions. However, as discussed in more detail in Section 4.3.4, for jet transverse energies $E_T \& 5 \text{ GeV}$, hadronization corrections become intolerably large and model dependent in the region . 2:5. On the experimental side the problem s with the reconstruction of jets with $E_T \& 5 \text{ GeV}$ in the forward region restrict the accessible region to 0. The cuts im posed on pseudorapidities ⁽ⁱ⁾; i = 1;2 and transverse energies $E_T^{(i)}$ of two nal state partons ⁹ in uence strongly the corresponding distribution in the variable x

$$x = \frac{E_{T}^{(1)}e^{(1)} + E_{T}^{(2)}e^{(2)}}{2E}$$
(45)

used in analyses of dijet data. At the LO and form assless partons x de ned in (45) coincides with the conventional fraction x appearing as an argument of photonic PDF.MC simulations show that

⁸All quantities correspond to p cm s.

 $^{^9}$ In realistic QCD analyses of two jets with highest and second highest E $_{\rm T}$. Jets with highest and second highest E $_{\rm T}$ are labelled \1" and \2".

for $E_T^{(i)}$ 5 GeV and 2.5 ⁽ⁱ⁾ 0; i = 1; 2, hx i' 0.25, is just the region where pointlike gluons dom in the D_e (x; P²; M²). This makes jet production in the region P² & 1 a promising place for identication of nontrivial aspects of PDF of virtual photons.

4 PDF of the virtual photon in NLO QCD calculations

M ost of the existing information on interactions on virtual photons comes from the measurements of F₂ at PETRA [18] and LEP [19] and jet production in ep collisions at HERA [20,21]. In [21] data on dijet production in the region of virtualities 1 P² 80 GeV², and for jet transverse energies E_T^{jet} 5 GeV have been analyzed within the framework of e ective PDF dened in (25). This analysis shows that in the kinematical range 1 GeV². P² E_T^2 the data agree reasonably with the expectations based on SaS parameterizations of PDF of the virtual photon. The same e data may, how ever, be also analyzed using the NLO parton levelM onte{C arlo program s¹⁰ that do not introduce the concept of PDF of the virtual photon. Nevertheless, so long as P² M² E_T^2 , the pointlike parts of PDF incorporate numerically important e ects of a part of higher order corrections, namely those coming from collinear emission of partons in Fig. 1. This makes the concept of PDF very useful phenom enologically even for the virtual photon. To illustrate this point we shall now discuss dijet cross{sections calculated by means of JETV IP [25], currently the only NLO parton levelM C program that includes both the direct and resolved photon contributions and which can thus be used to investigate the importance of the latter.

4.1 Structure of JETV IP

A llthe above mentioned parton levelNLO MC program s contain the same fullset of partonic cross{ sections for the direct photon contribution up the order 2_s . Examples of such diagram s 11 are in Fig. 12a (($_s$) tree diagram) and Fig. 12b ((2_s) tree diagram). Moreover all these program s contain also one{loop corrections to ($_s$) tree diagram s. They dier mainly in the technique used to regularize mass singularities: MEPJET and JETVIP employ the slicing method whereas D ISENT and D ISASTER use the subtraction method. Numerical comparison of JETVIP and the other codes can be found in [26,27]. To go one order of $_s$ higher and perform complete calculation of the direct photon contributions up to order 3_s would require evaluating tree diagram s like those in Fig. 12fk, as well as one{loop corrections to diagram s like in Fig. 12a. So far, such calculations are not available.

In addition to complete NLO direct photon contribution JETVIP includes also the resolved photon one. Once the concept of virtual photon structure is introduced, part of the direct photon contribution, namely the splitting term (23), and in higher orders also further terms in (18), is subtracted from the direct contribution (which for the virtual photon is nonsingular) and included in PDF appearing in the resolved photon contribution. To avoid confusion we shall henceforth use the term \direct unsubtracted" (DIR_{uns}) to denote NLO direct photon contributions before this subtraction and reserve the term \direct" for the results after it. In this term inology the complete calculations is then given by the sum of direct and resolved parts and denoted DIR + RES.

¹⁰ Three such program s do exist, D ISEN T, [22], M EP JET, [23] and D ISA STER [24].

