

TWO-PHOTON EXCHANGE IN $p\bar{p} \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- X$ AND A COMPARISON WITH QCD

B. SCHREMPF¹ and F. SCHREMPF¹

II. Institut für Theoretische Physik der Universität Hamburg, Germany

Received 22 October 1980

A thorough study of lepton-pair production from two-photon annihilation in $p\bar{p}$ collisions is presented. The differential cross section is calculated over a large range of energies ($27 \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 800$ GeV) as a function of the dilepton mass M as well as the dilepton transverse momentum Q_T and the Feynman variable x_F . No kinematical approximations (such as the equivalent photon approximation) are made. For $Q_T \approx 0$ the two-photon mechanism represents an important fraction of the $pp \rightarrow e^+e^-X$ cross section already at ISR energies, whereas at ISABELLE energies it dramatically dominates in the interval $0 \leq Q_T \leq 1$ GeV. At ISR energies these conclusions follow from a direct comparison of the two-photon contribution with $pp \rightarrow e^+e^-X$ data. For the ISABELLE energy range the expected $O(\alpha_s)$ QCD contribution to $pp \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-X$, corrected for soft gluon radiation to all orders (in leading bilogarithmic approximation), was taken as a reference. At larger Q_T and ISR energies the $\gamma\gamma$ contribution is negligible, whereas at $\sqrt{s} = 800$ GeV $\gamma\gamma/\text{QCD} \simeq 10\text{--}20\%$ almost everywhere. Furthermore, two-photon candidate events from the ISR are shown to be in reasonable agreement with theory. A decomposition of the $\gamma\gamma$ cross section into contributions from both proton vertices being elastic, inelastic and of mixed configuration is given. The results provide important clues for a future isolation of the two-photon mechanism.

1. Introduction

There is increasing theoretical and experimental activity in studying particle production from photon-photon annihilation. Both, the purely electromagnetic subprocess $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-$ and the subprocess $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow$ hadrons, including $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow$ q-jet and \bar{q} -jet at large transverse momentum, have recently been identified in e^+e^- collisions for the first time [1]. Moreover, first qualitative evidence for two-photon events of the type

$$pp \rightarrow \gamma\gamma X \\ \quad \quad \quad \hookrightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$$

has recently been reported [2] from the ISR.

¹ Heisenberg foundation fellow

In this paper we shall study in detail the two-photon contribution, $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$, in $\text{p p}^{(\ominus)}$ collisions. More specifically, we calculate the two-photon contribution to $\text{p p}^{(\ominus)} \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- \text{X}$ over a large range of energies as a function of the dilepton mass M as well as the dilepton transverse momentum Q_T and the Feynman variable $x_F = 2Q_L/\sqrt{s}$.

Up to now, only calculations of the two-photon contribution integrated over transverse and longitudinal lepton pair momenta, i.e. $d\sigma^{\gamma\gamma}/dM$ (or at best estimates of $d^2\sigma/dM dx_F|_{x_F=0}$) have been available [3–6]. Recently the $O(\alpha^4)$ two-photon contribution to $d\sigma/dM$ ($\text{pp} \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- \text{X}$) has been compared to the $O(\alpha^2)$ Drell-Yan mechanism [5, 6]. The $\gamma\gamma$ contribution was found to increase strongly with c.m. energy and to represent a serious competition process to the Drell-Yan mechanism for sufficiently high energies, both for $\tau \equiv M^2/s \ll 1$ and for $\tau \gtrsim 0.25$, say.

Of course, the relative importance of the two-photon mechanism may also vary dramatically with Q_T (and x_F). Let us briefly discuss the rough expectations.

For small values of Q_T the two-photon subprocess is expected to show a very steep Q_T distribution, much steeper than the total $\text{pp} \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- \text{X}$ distribution. Thus it seems well possible that the $\gamma\gamma$ mechanism becomes important, if not dominant, at small Q_T (even for values of τ and s where its Q_T integrated contribution is not large).

Recently, arguments have been put forward that perturbative QCD predictions for the lepton pair Q_T distribution remain reliable down to small Q_T , $\Lambda \lesssim Q_T \ll M$, if suitable resummation techniques are used, accounting for the emission of soft gluons to all orders [7–11]. In such a framework, the peak near $Q_T \approx 0$ is predicted to flatten dramatically (or even show a turnover) with a width proportional to $(M^2/\Lambda^2)^{0.31}$. Therefore, it is clearly important to investigate, whether this characteristic QCD effect is swamped by the two-photon contribution at high energies.

At large Q_T , one expects from dimensional analysis the same power behaviour,

$$s \frac{d^3\sigma^{\gamma\gamma}}{d\sqrt{\tau} dQ_T^2 dY} \underset{\tau, Q_T/\sqrt{s}, Y \text{ fixed}}{\sim} \underset{Q_T \text{ large}}{Q_T^{-2}} f\left(\tau, \frac{Q_T^2}{s}, Y, \log s\right), \quad (1)$$

for the two-photon contribution as for the $O(\alpha_s)$ QCD corrections to the Drell-Yan mechanism (involving the subprocess $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma$ gluon and gluon + $q \rightarrow \gamma q$). However, whereas the $O(\alpha_s)$ QCD contribution [12, 13] decreases for increasing energies due to logarithmic scaling violations, the two-photon cross section shows a quite dramatic increase like a power of $\log s$.

One might, therefore, well suspect that at very high energies and largish Q_T the two-photon mechanism contributes again at least a sizeable fraction to the lepton-pair cross section.

At the forthcoming very high energy machines (ISABELLE, $\bar{\text{p}}\text{p}$ collider, ...) there will certainly be measurements of the lepton pair Q_T distribution, tailored to test the

predictions of perturbative QCD. Correspondingly, an important issue in this paper is an extensive comparison between the two-photon contribution and predictions of perturbative QCD for $pp \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- X$ both at small and large Q_T and high energies $\sqrt{s} \leq 800$ GeV.

In summary, the purpose of this paper is to determine the kinematical regions (in all variables M , Q_T , x_F and \sqrt{s}), where the two-photon mechanism makes up a sizeable fraction of the differential $pp \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- X$ cross section. We particularly concentrate on Q_T distributions and energies available to the next generation of experiments.

This investigation is useful

(i) for estimating a significant two-photon background to perturbative QCD predictions;

(ii) for a future experimental isolation of the two-photon mechanism as a process of interest in itself.

Moreover, let us mention another possibly interesting aspect of this investigation: once the calculational machinery is set up for $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$, one may obtain—with minor modifications—information on signature and rates of events from the subprocesses $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow$ q-jet + \bar{q} -jet and $\gamma +$ gluon \rightarrow q-jet + \bar{q} -jet in $pp \rightarrow 2$ jets + X.

The paper is organized as follows. Sect. 2 is devoted to the details of calculation: subsect. 2.1 contains a short summary of the general formalism for

$$pp \rightarrow \gamma\gamma X \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- ;$$

in subsect. 2.2 we introduce the so-called ‘transverse photon’ approximation; subsect. 2.3 contains the parametrizations used for the elastic and inelastic proton form factors; in subsect. 2.4 we specify the QCD prototype calculation used for comparison, and subsect. 2.5 contains some kinematical restrictions, which our external variables have to satisfy. In sect. 3 we present and discuss our results: subsect. 3.1 contains information on the numerical calculations and various checks of the results; in subsect. 3.2 we decompose the $\gamma\gamma$ cross section into contributions from elastic and inelastic proton vertices and point out the dominant configurations in various kinematical regions. Our results for fixed values of Q_T and M and energies $27 \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 800$ GeV are presented in subsect. 3.3. The $\gamma\gamma$ mechanism is compared (i) with ISR data for

$$pp \rightarrow e^+ e^- X \text{ and } pp \rightarrow \gamma\gamma X \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- ,$$

(ii) with our QCD reference cross section for $pp \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- X$ with particular emphasis on very high (ISABELLE) energies. Subsect. 3.4 contains our results for fixed $x_T = 2Q_T/\sqrt{s}$ and $\tau = M^2/s \gtrsim 0.1$ and again a comparison with the contribution

expected from QCD. In subsect. 3.5 we briefly discuss the characteristics of the x_F dependence of the $\gamma\gamma$ mechanism. We close with a summary and conclusions in sect. 4. In the appendix we list the exact expressions for the kinematical boundaries of our four integration variables.

2. Details of calculation

2.1 GENERAL FORMALISM

A detailed presentation of the general formalism for the two-photon mechanism in proton-proton (antiproton) collisions

$$p\bar{p} \xrightarrow{(-)} \gamma\gamma X \quad (2)$$

$\searrow \ell^+ \ell^-$

may be found in refs. [3, 4]. Here, we shall only summarize the essential steps. Our notation is displayed in fig. 1, with proton four-momenta p_i ($i=1,2$), virtual (space-like) photon four-momenta q_i ($q_i^2 = -Q_i^2 < 0$), lepton four-momenta k_i , proton mass m and lepton mass μ . Moreover, let

$$Q \equiv k_1 + k_2 = q_1 + q_2 = (Q^0, Q_T, Q_L) \quad (3)$$

be the dilepton four-momentum with

$$Q^2 = M^2. \quad (4)$$

All kinematical variables (if not invariant) refer to the overall pp c.m. frame.




Fig. 1 Kinematics of the process $pp \rightarrow \gamma\gamma X \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$

The cross section for reaction (2) may be expressed [3, 4], according to the optical theorem, in terms of the absorptive parts of the virtual forward Compton amplitude and of the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ amplitude with $\ell^+\ell^-$ intermediate state (fig 2):

$$d\sigma = \frac{2m^2}{\sqrt{\lambda(s, m^2, m^2)}} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right)^2 \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{q_1^4 q_2^4} W_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}(-q_1, p_1) \times a^{\nu\nu', \mu\mu'}(q_1, q_2) W_{\mu\nu'}^{(2)}(-q_2, p_2) d^4q_1 d^4q_2, \tag{5}$$

where

$$\lambda(x, y, z) = x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - 2xy - 2xz - 2yz. \tag{6}$$

$a^{\nu\nu', \mu\mu'}(q_1, q_2)$ is the absorptive part of the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ amplitude, computable [3, 4] in QED:

$$a^{\nu\nu', \mu\mu'}(q_1, q_2) = \sum_{\text{lepton spins}} \int \frac{d^3k_1}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d^3k_2}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\mu^2}{k_1^0 k_2^0} (2\pi)^4 \times \delta^4(k_1 + k_2 - q_1 - q_2) T^{\mu\mu'}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-) T^{\nu\nu'*}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-), \tag{7}$$

and $W_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$ is the absorptive part of the forward (proton) Compton amplitude with standard decomposition into invariant structure functions W_1 and W_2 ,

$$W_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}(-q_i, p_i) = -W_1^{(i)}(x_i, Q_i^2) \left(g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{q_{i\mu}q_{i\nu}}{q_i^2} \right) + \frac{W_2^{(i)}(x_i, Q_i^2)}{m^2} \left(p_{i\mu} - \frac{q_{i\mu}q_i \cdot p_i}{q_i^2} \right) \left(p_{i\nu} - \frac{q_{i\nu}q_i \cdot p_i}{q_i^2} \right), \tag{8}$$




Fig 2. The optical theorem for $pp \rightarrow \gamma\gamma X$
 $\hookrightarrow \ell^+\ell^-$

involving the Bjorken scaling variables

$$x_i = -\frac{q_i^2}{2q_i \cdot p_i} = \frac{Q_i^2}{2q_i \cdot p_i}, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (9)$$

It is convenient [3, 4] to evaluate eq. (5) in terms of helicity amplitudes defined in the $\gamma\gamma$ c.m.s. The helicity projections of the amplitudes take the standard form in terms of photon polarization vectors $\epsilon_\lambda^\mu(q)$:

$$\alpha_{\lambda_1, \lambda_4, \lambda_1, \lambda_2}(q_1^2, q_2^2, M^2) = \epsilon_{\lambda_1}^{\nu^*}(q_1) \epsilon_{\lambda_4}^{\nu'^*}(q_2) \epsilon_{\lambda_1}^\mu(q_1) \epsilon_{\lambda_2}^{\mu'}(q_2) a_{\nu\nu', \mu\mu'}(q_1, q_2). \quad (10)$$

The helicity projections of the tensor $W_{\mu\nu}^{(i)}$ are defined analogously.

