Multiple interactions: a theory perspective

M. Diehl

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchroton DESY

LHC Physics discussion Hamburg, 21 February 2011





Introduction	The good	The bad?	The ugly?	Summary
•0	0000	000000	0	0

Multiple interactions

phenomenology based on simple, physically intuitive formula

 $\label{eq:cross} cross \ section = multiparton \ distributions$

 \times hard-scattering cross sections

```
Paver, Treleani 1982, 1984; Mekhfi 1985
```

also underlies implementation in event generators

questions:

- to which extent can this formula be derived in QCD?
- where and how does it need to be modified?
- can factorization theorems for multiparton interactions be formulated and proven?
- no definitive answers to all points, but some results and identified problems
 MD, Schäfer arXiv:1102:3081
 MD, Ostermeier, Schäfer, in preparation

ultimate goal: improved theory as a guide for phenomenology

Introduction	The good	The bad?	The ugly?	Summary
0●	0000	000000	0	0

Theoretical framework

- require all interactions to have hard scale
 ~> predictive power from factorization and pert. theory
- consider gauge boson pair production (pairs of γ^* , W, Z)



 jet production ≫ complicated, gluon exchange between spectator partons and produced jets Mulders, Rogers 2010

keep transverse momentum of bosons differential

- are interested in final-state distributions
- allows discussion of Sudakov logarithms hope that will eventually be useful for event generators
- need k_T dependent parton distributions Collins, Soper 1982; Ji, Ma, Yuan 2004; Collins, Rogers, Stasto 2007

Introduction	The good	The bad?	The ugly?	Summary
00	•000	000000	0	0

Basic results: space-time structure



- Iongitudinal parton momenta x_ip, x̄_ip̄ fixed by final state exactly as for single hard scattering
- transverse parton momenta not the same in amplitude and conjugate amplitude
- Fourier transform to impact parameter: $r_1 \rightarrow y$ and $\bar{r}_1 \rightarrow \bar{y}$ $r_1 + \bar{r}_1 = 0$ (from momentum conservation) implies $y = \bar{y}$
- interpretation: y = transv. dist. between two scattering partons equal in both colliding protons

same procedure for partons with index 2

Introduction	The good	The bad?	The ugly?	Summary
00	0000	000000	0	0

Basic structure: cross section

get cross section formula



$$\frac{d\sigma}{dx_1 d\bar{x}_1 d^2 \boldsymbol{q}_1 dx_2 d\bar{x}_2 d^2 \boldsymbol{q}_2} = \left[\prod_{i=1}^2 \hat{\sigma}_i (q_i^2 = x_i \bar{x}_i s) \right] \\ \times \left[\prod_{i=1}^2 \int d^2 \boldsymbol{k}_i d^2 \bar{\boldsymbol{k}}_i \delta(\boldsymbol{q}_i - \boldsymbol{k}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{k}}_i) \right] \int d^2 \boldsymbol{y} F(x_i, \boldsymbol{k}_i, \boldsymbol{y}) F(\bar{x}_i, \bar{\boldsymbol{k}}_i, \boldsymbol{y})$$

~

 $\hat{\sigma}_i = \text{ parton-level cross section} \\ F(x_i, \bm{k}_i, \bm{y}) = k_T \text{ dependent two-parton distribution}$

 result follows from Feynman graphs and hard-scattering approximation no semi-classical approximation required

•
$$\int d^2 {m q}_1 \int d^2 {m q}_2$$
 in cross sect. $ightarrow$ collinear distributions

$$F(x_i, \boldsymbol{y}) = \int d^2 \boldsymbol{k}_1 \int d^2 \boldsymbol{k}_2 F(x_i, \boldsymbol{k}_i, \boldsymbol{y})$$

recover usual cross section formula (slide 2)

Introduction	The good	The bad?	The ugly?	Summary
00	0000	000000	0	0

Multiparton distributions



- ▶ naive interpretation of $F(x_i, k_i, y)$: have two partons with transv. momenta k_1 , k_2 at a transv. distance y
- cannot be literally true because of uncertainty principle, but
 - in cross section variables enter as if naive interpretation were ok:

$$\frac{d\sigma}{\prod_{i=1}^{2} dx_{i} d\bar{x}_{i} d^{2} q_{i}} = \left[\prod_{i=1}^{2} \hat{\sigma}_{i} \int d^{2} \mathbf{k}_{i} d^{2} \bar{\mathbf{k}}_{i} \, \delta(\mathbf{q}_{i} - \mathbf{k}_{i} - \bar{\mathbf{k}}_{i})\right] \int d^{2} \mathbf{y} \, F(x_{i}, \mathbf{k}_{i}, \mathbf{y}) \, F(\bar{x}_{i}, \bar{\mathbf{k}}_{i}, \mathbf{y})$$