 $^{^{11}}$ In this subsection the various term s considered will be characterized by the powers of and $_{\rm s}$ that appear in hard scattering cross{sections. In the corresponding Feynm an diagram s of Fig. 12 these powers are given by the num ber of electrom agnetic and strong vertices. W riting (j $^{k}_{\rm s}$) will thus mean parton level cross{sections proportional to

 j_{s}^{k} , not term s up to this order! For the latter we shall employ the standard sym bolo (j_{s}^{k}) . Because PDF of the photon are proportional to , their convolutions in the resolved channel with partonic cross{sections $\binom{k}{s}$ are of the same order as partonic cross{sections $\binom{k}{s}$ in the direct channel. For approximations taking into account the rst two or three powers of s, in either direct or resolved channel, the denomination NLO and NNLO will be used.

At the order $\frac{2}{s}$ the addition of resolved photon contribution means including diagrams like those in Fig. 12c-e, which involve convolutions of PDF from both proton and photon sides with $\left(\frac{2}{s}\right)$ tree partonic cross{sections. For a complete O $\left(\frac{2}{s}\right)$ calculation this is all that has to be added to the O $\left(-\frac{2}{s}\right)$ partonic cross{sections in direct photon channel. However, for reasons discussed in detail in the next subsection, JETVIP includes also NLO resolved contributions, which involve convolutions of PDF with complete $\left(-\frac{3}{s}\right)$ partonic cross{sections (examples of relevant diagrams s are in Figs. 12g{j). This might seem inconsistent as no corresponding $\left(-\frac{3}{s}\right)$ direct photon term s are included. Nevertheless, this procedure makes sense precisely because of a clear physical meaning of PDF of the virtual photon! Num erically, the inclusion of the $\left(-\frac{3}{s}\right)$ resolved term s turns out to be very in portant and in certain parts of the phase space leads to large increase of JETVIP results compared to those of DISENT, MEPJET or DISA STER.

4.2 Factorization mechanism in pinteractions

The main argument for adding $\begin{pmatrix} 3\\ s \end{pmatrix}$ partonic cross{sections in the resolved channel to 0 $\begin{pmatrix} 2\\ s \end{pmatrix}$ ones in the direct and 0 $\begin{pmatrix} 2\\ s \end{pmatrix}$ ones in the resolved channels, is based on speci c way factorization m echanism works for processes involving photons in the initial state. First, how ever, let us recall how the factorization works in hadronic collisions. Jet cross{sections start as convolutions of $\begin{pmatrix} 2\\ s \end{pmatrix}$ partonic cross{sections with PDF of beam and target hadrons. The factorization scale dependence of these PDF is cancelled by explicit factorization scale dependence of higher order partonic cross{sections. This cancellation is exact provided all orders of perturbation theory ¹² are taken into account, but only partial in any nite order approximation, like the NLO one used in analyses of jet production at FERM ILAB. In hadronic collisions the inclusion of $\begin{pmatrix} 3\\ s \end{pmatrix}$ partonic cross{sections. The residual factorization scale dependence of Such NLO approximations is form ally of the order $\frac{4}{s}$ and thus one order of s higher than the term s included in the NLO approximation.

In p collisions (w hether of realor virtual photon) the situation is di erent due to the presence of inhom ogeneous term $s k_{\alpha}; k_{\beta}$ in the evolution equations (3(5). For quark distribution functions (nonsinglet as well as singlet) the leading term (=2) $k_q^{(0)}$ in the expansion of k_q is independent of s and consequently part of the factorization scale dependence of the $\binom{2}{s}$ resolved photon contribution is compensated at the same order $\frac{2}{s}$. In further discussions we shall distinguish two factorization scales: one (M) for the photon, and the other (M_p) for the proton. The content of the evolution equations (3{5) is represented graphically in Fig. 12, which shows examples of diagram s, up to order $\frac{4}{s}$, relevant for our discussion. Som e of these diagram s are connected by solid or dashed arrows, representing graphically the elects of variation of factorization scales M and M p respectively. The vertical dashed arrows connect diagram s (with lower blobs representing PDF of the proton, denoted $D_p(x;M_p)$ that di er in partonic cross{sections by one order of s, re ecting the fact that the term s on the r.h.s. of evolution equation for $D_{p}(x;M_{p})$ start at the order $_{\rm s}$. For instance, the ($_{\rm s}$) direct photon diagram in Fig. 12a is related by what we call M_{p} {factorization with $\binom{2}{s}$ direct photon diagram in Fig. 12b. Similarly, the $\binom{2}{s}$ resolved photon diagram in Fig. 12d is related by M $_{p}$ (factorization to $\binom{3}{s}$) resolved photon diagram in Fig. 12h. In fact each diagram of the order $\frac{k}{s}$ is related by M p{factorization to two types of diagram s at order $\frac{k+1}{s}$, one with quark and the other with gluon coming from the proton blob. Note that M p { factorization operates within either direct or resolved contributions separately, never relating one type of term s with the other.