The polarization vectors fulfill the standard orthogonality and completeness relations

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_m^\mu(q) \epsilon_{m'}^\nu(q) g_{\mu\nu} &= (-1)^m \delta_{mm'}, \\ \sum_m (-1)^m \epsilon_m^\mu(q) \epsilon_m^\nu(q) &= g^{\mu\nu} - q^\mu q^\nu / q^2, \\ q^\nu \epsilon_m^\mu(q) g_{\mu\nu} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

By P and T invariance there remain eight independent $\gamma\gamma$ helicity amplitudes or equivalently $\gamma\gamma$ cross sections σ_{ab} for transverse ($a, b = T \triangleq \lambda = \pm 1$) and scalar ($a, b = S \triangleq \lambda = 0$) photon polarization and interferences (τ_{ab}) thereof. They are given, e.g. in ref. [4]. For our case of unpolarized protons only six $\gamma\gamma$ cross sections occur. In particular, for $|q_i^2| \ll Q^2 \equiv M^2$ the dominant $\gamma\gamma$ cross section is [4]

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{TT}(M^2, q_1^2, q_2^2) &= (a_{11, 11} + a_{1-1, 1-1}) / \left(4\sqrt{\lambda(M^2, q_1^2, q_2^2)} \right) \\ &= \frac{4\pi\alpha^2}{\lambda(M^2, q_1^2, q_2^2)} \left[\frac{1}{2} (M^2 - q_1^2 - q_2^2) \right. \\ &\quad \times L \left\{ 2 + \frac{2\mu^2}{x} - \left(\frac{2\mu^2}{q_1 \cdot q_2} \right)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{q_1^2 + q_2^2}{x} + \frac{q_1^2 q_2^2 M^2}{2x(q_1 q_2)^2} + \frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{q_1^2 q_2^2}{x(q_1 q_2)} \right)^2 \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \Delta t \left\{ 1 + \frac{\mu^2}{x} + \frac{q_1^2 + q_2^2}{x} + \frac{q_1^2 q_2^2}{4x\mu^2 + q_1^2 q_2^2} + \frac{3}{4} \frac{q_1^2 q_2^2}{x^2} \right\} \right] \\ &= \frac{4\pi\alpha^2}{M^2} \mathcal{O}(L), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

with

$$M^2 x = (q_1 \cdot q_2)^2 - q_1^2 q_2^2 = \frac{1}{4} \lambda(M^2, q_1^2, q_2^2), \quad (13)$$

$$\Delta t = t_{\max} - t_{\min} = \sqrt{4x(M^2 - 4\mu^2)}, \quad (14)$$

$$L = \ln \frac{\mu^2 - t_{\min}}{\mu^2 - t_{\max}} = \ln \frac{(M^2 - q_1^2 - q_2^2 + \Delta t)^2}{4(q_1^2 q_2^2 + 4x\mu^2)}. \quad (15)$$

The other $\gamma\gamma$ cross sections behave as [4]

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\text{TT}} &= \frac{4\pi\alpha^2}{M^2} \text{O} \left(L \frac{q_1^2 q_2^2}{M^4} \right), \\ \sigma_{\text{TS}} &= \frac{4\pi\alpha^2}{M^2} \text{O} \left(-\frac{q_2^2}{M^2} \right), & \sigma_{\text{ST}} &= \frac{4\pi\alpha^2}{M^2} \text{O} \left(-\frac{q_1^2}{M^2} \right), \\ \tau_{\text{TS}} &= \frac{4\pi\alpha^2}{M^2} \text{O} \left(\frac{\sqrt{q_1^2 q_2^2}}{M^2} \right), & \sigma_{\text{SS}} &= \frac{4\pi\alpha^2}{M^2} \text{O} \left(L \frac{q_1^2 q_2^2}{M^4} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

For $|q_i^2| < M^2$ the quantities (16) are negligibly small [4] in comparison with σ_{TT} , but in σ_{TT} the q_i^2 dependence is essential in the large domain $M^2\mu^2 < q_1^2 q_2^2 < M^4$.

As outlined in sect. 1 we are interested in the differential cross section $d^3\sigma/dM^2 dQ_{\text{T}}^2 dY$, Y being the lepton-pair rapidity in the pp c.m.s., defined as

$$Y = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{Q^0 + Q_{\text{L}}}{Q^0 - Q_{\text{L}}}, \quad (17)$$

and related to Feynman x_{F} by

$$x_{\text{F}} = \frac{2Q_{\text{L}}}{\sqrt{s}} = \frac{2\sqrt{M^2 + Q_{\text{T}}^2}}{\sqrt{s}} \sinh Y. \quad (18)$$

Furthermore,

$$Q^0 = q_1^0 + q_2^0 = \sqrt{M^2 + Q_{\text{T}}^2} \cosh Y. \quad (19)$$

A straightforward calculation leads to the jacobian relation:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^4 q_1 d^4 q_2}{(q_1^2)^2 (q_2^2)^2} &= \frac{s}{4\lambda(s, m^2, m^2)} \frac{2\pi}{4\sqrt{-\lambda(Q_{\text{T}}^2, |\mathbf{q}_{1\text{T}}|^2, |\mathbf{q}_{2\text{T}}|^2)}} \\ &\times dM^2 dQ_{\text{T}}^2 dY \frac{dx_1}{x_1^2} \frac{dx_2}{x_2^2} \frac{dQ_1^2}{Q_1^2} \frac{dQ_2^2}{Q_2^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where one trivial azimuthal integration has already been performed. The Bjorken variables are defined in (9) and $-q_i^2 = Q_i^2$. Obviously, four integrations have to be performed in eq. (5) in order to calculate $d^3\sigma/dM^2 dQ_T^2 dY$. Let us remark that the $O(2,1)$ variables used in ref. [3] for a calculation of $d\sigma/dM^2$ are not so advantageous here.

The kinematical boundaries for the four integration variables x_i and Q_i^2 , $i = 1, 2$, are obtained as follows.

First, the range of the integration variable Q_2^2 as a function of Q_1^2 , x_1 and x_2 is restricted from

$$-\lambda(Q_T^2, |\mathbf{q}_{1T}|^2, |\mathbf{q}_{2T}|^2) \equiv (Q_T^2 - (|\mathbf{q}_{1T}| - |\mathbf{q}_{2T}|)^2) \times (-Q_T^2 + (|\mathbf{q}_{1T}| + |\mathbf{q}_{2T}|)^2) \geq 0 \quad (21)$$

in order to keep $\sqrt{-\lambda}$ real in eq. (20). The r.h.s. of eq. (21) depends on Q_2^2 quadratically (see appendix). Thus, $Q_{2\min}^2(Q_1^2, x_1, x_2)$ is obtained as solution of the equation $\lambda = 0$ in the form

$$Q_{2\min}^2 = \frac{x_2}{2a} (-b \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}), \quad (22)$$

with a , b and c given in the appendix.

The range of the integration variable Q_1^2 as a function of x_1 and x_2 is then restricted by the condition

$$b^2 - 4ac \geq 0. \quad (23)$$

Thus $Q_{1\min}^2(x_1, x_2)$ is obtained as solution of the equation $b^2 - 4ac = 0$ in the form

$$Q_{1\min}^2 = \frac{x_1}{2A} (-B \mp \sqrt{B^2 - 4AC}), \quad (24)$$

with A , B and C given in the appendix.

Similarly $x_{1,\min}(x_2)$ is determined from the roots of the limiting equation $B^2 - 4AC = 0$ (see appendix) and

$$x_{1,\max} = 1.$$

Finally

$$x_{2,\min} = x_{1,\min}(Y \rightarrow -Y, x_2 = 1) \quad (25)$$

and

$$x_{2,\max} = 1. \quad (26)$$

2.2 THE TRANSVERSE APPROXIMATION

Usually, in two-photon physics, the so-called equivalent photon approximation (EPA) is applied [4, 5], effecting great simplification. The essence of the EPA consists of

- (i) treating the two photons *on-shell* ($q_i^2 \simeq 0$);
- (ii) retaining only *transverse* photon polarization.

As a result of (i) and (ii) the cross section *factorizes* into a product of a $\gamma\gamma$ cross section and “flux factors” from the equivalent photon spectra produced by the colliding particles.

Unfortunately, approximation (i) is not suitable for our purposes. Since we are interested in a kinematical region where both

$$(q_1 + q_2)^2 = Q^2 = M^2$$

and

$$(q_{1T} + q_{2T})^2 = Q_T^2 \tag{27}$$

are large, we must certainly go beyond (i) of the EPA [cf. also appendix, eqs. (A.8, A.12)].

In view of eqs. (16) condition (ii) of the EPA also becomes doubtful for large Q_T . In principle one ought to take into account *all* $\gamma\gamma$ cross sections, to treat the q_i^2 dependences in eqs. (12), (16) exactly and to perform the q_i^2 integrations. However, in order to keep computing efforts within reasonable limits, in this investigation we have taken into account the transverse $\gamma\gamma$ cross section σ_{TT} only. Because of the numerical smallness [4] of the neglected cross sections relative to σ_{TT} for $|q_i^2|/M^2 \lesssim 1$, our results should be quite accurate for not too large Q_T^2/M^2 . At very large values of Q_T they should at least represent an order of magnitude estimate in the sense of a lower bound for the $\gamma\gamma$ contribution.

The important point is, that we calculate σ_{TT} exactly [eq. (12)], i.e. we retain the full q_i^2 dependences and perform the q_i^2 integrations explicitly.