- formally: $F(x_i, k_i, y)$ is a Wigner distribution
- can define as operator matrix element

$$F(x_i, \boldsymbol{k}_i, \boldsymbol{y}) = \mathcal{F}_{z_i \to (x_i, \boldsymbol{k}_i)} \langle p | \bar{q} \left(-\frac{1}{2} z_2 \right) \Gamma_2 q \left(\frac{1}{2} z_2 \right) \bar{q} \left(y - \frac{1}{2} z_1 \right) \Gamma_1 q \left(y + \frac{1}{2} z_1 \right) | p \rangle$$

like for single-parton densities

∼→ rigorous basis to study scale evolution possibility for lattice calculations

Introduction	The good	The bad?	The ugly?	Summary
00	0000	000000	0	0

Power behavior: single versus double hard scattering

from scattering formulae readily find



Introduction	The good	The bad?	The ugly?	Summary
00	0000	000000	0	0

Power behavior: single versus double hard scattering

from scattering formulae readily find

$$s \frac{d\sigma}{dx_1 d\bar{x}_1 d^2 q_1 dx_2 d\bar{x}_2 d^2 q_2} \sim \frac{1}{Q^2 \Lambda^2} \qquad Q^2 \sim q_i^2, \Lambda^2 \sim \text{GeV}^2$$

for both

$$\Rightarrow \text{ double scattering not power suppressed}$$

but if integrate over q_1 and q_2 then
single: $s \frac{d\sigma}{dx_1 d\bar{x}_1 dx_2 d\bar{x}_2} \sim 1 \quad \text{since} \quad \int d^2(q_1 + q_2) \sim \Lambda^2$
and $\int d^2(q_1 - q_2) \sim Q^2$
double: $s \frac{d\sigma}{dx_1 d\bar{x}_1 dx_2 d\bar{x}_2} \sim \frac{\Lambda^2}{Q^2} \quad \text{since} \quad \int d^2 q_1 \int d^2 q_2 \sim \Lambda^4$

i.e. single hard scattering has larger phase space for transv. momenta

Introduction	The good	The bad?	The ugly?	Summary
00	0000	•00000	0	0

previous formulae glossed over important details:

- quark flavors and quarks vs. antiquarks
- parton spin
- color
- scale dependence/evolution
- additional gluon exchange essential for factorization situation similar to single hard scattering, not discussed here

Introduction	The good	The bad?	The ugly?	Summary
00	0000	00000	0	0

Interference effects

- ▶ so far: distributions with operators $\bar{q}_2 q_2 \bar{q}_1 q_1 \rightsquigarrow$ double parton densities indices 1 and 2 refer to momentum fractions x_1, x_2
- but also have interference contributions (no probability interpretation)



- must be included in cross section formula but is discarded in existing estimates
- expect to decrease for small x_1, x_2 , since does not mix with gluons

Introduction 00	The good	The bad? ○○●○○○	The ugly? 0	Summary O
Snin str	ucture			



 $F(x_i, \boldsymbol{k}_i, \boldsymbol{y}) = \underset{z_i \to (x_i, \boldsymbol{k}_i)}{\mathcal{F}T} \langle p | \bar{q} \left(-\frac{1}{2} z_2 \right) \Gamma_2 q \left(\frac{1}{2} z_2 \right) \bar{q} \left(y - \frac{1}{2} z_1 \right) \Gamma_1 q \left(y + \frac{1}{2} z_1 \right) | p \rangle$

at leading twist: Γ_i = ¹/₂γ⁺, ¹/₂γ⁺γ₅, ¹/₂iσ^{+α}γ₅
 ⇔ unpolarized, long. polarized, transv. polarized quarks similar classification for gluons

spin correlations even in unpolarized target, e.g.

$$\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2 = \frac{1}{2}\gamma^+\gamma_5 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad q_1^{\uparrow}q_2^{\uparrow} + q_1^{\downarrow}q_2^{\downarrow} - q_1^{\uparrow}q_2^{\downarrow} - q_1^{\downarrow}q_2^{\uparrow}$$

not suppressed by hard scattering in two-boson prod'n

transverse spin correlations from Γ₁ = Γ₂ = ¹/₂iσ^{+α}γ₅
 → cos 2φ modulation between decay planes of the two bosons at low q₁, q₂ single hard scattering does not give cos 2φ term in general: correlated decay planes

Introduction	The good	The bad?	The ugly?	Summary
00		○○●○○○	0	O
Spin struct				



 $F(x_i, \boldsymbol{k}_i, \boldsymbol{y}) = \underset{z_i \to (x_i, \boldsymbol{k}_i)}{\mathcal{F}T} \langle p | \bar{q} \left(-\frac{1}{2} z_2 \right) \Gamma_2 q \left(\frac{1}{2} z_2 \right) \bar{q} \left(y - \frac{1}{2} z_1 \right) \Gamma_1 q \left(y + \frac{1}{2} z_1 \right) | p \rangle$

at leading twist: Γ_i = ¹/₂γ⁺, ¹/₂γ⁺γ₅, ¹/₂iσ^{+α}γ₅
 ⇔ unpolarized, long. polarized, transv. polarized quarks similar classification for gluons

spin correlations even in unpolarized target, e.g.