¹² In perturbation expansions of partonic cross{sections as well as splitting functions.



Figure 12: Examples of diagram s related by factorization mechanism . Only powers of s in parton level cross{sections are counted.

For M {factorization this cancellation mechanism has a new feature. Similarly as for hadrons, the $\binom{2}{s}$ resolved photon diagram in Fig. 12c is related by what we call hom ogeneous M { factorization to the $\binom{3}{s}$ resolved photon diagram s in Fig. 12g,h, and similar relation holds also between the diagram in Figs. 12e and 12j. However, the inhom ogeneous term in evolution equation for PDF of the photon im plies additional relation (which we call inhom ogeneous M { factorization}) between direct and resolved photon diagram s at the same order of s, represented by horizontal solid arrows. For instance, the LO resolved contribution coming from diagram in Fig. 12c is related not only by hom ogeneous M { factorization to the $\binom{2}{s}$ direct photon diagram in Fig. 12b. Similarly, the $\binom{3}{s}$ resolved photon diagram 12g is related by hom ogeneous M { factorization to the $\binom{2}{s}$ direct photon diagram in Fig. 12b. Similarly, the $\binom{3}{s}$ resolved terms (not shown) and by inhom ogeneous M { factorization to the $\binom{2}{s}$ direct photon diagram in Fig. 12b.

The argument for adding the $\binom{3}{s}$ resolved photon diagrams to the $\binom{2}{s}$ resolved photon ones relies on the fact that within the resulting set of NLO resolved contributions the hom ogeneous M {factorization operates in the same way as the M $_{p}$ {factorization does within the set of NLO direct ones! However, contrary to the hadronic case, the $\binom{3}{s}$ parton level cross{sections do not constitute after convolutions with photonic PDF a complete set of $\frac{3}{s}$ contributions, the rest com ing from the $\binom{3}{s}$ direct ones. A sthese $\binom{3}{s}$ direct photon constitute the com plete 0 $\binom{3}{s}$ calculated, the set of contributions included in JETV IP does not constitute the com plete 0 $\binom{3}{s}$ calculation. The lacking terms, like that com ing from the diagram 12f, would provide cancellation mechanism at the order $\frac{3}{s}$ with respect to the inhom ogeneous M {factorization. In the absence of $\binom{3}{s}$ direct photon calculations, we thus have two options:

To stay within the fram ework of complete O $\binom{2}{s}$ calculations, including the LO resolved and NLO direct contributions, but with no mechanism for the cancellation of the dependence of PDF of the virtual photon on the factorization scale M \cdot .

To add to the previous fram ework the $\binom{3}{s}$ resolved photon contribution, which provide the necessary cancellation mechanism with respect to hom ogeneous M {factorization, but do not represent a complete set of $\binom{3}{s}$ contributions.

In our view the second strategy, adopted in JETVIP, is more appropriate. In fact one can bok at $\begin{pmatrix} 3\\s \end{pmatrix}$ resolved photon terms as results of approximate evaluation of the so far uncalculated $\begin{pmatrix} 3\\s \end{pmatrix}$ direct photon diagrams in the collinear kinematics. For instance, so long as P² M² taking into account only the pointlike part of D (x; P²; M²) in the upper blob of Fig. 12g should be a good approximation of the contribution of the direct photon diagram in Fig. 12f. There are of course $\begin{pmatrix} 3\\s \end{pmatrix}$ direct photon diagrams that cannot be approximated in this way, but we are convinced that it makes sense to build phenom enology on this fram ework.

For the $\binom{2}{s}$ resolved terms the so far unknown $\binom{3}{s}$ direct photon contributions provide the rst chance to generate pointlike gluons inside the photon: the gluon in the upper blob in resolved photon diagram in Fig. 12e must be radiated by a quark that comes from primary ! $q\bar{q}$ splitting, for instance as shown in Fig. 12j. Note that to get the gluon in $\binom{3}{s}$ resolved photon contributions, for instance in Fig. 12h, within collinear limit of direct photon contributions would require evaluating diagram s, like that in Fig. 12m, at the order $\binom{4}{s}$! In sum mary, although the pointlike parts of quark and gluon distribution functions of the virtual photon are in a sense included in higher order perturbative corrections and can therefore be considered as expressions of \interactions" rather than \structure" of the virtual photon, their uniqueness and phenom enological usefulness de nitely warrant their introduction as well as nam e.