Moreover, let us point out an important technical detail: one has to be very careful when making approximations in the expressions for the integration limits (see appendix). For large Q_T significant contributions come from close to the kinematical boundaries of the integration variables. Even neglecting nucleon mass effects in the integration limits may lead to negative cross sections. The present calculation has been performed with the exact expressions for the integration limits, given in the appendix.

With the transverse approximation specified above and the jacobian relation (20), the cross section (5) takes the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{d^3\sigma^{\text{transv}}}{dM^2 dQ_1^2 dY} \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{p p}^{(-)} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma X \\ \downarrow \ell^+ \ell^- \end{array} \right) \\
 &= \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{\pi} \right)^2 \frac{1}{s^2} \int_{x_{2,\text{min}}}^1 \frac{dx_2}{x_2^2} \int_{x_{1,\text{min}}}^1 \frac{dx_1}{x_1^2} \int_{Q_{1,\text{min}}^2}^{Q_{1,\text{max}}^2} \frac{dQ_1^2}{Q_1^2} \int_{Q_{2,\text{min}}^2}^{Q_{2,\text{max}}^2} \frac{dQ_2^2}{Q_2^2} \\
 & \quad \times \frac{x_2}{\sqrt{(u_2^2 + [m^2/(s-4m^2)]x_T^2)(Q_2^2 - Q_{2,\text{min}}^2)(Q_{2,\text{max}}^2 - Q_2^2)}} \\
 & \quad \times W_{++}^{(1)} \frac{\sigma_{\text{TT}} \sqrt{\lambda(M^2, -Q_1^2, -Q_2^2)}}{4\pi\alpha^2} W_{++}^{(2)}, \tag{28}
 \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
 W_{++}^{(1)} &= 2mW_1(x_1, Q_1^2) + \frac{\nu W_2(x_1, Q_1^2)}{x_1} \\
 & \quad \times \left[\frac{2}{\lambda(M^2, -Q_1^2, -Q_2^2)} \left\{ (sx_1\xi_1 + Q_1^2)(sx_1\xi_1 - M^2) - sx_1\xi_1 Q_2^2 \right\} - \frac{2m^2 x_1^2}{Q_1^2} \right], \\
 W_{++}^{(2)} &= W_{++}^{(1)}(x_1 \leftrightarrow x_2, Q_1^2 \leftrightarrow Q_2^2, \xi_1 \leftrightarrow \xi_2), \tag{29}
 \end{aligned}$$

where σ_{TT} is given in eq. (12), the integration limits in the appendix, and

$$x_T = \frac{2Q_T}{\sqrt{s}}, \quad \tau = \frac{M^2}{s}, \quad \bar{x}_T = \sqrt{4\tau + x_T^2}, \tag{30}$$

$$\xi_2 = \frac{1}{2}\bar{x}_T \left(\cosh Y \mp \sqrt{\frac{s-4m^2}{s}} \sinh Y \right), \tag{31}$$

$$u_2^1 = x_2^1 - \frac{1}{2}\bar{x}_T \left(\cosh Y \pm \sqrt{\frac{s}{s-4m^2}} \sinh Y \right). \tag{32}$$

Moreover, in eq. (28)

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sqrt{-\frac{(u_2^2 + [m^2/(s-4m^2)]x_T^2)}{x_2^2} (Q_2^2 - Q_{2,\text{min}}^2)(Q_{2,\text{max}}^2 - Q_2^2)} \\
 &= \sqrt{-\lambda(Q_T^2, |\mathbf{q}_{1T}|^2, |\mathbf{q}_{2T}|^2)}. \tag{33}
 \end{aligned}$$

We recall that eq. (28) does not contain any approximations so far apart from the “transverse” one.

2.3 STRUCTURE FUNCTIONS

The proton structure functions $2mW_1$ and νW_2 represent the second building block besides the $\gamma\gamma$ helicity amplitudes, entering the

$$\begin{array}{c} pp \rightarrow \gamma\gamma X \\ \quad \quad \quad \hookrightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- \end{array}$$

cross section.

The elastic contribution reads [3, 4]

$$\begin{aligned} 2mW_1(x, Q^2) &\Rightarrow \delta(x-1)G_M^2(Q^2) \\ \nu W_2(x, Q^2) &\Rightarrow \delta(x-1)\left(G_E^2(Q^2) + \frac{Q^2}{4m^2}G_M^2(Q^2)\right) / \left(1 + \frac{Q^2}{4m^2}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where G_E and G_M are the usual electric and magnetic proton form factors and have the normalization $G_E(0) = 1$ and $G_M(0) = \mu_p$, with proton magnetic moment $\mu_p = 2.79$. In our calculations we use the standard dipole fit

$$G_E(Q^2) = \frac{G_M(Q^2)}{\mu_p} = \left(1 + \frac{Q^2}{m_0^2}\right)^{-2}, \quad m_0^2 = 0.71 \text{ GeV}^2. \quad (35)$$

For the inelastic structure functions $2mW_1$ and νW_2 , one may use, in principle, the experimental data directly as functions of x_i and Q_i^2 . For simplicity, however, we adopt for νW_2 the parametrization of Bloom and Gilman [14] in terms of the variable

$$\begin{aligned} \omega'_i &= \frac{1}{x_i} + \frac{m^2}{Q_i^2}, \\ \nu W_2 &= 0.557\left(1 - \frac{1}{\omega'}\right)^3 + 2.1978\left(1 - \frac{1}{\omega'}\right)^4 - 2.5954\left(1 - \frac{1}{\omega'}\right)^5, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

together with a more recent fit by Fox [15] for

$$R = \frac{\nu W_2}{2mxW_1} \left(1 + \frac{4m^2x^2}{Q^2}\right) - 1 = \frac{0.861Q^2}{(Q^2 + 0.988)^2} \quad [Q^2 \text{ in GeV}^2]. \quad (37)$$

This parametrization obviously ignores the resonance fluctuations present in the

data. However, since only integrals over the structure functions of the form

$$\int \frac{dQ^2}{Q^2} \int \frac{dx}{x^2} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 2mW_1(x, Q^2) \\ \nu W_2(x, Q^2) \end{array} \right\} \quad (38)$$

appear in eq. (28), one may qualitatively invoke duality arguments [16] to argue that these fluctuations probably will wash out in the integrals and that parametrization (36), (37) may thus be used right down to the inelastic threshold to good approximation.

The inelastic threshold condition,

$$(p_i - q_i)^2 \geq (m + m_{\pi^0})^2, \quad (39)$$

gives the constraint (for $x_i \neq 1$)

$$Q_i^2 \geq \frac{x_i}{1-x_i} [(m + m_{\pi^0})^2 - m^2] \simeq 0.27 \text{ GeV}^2 \frac{x_i}{1-x_i}, \quad (40)$$

which was built into our calculation.

In fact, one easily finds that the minimal Q_i^2 for inelastic scattering in eq. (40) increases* with Q_T^2 and hence, for large enough Q_T^2 , the resonance fluctuations should not matter anyway

For small Q_T and M we follow ref. [3] and multiply νW_2 in eq. (36) with a correction factor

$$\nu W_2^{(i)} \rightarrow \nu W_2^{(i)} Q_i^2 / (Q_i^2 + 0.15 \text{ GeV}^2) \quad (41)$$

in order to restore the gauge-invariance condition

$$W_2^{(i)}|_{Q_i^2=0} = 0, \quad (42)$$

and to match on to the observed real photoabsorption cross section $\sigma_{\gamma p}$ at $Q_i^2 = 0$.

2.4 QCD PROTOTYPE FOR $pp \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- X$

In order to assess the relative importance of the two-photon contribution in various regions of phase space, a suitable reference cross section is needed. Experimental data on $pp \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- X$ from FNAL are, at present, limited [17–19] to $\sqrt{s} \lesssim 27.3 \text{ GeV}$, $Q_T \lesssim 3.5 \text{ GeV}$ and $M \lesssim 12 \text{ GeV}$ and those from the ISR to $\sqrt{s} \lesssim 63 \text{ GeV}$, $Q_T \lesssim 6 \text{ GeV}$ and $M \lesssim 20 \text{ GeV}$. At small Q_T and ISR energies a direct

* E.g. for $x_F = 0$ this follows from using (see appendix) $x_i / (1 - x_i) \geq x_{2,\text{min}} / (1 - x_{2,\text{min}}) = (\frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_T - \tau) / (1 - \bar{x}_T + \tau - 4m^2/s)$ (with $\bar{x}_T^2 = 4\tau + x_T^2$) in eq. (40)

comparison of our differential two-photon distributions with representative ISR data is performed in subsect. 3.3.

For the discussion of our two-photon results in other kinematical regions—in particular at ISABELLE energies—we take simple, perturbative QCD estimates for $pp \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- X$ as a reference.

For $Q_T = O(M) \gg \Lambda$, the $O(\alpha_s)$ corrections to the Drell-Yan mechanism, i.e. the subprocesses

$$q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^* \quad + \text{gluon}, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{gluon} + q \rightarrow \gamma^* \quad + q, \\ \downarrow \ell^+ \ell^- \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \downarrow \ell^+ \ell^- \quad (43)$$

may be expected to represent the dominant QCD contributions to the dilepton Q_T distribution. The corresponding cross sections $d\sigma^{\text{QCD}}/dM^2 dQ_T^2 dY$ have been calculated by various authors [12, 13] and qualitatively agree with existing experimental data for a reasonable value of the running coupling constant [12]

$$\langle \alpha_s \rangle \simeq 0.3 \quad (44)$$

over the mass range $5 \leq M \leq 10$ GeV.