$$\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2 = \frac{1}{2}\gamma^+\gamma_5 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad q_1^{\uparrow}q_2^{\uparrow} + q_1^{\downarrow}q_2^{\downarrow} - q_1^{\uparrow}q_2^{\downarrow} - q_1^{\downarrow}q_2^{\uparrow}$$

not suppressed by hard scattering in two-boson prod'n

• could naively expect spin effects to decrease for small x_1, x_2 , but

- will see counter-example on slide 16
- for x₁ ~ x₂ ≪ 1 spin correlations may be weak a parton and the proton (far away in rapidity) important between two partons (close in rapidity)

Introduction	The good	The bad?	The ugly?	Summary
00	0000	000000	0	O
Color structu	Ire		June 13 miles	

$$F(x_i, \boldsymbol{k}_i, \boldsymbol{y}) = \frac{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{T}}{z_i \to (x_i, \boldsymbol{k}_i)} \langle p | \bar{q} \left(-\frac{1}{2} z_2 \right) \Gamma_2 q \left(\frac{1}{2} z_2 \right) \bar{q} \left(y - \frac{1}{2} z_1 \right) \Gamma_1 q \left(y + \frac{1}{2} z_1 \right) | p \rangle$$

• operators $\bar{q}_2 q_2$ and $\bar{q}_1 q_1$ can couple to color singlet or octet:

$${}^{1}F \to (\bar{q}_{2} 1 1 q_{2}) (\bar{q}_{1} 1 1 q_{1})$$

$${}^{8}F \to (\bar{q}_{2} t^{a} q_{2}) (\bar{q}_{1} t^{a} q_{1}) = \frac{1}{2} (\bar{q}_{2} 1 1 q_{1}) (\bar{q}_{1} 1 1 q_{2}) - \frac{1}{2N_{c}} (\bar{q}_{2} 1 1 q_{2}) (\bar{q}_{1} 1 1 q_{1})$$

- \blacktriangleright in gauge boson pair production contrib's from ${}^1\!F{}^1\!F$ and ${}^8\!F{}^8\!F$
- color octet distributions essentially unknown (no probability interpretation as a guide)

Introduction	The good	The bad?	The ugly?	Summary
00	0000	000000	0	0

Situation so far

 can extend basic cross section formula to include contributions from

- spin correlations direct influence on rates and distributions may not all be small at low x_i
- color correlations
- interference distributions (quark-antiquark and flavor) expect to be small at low x_i
- many distributions needed to calculate multiparton scattering some of them qualitatively unknown

Introduction	The good	The bad?	The ugly?	Summary
00	0000	000000	0	0

High q_T : more predictive power

- consider region $\Lambda \ll q_T \ll Q$, with $q_T \sim |\boldsymbol{q}_i|$ have $|\boldsymbol{k}_i| \sim q_T$
- k_T dependent distr'n = hard scattering & collinear distr'n hard scattering closely related to DGLAP splitting functions
- ladder graphs: independent hard scatters for pair 1 and 2



- |y| of hadronic size
- color factors favor singlet distr's compared to octet ones

Introduction	The good	The bad?	The ugly?	Summary
00	0000	000000	0	0

High q_T : more predictive power

- consider region $\Lambda \ll q_T \ll Q$, with $q_T \sim |\boldsymbol{q}_i|$ have $|\boldsymbol{k}_i| \sim q_T$
- ▶ k_T dependent distr'n = hard scattering ⊗ collinear distr'n hard scattering closely related to DGLAP splitting functions
- ladder graphs: independent hard scatters for pair 1 and 2



splitting graphs



- ▶ |y| of hadronic size
- color factors favor singlet distr's compared to octet ones
- perturbatively small |y|
- ► longitudinal q and \bar{q} spins fully correlated also large transv. spin correlation

▶ ladder graphs power suppressed by Λ^2/q_T^2 compared with splitting but have small-*x* enhancement

Introduction	The good	The bad?	The ugly?	Summary
00	0000	000000	•	0

Problems with the splitting graphs



- contribution from splitting graphs in cross section gives divergent integrals $\int d^2 y F(x_i, k_i, y) \bar{F}(\bar{x}_i, \bar{k}_i, y)$
- double counting problem between double scattering with splitting and single scattering at loop level

possible solution: subtract splitting contribution from two-parton distr's when y is small will also modify their scale evolution remains to be worked out

Introduction	The good	The bad?	The ugly?	Summary
00	0000	000000	0	•

Summary

- ► multiple hard interactions not power suppressed for cross section differential in |q_i| ≪ Q
- nontrivial spin and color structure interference in fermion number and quark flavor size of these effects presently unknown
- some simplification for transv. mom. $|q_i| \gg \Lambda$
 - collinear distributions as input
 - enhancement of color singlet combinations further studies needed to make this quantitative
- need multi-parton distr's depending on transverse distance between partons
- should remove small y contribution in order to avoid divergences and double counting