4.3 Theoretical uncertainties

NLO calculations of jet cross{sections are a ected by a number of ambiguities caused by the truncation of perturbation expansions as well as by uncertainties related to the input quantities and conversion of parton level quantities to hadron level observables.

4.3.1 Choice of PDF

We have taken CTEQ 4M and SAS1D sets of PDF of the proton and photon respectively as our principal choice. Both of these sets treat quarks, including the heavy ones, as massless above their respective mass thresholds, as required by JETVIP, which uses LO and NLO matrix elements of massless partons. PDF of the proton are fairly well determined from global analyses of CTEQ and MRS groups and we have therefore estimated the residual uncertainty related to the choice of PDF of the proton by comparing the CTEQ 4M results to those obtained with MRS (2R) set. The di erences are very small, between 1% at = 2.5 and 3.5% at = 0, independently of P².

For the photon we took the Schuler-S jostrand param eterizations for two reasons. First, they provide separate param eterizations of VDM and pointlike components of all PDF, which is crucial for physically transparent interpretation of JETV IP results. Secondly, they represent the only set of photonic PDF with physically well motivated virtuality dependence, which is compatible with the way JETV IP treats heavy quarks. The GRS sets [14,15], the only other param eterizations with built-in virtuality dependence, are incompatible with JETV IP because they treat c and b quarks as massive and, consequently, require calculating their contribution to physical quantities via the boson gluon or gluon fusion involving exact massive matrix elements.

4.3.2 The choice of n_f

JETV P, as well as other NLO parton calculations of jet cross{sections, works with a xed num ber n_f of massless quarks, that must be chosen accordingly. This is not a simple task, as the num ber of quarks that can be considered e ectively massless depends on kinem atical variables characterizing the hardness of the collision. Consequently, the optim all choice of n_f may not be unique for the whole kinem atical region under consideration. The usual procedure is to run such programs for two (or more) relevant values of n_f and use the ensuing difference as an estimate of theoretical uncertainty related to the approximate treatment of heavy quark contributions.

The number n_f enters NLO calculations in three places: in plicitly in $_s()$ and PDF and explicitly in LO and NLO parton level cross{sections. In our selected region of phase space the appropriate value of n_f lies som ewhere between $n_f = 4$ and $n_f = 5$, with the latter value representing the upper bound on the results (so far unavailable) that would take the b-quark mass elects properly into account. We have therefore run JETVIP for both $n_f = 4$ and $n_f = 5$ and compared their results. They di er, not suprisingly, very little ¹³. Explicit calculations give at most 10% in the direct channel and 5% in the resolve done. All the results presented below correspond to $n_f = 5$.

4.3.3 Factorization and renorm alization scale dependence

As mentioned in the previous subsection, proton and photon are associated in principle with di erent factorization scales M $_{\rm p}$ and M , but we followed the standard practice of assuming

¹³As the contribution of the b-quark in both direct and resolved channels is proportional to its charge, we except it to amount to about $e_b^2 = (e_u^2 + e_c^2 + e_d^2 + e_s^2) = 0.1$ of the sum of light quark ones.

M M_p = M and set M = $E_T^{(1)}$. The factorization scale dependence was quantied by performing the calculations for = 0:5;1 and = 2.

The dependence of nite order perturbative calculations on the renorm alization scale is in principle a separate ambiguity, but we have again followed the common practice of identifying these two scales = M. To reject this identication, we shall in the following use the term \scale dependence" to describe the dependence on this common scale.

4.3.4 Hadronization corrections

JETV IP, as a well as other NLO codes evaluate jet cross{sections at the parton level. For a meaningful comparison with experimental data they must therefore be corrected for elects describing the conversion of partons to observable hadrons. These so called hadronization corrections are not simple to de ne, but adopting the denition used by experimentalists [28] we have found that they depended sensitively and in a correlated manner on transverse energies and pseudorapidities of jets. In order to avoid regions of phase space where they become large we imposed on both jets the condition 2.5 ⁽ⁱ⁾ 0. In this region hadronization corrections are at in and do not exceed 10%, whereas for = 2.5 they steeply rise with decreasing . This by itself would not require excluding this region, the problem is that in this region hadronization corrections become also very much model dependent and therefore impossible to estimate reliably. Detailed analysis of various aspects of estimating these hadronization , with particular emphasize on their implication for jet production at HERA, is contained in [29].