The calculation by Kajantie and Raitio [12] represents a simple prototype and we have chosen to take it as a QCD reference for our $\gamma\gamma$ results in the region $Q_T = O(M) \gg \Lambda$. The $O(\alpha_s)$ QCD expressions to be used read as follows [12]:

$$s \frac{d^3\sigma(q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma^*g)}{d\sqrt{\tau} dQ_T^2 dY} = \frac{8}{3} \frac{\pi\alpha^2}{(\sqrt{\tau})^3} \frac{\alpha_s(s\tau)}{2\pi} \frac{4}{9} \frac{\tau}{Q_T^2} \\ \times \int_{x_{1,\text{min}}}^1 \frac{dx_1}{x_1 x_2} \sum_{i=1}^f e_i^2 [F_i(x_1) \bar{F}_i(x_2) + (1 \leftrightarrow 2)] \\ \times \frac{1 + \tau^2 / (x_1 x_2)^2 - x_T^2 / (2x_1 x_2)}{x_1 - \frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_T e^Y}, \quad (45)$$

and

$$s \frac{d^3\sigma(qg \rightarrow q\gamma^*)}{d\sqrt{\tau} dQ_T^2 dY} = \frac{8}{3} \frac{\pi\alpha^2}{(\sqrt{\tau})^3} \frac{\alpha_s(s\tau)}{2\pi} \frac{1}{3} \frac{\tau}{Q_T^2} \\ \times \int_{x_{1,\text{min}}}^1 \frac{dx_1 (\frac{1}{2} x_T)^2}{(x_1 - \frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_T e^Y) (x_1 x_2)^3} \\ \times \sum_{i=1}^f e_i^2 \left[F_i^{(1)}(x_1) G^{(2)}(x_2) \times \frac{(x_1 x_2 - \tau)^2 + \frac{1}{4} (x_1 x_2 + \tau + V)^2}{x_1 x_2 - \tau + V} \right. \\ \left. + (1 \leftrightarrow 2, V \leftrightarrow -V) \right], \quad (46)$$

where

$$x_2 = \frac{\frac{1}{2}\bar{x}_T e^{-Y} x_1 - \tau}{x_1 - \frac{1}{2}\bar{x}_T e^Y}, \quad x_{1, \text{min}} = \frac{\frac{1}{2}\bar{x}_T e^Y - \tau}{1 - \frac{1}{2}\bar{x}_T e^{-Y}},$$

$$V = \left\{ \left(x_1 x_2 - \frac{1}{4} (x_T + \bar{x}_T)^2 \right) \left(x_1 x_2 - \frac{1}{4} (x_T - \bar{x}_T)^2 \right) \right\}^{1/2}. \quad (47)$$

Moreover, simple quark (F) and gluon (G) distributions have been used in ref. [12]:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{valence:} \quad & V(x) = \frac{35}{32} \sqrt{x} (1-x)^3, \\ \text{sea:} \quad & S(x) = 0.15(1-x)^7, \\ \text{glue:} \quad & G(x) = \langle x_g \rangle (g+1)(1-x)^g, \quad g=7, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

$$\langle x_g \rangle = 0.56.$$

The exponents 3 and 7 in eq. (48) follow from counting rules, $V(x)$ is normalized to 1 when integrated over dx/x , the factor 0.15 in $S(x)$ was determined from neutrino data and $\langle x_g \rangle = 0.56$ from energy-momentum sum rules. It should be kept in mind, however, that the gluon distribution $G(x)$, in particular, is not very well known and hence introduces considerable uncertainties for large τ .

Instead of working with a fixed value of $\langle \alpha_s \rangle = 0.3$, as is done in ref. [12], we have taken instead

$$\alpha_s = \alpha_s(s\tau) \equiv \alpha_s(M^2) \simeq \frac{4\pi}{\beta_0 \ln(M^2/\Lambda^2)}, \quad (49)$$

with

$$\alpha_s(M^2 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2) = 1, \quad \text{i.e. } \Lambda \simeq 0.5 \text{ GeV}, \quad (50)$$

leading to

$$\alpha_s(5.5 \text{ GeV}^2) = 0.3. \quad (51)$$

As already pointed out in ref. 12, the argument of α_s is, of course, ambiguous.

We recall that the above $O(\alpha_s)$ QCD expression is formally valid only for $Q_T \sim M \gg \Lambda$. It would clearly be desirable also to have a reliable reference cross section in the region $Q_T \ll M$, \sqrt{s} large, since there the most sizeable manifestation of the two-photon mechanism is expected.

Starting with the work of DDT [7], arguments have been put forward that this region of Q_T may still remain accessible to (suitably resummed) perturbative QCD, provided that

$$\Lambda \lesssim Q_T \ll M \quad \text{and } \sqrt{s} \text{ large.} \quad (52)$$

In this region (52) the leading single logarithmic approximation [$\sim \alpha_s^n \ln^n M^2$] breaks down, since in addition large logarithms $\sim \ln(M^2/Q_T^2)$ appear.

However, several analyses [8–11] have recently suggested that, analogously to QED, the sum to all orders of both real and virtual gluon emission simply exponentiates to leading double-logarithmic approximation. Qualitatively, in Q_T space, this results [8–11] in a “quark form factor”

$$F_q(M^2, Q_T^2) \simeq \exp \left\{ - \int_{Q_T^2}^{M^2} dk_T^2 \left[\frac{d^3\sigma}{dk_T^2 dM dY} \Big|_{Y=0} / \frac{d^2\sigma}{dM dY} \Big|_{Y=0} \right]^{(\text{order } \alpha_s)} \right\} \quad (53)$$

$$\simeq \exp \left\{ - \frac{16}{25} \ln \frac{M^2}{\Lambda^2} \ln \left(\frac{\ln(M^2/\Lambda^2)}{\ln(Q_T^2/\Lambda^2)} \right) + \frac{16}{25} \ln \frac{M^2}{Q_T^2} \right\}, \quad (54)$$

producing a strong damping [if not a turnover, as implied in approximation (54)] of the $O(\alpha_s)$ Q_T distribution [8],

$$M^3 \frac{d^3\sigma}{dM dQ_T^2 dY} \Big|_{Y=0} \simeq M^3 \frac{d^2\sigma(\tau)}{dM dY} \Big|_{Y=0} \frac{d}{dQ_T^2} F_q(M^2, Q_T^2), \quad (55)$$

at small $Q_T \gtrsim \Lambda$.

The exponentiation of the $O(\alpha_s)$ result presents the advantage of being automatically in agreement with the lowest-order calculation when $Q_T \sim M$. Moreover, a characteristic prediction is that the peak near $Q_T \simeq 0$ flattens [8] with a width proportional to $(M^2/\Lambda^2)^{0.31}$.

As a reference for our two-photon results in the region $\Lambda \lesssim Q_T \ll M$, \sqrt{s} large, we take the shape of the Q_T distribution as given by Parisi and Petronzio [8] for ISABELLE energies and $M^2 = 120, 7500 \text{ GeV}^2$. It is a somewhat refined version of eq. (55), with exponentiation applied in impact parameter space and an intrinsic parton transverse momentum $\langle Q_T^2 \rangle_{\text{intr}} \simeq 0.4 \text{ GeV}^2$ accounted for (the effect of which turns out, however, to be unimportant [8] at ISABELLE energies and $Q_T \gtrsim 0.3 \text{ GeV}$).

We fix in addition the absolute normalization of the unnormalized Q_T distributions $dN/dM dQ_T^2 dY|_{Y=0}$ given in ref. [8] as follows:

We normalize them for larger $Q_T \gtrsim 2-4 \text{ GeV}$ to the $O(\alpha_s)$ calculation of Kajantie and Raitio [12], eqs. (45), (46), (48), since there the two shapes turn out to

agree nicely (see fig. 9). This way, the two QCD expressions used are consistent with each other. As a check for our normalization we extract the corresponding integrated cross section $M^3 d^2\sigma/dM dY|_{Y=0}$

(i) by integrating the normalized Q_T distribution of ref. [8] directly over Q_T^2 ;

(ii) by fitting it to the approximate equations (54), (55) at larger Q_T .

Both methods agree within $< 10\%$ and give

$$M^3 \frac{d^2\sigma^{\text{QCD}}}{dM dY}|_{Y=0} = \begin{cases} 8.4 \text{ nb} \cdot \text{GeV}^2 & \text{for } M^2 = 120 \text{ GeV}^2 \\ 3.4 \text{ nb} \cdot \text{GeV}^2 & \text{for } M^2 = 7500 \text{ GeV}^2 \end{cases},$$

and $\sqrt{s} = 800 \text{ GeV}$,

(56)

in qualitative agreement with experimental data [17–21] from FNAL and ISR for $\sqrt{\tau} \simeq 0.014$ and 0.11 .

2.5 KINEMATICAL RESTRICTIONS

In this subsection we list some kinematical restrictions, which our external variables

$$\tau = \frac{M^2}{s}, \quad x_F = \frac{2Q_L}{\sqrt{s}}, \quad x_T = \frac{2Q_T}{\sqrt{s}} \quad (57)$$

have to satisfy.

The fractional dilepton energy in the pp c.m.s. reads

$$\frac{2Q^0}{\sqrt{s}} = \{4\tau + x_F^2 + x_T^2\}^{1/2} = 1 + \tau - \frac{m'^2}{s}, \quad (58)$$

where m' is the total mass recoiling against the lepton pair. From the threshold restriction $m'^2 \gtrsim 4m^2$ we obtain from eq. (58)

$$|x_F| \lesssim \sqrt{(1 + \tau - 4m^2/s)^2 - 4\tau - x_T^2}$$

$$\underset{s \rightarrow \infty}{\simeq} \sqrt{(1 - \tau)^2 - x_T^2}, \quad (59)$$

$$x_T \lesssim 1 - \tau. \quad (60)$$

Therefore, in order to minimize effects due to the kinematical boundaries when displaying our results, we shall sometimes use the reduced variables

$$0 \leq \hat{x}_F \equiv \frac{Q_L}{Q_{L,\text{max}}} \simeq \frac{x_F}{\sqrt{(1 - \tau)^2 - x_T^2}} \leq 1, \quad (61)$$

$$0 \leq \hat{x}_T \equiv \frac{Q_T}{Q_{T,\text{max}}} \simeq \frac{x_T}{1 - \tau} \leq 1, \quad (62)$$

besides

$$0 \leq \tau = \frac{M^2}{s} \leq 1. \tag{63}$$

3. Results

3.1 NUMERICAL EVALUATION AND CHECKS

The four integrations in eq. (28) have been performed numerically with a Gauss-type integration method. A relative accuracy of 10% was required in every integration. A Monte Carlo method has also been tried, but, surprisingly, turned out to be more time consuming than the Gauss method*. Considerable effort was spent to obtain an estimate of the results in analytical form as well. This attempt remained, however, unsuccessful, since the dominant portion of the integration region turned out to depend on the external variables in a complicated way.

We have performed, among others, the following quantitative checks with our numerical results:

(i) The differential cross section $d^3\sigma/dM dQ_T^2 dY$ corresponding to the elastic configuration at the two proton vertices

$$pp \rightarrow \gamma\gamma pp \quad , \tag{64}$$

$$\quad \quad \quad \hookrightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- \quad ,$$

as well as the total two-photon contribution were integrated over Q_T^2 and Y . The resulting cross sections $d\sigma/dM^{(el-el)}$ were then compared to the accurate, existing calculations in ref. [3] for various values of s and M . The agreement turned out to be within $\sim 5\%$.

(ii) After integration over Q_T^2 only, we have checked our two-photon cross section $d\sigma/dM dY|_{Y=0}$ against ref. [5] for $s = 800 \text{ GeV}^2$ and $M^2/s = 0.2, 0.02$, and $\sqrt{s} = 800 \text{ GeV}$, $M^2 = 120 \text{ GeV}^2$ and $M^2 = 7500 \text{ GeV}^2$ with good agreement.

(iii) The total $\gamma\gamma$ contribution must clearly be symmetric under the substitution $x_F \leftrightarrow -x_F$. Hence, the comparison of our numerical results at x_F and $-x_F$ provides a powerful test of the accuracy of the numerical method used. This test is particularly non-trivial, since with the integration variables used the integrand is not manifestly symmetric in x_F .

