An unified description of HERA and RHIC data *

M. S. Kugeratski

Service de Physique Théorique de Saclay, CEA/DSM/SPhT, F-91191
Gif-sur-Yvette, France

and

V. P. Gonçalves[1], M. V. T. Machado[1] and F. S. Navarra[2]

[1]High and Medium Energy Group (GAME), Instituto de Física e Matemática,
Universidade Federal de Pelotas, C.P. 354, 96010-900, Pelotas, RS, Brazil

[2]Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, C.P. 66318, 05315-970 São Paulo,
SP, Brazil

Perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics (pQCD) predicts that the small-x gluons in the hadron wavefunction should form a Color Glass Condensate (CGC), which has universal properties, which are the same for nucleon or nuclei. Making use of the results in Ref. [1], we study the behaviour of the anomalous dimension in the saturation models as a function of the photon virtuality and of the scaling variable rQ_s, since the main difference among the known parameterizations are characterized by this quantity.

PACS numbers: 12.38.-t, 13.60.Hb, 25.75.Nq

1. Introduction

Signals of parton saturation have already been observed both in ep deep inelastic scattering at HERA and in dAu collisions at RHIC. As the saturation scale in HERA and RHIC are similar, we can check the universality property of the saturation physics in the gluon evolution in the target wavefunction, as claimed in the Color Glass Condensate formalism [2]. In other words, the gluon evolution in the nucleon or nucleus should be the same. In [1] we have showed that a small modification in the anomalous dimension

* Presented at School on QCD, Low-x Physics, Saturation and Diffraction, Copanello (Calabria, Italy), July 1-14, 2007.

proposed in [3], is able to describe both sets of data: HERA and RHIC. This can be an important signature of saturation physics.

In the first part of this note we will give some explanation about the differences among saturation models. In the second part we will compare the saturation models in the forward dipole cross section. Next, we will present how the anomalous dimension evolves with the scaling variable rQ_s and with the photon virtuality.

2. Saturation models

Several models for the forward dipole cross section have been used in the literature in order to fit the HERA and RHIC data. (To see how the observables measured are related with these models, see for example [1].) In particular, the phenomenological models, for example, from Refs. [4, 5] have been proposed in order to describe the HERA data, while those from Refs. [3, 6] have been able to describe the dAu RHIC data. Usually, in these models the function $\mathcal{N}$ has been modeled in terms of a simple Glauber-like formula

$$\mathcal{N}(x, \boldsymbol{r}) = 1 - \exp\left[-\frac{1}{4}(\boldsymbol{r}^2 Q_s^2(x))^{\gamma(x,\boldsymbol{r}^2)}\right] \ , \tag{2.1}$$

where γ is the anomalous dimension of the target gluon distribution. The main difference among these models comes from the predicted behaviour for the anomalous dimension (for a detailed comparison among them, see Ref. [7]), where the form of anomalous dimension is constructed considering known anlalytical solutions to the BFKL equation. In this letter we only present the form of the anomalous dimension given by the parameterization in Ref. [3] (which we have called by DHJ model):

$$\gamma(Y, \boldsymbol{r}^2) \ = \gamma_s + \Delta\gamma(Y, \boldsymbol{r}^2) \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$\Delta\gamma(Y, \boldsymbol{r}^2) = (1 - \gamma_s)\frac{|\log \frac{1}{\boldsymbol{r}^2 Q_T^2}|}{\lambda Y + |\log \frac{1}{\boldsymbol{r}^2 Q_T^2}| + d\sqrt{Y}} \ , \tag{2.3}$$

with $Q_T = Q_s(Y)$ a typical hard scale in the process, $\lambda = 0.3$ and $d = 1.2$. $\gamma_s = 0.63$ is the anomalous dimension for BFKL evolution with saturation boundary condition [8].

3. Results and discussion

We start with a comparison between the models: GBW [4], IIM [5], KKT [6], KKTm [9] and DHJ [3] (for a better understanding a check in



Fig. 1. Forward dipole cross section, as a function of the size dipole.

these references is suggested). In fig. 1 we compare the behaviour for the forward amplitude $\mathcal{N}$ as a function of the squared dipole size. The BK line correspond to a numerical solution of the BK equation with no-dependence in impact parameter [10]. The behaviour of the curves IIM, KKT and GBW we have already discussed in [7].

As already said before, the main difference between these parameterizations is the anomalous dimension. The difference between them can be demonstrated studying the Q^2 behaviour of the effective anomalous dimension, defined by $\gamma_{eff} = \frac{d\ln\mathcal{N}(rQ_s,Y)}{d\ln(r^2Q_s^2/4)}$. In fig. 2, is shown γ_{eff} as a function of the scaling variable rQ_s (a) and the virtuality Q^2 (b), using the average dipole size as $r = 2/Q$. We see that, while the GBW model presents a fast convergence to the DGLAP anomalous dimension at large Q^2, the IIM parameterization has a mild growth with virtuality, converging to $\gamma \approx 0.85$ at large Q^2. The KKTm and IIM parameterizations are similar at large Q^2, but differ at small virtualities, with the KKTm one predicting a smaller value. On the other hand, the predictions of the DHJ and GKMN parameterizations are similar at small Q^2 and differ at large virtualities. Here is convenient to remember that GKMN line, represents the modification in DHJ model. We have assumed that the Q_T is a constant factor, like $Q_T = Q_0 = 1$ GeV, *i. e.* that the typical scale is energy independent. As seen in Ref. [1], with this modification our prediction agree with experimental data. As a last check, in this reference, we have checked that the RHIC data are still well reproduced after these modications.

As a summary, in this letter we have analyzed current parameterizations for the dipole scattering amplitude which are able to describe separately the *ep* HERA and *dAu* RHIC data as well the parameterization in [1] that is



(a) (b)

Fig. 2. (a) The effective anomalous dimension as a function of the scaling variable rQ_s and (b) the Q^2 behaviour, at $x = 3 \times 10^{-4}$.

able to describe both sets of data.

This work was partially financed by the Brazilian funding agencies CNPq, FAPESP and FAPERGS.

REFERENCES

[1] V. P. Goncalves, M. S. Kugeratski, M. V. T. Machado and F. S. Navarra, Phys. Lett. **B643**, 273 (2006), and references therein.

[2] E. Iancu, A. Leonidov and L. McLerran, Nucl.Phys. **A692** (2001) 583; E. Ferreiro, E. Iancu, A. Leonidov and L. McLerran, Nucl. Phys. **A701**, 489 (2002).

[3] A. Dumitru, A. Hayashigaki and J. Jalilian-Marian, Nucl. Phys. A **765**, 464 (2006); Nucl. Phys. A **770**, 57 (2006).

[4] K. Golec-Biernat and M. Wüsthoff, Phys. Rev. D **59** (1999) 014017, *ibid.* **D60**, 114023 (1999).

[5] E. Iancu, K. Itakura, S. Munier, Phys. Lett. **B590**, 199 (2004).

[6] D. Kharzeev, Y.V. Kovchegov and K. Tuchin, Phys. Lett. **B599**, 23 (2004).

[7] M. S. Kugeratski, V. P. Goncalves and F. S. Navarra, Eur. Phys. J. C **44**, 577 (2005).

[8] E. Iancu, K. Itakura and L. McLerran, Nucl. Phys **A708**, 327 (2002).

[9] M. V. T. Machado, Eur. Phys. J. C **47**, 365 (2006).

[10] E. Gostman, E. Levin, M. Lublinski and U. Maor, Eur. Phys. J. C **27**, 411 (2003).