

SLAC-PUB-1280
(T/E)
July 1973

CAN WE MEASURE PARTON-PARTON CROSS SECTIONS? *

J. D. Bjorken

Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305

ABSTRACT

Multiple-core production in hadron-hadron collisions directly measures (in the context of the parton model) differential cross sections for parton-parton collisions. To obtain $\sim 20\%$ accuracy in reconstruction of the parton-parton kinematics requires transverse momentum of the cores $\gtrsim 5$ GeV/c. Experiments at NAL as well as the CERN-ISR appear feasible. What might be learned from such studies is discussed.

(Submitted to Phys. Rev.)

* Supported by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

I. Introduction

Observation at the CERN intersecting storage rings of a large yield of high transverse momentum hadrons^{1,2,3} invites many speculations regarding the production mechanism. Among the many mechanisms suggested, the parton model⁴ provides a simple intuitive way of thinking about the process and, most importantly, suggests other experimental ways of investigating this kind of dynamics. It is not at all clear that even the present data, especially that³ on the increasing K/π and p/π ratio with increasing p_{\perp} , can be accommodated by the simple parton picture (Appendix C contains the basis for these doubts). Nevertheless, we shall in this paper uncritically accept the simple parton model. Our apology is simply that the main purpose of this paper, to motivate the usefulness of multiple-core measurements, is to a large extent independent of model, but very simply expressed in parton terms.

Thus we shall suppose that an event containing high transverse momentum secondary hadrons is the consequence of a large-angle two-body⁵ collision of two partons present in the incident hadrons; these partons then "fragment" into high transverse momentum secondary hadrons. This general picture has been described in a previous paper⁶, hereafter called BBK. There the emphasis rested on the electromagnetic interactions of the partons. However it appears from the data that for the foreseeable future the electromagnetic contribution is overwhelmed by purely strong-interaction processes. This possibility was already entertained in BBK, and crude estimates of single-particle inclusive distributions were made, assuming that partons exchange $J = 1$ neutral gluons ($g^2/4\pi \lesssim 1$) as

well as photons ($e^2/4\pi \approx 1/137$). Fits to the data using such a model have even been tried⁷ and are not too bad, but scarcely convincing. A testable prediction is a scaling behavior given by dimensional analysis

$$E \frac{d\sigma}{d^3p} = \frac{\text{constant}}{p_{\perp}^4} F\left(\frac{2p}{\sqrt{s}}, \theta_{\text{CM}}\right) = \frac{\text{constant}}{s^2} f\left(\frac{2p}{\sqrt{s}}, \theta_{\text{CM}}\right) \quad (1.1)$$

Experimentally the exponent of s appears to be closer to three than two⁸, but it may be premature to draw definite conclusions. Another possible problem for parton models may lie in the aforementioned particle ratios, as discussed in Appendix C. However, parton model explanations of these inclusive spectra will be capable of great resiliency under experimental stress. There are three major uncertainties, associated with each major step in the simple parton model calculation. We recall the three elements of the recipe here, along with the problems they present:

I. Choose a collinear frame of reference in which the initial projectiles move relativistically and in opposite directions. Replace each projectile A, B by a beam of massless, non-interacting partons $\{i, j\}$ whose momentum distributions scale:

$$\frac{dN_i^A}{dp} = \frac{1}{p} f_{iA}\left(\frac{p}{P}\right) \quad (1.2)$$

P is the projectile momentum and p the parton longitudinal momentum.

The uncertainty here is that we do not know even the composition of the parton beams. The charged parton composition and momentum distributions are

in principle determined from electroproduction and neutrino production experiments. However about 50% of the proton momentum is not carried by charged partons.⁹ The remaining momentum is often speculated to be carried by neutral isoscalar $J = 0$ or $J = 1$ gluons, with unknown momentum distribution functions.

II. Regard the collision as a 2-body collision of a parton from each beam, the cross section depending only on s' and t' of the interacting parton pair and independent of the rest of the environment of "spectator" partons.

This uncertainty is the worst: we don't know the strong parton-parton interactions. If the interactions involve no dimensional coupling constants or large masses, then the scaling behavior of Eq. (1.1) may be expected.⁶ But even in the absence of a large mass parameter, trilinear couplings of $J = 0$ gluons do introduce a dimension. Violation of dimensional scaling could be accounted for in that way.¹⁰ Also, the parton interchange model of Blankenbecler, Brodsky, and Gunion¹¹ reminds one that mechanisms other than direct parton-parton collisions should also contribute; their model violates strongly the dimensional scaling in Eq. (1).