On the one hand, we faced the computation of a cross section depending on as many as four variables, M , Q_T , x_F and \sqrt{s} . On the other hand, we had to keep computer time within reasonable limits. Therefore, we had to use rather large step sizes for our variables. In all our figures the points indicate the actually calculated values, whereas the curves are eyeball interpolations only.

* Probably, because, for large Q_T , no variable transformation leading to an overall slowly varying integrand could be found

3.2 THE DOMINANT CONFIGURATION

The total $\gamma\gamma$ contribution is composed of a sum of terms corresponding to each of the two $p\gamma X$ vertices in fig. 1 being either elastic or inelastic:

$$d\sigma\left(\begin{array}{c} pp \rightarrow \gamma\gamma X \\ \downarrow \\ \ell^+ \ell^- \end{array}\right) = d\sigma_{\text{el-el}} + d\sigma_{\text{el-inel}} + d\sigma_{\text{inel-el}} + d\sigma_{\text{inel-inel}}. \quad (65)$$

In figs. 3, 4 we have displayed* the various contributions in eq. (65) separately as functions of \sqrt{s} . Fig. 3 illustrates the situation for fixed (smallish) Q_T and fixed M , fig. 4 refers to fixed $x_T = 2Q_T/\sqrt{s}$ and fixed $\tau = M^2/s$. At very small $Q_T \simeq 0.1$ GeV and fixed M the double elastic configuration clearly dominates up to very high \sqrt{s} , where the elastic-inelastic configuration takes over (figs. 3a, b). At somewhat larger Q_T , the situation is quite different, however (see figs. 3c, d). There it is the elastic-inelastic configuration which is generally dominant, in particular over the presently accessible energy range. For fixed x_T and fixed τ the elastic-elastic contribution vanishes extremely fast with increasing \sqrt{s} . Ultimately, at very high energies, the double (deep) inelastic configuration takes over (fig. 4).

The dominance of the el-el configuration for small Q_T and the el-inel configuration for larger Q_T is an interesting result of our analysis. Its qualitative interpretation is: as long as Q_i^2 at a given vertex is kinematically allowed to remain small, this vertex prefers the elastic over the inelastic configuration with an almost on-shell photon. However, as soon as a Q_i^2 is forced by kinematics (large Q_T !) to become large at one vertex ($Q_i^2 \gtrsim m_p^2$), the suppression due to the elastic form factor is very much stronger than the one due to the (deep) inelastic structure function. Hence, in this case, the vertex becomes (deep) inelastic.

Our result has interesting experimental consequences: *triggering on one elastic proton vertex does not significantly reduce the rate for $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow q\text{-jet} + \bar{q}\text{-jet}$ events* and thus helps to identify these subprocesses.

Furthermore, *working at large Q_T (and $\tau \neq 0$) automatically selects scattering of a highly virtual photon on an almost real photon target* at the subprocess level:

(i) the photon at the elastic vertex (Q_2 , say) remains almost on-shell ($Q_2^2 \lesssim m_p^2$) since the elastic proton (dipole) form factor strongly cuts off higher Q_2^2 in addition to the propagator effect $\propto 1/Q_2^4$,

(ii) the second photon (Q_1) in turn, is pulled far off-shell,

$$Q_1^2 \gtrsim \mathcal{O}(Q_T^2), \quad (66)$$

simply from kinematics (see appendix for $Q_{1,\text{min}}^2$).

* For historical reasons the correction factor (41) has not been included in figs. 3–5. This may affect somewhat the absolute values of cross sections for $Q_T \lesssim 1$ GeV.




Fig. 3. The (transverse) $\gamma\gamma$ contribution to $p p \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- X$ for different smallish values of Q_T and M as a function of \sqrt{s} . The total contribution (\bullet) as well as its decomposition into the three different components corresponding to both proton vertices being elastic (\blacktriangle), inelastic (\circ) and to the sum of the mixed configurations (\times) are displayed

3.3 RESULTS AT FIXED Q_T AND M

This subsection contains our “realistic” results which are (or will be in due time) accessible to experiment.

Let us first point out the typical features of the two-photon Q_T distributions for fixed M . In fig. 5 we display $d^3\sigma/dM^2 dQ_T^2 dY|_{Y=0}$ for $0.1 \leq Q_T \leq 7$ GeV at fixed $M = 3$ GeV and for four values of the energy from $\sqrt{s} = 27$ to 800 GeV. A




Fig 4 The (transverse) $\gamma\gamma$ contribution to $p \bar{p} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- X$ at fixed small $\hat{x}_T \approx x_T / (1 - \tau) = 0.04$ and two values of τ as a function of \sqrt{s} . The decomposition is as in fig 3.




Fig 5 The Q_T distribution of the (transverse) $\gamma\gamma$ contribution to $p \bar{p} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- X$ for $M = 3$ GeV and four energies ($27.3 \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 800$ GeV) at small and intermediate values of Q_T .

conspicuous feature is the very steep forward peak, coming mainly from the elastic-elastic proton vertex configuration (cf. figs. 3a, b). At values of $Q_T \gtrsim 2$ GeV the Q_T distribution flattens out considerably and becomes strongly energy dependent. Whereas at $Q_T = 0.1$ GeV the cross section increases only by a factor ~ 40 over the energy range considered, at $Q_T = 7$ GeV the increase amounts to four orders of magnitude. This effect becomes even more dramatic at higher masses M . Fig. 6 shows an increase by almost six orders of magnitude for $M = 8.5$ GeV and $Q_T = 7$ GeV.

Since we have four variables, Q_T , M , x_F and \sqrt{s} , at our disposal, we cannot possibly present results covering the whole kinematical range.

First generation experiments are obviously most likely to give results at smallish Q_T and M . Therefore, we present first of all in tables 1a–f the $\gamma\gamma$ contribution* to $pp \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- X$ and $pp \rightarrow e^+ e^- X$ at the ISR energy $\sqrt{s} = 63$ GeV, for five values of Q_T ($0.05 \leq Q_T \leq 1.65$ GeV), three values of M ($M = 4, 6, 8$ GeV) and six values of \hat{x}_F ($0 \leq \hat{x}_F \leq 0.8$). These values have been chosen such that integrations over any of the three variables, Q_T , M , and \hat{x}_F , can be performed with reasonable accuracy. In view of experiments at ISABELLE in the near future, we present a similar table, table 2, at $\sqrt{s} = 800$ GeV, with values of Q_T between 0.05 and 52 GeV, values of M ranging from 4 to 100 GeV and $x_F = 0$; the mass range has been chosen sufficiently large in view of experiments designed to measure in the mass region of the weak gauge boson. Notice also, that the two-photon contribution is equal for pp and $\bar{p}p$ collisions.

Let us now confront these $\gamma\gamma$ results with existing ISR data at $\sqrt{s} = 63$ GeV and with QCD estimates of the cross section at higher energies, in particular at $\sqrt{s} = 800$ GeV.

First of all, we compare the calculated $\gamma\gamma$ contribution to recent two-photon candidate events [2] in $pp \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- X$. To this end we integrate the theoretical $\gamma\gamma$ contribution at $\sqrt{s} = 62$ GeV and $x_F = 0.2$ over M from 2.6 to 6.85 GeV and compare the resulting $d\sigma^{\gamma\gamma}/dQ_T dY|_{x_F=0.2}$ to the preliminary data** of ref. [2] in fig. 7. The qualitative agreement is quite encouraging, even though the data seem to be shifted by 200–300 MeV towards larger Q_T in comparison with the theoretical curve. One should, however, keep in mind that the experimental distribution may still have to be corrected [22] for effects of Q_T resolution, which may well result in an horizontal shift of the histogram. The separate theoretical contributions from the elastic-elastic and elastic-inelastic configurations of the $p\gamma X$ vertices are also displayed in fig. 7. Notice that the elastic-inelastic configuration already dominates at $Q_T \simeq 1$ GeV.

* Notice that for small values of Q_T the $e^+ e^-$ cross section is bigger than the $\mu^+ \mu^-$ cross section (due to the electron-muon mass difference); the cross sections merge together around $Q_T \simeq 1.5$ GeV

**In ref [2] raw data for an unnormalized Q_T distribution—integrated over M from 2.6 to 6.85 GeV—at [22] $x_F = 0.2$ were presented. The Q_T acceptance is flat [22] for $Q_T \lesssim 1.8$ GeV. Using the absolute normalization given for $d\sigma^{\gamma\gamma}/dM$ in ref [2], the theoretical ratio $d\sigma^{\gamma\gamma}/dM dY|_{x_F=0.2} / d\sigma^{\gamma\gamma}/dM$ and the assumption that the selected events represent the full $\gamma\gamma$ contribution, we tentatively derived the absolute normalization of the Q_T histogram as shown in fig 7




Fig. 6 The quantity $Q_T^4 \frac{d^3\sigma}{dM^2 dQ_T^2 dY} \Big|_{Y=0} (p \bar{p} \rightarrow (\gamma\gamma)_T X)$ versus Q_T for $M=3$ and 8.5 GeV and four energies ($27.3 \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 800$ GeV). This figure illustrates the dramatic energy dependence at larger Q_T .

Next we come back to our qualitative argument of sect. 1, which leads us to expect a considerable two-photon contribution at very small values of Q_T . Figs. 8 and 9 show that this is indeed the case and that the effect becomes increasingly important for increasing energy. In fig. 8 ISR data [19] for $pp \rightarrow e^+ e^- X$ —integrated over x_F and two mass intervals—are shown. With the help of table 1 the corresponding theoretical $\gamma\gamma$ contributions are obtained. For $Q_T \simeq 0$ and smallish masses $4 \leq M \leq 4.5$ GeV the $\gamma\gamma$ contribution makes up as much as 70% of the $pp \rightarrow e^+ e^- X$ cross section. However, the $\gamma\gamma$ Q_T distribution is so steep that its contribution, averaged over the first Q_T bin, $0 \leq Q_T \leq 0.5$ GeV, is down to 30% and integrated over all Q_T down to a few percent. For somewhat higher masses, $\langle M \rangle \simeq 7$ GeV, the effect is less important ($\sim 25\%$ at $Q_T \simeq 0$).