4.3.5 Limitations of JETV IP calculations

D expite its undisputable advantage over the calculations that do not introduce the concept of virtual photon structure, also JETVIP has a draw back because it does not represent a complete NLO QCD calculation of jets cross{sections. This is true in the conventional approach to photonic interactions, and even m ore in the reform ulation suggested by one of us in [1]. In the conventional approach the incom pletness is related to the fact that there is no NLO param eterization of PDF of the virtual photon compatible with JETVIP treatment of heavy quarks. Note that in the standard approach the inclusion of ($\frac{3}{s}$) partonic cross{sections in the resolved photon channel is justiled by the claim that their convolution with photonic PDF are of the same order $\frac{2}{s}$ as the direct photon ones. In the reform ulation [1] this incom pletness has deeper causes. It rejusts the lack of appropriate input PDF but also the fact that a complete NLO approximation requires the inclusion of direct that a makes sense to build phenomenology upon the current JETVIP framework and the concept of PDF of the virtual photon is just the necessary tool for accomplishing it.

4.4 Dijet production at HERA

W e shall now discuss the main features of diget cross{sections calculated by m eans of JETV IP. To m ake our conclusions potentially relevant for ongoing analyses of HERA data we have chosen the following kinematical region

$$E_{T}^{(1)} = E_{T}^{c} + ; E_{T}^{(2)} = E_{T}^{c}; E_{T}^{c} = 5 \text{ GeV}; = 2 \text{ GeV}$$

2:5 ⁽ⁱ⁾ 0; i = 1;2

in four windows of photon virtuality

1:4 P^2 2:4 GeV^2 ; 2:4 P^2 4:4 GeV^2 ; 4:4 P^2 10 GeV^2 ; 10 P^2 25 GeV^2

The cuts on E_T were chosen in such a way that throughout the region $P^2 = E_T^2$, thereby ensuring that the virtual photon lives long enough for its \structure" to develop before the hard scattering takes place. The asymmetric cut option is appropriate for our decision to plot the sum s of E_T and

distributions of the jets with highest and second highest E_T . The choice of = 2 GeV, based on a detailed investigation [29] of the dependence of the integral over the selected region on , avoids the region where this dependence possesses unphysical features.

In our analysis jets are dened by means of the cone algorithm. At NLO parton level all jet algorithms are essentially equivalent to the cone one, supplemented with the parameter R_{sep} , introduced in [30] in order to bridge the gap between the application of the cone algorithm to NLO parton level calculations and to hadronic systems (from data or MC), where one encounters ambiguities related to seed selection and jet merging. In a general cone algorithm two objects (partons, hadrons or calorimetric cells) belong to a jet if they are within the distance R from the jet center. Their relative distance satis es, how ever, a weaker condition

$$R_{ij} = \frac{q}{(i_{j})^{2} + (i_{j})^{2}} \frac{E_{T_{i}} + E_{T_{j}}}{\max(E_{T_{i}}; E_{T_{i}})} R:$$
(46)

The parameter R_{sep} governs the maxim aldistance between two partons within a single jet, i.e. two partons form a jet only if their relative distance R_{ij} satisfies the condition

$$R_{ij} \qquad \min \frac{E_{T_i} + E_{T_j}}{\max (E_{T_i}; E_{T_i})} R; R_{sep} :$$
(47)

The question which value of R_{sep} to choose for the comparison of NLO parton level calculations with the results of the cone algorithm at the hadron level is nontrivial and we shall therefore present NLO results for both extrem e choices $R_{sep} = R$ and $R_{sep} = 2R$. To de nem om enta of jets JETV IP uses the standard E_T (weighting recombination procedure, which leads to massless jets.

4.5 Results

To asses phenom enological importance of the concept of PDF of virtual photons we now compare JETV \mathbb{P} results obtained in the D \mathbb{R}_{uns} mode, where this concept is not introduced at all, with those of the D $\mathbb{R} + \mathbb{R} + \mathbb$

We start by plotting in Fig. 13 the distributions d = d and $d = dE_T$ in the rst window 1.4 P^2 2.4 GeV². All curves correspond to $R_{sep} = 2$. The dimense between the solid and dashed curves is significant in the whole range of , but becomes truly large close to the upper edge = 0, where the DIR+RES results exceed the DIR_{uns} ones by a factor of about 3! In $d = dE_T$ distributions this dimense comes predom inantly from the region of E_T close to the lower cut{o $E_T^{c} + = 7 \text{ GeV}$. Fig. 13 also shows that the scale dependence is nonnegligible for both DIR uns and DIR+RES results, but does not invalidate the main conclusion drawn from this comparison. Interestingly, the scale dependence is weaker for the DIR+RES results than for the DIR_{uns} ones. Fig. 14 documents that the above results depend only very weakly on R_{sep}.