III. The momentum of each parton emerging after the high transverse momentum collision is approximately equal to the sum of the momenta of the hadrons emerging in the direction of the struck parton. While the transverse momentum of these hadrons relative to the initial beams is large, relative to the direction of the parent parton, their transverse momentum is small. The inclusive distribution of these hadrons scales in the same way as Eq. (1.1):

$$\frac{dN_{Ai}}{dP'} = \frac{1}{P'} g_{Ai} \left(\frac{P'}{p'} \right) \quad (1.3)$$

where P' is hadron momentum and p' is parton momentum.

The uncertainty associated with this final step is that we do not know the nature of this "parton fragmentation" into hadrons. The above picture, as described in detail in BBK and elsewhere,^{12,13} is at present not established. It is true that data from $e^+ - e^-$ colliding beams, electroproduction, and neutrino-production can tell us about "fragmentation" of charged partons. However that data yields no information about what the neutral partons do.

How can we extricate ourselves from such a mess?? One way is to abandon the parton model description for these collisions, for which there is (apart from lepton-induced phenomena) little real support. But it is probable that almost any model will be faced with similar uncertainties. Hence it may be that we shall have to explore much more than single-particle or two-particle inclusive distribution functions to make real headway. In particular, experiments which study multiple-core structures appear to be an especially attractive way to circumvent the uncertainties in Step III above, and to attack Step II at the experimental level by directly measuring the strong parton-parton interactions. It is the main purpose of this paper to examine this possibility and outline what might be learned from such studies. While this is done here in the context of the parton model, it should become clear that such measurements are likely to yield fundamental information for a wide variety of dynamical models.

II. A Multiple-Core Experiment

An idealized multiple-core experiment consists of a bank of hadron calorimeters or other devices surrounding the interaction region, capable of measuring

in each event the total amount of energy emerging into small elements of solid angle.¹⁴ The model we have described predicts that the energy will be localized into four cores for ISR center-of-mass kinematics, or three cores for stationary target kinematics (Figure 1). The axes of the cores point along the directions of the struck partons, and the angular size of a core of total energy E should be of order $\Delta\theta \sim 0.5 \text{ GeV}/E$. Evidently it is of central importance to verify the existence, coplanarity, etc. of these cores. But here we shall anticipate that this will turn out to be correct. For even setting parton interpretations aside, any other choice of distribution for the outgoing energy (fan-shaped, non-planar, isotropic, etc.) seems even more unprecedented than one composed of cores.

The purpose of studying the production of these cores is that the four-momentum of a core is approximately the same as the four-momentum of the parent parton. [The uncertainty is of order $0.5 \text{ GeV}/p_{\perp}$ for a core with transverse momentum p_{\perp} , as we shall discuss later on.] Thus a measurement of the angle and energy distribution of the cores is essentially a measurement of $d\sigma/dt$ for parton-parton scattering. A simple calculation using the naive parton model yields the formula

$$E_1 E_2 \frac{d\sigma}{d^3 p_1 d^3 p_2} \approx \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{i,j} f_{iA}(x_1) f_{jB}(x_2) \frac{d\sigma_{ij}(s', t')}{dt'} \delta^2(p_{1\perp} + p_{2\perp}) . \quad (2.1)$$

In this formula (E_1, p_1) and (E_2, p_2) are the energy and momenta of the cores.¹⁵ The functions $f_{iA}(x_1)$ and $f_{jB}(x_2)$ are defined in Eq. (1.2). The kinematical variables s' and t' describing the parton-parton collision are defined by the formula

$$\begin{aligned}
 s' &\cong p_{\perp}^2 \left(1 + \tan \frac{\theta_1}{2} \cot \frac{\theta_2}{2} \right) \left(1 + \tan \frac{\theta_2}{2} \cot \frac{\theta_1}{2} \right) \\
 t' &\cong -p_{\perp}^2 \left(1 + \tan \frac{\theta_1}{2} \cot \frac{\theta_2}{2} \right)
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.2}$$

and the longitudinal fractions x_1 and x_2 of the incident partons are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 x_1 &\cong \frac{p_{\perp}}{\sqrt{s}} \left(\cot \frac{\theta_1^*}{2} + \cot \frac{\theta_2^*}{2} \right) & x_2 &= \frac{p_{\perp}}{\sqrt{s}} \left(\tan \frac{\theta_1^*}{2} + \tan \frac{\theta_2^*}{2} \right) \quad \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{center-of-mass} \\ \text{kinematics} \end{array} \right) \\
 x_1 &\approx \frac{M p_{\perp}}{s} \left(\cot \frac{\theta_1}{2} + \cot \frac{\theta_2}{2} \right) & x_2 &\approx \frac{p_{\perp}}{M} \left(\tan \frac{\theta_1}{2} + \tan \frac{\theta_2}{2} \right) \quad \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{stationary target} \\ \text{kinematics} \end{array} \right)
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.3}$$

Some care must be taken in doing the kinematics for this process, and the above equations are especially convenient in that regard. In particular, Eq. (2.2) is invariant under longitudinal Lorentz transformation and is equally valid in the center-of-mass frame or in the frame in which one of the initial hadrons is at rest.