Whereas at ISR energies the two-photon dominance is restricted to very small values of Q_T , at ISABELLE energies it is more dramatic and extends over the

TABLE 1 (continued)
(c) $\hat{x}_F = 0.2$

$\frac{M}{Q_T}$	4	6	8
0.05	7.1×10^{-3} (1.2×10^{-2})	1.4×10^{-3} (2.2×10^{-3})	4.2×10^{-4} (6.2×10^{-4})
0.45	2.7×10^{-3} (3.9×10^{-3})	6.1×10^{-4} (8.4×10^{-4})	1.9×10^{-4} (2.6×10^{-4})
0.85	5.4×10^{-4} (6.4×10^{-4})	1.5×10^{-4} (1.8×10^{-4})	5.2×10^{-5} (6.1×10^{-5})
1.25	1.4×10^{-4} (1.5×10^{-4})	4.6×10^{-5} (5.0×10^{-5})	1.7×10^{-5} (1.8×10^{-5})
1.65	5.0×10^{-5} (5.0×10^{-5})	1.8×10^{-5} (1.9×10^{-5})	7.0×10^{-6} (7.2×10^{-6})

TABLE 1 (continued)
(d) $\hat{x}_F = 0.3$

$\frac{M}{Q_T}$	4	6	8
0.05	4.5×10^{-3} (7.6×10^{-3})	9.2×10^{-4} (1.4×10^{-3})	2.9×10^{-4} (4.2×10^{-4})
0.45	1.7×10^{-3} (2.5×10^{-3})	3.9×10^{-4} (5.3×10^{-4})	1.3×10^{-4} (1.7×10^{-4})
0.85	3.1×10^{-4} (3.7×10^{-4})	9.2×10^{-5} (1.1×10^{-4})	3.3×10^{-5} (3.9×10^{-5})
1.25	7.6×10^{-5} (8.2×10^{-5})	2.7×10^{-5} (2.8×10^{-5})	1.0×10^{-5} (1.1×10^{-5})
1.65	2.5×10^{-5} (2.5×10^{-5})	1.0×10^{-5} (1.0×10^{-5})	4.2×10^{-6} (4.3×10^{-6})

TABLE 1 (continued)
(e) $\hat{x}_F = 0.5$

$\frac{M}{Q_T}$	4	6	8
0.05	1.2×10^{-3}	2.6×10^{-4}	8.0×10^{-5}
0.45	3.7×10^{-4}	9.6×10^{-5}	3.3×10^{-5}
0.85	5.9×10^{-5}	2.0×10^{-5}	7.9×10^{-6}
1.25	1.3×10^{-5}	5.2×10^{-6}	2.3×10^{-6}
1.65	3.9×10^{-6}	1.9×10^{-6}	8.9×10^{-7}

(f) $\hat{x}_F = 0.8$

$\frac{M}{Q_T}$	4	6	8
0.05	8.1×10^{-6}	2.5×10^{-6}	9.4×10^{-7}
0.45	2.6×10^{-6}	9.3×10^{-7}	3.9×10^{-7}
0.85	3.5×10^{-7}	1.7×10^{-7}	8.2×10^{-8}
1.25	6.4×10^{-8}	3.7×10^{-8}	2.1×10^{-8}
1.65	1.7×10^{-8}	1.1×10^{-8}	6.8×10^{-9}

interval $0 \leq Q_T \leq 1$ GeV for masses ≥ 10 GeV. Fig. 9 shows the $\gamma\gamma$ cross section in comparison with an estimate of the QCD contribution to $pp \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- X$. We used the $O(\alpha_s)$ QCD calculation, corrected for soft gluon radiation to all orders in leading bilogarithmic approximation of ref. [8], normalized as described in subject. 2.4; it is represented by the dashed curve. The encircled dots represent the $O(\alpha_s)$ QCD calculation of ref. [12]; obviously both QCD expressions overlap well down to intermediate values of Q_T (as necessary for internal consistency). We used the two mass values $M^2 = 120$ and 7500 GeV², for which the QCD calculations of ref. [8] are available ($M^2 = 7500$ GeV², i.e. $M \simeq 87$ GeV, is in the expected Z-boson mass range). At this mass of 87 GeV the $\gamma\gamma$ dominance is dramatic (fig. 9): at $Q_T = 0.3$ GeV the ratio $\gamma\gamma/\text{QCD}$ for the $e^+e^- (\mu^+\mu^-)$ final state is as much as ~ 10 (6.4), averaged over a Q_T^2 bin $0 \leq Q_T^2 \leq 1$ GeV² it is still 3.8 (2.4), whereas the ratio of the Q_T^2 integrated cross sections amounts to 0.25 (0.19) only. At the lower mass of $M^2 = 120$ GeV² ($M \simeq 11$ GeV) the effect is less dramatic, but still significant (fig. 9): for $Q_T \simeq 0.3$ GeV and an $e^+e^- (\mu^+\mu^-)$ pair one finds $\gamma\gamma/\text{QCD} \simeq 1$ (0.7), if averaged from $Q_T^2 = 0$ to 1 GeV² $\langle \gamma\gamma \rangle / \langle \text{QCD} \rangle \simeq 0.77$ (0.46) and integrated over all Q_T^2 the ratio reduces to 0.24 (0.17). The Q_T^2 integrated $\gamma\gamma$ cross sections are in

TABLE 2
Same as table 1 for $\sqrt{s} = 800$ GeV and $x_F = 0$

M/Q_T	4	10 95	52	86 64	100
0 05	1.4×10^{-2} (2.3×10^{-2})	8.6×10^{-4} (1.4×10^{-3})	7.5×10^{-6} (1.2×10^{-5})	1.2×10^{-6} (2.0×10^{-6})	6.9×10^{-7} (1.1×10^{-6})
0 45	1.5×10^{-2} (2.3×10^{-2})	8.9×10^{-4} (1.4×10^{-3})	5.6×10^{-6} (9.1×10^{-6})	7.2×10^{-7} (1.2×10^{-6})	3.8×10^{-7} (6.1×10^{-7})
0 85	4.1×10^{-3} (5.4×10^{-3})	2.5×10^{-4} (3.5×10^{-4})	1.3×10^{-6} (2.0×10^{-6})	1.7×10^{-7} (2.4×10^{-7})	8.6×10^{-8} (1.3×10^{-7})
1 65	7.6×10^{-4} (8.6×10^{-4})	6.8×10^{-5} (8.3×10^{-5})	3.5×10^{-7} (4.5×10^{-7})	3.9×10^{-8} (5.1×10^{-8})	2.0×10^{-8} (2.6×10^{-8})
4	2.7×10^{-5}	6.9×10^{-6} (7.6×10^{-6})	5.6×10^{-8} (6.5×10^{-8})	6.4×10^{-9} (7.4×10^{-9})	3.3×10^{-9} (3.8×10^{-9})
20	$\approx 6.3 \times 10^{-9}$	7.7×10^{-9}	8.1×10^{-10}	1.4×10^{-10}	8.3×10^{-11}
36	$\approx 1.2 \times 10^{-10}$	2.3×10^{-10}	6.5×10^{-11}	1.7×10^{-11}	1.1×10^{-11}
52	$\approx 7.6 \times 10^{-12}$	1.7×10^{-11}	1.0×10^{-11}	3.2×10^{-12}	2.1×10^{-12}

good agreement with the results of refs. [5, 6]. Our analysis of the Q_T dependence has unravelled, however, that *behind a sizeable, but not exciting ratio of the Q_T^2 integrated $\gamma\gamma$ and QCD cross sections, $\int dQ_T^2(\gamma\gamma)/\int dQ_T^2(\text{QCD}) \approx 0.2$, there is hidden a ratio as large as 0.5 to 4 in the Q_T^2 bin $0 \leq Q_T^2 \leq 1$ GeV², depending on M and the $\ell^+ \ell^-$ final state.*

It has been emphasized that an experimental signature for the resummed QCD contribution in leading bilogarithmic approximation is the flat shape [7, 8, 11] or even a turnover near $Q_T \approx 0$ as well as the characteristic dependence [8, 11] of the width of the forward peak on the mass M . Our results show that *this effect* is partly or fully *swamped by the two-photon contribution*.

Fig. 10 shows the mass dependence for fixed $Q_T = 1.83$ and 3.55 GeV and* $4 \leq M \leq 25$ GeV. This figure, together with figs. 12 and 14, which will be discussed in detail later, illustrates the situation for intermediate and large Q_T , $Q_T \gtrsim 1.5$ GeV, say: at ISR energies and larger Q_T the $\gamma\gamma$ contribution is negligible everywhere

* At $\sqrt{s} = 800$ GeV the QCD calculation for $M \leq 10$ GeV is not trustworthy since for values $\sqrt{t} = M/\sqrt{s} \ll 0.02$ the involved constituent distributions (or, related to this, $d^2\sigma/dM dY|_{Y=0}$) are unknown




Fig. 7 The histogram shows the Q_T distribution of $\gamma\gamma$ candidate events [2] in $pp \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- X$ as measured at the ISR for $\sqrt{s} = 62$ GeV and $x_F = 0.2$. The distribution is integrated over the mass interval $2.6 \leq M \leq 6.85$ GeV. The tentative absolute normalization was obtained by us in subject 3.3. For comparison the theoretical prediction for the (transverse) $\gamma\gamma$ contribution is displayed (full curve) as well as its decomposition into contributions from both proton vertices being elastic (dash-dotted curve) and from one being elastic and the other one inelastic (dashed curve).




Fig. 8 ISR data [19] for the cross section $d\sigma/dQ_T^2$ ($pp \rightarrow e^+ e^- X$), integrated over x_F and two different mass intervals. The solid lines denote our calculated two-photon contributions to this process.




Fig 9 Q_T distributions for $pp \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- X$ at $\sqrt{s} = 800$ GeV and $x_F = 0$ for the two mass values used in ref [8], $M^2 = 120$ GeV² ($M \simeq 11$ GeV) and $M^2 = 7500$ GeV² ($M \simeq 87$ GeV). The solid lines (●) and (○) denote the $\gamma\gamma$ contributions to $pp \rightarrow e^+ e^- X$ and $pp \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- X$ respectively and the dashed line denotes the resummed QCD contribution to $pp \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- X$ including soft gluon emission to all orders in leading bilogarithmic approximation. It was given in ref [8] in unnormalized form for $Q_T \gtrsim 0.3$ GeV and normalized by us in subsect 2.4 to the $O(\alpha_s)$ expression of ref [12] (encircled dots) at larger Q_T .

(being of the order of a few percent), whereas at ISABELLE energies it amounts at least to 10% almost everywhere and rises up to 20%, e.g. for $Q_T = 1.83$ GeV and $10 \lesssim M \lesssim 100$ GeV (see figs. 9 and 10). It is still 14% for $Q_T = 3.55$ GeV over a similar mass range.

3.4 RESULTS AT FIXED x_T AND τ

In this subsection we present our two-photon results in comparison with the $O(\alpha_s)$ QCD contribution [12] to $pp \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- X$ as functions of the variables \hat{x}_T (x_T) and $\tau = M^2/s$ [remember $\hat{x}_T = x_T/(1-\tau) = Q_T/Q_{T\max}$]. We do this more for completeness reasons, since smallness of the corresponding cross sections will make measurements unlikely or impossible in most cases. Figs. 11 and 12 show the $\hat{x}_T(x_T)$ distributions for fixed values of τ and \sqrt{s} at $x_F = 0$. For reasons of presentation all cross sections have been normalized to the two-photon cross section at $\sqrt{s} = 27.3$ GeV, which is displayed separately in fig. 11 (at this energy $\mu^+ \mu^-$ data exist for $\tau \lesssim 0.25$ and $\hat{x}_T \lesssim 0.34$).