To track down the origins of the observed large di erences between D $\mathbb{R} + \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ and D \mathbb{R}_{uns} results we compare in Fig. 15 the D $\mathbb{R} + \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ and D \mathbb{R}_{uns} results to the subtracted direct ones (denoted D \mathbb{R}). The di erence between the D $\mathbb{R} + \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ and D \mathbb{R} curves, giving the resolved photon contribution d \mathbb{R}^{s} =d , is further split into the following contributions:

VDM part of photonic PDF convoluted with complete NLO parton level cross{sections (denoted NLO VDM).



Figure 13: Scale dependence of the distributions d =d and d =dE_T at the NLO.All curves correspond to $R_{sep} = 2R$.



Figure 14: R $_{sep}$ dependence of d=d and d=dE_T distributions. All curves correspond to = E_T.



Figure 15: C om parison of D IR + RES, D IR uns and D IR results for d =d (left plots) and individual contributions to d ^{res}=d , described in the text (right plots). The thin solid curve corresponds to convolution of the splitting term (23) with $\frac{res}{q}(\frac{2}{s})$ parton level cross{sections.



Figure 16: Fractional contributions to d res=d. Upper and lower dotted (dashed{dotted) curves correspond to pointlike quarks (gluons) convoluted with O ($\frac{3}{s}$) and O ($\frac{2}{s}$) partonic cross{sections. The dashed curve in a) corresponds to the NLO VDM contribution. The solid curves denote the ratio D IR_{uns}=D IR + RES.



Figure 17: Nontriviality fractions R_3 and R_4 as functions of and P^2 .

Pointlike quarks and gluons convoluted with $res (\frac{2}{s})$ and $res (\frac{3}{s})$ parton level cross{sections displayed separately in the upper right plot of Fig. 15. The full NLO resolved photon contribution is given as the sum

 $N LO VDM + \frac{res}{q} \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ s \end{pmatrix} \qquad q^{PL} + \frac{res}{G} \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ s \end{pmatrix} \qquad G^{PL} + \frac{res}{q} \begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ s \end{pmatrix} \qquad q^{PL} + \frac{res}{G} \begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ s \end{pmatrix} \qquad G^{PL} :$ (48)

Fractional contributions of LO and NLO terms to res coming separately from pointlike quarks and gluons are plotted in Fig. 16a as functions of . Several conclusions can be drawn from Figs. 15{16:

The contribution of the VDM part of photonic PDF is very small and perceptible only close to = 0. Integrally it amounts to about 3%. Using SaS2D parameterizations would roughly double this number.

The inclusion of $_{i}^{res}(_{s}^{3})$ parton level cross{sections in the resolved photon channel is num erically very in portant throughout the range 2:5 0. Interestingly, the $_{i}^{res}(_{s}^{3})$ results are close, particularly for the pointlike quarks, to the $_{i}^{res}(_{s}^{2})$ ones.

At both $\frac{2}{s}$ and $\frac{3}{s}$ orders pointlike quarks dom inate d^{res}=d at large negative, whereas as ! 0 the fraction of d^{res}=d com ing from pointlike gluons increases towards 40% at = 0.

We emphasize that pointlike gluons carry nontrivial information already in convolutions with $res(\frac{2}{s})$ partonic cross{sections because in unsubtracted direct calculations such contributions would appear rst at the order $\frac{3}{s}^{14}$. The convolution of the dom inant part of pointlike quarks¹⁵ with $res(\frac{3}{s})$ partonic cross{sections would be included in direct unsubtracted calculations starting also at the order $\frac{3}{s}$, whereas for pointlike gluons this would require evaluating the unsubtracted

¹⁴For instance, the resolved photon diagram in Fig. 12e would come as part of the of evaluating the unsubtracted direct diagram in Fig. 12k.