The reason for such care in calculating the kinematics is that while the parton four momentum is assumed to be null, i. e. $p^2 \approx 0$, and while the momentum P^{μ} of the jet of hadrons is taken to be approximately that of the parton, it does not follow that $P^2 \cong 0$. Indeed $P^2 \gtrsim O(p_{\perp})$ because of the small, but unavoidable, uncertainty in determining P^{μ} . The optimum theoretical accuracy in measuring P^{μ} is found by going to the frame in which the jet emerges at right angles to the incident beams. There we have

$$P^{\mu} = p^{\mu} + [O(0.5 \text{ GeV})]^{\mu}
 \tag{2.4}$$

This follows because only hadrons in the jet which emerge with $|p| = |p_{\perp}| \gg 350$ MeV may be safely identified as a "parton fragment," and hadrons with $|p| \lesssim 350$ MeV may, with high probability, belong to the jets oriented along the incident beams.¹⁶ These wee hadrons cannot, even in principle, be identified as a constituent of any one jet. Taking the vector $[O(0.5 \text{ GeV})]^{\mu}$ to be timelike and ≈ 0.5 GeV, we estimate

$$P^2 \approx (1 \text{ GeV}) \times |P_{\perp}|. \quad (2.5)$$

Thus as $P_{\perp} \rightarrow \infty$, also $P^2 \rightarrow \infty$. It definitely does not vanish. The moral is that from the measurement of the jets one must first reconstruct the parton null four vector p_{μ} [within the uncertainties inherent in the reconstruction, of order $0.5 \text{ GeV}/p_{\perp}$] and only then do the kinematics. There may be another more fundamental lesson to be learned as well; this is discussed in Appendix A.

III. Experimental Uncertainties

At this point it is evident that there are in principle difficulties and uncertainties in determining in a given event the important quantities x_1, x_2, s', t' for the parton-parton collision. In practice, in a given event one observes a localization of energy within an angle $\Delta\theta$ of the parton direction and (after perhaps some small background subtraction) one estimates the parton energy in terms of the hadron energy observed within $\Delta\theta$. It is clearly of importance to ascertain what fraction of the parton momentum is found, on the average, in those hadrons. We may estimate it as follows: if the hadron fragments are distributed longitudinally according to Eq. (1.3), and if their transverse momentum distribution is of typical exponential form, then

$$\sum_A E' \frac{dN_{iA}}{dP' dP_{\perp}^2} = \frac{a^2}{2} e^{-aP_{\perp}} g_i\left(\frac{P'}{P}\right) . \quad (3.1)$$

It follows that the mean fraction $\epsilon_i(E, \theta)$ of parton energy E found in the hadrons emerging within an angle θ of the parton direction is an integral over Eq. (3.1):

$$\epsilon_i(E, \theta) = \int_0^1 dx g_i(x) \left[1 - (1 + aEx\theta) e^{-aEx\theta} \right]. \quad (3.2)$$

For the "reasonable"^{6,17} choices $g_i(x) = 2(1-x)$ and $a = 6 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$, Eq. (3.2) is plotted in Figure 2. In general, for large θ ($aE\theta \gg 1$)

$$\epsilon(\theta) \approx 1 - \frac{2g(0)}{aE\theta} \approx 1 - \frac{0.7 \text{ GeV}}{E\theta} \quad (3.3)$$

The approach to unity is quite slow. In particular, the "missing energy" $E(1 - \epsilon(E, \theta))$ emerging in the large angle ($> \theta$) hadrons is independent of parton energy, and for $\theta \sim 30^\circ$ (~ 1 sr. of solid angle!) is of order 1 GeV. This result is consistent with and supportive of the comments made earlier. In order to obtain a determination of parton momentum good to $\sim 20\%$, it therefore appears that a parton transverse momentum $\gtrsim 5 \text{ GeV}$ is required. A 20% accuracy is perhaps a good match to the accuracy of energy determination obtainable in calorimeters.

However, this discussion of accuracy and backgrounds, etc., is full of a theorist's naivete. Fluctuations of individual events away from the mean behavior, combined with the steep fall in event rate with increasing p_{\perp} , may create a serious problem.¹⁸ An investigation of this may well require Monte Carlo

simulations of individual multiple-core events. Toward this end, a sensible way to proceed might be to suppose that the hadron fragments associated with a parton of momentum p are identical to the products of a γ -nucleon or π -nucleon inelastic collision at laboratory momentum p . This way of proceeding has some support from the deep-inelastic electroproduction experiments with hadron final states observed.¹⁹ The energetic electroproduced hadrons (at small ω) may be regarded as "parton fragments." But the behavior of these hadron final states appear to be very similar to those in photoproduction (or π -N) interactions at the same hadron center-of-mass energy.