Fig 10 (a) The quantity $M^4 d^3\sigma/dM^2 dQ_T^2 dY|_{Y=0}(pp \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- X)$ versus M for two intermediate values of Q_T and four energies ($273 \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 800$ GeV). The solid line denotes the (transverse) $\gamma\gamma$ contribution, the dash-dotted one the $O(\alpha_s)$ QCD contribution of ref [12] (b) The ratio $(\gamma\gamma)_T/QCD$ of the quantities in (a)

The following global trend becomes evident from fig. 12. If one keeps any two of the three variables τ , \hat{x}_T and \sqrt{s} fixed and increases the third one, the ratio $\gamma\gamma/QCD$ increases. The $\gamma\gamma$ mechanism becomes important or even dominant if any two of the three variables become large; most dramatic is the effect for large values of τ (modulo uncertainties in the gluon distribution):

$$\gamma\gamma/QCD \approx 100\%, \text{ e.g.}$$

$$\text{at } \sqrt{s} = 63 \text{ GeV for } \begin{cases} (M \simeq 55 \text{ GeV}, & Q_T \simeq 2 \text{ GeV}) \\ (M \simeq 40 \text{ GeV}, & Q_T \simeq 10 \text{ GeV}, \end{cases}$$

$$\text{at } \sqrt{s} = 800 \text{ GeV for } \begin{cases} (M \simeq 700 \text{ GeV}, & Q_T \simeq 10 \text{ GeV}) \\ (M \simeq 400 \text{ GeV}, & Q_T \simeq 240 \text{ GeV}. \end{cases} \quad (67)$$




Fig. 11 The $\hat{x}_T (= x_T/(1-\tau))$ distribution of the (transverse) $\gamma\gamma$ contribution to $p\bar{p} \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-X$ for four fixed values of τ ($0.09 \leq \tau \leq 0.81$) and the lowest energy considered, $\sqrt{s} = 27.3$ GeV

3.5 THE x_F DEPENDENCE

With the exception of table 1 we have restricted our discussion so far to $x_F = 0$. Fig. 13 displays the \hat{x}_F distribution of the $\gamma\gamma$ subprocess for a set of smallish values of τ and x_T and the two extreme energies $\sqrt{s} = 27$ and 800 GeV. The weak energy dependence of the dimensionless quantity $s d^3\sigma / d\sqrt{\tau} d x_T^2 dY$ becomes evident from fig. 13. Fig. 14 shows the $\gamma\gamma$ as well as the QCD contribution versus \hat{x}_F for a set of large values of τ and x_T and all four energies. Table 1 contains, in addition, the \hat{x}_F distribution of the $\gamma\gamma$ mechanism for various smallish values of Q_T and M at $\sqrt{s} = 63$ GeV. From all these results we extract a simple, approximately factorizing behaviour (within a factor of two),

$$\frac{d^3\sigma}{dM^2 dQ_T^2 dY} \Big|_{\substack{\hat{x}_F \lesssim 0.5 \\ Q_T \neq 0}} \approx f(\hat{x}_F) F(M, Q_T, \sqrt{s}), \tag{68}$$

over the \hat{x}_F range relevant for integrations over x_F . This may be useful for an estimate of the \hat{x}_F integrated cross section in kinematical regions not discussed explicitly here.




Fig 12 The $\hat{x}_T(x_T)$ distribution of the (transverse) $\gamma\gamma$ contribution (full curve) to $pp \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- X$ in comparison to the $O(\alpha_s)$ QCD contribution of ref [12] (dash-dotted curve) for four fixed values of τ ($0.09 \leq \tau \leq 0.81$) and four energies ($27.3 \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 800$ GeV). All $\hat{x}_T(x_T)$ distributions are normalized by the $\gamma\gamma$ distribution for $\sqrt{s} = 27.3$ GeV (fig. 11). The lower abscissa refers to the variable $\hat{x}_T = Q_T/Q_{T,max} \approx x_T/(1-\tau)$ (with $0 \leq \hat{x}_T \leq 1$) and the upper one to $x_T = 2Q_T/\sqrt{s}$.

4. Summary and conclusions

We present the differential cross section for the two-photon mechanism

$$p p \rightarrow \gamma\gamma X$$

$$\hookrightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$$

in interesting kinematical regions of the four variables M , Q_T , x_F and \sqrt{s} in the form




Fig. 13 The distribution of the (transverse) $\gamma\gamma$ contribution to $p p \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- X$ in the Feynman type variable $\hat{x}_F = Q_L/Q_{L,max}$ for small values of $\tau = 0.063$ and $x_T = 0.04$ and for the lowest and highest energies considered: $\sqrt{s} = 273$ and 800 GeV

of tables and instructive figures. A comparison with $pp \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- X$ (including

$$pp \rightarrow \gamma\gamma X \quad)$$

$$\quad \quad \quad \hookrightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$$

data at ISR energies and with estimates of the QCD contribution to $pp \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- X$ elsewhere, in particular at very high energies, is performed.

We find important manifestations of the two-photon mechanism. Already at ISR energies and very small Q_T the $\gamma\gamma$ mechanism represents an important fraction (30–70%, depending on M) of the $pp \rightarrow e^+ e^- X$ cross section; but it is negligible at larger Q_T . However, at ISABELLE energies, $\sqrt{s} \simeq 800$ GeV, its influence becomes dramatic: even if one averages over the fairly large Q_T^2 bin $0 \leq Q_T^2 \leq 1$ GeV² one obtains for the ratio of $\gamma\gamma$ to QCD: $\langle \gamma\gamma \rangle / \langle \text{QCD} \rangle = 0.5\text{--}4$, depending on M and the $\ell^+ \ell^-$ final state. Almost everywhere else the ratio still amounts to $\gamma\gamma/\text{QCD} \simeq$




Fig 14 The distribution of the (transverse) $\gamma\gamma$ contribution to $pp \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- X$ (full curve) in the Feynman type variable $\hat{x}_F = Q_L/Q_{L,max}$ in comparison to the $O(\alpha_s)$ QCD contribution of ref [12] (dash-dotted curve) for largish values of $\tau = 0.25$ and $x_T = 0.52$ and four different energies ($27.3 \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 800$ GeV)

0.1–0.2. (For $M \approx \sqrt{s}$, the $\gamma\gamma$ mechanism becomes dominant again; however, the rates are tiny there.)

Altogether, at ISABELLE, the $\gamma\gamma$ contribution becomes a serious background to the QCD contribution in particular for $Q_T \lesssim 2$ GeV. It totally swamps the experimental signature for the resummed QCD contribution in leading bilogarithmic approximation, which predicts a flat shape if not a turnover near $Q_T \approx 0$, as well as a characteristic dependence of the flattening peak on M .

Let us, furthermore, point out that (at $\sqrt{s} = 800$ GeV) the $\gamma\gamma$ contribution also constitutes a sizeable fraction of the background in the search of the Z-boson in $pp \rightarrow l^+ l^- X$.

The two-photon mechanism is also an interesting process in its own right. This paper contains detailed information on the signature and on rates of two photon events in large parts of the kinematical range of the four variables M , Q_T , x_F and \sqrt{s} . There are two tables, for $\sqrt{s} = 63$ and 800 GeV which even allow integration over M or Q_T (or x_F).

The $\gamma\gamma$ mechanism is most easily accessible at small Q_T , where its rates are largest *and* where in addition it tends to dominate the $pp \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- X$ cross section (absolute rates can be improved, of course, by integrating over M and/or x_F).

A further clue for a future experimental isolation of the $\gamma\gamma$ mechanism comes from a decomposition into contributions from the two $p\gamma X$ vertices being both elastic, of mixed (elastic-inelastic) configuration or both inelastic. We find that for $Q_T \lesssim 1$ GeV the elastic-elastic contribution dominates, while for $Q_T \gtrsim 1$ GeV the elastic-inelastic one takes over. Thus, triggering on one elastically scattered proton does not significantly reduce the $\gamma\gamma$ rate, whereas it may considerably reduce the background.

This may be particularly interesting for a possible isolation of the related subprocesses $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow q\text{-jet} + \bar{q}\text{-jet}$ and $\gamma + \text{gluon} \rightarrow q\text{-jet} + \bar{q}\text{-jet}$, for which the present work is kind of a ‘warming up’ exercise. Insisting on an elastically scattered proton should, for colour and triality reasons, suppress the huge background from subprocesses like $q\bar{q} \rightarrow \text{jets}$ or $\text{gluon} + q \rightarrow \text{jets}$. Left-over, ‘higher-twist’ subprocesses will decrease much faster with transverse momentum than the subprocesses of interest.

Finally, let us recall some uncertainties inherent in this investigation. As to our two-photon results, the only approximations made were the ‘transverse photon’ approximation (subsect. 2.2) and the parametrization used for the proton structure functions (subsect. 2.3), neglecting resonance fluctuations and scaling violations. As discussed, these approximations should not significantly affect our conclusions. As to the QCD reference cross section, scaling violations in the constituent distribution functions have been ignored as well. Moreover, we recall the uncertainties for very small values of $\tau \ll 0.02$ and also for large $\tau \rightarrow 1$. These limiting regimes of τ involve constituent distributions, where they are badly known.

We are very much indebted to P. Landshoff for inspiring discussions and active collaboration in the early stages of this work. We thank F. Vannucci and J. Field for valuable information about experimental aspects of two-photon physics.

We gratefully acknowledge the warm hospitality of the Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics of Cambridge University and of the Physics Department of Durham University, where much of this work has been done.

One of us (F.S.) thanks the Science Research Council of Great Britain for a Senior Visiting Fellowship during his stay at Cambridge and Durham Universities.