 $^{^{15}}$ T hat is, the one given by the splitting term (23).

direct term s of even higher order ${}^4_s!$ For instance, the contribution of diagram in Fig. 12g would be included in the contribution of diagram in Fig. 12f. Sim ilarly, the results of diagram in Fig. 12h would come as part of the results of evaluating the diagram in Fig. 12m.

In JETVIP the nontrivial aspects of taking into account the i = 1 (s = 3) resolved photon contributions can be characterized i^{16} by the \nontriviality fractions" R₃ and R₄

$$R_{3} \quad \frac{q^{PL}}{q} \quad \frac{\operatorname{res}({}^{3}_{s}) + G^{PL}}{\operatorname{res}} \quad \frac{\operatorname{res}({}^{2}_{s})}{g}; \quad R_{4} \quad \frac{G^{PL}}{g} \quad \frac{\operatorname{res}({}^{3}_{s})}{\operatorname{res}}; \quad (49)$$

which quantify the fractions of res that are not included in NLO unsubtracted direct calculations. These fractions are plotted as functions of res and P^2 in Fig. 17. Note that at rest = 0 alm ost 70% of

 $^{\rm res}$ com es from these origins. This fraction rises even further in the region >0, which, however, is experimentally dicult to access.

So far we have discussed the situation in the rst window of photon virtuality, i.e. for 1:4 $P^2 = 2:4 \text{ GeV}^2$. As P^2 increases the patterns of scale and R_{sep} dependencies change very little. On the other hand, the fractions plotted in Fig. 16 and 17 vary noticeably:

The D \mathbb{R}_{ns} contributions represent an increasing fractions of the D $\mathbb{R} + \mathbb{R} \in S$ results.

The relative contribution of pointlike gluons with respect to pointlike quarks decreases.

The nontriviality factor R_1 (which comes entirely from pointlike gluons) decreases, whereas R_3 , which is dominated by pointlike quarks and at in , is almost independent of P^2 .

All these features of JETVIP results re ect the fundamental fact that as P² rises towards the factorizations scale M² E_T^2 the higher order elects incorporated in pointlike parts of photonic PDF vanish and consequently the unsubtracted direct results approach the DIR+RES ones. The crucial point is that for pointlike quarks and gluons this approach is governed by the ratio P²=M² appearing in the multiplicative factor (1 $P^2=M^2$). The nontrivial elects included in PDF of the virtual photon will thus persist for arbitrarily large P², provided we stay in the region where P² M². Moreover, they are so large, that they should be visible already in existing HERA data. Provided the basic ideas behind the Schuler{S pstrand parameterizations of PDF of the virtual photon are correct, our analysis shows that the calculations that do not introduce the concept of virtual photon structure should signi cantly undershoot the available HERA data on dijet production in the kinematical region 1. P² E_T^2 ; E_T 5 GeV, 2:5 0, in particular for '0. Published as well prelim inary data discussed in [29,31] support this conjecture.

5 Summary and conclusions

We have analyzed the physical content of parton distribution functions of the virtual photon within the fram ework form ulated by Schuler and S jostrand, which provides physically motivated separation of quark and gluon distribution functions into their hadronic (VDM) and pointlike parts. We have shown that the inherent ambiguity of this separation, numerically large for the real photon, becomes phenom enologically largely irrelevant for virtual photons with P² & 2 3 G eV². In this region quark and gluon distribution functions of the virtual photon are dominated by their (reasonably unique) pointlike parts, which have clear physical origins. We have analyzed the nontrivial aspects of these pointlike distribution functions and, in particular, pointed out the role of pointlike gluons in leading order calculations of jet cross{section at HERA.

¹⁶D isregarding the VDM part of resolved contribution which is tiny in our region of photon virtualities.

The conclusions m ade within the fram ework of LO QCD have been con rm ed, and in a sense even strengthened, in our analysis of NLO parton level calculations using JETV P.W e have found a signi cant di erence between JETV P results in approaches with and without the concept of virtual photon structure. W hile for the real photon analogous di erence is in part ascribed to the VDM part of photonic PDF, for moderately virtual photons it com es alm ost entirely from the pointlike parts of quark and gluon distribution functions. A lthough their contributions are in principle contained in higher order calculations which do not use the concept of PDF, in practice this would require calculating at least ($\frac{3}{s}$) and ($\frac{4}{s}$) unsubtracted direct contributions. In the absence of such calculations the concept of PDF of the virtual photon is therefore very useful phonom enologically and, indeed, indispensable for satisfactory description of existing data.