IV. Extraction of Physics from Multiple-Core Measurements

What can we hope to learn from multiple-core measurements? Clearly the advantage over inclusive studies lies in the elimination of uncertainty regarding Step III and reduction of the problems in Step II to the direct experimental study of the parton-parton cross section $d\sigma/dt'$ as a function of s' and t' . The uncertainty of Step I regarding the structure of the incident parton beams is the main obstacle. However with some luck some of this can be overcome. From Eq. (2.1) we see that the quantity

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^N f_{iA}(x_1) f_{jB}(x_2) \frac{d\sigma_{ij}(s',t')}{dt'} \equiv f_B^T(x_2) F(s',t') f_A(x_1) \quad (4.1)$$

is what can be observed. If x_1 and x_2 are not too small ($> 0.3?$), a simple and reasonable hypothesis is that the important partons consist of u and d quarks and a single gluon g . Furthermore, if we neglect the (probably small) difference

between uu and ud cross sections, we may average over u and d distribution functions and obtain an effective dimensionality N of two for the vector space spanned by the vectors $f_{A,B}(x)$. It then seems not impossible to extract from data at fixed s' and t' , but variable x_1 and x_2 , the two-vectors $f_A(x_1)$ and $f_B(x_2)$, where

$$f_A(x) = \begin{pmatrix} f_{qA}(x) \\ f_{gA}(x) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f_{uA}(x) + f_{dA}(x) \\ f_{gA}(x) \end{pmatrix} . \quad (4.2)$$

Of considerable help is the fact that $f_q(x)$ is already reasonably well determined at large x from electroproduction data,²⁰ and the energy-conservation constraint

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f_{iA}(x) dx = 1 \quad (4.3)$$

serves to normalize the gluon distribution function $f_{gA}(x)$. Furthermore the hypothesis of equality of uu and ud interactions may be checked (at NAL) by comparing pp and pn interactions.

Such a simple working hypothesis as the above model might well not survive an onslaught of data. However, as new partons are added to the description their effect can be checked (again at NAL) by changing projectiles. For example, if \bar{u} and \bar{d} are needed to interpret data on pp collisions, then they should be of much greater importance in $\bar{p}p$ collisions or πp collisions. Likewise, strange quark interactions may be isolated by studying $K^\pm p$ interactions and comparing them with $\pi^\pm p$. Evidently an empirical approach is indicated here, with the data guiding the theoretical considerations along.

The expected rate for multiple-core events is evidently very good at the CERN ISR. It is still quite acceptable for high-energy secondary beams at NAL. To make this estimate, we first suppose that the inclusive distribution of partons (or cores) at ISR energies falls roughly as a power:

$$E \frac{dN_{\text{parton}}}{d^3 p} \Big|_{\theta_{\text{CM}} = 90^\circ} \approx \frac{C}{P^n} \quad (4.4)$$

with $n \sim 8$ for the momentum range (3-9 GeV) of interest. We take the inclusive distribution function for finding a π^0 , of momentum p , emerging from this parton to be

$$p \frac{dN_{\pi^0}}{dp} \approx \frac{2}{3} \left(1 - \frac{p}{P}\right) \equiv g_{\pi^0} \left(\frac{p}{P}\right) \quad (4.5)$$

Folding this over Eq. (4.4) gives

$$E \frac{dN_{\pi^0}}{d^3 p} \Big|_{\theta_{\text{CM}} = 90^\circ} \approx \frac{C}{p^8} \int_0^1 dx x^{n-3} g_{\pi^0}(x) \quad (4.6)$$

or

$$E \frac{dN_{\pi^0}}{d^3 p} \approx \frac{2}{3(n-1)(n-2)} \left(E \frac{dN_{\text{parton}}}{d^3 p} \right) \quad (4.7)$$

That is, for $n \approx 8$, the ratio of π^0 daughters to parent partons of the same momentum is $\sim 1/63$. From the observed π^0 spectrum¹, and integrating over all $p_{\perp} > 5$ GeV, we get

$$\frac{d\sigma_{\text{parton}}}{d\Omega} (p_{\perp} > 5 \text{ GeV}; \theta_{\text{CM}} = 90^{\circ}) \approx 6 \times 10^{-32} \text{ cm}^2/\text{sr}. \quad (4.8)$$