Appendix

In this appendix we give the exact expressions for the integration limits in eq. (28). Again, as in subsect. 3.1, numerical checks have been performed with the expressions below under $x_F \leftrightarrow -x_F$. Using

$$|\mathbf{q}_{i,T}|^2 = \frac{Q_i^2}{x_i} u_i - \varepsilon \left\{ q_i^{02} + \frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_T \frac{Q_i^2}{x_i} \cosh Y + \frac{Q_1^2 Q_2^2}{4m^2 x_1 x_2} \right\}, \quad (i = 1, 2), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

with

$$Q_i^2 = -q_i^2, \tag{A.2}$$

$$\frac{2q_2^0}{\sqrt{s}} = \bar{x}_T \cosh Y - \xi_2 \mp \frac{1}{s} \left(\frac{Q_1^2}{x_1} - \frac{Q_2^2}{x_2} \right), \tag{A.3}$$

$$\xi_2^1 = \frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_T \left(\cosh Y \mp \sqrt{\frac{s-4m^2}{s}} \sinh Y \right), \tag{A.4}$$

$$u_2^1 = x_2^1 - \frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_T \left(\cosh Y \pm \sqrt{\frac{s}{s-4m^2}} \sinh Y \right), \tag{A.5}$$

$$\varepsilon = \frac{4m^2}{s-4m^2}, \quad \bar{x}_T = \sqrt{4\tau + x_T^2}, \tag{A.6}$$

one may express the “triangle” function $\sqrt{-\lambda}$ in the jacobian (20), after a straight-forward but tedious calculation, as

$$\sqrt{-\lambda(Q_T^2, |q_{1T}|^2, |q_{2T}|^2)} = \sqrt{\left\{ \left(\frac{u_2}{x_2} \right)^2 + \varepsilon \left(\frac{x_T}{2x_2} \right)^2 \right\} (Q_2^2 - Q_{2,\min}^2)(Q_{2,\max}^2 - Q_2^2)}, \tag{A.7}$$

with limits of the Q_2^2 integration determined as

$$Q_{2,\min}^2 = \frac{x_2}{2a} (-b \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}), \tag{A.8}$$

where

$$a = u_2^2 + \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon x_T^2, \tag{A.9}$$

$$b = 2 \left[-\frac{Q_1^2}{x_1} u_1 u_2 + \frac{1}{4} x_T^2 \left((2 + \varepsilon) \frac{Q_1^2}{x_1} - s u_2 + \varepsilon s \xi_2 \right) + \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon s (\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2) u_2 \right], \tag{A.10}$$

$$c = \left(s \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^2 - \frac{u_1 Q_1^2}{x_1} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon s \left[\frac{x_T^2 Q_1^2}{x_1} \xi_1 + s \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^2 (\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2) - \frac{u_1 Q_1^2}{x_1} (\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2) \right] + \left(\frac{1}{4} \varepsilon s (\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2) \right)^2 + \varepsilon \left(\frac{x_T Q_1^2}{2x_1} \right)^2. \tag{A.11}$$

The equation $b^2 - 4ac = 0$, being quadratic in Q_1^2 , leads to the following limits of the Q_1^2 integration:

$$Q_{1\text{min}}^2 = \frac{x_1}{2A} (-B \mp \sqrt{B^2 - 4AC}), \quad (\text{A.12})$$

with

$$A = 4\left(\left(\frac{1}{2}x_T\right)^2 - u_1u_2\right) + \varepsilon(x_T^2 - (u_1 + u_2)^2), \quad (\text{A.13})$$

$$B = s\left[4u_2\left(u_1u_2 - \left(\frac{1}{2}x_T\right)^2\right) - 2\varepsilon\xi_2u_1u_2 + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon x_T^2(u_1 - u_2 + 2\xi_2) - 2\varepsilon\xi_1u_2^2 + \varepsilon(\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2)(u_2 + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon(u_1 + u_2)) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2x_T^2(\xi_2 - \xi_1)\right], \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$$C = \varepsilon s^2\left[-\left(\left(\frac{1}{2}x_T\right)^2 + \xi_2u_2\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon(\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2)\left(\left(\frac{1}{2}x_T\right)^2 + \xi_2u_2 - \frac{1}{8}\varepsilon(\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2)\right)\right]. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Let $u_1^{(\pm)}$ be the roots of the equation $B^2 - 4AC = 0$, quadratic in u_1 .

$$u_1^{(\pm)} = \frac{1}{2\alpha} (-\beta \pm \sqrt{\beta^2 - 4\alpha\gamma}), \quad (\text{A.16})$$

and

$$\alpha = u_2^4 + \varepsilon u_2^2\left(\left(\frac{1}{2}x_T\right)^2 - \xi_2u_2\right) + \varepsilon^2\left(\frac{1}{4}u_2^2(\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2) - \left(\frac{1}{2}x_T\right)^2\xi_2u_2\right) + \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^3\left(\frac{1}{2}x_T\right)^2(\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2), \quad (\text{A.17})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \beta = & u_2^3\left[-\frac{1}{2}x_T^2 + \varepsilon\left(-\xi_1u_2 - \left(\frac{1}{2}x_T\right)^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2)\right)\right] + \varepsilon\left(\left(\frac{1}{2}x_T\right)^2\xi_2u_2^2 - 2\left(\frac{1}{2}x_T\right)^4u_2\right) \\ & + \varepsilon^2\left[-\frac{1}{4}u_2^3(\xi_2 - \xi_1)^2 + \frac{1}{4}u_2^2\xi_2(\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2) + \frac{1}{8}x_T^2(\xi_2 - 3\xi_1)u_2^2 - \left(\frac{1}{2}x_T\right)^2\frac{1}{2}(\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2)u_2 - \left(\frac{1}{2}x_T\right)^4(u_2 - \xi_2)\right] \\ & + \varepsilon^3\left[u_2^2\frac{1}{8}(\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2)(\xi_2 - \xi_1) - u_2\left(\frac{1}{2}x_T\right)^2\frac{1}{4}(\xi_2 - \xi_1)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2}x_T\right)^4\frac{1}{2}(\xi_2 - \xi_1) + \left(\frac{1}{2}x_T\right)^2\xi_2\frac{1}{4}(\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2)\right] + \varepsilon^4\left(\frac{1}{2}x_T\right)^2\frac{1}{8}(\xi_2 - \xi_1)^2(\xi_1 + \xi_2), \quad (\text{A.18}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \gamma = & \left(u_2 \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^2 \right)^2 + \varepsilon \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^2 \left[\xi_1 u_2^3 + \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^2 u_2^2 + u_2^2 \frac{1}{2} (\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2) + \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^4 \right] \\
 & + \varepsilon^2 \left[-u_2^3 \frac{1}{4} (\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2) (u_2 + \xi_1) + u_2^2 \frac{1}{2} (\xi_2 - \xi_1) \right. \\
 & \quad \times \left\{ -u_2 \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^2 + \frac{1}{8} (\xi_1 + \xi_2)^2 (\xi_2 - \xi_1) + \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^2 (\xi_2 - \xi_1) \right\} \\
 & \quad \left. + \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^4 \left(\xi_1 u_2 + \frac{1}{2} (\xi_1^2 + \xi_2^2) + \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^2 \right) \right] \\
 & + \varepsilon^3 \left[\frac{1}{4} (\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2) \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (\xi_2 - \xi_1) u_2^3 + u_2^2 \frac{1}{4} (\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2) - \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^2 \xi_1 u_2 \right. \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \left. + \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^2 \frac{1}{4} (\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2) \right\} - \frac{1}{2} (\xi_2 - \xi_1) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. \times \left\{ \xi_1 u_2^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^2 + u_2 \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^4 - \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^4 (\xi_2 - \xi_1) \right\} \right] \\
 & + \varepsilon^4 \frac{1}{4} (\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2) \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^2 \left[u_2 \frac{1}{2} (\xi_2 - \xi_1) + \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^2 \frac{\xi_2 - \xi_1}{\xi_2 + \xi_1} + \frac{1}{4} (\xi_2^2 - \xi_1^2) \right],
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{A.19}$$

then the limits of the x_1 integration, depending on x_2 , are given by [using eq. (A.5)]

$$\begin{aligned}
 x_{1,\min} &= \max(u_1^{(+)}, u_1^{(-)}) + \frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_T \left(\cosh Y + \sqrt{\frac{s}{s - 4m^2}} \sinh Y \right), \\
 x_{1,\max} &= 1.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{A.20}$$

In the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the complicated expressions (A.16)–(A.20) reduce simply to

$$\begin{aligned}
 x_{1,\min} - \frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_T e^Y = u_1^{(+)} = u_1^{(-)} &= \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^2 / u_2 \\
 &= \left(\frac{1}{2} x_T \right)^2 / \left(x_2 - \frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_T e^{-Y} \right).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{A.21}$$

Finally, the limits of the x_2 integration are obtained by the substitution

$$x_{2,\min} = x_{1,\min} (\xi_2 \leftrightarrow \xi_1, u_2 \rightarrow u_1(x_1 = 1)),
 \tag{A.22a}$$

in eqs. (A.20), (A.21) and

$$x_{2,\max} = 1.
 \tag{A.22b}$$

References

- [1] Ch Berger, Proc Int Workshop on $\gamma\gamma$ collisions, Amiens, April 8–12 (1980) p 82,
W Wagner, Talk at 20th Int Conf on High-energy physics, Madison, Wisc, July 17–23, 1980
- [2] CERN-Harvard-LAPP-MIT-Naples-Pisa Collaboration, F Vannucci, Proc Int Workshop on $\gamma\gamma$ collisions, Amiens, April 8–12 (1980) p 238
- [3] M-S Chen, I J Muzinich, H Terazawa and T P Cheng, Phys Rev D7 (1973) 3485
- [4] V M Budnev, I F Ginzburg, G V Meledin and V G Serbo, Sov J Part Nucl 4 (1973) 100, Phys Reports 15 (1975) 181
- [5] C Carimalo, P Kessler and J Parisi, Phys Rev D18 (1978) 2443
- [6] R Moore, Z Phys C5 (1980) 351
- [7] Yu L Dokshitzer, D I D'Yakonov and S I Troyan, Phys Lett 78B (1978) 290, 79B (1978) 269, Phys Reports 58 (1980) 269
- [8] G Parisi and R Petronzio, Nucl Phys B154 (1979) 427,
G Curci, M Greco and Y Srivastava, Phys Rev Lett 43 (1979) 834, Nucl Phys B159 (1979) 451
- [9] C L Basham, L S Brown, S D Ellis and S T Love, Phys Lett 85B (1979) 297
- [10] C Y Lo and J D Sullivan, Phys Lett 86B (1979) 327
- [11] S D Ellis and W J Stirling, Univ Washington, Seattle, preprint, RLO-1388-821 (1980)
- [12] K Kajantie and R Raitio, Nucl Phys B139 (1978) 72
- [13] G Altarelli, G Parisi and R Petronzio, Phys Lett 76B (1978) 356
- [14] E D Bloom and F J Gilman, Phys Rev D4 (1971) 2901
- [15] G Fox, Nucl Phys B131 (1977) 107
- [16] B Schrempp and F Schrempp, Z Phys C6 (1980) 7
- [17] J K Yoh et al, Phys Rev Lett 41 (1978) 684
- [18] U Becker et al, CERN-Harvard-MIT-Naples-Pisa Collaboration, Proc Int Conf on High-energy physics, Geneva, 1979, vol 2, p 779
- [19] C Kourkoumelis et al, Athens-BNL-CERN-Syracuse-Yale Collaboration, Phys Lett 91B (1980) 475
- [20] A L S Angelis et al, CERN-Columbia-Oxford-Rockefeller Collaboration. Proc Int Conf on High-energy physics, Geneva, 1979, vol 2, p 770
- [21] A J Clark et al, Nucl Phys B142 (1978) 29
- [22] F Vannucci, private communication