A cknow ledgm ent: W e are grateful to J.C vach, J.F ield, Ch. Friberg, G.K ram er, B.P otter, I.Schienbein and A.Valkarova for interesting discussions concerning the structure and interactions of virtual photons and to B.P otter for help in running JETVIP. This work was supported in part by the G rant A gency of the A cadem y od Sciences of the C zech R epublic under grant N o. A 1010821.

References

- [1] J.Chyla:hep-ph/9911413
- [2] W .Bardeen, A.Buras, D.Duke and T.Muta, Phys. Rev D 18, 3998 (1978)
- [3] J.Chyla, Z.Phys.C 43, 431 (1989)
- [4] G. Curci, W. Furmanski, R. Petronzio, Nucl. Phys. B 175, 27 (1980)
- [5] P.Aurenche, R.Baier, A.Douiri, M.Fontannaz, D.Schi, Nucl. Phys. B 286, 553 (1987)
 P.Aurenche, R.Baier, M.Fontannaz, D.Schi, Nucl. Phys. B 296, 661 (1987)
- [6] J.Chyla, M. Tasevsky, in Proceedings PHOTON '99, Freiburg in Breisgau, May 1999, ed.S. Soeldner{Rem bold, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Supp., in press, hep-ph/9906552
- [7] G. Schuler, T. Sjostrand: Z. Phys. C 68 (1995), 607
 G. Schuler, T. Sjostrand: Phys. Lett. B 376 (1996),193
- [8] J.H. Field, F.Kapusta, L.Poggioli, Phys. Lett. B 181, 362 (1986)
 J.H. Field, F.Kapusta, L.Poggioli, Z.Phys.C 36, 121 (1987)
 F.Kapusta, Z.Phys.C 42, 225 (1989)
- [9] E.W itten: Nucl. Phys. 120 (1977). 189
- [10] W .Bardeen, A.Buras, Phys. Rev. D 20, 166 (1979)
- [11] J.Chyla: Phys.Lett.B 320 (1994), 186
- [12] J.Chyla: hep{ph/9811455
- [13] A.Gorski, B.L. Ioe, A.Yu. Khodjamirian, A.Oganesian, Z.Phys. C 44, 523 (1989)
- [14] M.Gluck, E.Reya, M. Stratmann, Phys. Rev. D 51 (1995), 3220
 M.Gluck, E.Reya, M. Stratmann, Phys. Rev. D 54 (1996), 5515
- [15] M.Gluck, E.Reya, I.Schienbein, Phys. Rev. D 60 (1999), 054019

- [16] J.Chyla, M. Tasevsky, in preparation
- [17] J.Chyla, M. Tasevsky, in Proceedings of W orkshop MC generators for HERA Physics, Ham burg 1999, p.239, hep-ph/9905444
- [18] Ch.Berger et al. (PLUTO Collab.), Phys. Lett. B 142 (1984), 119
- [19] F. Eme, in Proceedings PHOTON '99, Freiburg in Breisgau, May 1999, ed. S. Soeldner Rem bold, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Supp., in press, L3 Note 2403, submitted to Europhysics Conference High Energy Physics, Tampere, August 1999
- [20] C.Adb et al. (H1 Collab.), Phys. Lett. B 415 (1997), 418
- [21] C.Adb et al. (H1Collab.), Eur. Phys. J.C, in press
- [22] S.Catani, M. Seymour, Nucl. Phys. B 458 (1997), 291, Erratum bid. B 510 (1997), 503
- [23] E.M irkes, TTP-97-39, hep-ph/9711224
- [24] D.Graudenz, hep-ph/9710244
- [25] B.Potter, Comp.Phys.Comm.119 (1999), 45, hep {ph/9806437
 G.Kramer, B.Potter, Eur.Phys.J.C 5 (1998), 665, hep {ph/9804352
- [26] C.Duprel, Th.Hadig, N.K nauer, M.W obisch, in Proceedings of W orkshop MC generators for HERA Physics, Hamburg 1999, p. 142, hep-ph/9910448
- [27] B.Potter, hep-ph/9911221
- [28] M.W obisch, in Proceedings of W orkshop MC generators for HERA Physics, Hamburg 1999, p.239, hep-ph/9905444
- [29] M. Tasevsky, PhD Thesis, unpublished
- [30] S.D. Ellis, Z.Kunszt, D.E. Soper, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69 (1992), 3615
- [31] J.Cvach, in Proceedings D IS99, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 79 (1999), 501