Finally, taking half the full solid angle ($60^{\circ} < \theta_{\text{CM}} < 120^{\circ}$) gives a total

$$\sigma^{\text{effective}} (p_{\perp} > 5 \text{ GeV}; |\cos \theta^*| \leq \frac{1}{2}) \approx 3 \times 10^{-31} \text{ cm}^2 \quad (4.9)$$

at ISR energies. At NAL, one needs $E_{\text{incident}} \gtrsim 200 \text{ GeV}$ to comfortably attain $p_{\perp} > 5 \text{ GeV}$. Under these circumstances we have to require $x_1 \gtrsim 0.5$ and $x_2 \gtrsim 0.5$, and the factors $f_A(x_1)f_B(x_2)$ could suppress the above estimate by a factor 10-100. However, the distribution function $f_{qM}(x)$ for a meson projectile M is anticipated^{6,17,21} to behave as $(1-x)$, not $(1-x)^3$, for large x , giving perhaps considerably less suppression than for a baryon projectile. But even the conservative estimate $\sigma \gtrsim 3 \times 10^{-32} \text{ cm}^2$ is still sufficiently large to make an experiment very feasible.

V. Conclusions

Multiple-core experiments appear to be a feasible and attractive way to bypass some of the difficulties of parton model interpretations of inclusive hadron spectra at high transverse momentum. We believe that these experiments have an intrinsically fundamental flavor, and will likewise be useful if some other model of high p_{\perp} phenomena turns out to better describe the data. For example, in the Blankenbecler, Brodsky, Gunion parton-interchange model¹¹, the multiple-core experiment appears to measure directly the square of a

single two-body parton-parton wave function at large relative p_{\perp} . [However, we have not succeeded in determining the precise quantity measured, but hope to return to this question at some later time.]

Finally, one must not forget that these measurements are an excellent way to search for any heavy objects ($m \gtrsim 10$ GeV) which are produced (not necessarily through strong interactions) in parton-parton collisions. The prototype is the W^{\pm} , decaying into only hadrons via an intermediary parton-antiparton pair. This would show up as a narrow s-channel resonance in $\frac{d\sigma}{dt}(s', t')$. Similarly, associated production of two massive objects each decaying into hadrons via parton-antiparton pairs would be seen as production of 4 cores of high p_{\perp} and high relative p_{\perp} . And, of course, leptons (including neutrinos) are special kinds of partons and can be included in the game.²²

Indeed, in looking toward that future day when center-of-mass energy is measured in many hundreds of GeV, the separation of individual channels or even individual hadrons in pp collisions will diminish in importance, both because of difficulties in experimental resolution and of decrease in intrinsic interest. Conversely the study of the production of groups of hadrons representing individual partons greatly increases in importance, certainly for weak and electromagnetic interactions and probably for strong interactions as well. For $p_{\perp} \gtrsim 50$ GeV, the 1% accuracy of parton kinematics compares well with the accuracy of present day hadron-hadron two-body kinematics. Thus the physics as $s \sim 1-10$ TeV² at the parton level might well be approached in a way much like the physics of hadrons at $s \sim 1-10$ GeV². Were such dreams to come true, the parton, while impossible to observe in isolation, would in an operational sense attain a reality comparable to what is ascribed to hadrons. Whether that would make them more real in a fundamental sense is a question best left to philosophers.

Acknowledgements

It should be no surprise that many of the conclusions of this paper have been independently arrived at by various experimental physicists; indeed the basic ideas go back to cosmic-ray physics. More specifically, the NAL proposal of the Harvard-Penn-Wisconsin collaboration²³ and of Frisch et al.²⁴, as well as the ideas of W. Willis,¹⁵ cover much of the same ground as this paper. I have benefitted very much from discussions with D. Ritson, D. Cline, R. Cool, H. Frisch, B. Winstein, W. Willis, W. Selove, A. Erwin, and F. Turkot, as well as my theoretical colleagues at SLAC and NAL. In particular I thank S. Ellis for interesting discussions; his paper⁷ with M. Kisslinger also explores many of the issues discussed here in considerable detail.

Appendix A: Is the Parton Mass Zero or Infinite?

As we discussed in Section II, the identification of the momentum $\sum_i p_i^\mu$ of a group of high p_\perp hadrons with the parton momentum raises the point that, while the parton four momentum is generally considered (and in this paper specifically assumed) to be null, $(\sum_i p_i^\mu)^2$ is certainly not zero, and in fact is $\gtrsim |p_\perp|$. We demonstrated that this feature does not stop one from identifying the parton four momentum up to a fractional uncertainty of order $(1 \text{ GeV})/p_\perp$.

This situation invites consideration of the same phenomenon at the parton level itself. In other words we may ask, in what sense is the parton four momentum really null? The answer may well be similar: no matter how large the momentum p that a parton carries, it emits and reabsorbs wee partons at a rate independent of its momentum. Therefore it is typically off energy shell by an amount $O(1)$ and off mass shell by an amount $O(p)$, even as $p \rightarrow \infty$.

The presence of these wee interactions appears desirable in order to cope with the problems raised by Kogut, Sinclair, and Susskind²⁵ in connection with the process $e^+ e^- \rightarrow$ hadrons. In that process one expects first that the massive virtual photon materializes into an energetic parton-antiparton pair which subsequently evolves into hadrons. However if the partons possess fractional charge (as suggested by electroproduction and neutrino data), the energetic partons must do something in a time scale $O(1)$ or else find themselves isolated at distances large compared with 10^{-13} cm. The emission of wees can create enough spoor of parton-antiparton pairs along their outgoing trajectories to allow a polarization current to flow, neutralizing the fractional charge.

On the other hand, for electroproduction (viewed in the laboratory frame) the important distances for the free parton propagation can be large ($\approx 2\omega \times 10^{-14}$ cm). However, the most favored assumption (epitomized in Figure 3) is that of free parton propagation over such distances, which in the light of the above comments becomes suspect. The problem is how to allow emission of wee partons without destroying the impulse approximation and scaling behavior at large ω . Perhaps $I = 0$ wee vector-gluon emission, which only puts an eikonal phase on the wave function of the energetic parton, is in the right direction. However, I certainly do not claim a clear understanding of these problems, and raise this issue here mainly to underline, first, that parton propagation may well be more subtle than what is illustrated in Figure 3, and secondly that the more mundane problem of the empirical identification of the null four momentum of a parton involves a closely analogous situation.²⁶

Appendix B: Angular Correlations

Of current experimental interest at the CERN-ISR is the determination of the angular correlation of two high p_{\perp} cores. Equation (2.1) may be applied to this question. We rewrite it as follows:

$$\frac{d\sigma_{AB}}{dp_{\perp}^2(\cos\theta_1)d(\cos\theta_2)} = \sum_{ij} \frac{f_{iA}(x_1)f_{jB}(x_2)}{\sin^2\theta_1 \sin^2\theta_2} \frac{d\sigma_{ij}}{dt'}(s', t') \quad . \quad (B.1)$$

For purposes of estimation, we may take $f_{iA}(x)$ and $f_{jB}(x)$ to be equal to the structure function νW_2 as measured in deep-inelastic electroproduction. The main variation in the yield comes from the factor $f(x_1)f(x_2)/\sin^2\theta_2$, which is

plotted in Figures 4-7 for typical choices of p_{\perp}/\sqrt{s} and θ_1 . We have also plotted s' and t' , which are not strong functions of $\cos\theta_2$. Thus the angular dependence is not critically dependent on the s' and t' dependence of the parton-parton cross section.

In any ISR experiment which triggers on a single high p_{\perp} secondary (which we here consider a constituent of produced parton 1), that particle will on the average carry a major fraction ($\sim 70-80\%$?) of the total parton, or jet, momentum (this follows from Eq. (4.6)). Thus the quantities p_{\perp}/\sqrt{s} and θ_1 for parton 1 are reasonably well determined. Any energetic particle of high p_{\perp} detected in the opposite hemisphere should point approximately along the direction θ_2 (and of course approximately coplanar with particle 1). High p_{\perp} particles produced on the same side of the intersecting beams should have low ($\lesssim 0.5$ GeV) relative transverse momentum, inasmuch as they belong in the same parton jet.

Appendix C: Particle Ratios

In the text we intimated that measurements of the inclusive hadron distributions alone can neither destroy nor establish the parton picture because of the large freedom in choice of partons, how they interact, and how they fragment. This view is too pessimistic. There is already possible trouble in sight. The ratios K/π , p/π^+ and \bar{p}/π^- have been observed³ to increase with increasing p_{\perp} , up to $p_{\perp} \sim 3$ GeV. If we regard hadrons with $p_{\perp} \sim 3$ GeV as bona fide parton fragments, this indicates that parton-fragmentation products in $e^+e^- \rightarrow$ hadrons or electroproduction should likewise be relatively rich in heavy particles. Were the ISR particle ratios to become extremely large, we would find such an

embarrassingly large p/π^+ ratio in e^+e^- annihilation to make it unlikely that the model is correct.

To crudely estimate the status of this situation, let us again suppose that the inclusive distribution function of high p_{\perp} , 90° partons, or cores, produced in hadron-hadron collisions at ISR energies ($\sqrt{s} \sim 50$ GeV) falls as a power of p_{\perp} , as given by Eq. (4.4). Following the arguments leading to Eq. (4.6), we obtain for a rough estimate

$$\frac{p}{\pi^+} = \frac{\int_0^1 dx x^{n-3} \bar{g}_p(x)}{\int_0^1 dx x^{n-3} \bar{g}_{\pi^+}(x)} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where the barred average is over the types of partons i produced in the p - p collision. It follows that for some values of x (and most likely large values of x) the $\bar{p}/\pi^- = p/\pi^+$ ratio in e^+e^- annihilation must be as large as that observed at the ISR (roughly 50% at $p_{\perp} \sim 3 \pm 0.5$ GeV).

Kogut and I estimated¹⁷ the \bar{p}/π^- ratio for e^+e^- annihilation using "correspondence" arguments, and found a ratio smaller by over an order of magnitude. Would a much larger ratio be "unreasonable?" Guided mainly by the survival instinct we may try to revise upward the normalization of the proton inclusive distribution, given in Figure 16 of that paper. If we multiply it by a factor 20, and estimate the integrals from Eq. (C.1) using $n = 8$, we obtain $p/\pi^+ \sim 20\%$. Considering the large amount of guesswork, this is perhaps satisfactory. But the p/π^+ ratio at small x in the colliding beam process becomes as big as 50%! To rationalize this, one can appeal to the Feynman conjecture that the mean

baryon number found in the parton-fragmentation region is of order $1/3$.

Then such a large p/π ratio can be approached.

The whole situation looks on the one hand uncomfortable and on the other hand quite spectacular in its implications for e^+e^- annihilation. However it would be premature to bury the parton-fragmentation hypothesis for hadron-hadron collisions at the present time. The easiest excuse is that, as in the BBK picture^{6,7}, the inclusive hadron distributions at the ISR contain two components, the tail of the low p_{\perp} distribution and the high p_{\perp} parton fragments, and that $p_{\perp} \sim 3$ GeV is still controlled by the low p_{\perp} tail. Yet two points appear quite clear: First, the problem of p/π ratios and K/π ratios deserves most careful attention, both theoretically and experimentally. And second, if the p/π ratio continues to rise with increasing p_{\perp} , the picture put forward in this paper will become increasingly difficult to support.

Even were this to turn out to be the case, we still hold to the view that the multiple-core experiments will be of great value in yielding fundamental information on what is responsible for the high p_{\perp} events.

References

1. B. Blumenfeld, F. Busser, L. Camilleri, R. Cool, L. DiLella, G. Gladding, L. Lederman, L. Litt, A. Placci, B. Pope, S. Segler, A. Smith, J. Yoh, and E. Zavattini, report of the CERN-Columbia-Rockefeller collaboration to the Vanderbilt Conference on New Results from Experiments on High Energy Particle Collisions, Vanderbilt University, 26-28 March 1973 (to be published).
2. M. Banner, J. Hamel, J. Pansart, A. Stirling, J. Teiger, H. Zacccone, J. Zsembery, G. Bassompierre, M. Croissiaux, J. Gresser, R. Morand, M. Riedinger, and M. Schneegans (Saclay-Strasbourg ISR collaboration); contribution to the 14th International Conference on High Energy Physics, as reported by M. Jacob in Vol. 3 of the Proceedings; National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois (1972).
3. B. Alper, H. Boggild, G. Jarlskog, G. Lynch, J. Weiss, P. Booth, L. Carroll, J. Jackson, M. Prentice, G. vonDardel, L. Jonsson, G. Damgaard, K. Hansen, E. Ldise, F. Bulos, W. Lee, G. Manning, P. Sharp, L. Leistam, A. Klovning, E. Lillethun, B. Duff, F. Heymann, K. Potter, D. Quarrie, and S. Sharrock (British-Scandinavian ISR Collaboration), Physics Letters (to be published).
4. R. P. Feynman, Phys. Rev. Letters 23, 1415 (1969).
5. The restriction to two-body processes is made only for simplicity; generalization to multiparton final states, if found, offers no difficulty of principle.

6. S. Berman, J. Bjorken, and J. Kogut, Phys. Rev. D4, 3388 (1971).
7. D. Cline, F. Halzen, and M. Waldrup, to be published. S. Ellis and M. Kislinger, to be published.
8. M. Jacob, CERN preprint TH 1639-CERN; see especially Fig. 3.
9. See, for example, C. H. Llewellyn Smith, Physics Reports 3C, 262 (1972).
10. The model of D. Amati, L. Caneschi, and M. Testa, CERN preprint TH-1644, while not phrased in parton terms, is closely related to such a picture.
11. R. Blankenbecler, S. Brodsky, and J. Gunion, Physics Letters 39B, 649 (1972); Phys. Rev. D6, 2652 (1972); SLAC-PUB-1140 (1972). This has been developed further by P. Landshoff and J. Polkinghorne, Cambridge University preprints DAMPT 73/4 and 73/10.
12. R. P. Feynman, Photon-Hadron Interactions, W. A. Benjamin, Inc., 1972.
13. M. Gronau, F. Ravndal, and Y. Zarmi, Nucl. Phys. B51, 611 (1973).
14. Such devices have been recently discussed in connection with PEP and ISABELLE studies; see for example W. Willis, Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on High Energy Physics, National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois (1972), and Brookhaven National Laboratory report CRISP-72-15; BNL6841; also W. Selove, CERN NP internal report 72-25 (1972).
15. More accurately, p_1^μ and p_2^μ are the reconstructed null ($p_i^2 = 0$) four-vectors of the partons. The reconstruction is best attained by requiring $p_{i\perp} = P_{i\perp}$; $\theta_i^{(\text{parton})} = \theta_i^{(\text{core})}$ as discussed below Eq. (2.3).
16. The nature of these fragmentation regions have been discussed in detail by R. Savit, SLAC preprint SLAC-PUB-1185 (to be published).

17. J. Bjorken and J. Kogut, Phys. Rev. (to be published).
18. We are thinking here of the corresponding problems in interpretation of cosmic-ray phenomena.
19. A recent review has been given by J. Dakin, SLAC preprint SLAC-PUB-1236.
20. G. Miller, E. Bloom, G. Buschhorn, D. Coward, H. DeStaebler, J. Drees, C. Jordan, L. Mo, R. Taylor, J. Friedman, G. Hartmann, H. Kendall, and R. Verdier, Phys. Rev. D5, 528 (1972); A. Bodek, MIT thesis, COO-3069-116 (1972).
21. S. Drell and T. -M. Yan, Phys. Rev. Letters 24, 181 (1970); G. West, Phys. Rev. Letters 24, 1206 (1970).
22. S. Berman, Brookhaven National Laboratory report NBL 17522, "Isabelle Physics Prospects," 1972.
23. D. Cheng, C. Rubbia, L. Sulak, R. Piccioni, W. Ford, T. Ling, A. Mann, A. Benvenuti, D. Cline, R. Imlay, and D. Reeder, NAL Proposal 200, "Search for High Transverse Momentum Jets with a Magnetic Spectrometer."
24. H. Frisch, J. Pilcher, M. Schochet, and B. Winstein, NAL Proposal 222 "A Proposal to Study Hard Hadron-Hadron Collisions."
25. J. Kogut, D. Sinclair, and L. Susskind, IAS preprint (to be published).
26. The ideas of G. Preparata, Phys. Rev. D7, 2973 (1973), involving infinitely massive quarks interacting with effectively zero or small mass, also seem to be closely connected with this viewpoint.

Figure Captions

- Figure 1 (a) Schematic structure of a multiple-core event, as seen in the center-of-mass frame.
- (b) Schematic structure of a multiple-core event, as seen for stationary-target kinematics (conventional laboratory frame).
- Figure 2 (a) Fraction of parton energy E emerging in hadrons at angle $\leq \theta$ with respect to the parton direction.
- (b) Missing energy ΔE associated with hadrons emitted at angle greater than θ with respect to the direction of the parent parton.
- Figure 3 "Handbag" diagram often used to interpret scaling behavior in deep-inelastic electroproduction.
- Figure 4 The factor $F(\theta_1^*, \theta_2^*, p_\perp/\sqrt{s}) = f(x_1)f(x_2)/\sin^2 \theta_1^* \sin^2 \theta_2^*$ which controls the angular distribution and correlation of high p_\perp cores here plotted for $\theta_1^* = 90^\circ$ and $p_\perp/\sqrt{s} = 0.1, 0.2$ and 0.3 as a function of $\cos \theta_2^*$. Also shown are s' and t' (arbitrary units) as a function of $\cos \theta_2^*$ for $\theta_1^* = 90^\circ$. Notice the insensitivity of s' and t' with angle. We have chosen $f(x) = 2\nu W_2^{eD}(x)$; hence gluon contributions are neglected here.
- Figure 5 Contour plot of the function $F = f(x_1)f(x_2)/\sin^2 \theta_1 \sin^2 \theta_2$ as a function of $\cos \theta_1$ and $\cos \theta_2$ for $p_\perp/\sqrt{s} = 0.1$.
- Figure 6 Contour plot of F , as in Fig. 5, for $p_\perp/\sqrt{s} = 0.2$.


Figure 7 Contour plot of F , as in Fig. 5, for $p_{\perp}/\sqrt{s} = 0.3$.

Figure 8 Contour plot of F , as in Fig. 5, for $p_{\perp}/\sqrt{s} = 0.3$ and $f(x_1)$
replaced by a conjectured "mesonic" structure function:
 $f(x_1) = (1 - x_1)$.


Before



After



(a)



(b)

2351A1

FIG. 1






FIG. 2



2351A3

FIG. 3




FIG. 4





FIG. 5



235186

FIG. 6





FIG. 7



2351A8

FIG. 8